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The context...

• Economic crisis?
• More than that?
• Technological change and globalization
• Turning point? Interregnum?
• Effects in politics and in policy making? Effects in Democracy?
### Mortgage Evictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Catalunya</th>
<th>Galícia</th>
<th>País Basc</th>
<th>Madrid</th>
<th>Andalusia</th>
<th>Espanya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Los desahucios en España

Evolución Número de desalojos

Acumulado

216.418 desalojos

Fuente: Consejo General del Poder Judicial
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Satisfaction with democracy

Interest on politics
Political Legitimacy
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Government

Functionality

Governance?
Radical democracy?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model of democracy</th>
<th>Priority value</th>
<th>State-society relationship</th>
<th>Forms of participation</th>
<th>Values in participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The three pillars of democracy

Democracy

Representation

Deliberation

Direct Participation
Governance models:

**Civil Society**
+ democracy
   -> Community oriented policies

**Bureaucratic Government**

**Neoliberalism**
+ corporatism
   -> Market oriented policies

- The State is inefficient
- Representative democracy is insufficient
## Democratic quality of governance networks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network features</th>
<th>Low democratic quality</th>
<th>High democratic quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor’s system density</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity of relationships</td>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power relationships</td>
<td>Asymmetric</td>
<td>Symmetric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial positions</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy impacts</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeability</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media impacts</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traditional Government

Representative Democracy
State as a single decision maker and privileged executor
Top-down
Bureaucracy

Participative Governance

Deliberative Democracy
Network Governance: State+Market+Society
Top-down Participation
Citizen engagement in policy making processes

Social Innovation?

Radical Democracy
Contestation and/or collaboration
Bottom-up
Active Implementation
Policy Co-Production
Individuals (Community Participation) vs. Institutions

- Traditional forms of government
- Participatory governance
- Market
- Social Innovation
Social movements participation strategies:
Number of cooperatives

Number of demonstrations
Social evaluation of citizen’s initiatives:

- PAH: 74.00%
- Afectats Preferents: 65.70%
- Sindicats: 23.70%
- Càritas: 86.90%
- ANC: 53.40%
- Bancs d’Aiments: 91.90%
Technological Change/Social Change

• New Interactive and Relational Spaces
• New action dynamics that challenges the traditional mediation/brokerage spaces that are not able anymore to produce added value
• Overcome the idea of addressing the TICs or the Internet as just a “new tool”
• Positive and negative effects of the technological change
Effects on politics and policy-making

- Crisis of the nation-state dimension (territory, population, sovereignty), in a context of globalization dynamics
- Financial capitalism increases (blackmail) capacity over territorialised political enclaves
- More capacity for fiscal evasion and elusion
- Difficulty to maintain post “45” (Socialdemocratic) kind of agreements and alliances (Welfare State, redistributive policies,...)
  - “The classical welfare state is slowly but surely evolving into a participatory society – one, that is, where citizens will be expected to care of themselves, or create civil-society solutions for problems such as retiree welfare” (Williem Alenxander, King of the Netherlands)

Effects on policy-making (actors with new resources, connective action –Arab Spring, 15M, Occupy,...), viral dynamics and politics, techno-politics...
Social Innovation and Power

• Social innovation as the answer? The perspectives of the OCDE, Big Society, Participative Society...Horizon 2020
SOCIAL INNOVATION: CORE DIMENSIONS

• Content dimension: Satisfaction of human needs that are not currently satisfied, either because ‘not yet’ or because ‘no longer’ perceived as important by either the market or the state.

• Process dimension: Changes in social relations, especially with regard to governance, that enable the above satisfaction, but also increase the level of participation of all but especially deprived groups in society.

• Empowerment dimension. Increasing the socio-political capability and access to resources needed to enhance rights to satisfaction of human needs and participation
Social Innovation and Power

• Social innovation as the answer?
• Social innovation and power (Moulaert)
• ¿Towards a new conception of the public?
• Beyond participation: influence, resistance, dissent
• Self-production, P2P, Commons (Polanyi, Ostrom, Bollier, Coop,...)
• Co-producing policy?
Common-based peer production (CBPP)

is an emerging and innovative model of collaborative production

frequently taking place or supported through a digital platform.

It agglutinates a set of diverse areas of activities and set of cases that tend to share
to be characterized by

peer to peer relationships (in contrast to the traditionally hierarchical command and
contractual relationships, and with limited mercantile exchange)

and be developed with commons setting, which generally takes the form of the
open access provision of commons resources

that favors access, reproducibility and derivativeness.
Social innovation in the face of the crisis

Map of social innovation practices in Catalonia
Territorial distribution: a preliminary approach

Horts urbans

Cooperatives de consum

Moviment anti-desnonament
**Reflexiones abiertas**

1. **Innovación social supone un cambio en la definición de los problemas.** Lo que antes era entendido como “normal”, ahora se convierte en una demanda social.

2. **Innovación social es un proceso lleno de interacciones.** Fijar la mirada en los emprendedores sociales no nos deja ver la ecología productiva desde la que emergen respuestas innovadoras.

3. **Los procesos de autorganización social siempre tienen problemas de escala.** Son necesarios mecanismos institucionales (normas convenidas socialmente) para facilitar la escalabilidad.

4. **La innovación social no sustituye** los mecanismos para garantizar condiciones de igualdad. El “solucionismo” no es lo mismo que la garantía universal de los derechos sociales.
“There is, clearly, an unanalyzed “scale problem” at work here. The possibilities for sensible management of common-property resources that exist on one scale, such as shared water rights between one hundred farmers in a small river basin, do not and cannot carry over to problems such as global warming or even to the regional diffusion of acid deposition from power stations” (Harvey, 2011)
THANK YOU!

- JOAN SUBIRATS
- Joan.subirats@uab.cat
- http://igop.uab.cat