

A cross-disciplinary and international perspective about social enterprise

Jean-Louis Laville¹ and Philippe Eynaud²

This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge/CRC Press in THEORY OF SOCIAL ENTERPRISE AND PLURALISM: Social Movements, Solidarity Economy, and Global South on May 2019, available online: <https://www.routledge.com/Theory-of-Social-Enterprise-and-Pluralism-Social-Movements-Solidarity/Eynaud-Laville-dos-Santos-Banerjee-Avelino-Hulgard/p/book/9780367260408>

To cite this paper:

Laville J.L., Eynaud P., 2019, “A cross-disciplinary and international perspective about social enterprise”, in Eynaud P., Laville J.L., Dos Santos L.L., Banerjee S., Hulgard H., Avelino F. (2019), *Theory of social enterprise and pluralism: Social Movements, Solidarity Economy, and Global South*, Routledge Publisher, Oxfordshire, June, pages 44-66.

Introduction

This chapter endeavours to clarify the connections between the idea of social enterprise which is currently the focus of international attention and previous notions: the third sector, the social economy and the solidarity economy. There is a risk of some confusion among these terms in international literature on the subject. To minimise this risk, this contribution aims to distinguish between three approaches to social enterprise, in turn examining the third sector, the social economy and the solidarity economy to point up the salient issues in defining the concept, ranging from ethnocentrism to openness to plurality. Going forward, we think it would be useful as a preamble to go back over a few historical landmarks. They will help to mark off the terrain and help the reader to better understand the backdrop against which social enterprise has emerged—contrasting versions of which are subsequently presented in the three parts of the paper.

One should recall that after the Second World War, an international consensus manifested in the Declaration of Philadelphia in May 1944 acknowledged the need for a new model in which economic development is valid only if it fosters social development. Economic growth is considered as a means, the end goal being social development. From this premise, we saw the instatement of Keynesian policies allowing for public regulation of the economy. This led to a remarkable development of the social state, often referred to as the Welfare State because it includes a generalisation of social security systems as the extension of social policies. In this period, the social economy—seen as the ensemble of non-capitalistic

¹ Professor at the Conservatoire national des arts et métiers (Cnam, Paris), head of the Chair of Solidarity Economy

² Professor at Sorbonne Business School, Université Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne

organisations (nonprofit, cooperative, mutualist)—notwithstanding its economic importance, had difficulty attaining political significance. Its components are fragmented by an institutional architecture based on the separate yet complementary workings of the market and the state: cooperatives compete with other enterprises in the market while mutualists and non-profit organisations are increasingly relegated to act within the confines of the social state.

The market-state synergy led to what is referred to as the Thirty Glorious Years (1945-1975) in Europe (the North). The steady expansion, however, obfuscated continuing economic exploitation and domination. Decolonisation and the denouncing of inequalities destabilised that synergy. The powerful liberation movement among peoples of the South coincided with the eruption of new social movements in the North. Protests movements converged to question the failures in democracy hidden behind the smokescreen of the market-state duality. To sum up some of the most emblematic collective actions, declarations of independence gave rise to a movement of non-aligned countries, ecologists began to question the compatibility of a growth economy, based on unlimited expansion, and the limits of the planet. Feminists denounced continuing gender and race discrimination despite the social equality principle brandished by the Welfare State. It has become obvious that social conflict goes beyond the class struggle. Even though many social movements have been fragmented, the issues they have raised continue to have pertinence through the many social innovations of civil society. Among them are those conceived around the idea of the solidarity economy that renews the notion of social economy, again advocating social change and insisting on the public dimension of initiatives that inherently raise societal questions. In other words, the solidarity economy has invented a mix between the social economy and social movements.

This first cultural crisis, reflecting an erosion of the ideology of progress and demanding new spaces of democratisation, was nonetheless impacted by another eruption: the economic crisis. It is symptomatic to see how the school of thought that proposes to interpret this—commonly labelled neo-liberalism—is built around a reaction against public intervention as well as against collective actions in civil society. The theoreticians, such as Hayek and Friedman, evoke the spectre of an ungovernable society. They maintain that the perverse effects of the state's excesses coincide with the proliferation of pressure groups influencing public authorities, and thus distorting competition. Their project is therefore a primarily political agenda, consisting in limiting democracy to reprioritize competition. This trend is explicit in the Washington consensus which replaced the Declaration of Philadelphia in 1989. As the main benchmark shared by the majority of governments, Keynesian thinking then bowed down to neo-liberalism. Government leaders inspired by the latter prescribe restricting the scope of public intervention, promoting massive deregulation and privatisation. With this same rationale, they also suggest a third sector made up of entities with no voice in the matter but focussed solely on production of goods and services, particularly for the poorest populations. This cursory review suffices to show that the terms third sector, social economy

and solidarity economy are far from interchangeable, and that their differences take on meaning in a period of history in which great changes are eventuating, caught up in cultural and economic crises.

From this starting point, it is easier to situate the notion of social enterprise by showing that its protean significations refer to diverging positions on the above-mentioned concepts, and to eventually contradictory projects. The three versions successively developed below will define more precisely, behind the apparently widespread consensus, which frameworks and types of action are actually being mobilised

1. Social enterprise, the third sector and the new capitalism

In the US, the term social enterprise emerged at the end of the 20th century. Harvard Business School, a pioneer in 1993 through its Social Enterprise Initiative, was joined by other major universities (Berkeley, Columbia, Duke, Yale, etc.). In the wake of this movement, following Dees and Anderson, two schools of thought then emerged: the school of market resources and that of social innovation (Defourny, Nyssens, 2010). But these terms alone cannot suffice to describe the developments at the beginning of the 21st century. While neo-liberalism was at first associated with unbridled competition, it lost credibility and a new wave of protective measures engendered a new rationale, stemming mostly from the realisation that competition in itself is not the whole picture. In contrast to this "cold" mechanism, lauding the virtues of enterprise is seen as a rehabilitation of "warm" values, as was noted by Foucault (2004, pp. 247-248). The second wave of neo-liberalism explicitly adds the social factor to its basic tenet, competition. From this point, the representation spread that attaining a social objective assumes the standardisation of management. It is therefore relevant to add another school to the market resources and the social innovation schools: the social business school. The latter promotes a new normativity, that mirrors private enterprise methods, in the social field.

The rise of managerialism

The type of social enterprise proposed by the market resources school recommends more mobilisation of resources in third sector organisations so they can better accomplish their missions (Skloot, 1987; Young and Salamon, 2002). Proponents of the innovation school insist on the personality of the entrepreneur, an agent of change who acts through companies with a social objective, but which take various forms. At this juncture, the third sector took an initial step towards enterprises with social attributes, for instance through charitable corporate sponsorship or corporate social responsibility.

The lines are further blurred by the social business school that combines the previous two but adds a hitherto unseen virtue of management, meant to control the effectiveness and efficiency of invested resources. The social impact is presented in terms of quantifiable measures meant to attract capital contributors, arguing that a social objective is within reach

of a vast number of organisations, provided that they adopt private-sector management methods. This school can be considered as the school of managerialism, founded on the belief in the virtues of management to resolve social problems. Managerialism is, essentially, a "system of describing, explaining and interpreting the world through management categories" (Chanlat, 1998). This is to say that it prioritises performance, instrumental rationality and auditability (Avare, Sponem, 2013, p. 142).

The chief proponents of this school, Yunus and other theoreticians, play on those emotional springs referred to in Hayek to favour an enterprise oriented towards causes rather than towards profit but functioning according to the principles of management prevalent in a traditional enterprise (Yunus, 2008, pp. 52-53). They forget about the political questions inherent to associations and argue that a half-developed capitalistic structure harbours a social business capable of covering its costs entirely (Yunus, *op.cit.*, pp. 48-54). The non-distribution of surpluses should therefore be linked to self-financing to redeploy associative action and introduce "the advantages of competitive markets in the field of social progress" (*ibid.*, p. 60). The warmth mentioned above is perceivable in the enthusiastic phrase: "When the social-business concept becomes well known and begins to spread to all the free-market economies of the world, the flood of creativity that this new business channel will unleash has the potential to transform our world" (Yunus, *op.cit.*, p. 74).

The social business advocated by Yunus boasts a managerial approach aligned with capitalist enterprises, going as far as constituting a new capitalism with a social goal in partnership with large groups mindful of their social responsibility. Such social enterprise rhetoric harbours a mimetic and normative isomorphism. Objective and neutral on the surface, it turns out in fact to be motivated by a utilitarian rationalism, performance-oriented in the tools it prescribes, such as bottom-of-the-pyramid marketing, and impact metrics based on a double or triple bottom line. To this are added initiatives leading to the financialisation of social action through *social impact bonds* with extensions into culture (Hearn, 2014) and into international solidarity (Faber, Naidoo, 2014).

The moralisation of capitalism

The first characteristic of this version of the social enterprise lies in the parallel between capitalism and neo-capitalism. In the 19th century, the naturalisation of capitalism as the modern economy was underpinned by the assumption of its ability to procure wealth for nations and populations. As this promise failed to deliver, a philanthropic trend emerged wherein capitalistic development was necessarily associated with compassion for society's poorest people, indispensable to controlling their behaviour. This "moralisation of the poor" according to Thompson (1988) reduced the social issue to a focus on poverty. We find this same two-phase development in neo-capitalism. Whereas at the end of the 20th century neo-capitalistic arguments first focused on reinstating worldwide competition, the beginning of the 21st century saw the emergence of a social enterprise rhetoric. Targeting beneficiary

groups, it re-introduces a form of paternalism towards them. With the millennium objective at the beginning of the 21st century, strategies to reduce poverty supersede structural adjustment programmes that had become popular in the wake of the Washington consensus. The rhetoric has indeed adopted inclusion, empowerment and economic security, but without going back on market deregulation and macro-economic austerity policies (Bacqué, Biewener, 2015, p. 91). In this model, market access provides the answer to what were considered individual problems (Brown, 2006, p. 690). The sole purpose of social enterprise is to generate apprenticeships and facilitate skills acquisition at the micro level, without considering the allocation of resources on the macro level.

As a consequence, the second important characteristic is that the enterprise itself is put forward as the mode of action, to such a point as to make one wonder, with Laval (2007), if it has not become the sole legitimate form of collective action. In any event, it is part of a uniform levelling of the world, reducing all other forms of expression of civil society to a bygone mode. This symbolic invalidation again calls to mind the kind of centuries-long neglect of indigenous cultures and economies, all of which were assimilated to backwards forms of organisation to legitimise the confusion between capitalist economics and modernity. This attention to enterprise reflects the image of the social entrepreneur, who is seen as a rational actor, committed, who manages the social enterprise from the dual perspective of the social and economic realms.

The third characteristic stems logically from the second. The argument used is a plea for private initiative, combining responsiveness and proximity, as opposed to public initiative identified with bureaucracy. Grouping together civil society and enterprises was encouraged in the UK, where the two were combined in the idea of an independent sector in the 1980s, then a Big Society in the 2000 years. The consequence as noted by Defourny and Nyssens (2013) can be "a process of hierarchisation and selection of social challenges depending on the extent to which they can be treated in an entrepreneurial and marketing mode".

Following this logic, and this is the fourth characteristic, the choice offered is the direct opposite of the Social State. Solidarity no longer emanates from a set of rules defined by representative democracy; it is rather an enlightened action of private operators, enterprises, patrons or foundations. The private solution to the social problem leads to its depolitisation. It can even throw democracy off course towards a plutocracy if we consider the concerns expressed by Barkan (2013), which are borne out by the power of certain foundations. As an illustration, the annual budget of the Gates foundation is twice that of the WHO (World Health Organisation), consequently weighing heavily on choices of international public health priorities, which raises the question of its legitimacy.

A focus on philanthropy

This observation does not mean that modes of co-operation among enterprises, public authorities and civil society should be excluded. However, it does point up a necessary vigilance as to what kind of agenda could motivate such partnerships, formed by private interlocutors strictly for financial reasons. Above all, this approach to social enterprise discourages any reflection on problems of power. It opts for empiricism and eschews any theory which is not management-oriented or outside the economic mainstream. It neglects the macro-economic argument, and especially sociological and anthropological data on the structure of societal relationships. It proves to what extent the social enterprise solution is contextualised and, in this case, fashioned by the most popular Anglo-Saxon modes of thinking. The focus on private actors coupled with micro-economic reasoning point up the cultural bias that views social enterprise only through its function. Minimising the third sector, this vision of social enterprise is ultimately absorbed entirely into the new capitalism, of which it is simply the social component.

In this choice, social enterprise is faced with the inexorable tension between capitalism and democracy that Habermas refers to when choosing capitalism. In a period when people heavily impacted by globalisation voice profound uncertainties about the economic system, this version seeks to pacify society with a remake of philanthropy, thereby eluding political conflict. It substitutes managerial logic for actions in defence of human rights.

2. Social enterprise and the social economy

This second version is noteworthy for its combining the social goal with internal functioning. Managerial standardisation is secondary, and emphasis is put more on diversity among types of enterprise and property rights.

The EMES Network worked to construct this second ideal-type as understood in Weber (1965), e.g., to establish types of enterprises based on their most basic dimensions, to be used as benchmarks for comparing entities under observation. Two aspects were defined to start with: economic and social (Defourny, 2001, pp. 16-18) before three types emerged: economic, social and governance, each one corresponding to three indicators developed by Defourny and Nyssens (2013, pp. 13-15).

A broader approach

The EMES network proposes certain indicators, among which the economic factors are:

- A continuous production of goods and/or selling services: Production is the reason—or one of the principal reasons—for the existence of social enterprises. Unlike some traditional non-profits, the major activity of social enterprises is not advocacy or redistributing financial flows (as is the case, for instance, of many foundations). Instead, they are directly involved in the production of goods or provision of services to people on a continuous basis."

- A significant level of economic risk: The founders of a social enterprise assume totally or partially the inherent risk. Unlike most public institutions, their financial viability hinges on the efforts of their members and workers to secure adequate resources.
- A minimum amount of remunerated work: Like traditional non-profit organisations, social enterprises can use monetary or non-monetary resources, as well as paid employees and volunteers. However, a minimum number of remunerated jobs is required of a social enterprise."

The Social indicators are described as:

- An explicit aim to benefit the community: One of the main objectives of social enterprises is service to the community or to a specific group of people. In the same perspective, a feature of social enterprises is their desire to promote a sense of social responsibility at the local level.
- An initiative emanating from a group of citizens: Social enterprises are the result of collective dynamics involving people who belong to a community or group that shares a well-defined need or aim; this collective dimension must be maintained over time in one way or another, even if difficulties sometimes arise, especially when individuals leave after having filled an important role in the creation or leadership of the organisation.
- Limited profit distribution: Social enterprises are often organised in the form of associations which cannot distribute any profit among their members or directors. Or, like co-operatives in many countries, they can distribute a limited amount of earnings—thereby avoiding profit-maximising behaviour.

The governance indicators are connected to:

- A high level of autonomy: Social enterprises are created by a group of people on the basis of an autonomous project, and they are governed by these people. They may depend on public subsidies, but they are not managed, directly or indirectly, by public authorities or other organisations (federations, private firms, etc.). They have both the right to take up their own position ("voice") and to terminate their activity ("exit").
- A decision-making power not based on capital ownership: This criterion generally refers to the principle of "one member, one vote" or at least to a decision making process in which voting rights in the final decision-making body are not allotted according to capital shares. Although the capital owners obviously have their say, decision making is generally shared by all stakeholders.
- A participatory dynamic involving various parties affected by the activity: Representation and participation of users or customers, influence of various stakeholders on decision making and a participative management often constitute important characteristics of social enterprises. In many cases, one of the aims of social enterprises is to further democracy at the local level through economic activity.

The promotion of democratic solidarity

The primary feature of this second version of social enterprise is that it enlarges the social question, taking into account not only the poverty problem, but also factors of inequality. Rooted in the social economy, with its diversifications influencing its historical forms from co-operatives through mutualists and associations, the social enterprise stands apart from the philanthropic reference. Its designated place is part of the history of democratic solidarity, of collective actions led by free and equal citizens in the eyes of the law seeking a common good. Moreover, the inequalities tackled by social enterprises in this second manifestation are not only social in nature, but might concern cultural discriminations or environmental damage which also jeopardise equality under the law.

The reference to organisation and collective entrepreneurship replaces the examination of the leader's personality. Related to the 'commons' as defined by Ostrom, the social enterprise in this case is governed by norms that are validated by the collective, and can be extended, according to Bacchiega and Borzaga (2001) to co-ownership by several stakeholders. This has been translated concretely into recent legislation on social co-operatives in several countries. Social enterprise is not expanding exclusively by promoting best commercial practices, seeking foundation support or emulating entrepreneurs. It is open to articulation with public policy. In the second option, when foundations are solicited, they do not define the courses of action, they complete the public action while examining its limitations and shortcomings.

Inscribed in the lineage of the social economy, the social enterprise reflects its heritage: insistence on collective property and combining association and enterprise. Limitations are encountered due to its concentration on the organisational dimension. Although the specific type of enterprise is made clear through the limits imposed on profit distribution and the powers attributed to capital ownership, the type of economy proper to the collective enterprise is only sketchily defined. Its solidarity is indeed democratic in nature due to the role ascribed to collective help and co-operation, distinguishing it from philanthropy. However, its underpinnings are not so clear, as it relies on two types of interest, either mutual or general. Collective enterprise has been placed at the centre of social economy theorisation by virtue of the inherent trust in organisation as a vector of change, but the definitions of the economics and solidarity on which it is founded remain vague.

In addition, there is some uncertainty over political mediation. Its operation is sometimes qualified as democratic based on the sole criterion of equality among members. This necessary condition is not sufficient to trigger social change. It would be useful to continue examining modes of action capable of strengthening internal collective ownership and authorise negotiations on the institutional framework.

The difficult integration of Southern entities

The approach to social enterprise voiced by EMES does not really take account of all facets of international reality. Although Africa, South America and Asia have also seen such organisations deployed, they have not had enough say in their conceptual deployment. Therefore, it is essentially the Western approaches described below that have been applied there.

As admitted by EMES from the start, these approaches need to be adapted to reflect the evolution of various practices, in Europe and elsewhere. The diversity of intercultural dialogue is a necessary risk. Spatial and temporal considerations regarding the magnitude of the phenomenon lead one to gamble on diversity and intercultural dialogue. This openness has had some incidence on the European approach to the social enterprise, on combining of economic principles and co-ordinating them with public policies that determine criteria for production, autonomy and risk. It is continuing thanks to activities co-organised with the South American research network, RILESS (*Red de investigadores latinoamericanos de economía social y solidaria*) and with the inclusion of non-European members into the EMES network. Several international conferences and platforms have been set up to allow for more exchanges made possible by the ICSEM project (International Comparative Social Enterprise Models).

In this respect, the epistemology of the South may prove relevant because it abandons the monopoly of "dominant visions of western modernism" to take in "subordinate versions reduced to silence" (Santos, 2011, p. 33), which stems from a sociology of absences and emergences. The sociology of absences consists in an inquiry explaining that what does not exist is in fact actively produced as non-existent., i.e., as a non-credible alternative to what exists. The sociology of emergences addresses alternatives identified as real possibilities. It extends the present by adding realistic future possibilities to existing reality, and the hopes engendered by those possibilities. The point is to expand, symbolically, the importance of knowledge, practices and actors with a view to identifying trends that will emerge in the future (Santos, 2016).

This means drawing attention to social histories that have been denied or neglected, and taking them into account. This view is not limited to certain regions of the world. Southern countries have certainly been the most affected by various forms of ostracism and discrimination, but the South exists in the North as well, as do oligarchies in the South that profit from the dominant order. The epistemology of the South addresses, in a comprehensive manner, not only life experiences in the geographical South, but all those which have been structured by dominant frameworks of analysis, in order to understand them in an intelligible framework.

3. Social enterprise and the solidarity economy

The theorisation of the solidarity economy was initiated jointly in South America and Europe (Singer, 2006; Eme, Laville, 2006; Laville, Gaiger, 2009), expanding on the theoretical tenets of the social economy with particular attention to economics and policy in a substantive sense in order to differentiate it from the concepts that pervaded the literature of the 20th century.

A substantive approach

The orthodox approach to economics can be qualified as formal. Rareness occupies the central place in the analysis, with material interest as the motivation of individual choices. The compatibility of the two is ensured by the dynamics of supply and demand. The formula reveals an economic sophism, confusing economics and market mechanisms. However, there is another more substantive approach to economics based on several principles of economic behaviour (the market exists, but so do redistribution, reciprocity and domestic administration). It was Polanyi (2008, 2011) who brought out these differences between the two approaches and synthesised anthropological observations that comforted and consolidated the unorthodox proposition of a substantive economy. Focussed on a critique of modernity as a market society, he nonetheless refrained from reliance on this pluralistic analysis to understand contemporary economies. The contributions of South-American authors are decisive in this regard, particularly with respect to the notion of the popular economy, which constituted one of the essential bases for the genesis of the solidarity economy (Coraggio, 2011, Quijano, 2008, Razeto, 1993).

As concerns the political aspect, an early school of thought refers it to public authorities. To wit, in a democratic society there must be a monopoly on legitimate violence, using Weber's term, i.e., a coordinating body to ensure that society does not amount to a warlike free-for-all, and that society's rules are complied with. However, a second school of thought insists that the political arena contains public spaces where people come together to define the rules governing their common world. Paralleling what was said for the economy, integration of public spaces in politics authorises the shift from a formal concept, centred around representational democracy, to a substantive definition that takes citizen participation into account. The importance of public spaces is emphasised in the political philosophy of North America, in Fraser (2005) and South America in Avritzer (2002), as well as in Europe with Arendt (1961) and Habermas (1993). This orientation stands apart from a reductive paradigm based on the expression of individual preferences, which interprets democracy through a selection of options to be voted upon. It enlarges the political process to encompass forums that emanate from a deliberative model accentuating the subjectivity involved in forming opinions and decisions. Where western conceptions influenced by Arendt favour an autonomous political theory, wary of perversion by the economy, South-American authors such as Sousa Santos and Rodriguez Garavito (2013) cross the lines that separate the political and economic spheres. Extending the reasoning of Fraser (2005, pp. 107-144) by which

popular public spaces necessarily address socio-economic questions, they analyse initiatives to improve daily life via democratic and socio-economic processes which cannot be dissociated.

Addressing these issues, twelve researchers from four continents have worked to lay out the steps of a process more reflective of multiculturalism in elaborating a social enterprise. Coraggio et al. (2016) provide a basis for reflection compatible with the theories put forth in the second version mentioned above, as they proceed from the same criteria. Reformulating those criteria, this work nonetheless encourages further research. The underlying hypothesis is that concepts reflect a context, and that the variety of situations should lead to questioning existing theories instead of merely adapting pre-established frameworks. This third version, therefore, calls for a reformulation of the nine criteria of the ideal-type elaborated by EMES. As this is an emerging concept, a longer development is needed to further analyse the questions it raises.

Reframing the indicators

- Firstly, the economic indicators initially proposed by the EMES network were influenced by the discussion on the solidarity economy. As stipulated in a theoretical socio-economic approach (Laville, Nyssens, 2001, pp. 312-332), the role of hybridisation among economic principles was emphasised. Seeking resources to achieve a project supposes going beyond the market and redistribution, which alone will not suffice. Without neglecting leeway inherent in institutional constructions embodying those two principles, it is important to add to them the resources gathered from reciprocity (Servet, 2013), as well as from householding (Hillenkamp, 2003). Of course, these two principles themselves do not convey a desire for equality, but a comprehensive vision encompassing productive and reproductive spheres opens the way to the right conditions, allowing the symmetry and sharing inherent to reciprocity and householding to help reduce inequalities. Insistence on this requirement leads to the indispensable deliberation needed to reconcile the economic, social and environmental aspects involved. The consensus on these three aspects in sustainable development, approved in the Earth Summit meetings from 1992 to 2012, was criticised for its lack of clarity regarding decision-making processes—which in a capitalistic enterprise is still reserved for investors. (Van Griethuysen, 2010, pp. 60-79). More than the economic risk of the founders, it is the capacity to decide the hierarchy of these three aspects through deliberation that defines the internal functioning of social enterprises. Witness the collective choice to favour the environment observable in all continents where different types of agriculture come into conflict. Faced with damages of mass-production, actors in eco-farming social enterprises give priority to preserving nature over the long term. Likewise, sending farmers organic seeds that can be freely used and reproduced, considered as part of the

commons, is a reaction to the "*enclosures*" created by the chemical farming industry, that force farmers to purchase privately-owned seeds on a periodical basis. In addition to entrepreneurial risk, the specificity of social enterprises is that they set up economically-oriented activities, to use Weber's term (1995, pp. 101-102, 130), e.g., economic activities considered as a means to other kinds of ends. This version of social enterprise brings forth, above all, forms of popular organisation which were symbolically invalidated after the 19th century in order to naturalise capitalism as the new model of a modern economy. Recovering from that absence after the ousting of the popular economy as archaic, we find its track again without transforming it into a sort of barefoot capitalism (De Soto, 1994), nor fantasising it as an informal market economy (Fontaine, 2014). On the contrary, it signifies a return to embedding economic principles into action (Servet, Hillenkamp, 2015). Resituating the social enterprise in the context of the popular economy can gain strength from an economic anthropology that breaks with the evolutionist belief in development by stages. As observed by Meek (1976), the theory of the four stages of development (hunting, pastoralism, agriculture, then commerce) engendered a story of human development that prevented conceptualising multiple types of economies. Starting from Smith, a radical discontinuity is postulated between the different stages, the first one a sort of scarcity, the last wealth and abundance. As progress in this last phase is tantamount to growth, the previous stages are relegated to the past and have nothing relevant to offer contemporary society. Running counter to evolutionism, the popular economy encompasses economic activities and social practices set in motion by groups of people "with a view to guaranteeing, by using their own labour and available resources, the basic material and non-material needs" (Sarria Icaza, Tiriba, 2006). For this reason, it is, for Coraggio (2006), an economy of work that resists capitalist standardisation and tends towards a pluriversity with its geo-specific singularities. The life-continuing work of its members is combined with the professional training and collective organisation. It is not a minimum amount of paid work that defines the criterion, but multi-dimensional work. Moreover, insertion into a formal framework is no longer essential, as the largest informal social enterprises are in Africa and in South America (Gaiger, 2013). In keeping with feminist studies, it is therefore a priority to co-ordinate production and reproduction, as stated above, and to reject the separation between formal and informal economies.

- Secondly, the social indicators may also being envisaged in a substantive sense. The economy stems from an institutional process that establishes rules governing relationships to the environment and interaction between human beings. The invention of the social dimension in modern societies is one of the results of that process, and thus cannot be limited to an ensemble of quantifiable needs. In the inexorable tension between capitalism and democracy, as understood by Habermas's expression (1998, p.

379), the social is a historical category that engendered a protective body which, in the twentieth century, became the Welfare State. When the dualism between free-market capitalism and the Welfare State is stretched beyond its limits, the emergence of the social enterprise cannot be addressed simply by way of functional logic. It calls into question the autonomous nature of the social category and is not satisfied with simply attenuating the impact of unemployment or exclusion. In the solidarity economy perspective, transformation and reparation dimensions (Blanc, Fare, 2012, p. 76) are intertwined in different ways according to the experiences. These mixes between transformation and reparation also reveal a mutation in the interpretations of social change: the paradigm of revolution that marked the 20th century is followed by the paradigm of transition and *care*, advocating vigilance when passing from the old to the new as well as concern for the other, replacing the obsession with the new and the Promethean view of mankind that it assumes. From this, it follows that the projected changes must let go of the idea of a global alternative and aim for multiple alternatives (Santos and Rodriguez Garavito, 2013, p. 129), and they must also procure an improvement in living conditions (Gaiger, 2006, pp. 350-353; França Filho et al., 2006). This emerging sensitivity converges with the remarks addressed by Southern feminism to Northern feminism, for being too concentrated on questions of identity and unmindful of everyday constraints. In a word, it questions the "all or nothing" protest attitudes so prevalent in traditional western criticism, because it obfuscates "the silent transformations" which contain "the new seeds of possibility" (Jullien, 2009, pp. 156-158). In this version of social enterprise, we find room for autonomy through the self-organisation on which it is based. It touches on the principle of the commons, in the sense that the participative dynamic referred to in the EMES ideal-type translates as an "instituting praxis", or "purposeful institution building" which "above all consists in establishing rules of law" (Dardot, Laval, 2014, p. 440).

- Thirdly, the substantive perspective requires the presence of political indicators. The reconfiguration of the social dimension in these terms indeed assumes a political dimension, which is present in many social enterprises. They are not simply meant to embark on economic activities, they include a public dimension in the sense that they delineate public problems (Cefaï, 2007, pp. 411-466). To see them only as private endeavours would be to deprive them of part their make-up. Therefore, "production spaces but also public spaces and socialisation venues", the initiatives of women can be assimilated neither to cultural movements nor to enterprises. Nonetheless, they have the "particularity of combining to a greater or lesser degree an economic activity and political action" (Guérin, Hersent, Fraisse, 2011, pp. 17-21). Other examples abound. In Europe, there are the social co-operatives of Southern Italy (Bucolo, 2015), the *Régies de quartier* in France (Gardin, 1999), the Animar network in Portugal, all of which work towards the democratisation of social relationships. In South America,

the notion of "*emprendimiento economico solidario*" gives the social enterprise a popular and transforming tone (Gaiger, 2009, p. 181-187). The institutional framework is not fixed and, as recommended by Mendell (2013), its recompositions, as well as the ambiguous processes generated by innovations, need to be studied to determine the links between recognition and normalisation. Coraggio (2015, pp. 233-252) did this for the social and solidarity economy in several countries of South America, pointing up contrasting national itineraries. In Argentina, the social and solidarity economy is a new policy led by an active social State. In Brazil, the solidarity economy is torn between the same kind of perception, aiming at helping the poor and founding a civil rights movement. Innovative institutional practices such as the Bolivian and Ecuadorian constitutions also contain major contributions regarding the legal manifestation of a solidarity economy within a pluralist economy, understood as a means to "living well" (*buen vivir*) (Acosta, 2016, pp. 197-206). In the end, the crux of the solidarity economy and its ensuing social enterprises does not lie solely in economic performance. It encompasses their capacity to modify the institutional framework, bearing in mind that the link between innovation and social transformation is at the heart of the problem (Klein, Laville, Moulaert, 2014; Ferrarini, 2016).

Combining protection and emancipation

Andean philosophies of life as recognised through this reference to *el buen vivir*, such as *sumak qamaña aymara*, converge with the notion of livelihood expressed by Polanyi, combining a preoccupation with the continuation of life and attention to Aristotle's "good life". This affirmation, the symbolic opposite of the growth objective, is obviously difficult to translate into public policy. Two hurdles arise. The first, emblematic of the North, focuses on denouncing half-measures and claiming redress from an unquestioned State (Frère, 2015), while the second, more characteristic of the South, is more open to invention but can veer towards idealised activism (Wanderley, 2015). This is why the dialog between South and North is so essential: surpassing these symmetrical hurdles requires a joint elucidation of the ambiguity inherent to established practices, one which can confront the complexity of reality knowing that change comes slowly, while ensuring that initiatives are not stripped of their social impact.

These original practices lead the social enterprise to deploy the concept of institutional entrepreneurship which, instead of fitting into the existing framework, changes it in order to realise previously neglected potentials (Valéau, 2016). This ability to upset isomorphisms can be likened to a cause-motivated entrepreneurship, in Neveu's sense (2015) which identifies a problem and makes it the subject of public debate. Institutional entrepreneurship is not limited to an individual commitment; it can be exercised collectively as pointed out below through the idea of generating institutions through praxis. More specifically, the sociology of

associations (Laville, Sainsaulieu, 2013) explains this praxis by demonstrating that it relies on actions that merge into projects. In associations—social enterprises in particular—the logic of action can manifest itself through mutual assistance among participants dealing with the same problem, or movements involving actors with the goal of changing society. Action can also be multilateral when various kinds of stakeholders agree on a point of view. Different as they may be, all of these processes of action stem from democratic solidarity. Institutional entrepreneurship ultimately leads to inserting economic activities into political reality. In other words, all interactions between public authorities and society's initiatives entail mutual effects, the intensity and features of which vary considerably over time (Laville, 2000, p. 531 - 550). In an area such as social inclusion, institutional entrepreneurs have demonstrated that they are capable of influencing the orientation of public actions (Laville, Lemaître, Nyssens, 2006, pp. 272-295).

The reference to solidarity already contained in the social economy avoids pitting protection against emancipation in the solidarity economy. While social enterprises have been perceived as vectors of protection for underprivileged populations, the mission of some of such enterprises takes on full meaning only in the sense that they wish to go past traditional or philanthropic caretaking. Going back to the modern commodification movement, Polanyi (1944) demonstrated that it inspired counter-currents in society. Fraser (2013) then pointed out that this protection can allow dominations that sometimes appear benevolent. Or, on the contrary, greater powers of action can facilitate the emancipation (Bacqué, Biewener, 2015) of those concerned. In this threefold movement—commodification, protection, emancipation—the social enterprise, when underpinned by a democratic conception of solidarity, turns out to be a tool for uniting protection and emancipation.

However, social enterprises cannot escape elimination or manipulation if they do not aim towards intermediary public spaces in addition to their own autonomous public spaces. Their specific features help to detect the ways in which "associative relationships" are deployed and maintained in "autonomous public spaces", to use the term employed by Habermas (1993, p. XXXII). They serve for debating and deciding, independently from money- and power-driven systems, on how to live together, and to examine the operation of public surveys, to borrow from Dewey (1915)—a space where citizens can experiment and evaluate on a collective basis. This is the case for the Brazilian Forum of Solidarity Economy, where claims are formulated and negotiations with public authorities are initiated. These circles and forums are indispensable to the associative work of actors, researchers and public decision-makers. As one example, meetings like this made it possible to measure social utility using an original schema rather than standardised impact studies (Gadrey, 2006). Subaltern counter-publics need to define their demands autonomously, but they also need intermediary public spaces to ensure that those demands can influence political decisions, as noted by Fraser (2015).

Conclusion

The international discussion has centred largely around the first two versions of the social enterprise, as witness the positions of the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). As from 1999, the organisation has published literature on the subject that borrows from these two first versions, referring to the social enterprise as "any private activity in the public interest, organised with an entrepreneurial strategy whose main purpose is not the maximisation of profit but the attainment of certain economic and social goals". This composite approach uses key terms that accentuate the impression of a mix between the Anglo-Saxon and European concepts; EMES is cited, but autonomy is assimilated to compliance with market rules, viability and a high level of self-financing. While keeping the idea of responding to "new demands for societal types", identified at the time by the EU Forward Studies Unit with "local development and employment initiatives" (Juan, 2000), the approach relies heavily on social re-integration via economic measures, which maintains the ambiguity. Either social enterprises limit themselves to patching up the increasing lacunae in social equality, specialising in temporary measures for the unemployed to make them more marketable in the future, or they are an original way of fulfilling unsatisfied needs, broadening the diversity of entrepreneurship and economic systems. Notwithstanding the fuzzy definition, it steers clear of any criticism of democracy. Incontestably, if discussions remain circumscribed within the first two western-centred versions, this absence can only persist in the future.

However, the second version harbours another potential. As mentioned, it has already been amended by questions raised by the solidarity economy, which emerged at the same time in the North and the South. It is argued that the stance could continue to develop towards enriching approaches to the social enterprise by taking account of minimised or neglected realities. The ideal-type of social enterprise inferred from the solidarity economy can be developed independently. It can also be interwoven with the initial EMES criteria to yield an ideal-type proper to the social and solidarity economy. What matters above all is to attain a coherent construct based on the plurality of these configurations.

The third version described above is livening up international discussions around the social enterprise. The paradigmatic debate recommended in the epistemology of the South can be resumed in one suggestion, which is to value complexity. It is different from a formal, orthodox methodology relying on restructuring and simplifying realities by isolating its components. The thinking that opens onto complexity goes beyond theorising or deductive reasoning to guide the analysis. Instead it clears a space for the hybridisation reflected in substantive economics, open to a plurality of economic behaviours and substantive democracy in its acceptance of multiple public spaces. This emphasis on hybridisation breaks free from the postulates of modernity (Latour, 2005), and outlines the possibility of another relationship between the sciences and society.

Following this line of thought, conceptualisations of solidarity can be renewed. Solidarity in social enterprises has become too focused on assistance to beneficiaries or the common interests of the members. This variant of solidarity that authorises dependence on assistance, or presents itself as a simple variant of the mutual or general interest, will not suffice. The existing range of social enterprises includes another way to see solidarity which refers to a principle of integration, opposed to power and money as stipulated by Habermas (1990, p. 122). This non-contractual, non-utilitarian democratic solidarity deals with the living world, opposite the systems. It is not a charitable or philanthropic margin correction of systems that would preserve their grip on society. It is a factor of resistance, another form of social and political bond which derives its strength from the indignation triggered by the magnitude of inequalities and injustices. In this spirit, Honneth (2000) makes it one of the three spheres of recognition, along with love and law.

This strong conception of solidarity does not sidestep the public dimension of initiatives, in which economic activities cannot be dissociated from societal convictions. Social enterprises are not simply organisations, they stem from projects underpinned by concepts of legitimacy and the significance of actions. In a profit-oriented private enterprise, decision making is the privileged right of investors. Public services are based on standards established by due process of representative democracy. The social enterprise cannot therefore be reduced to a private or general interest activity, it is the result of a specific entrepreneurship with the accent on its institutional character. To begin with, it is formed according to an institution-generating logic, expressed in rules and stipulations, based on agreement with respect to the goals of collective action. Moreover, it exerts pressure on the institutional framework to fight negative discrimination against experiments that break down barriers erected between the economic and social domains. In other words, social enterprises can challenge instituted social forms through the very recommendations they open to public debate.

This observation leads us to consider anew the topic of the enterprise invading the current worldview. The focus on this form of action could widen the rift between economics and the other social sciences. In an approach integrating both economic and social sciences, would it not be better to bring together what has long been separated, namely enterprise and social movement? Sociologists studying current social trends converge on this subject, with observations contained in this contribution. Pleyers and Capitaine (2016, p. 11) state: "the distinction established in the 1970s and 1980s between traditional movements centred around mass organisations, or those oriented towards redistribution, and 'new social movements' centred around recognition issues, falls short. The revolts of the 2010 years are no longer 'new social movements'. Their demands are deeply intertwined around economic, social, political and cultural causes. This renewal of solidarity, collective action and democracy—under what form and terms remains to be defined" — (op. cit., p. 13) cannot be understood by isolating the enterprise from the overall dynamics. To avoid disciplinary cloistering in economic and

management sciences, examining social enterprises in all their diversity calls for new ways of apprehending the problems, integrating transdisciplinary as much as intercultural approaches.

Table 1 The three conceptual versions of social enterprise

	Third sector and social business	Social economy	Solidarity economy
Objective	Reduce poverty	Promote equality in status (One person, one vote)	Promote equality in action and in living well
Form	Social entrepreneurship	Collective entrepreneurship	Institutional entrepreneurship
Argument	Answers to social challenges according to entrepreneurial feasibility	Combining association of persons with economic activities	Articulate protection and emancipation through deliberation.
Means	Solving the social problem through private initiative	Organising collective ownership	Developing autonomous and intermediary public spaces
Type of solidarity	Dominance of philanthropic solidarity	Democratic solidarity	Democratic solidarity

References

Avare, P. and Sponem, S. (2013). Le managérialisme et les associations. in C. Hoarau, J.L., Laville, *La gouvernance des associations. Economie, sociologie, gestion*, Toulouse, éditions Erès.

Arendt, H. (1961). *Condition de l'homme moderne*, Paris, Calmann-Lévy.

Avritzer, L. (2002). *Democracy and the Public State in Latin America*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Bacchiega, A. and Borzaga, C. (2001). Social Enterprises as Incentive Structures: An economic analysis. in C. Borzaga, J. Defourny (eds), *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*, London and New-York, Routledge.

Bacqué, M.H. and Biewener, C. (2015). *L'empowerment, une pratique émancipatrice?*, Paris, La Découverte.

Barkan, J. (2013). Plutocrats at Work: How Big Philanthropy Undermines Democracy. *Social Research*, 80, pp. 635 – 652.

Blanc, J. and Fare, M. (2012). Les monnaies sociales en tant que dispositifs innovants : une évaluation, *Innovations sociales*, 38.

Bornstein, D. (2004). *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Brown, W. (2006). American nightmare: neoliberalism, neoconservatism and de-democratization. *Political Theory*, vol. 34, n°-, pp. 690 – 714.

Bucolo, E. (2015). Le rôle des coopératives sociales gérant des biens confisqués à la mafia dans la définition d'une politique publique locale : un exemple d'interaction entre pouvoirs publics et initiatives de l'économie sociale et solidaire. *Revue française de socio-économie*, premier semestre, Penser l'économie solidaire. Une perspective internationale.

Cefaï, D. (2007). *Pourquoi se mobilise-t-on? Les théories de l'action collective*. Paris, La Découverte.

- Chanlat, J.F. (1998). *Sciences sociales et management*. Paris, Eska.
- Coraggio, J.L. (2006). Economie du travail. In J.L. Laville, AD. Cattani (dir.), *Dictionnaire de l'autre économie*, Paris, Folio-Gallimard.
- Coraggio, J.L. (2011). *Economia social y solidaria. El trabajo antes que el capital*, Quito, ediciones Alba-Yala.
- Coraggio, J.L. (2015). L'économie sociale et solidaire et son institutionnalisation en Amérique latine : cinq pays, cinq processus. *Revue française de socio-économie*, premier semestre, Penser l'économie solidaire. Une perspective internationale.
- Coraggio, J.L. et al. (2016). The theory of social enterprise and pluralism", in J.L. Laville, D. Young, P. Eynaud, *Civil Society, the Third Sector and Social Enterprise*, London and New-York, Routledge.
- Dardot, P. and Laval, C. (2014). *Commun. Essai sur la révolution au XXI^e siècle*, Paris, La Découverte.
- Dees, J-G. (1998). Entreprising Nonprofits. *Harvard Business Review*, January - February, pp. 55-67.
- De Soto, H. (1994). *L'autre sentier : La révolution informelle*. Paris, La Découverte.
- Defourny, J. (2001). From sector to social enterprise. In Borzaga, C., Dedourny, J., (eds), *The emergence of social enterprise*, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 293 – 311.
- Defourny, J. and Nyssens, M. (2013). L'approche de l'entreprise sociale dans une perspective comparative. *Working Paper n°13/02*, EMES working paper series.
- Dewey, J. (1915). *The Public and its Problems*. Carbondale, University Press Drive.
- Eme, B. and Laville, J.L. (2006). Economie solidaire. In J.L. Laville, AD. Cattani (dir.), *Dictionnaire de l'autre économie*, Paris, Folio-Gallimard.
- Ferrarini, A. (2013). The Theory of Social Enterprise and Pluralism. In J.L. Laville, D. Young, P. Eynaud, *Civil Society, the Third Sector and Social Enterprise*, London and New-York, Routledge.
- Fontaine, L. (2014). *Le marché. Histoire et usages d'une conquête sociale*. Paris, Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (2004). *Naissance de la biopolitique*. Cours au Collège de France 1978 - 1979, Paris, Gallimard-Seuil.
- França Filho, G.CC., Laville, J.L., Siqueire, M., and Magnen, J.P. (eds.). (2006). *Acção Pública e Economia Solidaria. Uma perspectiva internacional*, Salvador. Porto Alegre, Edufba – Edufba.
- Fraser, N. (2005). *Qu'est-ce que la justice sociale ? Reconnaissance et redistribution*. Paris, La Découverte.
- Fraser, N. (2013). Marchandisation protection sociale, émancipation : vers une conception néo-polanyienne de la crise capitaliste. in I., Hillenkamp, J.L., Laville, *Socioéconomie et démocratie. L'actualité de Karl Polanyi*, Toulouse, éditions Erès.

- Fraser, N. (2015). Entretien avec Hersent, M., Laville, J.L. and Saussey, M.. *Revue française de socio-économie*, premier semestre, pp. 253 – 259.
- Frère, B., (dir.). (2015). *Le tournant de la théorie critique*. Paris, Desclée de Brouwer.
- Gadrey, J. (2006). Utilité sociale. In J.L. Laville, A.D. Cattani (dir.), *Dictionnaire de l'autre économie*, Paris, Folio-Gallimard.
- Gaiger, L.I. (2006). Entreprise solidaire. In J.L. Laville, A.D. Cattani (dir.), *Dictionnaire de l'autre économie*, Paris, Folio-Gallimard.
- Gaiger, LI. (2009). Empreendimento Economico Solidário. In A.D., Cattani, J.L., Laville , L.I., Gaiger, and P. Hespanha,, *Dicionario internacional da outra economia*, Coimbra Sao Paulo, Almedina, pp181-187.
- Gaiger, LI. (2013). O Mapeamento Nacional e o Conhecimento da Economia Solidária. *Revista da ABET (en ligne) 12*, pp. 7 – 24.
- Gardin, L. (1999). Economie des régies de quartier. Recherche à la demande du Comité national de liaison des Régies de quartier, Paris, Crida - Lsci, Cnrs.
- Guérin, I., Hersent, M., and Fraisse, L., (2011). *Femmes, économie et développement*, Toulouse, éditions Erès.
- Habermas, J. (1990). La crise de l'Etat-providence. In *Ecrits politiques*, Paris, Le Cerf.
- Habermas , J. (1993). *L'espace public*. Paris, Payot.
- Habermas, J. (1998). Théorie de l'agir communicationnel. Paris Fayard, tome 2.
- Hillenkamp, I. (2003). Le principe de householding aujourd'hui. Discussion théorique et approche empirique par l'économie populaire. In I., Hillenkamp, J.L. Laville, *Socioéconomie et démocratie. L'actualité de Karl Polanyi*, Toulouse, éditions Erès.
- Hillenkamp, I. and Servet, J.M. (dir.). (2015). *Le marché autrement*. Paris, Classiques Garnier.
- Honneth, A. (2000). *La lutte pour la reconnaissance*. Paris, Le Cerf.
- Juan, M. (2000). *Diversité européenne : Mode d'emploi*. Paris, éditions Descartes et Cie.
- Jullien, F. (2009). *Les transformations silencieuses*. Paris, Grasset.
- Klein, J.L., Laville, J.L. and Moulaert, F. (2014). *L'innovation sociale*, Toulouse, éditions Erès.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Nous n'avons jamais été modernes*. Paris, La Découverte.
- Laval, C. (2007). *L'homme économique*. Paris, Gallimard.
- Laville, J.L. (2000). Le tiers secteur. Un objet d'étude pour la sociologie économique. *Sociologie du travail*, n°4, vol. 42, octobre - décembre, Qu'est-ce que le tiers secteur? Associations, économie solidaire, économie sociale.
- Laville, J.L. and Nyssens, M. (2001). The social enterprise towards a socio-economical approach. In C Borzaga, J. Defourny (eds.), *The emergence of Social Enterprise*, London and New-York, Routledge.

- Laville, J.L., Lemaître, A. and Nyssens, M. (2006). Public policies and social enterprises in Europe: the challenge of institutionalization. In M. Nyssens, (ed.), *Social Enterprise. At the Crossroads of Market, Public Policies and Civil Society*, London and New-York, Routledge.
- Laville, J.L. and Gaiger, LI. (2009). Economia solidària. In AD., Cattani, J.L., Laville, LI., Gaiger, P. Hespanha, *Dicionário Internacional de Outra Economia*, Coimbra, Sao Paulo, edições Almedina.
- Laville, J.L. and Sainsaulieu, R. (2013). *L'association : Sociologie et économie*. Paris, Fayard – Pluriel.
- Meek, RL. (1976). *Social Science and the Ignoble Savage*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Mendell, M. (2013). La démocratisation économique comme processus institué. In I., Hillenkamp, J.L., Laville, *Socioéconomie et démocratie. L'actualité de Karl Polanyi*, Toulouse, éditions Erès.
- Neveu, E. (2015). *Sociologie politique des problèmes publics*. Paris, Arnaud Colin. Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economiques, 1999, "Les entreprises sociales", Secrétariat du programme Leed, Paris, OCDE.
- Pleyers, G. and Capitaine, B. (2016). *Mouvements sociaux : Quand le sujet devient acteur*. Paris, éditions de la Maison de sciences de l'homme.
- Polanyi, K. (1944). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of our Time*. Boston, Beacon.
- Polanyi, K. (2008). *Essais*. Paris, Seuil.
- Quijano, A. (2008). Solidaridad y capitalismo colonial moderno. *Otra economia*, Vol. 2.
- Razeto, L. (1993). *Los caminos de la economia de solidaridad*. Santiago, édition Vivarium
- Santos, B. de S. (2011). Epistémologies du sud. *Etudes rurales*, n°187, Paris, EHESS.
- Santos, B. de S. and Rodriguez Garavito, C. (2013). Alternatives économiques : les nouveaux chemins de la contestation. In I., Hillenkamp, J.L., Laville, *Socioéconomie et démocratie. L'actualité de Karl Polanyi*, Toulouse, éditions Erès.
- Santos, B. de S. (2016). *Epistémologies du Sud : Mouvements citoyens et polémique sur la science*. Paris, Desclée de Brouwer.
- Sarria Icaza, A.M. and Tiriba, L. (2006). Economie populaire. In J.L. Laville, AD. Cattani (dir.), *Dictionnaire de l'autre économie*, Paris, Folio-Gallimard.
- Servet, J.M. (2013). Le principe de réciprocité aujourd'hui. Un concept pour comprendre et construire l'économie solidaire. In I., Hillenkamp, J.L., Laville, *Socioéconomie et démocratie. L'actualité de Karl Polanyi*, Toulouse, éditions Erès.
- Singer, P. (2006). Economie solidaire. In J.L. Laville, AD. Cattani (dir.), *Dictionnaire de l'autre économie*, Paris, Folio-Gallimard.
- Skloot, E. (1987). Enterprise and Commerce in Non-profit Organizations. In W.W. Powell ed., *The Non-profit Sector : a Research Handbook*, New Haven, CT : Yale University Press.

- Thompson, E.P. (1988). *La formation de la classe ouvrière anglaise*. Paris, Seuil – Gallimard.
- Valéau, P. (2016). Democracy, institutional entrepreneurship and socio-political performance: the contribution of management science to a reassessment of traditional associationism. Paris, *communication à la 2^e conférence EMES - Polanyi*, 19 et 20 mai.
- Van Griethuysen, P. (2010). Pourquoi le développement durable s'est-il imposé là où l'éco-développement a échoué? Débats pour la suite du monde. In Y-M., Abraham, M., Louis, P., Hervé (eds), *Développement durable ou croissance soutenable?*, Montréal, Ecosociété.
- Wanderley, F. (2015). *Desafios teóricos y políticos de la economía social y solidaria. Lectura desde America latina*. La Paz, Plural editores.
- Weber, M. (1965). *Essai sur la théorie de la science*. Paris, Plon.
- Weber, M. (1995). *Économie et société. Les catégories de la sociologie*. t.1, Paris, Plon.
- Young, D. and Salamon, L.M. (2002). Commercialization, Social Ventures, and For-Profit Competition. In Salamon, L-M., ed., *The State of Nonprofit America*, Washington DC : Brookings Institution.
- Yunus, M. (2008). *Vers un nouveau capitalisme*. Paris, Editions Jean-Claude Lattès.