Reconfiguring the social and solidarity economy in a Danish/Nordic welfare context

Lars Hulgård[1] and Linda Lundgaard Andersen[2]

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:

Hulgård L., Lundgaard Andersen L.,2019, "Reconfiguring the social and solidarity economy in a Danish/Nordic welfare context", 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 69-89.

Introduction

When looking at definitions and understandings of the social and solidarity economy, one issue stands out as particularly significant. The issue of how research links the organizational analysis of particular social enterprises to societal dimensions at the macro-level. As suggested by Granovetter (1973) the ways in which action at the organizational micro-level relates to and even transforms into new structures, is a constant puzzle for the social sciences. He opened his now famous article by noting that contemporary sociology is marked by a fundamental weakness, since "it does not relate micro-level interactions to macro-level patterns in any convincing way" (Granovetter, 1973: 1360). A similar critique is relevant, when we look at research in the field of social enterprise. Whereas we have solid knowledge on micro-level interactions within and among social enterprise and as an emerging field, knowledge on macro-level eco-systems even at the supra national level, the link between the two tends to be an object of only marginal interest. In the social economy tradition, social enterprise is primarily a matter of organizational criteria and specificities (Borzaga and Defourny, 2001). Accordingly, when applying a social economy perspective to the field of social enterprise the analysis of organizational characteristics is only indirectly linked to the broader societal framework of economy and democracy. Compared to this, the solidarity economy perspective is aimed exactly at linking the organizational analysis to a societal analysis. Thus, it asks questions of what type of democracy and what type of economy are the social enterprises engaged in realizing?

In this chapter, we first highlight the difference between adopting a social economy and a solidarity economy approach to social enterprise and social entrepreneurship. Within the framework of a social economy perspective, social enterprise is first defined through a set of organizational criteria (Borzaga and Defourny, 2001) leaving the relation to the broader and deeper issues of economy and democracy open (Gardin, 2006; Laville, 2010). As a contrast to this, solidarity economy links the organizational dimension of a particular social enterprise to the broader political and economic framework of the particular society (Laville, 2010, p.230). Following Granovetter, the solidarity economy analysis of social enterprise rejects to understand only the specific organizational capacities and character-

[1] *Professor of social entrepreneurship, Roskilde University, Denmark*

[2] *Professor in learning, evaluation and social innovation at Roskilde University, Denmark*

istics of a certain social enterprise, but insists on understanding how it is embedded in that larger societal framework. Often the social enterprise and the social enterprise ecosystems are contributing to reinforce the capitalist structure of contemporary society, in other situations they are part of a counter discourse attacking the capitalist and neoliberalist hegemony. Secondly, we present and discuss two specific social enterprises that both reflects the diversity of social enterprise and social entrepreneurial initiatives in a Danish welfare context and provide important insights for developing theories on solidarity economy adopted to a Scandinavian welfare state context. The two initiatives differ in shape, space/geography and organizational structure but are important examples of pluralism in a Danish welfare context (Andersen, 2015). Roskilde Festival and Skovgård Hotel share a number of features that place them as interesting agents of solidarity economy. They both display a differentiated activity portfolio of business; public and civil character and they display a differentiated profile of reciprocity, redistribution and democracy that place them as influential in local, regional and national/international contexts. Finally, in the concluding section we discuss how an analysis based upon solidarity economy differ from one based solely upon a social economy perspective, and secondly some future perspectives for the continued evolution of the Danish/Scandinavian welfare model.

1 - The relation and distinction between social and solidarity economy?

Whereas scholars from the social economy tradition can argue and quarrel among themselves about how to define precisely the organizational criteria of a social enterprise, solidarity economy is about applying a meta-perspective to the discussion and relating the specific organizational types to the broader question of economy and democracy (Laville, 2010). Following the social economy principles, social enterprises are specific types of organizations, whereas looking at organizations from the perspective of solidarity economy we move from the specific enterprise/organization level to the societal level asking questions about how the enterprise is embedded in and articulating forms of economy and democracy.

When analysing from the perspective of solidarity economy critical questions to the dominating forms of economy and democracy cannot be avoided to the same degree as in the organizational (social economy) analysis of particular social enterprises. In the view of a solidarity economy framework, the boundary is not between for-profit and non-profit organizations, but between capitalist and social- and solidarity economy organizations. This is also the case in the European EMES tradition of social enterprise. However, whereas some scholars, consultants and policy makers promote a new social economy consisting of a complete mix of conventional business with a strong corporate social responsibility (CSR) profile and social enterprises mixing all types of resources (Reich, 2011; Sørensen and Lund, 2018), such a perception does not make any sense for a solidarity economy perspective. Whereas the former does not have any systematic notion about the larger economy in which the social enterprise is embedded, this is the main concern for the solidarity economy analysis, since it asks, how can an enterprise be social if it does not question, challenge and provide alternatives to the way in which the ordinary capital flows?

The notion that the economy rests upon a plurality of principles and rationales is a core value in European social history, but this perception is under heavy attack by neoliberalism and privatization of public responsibility. In Europe, even the social economy was closer to the principles of solidarity economy that we adopt in this article than to the "anything goes" principles adopted by much contemporary social enterprise analysis (Pestoff and Hulgård, 2014). In the past, both political statements and scientific accounts have valued the presence of a non-capitalist economy. When Prodi, former President of the

European Union in a speech in 2002 to an assembly of social economy organizations spoke about the value of a European social economy, he particularly emphasised how this tradition is important due to its capacity as being schools of democracy and solidarity. People practice active citizenship and engage in local decision making in such organizations that are expanding both the internal and the external efficiency due to an increase in the level of social capital. Accordingly, to Prodi, solidarity is more likely to spread from cooperatives established at the local level than from conventional business.

The expression of social enterprises being schools of democracy and egalitarian solidarity does not make any sense for social enterprise scholars who do not critically address the rationales of the conventional market driven economy and the neoliberal principles of the state. Instead, these pundits of the 'new social economy' tend to isolate the so-called social value to be the one particular entity that identifies a social enterprise. In stark contrast to this, in the Prodian perspective, the social, economic and political values are an integrated configuration. Laville (2010) proposes a similar perspective, when he argues that in the European tradition of social economy there is priority of "a shared patrimony over returns to individual investments. In other words, in Europe, what is stressed at the organizational level is legal limits on private appropriation of benefits" (Laville, 2010) and not the ability to produce added economic value. Also in the critical tradition of social enterprise and social economy studies, the critique of 'market fundamentalism' is an important characteristic. The EMES Network and other critical positions to contemporary social economy adopts the pluralist Polanyian framework. Following Nyssens (2006: 318) "social enterprises mix the economic principles of market, redistribution and reciprocity, and hybridize their three types of economic exchange so that they work together rather than in isolation from each other". Whereas Nyssens operates with a Polanyian approach at the organizational level, Roy (2015) specifies that not even markets in general can be "set apart and elevated above socio-political forces" (Roy, 2015).

In the decades, after the EMES Network defined social enterprise as organizations mixing resources and objectives, the world of social enterprise is increasingly colonized by conventional capitalist and neoliberal 'statist' strategies. In fact, the language of SI (all aspects related to social innovation) and SE (all aspects related to social enterprise and entrepreneurship) works perfect in unison with both neo-liberal and neo-conservative or even authoritarian regimes. With strategies of social impact investment and Social Impact Bonds as a way of scaling the impact of SI and SE has become a quick fix to the solution of social problems with corporate strategies (Roy, McHugh and Sinclair, 2017). When a leader of a Danish social enterprise in a press release claims, that time has come to depart from an outdated critique of capitalism and instead embrace capitalism from the perspective of social enterprise it is an example of an approach miles away from the one celebrated by Romano Prodi. Whereas the Danish social enterprise leader aim at embracing capitalism with the values of social enterprise, the former president argues for the existence of another economy far from the principles of capitalism, and we have to ask ourselves whose strategy is most likely to succeed? According to the Danish leader, we should establish a social enterprise 'version 2.0' that at its core is a mix of capitalist principles with civil society. We have to ask ourselves if such a strategy will lead to more equality or the opposite. When the most powerful private foundations today proclaim catalytic philanthropy as their main approach to civil society, NGOs and social enterprises it is based upon principles that are aimed at weakening the critical and non-capitalist potential of the social and solidarity economy. When the Danish government close the public centre aimed at building an eco-system for the social economy and instead subordinates all measures targeting social enterprise under the "Dialogue Forum for Societal Responsibility and Growth" within the Danish Business Authority it is an example of a neoliberal policy aiming at pulling out the ability of establishing another plural economic reality.

These are but few examples of the way in which social enterprise gradually have moved from being an engine of resistance to become a victim or a vehicle for the isomorphic and colonizing tendencies promoted by the worlds of private enterprise and public governance. However, at the same time we see remarkable resistance from social movements inspired by post-colonial thinking and counter-hegemonic globalization (de Santos, 2001). Already in the late 1990s Boaventura de Sousa Santos provided insight into ways to envisage how another economy must be intrinsically linked to issues of democracy, human rights and people-centered development (Santos 2001). In this perception, social enterprise is a part of other counter-hegemonic strategies aimed at emancipation and not solely a provider of social value to be utilized by the Bottom of the Pyramid. With the Sociology of Absences (Santos, 2001) we get a method to understand how social enterprise that was once a critical and central force in the formation of European social history gradually was transformed to social business performed at the intersections of market, state and civil society. "The sociology of absences is the procedure through which what does not exist….is conceived of as the active result of a given social process…The sociology of absences invents or unveils whatever social and political conditions, experiments, initiatives, conceptions have been successfully suppressed by hegemonic forms of globalization" (Santos, 2001).

As we shall see in the following sections, the Sociology of Absences is only one among several contemporary perspectives aimed at understanding better how to elevate the study of social enterprise as an organizational entity to the level of a societal analysis of the economic and political framework in which it is embedded.

2 - Reconfiguring the social and solidarity economy

We see a growing interest that seems to be rooted in policy, economy, citizenship, democracy, sustainability, recognition, livelihood, empowerment, global visions – challenging and scrutinizing the concept of social economy both embraced and juxtaposed by solidarity economy. Utting clarifies, that "accepting the reality of the capitalist system and its core institutions or 'rules of the game', social economy is primarily about expanding the economic space where people-centred organisations and enterprises can operate. It is fundamentally a contemporary variant of 'embedded liberalism' (Ruggie 1982 via Utting, 2015), i.e. it is about re-embedding enterprise activities in progressive societal norms and creating or strengthening institutions that can mitigate or counteract perverse effects of 'business as usual'. Solidarity economy, for its part, pushes the envelope of social and systemic transformation. It emphasises issues of redistributive justice, so-called 'deep' sustainability, alternatives to capitalism and the debt-based monetary system, as well as participatory democracy and emancipatory politics driven by active citizenship and social movements activism" (Utting, 2015, p. 2).

In tracing the sharing and difference of social and solidarity economy many researchers revolve seeking to identify the horizon, the embeddedness, the critique and the origins. Laville points to, how "the tradition of social economy and the resurgence of associative democracy in the late twentieth century have generated a new theoretical perspective: the SSE. It critiques the non-profit approach, which tends to dominate international development discourse regarding the role and nature of civil society, and it creates an original framework of analysis by mixing social economy and solidarity economy viewpoints. The core elements of each approach, which are now coming together both conceptually and strategically"(Laville, 2015, p. 47). Social and solidarity economy has a long history, develops, and changes positions throughout history and different parts of the world display different take on SSE. This is interesting from a Nordic perspective. As we have pointed out, the refined distinctions, differentiation of social, and solidarity economy is unfamiliar in the Nordic countries – apart from one Swedish example. This is even more interesting

since a number of initiatives that very well could be labelled solidarity economy has co-created the Danish and Swedish welfare history.

Mendell situates comprehensive community initiatives as part of the solidarity economy and label these as community-based approaches to social, economic and environmental problems. They share specific features: multi-stakeholder processes of participatory governance, involving organizations, sectors of activity, citizens and government, drawing on local experience, expertise and knowledge and bringing new resources to strategic decision making at the local level. They require institutional innovation. This approach challenges prevailing theories of wealth creation that consider resource allocation as the job of the market and social provision as the obligation of a thin state. It demonstrates the transformative capacity of collaboration and partnership among citizens (Mendell, 2010). As such, this points to how substantial community-based approaches provide the potential for transformative capacity. Further, it clarifies that "all SSE enterprises, whatever their organizational form, require multiple tools – labor market (training), capital (financial instruments), research (partnerships with researchers), commercialization strategies (access to markets) and enabling public policy. Moreover, because the SSE is rooted locally, it requires both situated and macro policy measures. As emphasized throughout this article too often, focus on the SSE is reduced to enterprises, organizations or sectors, missing its broader developmental capacity and potential (Mendell & Alain, 2015: 166).

Gibson-Graham's work on rethinking the economy with thick description and weak theory seems well in place if we further need to deepen our critical understanding of social and solidarity economy (Gibson-Graham, 2014). In their work on reading the landscape for economic difference and theorizing diverse economies, they situate thin versus thick descriptions. They advocate a move away from 'strong theory' with its "embracing reach" and "reduced, clarified field of meaning" towards 'weak theory' which, though "little more than description", powerfully attends to nuance, diversity and overdetermined interaction. Weak theory does not elaborate and confirm what we already know, it observes, interprets and yields to emerging knowledge. The definition of social enterprise provided by the EMES Network in 2001 was part of the weak theory approach, since it was an observation of something new, something that was the emerging result of a movement in the three constitutive spheres of modern society, state, market and civil society. Even today, we may better observe social enterprises from the perspective of weak theory, due to their heterotopian characteristics (Jørgensen, (2017). Foucault coined the concept of heterotopia to enable the understanding of organizations that transcends and disturbs the existing organizational order (Foucault, 1971; 1986). To rethink the economy using thick description and weak theory is to carefully reconsider the 'large issues' that 'small facts' are made to speak to (Gibson-Graham, 2014). When relating the Gibson-Graham notion of thick description to Santos' sociology of absences aimed at providing a theory for better linking local practices to a large-scale counter-hegemonic movement, we get a configuration for better understanding how local practices of social enterprise are embedded in the broader societal framework of a given practice. In contrast, a weak theory of diverse economies opens to these and a myriad of other motivating forces that are not only confined to so-called non-mainstream practices. A much wider range of social relations bear on economic practices including, to name just some, trust, care, sharing, reciprocity, cooperation, divestiture, future orientation, collective agreement, coercion, bondage, thrift, guilt, love, community pressure, equity, self-exploitation, solidarity, distributive justice, stewardship, spiritual connection, environmental and social justice. It is in the apprehension of these multiple determinations that ethnographic thick description comes into its own and leads the way towards rethinking the economy (Gibson-Graham, 2014).

3 - Sweden as a pioneer in an advanced understanding of social economy

When trying to apply the thick description model to the evolution of social economy in Scandinavia we find some interesting results that illustrates that not only the social enterprise model in a restricted social economy version has been present in the contemporary history of the Scandinavian welfare states. Also, when applying a solidarity economy approach we find some interesting results concerning the inter relation between social enterprise, solidarity economy and the welfare state.

In 1998, the Swedish government became an international forerunner of contemporary social economy by launching a high-level cross-ministerial working group to start the process of defining a national strategy on social economy and social enterprise in the context of the Swedish welfare state. The work resulted in two reports and the appointment of a minister for social economy. Both these initiatives are significant to understand the possible role of social enterprise and social economy in the context of a Scandinavian type of welfare state. This work was done at an intellectually advanced level that addressed the issue of social economy from a perspective that is more open to inputs from civil society, government and market than what we see in most policy programs today at an international level. The ambitions were clearly not just restricted to work on building organizational models and workshops for scaling the embryonic social enterprises that had begun to emerge, but to constantly trying to situate the social enterprise model in the context of an institutional and universally oriented welfare state. Not as a replacement for the welfare state, but as a recognition of institutions that had already existed for decades if not centuries working to improve the livelihood of ordinary people and communities.

Accordingly, such public policy work as the Swedish one can assist in understanding the full potential of a social and solidarity economy and the plural framework of economy in a universally oriented welfare state. Furthermore, we argue that the work by the Swedish government can be better understood in the framework of solidarity economy than in the more restricted social economy/social enterprise perspective that tend to remain focused on organizational dimensions and capacities.

Already in 1997, the Swedish government at a meeting on November 27th decided to “map the conditions for social economy”. In the report following this decision, the government adopted an advanced understanding of the social economy that we today see as being particularly relevant in the framework of solidarity economy. The cross-ministerial working group following the government decision pointed out the three criteria of democracy, solidarity and an open approach to organizational dimensions as important principles when forming the social economy in Sweden. When adopting a solidarity economy approach to social enterprise these three criteria are even today among the most important in ambitions of realizing the full emancipatory potential of ‘social enterprise’. Unfortunately, they are also among the three core values of the social economy that are either under heavy attack from investors who are aiming to improve their social impact investments, or they suffer from a complete neglect from public agencies whose primary concern is the efficiency of work integration social enterprises (WISE). Accordingly, many scholars are observing the dimension of participatory democracy as the most fragile of the three dimensions in the EMES framework of social enterprise (Pestoff & Hulgård, 2015). In the report from the Swedish government, “associational democracy, primarily one member, one vote, is in Sweden an important method for governing enterprises in the social economy” (Ds 1998:48). The government committee furthermore expressed a distance to the use of the word solidarity, since in the Swedish language the word has “slipped towards encompass lesser mutual relations” and instead meaning “sympathy” that is closely related to charity (Ds 1998: 48). The committee ends a brief discussion of the notion solidarity by emphasizing that irrespective of the specific choice of concept it should reflect an egalitarian approach in the sense of “societal contexts with shared experiences as a basis” (Ds 1998:48), and thus distinguish itself from charity

based forms of the solidarity concept. Furthermore, the report emphasizes that the social economy is a dynamic sector, "a kind of process that constantly develops itself" and thus it encompasses a multitude of organizational types where many would not even be considered enterprises from a conventional perspective.

We argue that this early Swedish government interest in social economy represents a groundbreaking work to understand how social- and solidarity economy may be seen as slightly different phenomena and secondly how solidarity economy could be relevant in a Scandinavian context.

4 - Solidarity economy in a Scandinavian context

Not only the Swedish government approach to social economy in the mid late 1990s, but also the historic trajectory of the Scandinavian countries form a possibility for a more plural and advanced form of social economy than the one that nowadays is being full-fledged institutionalized in so-called eco-systems of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship. Both from the perspective of individual social entrepreneurs and innovators and among powerful stakeholders in governments and (private) foundations the perspective of social economy is to become better skilled and positioned on the quasi market of social service that businesses and social enterprises "increasingly take part in" (Selle and Strømsness, 2018: 17). This view is a sad limitation of experiences generated in the Scandinavian welfare model to be found in the historic trajectory of the European social economy that was engaged in building another economy. A potential that was still fully recognized in the 1998 policy paper from Sweden.

Following Hulgård (2016) the typical Scandinavian welfare state facilitates a relationship between civil society and state that nourishes bridging and linking types of social capital that is more related to the notions of citizenship than to membership and volunteerism. The institutional-redistributive welfare state (Titmuss, 1987) in the Scandinavian countries was based upon institutions that encourage people to perceive themselves as being members of a broader national community rather than merely worrying about their own family, immediate neighbours, and their individual benefits. To understand the positive correlation between civil society and the Scandinavian welfare states, it is helpful to delve deeper into the institutional aspect rather than the redistributional aspect of the so-called "Institutional-Redistributive" model of welfare (Titmuss, 1987). This model of welfare is based upon a conception of social justice that does not merely see man as an individual or as belonging to specific local communities or associations but as a citizen with social rights (Titmuss, 1987: 264).

The historical legacy of an institutional welfare state model is to stimulate bridges of solidarity between groups and across otherwise segregated communities. Much macro-oriented theory has scrutinized the redistributional aspects of various welfare state regimes while neglecting to pay similar attention to the institutional capacity and specific institutional configurations. Such theories have partly failed to understand the *sociology* of the welfare state in terms of examining relations, relational goods (Donati, 2014), patterns of co-production and collaboration between public and private actors (Pestoff, 2009), between civil society-based institutions and public institutions in specific local welfare production (Hulgård and Andersen, 2012). However important the redistributional and de-commodifying capacity of a welfare state may be, this does not say much about specific institutional configurations of actors and institutions involved in the actual co-construction and inter-relational character of welfare.

The Scandinavian countries form a unique background and a laboratory for a new reconciliation between an empowered solidarity economy (Polanyian framework) and a continuation of the universal orientation of the welfare state (Titmuss framework). Adding to this within the tradition of critical theory, it seems urgent to ask if the road towards a

continued downsizing and privatization of the welfare state also in the Scandinavian countries (especially Sweden and Denmark) can be challenged by systematic investments in solidarity economy. This could be in the form of programs for co-production and mixed types of welfare provision, where civil society is equally recognized for its political dimension in matters of decision-making (Fraser, 1992; Habermas, 1992), and for its capacity for service provision produced and delivered by volunteers, user, owners and social entrepreneurs.

We now turn to presenting two specific social enterprises that both reflects the diversity of social enterprise and social entrepreneurial initiatives in Denmark and provide important insights for developing theories on solidarity economy in a Scandinavian welfare context. The two initiatives differ in shape, space/geography and organizational structure but are important examples of pluralism in a Danish welfare context (Andersen, 2015).

Case one: Roskilde Festival

Roskilde Festival is an association that has initiated and for decades provided one of the oldest and largest music festivals in Europe. The festival has performed since 1971 and has a long history rooted in local town fairs in Roskilde since the 1930s. Each year a local group – the Roskilde Foundation of local businesspersons, prior mayors, city managers and citizens – planned and conducted a town fair usually situated by the town harbor and later at the agricultural show site providing cultural events and entertainment, music, historic events and local food. The local residents showed up and the event was an important contribution to sustaining community cohesion and sustainability. Since its beginning, a donation profile has been significant. Even for these small local town fairs, the committee decided that a surplus should be donated to local voluntary activities and associations. From the minutes of the executive committee in the 40s and 50s, it appeared that small donations were given to local kindergartens, after-school care, a youth club and a summer camp along with buildings renovation (Roskilde Foundation History: 10). In the 60s, the event profile developed and now included a beat festival with modern music for young people and by doing this the foundation was able to attract quite another group of audience – and thereby increasing the numbers of guest and the turnover. In the early 70s, the foundation began to discuss the options for strengthening the music festival and a group of dedicated people undertook the revival of a failed music festival. Two young students at the age of 17 and 19 from the local high school took the lead and launched the first festival in 1971. They did it partly for the sake of music and partly in opposition to what they considered a society dominated by bourgeois conventional values. Accordingly, since the very beginning the objectives has been both to contribute to culture through music and to exercise solidarity with people in need. Moreover, in many other parts of the world solidarity, music and culture festivals aimed at stimulating local community initiatives and supporting special groups of citizens. This micro-history of a small local music festival rooted in solidarity and voluntary work in Roskilde, Denmark in many ways mirrored a larger international movement uniting the power and initiative of ordinary people with music, culture and solidarity with marginal people and communities.

Originated from this decade long history the Roskilde Festival has been able to grow and display a rich variety of infrastructure, of innovative events, of governance and not the least music. Nowadays the festival is run by 65 employees and approximately 31.000 volunteers, of whom Roskilde Festival organize 11.000 volunteers. 300 volunteers are organized and work the whole year around. Adding to the numbers, 220 NGOs and volunteer organizations recruit and organize 20.000 volunteers that are delivering services during the festival and provide different features of social innovation since they

often deploy their own original take on their products or services at the festival (Roskilde Festival Annual Volume, 2017).

The festival organization displays a network-based project organization where employees and volunteers participate and collaborates with extensive self-government on cross-sectional tasks all year round, organized under the Roskilde Festival Group (RF Group). As a large organization with a large number of volunteers, Roskilde Festival is rather unique due to its size, its longevity and its democratic governance. The festival is a nonprofit hybrid organization that is funded by its own income and revenue mixed with the non-monetary resources generated by the vast number of volunteers, which is rarely seen in hybrid organizations (Andersen, 2015, p. 61). In the last 15 years, the RF group has worked with sources of income other than the festival: counseling, project management, course work, and safety work and equipment rental. Recently, the RF Group has initiated the development of a Roskilde Festival Folk High school in which RF has provided the value base for the profiling.

Liza, a local resident in her sixties has been a Roskilde Festival volunteer for 23 years. She explains: “It began when we were newcomers in Roskilde and I was looking for a way into the local community and to make a difference. I knew about the festival and had some friends actively involved and then I just went to a meeting for volunteers”. Liza has been in charge as a group leader for one of the guest entrance and tickets teams ever since and runs a group of around 20 people. The social value and the impact of her voluntary work addresses two distinct dimensions: her personal and individual value and meaning and the wider impact for the local community and the actions of solidarity that the festival make possible. Liza explains: “Firstly, going to the festival each year to prepare and to do the shifting team-slots at the ticket entrance is both hard work – we work from 9 to 22 o’clock each of the festival days – and a thrill to meet my team-colleagues and the local friends that I only meet this once a year. That makes this occasion very special to me. Secondly, I also take immense pride when reading in the papers on hearing about the donation profile. When important local initiatives or (inter)national NGOs get funded I think for myself that this is something that I have been part of and made possible. And that is a great feeling”!

John is another volunteer in his late 30s - does voluntary work all year around providing support activities of the voluntary work, the volunteers and the voluntary managers. This is a large and significantly important group in the festival staff providing a lot of work and their work effort secures the donation profile and means of solidarity. John and his team provides team management training, strategic work and discussions, how to improve work processes, problem solving and to provide a team spirit. John explains his reasons for volunteering: “I was invited by a friend that knew about the festival and one of its leading spokespersons and he invited me to join for a meeting facilitation. Therefore, my first encounter was like an ad-hoc volunteer – and then afterwards, I was invited to join the so-called ‘process-group’ – a group that I now head. It has turned out that I can profit both ways so to say - my professional work contributes to my voluntary work and vice versa”. John elaborated how his voluntary and professional work intersects and complements each other – and that is very rewarding. Nevertheless, he also emphasizes that the voluntary work at the festival is of a special kind providing competence development in a quite unique setting unlike ordinary work places since the people, task and collaboration are embedded in solidarity outcome and outreach. As for his understanding of value, he says, “It is very important for me that my volunteering makes a difference to other people and therefore the many donations is imperative. That is a very important motivation for me. However, it also has to be different from my professional work since I otherwise find it a little too boring”. John then, weaves together both personal, professional and the outside world as significant for

his reasons for his volunteer engagement but fundamentally driven by contributing to the solidarity economy.

As mentioned since its beginning donation has been the Roskilde festival DNA. To illustrate this nowadays, the 2017 festival generated overall a surplus of Dkr 47 million (6,3 million €), of which Dkr 16 million was used for donations. 200 NGOs, organizations and corporate trade and service activities provided services for Dkr 19 million serving festival guests. According to the festival yearbook, 2017 a theme of cultural equality and community was celebrated through festival hall debates and workshops on gender, ethnicity and religion aimed at festival guests. Several donations supported cultural equality and the surplus from Making The Change ticket went untouched donated to German Discover Footballs work for release through sports for women, and Association La Red in Switzerland was supported to promote cultural life and volunteering between cultures. The festival supports female musicians and artists and provide music-sponsorships for young girls.

The donation profile for 2017 comprised 148 project-initiatives that received funding ranging from 25.000 to 500.000 Dkr focusing on subjects like 'strengthening the voices of youth in terms like 'new generations in the public debate' and 'cultural life in focus'. A second theme focused on music possibilities and supported music as arenas of developing and enacted in the whole of Denmark and abroad - especially music as tool for and means of community building. A third theme supported 'the good community' where people come together creating new communities for lonely or vulnerable young people seeking to become part of a community. A fourth theme 'Roskilde Moves' supported the local NGOs and associations in Roskilde municipality and local volunteerism. A fifth theme 'On the run' covered 'Young on Escape' and 'Prevent the Escape', focusing on the refugee situations and migration challenges that are being dealt with the world over. A sixth theme 'The earth calls' supports initiatives focusing on sustainability, environment and climate. A seventh theme 'Respecting the free space' focusing on cross-border behavior and how to behave with respect for each other and the community.

In general, music and other festivals offer greater potential for local economic development compared with for example "traditional" manufacturing sectors. However, sustainable music festivals such as the Roskilde Festival are based upon radical pluralism both in the economic character as well as in the social dimension and organizational characteristics. Such a plurality is the effect of a continuous effort with a recirculation of acquired knowledge and relations in environments with distinct receptive and disseminating features (Hjalager, 2009: 247). The festival has increased its scope, particularly by diversifying into new services, entertainments and experiences provided leading to spin-offs outside the festival area – leading to a widely inter-linking with the social life and the economy of the local area (Hjalager, 2009: 270). The audience comes from most of Europe, although with some emphasis on the Danish home-market and according to tourist board estimates, the festival accounts for a total turnover of around 30 million Euros per year. Thus, the festival represents between 20 and 25% of the total annual tourism turnover in the area. It is an event that engages a large proportion of the town's 55,000 inhabitants in some way or other (Hjalager, 2009: 271).

Case two: Skovsgård Model

We have followed the evolution of the Skovsgård Model for almost 30 years starting with discussions about the big social innovation programs in the late 1980s and their impact on social work. The founder of the organization that led to the establishment of the Skovsgård Model expressed his visions in an article in 1990. He expresses a vision of another entrepreneurial model than the conventional one. Accordingly, he outlines a few characteristics of social enterprise almost a decade before the notion of social enterprise

took off: "Not until the moment when we dare to formulate the beat or rhythm of a social policy, where it becomes possible to develop an alternative labor market will we be able to liberate the ties that control unemployed, handicapped and social loosers.(.).it is necessary to make room for a labor market, or an entrepreneurial model, where necessary goods are produced, material as well as intangible, that can be utilized by others.(.).our culture, our solidarity will suffocate if we continue to force groups that by incident are not useful for the conventional labor market to submit to norms and beats decided and formulated by the smart people, the strong people and pushy persons concerned mainly for self-promotion obscuring the efforts of others (Kristensen, in Hulgård, 1990: 38). With thoughts like this, the founder anticipated a multi-dimensional social enterprise model aiming at reinforcing the relational elements of economic activities and social life. What began as one single social enterprise in 1983 has today developed into a network model of three independent social enterprises that is contributing crucially to economic and social cohesion in a rural area previously marked by de-growth and de-population.

Between 2015 and 2018, a number of Danish case studies has been conducted as a part of the EU-Horizon 2020 SOLIDUS project. The case study focused on empowerment, social justice and citizenship and led to an analysis centering on themes of democracy, pluralism, transparency, recognition, solidarity economy as well as social and political impact (Eschweiler, Hulgård, Nielsen and Schneider, 2018).

The Skovsgård model consists of three legally, economically and organizationally independent social enterprises and a foundation cooperating in a network, all following the same values and principles of providing social and economic integration of people with mental disabilities in a rural municipality in Northern Jutland. The three social enterprises are the *Købmandsgården* (Merchant House) which was the first organization, and thus the historic origin of the model. When it started in 1983 as a social pedagogical collective it had four residents with mental disabilities. The goal of *Købmandsgården* is to provide maximum independence for the residents by providing meaningful jobs integrated in local communities, thus strengthening their sense of self-esteem and developing their resources, rather than hiding them in care homes or closed workshops (Eschweiler, Hulgård, Nielsen, & Schneider, 2018: 14).

Today *Købmandsgården* employs 26 people on special terms and 15 regular full-time employees with different educational backgrounds. The foundation owns three houses in Skovsgård and the original *Købmandsgården,* offering accommodation to 19 disabled employees in independent housing communities. The financial context were provided by loans through local banks and mortgage payments are covered by public funding for housing and the rent residents pay from their pension. Other special terms employees are either living by themselves or with their families. Following a 'learning by doing' approach, jobs consist of horticultural work for their own supply, craftsmen and green teams providing services for local citizens like storing and re-assembling garden furniture, clearing snow or cutting grass for the elderly, or decorating for public events. They cooperate with the local carpenter and the mink farm, do theatre and pottery workshops, and work on a local camping site.

Skovsgård Hotel is the second social enterprise that collaborates in the Skovsgård Model. It is of particular interest for a solidarity economy perspective with its multi-dimensional and strongly embedded character. It was founded by 75 citizens in 1992. By that time, it was just an empty building since it had gone bankrupt several times, when a group of local citizens together decided to reorganize the hotel. In fact, they expanded the idea of what it means to run a hotel, and made it more relevant and sensitive to the local community than that of most privately owned hotels. Accordingly, they formulated three objectives that are still core values for the Skovsgårds Hotel today. Firstly, they wanted to ensure that there would still be a hotel in their community. Secondly, they decided to establish employment for people at the outside of the conventional

labor market. Last but not least, the hotel should be a public space for cultural activities in the broadest sense. It employs approximately 15 people with disabilities along with four full time and two part time staff like a professional chef and finance person. The enterprise follows the same principle of active integration of people with disabilities in the local community and labour market, working peer-to-peer, benefitting from the hotel's activities (hotel operations, restaurant, live-concerts, IT-workshops, cultural clubs and events) and attraction of tourists. When we visited the hotel for two full days, we got a good insight into the value of an embedded economy. The music and dance hall of the hotel, the centre for many cultural activities including many professional concerts, had just gone through a major renovation including a new floor. The monetary cost was kept at a low amount although the quality of the restauration was high. This was only possible due to all sorts of citizen- and community based contributions including crowdfunding and voluntary help.

However, a hotel kitchen needs supplies, which lead to the next entity within the model, *Råd & Dåd.[Advice & Deed]* that started in 1994, first with a horticultural team of disabled and professional staff growing and delivering organic vegetables to the hotel, local restaurants and private households. Then they established a craft team, a creative team, a second-hand shop, and a grocery store, employing a total of 5 teams of 4-6 people besides the supervisor and the merchant. Today *Råd & Dåd* has around 50 employees, 13 of which on ordinary, mostly part-time contracts, and about 20 local volunteers. Every work team leader gets the same pay, and all the employees on special conditions get the same pay. The grocery store is an important example of rural development through actions of egalitarian solidarity. It illustrates how solidarity can be institutionalized in a hybrid complex manner. During our visit, we heard the story about a village that the older residents could remember once had 38 small businesses, the last of which was about to close a few years ago. Citizens came together with people from *Råd & Dåd* to run the store with a mix of volunteer staff members, a professional merchant as well as special needs employee. The change from a purely commercial grocery store to a hybrid grocery store organized as a social enterprise was probably only made possible through the active engagement of the local mayor. Furthermore, Råd & Dåd received some funding from the Danish Social Capital fund. In addition to the grocery store a combined indoor/outdoor public meeting space has been added for celebrations, discussions and public meetings, a local campsite and a harbour cafe.

The three social enterprises, Købmandsgården, Skovsgårds Hotel and Råd & Dåd all collaborate in the Skovsgård Model, that has received several awards, including the national award for social enterprise in 2012. The collaboration exercise democratic governance trying to exert as little hierarchy and centralised decision-making power as possible both when collaborating in the model, and when working with mentally disabled people. The Skovsgård model builds on the notion that if everybody contributes to society to the best of one's abilities, acceptance will arise and by giving people with mental disabilities meaningful tasks they are being recognized as people with resources; they are fellow citizens. The model builds on the PHIL-principle: Production (by the users), Handicap/disability (to link the disabled users with the typical population), Integration (of the users into the local community), and Local (the project has to create life in the local community) (Eschweiler, Hulgård, Nielsen and Schneider, 2018: 16). Today the different entrepreneurial activities employ more than 60 people with special needs, a variety of professionals like a chef, social workers, a merchant, a carpenter, and numerous local volunteers. However, the label "volunteer" makes only little sense in the case of the social enterprises forming the Skovsgård Model. Perhaps we even lack concepts to understand the work and life of stakeholders engaged in solidarity oriented social enterprises such as the ones forming the Skovsgård Model. In the hotel they are co-owners, in the grocery store they are voluntary merchants, and in both places they are first of all citizens

and human beings exercising a huge variety of rights and actions necessary to keep their rural community alive and vibrant.

5 - Reconfiguring the social and solidarity economy in a Danish and Nordic context

In this chapter, we have sketched out the significant sharing and differences of social, and solidarity economy (SSE) in a Danish and Nordic context. We have further included two social and solidarity oriented Danish case studies both delivering a large number of different services and products for vulnerable and ordinary citizens, for local community and for national/international users. In conclusion, we find that our two cases in many ways address several of the defining criteria. The two initiatives differ in shape, space/geography and organizational structure but are important examples of pluralism in a Danish welfare context. Roskilde Festival and Skovsgård Hotel share a number of features that place them as interesting agents of solidarity economy. They both display a differentiated activity portfolio of business; public and civil character as well as a differentiated profile of reciprocity, redistribution and democracy that place them as influential in local, regional and national/international contexts.

Both cases address and articulate the hybridization of resources and objectives in different manners. They are obvious illustrations of how to break the boundaries of organizational social enterprise analysis and investigate more intensely the wider societal context. Roskilde Festival reallocates a large proportion of their revenue for social, environmental and global purposes – providing a huge impact at local, national and international level. Their governance seeks to develop a bottom up democratic and participatory management in which the volunteers and volunteering managers are given agency and influence. The trajectory of solidarity is maintained and refined from the veery beginning when two high school students invented the festival to raise money and awareness for US prisoners on death row. Furthermore, the festival serves as a centre for experimentation in so different areas as city planning, climate change mitigation, risk management and lifelong learning. All areas important for the benefit of reaching a new welfare state reconciliation between an empowered civil society and a redistributive state. Skovsgård's Model provides value generation by hybridizing market, reciprocity and redistribution in multiple institutional configurations. The Skovsgård Model and the collaboration between the three separate organizations could serve as an important global lesson on how it is insane to reserve economic action primarily to a disembedded market sphere. When citizens come together to collectively buy, own and run an abandoned hotel they disrupt the logics of a disembedded market economy. They become agents and owners of a more sophisticated model of a sustainable livelihood model, and in fact, they become pioneers of a welfare model that has more to do with an institutional-reciprocal model of welfare (Hulgård, 2015). This model already exists in embryonic form and if reinforced "it will make societies and citizens more resilient and competent to face the negative consequences of marketization and privatization without losing the objectives of entrepreneurship, enterprise and innovation" (Hulgård, 2015: 217). When the citizen re-opened the hotel as a space for a plurality of meaningful exchange, they also mended the failure of a disembedded market. Through an integration of entrepreneurial and reciprocal values they provided the broader citizenry with an example of a sustainable society. Their model is targeting regional recession, engaging a substantial number of local volunteers in their different enterprises in a reciprocity adding to a more solidarity local community and redistributing their generated surplus and revenues in a continuously growth of social enterprises and cohesive local communities. This done in a rural part of the country that otherwise suffer from de-population and de-growth. Utting talks about redistributive justice and 'deep' sustainability, alternatives to capitalism and the debt-based monetary system, as well as participatory democracy and emancipatory politics driven by active citi-

zenship and social movements activism" (Utting, 2015:2). Both our cases demonstrate how 'deep sustainability' could be realised and deepen our understanding of the complex web and institutional configurations that underpin such a development.

Mendell talks about comprehensive community initiatives as part of the solidarity economy incorporating "multi-stakeholder processes of participatory governance, involving organizations, sectors of activity, citizens and government, drawing on local experience, expertise and knowledge and bringing new resources to strategic decision making at the local level" (Mendell, 2010). Such a diversified and comprehensive form is clearly demonstrated in the two cases presented here. The constant growth and strengthening of the social and solidarity dimensions in both cases comes across because of a widespread, long lasting cross-sectoral collaboration that throughout the years are capable of pursuing multiple objectives and visions. Also Gibson-Graham's critical point on 'weak theory' leading us to "little more than description", powerfully attending to nuance, diversity and overdetermined interaction, proves its potential in our two cases (Gibson-Graham, 2014). By 'deep-diving' into the two cases and provide thick descriptions we see how, trust, care, sharing, reciprocity, cooperation, gender and diversity, equal rights, future orientation, collective agreement, bridging and bonding, community engagement and pressure, solidarity, distributive justice, bottom up governance, environmental and social justice, global conscience – all serve as drivers for the social and solidarity cases. Social and solidarity economy, as defined in this book, stands opposite to the dominant more restricted and market-conventional approach that tend to dominate the Danish and Nordic policy discourse. The wisdom offered by our two cases on social and solidarity economy clearly demonstrates, how SSE is much more demanding, much more rewarding but also providing much more multiplication on several parameters.

References:

Andersen, L. L. (2015). Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation: Human Economy, Governance and Volunteerism Revisited. *Cursiv*, (15), pp. 35–54.

Block, F. & Somers, M. (2014). The Power of Market Fundamentalism. Karl Polanyi's Critique.

Borzaga, C. & Defourny, J. (eds.) (2001). *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*. London: Routledge.

Defourny, J., L. Hulgård & Pestoff, V. (2014). *Social Enterprise and the Third Sector – Changing European Landscapes in a Comparative Perspective*. New York: Routledge.

Eschweiler, J., Hulgård, L., Nielsen, L. V., & Schneider, E. F. (2018). *WP 2: Spatial dimensions of solidarity. Case Studies Denmark. Solidus. Solidarity in European societies: Empowerment, Social justice and Citizenship. EU: Horizon 2020.*

Fraisse, L, Guerin, I. & Laville, J.L. (2007). Economie solidaire: des initiatives locales a l'action publique. Introduction, *Revue Tiers Monde*, 58, 245-253.

Gardin, L. (2006). "A variety of resource mixes inside social enterprises," in *Social Enterprise* Nyssens, M. (ed.) Oxon: Routledge.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2014). "Rethinking the Economy with Thick Description and Weak Theory". *Current Anthropology*, *55*(S9), pp. 147–153. https://doi.org/10.1086/676646.

Granovetter, M. (1973). "The Strength of Weak Ties," *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (6), pp. 1360-1380.

Hjalager, A. (2009). "Cultural Tourism Innovation Systems – The Roskilde Festival," *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *9*(2–3), pp. 266–287. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250903034406.

Hulgård, L. (2015). "Differing perspectives on civil society and the state," in Laville, J-L., Young, D. & Eynaud, P. (eds.) *Civil Society, the Third Sector and Social Enterprise: Governance and Democracy*. Oxdon: Routledge, pp. 205-222.

Hulgård, L. (1990). *Summa Summarum - Journal for Social Development* no. 1, vol. 1. Copenhagen: The National Board of Social Services.
Kristensen, K (1990). "Kommentar til Clausen" in *Summa Summarum - Journal for Social Development* no. 1, vol. 1, 1990 Hulgård, L. (ed.) Copenhagen: The National Board of Social Services.
Laville, J.-L. (2010). “Plural Economy”, in Hart, K., Laville, J.-L. & Cattani, D. C. (eds.): *The Human Economy*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 77-84.

Laville, J.-L. (2015). "Social and solidarity economy in historical perspective", in P. Utting (Ed.), *Social and solidarity economy: Beyond the fringe* London: Zed Books: Just Sustainabliities, pp. 41–56.
Laville, J.-L. & Hulgård, L. (2017). *Solidarity Economy, Reciprocity and Social Innovation – SERESI*, presented at EMES Conference, Louvain-la-Neuve, 3-6 July, 2017.
Mendell, M. (2010). "Empowerment: From Noise to Voice," in *Universitas Forum* (Vol. 2).
Mendell, M., & Alain, B. (2015) "Enabling the social and solidarity economy through the co-construction of public policy," in Utting, P. (Ed.) *Social and solidarity economy: Beyond the fringe*. London: Zed Books: Just Sustainabilities, pp. 166–184.
Polanyi, K. (1944; 2001): *The Great Transformation. The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Reich, R. (2011). *The Promise and Peril of the New Social Economy*, Speech Stanford: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Bhki3d_4Lk.
Roy, M. (2015). *Conceptualizing Social Enterprise as a Healt and Well-Being 'Intervention'*. PhD Thesis. Glasgow: Glasgow Caledonian University.
Roy, M., McHugh & Sinclair (2017). "Social Impact Bonds - Evidence-based policy or Ideology?" in *Handbook of Social Policy Evaluation*. Northampton: Edward Elgar, pp. 263-279.
Sørensen, K.I. & Lund, A.B. (2018). *Sorgfrit Udkomme & Timeligt Velvære?* Copenhagen: CBS Center for Civilsamfundsstudier.
Utting, P. (2015). Introduction: The Challenge of Scaling up Social and Solidarity Economy," in Utting, P. (Ed.), *Social and solidarity economy: Beyond the fringe*. London: Zed Books: Just Sustainabliities, pp. 1-37.