

editorial statement

Commoning in the Institution: Staying with the Contradiction

The commons is often welcomed into institutional space as a promise: of togetherness, care, shared ownership, and collective labor. Exhibitions, residencies, and public programs now speak fluently of “commoning,” of working together beyond extractive logics. Yet this embrace is never neutral. When institutions host commoning, they inevitably reshape it — not only through infrastructure and funding, but through the very grammar of their operation: hierarchy, visibility, output, and value capture. What does it mean, then, to practice commoning within the institution — a site that both enables and restricts its possibilities?

This is not a question of hypocrisy. It is a terrain of contradiction. And contradiction, as we argue here, is not something to fix or transcend. It is the material of practice. Commoning within institutions will always be compromised. But to dwell in that compromise — to become attuned to its contours, to move strategically within its gaps, to refuse its demands when possible — is perhaps where a different kind of resistance can emerge. Not the clean resistance of ideological purity, but the messy, partial, fugitive kind. The kind that doesn’t resolve contradiction but lives with it. Maybe even chills with it.

What this contradiction offers is not a closed analysis, but a spectrum — a range of attitudes, tactics, and positions that make themselves felt differently depending on context. Some practices lean into the language of the institution to survive. Others mimic, mock, or fictionalize institutional structures to hold space for something else. Some look for ways to redistribute resources; others focus on maintaining fragile infrastructures of care. This spectrum is not a linear path from resistance to assimilation. It is a dispersed, sometimes contradictory ecology of approaches — each entangled in the conditions of its emergence.

We want to resist both cynicism and purity. On one hand, there is a tendency to disavow all institutional collaboration as co-optation, as if autonomy were still a viable fantasy. On the other, there is a cheerful optimism — a belief that by speaking the language of the commons, institutions can be transformed from within. But optimism, as Lauren Berlant warns, can be cruel: it attaches us to possibilities that depend on the very structures that block their realization. The fantasy that commoning can be absorbed without contradiction risks making us complicit in our own extraction — not by force, but through hope. The challenge, then, is not to abandon optimism but to reconfigure it: to ask what forms of commoning might still be possible, even if they are partial, compromised, or non-redemptive.

This editorial begins from that impasse. It maps the contradictions of working in and for the commons within institutional settings, especially in the cultural field. We draw on historical materialist frameworks — beginning with the question of labor, value, and representation — and move through the affective economies of conviviality and friendship, toward speculative practices that fictionalize and subvert the institutional form itself. Along the way, we ask what it means to govern, reproduce, and sustain something together inside structures that depend on individuation, competition, and abstraction. We turn toward the undercommons — not as a hidden place, but as a way of inhabiting the visible differently. And we return, again and again, to the contradiction: not to solve it, but to stay with it.

Labor, Conviviality, and Abstract Value

In the cultural institution, not all work counts as labor. This distinction is rarely stated outright. Instead, it is enforced through tone — through the soft coercion of friendliness, the aesthetics of care, the atmospheres of being casual. When artists are invited into institutions under the guise of openness, support, or hospitality, they often enter environments where their contributions are assumed to be

natural extensions of who they are: creative, generous, collaborative. Their labor is framed not as labor at all, but as presence, availability, enthusiasm — as being part of the “vibe.”

This is not accidental. It is part of how institutions reproduce themselves. The employed class — curators, producers, coordinators — often depends on the presence of a more precarious class: the invited, the commissioned, the resident. One holds long-term contracts and pensions; the other is paid in short-term fees, exposure, and belonging. This asymmetry is rarely addressed. Instead, it is obscured through the aesthetics of horizontalism: shared meals, group photos, open calls written in lowercase.

The problem isn't conviviality itself. It's how conviviality functions as a pedagogy of de-economization — a way to render labor invisible by reclassifying it as fun, social, or inherently fulfilling. This mirrors a longer history of feminized labor: domestic work, emotional care, and reproductive labor that has been systemically devalued precisely because it is seen as natural or unquantifiable. Within art institutions, we see this logic extended to the figure of the artist: expected to care, to be flexible, to collaborate joyfully, all while navigating structural insecurity.

A historical materialist perspective helps clarify this. As Marx theorized, labor does not hold inherent value. It becomes valuable only when abstracted — made exchangeable and commensurable through social relations. This is the concept of abstract labor: labor stripped of its specific content, converted into a generalized measure of productivity. In this light, the problem is not that artistic labor is “undervalued,” but that it is often refused abstraction altogether. It is not recognized as labor, but instead aestheticized as expression or presence.

Yet institutions still manage to extract value from it. They do this not by commodifying the work directly, but by embedding it in their metrics of success: community engagement, social relevance, innovation. The artist's unpaid group facilitation becomes part of an impact report; their spontaneous collaboration becomes proof of an institution's progressive ethos. The surplus value is not in the work, but in the institutional framing of the work.

Commoning, when it enters this scene, is especially vulnerable to such capture. Because it foregrounds collective processes over individual outputs, it becomes easy to conflate with informal labor — labor done out of care, not for compensation. This blurring can be intentional (as survival strategy) or coercive (as institutional tactic), but the result is the same: the reduction of collective effort to symbolic capital.

How, then, can commoning practices navigate this? Perhaps the first step is to name the affective economy they inhabit — to recognize when support becomes extraction, and when care becomes currency. Only then can other kinds of labor — slow, relational, not always visible — begin to assert their value on different terms.

Friendship as Fuel — Sociality as a Means of Production

In the art world, sociality often takes on the shape of capital. Openings, dinners, residencies, group chats, shared studios — all these relational formats are sold to us as vital conditions of working together. And indeed, they can be. But within institutional structures, friendship frequently becomes a means of production, a form of surplus labor extracted in the name of community, collectivity, or vibe. Social life is not external to the production of value; it is folded into it.

This is especially visible in the sphere of artistic commoning, where the emphasis on collaboration, mutual care, and informal governance can obscure the underlying processes of abstraction. Much like labor is abstracted to become valorized — measured not by content but by exchangeability — friendship, too, is abstracted. It must be made legible to others: funders, audiences, boards. The

intimacy of a collective becomes a brand. A fleeting moment of mutual support becomes a group photo. Affection is proof of coherence; coherence becomes proof of success.

This process mirrors the logic of tokenization, both in cultural and financial contexts. In finance, tokenization involves converting a real-world asset into a digital token that can be traded, fractionalized, and circulated. In cultural institutions, the representation of sociality functions similarly: it abstracts the messiness of relationships into something recognizable, reproducible, and exchangeable — a “scene,” a “community,” a “practice.” This enables it to circulate, to accrue symbolic capital, to be named in reports and evaluation forms.

In this sense, representation becomes a soft instrument of enclosure. It delineates the boundaries of what counts as value, as labor, as collective presence. Like the historical enclosure of common land, it extracts and secures what was previously held in common — relationally, affectively, or informally — and reclassifies it as property: an image, a name, a citation. A group becomes a case study; intimacy becomes a deliverable. And once enclosed, it can circulate, be measured, be owned — by institutions, funders, or audiences. The commons of relation is thus gradually fragmented into individual, representable tokens.

Here, the political potential of friendship is neutralized. Instead of becoming a ground for solidarity, refusal, or conflict, it becomes a tool of representation. What might have been a space of shared struggle becomes an aesthetic. And in many cases, this abstraction is necessary for survival. One cannot secure funding for unphotographed intimacy. One cannot report on trust without turning it into a diagram. The institution does not see what cannot be rendered.

This logic does not only operate from above. It shapes how artists relate to one another. Networking becomes not just instrumental but existential. The conditions of cultural labor — scarcity, precarity, individualization — encourage investment in social relations not for their own sake but for the access they might provide. This corrodes the ground on which friendship could stand. It makes every encounter potentially strategic. It renders refusal costly.

To common within this context is to take on significant risk. It is to build relations that might resist or refuse visibility, and thus remain unvalorized. Or, conversely, to engage visibility tactically — to simulate coherence where there is none, in order to extract resources to keep going. Neither position is pure. Both are implicated. What matters is not whether a project “truly” embodies commoning, but whether it remains attentive to **how its sociality is framed, circulated, and extracted.**

Perhaps one task for commoning today is to find ways to stay in relation without being captured by representation. To assert the value of that which cannot be photographed, recorded, or diagrammed — and to do so not through disavowal, but through careful navigation of the terrain we’re already in.

Fictional Institutions, Real Propositions

If institutions are, at their core, social fictions — legal constructs sustained by repetition, architecture, documentation — then they can also be re-fictionalized. Artists and cultural workers have long recognized this, not only critiquing institutions from the outside but appropriating their formats from within. The fictional school, the speculative union, the DIY museum, the performative grant body — these forms don’t merely parody. They generate alternate logics, making visible the arbitrariness and violence of existing structures while rehearsing other ways of being together.

These practices don’t claim to be outside the system. In fact, they often acknowledge their parasitic relationship to it. They feed on institutional codes — logos, language, policy — in order to build protective membranes around fragile intentions. What they offer is not a purified alternative, but a

zone of fugitive infrastructure: temporary, unstable, self-aware. In this sense, they echo the sensibility of the undercommons.

Fred Moten and Stefano Harney write that the undercommons is not a place but a mode of being — a way of living in the institution without being of it. It is what persists in the breaks, the back rooms, the informal WhatsApp threads, the things we don't put in our bios. Fictional institutions often operate in this way: they use the appearance of legitimacy to shelter informal, opaque, or unruly relations. They allow us to gather in ways that might otherwise be denied visibility, funding, or permission.

What makes these fictions powerful is not their distance from reality, but their closeness to it. They don't escape institutional capture, but rather mimic it with just enough fidelity to pass. They create slippages. A speculative labor union may not be legally binding, but it shifts the discourse. A fictional grant may not fund real money, but it funds real time, real thinking. These fictions become zones of resonance — a way to name what doesn't yet exist, or no longer exists, but still insists.

There is a tactical advantage here. By appropriating the institution as form, artists gain access to its affordances — infrastructure, language, recognition — without accepting its totalizing logic. This is not a refusal of representation, but a refusal to believe in its neutrality. It is a way to frame differently: to produce legibility on one's own terms, to redirect visibility toward shared problems rather than fixed identities.

Of course, these gestures can be co-opted too. The fictional institution risks being absorbed back into the branding machinery of the real one. But this doesn't cancel its force. It just reminds us that fiction is a terrain, not an escape. The point is not to flee institutions, but to reorganize belief in what they could be — to disidentify with their mandates while using their forms as temporary vessels.

If commoning today is entangled with representation, perhaps fiction is a tool to loosen that knot. Not by refusing structure, but by writing new scripts into it — scripts that remember the undercommons, that resist capture, and that hold space for ways of working that don't yet have names.

Staying with the Trouble of the Institution

The contradiction between commoning and institutionality cannot be solved — and perhaps it should not be. Attempts to resolve it often result in reduction: either into cynicism (“all institutions are extractive”) or utopia (“we can transform the system from within”). Both positions flatten the messy realities in which cultural workers actually operate. The contradiction is not a dead end. It is a practice. And within it, there is space — not for purity, but for experimentation, negotiation, and divergence.

This publication embraces that space. It does not present a singular vision of the commons or a blueprint for institutional transformation. Instead, it gathers a spectrum of practices that navigate this terrain differently. Some contributions work tactically within institutional frames, stretching them from the inside. Others reject visibility and instead build local, opaque, or fugitive infrastructures. Some make demands; others make fictions. Some tend toward world-making, others toward refusal. Taken together, they do not cohere — and that is precisely the point.

To common within the institution is to inhabit the tension between infrastructure and improvisation, between recognition and withdrawal, between working and being worked upon. It requires fluency in competing registers: administrative, affective, speculative, technical. It demands an ability to read between lines — to know when the friendly gesture conceals unpaid labor, when a collaboration becomes extraction, when visibility becomes a trap. But it also opens the possibility of partial solidarities, of new alignments and modes of survival, if we can remain sensitive to the conditions in which our practices unfold.

This is why staying with the contradiction matters. It is not a moral position, but a material strategy. It allows us to track how value is produced and where it is stolen. It allows us to refuse the forced choice between co-optation and purity. And it reminds us that commoning does not happen in the abstract. It is relational, situated, and often compromised. But it also lives on — in the details, in the margins, in the practices that insist on care even when care is not funded, in the gestures that refuse legibility, in the infrastructures we build not to scale, but to hold each other.

To stay with the trouble of the institution is to take contradiction as a condition, not a failure. And perhaps to develop, within it, a kind of relational literacy: a sensitivity to what kinds of relations we are enacting, abstracting, preserving, or dissolving — and for whom. If there is resistance here, it is not always dramatic. Sometimes it looks like a conversation that doesn't end in a report. Sometimes it's an alliance that doesn't announce itself. Sometimes it's just knowing when to say no, and who will still be with you afterward.

We hope this publication holds space for these tensions — not to resolve them, but to make them available for reflection, strategy, and care. And in doing so, to join the long, unfinishable work of keeping the commons alive, even — and especially — from within the walls that seek to contain it.

work-in-progress

*Spectrum :

(1) a commonwealth

Subsidized ----- Grassroot? Non-state funded?

(2) a community of commoners and their social relations

INSTITUTIONAL -----NON INSTITUTIONAL

(3) a praxis of commoning, of doing in common.

Centralized - Distributed?

EXTRACTIVISM (Enclosure)-----COMMONING

+Geography?

Type of contributions:

- **Archive of spaces and informal collectives:** offering different frameworks for artists and cultural workers to organize + proposing a spectrum of strategies for navigating institutional engagement — from tactical compliance to subversive mimicry.

ex. Navigate institutional constraints through partial engagement or refusal

ex. Redistribute resources or foster infrastructures of care.

ex. Maintain autonomy while using institutional platforms.

- **Projects and actions:** offering practical inspirations for collective practice by highlighting **experimental forms** like fictional institutions, speculative unions, etc. as viable modes of resistance and survival.

--> encouraging practitioners to build infrastructures of care that resist commodification and visibility.

- **Tools and tactics:** offering templates, exercises, strategies, or frameworks that can help others work within contradiction consciously while promoting transparency around compromise, negotiation, or redistribution.

#key: while also experimenting with mediums like: collaborative writings, maps, diagrams, visual essays, transcripts of assemblies, project translated into scripts, set of instructions

fictional institution, speculative unions, other projects etc:

TAMI (Maren)

The Union* for Unvalorized (design) Labors (Noam)

The Art School (Noam)

The Outpost of Unreal Institutions (Pete)

[Hyperburgers](#) - Inconvenience Store by Francesca Tambussi

spaces and collectives:

Delineation/glossary?

What we actually mean by the words like “collective” “cooperation” “institution” “extitution” “Undercommons?” “artist-run space” “space” etc

Online initiatives?  [Canadian Journal of Development Studies_ Revue canadienne d'ét...]
→ this is nice

+ Initiatives in the South adjacent the dutch funding body (Morocco, Indonesia, Turkey... according to the dutch international funding policy) and the “real subsumption” of the potential of art practice

#we have

Conversation around the strategy in the midst of the subsidy cut (counting as 2 contributors)

(1 or 2 contributor x3 or 4)

BAK Camp (Utrecht) -

<https://www.bakonline.org/en/basecamp/collective/jeanne+van+heeswijk/>

+BALTAN

Something in Berlin/Germany (case that exemplifies the subsidy being weaponized)

<https://oyoun.de/en/>

(1 contributor)

Josh Plough https://www.instagram.com/ziemniaki_i/

<https://fringewarszawa.com/>

(Who represent their spaces?)

→ **CONVERSATION**

Binna Choi (Former director of CASCO) herself directly, because I assume it can offer us a more critical distance to make the implementation of the commons idea into an institution described in retrospect.

→ **TEXT**

Arts of the working class: (what format they have? Also financial?)

→ **INTERVIEW**

??? Pete Fung: what about commissioning a piece where he uses the tools of the outpost to investigate several “case studies”?

→ **MAPPING**

→ **CECILIA**

*(1) a commonwealth

Subsidized - Grassroot? Non-state funded?

(2) a community of commoners and their social relations

INSTITUTIONAL -NON INSTITUTIONAL

(3) a praxis of commoning, of doing in common.

Centralized - Distributed?

EXTRACTIVISM (Enclosure)-COMMONIG

+Geography?

??? Learning from Documenta

(<https://www.on-curating.org/issue-33-reader/learning-from-documenta-a-research-project-between-art-and-anthropology.html>) Against an extractive institution and its geopolitics (documenta 14) (I know some of them personally)

→ **TEXT**

→ **NOAM**

[#tools/methods](#) (3 full contributors)/ written interviews-collective doc

Constant (Brussels) – <https://constantvzw.org/site/> Has a lot to share about open technologies and collective practices

Notshitprint (ams): **printing**

Yin Aiwen (<https://www.instagram.com/aiwenyin/>)

LARP! They're amazing and has a lot to say about community, commoning and its financialization

TAMI (Maren):

Fiction as a tool

Hackers and designers

[#case study or direct involvement?](#)

[The Hmm: also a case study? Or a more direct involvement?](#)

Byebyebinary (Brussels) – Queer graphic design collective with a lot (like more than 40) members, and I really want to understand how they operate. I can reach out. -> Case Study/a transcription?
Graphic design & typography

Kiosk Radio? (Brussels) - They're a bit boring but their business model of selling beer appears to be very effective :D -> Case study?

Extra Practice (Rotterdam)
→ MAPPING: alternative history/mapping of Extra Practice through this idea of how the intentions and goals and dynamics changed until now.

Cholographics or El Alto Aesthetics (a collective) (Bolivia)
→ space (a space, not a collective!) & context & identity / decolonial practice
→ INTERVIEW: interesting about being a SPACE more than a collective. From there: commoning through identity, reappropriation, community

#casestudies -> Share with Pete

Robida

de Appel Amsterdam -> Case Study
→ Tools/methodologies, also a GENEALOGY of the institution. I like the idea to try to use mapping tools

PAF (Performative Art Forum)

Amaneï Salina <https://www.amanei.com/open-call-iancura>

Sakiya (west bank) <https://sakiya.org/>

Ex asilo (naples)

Munnen (Stockholm) https://www.instagram.com/_munnen_/ -> Case Study

Futuress:

I see futuress working better as a possible case study too. Otherwise, it could be interesting to commission them a selection, but I wonder about what this would entail. I know they would be happy to publish on paper too even in smaller cases, but then here it would come with new implications, for them and the authors.

DOPO? (Milan)

Born as a collective working space (and still operating as such) then starting to make their own programming etc. I believe their take within the Italian context is quite interesting. Some of them are a bit "cool kids", like quite successful yet young for the Italian context. Nonetheless, both the way how they run things and how they go on financially could be an

interesting one.

→ MAPPING ? or INTERVIEW specifically in the idea of **working SPACES**.

Extra Practice (Rotterdam)

Crater Invertido (Mexico City)

Do we have time for commoning?

#Creative commons resources:

-Open!

<https://onlineopen.org/about.php>

-Ephemeral journal x open source material:

<https://ephemerajournal.org/>

A bit dated but: <https://ephemerajournal.org/issue/excellent-institution>

Or institution vs extitution:

<https://ephemerajournal.org/contribution/extitutional-theory-modelling-structured-social-dynamics-beyond-institutions-0>

(--not so sure about the non commercial use they require:

https://wiki.creativecommons.org/wiki/NonCommercial_interpretation)

-International Journal of the Commons:

<https://thecommonsjournal.org/>

-The Internet Archive

<https://archive.org/>

→ POSSIBLE TEXTS:

-Marina Vishmidt (<https://onlineopen.org/download.php?id=128&wordcount=5664>)

She's no longer here with us, but I think it would be meaningful to republish some of her text about commons.

-A Philosophical Examination of the Ethical Foundations of the Commons

<https://thecommonsjournal.org/articles/10.5334/ijc.1379>

-Towards a Theory of Value as a Commons (digital commons)

<https://thecommonsjournal.org/articles/10.5334/ijc.1153#3-towards-a-theory-of-value-as-a-commons>

-Commonism and capabilities

<https://ephemerajournal.org/contribution/commonism-and-capabilities> (not sure about the license)

-History and commons (here good for finding references but often the references are not cc)

<https://thecommonsjournal.org/articles/10.18352/ijc.769#r12>:

-Early Medieval Commons? Or How the History of Early Medieval Europe Could Benefit from a Necessary Conversation: The Case From NW Iberia

<https://thecommonsjournal.org/articles/10.5334/ijc.1109>

To consult:

Hyein Park (<https://parkhyein.com/>) Can suggest more initiatives in the “south” that was involved in the previous documenta

Mayar El Bakry: I heard from Mayar, also asking for her inputs on north african regions. She said she would be happy to have a very informal chat, also to say hi, but maybe I can do it alone for now if this seems like a lot of time for you! And ask for some advice/hearing what she is up to!

Notes with Mayar:

in Cairo: Contemporary Image Collective

<https://www.transartists.org/en/air/contemporary-image-collective>

African context: Matri-archi

<https://www.matri-archi.ch/>

Based in Switzerland! → european fundings: to use colonial structure to get funded. it is an alibi — power dynamics

in Senegal: Raw Material Company (institution)

<http://www.rawmaterialcompany.org/?lang=en>

part of their practice is to hijack european fundings
question of reparation

individuals:

<https://www.aucegypt.edu/fac/ghalia-elsrakbi>

<https://www.engyaly.com/>

Morocco:

<https://dinabenbrahim.design/>

Cairo-NI: <https://www.instagram.com/sherinesalla/>

Mayar project in Cairo:

Mayar El Bakry, Noureldin Ahmed, Randa Hadi, Sherine Salla, Nada Ezzeldin, and Sohaila Khaled

<https://www.mayar.ch/for-us-with-us-by-us>

Alternative findings: <https://mophradat.org/en/>

Noam's response to the notes from Mayar:

I think our intuitions are aligning in the sense that it makes more sense for the purpose of this conversation to have somebody who can speak on behalf of an organization (such as Contemporary Image Collective, Marti-archi, Raw Material Company) not individuals. I'd also say CIC and RMC to be put in conversation with BAK and Baltan mediated by Josh:)

Dalia's references:

<https://owneh.org/>

<https://instituteofradicalimagination.org/>

Institute of Radical Imagination (IRI) is a group of curators, artists, activists, scholars with a shared interest in co-producing knowledge as artistic and political research-interventions aimed at implementing post-capitalist forms of life in the Mediterranean and the Global South.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tragedy_of_the_commons

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tragedy_of_the_anticommons

Budget

Josh with:	450
Baltan	200 ok
CiC	200 ok
Otwarty Jazdow	200 ok
Oyoun	200 ok
CC Texts	
Aiwen	500 (essay)
Binna Choi	500 (essay) OK
Arts of the working class	350 (interview) OK
Pete + Maren?	400 ? (reframing research)
Clara+Chris	400 (interview)
Noam text	?
Reframing of our material/ visual research (Bianca)	500

Aiwen x riso	?
Common pot list	?
TOTAL	4600
TOTAL to be used	5000

This week-we reach out (NO 24-25-26 OCT)

- Tool contributors: Constant, Notshitprint, Clara and Yin (Noam + small paragraph contextualizing the section) / Maren OK, Institute (sent through website form) (Cecilia)
- Casco (Cecilia) OK
- **Josh** (Cecilia- Keep the contact alive, maybe offer another meeting before the conversation starts)
- Pete check in again (Cecilia) OK
- **Bianca** check in / check intentions (Cecilia)
- Anouk x Public Domain texts (Interview? Anouk)

doc x tool section

If the commons consist of the commonwealth, the community of commoners, and the praxis of commoning, the aim of this section is to draw attention to the praxis and the specific tools in use here. Are the master's tools truly insufficient for dismantling the master's house? What technologies do we have at hand that can potentiate the praxis of commoning? What forms of agency remain when our tools are already conditioned by real subsumption—the tendency of capitalism not only to command labor formally (through wage relations) but also to transform the material and social organization of production itself? How might you offer these tools to other commoners?

- **Constant (Brussels)** – <https://constantvzw.org/site/> Has a lot to share about open technologies and collective practices
- **Notshitprint (ams): printing**
- **TAMI (Maren): Fiction as a tool (-with survey format)**
- **Institute of radical imagination**
<https://instituteofradicalimagination.org/2018/05/22/iri-general-assembly/>

Part 1:

How do you define your organizational structure?

Do you consider yourself an institution? If yes, how? If not, why?

What are the guiding principles of your work and the challenges you face in practice (internal organizational challenges and/or external pressures)?

What would you count as resources and knowledge within your organization? And what resources or knowledge do you treat as commons?

Part 2: Tools and methodologies

How do you make collective decisions in your organization?

If your collective/institution faced an existential crisis (funding cuts, loss of space, key members leaving, external pressure), what 5 concrete tools, practices, or resources would be most essential for survival?

Describe a methodology, process, or practice that's central to how you work together.

Do you see artistic/creative practices as tools for institutional change? If so, how?

Part 3: Imagining the Institution

Name a role or function that's missing in institutions you have worked with/in your institution

If you could start an institution from scratch, which aspects of the institution would you be more interested in shaping or working on?

If you could start an institution from scratch, what is the first thing you would remove?

And what's the first thing you would add?

Describe a ritual, object, or room your ideal institution would have. And why would this be important?