3rd International Conference

on Public Policy (ICPP3)

June 28-30, 2017 – Singapore

P12 Challenges for Multilevel Governance: Civil Society and Institutional Conditions for Effective Inclusion in Latin America and Europe

Title of the panel

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ELITES AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NEW GOVERNANCE

Author(s)

Dr. José-Manuel Canales-Aliende

Universidad de Alicante,

España

Jm.canales@ua.es

Dra. Adela Romero-Tarín

Universidad de Alicante

España

adela.romero@ua.es

Abstract

This paper analyzes from an essential perspective the role of the elites in the present society as a consequence of the globalization and therefore of the governance. Therefore, this paper questions the role of these in the new global context and how they will develop in the present and future relations between elites and civil society. In addition, it will describe the role that civil society in these new times must make so that governance ceases to be theoretical and can take shape, despite legal uncontrol. Political and of the exerted pressure of the elites to the traditional political powers. This fact rethinks a new context, with different problems and characteristics in the face of the old dilemma of the antinomy between technocracy and democracy.

1

1. Brief Introduction and General Approach

1.1. Some General Considerations

The current study, the different approaches and the contributions on public policies are certainly plural, diverse and complex, as is the society on which they act, while this affects them.

This complexity and heterogeneity, previously indicated by public policies, and the idiosyncrasy of contemporary society, called in many forms all expressive of its polyhedral reality (so-called liquid society, postindustrial, postmodern, digital, knowledge) That there are many variables pointed out with the intention of explaining and analyzing this reality. Therefore, there is no single and independent explanatory variable of current social reality, and of public policies; But several and diverse, being the current challenge of the study of public policies to take them all into account, and in a systematic, comprehensive and holistic way.

In this study we intend to emphasize and signify two variables that we consider to be the most important for the study and analysis of public policies, namely: a) the role of political elites and b) administrative innovation. Both variables or aspects should be related in turn with the rest of the variables to be considered, and especially with the environment or the context in which public policies are considered.

On the other hand, and without prejudice to the foregoing, our reflections are of a general nature, and as observable and remarkable trends in public policies; Although this generic vision should in each specific case or country, be completed with the detailed analysis to be taken into account for its study and consideration.

Public policies must also be analyzed and framed within the public sphere (Habermas, 1999), and in a context of globalization that has surpassed the "Westphalian" model of the State, and with the utopia of a cosmopolitan or global government and justice (Held, 1995) (Habermas, 1999, 2002) (Rawls, 2006).

Democracy today requires not only voting and representation; But reflection, deliberation, transparency and evaluation. In this sense, Habermas (2002) has spoken of the need for a democracy that requires self-determination, that is, to offer the non-theoretical, if not real, possibility of greater control of public institutions, circumstances and public policies that determine and influence The life of the people.

As stated in previous lines, our position is that there is not only a certain crisis and regression of democracy, but also added to the above, a bad government and an inadequate Public Administration, which makes the design, formulation and The management or implementation of public policies is not always the most effective, timely and transparent on

2

many occasions; And this is partly due to a lack of adequate and sufficient leadership and administrative innovation.

One of the possible causes of crises and their lack of political regeneration in modern democracy is undoubtedly individualism and indifference to the public, and between people. On this question, Arendt (1974) called it "the disarticulation of public space", which can lead to a dangerous process of totalitarianism, and which has been defended by economic neoliberalism aimed at privatization and deregulation of the public sector.

1.2. Some considerations on the current context and the effects of globalization

It is already a paradigm the current context of globalization in which we are immersed, which has produced among other effects a profound crisis of contemporary political systems, and especially the classic model of representative democracy and the model and classic functions Of the State, even going so far as to speak of a "democratic regression" in the world.

The representative classical democracy fruit of the citizen's election is questioned, it is insufficient, and its operation causes apathy, distrust and citizen alienation. All of this was produced among other causes by a series of phenomena among which we would highlight the following: a) the economic crisis; B) the loss of legitimacy and corruption in political-administrative systems, and in particular in political parties; C) progressive social exclusion and loss of status of the middle classes; D) migration and multiculturalism; E) lack of political leadership; etc.

Faced with these significant and relevant but at the same time worrying and problematic facts, the contribution of the "Critical School" of the Social Sciences or called Frankfurt School, whose most emblematic figure is Habermas, is to propose as a way Alternative the primacy of the public sphere.

However, civil society as well as the public sphere, are global and therefore, their problems, demands and challenges that are included, are also global.

Faced with this new reality, there is only one solution, an exit that can respond to a paradigm of governmental cosmopolitanism or global governance, and overcome capitalism towards a new reality. While it is true that we are still far from it, the roads seem clear but difficult, and passivity and / or ignorance about this vision and process only lead to predictable chaos.

Public policies, regardless of their scope, content or the level of government that adopts them (Vallés, 2000), must necessarily take into account this macro and ad extra vision of the cosmopolitanism in which they are inserted, together with the reality of the context of globalization. This last factor is important to not forget, since it represents the integrative formula that is "think globally and act locally".

Public policies, in turn, within the specific political system in which they will act, must also take into account the context and characteristics of that political system, and the new role of

3

the State and its new functions. The current or "modern" state must be modest, respectful and helpful to citizens (Crozier, 1992), although the role of the State is still necessary, and it must play new roles, not all of them properly providing and providing services and Public goods, but above all regulation and control. This in turn will provoke other and different public policies, and not just the traditional ones.

The analysis of the current political system, and of the State inserted in it, and the sum of multiple and diverse social and political institutions must take into account not only the classic and formal institutions, but also more informal ones, fruit of clientelism, and of associationism, which Influence and determine the vision and behavior of political actors and leaders, and thus affect public policies.

The weakness, informality, and relativity of the institutional context should not be forgotten in the analysis of these and of public policies.

Now one thing is citizen participation in the process of making decisions in a real and not symbolic way; And another thing is purely an informational citizen participation.

1.3. Some considerations about the current knowledge society and its implications

Current society is known as "knowledge" or "learning" (Stiglitz & Greenwald, 2016) in which not only knowledge but also learning is important. Learning is today a goal, a challenge, and a process throughout the life of the people.

Knowledge or talent also have an individual or personal dimension as well as a social dimension. This will involve the demand and the need for constant training of all social actors, and within them also of the political and administrative elites, as well as the crucial importance in the processes of socialization and learning of the school, which will follow Other processes throughout the life of the people.

Today, the school appears as the key and primary institution in the socialization of citizens, and in it public values must be transmitted within the framework of an adequate citizen education, with special emphasis on the full validity and strict compliance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Rights of Man and Citizen.

1.4. Some considerations about innovation in the current social process

Innovation along with education, as expressed by the totality of the doctrine, constitute today the two essential ways or formulas for the change and the current social progress.

On the other hand, innovation can not be improvised, but strategically planned after a process of participatory reflection, achieving through it increased productivity, comprehensive economic and social development, solving and responding to existing social demands and problems.

Governments to achieve innovation must spend as a priority on three objectives: education, research and infrastructures. Innovation is more than pure R & D, and requires an insight, an interactive multidisciplinary approach and procedure, and multiple and diverse actors and institutions.

The approach and purpose of innovation is citizen satisfaction and requires not only a purely logical and technocratic rationality, but also political; And which is not purely symbolic.

Educational institutions and, in particular, research centers and universities are called to play a relevant role in this area, developing the knowledge, skills and innovation skills of citizens to the maximum extent possible.

However, innovation at the corporate level and at the public level must be complemented, integrated and coordinated for the better attainment of its goals.

The administrative innovation or innovation of Public Administrations, which will be discussed later, is one of the manifestations of public innovation, which should be a consequence of a previous political decision and not the result of a purely technocratic approach. On the other hand, that of the Administration must be complementary, and must be coordinated with political, social and cultural innovation. However, innovation is not enough only in institutions, but also, justice must prevail in them as truth must do in systems of thought (Rawls, 2006).

Institutions in turn should be considered not with a formalist vision, but relative or contextual. If institutions have this character, so will their innovation processes and public policies. Strongly structured, well-connected, sensitive and effective institutions, faced with the heterogeneous demands of citizenship and civil society, are the antidote to populism.

Civic republicanism as an ideology promotes democratic regeneration, basically through the regeneration of public institutions.

1.5. Public policies and the Third Sector

Faced with the rigidity and crisis of current capitalism, a phase called postcapitalism, it is presented as one of the possible solutions and challenges and as a real synthesis or third way between state capitalism and neoliberal business capitalism, that of the so-called social economy, Third Sector of the economy or with similar denominations. Moreover, this sector would be integrated with the public and private sector, in the concept of the Royal Academy of the Spanish Language of Governance.

Governance at the state or national level, and supra-national or supranational level, will also imply the simultaneous role of the Third Sector. This Third Sector is a true "tailor's box", as it is known and integrates a diversity and plurality of associations and movements (social, ecological, indigenous, feminist, ...), and is expressive in addition to the social capital of each Country, and promoter of a more inclusive and integral economic and social development

more just, and not of a mere economic growth that only benefits to the high layers of the social structure. The economy would be more shared and more collaborative between sectors.

For all this, the expressive public policies of governance will have new actors and institutions participating in them, not only in the design phase but also in the execution. Public policies are publicly owned, there is a more real co-ownership, citizens are "stateholders" of the public, but also participate in the externalized execution of public policies.

Today, moreover, the knowledge society implies a pluralistic and networked economy and society, which in turn makes the management of public policies reasonably shared by the public sector and the Third Sector; And it is not so much a return to classic Keynesianism, but to a different process and experience.

An added value of the presence and participation of the Third Sector in public policies is that it will include the economy, and it will be collaborative and shared, and not exclusive or exclusive, so it will avoid oligopolies and monopolies resulting from the variety And diversity of actors and stakeholders that should represent the various consensual interests.

Throughout history, social movements have been fundamental agents of social transformation, ... and they differ from the mobilization of demands in which they are situated outside the institutionality, if this does not respond to their values and projects. These are understood as socio-cultural movements aimed at transforming the values of society, rather than taking positions in the structure of the State, although they tend to have important political effects (Castells, 2016).

2. Leadership and political elites

2.1. Some General Considerations

The study of political elites is a traditional study within the social sciences, especially political science, and has been the subject of analysis by numerous social scientists, among them Mosca, Pareto, Michels, Mills, Crozier, among others.

How the typologies they respond to, their characteristics, mobility and promotion, recruitment and training, etc., arise. Of political elites, span hundreds of studies and pages; Being the key question whether these are essentially inbreeding or not; That is, if they are democratic and meritocratic, and we should analyze their reality in each country, in each historical moment.

Political elites or the "political class" will influence and be influenced by the political system, and will or will not have a relevant role in their regeneration and change.

It is not the main object of this study, the consideration of the phenomenon of relations between political elites and political parties. These are one of the causes and effects of the current crisis of the political system, in which they have lost much of their identity, and demand of them greater coherence, transparency and internal democracy.

There is no doubt that the peculiarities and characteristics of political parties will influence the roles and characteristics of political elites in each political system, but as is well known, not all political elites are necessarily linked to political parties.

Another aspect added to the previous one, which we also want to mention and which affects political leadership and political elites, which is not a direct object of this study, is the relationship between political elites and the rest of the elites With social movements and with populism.

However, we must point out that in the current process is increasingly important of the personalization of politics, the fruit of communication. One of the challenges of present-day democracy is that elites are transparent and democratic and do not produce distrust and rejection in citizenship, "since the modern state is threatened by the power of powerful and well-organized elites, They repatriitialize the State and its institutions for the benefit of its members (Fukuyama, 2016)

Today's representative, participatory, reflexive, and deliberative democracy requires genuinely democratic political elites who know how to listen and lead citizens, and at all, it is worth talking about a parliamentary democracy of an elitist character, where there is only in the Schumpeterian sense a competition between Leaders on the margins of society and citizenship. Full democracy and quality, as a result of the so-called "democratic regeneration", inspired by civic republicanism, requires transparency, and this is adequate public information and communication, especially with the complexity and modernization of politics.

One relevant aspect that arouses great interest in socio-political analysis is the study of the type, characteristics and conduct of political leadership carried out by political elites. The study of political leadership, which has received attention from various disciplines, is classic, varied, and very broad.

The typology of political leadership is in turn the fruit and reflection of the historical context of the existing model of political system. If it is open, inclusive, pluralistic, oriented or not to change, this may be political leadership, although this correlation and consequence is not always the case, and vice versa. Open, transformative, pluralistic and democratic leadership can meet the resistance of a closed and asylum political system; and vice versa.

On the other hand, the capacity for leadership, is not born with it or improvised, but is fruit of experience. So today, we talk about Government Schools, as the right place to qualify for it.

Leadership in addition to the classic democratic, transformative, pluralistic, integrative characteristics must also be for "times of crisis." That is to say, to be prepared to prevent, confront, manage and solve the crisis, which in this moment of globalization, is plural, diverse and very dynamic. The dignity, transparency and effectiveness of political action must also be restored, within the framework of the application and development of the current thinking of "civic republicanism", therefore, public policies are a very useful manifestation and a suitable means for that.

Another current problem, not only of academic interest but of public opinion, is the degree or not, and the intensity of the bonding of the elites among themselves, and their easy or non-circulation; And the relations of influence between them with the various pressure groups, especially the economic ones. Regulations such as "Open Government" or "Laws of Transparency" and "Lobby Control" are intended to regulate and control these political phenomena.

The role of lobbyists in the design and formulation of public policies is now also a relevant topic from a theoretical and practical point of view for political studies.

According to Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) elites "uprooted" from the public or "extractive", lead to selfishness, their particularism, and disaffection and alienation from the citizens, or the "rebellion of the masses" (Ortega and Gasset, 1929) even ending as a final effect of the crisis, the disappearance of the democratic, representative and pluralistic political system, and the economic system and development, and of course the poor and inefficient functioning of public institutions.

2.2. The Leadership Needed Today

Ideal leadership in the Weberian sense, as it is known, does not exist, nor does the general formula valid for all circumstances and contexts. The leadership must therefore adapt in its different modalities and styles to concrete historical and sociopolitical reality, the institutions that are going to carry out the different public policies, and the typologies and challenges of each public policy.

Leadership in the current context of the existing multiple crisis (social, political, economic, and values) should above all have at least these basic characteristics and styles, namely: a) democratic; b) participatory; c) integrator; d) innovative or transformational; e) charismatic (not authoritarian, but as an expression of humanity and closeness). The charism implies respect and acceptance of others; f) transparent; g) responsible for their decisions and actions; h) visionary, with prospecting capacity; (i) management and management capacity; j) the ability to communicate with employees of the institutions they lead, with civil society and with citizens. Communication is not just an image, it implies an intersubjective and social relationship; k) capacity for analysis and reflection and not for improvisation and amateurism; and l) capacity to manage the complexity and political, economic, social and cultural diversity of today.

But in addition to those above-mentioned political styles and characteristics of the elites of that character, in addition all types of leaders should have and perform in other characteristics, abilities and skills more of human character, and according to a recent bibliography, would be the following: a) First, to know themselves, with their strengths and weaknesses; b) to contribute the best of himself, in all his decisions and actions; c) the capacity for influence and persuasion; d) to bring about positive and innovative changes, despite possible adverse circumstances, seeking alternative and possible formulas; E)

treatment and relationship with all persons, whether or not they are members of their institution, with humility, deep respect and affection; f) empathy; g) emotional intelligence; h) the capacity for interpersonal and social communication; i) develop listening skills; and j) capacity for negotiation and consensus (Sharma, 2010).

Good leadership allows not only the effective development of public policies but also, and above all, brings greater legitimacy and quality to democratic and participatory governance. The role of the political leader is not only that of prior analysis, decision and formulation of public policies; But also and above all, the management and management of public policies, integrating and coordinating the vision, mission and execution of the same.

On the other hand, leadership should not necessarily be unipersonal or unique, but it seems that the current trend of democratic regeneration and a quality democracy is the result of a pluralistic political, social, economic and cultural approach or vision that Demands necessarily collective, plural, or team leaderships.

3. Administrative Innovation

3.1. Some General Considerations

As we have already pointed out above, administrative innovation is part of public innovation, and this in turn is of social innovation or of society, and this in a given temporal and geopolitical context. If this is carried out in a disintegrated and uncoordinated way, it will inevitably be doomed to failure.

However, administrative innovation is not intended to be something from one day to another, but involves a process with the characteristics that we will point out later.

The term administrative innovation is synonymous with administrative reform and modernization, although it has a special symbolic burden due to its expressive accommodation to the new reality and current context of the knowledge society, compared to other previous historical periods; And it is linked and also expressly integrates processes of innovation or social change in the era of knowledge.

3.2. Special consideration for administrative innovation

Administrative innovation must be "the result of a previous political decision, characteristic of democratic political systems to make it fully legitimate. The market, therefore, can not and should not replace legitimate political decisions, although it certainly must and can influence them; Which leads from the outset to postulate the unequivocal need for the re-politicization of the Public Administrations, in the face of past mercantile and neoliberal technocratic experiences and tendencies, which legitimized and guided them only in relation to the cost

and functioning of the market, In addition, we are witnessing a process that would qualify as increasingly necessary and unstoppable, progressive demands for participation in the debate and alternatives of public decision-making processes and in the evaluation of their performance and results by civil society and the Citizenship "(Canales Aliende, 2003: 21-22)

While administrative elites, managers, public managers and public employees are and should be the main actors in the implementation of administrative innovation; No doubt the political decision as has been said is previous, and political elites must guide, direct and support this complex process of change. It is common that after the design, formulation and communication of public policies by policy makers, they forget or disconnect from the process decided, leaving actors and administrative institutions to act freely.

Innovation or administrative change should be planned with the various objectives, projects, and techniques to put into practice.

It is obvious, as has already been said, that without effective, transparent and flexible institutions, administrative innovation processes can not be easily carried out.

While there are common trends, basically pointed out by the OECD, there is no valid and uniform universal formula for each situation and country. Administrative innovation must adapt to the context in which it is to be implemented and developed, avoiding easy and simple institutional and managerial "mimics". The so-called "good practices" should certainly be taken into account in their case, but their application should be prudent and appropriate to the environment, actors, problems, situations, institutions and public policies to implement.

3.3. The characteristics of administrative innovation and public policy

On the other hand, the process of administrative innovation should be above all, reflective, participatory, planned and evaluated sufficiently and in turn with the process and the phases of public policies.

Administrative innovation, complementary and a consequence of political innovation, undoubtedly also contributes to the legitimacy and democratic quality of political-administrative systems.

The reflection phase implies that prior to the formulation of any public policy, the decision should include in advance a detailed analysis of the reality and the problem to be solved, accompanied by the greatest possible information and documentation. The existence of databases, with indicators and economic and social statistics, as well as "good practices", helps a lot to any diagnosis.

However, if this is fundamental and necessary, so too is the existence of a meritocratic, independent and professional public function, far from clientelism and political opportunism.

It is today a paradigm that, in the face of the "ideal" and classic model of the Weberian bureaucracy, the relationship between politics and administration, and therefore between

politicians and civil servants, is not a rigid and formal separation, but a mutual and dialectical relationship among them.

The democratic ideal and the separation of powers is the necessary and desirable collaboration between politics and public administration, that is to say between politicians and civil servants, and in the reflection phase this means that officials, endowed with knowledge and "expertise" Advise and duly advise the politicians, who are the final decision makers. However, this advice and support should not imply a substitution of the "political class" for the "bureaucratic class", since only politicians enjoy the democratic legitimacy of elective representation.

On the other hand, in the reflection phase, the presence and opinion of citizens and civil society, through the various means of citizen participation and representation, which are manifestations in addition to reflective, deliberative democracy And participatory; Complementary but not substitute for representative classical democracy.

The most successful experiences of the so-called "participatory budgeting" would be applicable, as appropriate formulas to know and shape the preferences and demands of citizenship. Once the process of reflection, debate, and choice, of some or some of the possible and viable alternatives has been completed, the decision on the matter, which corresponds to the politicians, must be formulated.

The latter, should be as clear and transparent as possible, to adequately explain and communicate to citizens the said action to be implemented. It will not be a question of a formulation and communication that implies a simple and simple citizen's adhesion, but of an adequate explanation and motivation to achieve citizen identification and monitoring, not of imposition, but of persuasion and consensus.

On the other hand, this debate and subsequent consensus, as pluralistic as possible, should not be understood as the mere final sum of different interests and positions, but as something more and different, but as a result of an intersubjective reflection and communication that integrates and expresses Pluralistic opinion fairly; Surpassing the utilitarian conceptions (Betham, 1990) administrative innovation, and this in the managerial framework of public policies.

Justice does not derive from negotiation between selfish people who want to optimize their chances of success and personal security, nor is it the result of a pact between people with unequal power with that which exists in civil society, but the commitment to the idea arises That we are all equal to determine the content of justice and to reformulate "the social contract"; And this through mechanisms of representation that guarantee impartiality and consensus (Rawls, 1977).

As part of the decision, this will entail a strategic plan, not short-term, and new public projects that develop it, and that will be reflected in the annual budget with clear objectives, possible and basically measurable.

The reflection, the decision and the formulation of agreements and possible public policies, leads in turn to the implementation or management of the same ones; And here at this stage the improvement of public management and the use of public management techniques (if those of the private business sector are used, they must be adapted to the public sector without easy mimicking). On the other hand, good and effective public management, shows and implies professionals of management and public management, and not amateurs or persons incompatible with this field by causes and origin clientelaries not at all neutrality, professionalism and independence Required.

In the final phase of public management and public policies, the evaluation must be carried out. The autonomy and flexibility of the implementation phase does not preclude further evaluation; And without this there is no value judgment with rigor on the results; And without evaluation there can be no later demand for responsibilities, or recognition of what is acted upon, or "good practice".

Evaluation is a philosophy, technique and methodology of the new culture and modernization of the public. It also appears as a key aspect of any administrative modernization process.

The evaluation can and should be pluralistic, with the coordinated, systemic and complementary participation of several political-administrative institutions (the Parliament, the Ombudsman, Supreme Audit Institutions, etc.) and among the latter, citizenship.

Citizen participation through various formulas is of great interest and usefulness, and this in particular through so-called "social audits".

Although the process of administrative innovation must be comprehensive, total, holistic or encompass the whole of a public organization in addition to improvements in the five essential but not unique factors of the same, namely: a) organizational structures; b) administrative procedures; c) budgets and economic and financial resources; d) communication and information; and e) people, formerly called human resources.

For an effective change, it must affect at least those five elements mentioned above, and in particular that referred to people. Institutions are ultimately what their people are, and these are determinants for their change, and especially this, through the change of administrative culture or "public corporate culture."

These five elements or basic variables of the content of a public organization or institution, together with its own culture, constitute in turn the essence, the substrate and the characteristics that identify any one of them and differentiate it from the rest, and in turn Also condition and characterize the process of administrative innovation of the public policies of each public institution.

Administrative innovation in turn is not an end in itself, but is an instrument or finalist way for and to achieve good governance. It is through public institutions in accordance with the demands of citizenship and society, inspired and guided by the following essential principles: a) efficiency, economy and efficiency; b) citizen empowerment; c) ethics and transparency; d) ecology; and e) the defense, the guarantee of legality and human rights.

An objective aspect to emphasize of the administrative innovation, is the necessity of the participation of the own public employees of the public institutions and of the citizenship in the phases of the public policies.

3.4. Neo-institutionalism and administrative innovation

In recent years, as a result of the multidisciplinary current in the social sciences in general, and in political science in particular, institutionalism has emphasized the importance of institutions in considering public policies in their various phases and Typologies. Somehow, this current came to replace and surpass the "public choice", the "rational choice" or "Public Choice Theory" of the eighties and of the Theory of Games, negating aspects and social influence in all collective action of the institutions, and at the same time very formalistic and rationalistic, without considering aspects of the corporate culture and the behavior of the people.

The State is the integrated set of a plurality and diversity of political-administrative institutions, which must be coordinated adequately and effectively. The current political system unlike the past, is not so "statocentric" but "polycentric".

Recently the iusinstitutionalist vision has been corroborated and reinforced, the result of the work of Acemoglu and Robinson, which reflect on the political and economic institutions that are appropriate and inclusive and therefore not "extractive", which also implies inclusive and pluralistic elites. For these authors, economic and social development is the result of adequate institutions, and presupposes the existence of stability and economic and social development, as well as minimal political legitimacy (Lipset, 1989).

However, institutional change is only possible and desirable at critical moments, and the media and new technologies can help it, but they are by no means decisive in the process of change and previous political stability.

These authors, Acemoglu and Robinson (2012), have subsequently been supported by a number of authors, notably Nobel laureates such as Kenneth J. Arrow, Peter Diamond, Robert Solow, George Akerlof, and Gary S Becker.

Innovation, flexibility, differentiation, specialization, professionalization, stability and institutional effectiveness are necessary and complementary aspects of the democratic regeneration process of any country, and safe safeguard against easy and demagogic populism.

4. Conclusions and final reflections

1. In the previous lines we have tried to emphasize the importance of public institutions along with administrative innovation, as well as the role and characteristics that leaders must have for change, consensus and "reformulated social contract" as aspects or variables that are also relevant In the study and development of public policies, understanding them as the means to achieve justice and the effectiveness of human rights.

It can not be ignored that the latter are developed "in" and "by" public institutions, and that among the main actors who analyze, design, formulate and execute are the leaders and other people who act in institutions. Ultimately, public policies are designed and executed by people, for people (citizenship), and are not just something purely abstract and laboratory-free from the reality to which they apply.

2. Therefore, human nature will always be present in them, and will condition them and can not be detached. The defense and the new articulation of public space within the vision of "civic republicanism", and therefore of public policies, must undoubtedly produce, in the context of a new global civil society and governance, an overcoming of the danger of a citizen Isolated, without social ties; And a democracy not only formal, symbolic and electoral.

3. Transparency, control, consensus, participation, responsibility and social solidarity are variables to be proclaimed and applied in public policies. All this in a new context of complexity, diversity, dynamism, consensus and social legitimacy, in which we must analyze and take into account the contextual, historical and evolutionary nature of public institutions along with public policies.

The new times and context, the new demands and challenges citizens and the new actors, undoubtedly demand new public policies reformulating and updating the classic theories.

5. References

Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J. A. (2012) *Por qué fracasan los países. Los orígenes del poder, la prosperidad y la pobreza*. Barcelona: Deusto.

Aguilar Villanueva, L. F. (1992) *Antologías de Política Pública*. México: Porrúa

— (2014) *Gobierno y Administración Pública*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Arendt, H. (1974) *Los orígenes del totalitarismo*. Madrid: Taurus.

Bardach, E. (2008) *Los ocho pasos para el análisis de las políticas públicas. Un manual para la práctica*. México: Porrúa.

Beck, U. (1998) *¿Qué es la globalización? Falacias del globalismo, respuestas de la globalización*. Barcelona: Paidós.

— (2002) *La sociedad del riesgo global*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Betham, J. (1990) *Falacias políticas*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Constitucionales.

Birnbaum, P. (1977) *Les sommets de l'État. Essai sur l'elite du pouvoir en France*. Paris: Seuil.

Blondel, J. (1987) *Political leadership. Toward a general analysis*. London: Sage.

Bobbio, N. (2000) *El futuro de la democracia*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Born, A; Hart, P.; Stern, E. & Sundelius, B. (2007) *La política de la gestión de la crisis. El liderazgo público bajo presión*. Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Administración Pública.

Camps, V. (2010) *El declive de la ciudadanía. La construcción de una ética pública*. Madrid: PPC.

Canales Aliende, J. M. (2002) *Lecciones de Administración y Gestión Pública*. Alicante: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alicante.

— (2003) "Algunas reflexiones sobre los principales problemas y desafíos pendientes en la innovación de las Administraciones Públicas". En Fernández, M.; Sierra, J. y Valero, J. *Nuevos retos en el horizonte de las Administraciones Públicas*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia. Pp.21-28.

— (2009) *Documentos básicos para la modernización y el fortalecimiento de las Administraciones públicas en Iberoamérica*. Alicante: Editorial Club Universitario.

— y Sanmartín Pardo, J. J. (2014) *Introducción a la Ciencia Política*. Madrid: Universitas.

— y Romero Tarín, A. (2014) "El liderazgo político". En J. M. Canales Aliende y J. J. Sanmartín Pardo. *Introducción a la Ciencia Política*. Madrid: Universitas. pp.241-252.

— (2015) *Estudios sobre Democracia, Gobierno y Administración Pública contemporánea*. Madrid: Universitas.

Castells, M. (2016) *De la crisis económica a la crisis política. Una mirada crítica*. Barcelona: La Vanguardia.

— (2016) "Movimientos sociales, partidos emergentes y reconstrucción democrática". *¿Está en declive la democracia liberal?*, Dossier núm. 59, enero-febrero, pp.42-45.

Crozier, M. (1982) *Strategies for Change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

— (1992) *Estado moderno, Estado modesto. Estrategia para el cambio*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Dahl, R. (1999) *La democracia. Una guía para los ciudadanos*. Madrid: Taurus.

Delgado Fernández, S. (2004) "Sobre el concepto y el estudio del liderazgo político. Una

propuesta de síntesis". *Psicología Política*, núm. 29, pp. 7-30.

Dror, Y. (1994) *La capacidad para gobernar. Informe al Club de Roma*. Barcelona: Galaxia de Gutenberg y Círculo de Lectores.

Durán, P. (1999) *Penser l'action publique*. París: Librairie Generale de Droit et de Jurisprudence.

Fukuyama, F. (2016) *Orden y decadencia de la política. Los orígenes del orden político. Desde la revolución Industrial hasta la globalización de la democracia*. Barcelona: Deusto.

Galli, C. (2013) *El malestar de la democracia*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

García Pelayo, M. (1986) *El Estado de Partidos*. Madrid: Alianza.

Goleman, D. (1997) *La inteligencia emocional*. Barcelona: Kairós.

— (2015) *Cómo ser un líder*. Barcelona: Ed. B.

González, F. (2013) *En busca de respuestas. El Liderazgo en tiempos de crisis*. Madrid: Debate.

Habermas, J. (1999) *Problemas de legitimación en el capitalismo tardío*. Madrid: Cátedra.

—(2002) *Acción comunicativa y razón sin trascendencia*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Held, D. & Archibugi, D. (1995) *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a New World Order*. Gran Bretaña: Polity Press.

Jauregui, G. (1994) *La democracia en la encrucijada*. Barcelona: Anagrama.

Jobert, B. & Muller, P. (1987) *L´État en action. Politiques Publiques et corporatismes*. Paris: Presses Universitaries de France.

Laclau, E. (1977) *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory. Capitalism, Fascism, Populism*. London: Verso.

Lasch, C. (1996) *La rebelión de las élites y la traición a la democracia*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Le Gales, P. & Lascoumes, P. (2007) "Introduction: Understanding Public Policy through Its Instruments—From the Nature of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy Instrumentation". *Governance*, Vól. 20, núm.1, pp. 1-21.

Lindblom, C. E. & Braybrooke, D. (1963) A Strategy of Decision: Policy Evaluation as a Social Process. *Glencoe, The Free Press of Glencoe, and London, Collier-Macmil-lan*, núm. ix, pp. 268-289.

Linz, J. J. (1997) "El Liderazgo Político en la Sociedad Democrática". En M. Alcántara y M. A. Martínez. *Política y Gobierno en España*. Valencia: Tirant lo Blanch.

Lipset, S. M. (1989) "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy". *American Political Science Review*, núm. 53, pp.69-105.

Mair, P. (2013) *Gobernando el vacío. La banalización de la democracia occidental*. Madrid: Alianza.

Majone, G.(1997) *Evidencia, argumentación y persuasión en la formulación de políticas*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Mason, P. (2016) *Postcapitalismo: Hacia un nuevo futuro*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Meny, Y. (2005) *Crisi e futuro della democrazia. Per una terza revoluzione democrática*. Firenze: Passigli.

Mills, C. W. (1957) *La élite del poder*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Mosca, G. (1984) *La clase política*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Mouffe, C. (1999) *El retorno a la político. Comunidad ciudadanía, pluralismo, democracia radical*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Muller, P. (2006) *Las políticas públicas*. Bogotá: Universidad del Externado.

Natera Peral, A. (2001) *El liderazgo político en la sociedad democrática*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.

Noche, J. & Poinsard, R. (1984) *L'Evaluation des Politiques Publiques*. Actas del Coloquio ENA. Paris: Economía.

Nohlen, D. (2003) *El contexto hace la diferencia, reformas institucionales y el enfoque histórico-empírico*. México: UNAM.

North, D. C. (1993) *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olson, M. (1992) *La lógica de la acción colectiva. Bienes públicos y la teoría de grupos*. México: Limusa Noriega.

Ortega y Gasset, J. (1999) *La rebelión de las masas*. Madrid: Espasa.

Ostrom, E. (2000) *El gobierno de los comunes. La evaluación de las instituciones de acción colectiva*. México: UNAM-Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Owen, J. (2015) *El Establishment. La casta al desnudo*. Barcelona: Planeta.

Paige, G. D. (1972) *Political Leadership*. New York: Free Press.

—(1977) *The Scientific. Study of Political Leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Papadopoulos, Y. (2013) *Democracy in crisis? Politics, Governance and Policy*. London: McMillan.

Pasquino, G. (2000) *La clase política*. Madrid: Acento.

Pérez Díaz, V. (1993) *La primacía de la sociedad civil*. Madrid: Alianza.

Peters, B. G. (2015) *Advanced introduction to Public Policy*. Chetelham: Elgar.

—(2015) *American Public Policies. Promise and Performance*. Londres: Sage.

Piketty, T. (2014) *El capital en el siglo XXI*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Powell, W. G. & Dimaggio, J. P. (Ed.) (1991) *The new institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Rawls, J. (2006) *Teoría de la justicia*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Rifkin, J. (2014) *La sociedad de coste marginal cero*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Robles Egea, A. y Álvarez Junco, J. (1996) *Política en penumbra: patronazgo y clientelismo políticos en la España contemporánea*. Barcelona: Siglo Veintiuno.

Roth, A. N. (2010) *Enfoques para el análisis de políticas públicas*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.

— (2014) *Políticas Públicas: formulación, implementación y evaluación*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.

Sánchez-Cuenca, I. (2010) *Más democracia, menos liberalismo*. Madrid: Katz.

Sartori, G. (1988) *Teoría de la democracia (Vol. 1) El debate contemporáneo (Vol. 2) Los problemas clásicos*. Madrid: Alianza.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1971) *Capitalismo, socialismo y democracia*. Madrid: Aguilar.

Sharma, R. (2010) *El líder que no tenía cargo*. Barcelona: Penguin Random House.

Subirats, J. (1989) *Análisis de políticas públicas y eficacia de la Administración*. Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Administraciones Públicas.

— ; Knoepfel, P.; Larrue, C.; & Varone, F. (2012) *Análisis y gestión de políticas públicas*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Touraine, A. (1994) *¿Qué es la democracia?* Madrid: Temas de hoy.

Stiglitz, J. E. & Greenwald, B. C. (2016) *La creación de una sociedad del aprendizaje*. Madrid: La esfera de los libros

Vallés, J. Mª. (2000) *Ciencia Política. Una introducción*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Villacañas Berlanga, J. L. (2015) *Populismo*. Madrid: La Huerta Grande.

V.V. AA. (2016) "¿Está en declive la democracia liberal?" *Dossier*, núm.59, enero-marzo. Barcelona: Periódico La Vanguardia.

Weiss, C. H. (1998) *Evaluation*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Von Byme, K. (1994) *Teoría política del siglo XX: de la modernidad a la postmodernidad*. Madrid: Alianza.

Zittoun, Ph. (2014) *The Political process of Policy making: A pragmatic approach to Public Policy*. London: Palgrave, Mcmillan.