

Commoning infrastructures: collaborative design of a political tent as cosmogram.

Pablo Piquinela

Instituto de Psicología Social, Universidad de la República
Scholarship from the National Agency for Innovation and Research (ANII, Uruguay)
ppiquinela@psico.edu.uy

Gonzalo Correa

Instituto de Psicología Social, Universidad de la República
Member of the National Researchers System (ANII, Uruguay)
gcorrea@psico.edu.uy

Abstract

In the last decades, Science and Technology Studies (STS) has contributed with several conceptual tools to understand the role of things in the political composition of the world. Since this approach, matters, far from being conceived as accessory, are considered as constituent parts of any collective, at the same time, as key components to infrastructure the relationships that support the collective life (Star, 1999). Assuming this perspective, this paper proposes to study the production of the common and its infrastructural process taking, as a starting point, the study of redesign practices of an object belonging to the Uruguayan Social and solidarity economy network, a network that brings together different ventures and collectives around this particular way of understanding the economic relationships. The object in question is a tent recently incorporated by the network in order to transmit, share and circulate the values and local productions of the social and solidarity economy. Put to circulate around the city, the tent is a space for conversations and exchanges, a trade fair and an exhibition space where crafts, food, architectural designs, speeches, knowledge and a whole set of practices gathered around to that alternative form of economics. In order to promote this transmission, the Social and Solidarity Economy Network has proposed to intervene its design, seeking to harmonize its form and aesthetics with the values of the collective. From the study of its collaborative redesign we propose to analyze the composition experience of the tent as a cosmogram. The notion of cosmogram, formulated by John Tresch (2005) and taken up again by Bruno Latour (2007) to explain his version of cosmopolitics, gives an account of the compositional character of life in common, emphasizing the relational plot where humans and non-human roles and functions are distributed. A cosmogram is an inventory of objects, practices and relationships that together make up an idea of the world. In the words of Tresch (2005), it is "a text that results in a concrete practice and set of objects, which weave together a complete inventory or map of the world" (p.68). A concept like this will be useful to combine, in the same movement, the commons and the collective, showing the process of infrastructure that places them as part of the same common world.

Keywords

commons; infrastructure; cosmogram; collaborative design; social and solidarity economics; material politics.

This paper presents preliminary results of Materiality and Politics: the social and solidarity economy tent as a manifesto. Funded by the National Research and Innovation Agency
POS_NAC_2018_1_152134

Commoning infrastructures: collaborative design of a political tent as cosmogram.

Introduction

In the last decades, Science and Technology Studies (STS) has contributed with several conceptual tools to understand the role of things in the political composition of the world. Since this approach, matters, far from being conceived as accessory, are considered as constituent relations of any collective, at the same time, as key components to infrastructure the relationships that support the collective life (Star, 1999). The interest of this field by the political practices goes back to its beginnings when diverse investigations were centered in understanding the relations of power inside the production of the scientific facts (Latour and Woolgar, 2013, Shapin and Schaffer, 2005). Thus, they showed how the products of techno-science -its laws, laboratories, and truths- were the result of a political exercise of separation between the natural world and the cultural world, inaugurating a division of domains where science and technology took nature as their object resulting from the installation of this gap (Callon, Lascoumes and Barthe, 2001). In the midst of this criticism, the notion of matter of fact, which had so much served critical thinking against mysticism and religion, was challenged through the demonstration of its conflictive and agonistic nature, realizing the multiplicity of concerns that participate in the stabilization and construction of any fact (Latour, 2004). This passage from matter of fact to matter of concern will be key to understanding not only the political character of science and technology, but also the way in which STS practice the explanation as an aggregate of reality as opposed to other forms of criticism that aim to subtract it from their arguments. In this line of aggregation, more recently, María Puig de la Bellacasa (2011), drinking from feminist critique of science, will integrate the idea of matter of care to account for both the ethical-political dimension of the production of socio-technical assemblages as well as all the processes necessary to sustain the existence of their products and their inclusion in human lives. Taking concern and care as constituents of common life, other studies have shown the importance of these practices in the design and maintenance processes, as is the case of the study about the Paris subway carried out by Jérôme Denis and David Pontielle (2015).

This early and ongoing concern for politics by STS is expressed in a constant preoccupation with how to democratize science and democracy (Kleinman, 1998). An example of this can be found in that process, initiated in the late 1980s and consolidated in 2000, which made possible the emergence of various initiatives that, supported by the participatory component, attempted to build bridges between experts and laypeople with a view to dealing democratically with the controversial issues of techno-science. This interest in promoting and studying different participatory experiences, based mainly on dialogical mechanisms, will be conceptualized by Sheila Jassanoff (2003) as a participatory turn, emphasizing an action program that seeks to restore the separate terms, nature and culture, science and politics through their representatives: experts and lay people. Around these debates, it is worth mentioning the conceptual and practical effort to go beyond the tacit acceptance of both terms, betting on the production of participation mechanisms or hybrid forums as a radical way of suspending the identities of experts and laypeople diagrammed by the gap (Callon, Lascoumes & Barthe, 2001; Farías, 2016a).

The efforts to practice a policy not based exclusively on arguments and reasons, but one that includes in its work other beings not necessarily human and that put in the center the affectation, will make it possible to radicalize the inclusion of things and other non-human beings in the ways of understanding the political. An example of this can be found in the work of Nortjes Marres and Javier Lezaun (2011) who call for innovative ways of introducing everyday objects into our understanding of politics. This materialistic and relational program, expressed in many STS practitioners, will be a key condition for articulating this field with others, such as design or anthropology to name but a few, heralding new ways of political action, thereby broadening our understanding of what a collective is and, with it, the very meaning of politics (Latour, 2007a). The experimentation of anyone on any issue will become one of the key concerns for such articulation (Savransky, 2014).

This trend will gain even more strength with the other that, in recent years, has assumed activism as a fertile field for experimentation (Sismondo, 2008; Estalella and Sánchez-Criado 2018). The meaning of the collective as something more than human and the suspension of the identities of expert and lay person has made it possible to investigate more experimental, symmetrical and collaborative ways of thinking about the production of common worlds from situated experiences. This new trend is what Ignacio Farías (2016b) calls collaborative turn. These emerging perspectives, product of the mixture between activism and academia, conceive STS as a theoretical perspective as well as a practical one, that is to say, a renewed space of production that allows to investigate, design and promote in a collaborative way collective processes of production of common goods based on experimentation.

Assuming this perspective, this paper proposes to study the production of the common and its infrastructural process taking as a starting point the study of the redesign practices of an object whose owner is the Montevidean Social and Solidarity Economy Network, a network that brings together different ventures and collectives around this particular way of understanding the economic relationships. The object in question, which as we shall see is more than an object, is a tent recently acquired by this activist collective whose redesign process will mobilize the political experience of the network itself which, through the infrastructure of a common good, will infrastructure its own ethical, affective and political relations. Susan Leigh Star (Star, 1999) defines infrastructure, not as substances, but in a relational way whose purpose is none other than to sustain the lives of different communities of practice. It is through this idea of infrastructure as a process or set of relationships that we want to take the experience of the social and solidarity economy network tent as an example of infrastructure where the legal, the economic, the political and the design take part in a continuous process of production of a common good and at the same time of a collective mobilizing a multiplicity of actors that are not exclusively human.

Commoning infrastructures and infrastructuring commons

Throughout her work of more than three decades, Susan Leigh Star along with several

colleagues was contributing elements and concepts to think about the role of infrastructures for the sustainability of life. Infrastructures, as their name indicates, are those material relationships that structure under different communities of practice. Far from being understood as hard, stable and strictly material -as an engineer would do-, these are conceived as relations that make the action of certain collectives possible or impossible. In an article from 1999, Star summarizes certain characteristics of infrastructures, some of which we would like to highlight: firstly, their relational character; secondly, the idea that these are imbued in other infrastructures and therefore do not arise ex nihilo; thirdly, their development takes place in a modular and incremental way; fourthly, the role that standards play in their production and maintenance; and, finally, the existence of different learning communities that practice them, being their use transparent for them (Star, 1999, pp. 381-382).

Designed and conceived in this way, infrastructures are power relations that are expressed in a material and relational way in certain supports for life. On them different communities of practice develop their existences, converge or mutually exclude each other, express agreements and disagreements, strengthen or diminish their conflicts. Infrastructures will not be thought of as a mere scenario where action takes place, but as constitutive parts of the vital relationships that unfold within them. Given the confluence of different communities, sometimes with opposing interests and functions, it is possible to deduce different interpretations of the same infrastructure according to the collective that uses it. This possibility of multiple interpretations is what Susan Leigh Star called interpretive flexibility: an infrastructure can mean a very different use for one set of actors than for another. For an engineer the design of a bridge can mean a technical problem to be solved, but for a pedestrian or car driver the possibility of passing from one point to another, avoiding the obstacle of a river. This flexible character in the interpretation of an infrastructure shows us the political dimension of its practices. Infrastructure becomes conflictive when its uses are exclusive to a few and exclude others, as Langdon Winner (1980) well taught with the Moses crosswalks on Long Island. A ladder for an architect can be a source of pride or even for a person who walks on his feet something practical and accessible, but for a person in wheelchairs it can mean a barrier, an obstacle that makes him disabled.

Interest in infrastructures means interest in the power relations that make up our daily existence. As Star says, when infrastructures fail, break down or cease to function, we realise their importance and what they sustain. Precisely to study them it is necessary to remove them from their silent and invisible place, exposing all the relationships that make it the infrastructure of other processes, relationships and practices. This methodological gesture is what Bowker (1994) calls infrastructural inversion; it precisely consists of inverting the relations and putting on top what was below. In this way, when they are decomposed, the infrastructures acquire visibility and what they sustain becomes explicit, showing their invisible and daily work to sustain a particular order of existence.

The idea of the common has aroused special interest in recent years in the academia as well as in different collectives of activists and social organizations. This idea expresses a particular way of understanding the collective as well as the emergence of different communities of concerned groups around an issue or good. Their different modes of understanding compose a political field where a concern for the common emerges which gives rise to new practices of community building and which, therefore, acquire political relevance insofar as it makes

possible a field of possible experiences which enable us to think of the political as a field of affections (Monetti and Piquinela, 2019 forthcoming). One of the usual forms of understanding refers to the juridical-economic relationship in relation to goods or spaces, associated with the set of collective practices that sustain or manage a good (Östrom, 2000). This perspective, although it refers to goods that are materially expressed in multiple ways (whether natural goods such as air or intangibles such as communication), focuses on these as substantial goods that can be separated from the communities that practice and defend them, ignoring or leaving in the background that they are goods that involve communal relations in themselves by their direct link with the sustainment of life (Gutierrez, 2017). As many authors affirm, common goods cannot be thought of in a substantial way but as relations (Caffentzis and Federici, 2014), but not of any nature but of a particular type, relations that sustain our existence and that escape, in relation to their property, from the logic of the market and the State. In other words, goods that belong to everyone and nobody at the same time are neither public nor private property, although this does not mean that they are not threatened by privatization or protected and regulated by the state administrative apparatus (Lafuente, 2007). Since they are not substantial, common goods do not exist as such beforehand: different authors agree that when these goods are in danger we realize the importance they have for the maintenance of common life and therefore become common to our lives at the moment when these vital conditions are threatened (Caffentzis and Federici, 2014; Lafuente, 2007). Goods such as water, air or communications become common goods in the presence of an actor who intimidates and endangers their existence and, together with it, ours.

While not all infrastructure is a common good, we can think of common goods as infrastructures that make possible to sustain our lives, that is, the political and material relationships that support collective life on the planet. Because they are relationships, commons are part of larger and more complex networks. They do not exist in themselves except in direct link with the lives they support and empower. But a good to become common good must be infrastructured as part of the vital relationships it enables, but with one caveat: at the same time that the good is infrastructured, the community that claims it for itself is infrastructured too. The infrastructuring of the common good is also the infrastructuring of its community, ultimately, the production of any common good is nothing more than the communalization of a vital infrastructure. Community and common good are simultaneously infrastructured in the same act of creation of the relations that sustain them both. That is why, in order to talk about these processes of creating common infrastructures, we appeal to the idea of composition. Following Gilles Deleuze's (XXX) approach, composition is not synonymous with structure, nor with totality. It is an open collective process, in constant decomposition and recomposition, which brings together heterogeneous elements that co-work and that in this co-working affect and mutually transform each other. The composition supposes the meeting of the heterogeneous and different as well as the production of a common body in constant becoming and the confluence of the multiple affectations that produce it. As Ronald Bogue (2014) maintains, from the joint work of Gilles Deleuze and Guattari (1987), “[s]uch a collectivity is “Dividual” (...), neither a composition of the One out of the Many nor a manifestation of the One in the Many. Its cohesion and articulation into multiple elements proceed via the speeds and affects of a becoming” (p. 41).

Next, we will present the experience of acquiring, redesigning and putting into circulation the tent of the social and solidarity economy network of Uruguay. From this, we will think the processes of infrastructuring of a common good, the tent, and simultaneously the process of

infrastructuring of the network itself from the relations that mobilize for the stabilization of that commons.

Making a network

The social and solidarity economy refers to a set of practices and organizations within which are included expressions of self-management, cooperativism and associativism with different levels of organization, but which share some common postulates such as horizontality, equity, fair trade, responsible consumption and care of the environment. It is usually understood as a broad spectrum of organizations and movements within which are the cooperativism, the popular economy, the social economy and the enterprises recovered by their workers.

The experience we are interested in analyzing is promoted by the Montevideo Network of Social Economy in articulation with the Coordinator of Social and Solidarity Economy of Uruguay, space that groups the territorial Networks and is consolidated in 2008. One of the tasks of this space is to promote and disseminate the social and solidarity economy in the country and to manage marketing spaces based on the premise of responsible consumption and fair trade. This is a set of local networks made up of producers and artisans. These, distributed in local and territorial networks throughout the country, constitute meeting spaces that generate collective actions that allow them to participate in all the economic phases linked to their product such as production, distribution, marketing and consumption (CES, 2012). From collective discussion spaces, they organize activities and undertake joint actions that seek the promotion of the social and solidarity economy in the country as well as international exchanges with fair trade networks and movements that make up the World Social Forum. One of their main postulates is horizontality, which is why they choose not to have a structure made up of posts but rather work commissions with distributed roles. These groups organise various activities, such as exhibitions and fairs, both to disseminate their values and to market and circulate their products. Among these groups, the Montevideo Network is the largest and most dynamic. From the dialogue between the Montevideo Network and various actors arises the idea of buying and circulating a tent in the city of Montevideo in order to have a traveling space to disseminate their productions with a greater degree of autonomy.

From the moment we learned about the experience, in agreement with the Network, one of the authors of this article began to develop a collaborative and multi-sited ethnography (Marcus, 1995) from which he held interviews with the promoters of the proposal, participated in Network assemblies, meetings of the Coordinator, in the conversations for its installation as well as in its installation in the eastern zone of Montevideo during April 2018. During this installation, it was part of the previous meetings and agreements, as well as of the conversations of layout of the space; also, and at the request of the members of the tent, it was supported in the evaluation of this installation on the part of the entrepreneurs.

Redesigning a tent: constructing a material and political subject

The object in question, which is taken as a starting point for this analysis, is a tent recently incorporated by the network in order to transmit, share and circulate the values and local productions of the Social and Solidarity Economy. Put to circulate around the city, the tent is a space for conversations and exchanges, a trade fair and an exhibition space where crafts,

food, architectural designs, speeches, knowledge and a whole set of practices gathered around to that alternative form of economics. In order to promote this transmission, the Montevidean Solidarity Economy Network has proposed to intervene its design, seeking to harmonize its form and aesthetics with the values of the collective. As part of the redesign process, a call for designers, architects and psychologists has been made to make possible the realization of an ad hoc instance that brings together experts and activists in the creative process in a collaborative way.

The tent is a large folding metal structure that through nuts is composed of white tarpaulins that delimit the space. Its own conformation enables it to generate spaces such as doors or windows in a random way, adjustable according to temperature and air circulation. This tent circulates from its acquisition by the department of Montevideo, adapting its contents and armed to each territory where it is installed. In general, its installation takes place in public spaces such as public building esplanades, squares, parks or bus terminals. Its large size and its conformation from canvases makes it look like a large white sphere from the outside, which makes it necessary to enter to get to know its proposal.

Tenting a collective

The idea of the tent arises from the evocation of a previous experience that some of the members of the network had had. In that opportunity, a group of artisans who commercialize jointly -under the name of Mercado de los Artesanos- faced the difficulty of having to stop for a few days the commercialization of their crafts due to the refurbishment of the new place where they would settle their market. The temporary absence of building was resolved through the assembly of a tent in a central square, close to the premises being repaired. This tent served as a sales space during the time that the building reform lasted. This story was told by one of the most active members of the network:

"Miriam tells us that the idea of the tent arises from an experience that those who were part of the Mercado de los Artesanos had at the time of their move. As the new premises were being repaired and there was a need to continue selling, during that time they decided to set up a tent in Plaza Cagancha, outside of where the new Mercado de los Artesanos would be. She tells us very excited that something different happened there, that the instance of sharing that space was very significant for those who participated" (Notes of fieldwork, day 2, June 2017).

During that time, that tent, which would later inspire this other, delimited a space that served, among other things, to share stories and knowledge that strengthened the practices of mutual support. That experience was strongly marked in the memory of that member, who told us the situation very vividly and with a lot of emotion giving an account of a collective feeling around

that memory. This story is significant for understanding the affective component of the relationships at stake in that design. The updated presence of this memory, expressed by many of the members of the network, teaches us that the composition of a commons such as a tent is made of materials (such as canvases and metals), as well as affects. We could quickly fall into the temptation to make a linear interpretation and say loudly that that experience is the "origin" of this other tent or at least its "model". Far from this approach, we understand that this experience, transmitted affectively, is part of its constituent relations; it is not simply a nostalgic evocation but a presence that diagrams the present and the future of the tent. The tent as a commons does not have a precise origin, the idea of its acquisition is part of an affective and relational field where the whole process of redesign is inscribed. To a certain extent, the image of the tent expresses the power of a collective that needs to circulate through space and make visible another way of understanding and practicing economic relations.

Why a tent? A tent is not just any object, its material characteristics make it delimit a space producing an atmosphere separated from an outside, able to contain and diagram different encounters and bodies in its interior, allowing the use of open space protected from the elements. Another quality that we understand relevant to a tent is its ability to assemble and disassemble, which allows it to be moved from one place to another, being an ephemeral architecture but constant. These qualities of any tent, is what allows the network to imagine one for them, one that allows them to take the space of the city and develop their activities of circulation, marketing and dissemination under the protection of its structure and itinerant way.

Who are they? From the collective decision to initiate the process of acquisition, redesign and circulation of the tent begin a series of conversations with institutional, social and political actors in order to gather the necessary resources to make it possible. This process will force them to redefine who they are, broadening the collective through association with other groups similar to the ideas of this "other economy" that have in common the desire to promote political practices expressly associated with the Social and Solidarity Economy. Among the other actors that provided economic support are some state actors, such as the Social Solidarity Economy Unit of the Montevideo City Council (IM), the Ministry of Social Development (MIDES) and the National Cooperative Institute (INACOOOP), and other social actors, such as the Federation of Production Cooperatives of Uruguay (FCPU), the Coordination of Uruguayan Solidarity Economy (CES), the National Association of Enterprises Recovered by Workers and the Institute for Social Economic Promotion of Uruguay. This association made up of state collectives and civil society gives an account of the weaving work made possible by the idea of the tent. In some way, it inscribes a new topology that operates on the limits between the public and the common, making possible the development of a proposal that,

despite having the support of the State, manages to exercise its autonomy without losing its creative and productive capacity. As a boundary object (Star, 2010), the tent mobilizes different actors, being an object that facilitates cooperation between different collectives without the need to reach consensus. This new association, deployed from the tent, does not alter the limits of the Social and Solidarity Economy Coordinator, on the contrary, it enhances its action by influencing other collective processes with a view to enhancing the practices of the SSE. This does not mean that all these actors have the same ideas regarding how this economy should be practiced.

Within the framework of these alliances, an agreement was established with the Enlace space of the Montevideo City Hall (a coworking space that stimulates innovative economic and cultural ventures) so that it is the place where the material metal structure, tarpaulins, posters and other objects that make up the tent can be kept while it is not in use. The rest of the materials necessary for its assembly (tables, chairs, lights, tablecloths, among others) are provided by the different groups that participate in the tent, being a way of materializing the commitment of each one of these for its support. This distributed participation shows the collective dimension of the tent and the association work required for its existence.

Containing a Solidarity world

The tent is presented as a large structure that contains within itself a series of very particular relationships between people, materials, products and ideas. This delimited space defines through clear guidelines (such as the prohibition of the resale of products) which relationships are allowed to contain and which are not. The content of the tent is determined both by its conformation and mobile structure (its canvases, its structure, its tables and chairs) and by the products that can circulate in it. The definition of what it contains is to be found in the guidelines of the relations that comprise the Social and Solidarity Economy and, in this sense, they are delimited by the relations of production, transport and marketing. One of the first premises is the relationship of the person that commercializes with its product, since it must be manufactured or produced in an artisanal way and its commercialization must be without intermediaries. In this way, it is understood that the products are commercialized directly by the person who makes them and there is no intermediation that adds a speculative value to the sale. Also outside this space are those products linked to large-scale production and transport, since it is understood that they entail a series of production and transport relationships marked by the overproduction of resources as well as by labour dependency

regimes marked by labour relations, generally exploitation. In this way, the collective considers it desirable that the tent contains those products manufactured or cultivated by the people who sell them and that their value is not associated with a market value but with the production process itself. Likewise, what is exhibited is linked to manual labor that is closely related to the ideas or stories of the people who are commercializing them and who intend to exhibit them within this framework.

These definitions, based on the principles that define the SSE, are also the boundaries of the tent. Not only its openings and structures establish the outside and the inside, but also these criteria that are associated with those other materials composing the itinerant space of the SSE. Somehow, the values are already expressed in a pragmatic way in the very constitution of the tent. These compositional principles affirm what may or may not be composable with these relationships. Not anything or collective can enter and make a common body. At the same time as becoming a tent, the SSE is being practiced.

Protocolizing the tent

Each installation of the tent is unique because those who exhibit, what is exhibited as well as the activities that are deployed are specific to each of the assembly proposals. This singularity also depends on the moment in the year in which it is installed, as well as the geographical space where it is located. To carry out each installation, an open call is made to people and groups of entrepreneurs, craftswomen, weavers and producers who must submit a sales proposal, giving priority to those people who belong to the area where it will be installed. This call is made by a work group of the Network created only for the purposes of this assembly (then for the next one, the group will be integrated by other members).

As we can see the tent has its rules and guidelines, its definition is an inherent part of the political conception of the collective. Its constant movement and conformation makes the Network make efforts to standardize and stabilize the contents of the tent as well as its functioning, and ultimately, its form. These definitions are agreed in meetings that, through conversations, build the agreements that govern the stability of the tent. The collective generates this space of exchange where, in a quite informal way, consensus is reached from the articulation of the different proposals presented.

Although each installation of the tent is unique, there is an agreement that defines certain general guidelines for its establishment. This agreement, which is expressed in a brief draft and is known as the "Coexistence Agreement", is designed so that it can be modified to fit each of the installations. The text has eight points that express the following:

- “1- Everyone is responsible for their product, but we have to know that they must respect the values of the SSE and there can be no resale.*
- 2- We must assemble the tables, place the tablecloths and take responsibility for them.*
- 3- Distribute the stands through a lottery.*
- 4- To name a person in charge for day of the tent in front of unforeseen, who will have to arrive before the serenade leaves.*
- 5- Have a communication team for each day, colleagues who support the task of attending to the press, radio, etc.*
- 6- Have a person responsible for collecting 10% of sales at the end of each day.*
- 7- Respect the collective schedules that have already been reported, in case of retiring leave someone to cover it and the last day respect the closing time.*
- 8- To know where the inputs that the Municipality contributes to improve the quality of the day will be placed, to share and to inform of the collective use”.*

Although this proposed agreement, which will be submitted to the group formed at that particular installation, explicitly establishes parameters of installation, its main objective is to generate guidelines that enable trust, agreements and mutual support among those who participate in the installation of the tent. In addition, it delimits and makes visible the link with the State, specifying that the participating municipalities will have a place to put their inputs and materials. The draft begins with the principles of horizontality and equity in the distribution of spaces and tasks, being the lottery and compliance with the agreements by all expressions of these values. As can be seen in points 4, 5 and 6, responsibilities and roles that enable the operation of the tent are established and, particularly in point 6, the percentage of sales destined to finance the redesign is mentioned. In this way, it sets guidelines for the people, products and materials that make up the tent to accompany their postulates. The agreement also serves as a political orientation for the tent as it delimits what it contains and how, how products and people can be laid out and distributed throughout the space, and how participation in the installation is conceived. The tent in its relations produces political attributes that will be delegated in its redesign, the distribution of its spaces and the delimitation of its contents.

Diseño: Designing new values

As we saw, the tent is white and its interior shapes a diaphanous space. Its redesign appears

as a purpose that mobilizes the Network, a kind of promise that allows them to continue doing things. So far we have seen that the tent is installed under the principles of the SSE, yet the collective insists that it must be redesigned so that its structure, forms, internal distribution and colors (to mention just a few of its attributes) express the values of this kind of economical practices.

Since its acquisition, the tent was conceived as an object that, in its transfer, transmitted a clear political idea: it is acquired with the idea that it can express, through different ways - from its own redesign, through musical proposals to talks - the values and principles of the social and solidarity economy. In this way, and with the focus on its redesign, since its acquisition, the Network began to implement actions that would make its financing possible.

"We must not lose sight of the fact that the tent, yes or yes, has to be designed and that it has to transmit the values of the social and solidarity economy," says Miriam. Ana answers "the visual is what gives results to transmit and call" and Elsa adds, "With the white tent we are not saying anything" (Notes of fieldwork, day 6, September 2017).

The idea that the "white tent" does not convey any message is linked to the fact that it can be associated with any other that is set up in the city -such as the book fair tent, the city hall's entertainment tent or other tents that act as sales space for products from other collectives. The first efforts of differentiation and singularization were directed to think how to convey materially the values of the SSE and to plan the costs of this eventual design capable of endowing the tent with a unique character. They contacted the Faculty of Architecture and Industrial Design (FADU), agreeing to work with a group of students who, after having had a first meeting, transmitted general ideas and possible costs. The first design attempts focused on communicating, through drawings, the ideas of cooperation and solidarity at the request of the members of the Network.

Those first ideas served as an initial kick-off to continue the conversation, leading to a greater number of FADU industrial design students who, guided by a teacher, would develop interior design proposals as part of their curricular activities. This group of students was also joined by psychology students who focused on contributing, through workshops with the members of the coordinator, to the definition of the values to be taken into account for the design. The conformation of this work team resulted in actions of different order. The FADU students,

taking ideas about social economy as triggers, appealed to their previous knowledge about design for the realization of a visual figure that could express the SSE.

The group of psychology students, on the other hand, took as a strategy the realization of participant observations, interviews and workshops. In the participative instances, the participants gathered in subgroups shared anecdotes, experiences and affections lived in the installations of the tent. The students set up a space to recover memories that would help to collectively express the principles and values enunciated in those experiences. Assuming as its own the idea that entities do not possess essences but that these are emergencies that in their own heterogeneity will be composed (Domènech & Tirado, 2005), the group of psychology students began a process that sought to de-essentialise the terms and take them out of the moral scheme (good values, bad values) to come to think of an ethical proposal where the collective could define what it understands by solidarity, horizontality, responsible consumption, among other notions no longer as universal values but as practices and experiences related to the becoming of the collective. These interventions took place within the framework of work of undergraduate students of the University of the Republic. Somehow, the very idea of Social and Solidarity Economy is permeated by academic studies and theoretical reflections in relation to cooperative, activism, ecological experiences, among others. Within the network of artisans and producers, there are concepts of academic studies, from which political positions are based. In short, it is a work with actors who know the logics and forms of argumentation of academia and, in many cases, share the same readings and interests.

But for them the concepts that mobilize the SSE are more than ideas, they are bearers of an alternative world proposal. Not in vain, they insist on the redesign of the tent in the values. This idea of moral nature, carrier of a very particular conception of politics, is centered in the existence of universal values that contribute to give form to an idea of good living. The problem we face is how these values are created, that is, how relationships, behaviours and behaviours expected of others are valued. There is a tension in the network between some previous definitions inherent to the idea of social and solidarity economy and their own definitions, needs or possibilities as a group. In this plane a movement is played where its ethics can be submitted to a moral idea. The strategy of the group of psychology students consisted in defining values, not in a normative way, but by making visible and giving meaning to the network's own practices: that is, they decided to move from a normative idea of solidarity, mutual support, cooperation, among others, to a practical idea of these principles. This movement made it possible to question and tension both ideals and practices, shaping an ethical plane that put affections in the first scene (Deleuze, 2008). In this sense, to produce

values is also to affirm a particular way of understanding human relations and, with it, of practicing those bonds. The collective's insistence on transmitting values through the redesign of the tent refers to this idea.

These valuations mark for the group of the Network a very clear limit between what can contain the tent, the relations that it entails, and the outside. But this value, in a moral sense, is also economic value. There is no distinction between the valorization of behaviors related to others (ethical level) and the valorization that is played in the production and marketing of their products. The valorization is for them the production of a new world. The tent, as an integral part of these relations, is not alien to these practices of value production, to the point that its functioning depends on these same valorizations.

Discussion

The idea of a cosmogram was first heard by John Tresch (2005) in a lecture given by David Ramrosch, a historian of religion, when he talked about the Tabernacle, the temple that Moses built at the end of Exodus. The Tabernacle is the entire representation of the cosmos. Tresch says:

“The Tabernacle is a temple with the architectural plan, materials, and even the colors chosen by God. It's adapted to the religious life of a nomadic people: it's portable. Like a tent, it can be taken down and built again, and it's made with all the technologies that the Hebrews had at that point: metal working, weaving, drawing, dyeing, woodwork, all of which God mentions by name. At its center is an altar, the Ark of the Covenant, and inside that are the tablets of the Law, a census of all the members of all tribes, and all the prescriptions on ethics and food: classifications of different kinds of action, different types of people, different plants and animals. In other words, the text of Exodus is a cosmogram that will embody the relations between humans, God and nature” (Tresch, 2005, p. 67).

It is no longer a cosmology or cosmovision, as if one could explain a culture outside of it, but a cosmogram, a set of material relations, objects, symbols, animals, plants that make up the world of those who practice it. Curiously, the example that serves to develop the notion of cosmogram - the Tabernacle of the people of Moses - is a tent. A closed and portable space that allowed the Hebrew people to move their world on their shoulders. In a similar way, the Social and Solidarity Economy Network has been producing its own Tabernacle: a tent where to put in relation the objects, the people, the products, the values that make a particular way of understanding the production of values associated with life. The notion of cosmogram, formulated by John Tresch (2005) and taken up again by Bruno Latour (2007) to explain his version of cosmopolitics, gives an account of the compositional character of life in common, emphasizing the relational plot where humans and non-human roles and functions are distributed. A cosmogram is an inventory of objects, practices and relationships that together make up an idea of the world. In the words of Tresch (2005), it is “a text that results in a concrete practice and set of objects, which weave together a complete inventory or map of

the world” (p.68). A concept like this will be useful to combine, in the same movement, the commons and the collective, showing the process of infrastructure that places them as part of the same common world.

The enunciation of the tent as a commons, leads us to think about the production of the common in the experience. The immanent character of its definitions, delimitations and territorial inscriptions, and of the actualization of the idea of social and solidarity economy that is realized in it, is inscribed in a plane of affections that actualize a desire of construction of a space that conforms an affective plot. This field of relations constitutes the tent as an object that can only be explained from its affections, relations and materials. Its products express a history, a knowledge and a form of production of life that overlap a personal and political plane as a way of understanding the sustainability of life. The tent is a great space for conversations and exchange and each encounter, whether a sales situation or a shared moment between saleswomen, is an opportunity to exchange stories, knowledge and ideas about the products. In them are inscribed their family histories, the knowledge transmitted through generations, as well as an idea of production, marketing and consumption that rescues the value of craftsmanship and work without exploitation. In short, the idea of a world to come.

The tent, as an object that carries and contains a world -the tent as a cosmogram- carries within itself an idea of a political agency that rescues knowledge as politics and gives the tent the capacity to make politics through its proposal and the idea of its redesign. In fact, in addition to referring to values such as solidarity, horizontality and the idea of building a possible "other world", the concrete reference to the social and solidarity economy as a practice is mentioned by the members of the Network as "what happens in the tent". That is to say, the tent is not defined from a previous idea of Social and Solidarity Economy but this idea is going to be defined from its effects and its relations. In some way, there is a process of delegation (Latour and Woolgar, 1986) in the object that remains contained within itself, by the relations that it generates, an idea of solidarity, horizontality, responsible consumption, care of the environment, among others, that the human and non-human collective puts into play in its circulation. This updates an idea of Social and Solidarity Economy that appears imbricated with the unfinished initiative of redesign, a project that drives them to redefine themselves and think of themselves as practitioners of this "other economy". In this sense, the initiative is composed on an ethical level of the politics and practice of an economy of solidarity. These ideas are presented against the moral mandates that an idea of solidarity economy - with values or parameters that are already given to the group- can carry with it. This valorization of their practices, in the form of ethics, conform a policy of economy and a policy of reproduction of the very particular life. It expresses by itself, the political decision to transmit in and to practise a political proposal. In the idea of the tent, which was born together with its redesign, the Network positions itself as a political actor that carries a message to transmit. The tent as a space in circulation, the materials that compose it and those that are for sale, the relationships that are at stake make the tent a space/object in permanent construction that

starts from the idea of ethical production in constant mobility composing its unique way of doing politics.

References

Bogue, R., 2014. *Deleuze on music, painting, and the arts*. Routledge.

Bowker, G., 1994. Information mythology and infrastructure. In L. Bud-Friedman (Ed.), **Information acumen: The understanding and use of knowledge in modern business** . London: Routledge, pp. 231-247.

Caffentzis, G. and Federici, S., 2014. Commons against and beyond capitalism. *Community Development Journal*, 49 (1), pp. 92-105.

Callon, M., Lascoumes, P., and Barthe, Y., 2001. *Acting in an uncertain world: An essay on technical democracy*. Cambridge: The MIT Press

CES (Coordinadora de Economía Solidaria), 2012. **Quiénes somos**. Available at: <http://economiasolidaria.org.uy/coordinadora-nacional/quienes-somos/> (Accesed: 12 july 2019)

de La Bellacasa, M. P., 2011. Matters of care in technoscience: Assembling neglected things. *Social studies of science*, 41(1), pp. 85-106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312710380301>

Deleuze, G., 2008. *En medio de Spinoza*. Buenos Aires: Cactus.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F., 1980. *Mille plateaux: Capitalisme et schizophrénie, II*. Paris: Minuit. Trans. Brian Massumi under the title A Thousand Plateaus (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987)

Denis, J., & Pontille, D., 2015. Material ordering and the care of things. **Science, Technology, & Human Values**, 40(3), pp. 338-367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243914553129>

Domènech, M. & Tirado, F., 2005. Asociaciones Heterogéneas y actantes: el giro postsocial de la teoría del actor-red. *Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana*. Madrid: AIBR.

Estalella, A., & Criado, T. S. (Eds.), 2018. **Experimental collaborations: Ethnography through fieldwork devices**. New York: Berghahn Books.

Farías, I., 2016a. Devising hybrid forums: Technical democracy in a dangerous world. **City**, 20(4), pp. 549-562.

Farías, I., 2016b. A collaborative turn in STS? *EASST Review*, 35(1).

Gutierrez, R., 2017. **Horizontes comunitario-populares: Producción de lo común más allá de las políticas estado-céntricas**. Barcelona: Traficantes de sueños.

Jasanoff, S., 2003. Technologies of humility: Citizens participation in governing science. **Minerva**, 41 (3), pp. 223-44.

Kleinman, D. L., 1998. Beyond the science wars: Contemplating the democratization of science. **Politics and the Life Sciences**, 17(2), pp. 133-145.

Lafuente, A., 2007. Los cuatro entornos del procomún. **Archipiélago: Cuadernos de crítica de la cultura**, 77-78 (15).

Latour, B., 2004. Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern. **Critical inquiry**, 30 (2), pp. 225-248.

Latour, B., 2007a. Turning around politics: A note on Gerard de Vries' paper. **Social studies of science**, 37(5), pp. 811-820.

Latour, B., 2007b. **Nunca fuimos modernos. Ensayo de antropología simétrica**. México: Siglo XXI Editores.

Latour, B. and Woolgar, S., 1986. **Laboratory Life. The Construction of Scientific Facts**. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Marcus, G. E., 1995. Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited

Ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 24 (1), pp. 95-117.
doi:10.1146/24.100195.000523

Marres, N., & Lezaun, J., 2011. Materials and devices of the public: An introduction. **Economy and society**, 40(4), pp.489-509.

Monetti, S. and Piquinela, P., forthcoming. La cuestión de lo común como campo político: la producción de comunidad. **Castalia**, 30 (1). Article submitted for publication

Östrom, E., 2000. **Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action**. Cambridge University Press.

Savransky, M., 2014. Of recalcitrant subjects. Culture, **Theory and Critique**, 55(1), pp. 96-113.

Shapin, S. and Schaffer, S., 2005. **Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life**. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sismondo, S. 2008. Science and technology studies and an engaged program. **The handbook of science and technology studies**, 3, pp. 13-32.

Star, S. L., 1999. The ethnography of infrastructure. **American behavioral scientist**, 43 (3), pp. 377-391.

Leigh Star, S., 2010. This is not a boundary object: Reflections on the origin of a concept. **Science, Technology, & Human Values**, 35(5), pp. 601-617.

Tresch, J., 2005. Cosmogram. **Cosmogram**. Lukas & Sternberg, pp. 67-76.

Winner, L., 1980. Do artifacts have politics?. **Daedalus**, 109 (1), pp. 121-136.