
PREFACE

The journal P2P&Innovation releases its second number in a global scenario with another capitalistic crisis, which seems to have a never-ending capacity to recycle and adapt itself to financial and productive difficulties, as well as those related to demand. The strain between crisis and adaptation raise demands for creative and innovative solutions capable of responding to local problems and generating welfare in a sustainable way.

It is in this scenario that our contemporary society sees the emergence of very particular forms of production in a rather intense way, forms which are also peculiar as they are processes of communication. The relations between language and work are at the basis of innovative and collaborative means of production. Such collaboration does not exclude command, however it opens many possibilities for the autonomy and emancipation of those who work with them.

Collaboration and competition are not opposed to each other, in fact they complement each other like modes of action in contemporary organizations, according to the term economy, perhaps forgotten in its double meaning, “concurrency”, indicating contribution for something to happen and, at the same time, meaning competition. Production without ties of knowledge appropriation may accelerate the generation of practical solutions. Sharing problems can lead more rapidly to the necessary solutions.

The first article in this issue is “The End of Capitalism and the Return of Koinonia”, by Fernando Suárez Müller, from the Utrecht University/Faculty of Humanities. Müller discusses the financial crisis of globalized capitalism, trying to present alternatives. The Hegelian conception of a parliamentary system based on participative economy with its basis on autonomous communities, and not on individuals, suggests the reconciliation of public and private interests, which would not be possible based on the Marxist conception, but is close to current movements in search of alternatives for capitalism.

Hegel’s conceptions and movements, like Michel Bauwens’ P2P, Alan Caillé’s conviviality, and the welfare movement created by Christian Felber, have in common the notion of koinonia. In this sense, Suarez Muller considers Bauwens’, Caillé’s, and

Felber's approaches, alternatives to capitalism, that propose the construction of collaborative communities and cooperative local and global ventures pointing out a step taken in society's evolution, from capitalism to koinonia.

The second article is written by Vasilis Kostakis and Chris Giotitsas about "The Political Economy of the Bitcoin". In this article, the authors argue that the warm-up of the 2007-2008 financial crisis allowed the emergence of various alternative practices in terms of production, circulation and use of money. The essay explores specifically the political economy of the ecosystem that uses the digital currency Bitcoin: its nature, its dynamics, its advantages and disadvantages.

The authors conclude that the Bitcoin is an experiment of "distributed capitalism" and has to be perceived mainly as a technological innovation: it does not provide answers and pragmatic solutions to current points of view about the financial crisis, however, it does sets forth useful and appropriate questions on the principles and bases of the dominant political economy.

The third article, by Celio Turino, creator of the program Live Culture of the Ministry of Culture during President Lula's government, is entitled: "Culture to Unite Peoples". Turino was recently in Rome to present his work to Pope Francis. In his article he reports the experience of some countries in Latin America with the introduction of Points of Culture. He gives examples of development and articulation of a network of socio-cultural leadership and autonomy, through which diversity is practiced.

Beginning by stimulating the dialogue with the government, Turino comes to the conclusion that the State needs to help society, maintaining sound public equipment and quality services, besides it is also necessary to do things together with society. Having more networks the Point of Culture gets articulated and it will be better empowered, whether from a social, economical, and political perspective, or in creative and artistic aspects.

This discussion is particularly relevant at the beginning of the second term of Dilma Rousseff's office, when there is a sign for the return of investment in the program Live Culture and innovative actions coming with it. A truly cultural policy

implies the relationship of the State with society based on strengthening its public equipment and ending precariousness of its work relations.

The next article, by Gonçalves Reis, Kuramoto and collaborators, asks the following question: “Can instructions to authors stimulate open access in Brazil?” The authors observe that an indispensable resource for the development of Open Science is to have minimal standards of information about the Open Access Policy in the instructions to the authors. They analyzed 93 instructions to authors in Health Science journals in the SciELO Brasil collection.

The authors observed that the journals available in the web which have an ISSN online version, do not offer information for disclosure in digital resources, reflecting the printed model in its guidelines. Journals do not inform about the dissemination of the scientific production through social networks, secondary magazines, and institutional or thematic repositories. Thus, it looks like the absence of such stimuli in the instructions to the authors does not support Open Access Policies.

Finally, the last group of articles addresses the work done by activists and scholars in Ecuador in a venture entitled FLOK Society: Free Libre Open Knowledge Society. This project is interesting because it tried to combine supportive and collaborative forms of production with traditional political action in a populist and leftist Latin-American government, in this case Rafael Correa’s government.

Three articles in sequence are then presented, related to this extremely rich experience lived so close to us. The first article is by Barandiaran and Vasquez, “Becoming Pachamama of Knowledge”, in which the conceptual bases of this proposal are presented. In this chief document (expandable and liable to be reviewed) the bases for the design of a process of collaboration and social participation (institutional and popular) are offered, as well as experts, which resulted in a productive Summit (not merely expositive).

The ambitious aim of the authors includes unleashing and coordinating a participative process in global scale of immediate national implementation in order to change the productive matrix towards a society of common and open knowledge in Ecuador.

The second article about the Flok society experience is by Vila Viñas: “Ecuador’s Flok Society 1.0: Local Transition towards Social Economy of Knowledge is on its Way”. It is an evaluation article. The author describes processes, collaborators, and the repercussion of the preparation of the Ecuadorian project “Flok Society”, that envisages the making of plans intending to strengthen the social economy of open and common social knowledge.

The third article is another evaluation of the Flok process, done by Michel Bauwens, from the P2P Foundation: “Why will P2P Foundation not Use the FLOK trademark in the Future?” It reports the experience in the implementation of the P2P process, collaboration and sharing of knowledge. Among the difficulties that were faced, a major factor was the resistance of the government in providing effective support, considered non-strategic.

The author observes that many times, not in explicit ways, the government confirms support but ends up hindering the progress of the project. Another challenge is lack of trust from the civil society in a project supposedly sponsored by the government. After the experience in Ecuador, the author arrives at the conclusion that the Flok process should not be implemented in the P2P Foundation future plans, and that issues related to the political and historical context of a country need to be taken into account in future projects.

Ecuador’s experience shows how complicated it is to combine governmental public policies with local actions of production and innovation. Statements of intention to change the social dynamics of production are not enough. Besides, it is not the case of making an apology of precariousness or lack of resources to do the work. The challenges of the relationship between language and work persist and become more complex.

At the release of this issue of P2P&Innovation, we would like to welcome Liz-Rejane Issberner who is now part of the Editorial Committee of this journal. Liz-Rejane is a Senior Researcher of the Brazilian Institute of Information in Science and Technology – IBICT, Coordinator of the Post-Graduate Program in Information Science, in the framework of the agreement IBICT/UFRJ, and she has a scholarship in

Research Productivity. She is the leader of the research group Information, Knowledge, Innovation, and Environmental Sustainability.