NOTES ON GOVERNANCE

JOSÉ BRAGANÇA DE MIRANDA
CICANT/ LUSÓFONA UNIVERSITY (PORTUGAL)

José A. Bragança de Miranda holds a PhD in Communication Sciences from the New University of Lisbon, with aggregation in «Theory of Culture» at the same University. He is currently Professor at Lusófona University, a researcher at CICANT and a collaborator at ICnova (UNL). He was the director of ECATI – School of Communication Sciences. Architecture, Arts and Information Technologies of Lusófona University. He is a member of the SOPCOM-Portuguese Association of Communication Sciences of which he was a co-founder and board member.

He curated the Ligações_Links_Laisons project for Porto2001 – European Capital of Culture, in collaboration with Maria Teresa Cruz, a project that resulted in the book *Crítica das Ligações na Era da Técnica* (Tropismos, 2002). He was President of the Communication Sciences panel at FCT, President of the Documentary Jury (2006) at ICAM, a member of the BESfoto award jury, and a member of the Jury for the Luso-Spanish Culture Prize.

He has lectured on the Theory of Culture and Contemporary Arts, Media Theory and Digital Aesthetics. He is the author of numerous essays and books. His latest book *Constelações: Essaios sobre Técnica e Cultura na Contemporaneidade* will be published by Documenta in February 2023. Since December 2022 he has been Rector of Lusófona University.

Corresponding author
José Bragança de Miranda
Lusófona University
Campo Grande 376
1749-024 Lisboa

Abstracts

Governance is a multi-layered concept that depicts a myriad of formulations and potential affordances. In this paper we present and discuss some of the key topics that frame the governance problems European Universities face nowadays. We depart from institutions and their interactions with the outer world and their own organizational structures and then focus on power and productivity as the two core variables influencing governance. Following the contributions and remarks of several thinkers throughout history, we then reflect on the emergence of governance and the central function it has had throughout history in supporting how institutions survive and prevail sometimes in daring circumstances. We end our notes with an assertion of the plasticity of the concept and its many affordances that go way beyond managerial or political thinking, making governance uncapturable.

Notes on Governance

This essay is about problematizing governance, which implies locating it with some precision within the broader context of institutions life and development. We have endless books on the subject, but they all start from its obviousness towards a more agile and open government of organizations, proposing countless models to configure it. It is suspected that taking governance seriously implies rethinking this plurality and critically determining its conditions of existence.

1.

To think about governance, we will start with institutions. The Latin formula *vita instituere* should be read as the fact that there is no human life outside the institution, not even animal life, and that between institution and life there is no opposition because, as Roberto Esposito states, "the two sides of a single figure that delineates at the same time the vital character of institutions and the instituent power of life" [1]. It is not a matter of life formatted by the law, nor even biopolitics, although the law is part of it because it is itself instituted and participates in life[2]. In the institution, the possibility that life is a dignified life is at stake.

Institutions can indeed assume an enormous variety of forms, some of which are unbreathable and violent, but only because they deny something of the institution's essential nature. Disregarding this aspect explains why authors such as Foucault, Marcuse or Goffman[3] have produced a radical critique of the institution, accusing them of domesticating and harming human spontaneity and freedom or, on the contrary, of being factories of power, money, of death, etc. However, it is the effect of having closed themselves in a rigid, purely mechanical "form," which can be productive, but makes life worse.

Whatever the institution, it is the effect of an instituting power where it originates and is inserted in the world and of a constituent power that permanently refounds it. Through this power, the origin is assumed to be imperative, and its potency comes from sticking to the promise of its foundation and achieving, through its activity, that the decision of the origin becomes more precise, and more transparent.

Indeed, the institution is open because being in time corresponds to its nature, as can be seen from Merleau-Ponty: "By institution we understand those events of an experience that give it lasting dimensions, in relation to which a whole series of other experiences will have sense, will form a thinkable sequence or history" [4]. Simultaneously, it is within it that the entire founding act takes place, which creates other institutions, which are added, while others disappear, or still others come from the depths of history, as is the case of the institution of language or the State[5], all giving shape to life ".

---

1   Roberto Esposito (2021), Institution. Polity Press, Cambridge, 2022, p. 1.

2   For a discussion of the vitam instituere and its legal non-determination cf. Yan Thomas "Droit romain et histoire de la science juridique en Occident" (accessed on May 20, 2021. URL : http://journals.openedition.org/annuaire-ehess/18891)

3   An overly sharp opposition between individual and institution tends to generate theories of the total institution, repressive and without rest. This is the case of the "panopticon" thesis in Michel Foucault, Naissance de la Prison, Gallimard, Paris, 2020.

4   Maurice Merleau-Ponty, L'Institution & Le Problème de la Passivité – Notes de cours au Collège de France (1954-1955), Belin, Paris, 2015, p. 6.

5   The radical critique of the institution reveals power as its absolute counterpoint. Deleuze states: "The institution always presents itself as an organized system of resources. This is, in fact, the difference between the institution and the law: the latter limits actions, the former is a positive model of action... Such a theory will finally give us political criteria: tyranny is a regime where there are many laws and few institutions, democracy a regime where there are many institutions and few laws. Oppression manifests itself when the laws affect men directly, and not the pre-existing institutions that give guarantees to men". Cf. Deleuze, Instincts et Institutions, Paris, Hachette, 1955, p. IX

The term institution is preferable to organization, which meta-phors the body, assuming a cohesive, compact, and self-contained totality, which is not even applied in biology. Organology always tends to exclude the third or the contradiction, as something threatened, and above all because it presupposes a strong teleology with ultimate and determining ends[6]. The same does not happen with the institution, which is permanently marked by its openness to the forces that threaten or deprive it. If the organism is illusorily closed, the institution, by its temporal logic, is a kind of transactional relais between interior and exterior. As Esposito points out, "The logic of the institution – or rather of what in this book I will call "instituent praxis" – implies a continual tension between inside and outside. Whatever lies outside institutions, before being institutionalized itself, alters the previous institutional structure, challenging, expanding, and deforming it"[7].

In practice, whatever the institution, whatever the rigid organization, it is impossible to abolish the outside, "nature" (Physis) is not questionable in history, but everything depends on how it relates to its outside, and this reveals how to work inside. Within this logic, the exterior is a kind of environment where the institution is inserted and simultaneously produces it. This opening corresponds to risk, as it occurs without guarantee, which would only be possible if the environment were itself part of the institution, which is impossible. Coming from economics, the idea of the market gives an institutional basis to the institutional environment; if using this term, the market would be made up of countless "markets" - the subjects in

the State, the free market of companies, the participants in the interaction in the case of networks, the of art. In short, all institutions evolve in a tendentially global market, a kind of market of markets where universal "commerce" develops, to use António Escohotado's formulation[8]. In the same process where they produce and increase networks and markets, institutions evolve within them in a paradoxical relationship of parts and whole[9].

Contrary to the organicist visions that resolved what is happening at their borders, trying to make them rigid and opaque, or trying to control them, which leads to a dramatization of command, the crisis that marks all recent experience and the forces at large in general media, it reveals that borders are prose, continually being redrawn. If conditions such as legal ones, contracts and the type of property seem to guarantee stable borders, these are always threatened by informal and contingent forces, which can be overwhelming. The 2009 crisis showed that an unexpected event caught the institutions off-guard. It is true that the borders that separate intuition towards the inside and the outside are unstable, but that dividing threshold remains.

We are always immersed in the immanence of the world, which rests on the general productivity of humans and on the historical ways in which this is used, targeted, and appropriated. F. W. J. Schelling underlined the original productivity of nature", in its absolute indetermination and continuity since "all products are still invisible and dissolved in

---

6   The notion of the organism as an entity closed in on itself and with an internal purpose, developed by Kant in his third critique, tended to model the idea of organization that still determines us today. On the nineteenth-century debate around this problem, cf. Timothy Lenoir, The strategy of life: Teleology and Mechanics in Nineteenth-Century German Biology. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1982.

7   Esposito, id., p. 9

8   In this market of markets power, money, art, health, war materials, etc. are exchanged. The term is controversial because it implies commerce, whose criticism runs through history well before the emergence of capitalism. For a historical analysis of this problem, cf. António Escohotado, Los Enemigos del Comercio. A Moral History of Property, Espasa, Madrid, 2013

9   The totality in itself is nothing because in fact, we only have institutions, objects, and bodies, but in their sum, it forms a "whole", despite being inapprehensible. This is the basis of the debate in a recent book, which deserves some analysis. See Markus Gabriel & Graham Priest, Everything and Nothing, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2020.

universal productivity"[10]. It is on it that historical productivity is built[11], made up of an infinity of moves, objects, gestures, and thoughts, i.e., the entire institutional fabric[12]. In the 19th century, Marx became aware of this general productivity of humans, despite its problematic relationship with Physis, maintaining that it is dominated by a general form, that of Capital, which has to be abolished to be able to liberate it. But in the logic of the institution, characterized by openness and multiplicity, it is difficult to think of a general and transcendent form, be it Capital, "Power," or "emancipation"; or, more empirically, a mega-institution that articulates and dominates all others. Immersed in the immanence of life and institutions, everything happens there, through successive arrangements and rearrangements[13].

Historical, national, entrepreneurial and global forms exploit that universal productivity, conflicting around their production and distribution, tending out of necessity towards a logic of "more" that the ancients called pleonexia[14], which is far from being "psychological" or "moral", but which depends on what Hobbes called the libido dominandi or Spinoza the conatus[15]. A famous philosopher spoke of the "will to power" (Wille zur Macht), but it very simply corresponds to the exercise of a power to maintain or conserve itself, which in reality is part of the logic of survival of any institution, whatever it may be[16]. It would be that cold logic of the modern, always more profitability, always more strength, always more weapons or more money; but also, how not to think of more freedom, more equity, more knowledge, less tangible goods, but expectant and necessary.

2.

If it seems like a fictional or speculative leap, that of postulating a general form or absolute power that dominates, captures or exploits everything without ceasing to be part of the struggle and interests in presence. However, the emergence of a managerial reason that spreads throughout all the institutions it is easily verifiable. Niklas Luhmann's notion of a generalized medium is helpful in this context[17], in this case, that of a management function that has tended to become universal. This new general functionalization is due to modernity and its tendency to certify itself mathematically, the need for calculation, and the growing algorithmization of

---

10   Friedrich Schelling (1799), First Outline of a System of the Philosophy of Nature, SUNY Press, Albany, 2004, p. 87. And he adds in a decisive thesis: "The product of productivity is (each time) new productivity", ib, p. 231

11   This productivity is defined by the Greeks by the word techné, at the same time, technique and art.

12   Joseph Kaines states, "Our wondrous civilization is the result of the silent efforts of millions of unknown men, as the chalk cliffs of England are formed by contribution of myriads of foraminiferas". Cf. Joseph Kaines, «Western Anthropologists and Extra Western Communities» (1873),

13   t is not a wonderful world. Catastrophe is always possible, given the nature of which there are at least 5 general extinctions of life or history with the concentration camp or nuclear war. From the ecological quadrant comes the warning that we would be entering the sixth extinction. Cf. Elizabeth Kolbert, The Sixth Extinction; In Unnatural History, Holt, New York, 2014.

14   On this "more" logic, see Medhi Belhaj Kacem, Système du Pléonectique, Diaphaes/Anarchies, Paris, 2020

15   About the conatus, Spinoza states: "The endeavor [conatus] by which each thing endeavors to persevere in its own being is simply the actual essence of the thing itself." Cf. Spinoza (1677), Ethics proved in geometrical order, CUP, Cambridge, 2018, p.102.

16   It is a question of persisting in what is in oneself and not of surviving at all costs, implying dominating the negative through increasing power. As Georges Bataille points out "in a universal way, isolated or in groups, men find themselves constantly engaged in processes of expenditure…. Men assure their own subsistence or avoid suffering in order to accede to the insubordinate function of free expenditure". Indeed, the institution is weak if essential expenditure is not present in productivity, a moment of pure gift. Cf. Georges Bataille. "The notion of expenditure" in Visions of Excess, University of Minnesota Press, 1986.pp. 128-129.

17   The notion of generalized media proposed by Luhmann includes money, power, truth, love, etc., that function as regulatory means of a series of conflicts. Cf. Niklas Luhmann (1984), Social Systems, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1995, pp. 377-378.

experience[18]. Like every function, this one also has a variation space that goes from "power", in the extreme case, infinite, absolute power, and in the other extreme, its zero-degree, an-arkhé, such as it is aimed at, in failure, by historical anarchisms.

There is also a dream around managerial reason, which has its nightmares when it seeks to fulfill itself. There is no lack of examples, such as Bogdanov and his tektology (1928) As the author was condemned to death in the Moscow trials of the 1930s, she somehow sought to give form to the perspective opened up by the 1917 revolution. Evident, in addition to abolishing all institutions founding it in a single one, this vague "society" of totalizing programs to be realized would be tektology itself and would disappear as a problem[19]. Totalizing programs never managed to get rid of this paradox. On the other hand, it is symptomatic that liberal societies understood that there had been a Managerial Revolution (1940), as happened with James Burnham[20]. In addition to accounting for the rise of a class of managers and a general trend towards management, which is empirically attested.

The other extreme variation, that of an-arkhé, which can take various forms, from the most radical of pure concreteness in the style of Reiner Schurmann[21], or negatively, that of a destituent power to use Agambem's formulation[22], to more mitigated forms that show that an-arkhé, by the very logic of the institution, is part of the power that prevents it from crystallizing or repeating itself indefinitely,

In short, between its extremes, the management function will vary between governmentality, administration, more or less participatory management, administration, control, and, according to some, governance. We will maintain that it is necessary to extract it from the function, if that is possible, since not being equivalent to the Government or the an-arké, it is difficult to locate it theoretically. But this is a critically necessary task.

3.

An institution is characterized by a given productivity, an articulation between inside and outside, and a matrix of relationships that structure it, having something open and undecidable. Despite being part of the network of institutions where life on Earth and its forms takes place, in addition to the space in common with similar ones, each institution is unique and singular. There is no family in general, but "this" family, this

---

18 From Weber to Heidegger came a series of criticisms of the universalization of calculus in modern times. However, the growing algorithmization of life is quite significant. See, for example, Pedro Domingos, ¬The master algorithm: how the quest for the ultimate learning machine will remake our world, Basic Books, NY, 2015.

19 The ambition of tektology is desmesurate. Says Bogdanov, "For tektology, the unity of experience is not "discovered," but activity created by organizational means: "philosophers wanted to explain the world. but the main point is to change it" said the greatest precursor of organizational science, Karl Marx. The explanation of organizational forms and methods by tektology is directed not to a contemplation of their unity, but to a practical mastery over them". Cf Alexander Bogdanov, Essays in Tektology: The General Science of Organization, Intersystems Publications, Seaside California, 1984 p. 61

20 For Burhnam "The theory of the managerial revolution predicts that capitalist society will be replaced by "managerial society" (the nature of which will be later explained), that, in fact, the transition from capitalist society to managerial society is already well under way ". James Burnham (1941), The Managerial Revolution: What is Happening in the World, John Day Company, NY, 1941, p. 28,

21 The Greek term Arché is constitutive of Western metaphysics, meaning principle, base, command, and foundation. Anarchism is based on an attempt to deny all principles, but the essential thing is to discover in the arché its dimension of an-arché, freeing the diversity that it denies in order to establish itself. An essential study of this problem is Reiner Schurmann (1982), Heidegger on Being and Acting: From Principles to Anarchy, Indiana UP, Bloomington, 1987.

22 As Agamben states, "a destituent potentiality is one that never lets itself be realized in a constituted power." Cf Giorgio Agamben, "Destituent Potentiality and the Critique of Realization" in The South Atlantic Quarterly 122:1, January 2023. p. 15.

"company." Governance allows thinking about this uniqueness, which makes the elements that make up the institution problematic. It aims at the set without being able to ignore the fact that, by definition, this is never static or purely material, not constituting a mechanism tending to be automatic.

This singularity is based on the decision where the institution originates and which is grounded on the "good" that defines and justifies it. In the case of the University, for example, this decisive good is knowledge in all its aspects. With knowledge distributed throughout life, as Aldo Leopodo refers less enigmatically than it appears, the "mountain thinks"[23], like the craftsman, the mechanic, and even the simplest animal. The knowledge of the University is a knowledge of knowledge, which is inscribed in the shared space formed by other universities. Each institution adds knowledge with new knowledge and new productivity, but it is only justified because it constitutes something original and unique that adds something that only it can do. In this sense, the realization of the idea that drives it is expressed in an image. At the same time that it is produced, a dynamic image is[24] created that characterizes the specificity and uniqueness of the institution. Knowledge is the historical product of all humans, which accumulates since the dawn of time. We are all his heirs and are shaped by him. It is based on it that it is possible to fight against abusive appropriations and unfair distributions.

All this is done in terms of a Good, which becomes problematic when it becomes an absolute good. Indeed, in a plural society, all goods are relative and are defined by what they produce, but also by the way they are produced and, above all,

by the nature of how they relate to other means. Among the available goods, "power" is one of the most complex. The institutions that produce "power" as a decisive asset are usually political, military, and monopolies. etc., tend to undermine the open and plastic nature of the institution. An institution has power, but it does not produce power, but simply the good that defines its mission.

This mission has to be permanently rethought, as it is a task that is always unfinished and requires remarkable plasticity to adapt to the challenges, threats, and uncertainties of the environment in which the entire institution evolves. It is from archaic warfare that originates the idea that total control of the interior and exterior of the institution is possible. Furthermore, its historically attested effect is the tendency toward total governance based on hierarchical and pyramidal structures and rigid chains of command. It is true that there are a series of management and government modulations that seek to lessen the effects of the governmentalization of institutions. However, models and geometries, whether pyramidal or not, are of little use if the direction is not immanent to the plasticity of the institution in its dynamism.

More than a logic of power, institutions, most certainly those based on an alliance of institutions, must correspond to a logic of recognition, postulated by Hegel in the phenomenology of Spirit. In Kojève's interpretation: "real and wrong man is the result of his inter-action with others; his I and the idea he has of himself are 'mediated' by recognitions obtained as a result of his action by him. And his true autonomy of him is the autonomy that he maintains in the social by the effort of that

---

23   This is a beautiful intuition by Aldo Leopold. Cf. "Thinking like a mountain" in Aldo Leopold (1949), A Sand County Almanac, Oxford UP, Oxford, 1968, pp.120f

24   Concerning the image, two trends of analysis are confronted. The one that underlines its static nature or "form" and other that accentuates the living image to be made, which is close to what in the German language is called Gestalt. In a posthumously published text, Carl Einstein uses the term combatively against the crystallization of the world into concepts and forms, resorting to "the "proliferation of gestalt, such that the deadly, ever more pervasive order is combatted and destroyed by an intensified disorder, i.e., by a continually renewed gestalt formation". Cf. Carl Einstein, "Gestalt and Concept" in October, 107, 2004, , p. 174

action"[25]. It is not about recognizing a well-defined and stable subject or institution, but it is in the struggle for recognition of the uniqueness of the participants that the process of individuation is founded outside of all violence.

It is because instituting power is never done, but in the process of being made, one returns time and time again to the forms of government and the logic of management. Weak institutions look for the best scheme and apply it, but no scheme is permanent, any more than instituting life is. The emergence of the governance issue, without forgetting to relate it to management, is evident in times of crisis and, above all, in instituting moments with the institution being built. This is evident in FilmEU, whose uniqueness is asserting itself. The discussion on governance has nothing to do with the choice of a model or management scheme, as the whole model is too abstract and general to be transposed to an institution in its singularity to be made. The insistence on governance results from the need to invent the plastic form that the institution assumes in its dynamics. Playing in time, it is about not being destroyed in time; having to manage it's all about not getting trapped in the forms pt ut in place for that.

4.

The idea of governance has been implicit since the beginning of Western culture. It goes back to Aristotle's Economicus, of which we find an echo in Geoffrey Chaucer's definition of the 'governance of hous and lond' [the governance of house and land][26]. In fact, the Greek oikonomia was the administration and management of the Oikos, of the house, which Aristotle clearly distinguishes from government and governing, since "The art of administering a house and that of administering a polis differ from each other not only in their the extent to which the house and the polis also differ (since the former is the foundation of the latter), but also in the fact that the administration of the polis involves many rulers and that the domestic administration depends on only one"[27]. The circumstances of Aristotelian governance were less violent than those of the Polis, namely when governed by a tyrant. It is a question of "wise governance" as Chaucer still refers, or sweet governance as others would say in the same Prologue. This a problematic thesis to understand when we look at the Greek and medieval conditions marked by slavery and the exclusion of women from governance. In any case, the Aristotelian distinction indicates an irreducible difference of governance in relation to the government.

Somehow sweet governance prevailed in love or in families, despite Greek tragedies like Aeschylus's Oresteia, which pile horrors upon horrors. It is true that the government entirely dominated at the top of the chain of command and command. The high-low axis dominated all of history until modernity, barely distinguishable from theocracy and the State. Something abruptly changes when Hegel defines the State as the modern God[28]. But it doesn't change direction, typically from top to bottom, which grants command. The directors, first of all direct the direction, in space and time. The universalization of the State occurs in a general way and expands to all dimensions. Foucault, in his studies

---

25 Cf Alexander Kojève (1947), Introduction to the Reading of Hegel, Cornell UP, NY, 1980, p.15. The notion of recognition has given rise to an important debate on the relationship between recognition and political struggle. See, for example, Axel Honneth & Jacques Rancière, Recognition or disagreement: a critical encounter on the politics of freedom, equality, and identity, Columbia University Press, NY, 2016.

26 Geoffrey Chaucer, The Prologue to the Wife of Bath's Tale in Canterbury Tales (1400)

27 Aristotle, Os Económicos, IN/CS, Lisbon, 2004, p. 35

28 According to Hegel: "The state consists in the march of God in the world, and its basis is the power of reason actualizing itself as will. In considering the Idea of the state, we must not have any particular states or institutions in mind; instead, we should consider the Idea, this actual God, in its own right [für sich]." Cf. G.W.F Hegel (1821), Elements of the philosophy of right, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, 2012, p, 156.

on governamentalization, showed this well[29]. The dissemination of government shaped by the figure of the State spreads virally, applying to all institutions, thus emerging a management function that was obsessively worked on, and which is distinguished from the strong government by some essential variations. Nevertheless, without coming to call it into question, each theory and each new model has further expanded this function.

The emergence of governance seems to be the effect of the crisis in the management role that became evident at the end of the 20th century. This crisis can be explained by essential mutations in the "environment" where institutions evolve, which is markedly complex, affected by transversal problems such as the climate crisis, globalization, the emergence of technological networks, the emergence of transnational alliances and associations, the need for democracy recognition of identities in resistance, and the hybridization of political, ethical and aesthetic problems that disrupted reality, articulating conflicting values among themselves, but to which institutions, even the strongest companies, have to respond, even within themselves, that it is not immune to what goes on abroad[30].

It is not apparent that this mutation is due to a convulsion within democracies and affluent societies, which would explain why authoritarian governments accuse it of being a source and victim of moral or political decadence. The universal problem affects everything and everyone, despite the variation in concrete conditions, because the planetary era we

have entered[31] and the technological networks make them present and instantaneous.

Governance emerges as a need to respond to the immense complexity of the conditions of existence, still being the result of the critical awareness of the institution that finds itself fragile and absolutely unique. Instead of solving the problem, the proposition of countless administration and management models and schemes tends to make the crisis the managerial reason. It is also true that each one operates following a given model. However, the multiplicity of models and the emergence of new creations by management theorists and philosophers showed that the problem was another. The creation of abstract models contradicted the real and the institution. Multiplicity itself was a sign that something had to be aimed at in excess or obliterated within the management itself. Thus, governance is the moment of inconceptuality in the middle of management, pointing to the possibility of a government that is up to the contemporary, technical, but above all, ethical and political injunctions and implies a new relationship with the existing models of management.

These do not disappear but are appropriated and rearticulated as a result of governance. This kind of rest of government and management is present in all institutions to a greater or lesser extent. The comfort of top-down command or strong governance, which does not disappear even in companies working in conditions of pure liberalism, returns whenever there is an intense crisis in reality, be it economic, political, or linked to war or epidemic. In short, in a crisis, the command

---

29   In one of the courses on the birth of biopolitics, Foucault states: "the state is nothing else but the mobile effect of a regime of multiple governmentalities". Cf. Michel Foucault (2004), (2008) The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79, Palgrave, New York, 2008, p. 77.

30   As Bevir notes: "The resurgence of the word 'governance' arose from theoretical and empirical challenges to the idea of the state as a unified sovereign entity that encompassed people with a shared culture and a common good. When social scientists challenged this concept of the state, many of them adopted formal modernist theories of social organization. Governance provided a theoretical term to discuss general issues of social coordination irrespective of whether or not government played an active role in such coordination". Cf. Mark Bevir, Governance, Oxford UP, 2012, p. 23

31   Which now announces itself as extraplanetary, just look at the tenacious competition for the colonization of the Moon and Mars by the great geopolitical powers, especially the USA and China

model tends to impose itself and prevail, becoming much more evident in the case of the State, which holds the possibility of enacting a state of emergency. As a result, governance, which requires more time, is opaque, and in a crisis, time is shortened, just as resources are scarce. Nevertheless, governance remains expectant.

5.

In addition to the changes in the institution's environment and internal structure, a series of transformations have enhanced it. Merging with the fluid nature that characterizes all institutions, even the most averse to this fluidity, governance is in process[32]. Now, any process is based on a relational ontology, as it is on the strength and quality of relations and interrelationships on that its productivity, or its failure, depends. This is not new, as certain historical metaphysics based it on the opposition between subject and relationship, focusing on the stabilization and fixation of the subjects[33]. Ortega's old thesis that man is himself and his circumstances start from the idea that man and his relationships are something different when instead, the fixation of the subject passes through control and work on the relationships in which he is inserted. The relationship has always been something repressed, given its potential instability and hybridity, but it is the relationship that

constitutes any possible individuation[34]. Given the priority of the relational, any identity or individual, or figure, such as that of the institution, reveals itself as something open and in the process of becoming.

The turn towards the relational is not due to a change in ideology, but it has become evident with the increasing technologization of relationships through the emergence of technical connections, which take on an infinity of forms, such as connectivity, interactivity, links, telepresence, etc. serving as revealers of something that was repressed out of necessity. by the technical conversion that emerges as relationships. This turn is realized by Gilbert Simondon[35]. Due to their very associativity, technical relations constitute a network physically installed on Earth, which develops as a huge network of networks, in permanent pulsation the connections and disconnections that occur in it. In short, if the networks reveal the relationship with priority, at the same time, they reveal the reticular logic that crosses the entire historical experience, from traffic networks to family networks, power, etc. Almost spontaneously, we see that the idea of a network is imposed, but it does not offer guarantees. As Galloway rules the network can be one of ruin or victory[36]. The theory of networks immediately emerges to account for the situation, but the network is itself highly productive and conducive to conditions, but also highly conditioning.

32 Whitehead strongly renewed contemporary thought by proposing a theory of becoming and process as opposed to positivism, which only recognizes stable and static entities. In an essential book, he rigorously develops the thesis: "the actual world is a process, and that the process is the becoming of actual entities." Cf. Alfred North Whitehead (1929), Process and reality. The Free Press, 1978, p. 22.

33 Plato's Symposium dedicated to Eros, the god of attachments, constitutes an essential moment of Western thought on attachments, the evil that comes from them and the possibility of using them in the creation of the free subject

34 It is true that the violence of the master-servant, man-woman, human-animal relationship, etc., was the engine of the modern tendency to abolish the forced relationships characteristic of medieval times, creating the modern individual, whose relationships are guaranteed by a legal contract.

35 The priority of the relationship is essential to think about the processes of individuation. As Simondon says, we have to "consider every veritable relation as having the status of being and as developing from within a new individuation; relation does not spring forth between two terms that would already be individuals; relation is an aspect of the internal resonance of a system of individuation". Cf-Gilbert Simondon (1964), Individuation in light of notions of form and information, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 2020, p.8.

36 By definition, in their dynamics, networks can assume an infinity of forms, whether in virtual space or in their relationship to reality. As Galloway states, "There are many kinds of networks; they are not internally simple, nor globally uniform. Some networks are rigid and hierarchical, while others are flexible and resist hierarchy". Cf. Alexandre Galloway, "Networks" in W. J. T. Mitchell and Mark Hansen (eds), Critical terms for media studies, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2010, p. 282.

Given the priority of the reticular, much depends on the quality of the relationship, and on the possibility of managing relationships in flexible and open but productive, institutions. The institution's reticular structure confers stability, more or less potent, to the multiplicity of relationships more quickly about the internal structure than to the networks that constitute the fabric of reality, with which it necessarily articulates and associates. It is about achieving maximum fluidity through connected, concrete acts and in the permanent definition of free agents to potentiate through permanent negotiation and monitoring of the ongoing processing. This implies a clear definition of the good to be produced and a willingness to experiment with ways of implementing it that always make it explicit.

In fact, within the institution, it is necessary to establish a division of labor that segments the function into a series of dimensions or quasi-institutions. The same happens concerning the outside, which is necessary to resort through the ordering of services and devices, but also of associations and alliances and from which a disturbance event arises. A supply failure or insufficient supply affects the institution as a whole. As this imperative extends to all institutions, the productive, distributive and consumption elements grow in complexity.

Given the instability of overly rigid management models, governance seems to necessarily result from the need to adapt to this fluid and often a crisis. Demand provides an effective response that tends to refocus and control networks. The situation is complex since failures, exploitation, and interruptions can arise in the reticular connection, and even an inability

to determine at least the expected effects and above all, to determine the chain effects, which escape any possibility of control[37].

On the other hand, the mere participation in the network or the insertion in its physicality seems to lead to a process of generalized control, ranging from the use of networks by the State or by large companies such as Google or Twitter to the influential utopias of denouncing the absolute vigilance. Leaving aside these utopias, which are interesting in terms of literature, it must be recognized that, since the control of networks is a real problem, ranging from privacy to political interference in elections, for example, it is necessary to include it in the logic of the institution and minimize it or resist him. Empirically, the logic of control corresponds to one more element to be considered in an environment increasingly characterized by political, financial, ethical, and technical problems, etc.

It is only possible to respond to the increase in complexity, the crisis, the contingency with more control, returning to the classic models of governance and its variants, or better governance.

6.

Numerous theories of governance seek to go beyond this alternative, but it deforms with an essential difficulty: governance contains a part of non-conceptuality that no theory manages to exhaust[38]. Any institution. Firstly, because by the mere fact of its existence, the institution already contains some form of direction or governance, evolving simultaneously in the

---

37   Allenby and Daniel Sarewitz, in a precise analysis of the effects of technology, show that in addition to the secondary effects, which are still workable, there is a Level IIII connected to the earth in the Anthropocene epoch that evades any calculation, requiring other forms of approach. Not seeing this since the relationship "'cause and effect' is the opiate of the rational elite". Braden R. Allenby & Daniel Sarewitz, The techno-human condition, Massachusetts, MIT Press, 2011, pp.70.

38   We are referring to the concept of non-conceptuality proposed by Hans Blumenberg, which refers to the images and metaphors that are at the base of concepts and which remain uncaptured and active: "That is why metaphorology, if it does not want to limit itself to the auxiliary function of metaphor for the formation of concepts, but wants to become a guide for looking at the lifeworld, will not get by without being included in the broader horizon of a theory of non-conceptuality". Cf. Hans Blumenberg, Theorie der Unbegrifflichkeit, Frankfurt, Surkamp, 2007, p. 101.

general space of management that constitutes an available fund of theories, techniques, and models - a kind of available fund that can always be drawn on, and this happens all the time. Even when governance is explicitly envisaged, abolishing its zone of inconceptuality, that crucial moment of the imagination, its materialization always resorts to pre-existing forms. Even better, the materialization of governance immediately becomes a new theory and model, which is added to the existing ones.

Given the nature of the institution, and the fact that it is open and dynamic, a series of hidden factors and variables always escape, preventing the theory from being able to predict everything that exceeds it, like a kind of infallible butterfly hunt. Hence, governance cannot be fully modeled, acquiring a stable topology where management is inscribed. It exists as a limit of current governance. It emerges at the institution's critical moments, it reveals itself in the fact that it is constantly being revised and reinvented. As Defarges states: "a heterogeneous set of very diverse devices, each problem, each institution, each company defining its governance space. These spaces are neither closed nor fixed. They interpenetrate each other, maintaining multiple and evolutionary relationships. A common inspiration characterizes these systems - the idea of governance"[39]. What exceeds the non-conceptuality of governance is its real and double the institutional imagination, implying the possibility of creating concepts in the same course of events where the institution lives and takes risks. Governance is not a "model" because it is concrete and demands reinvention. The thought that gives

it consistency tends to respond better to a complex, plural environment, marked by tensions of all kinds, by various laws and rigidities.

Being highly plastic, governance draws on the existing background of theories and models to adapt its ongoing management to the circumstances. in the event of a serious crisis, the institution's concrete life resorts to centralized management to the Board's unity of command. However, the persistence of governance within what it seems to deny makes such a decision provisional and unstable. Does it reappear after the crisis, giving rise to lighter and more flexible ways of management? It is an undecidable subject, which depends on each institution, and the tensions that weaken it, and has to be answered. Not recognizing this material precipitation of governance in governmentality would make it a kind of utopia of pure negotiation and collaboration between partners and allies in a kind of absolute understanding. The effect would be perfect self-regulation, which is no less illusory than the perfect market. The space of governance is that of the game, where the agonistic element tends to disappear, as it always leads to a zero-sum game, to the advantage of a game in which everyone wins something by cooperating. It is about playing and enforcing the game's rules in unstable situations. In real conditions marked by conflict and unexpected contingent problems, governance seems weak[40]. Absolute governance would only be possible at the end of conflicts and wars, but in that situation, it would no longer have a reason to exist. It would be almost as natural as the architecture of bees or spiders[41].

---

39 Cf. Philippe Moreau Defarges, La Gouvernance, Paris, PUF, 2022, p. 43.

40 Criticizing its lack of political pertinence, Gaudin asks: "Governance today resembles a hope shared by all. Why has a modest, bland, even mediocre notion, which is not linked to any utopia or political messianism, become on the consensual horizon, an almost indispensable reference in contemporary discourse?". Cf. Jean-Pierre Gaudain, , Critique de la Governance: une nouvelle morale politique?, Éditions de L'Aube, La Tour d'Aigues, 2014. p, 12

41 In his analysis of post-history, where negativity and conflict have disappeared, Kojève argues that we would enter a "superior animality" because "after the end of History, men would construct their buildings and works of art as birds build their nests and spiders spin their webs, would perform musical concerts after the fashion of frogs and cicadas would play like a young animal, and would indulge in love like adult beasts". To his relief, he finds in Japaneseism an alternative to this conclusion. Cf. Kojève, op. ult.cit., p. 160.

Governance is metapolitics since the State confiscates politics by crystallizing it through Law and governance. It is related to politics, but without being part of it. This fact has led some to consider it a "depoliticized politics" equivalent to an extreme of managerial reason. This leads an author like Giorgio Agamben to defend that it is necessary "to bring to light the Ungovernable which is the beginning and, at the same time. the vanishing point of every politics"[42]. Governance in its extreme form, which tends to suspend governance, seems to point to the ungovernable, but with a radical difference, it is not based on an impossible position outside the institutions, which it denies despite always being theirs, even if it is language or language or any other. There is no politics of the institution, although it includes among its problems and matters the State and politics, which seek to capture politics for governmentality. Something that Lévinas defines as metapolitics is at stake[43]. This relationship is much more unrestricted, plural and open, not fearing the ideality of justice without intending to capture it, revealing a necessary background throughout the institution, which can be defined as an-arkhé, which respects this creation ex nihilo that corresponds to the foundation of the institution that remains active in everything it develops. In short, the instituting is haunted by the destituent.

7.

To complete. Although governance is inscribed in the managerial reason that is formalized and rationalized in modernity and crosses all institutions and the State itself, it goes beyond this logic and, in a way, constitutes an essential element for its critique and the guarantee of its inventiveness. It has always been in every institution and common activity, for example, the family and associations of all kinds, but virtually. Amid the power of direction, it is the vision that a free relationship is possible within what denies it. . This is why people speak of sweet governance, the strength of love, and persuasion insofar as they exceed command and power. Its thematization corresponds to the coming to the surface of this almost anarchist background, which emerges as a counterpoint to the passionate criticism and defense of the various management models that have been imposing themselves in an unstoppable unfolding of government and governamentalization. Therefore, it cannot be a form of structuring, rigid scheme, or theory since it has no consistency in itself. Its consistency comes from its relationship with other forms of management, which are more imposing, authoritarian, and, in extreme cases, violent. It is founded on the threshold of managerial reason, preventing its closing line where the institution would wither.

The fact that governance is uncapturable does not mean it is "ideal". Given the existing plurality and dissonance between institutions, governing is imposed by necessity; and if this ideal extended to the whole of life and were the effect of everyone's free actions, governance would cease to exist and would be useless. It exists because there are crises and conflicts where all the powers of governance are grounded on the institution's will to survive or the desire to strengthen. Governance aims at that background of an-arkhé that persists in all order and law, and that has as its horizon those absolute ideas that are the just, the beautiful, the good, and the truth. Occupying all vision, it is the life that hides them.

42   Giorgio Agamben (2008), What Is an Apparatus?, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2009, p. 35

43   Metapolitics is not something that is above and beyond politics, nor is it politics in areas where the State does not intervene, it is, as Abensour states "metapolitics emanates from a sensibility that is both enjoyment and exposure to others, the two aspects being closely related, a sensibility that is shared by all beings of flesh and blood. To tell the truth, metapolitics not only describes a turning point – «turning away from one thing towards another» – but also designates a content, a meta-ontological region, by the fact that it is situated beyond the conatus essendi, and goes as far as an inversion of the conatus, under the species of proximity, another way of referring to the "human exception", to the intrigue of the human". Cf. Miguel Abensour, Emmanuel Levinas L'intrigo dell'umano Tra metapolitica e political. Dialogue with Danielle Cohen-Levinas, Inschibboleth Edizione, Roa 2013, p. 104.

However, what uncovers and brings to life what, in history, has shone as a promise of the best, is present in every instituting act, which adds something unique to what is already in progress. We expect a decisive contribution to knowledge from the alliance of universities that created FilmEU, with its clear vision of what is to be done in cinema and the arts. That we question ourselves about the ways of doing this, about the governance that should guide us, about our instituient singularity, does not constitute a provisional moment that shall end quickly to go to work. Still, it is already the work from which everything else will emerge.