1. Innovation drives the growth of economies. This claim has never been more true; yet, it’s meaning has changed. Today, the biggest economic change on the horizon doesn’t have to do with any particular innovation, any particularly breakthrough technology. It will not be a quantum computer, a new Pathfinder or a revolutionary energy source. The technology has already come, but “revolutions” are never technological, they are always social. Only technologies that change societies are revolutionary. The change that can, and most probably will happen, is the social aftermath of the communication breakthrough that the Internet has brought. (dwa zdania o poprzednich tego typu przełomach – industrial revolution?). The balance is now shifting from economy based on monetary incentives, rivalry / competition and enclosure of knowledge (the implicit values that are often not stated) towards social motivations, collaboration and openness. Those values – often openly expressed are the basis of peer production. However, the shape of the commons based peer production communities are defined by the underlying technology that has allowed them to appear.
2. What made this change possible:
   1. Technological enablers (through communication):
      1. Lowered transaction costs – (self-)managing a huge group of people has never been cheaper
      2. Access to enough motivated / talented / knowledgeable / innovative potential due to the vast reach through ICT
   2. Motivational factors (cognitive surplus – Shirky – and social – Shirky doesn’t show the full picture; the individualization of western societies has led to social surplus as well):
      1. Easy way to fulfil social needs of self-presentation, authority build-up, support, social identity
      2. Easy way to fulfil individual needs of self-expression, creativity, freedom, agency, personal development
   3. Market context:
      1. Change from service to information economy (knowledge-based economy): (globalization has led) the market (to) demands products and services that are complex, diverse (fitted to many individual needs), flexible and that need to be produced in an environment and for a context that is not precisely defined, is uncertain. These need exploration and experimentation to develop and require insights and tacit knowledge.
3. There is an inherent risk however. Will the free labor of socially motivated individuals be a new offensive capitalism with even more exploitation than before (and worse as it would be unconscious)? A tool for authoritarian ideological control? (Jemielniak) (it is as much about giving freedom as it is about taking it away Sennett 2007). Fortunately, the choice which way this new economic revolution will go (new paths or reaffirm the old inequalities) is not totally random. To a large extent it depends on the proper codification of values. In law, such codification was ensured by constitutions. They coded the nation’s values and virtues into implementable and enforceable rules. Today, a different type of code can similarly ensure the presence or absence of certain community values (lessig).
4. It is not a new idea that technological artifacts shape the behavior of communities. Even such a mundane artifact as a door imprints certain rules into the “insider” community – those that enter the building most often (i.e. “beware, on the way back the door might slam you in the face”) and discriminates against those that come from “outside” of the community (and the building…) (letour). Indeed, the “society” is built of human and non-human actors and should be analyzed by technologist and social scientists as well.