

After the Keynesian paradigm and the paradigm of Economic Liberalism, the essential place of SSE in a new paradigm for the twenty-first century

Pierre Bauby

Since the Second World War, we have seen, **two structuring paradigms** of organization and regulation of societies, in Europe in particular : the *Keynesian* paradigm and the paradigm of *Economic Liberalism*

In the framework of each nation-state, the **Keynesian paradigm** has been based on dynamic inter-relationships between economic and social approaches, with a major role for national, regional and local public authorities to boost and regulate their interventions. It led to the rapid growth after the post-war period

However, from the middle of the 1970s, economic crisis developed. It was not only a cyclical or cyclical crisis of overproduction or over accumulation, it was also a question of the exhaustion of Fordism, in particular because of the **contradiction between a mode of regulation in the framework of each nation-state and the growing internationalization** of economies and societies, with in particular the process of European integration.

Since the 1980s, the state and the public authorities can no longer be analyzed in the context of nation-states alone, but by taking into account the **dual process of decomposition-recomposition** that is working on them, with on one side the microsocial and territorial, and, on the other side globalization

A profound **ideological reversal** took place, with the return of arguments in favour of a "minimal state", essentially focused on 'regalian' and security issues, limiting its economic action to the protection of competition

The new **neo-liberal economic paradigm** was based on faith in the virtues of the market and competition to organize, structure and regulate society

The only function and function of the **State** should be to defend borders (survival), to maintain public order (the police) and to enforce the rules of the social game (justice). When it goes beyond these functions, it causes more damage than benefits and it necessarily restricts the freedom of people and citizens

From the 1980s, this second structuring paradigm quickly showed its limits and unacceptable apologies, in each country as well as on the global level.

The free market and competition - which also requires organization and regulation by public authorities - spontaneously led to the development of **series of polarizations**

economic (concentrations leading to monopolies or oligopolies that can abuse their dominant positions),

social (growing inequalities),

territorial (metropolisations, desertifications, gentrifications),

environmental (by increasing externalisations),

generational (privileging the short term),

financial (commodification of all human activities)

Last ten years, the succession of these two paradigms has led to economic, political, ideological confrontations, to situations where they self-maintain and **refer to each other** - more or less state, state or market , nationalisations or privatizations, etc. - while neither of them today is the bearer of solutions to the essential stakes of the 21st century.

At the same time, this led to the conclusion that while **public enterprises** played an important role in the first paradigm, and large **private companies**, in the second, in the two paradigms, **social economy** has certainly been present and developing, but without playing a major role

Today we are faced with the need to **co-construct a new paradigm** with all stakeholders. The "**common values**" of the European Union on its could play this role, I think.

European construction is not based on a pre-established model that should be followed. It was done step by step, as agreements between the founding states could emerge from combining the interest of each ones and the common interest. We therefore know neither its outcome nor its duration.

Traditionally, the nation-states - as they emerged from the nineteenth century - were based either on a **close relationship** between a territory, a nation, a language, a culture, where the state created the nation (as in the case of France) or on the contrary, the state emerged from the nation (as in the case, in particular, of federal states).

European construction does not suit the same path. It follows a dialectical relationship between **diversity and unity**:

diversity of nations, histories, traditions, languages, territories, institutions, needs, expectations and aspirations, and, at the same time,

unity of a base of "common values" forged in the economic, social, political and cultural history of the European continent, which makes it possible to refer to a "European social model".

At the heart of these **common values**, democracy and human rights play a decisive role. These are the legacy of a long history, political and social movements, "national revolutions", conflicts and wars, dictatorships, concentration camps and gulags ...

For 70 years, they led – accompanied by many uncertainties - to the acceptance of a conflictuality governed by rules, the common values preeminence and the primacy of fundamental rights.

It is by **starting from our social model**, our common values, our civilization, fundamental rights, that we can define what is **essential to us** in globalization, what we must defend and promote

In this new dynamic of a **co-construction of a new paradigm** based on values makes , the ESS may no longer be neither an appendage nor a miracle remedy with hegemonic pretensions, but **one of the solutions**, in close interrelation with on the one hand the **public economy and the private sector**, on the other **the "state" and the "market"**, as it promotes dynamic cooperation between all actors, what can be described as "**coopetition**" (cooperation and competition), to combine territorialized initiatives and active participation, co-construction and co-management, economic, social, environmental and democratic ends.