



THE SOCIAL ECONOMY AS A GALAXY POWERED BY VIRTUOUS ENERGIES

RUI NAMORADO

Professor Emeritus of the Faculty of Economics at the University of Coimbra

1. Introduction
2. The social economy as a galaxy
3. The virtuous energies of the social economy
4. Values and principles of the social economy
5. Conclusion

1.

INTRODUCTION

1.1. The social economy expresses the autonomous consideration of a socio-economic space external to the public sphere and, ultimately, alien to the capitalistic logic of profit. There are other expressions that reflect other gazes into the same space. This one, however, has a special strength in some European countries, including Portugal, and is of some considerable import throughout the European Union.

Whilst remaining true to a common generic identity, the face of the social economy varies from country to country, as it reflects the paths taken by each nation's history. This does not detract from the possibility and usefulness of analysing and valuing this identity as a global reality; one whose logic we seek to understand.

What we have here is a dynamic space that is still gestating and has ample potential for both maturing and radiating. Its affirmation depended mainly on the involvement in that process of the entities that are, today, a very part of this economy. However, it has also been marked by the various public strategies and policies engendered as responses to what, in capitalist terms, was seen as the social issue. Nor can we set aside the resonance of the theoretical and doctrinal issues that have

shaped it as an object of knowledge or its interaction and programmatic osmosis with the emancipatory struggles of humanist affirmation through which its victims have resisted capitalist predation.

1.2. Thus, the social economy started out as a *reality in itself*, with no self-awareness. It evolved through the autonomous dynamics of its various components, which did not recognise each other as parts of the same whole. When its maturity was sufficient to make institutionalisation possible, by generating a social space that both recognised itself as such and lent socio-political legitimacy, it became objectively possible to take a global view of the social economy. Thus, it became easier to detect interactions and confluences within it, as well as to revisit the histories of its components by combining them, and doing so in the light of a belonging, of no prior importance, to a space that transcends them. It is, therefore, natural that the various energies that give life to the social economy interrelate, thus underscoring their similarities and complementarities and raising the profile of both their common roots and their differences.

If we look closely enough, we can see that all of them have played a key historical role in the enabling and social construction of the human species, as it moves towards a dignifying and liberating civilisational and cultural affirmation, even if such progress is subject to the randomness of obstacles and setbacks. These energies were the connective tissue and sap that drove the emergence of human societies; they were their way of being. They nourished development, projecting themselves in multiple materialisations that, throughout history, emerged differently and in disparate territorial and cultural circumstances.

However, all these energies that structured collective action, by enhancing social dynamics, were more fruitful and more underpinning, the less they hindered the affirmation and maturing of the individuality of each human being as an autonomous, but never isolated, protagonist in the historical process.

Each of the great structuring typologies of collective action, which will be highlighted here, naturally brought together different materialisations, translated into specific energies that defined the concrete way of being of each entity or organisation and, ultimately, of each protagonist.

The integration of the constitutive energies of the social economy in the historical process, as forces and logics that induce humanity, makes it clear that they are not just the result of historical circumstantialisms, however important, or of socio-political imaginations, however brilliant. This

does not imply that these circumstantialisms or these theoretical and doctrinal imaginations are irrelevant in any way, as they reflect the intensity with which they have been imbued by the corresponding social practices.

1.3. The differentiation between living beings, which induced humanity, reached its final stage through the collective action of human beings. It was this that allowed the species to survive. Social life, the stirring of culture and the emergence of civilisation are all rooted in this differentiation. Once beyond the survival stage, the differentiations between humans intensified and stabilised, allowing the crystallisation of hierarchies that induced power relations and relations of exploitation. The process that generated this type of society resulted in the strengthening of hierarchies and inequalities. Inequalities in the necessarily intertwined distributions of wealth and power, each of which enhances the other.

Free association, cooperation among equals and reciprocal solidarity rooted in the community lost ground and became subordinate to the imperative logic of the societies of exploitation that became dominant. The social fabric reflected the successively diverse ways in which societies of exploitation reproduced themselves throughout history. Their own characteristics, their own structuring logic, became dominant. However, this did not prevent the subordinate survival of the logics and energies on which humanity was based.

In fact, if we look at the more dominant active principles of the social economy, particularly at the more striking impetuses that underpin the construction of the same, we find that those that reflect the cooperative, solidary and reciprocal energy are the most prominent and distinctive. However, if we examine them closely, we see that those organisations whose main structuring alignments are seated in these energies have largely resulted from differentiating processes occurring within broader sets. In truth, both cooperatives and mutual societies reflected the dynamics of specialisation of what some have called the initial associative nebula.

Let us call the energy of this nebula associative. The enormous range of activities in which such associations engaged meant that this associative energy took numerous disparate forms. This diversity induced various degrees of differentiation. The lesser differentiations engendered a diversity of types of association as a general category, whereas greater differentiations led to the emergence of new spaces capable of inducing categorically autonomous political-normative responses.

In Portugal, this autonomy was clearer in the case of the cooperatives. They gave rise to a differentiated legal space; one rooted in a new legal category—the cooperative. In fact, cooperativeness has its own legal and constitutional resonance and is regulated by a specific Cooperative Code.

1.4. By assuming itself to be a specific socio-political reality and being recognised as such, the social economy has acquired its own identity. An identity that is rooted in its components and yet also transcends them. The intensity with which the social economy tends to affirm itself is a factor in its development and will dialectically strengthen it.

Basically, it is a matter of attributing worth, as has already been said, to the process of converting a *social economy in itself* into a *social economy for itself*. This process is triggered by the protagonism of the different types of social economy entities, by the public policies that most directly concern them and by the theoretical and doctrinal framework construed through the study of the same. In other words, this is a process that reflects the way in which the social economy permeates the evolution of capitalism, intruding on it to the extent that it becomes one of its aspects. For some, it is seen as bringing balance, while others see it as a harbinger of its own possible downfall.

This ongoing maturing of the social economy enhances the appreciation of its overall logic and reinforces the importance of understanding the nature and the conflation of the various types of forces that drive it. In order to clarify the essence of this overall logic and the main types of energy it translates into, it may be useful to resort to a descriptive metaphor, the metaphor of the galaxy.

1.5. Comprehending the system of forces that combine to form the dynamics of the social economy is an important part of coming to understand it. In searching for such an understanding, by resorting to the metaphor of the galaxy, it is necessary, or just convenient, to identify the energies into which these forces translate.

It should be borne in mind that the social economy is a weaving of diversified collective actions that are the result of individual decision-making that tends to be free. It is these collective actions that embody the sought-after energies. Their diversity squares with the irreducible specificity of each concrete action. However, this heterogeneity may be addressed, by organising it into major types according to their characteristics. These types will be designed as a function of the characteristics that are seen as important.

Thus, if we start from the *social economy for itself* as it is today¹ and delve into the historical trajectory of its main constellations, we are able to typologically group the energies that have given these constellations life. These types of energy are present in all the constellations, but in some cases, they can form the backbone of the dynamics of one of them.

2.

THE SOCIAL ECONOMY AS A GALAXY

2.1. If we look at the social economy as a whole, with its surprising global dynamic, and pay attention to the sometimes-contradictory impulses that run through it and to the different identities manifested within it, we find that it is a complex moving mechanism. A mechanism moved by its own logic, which incorporates components that are also both relatively complex and endowed with their own specific logics.

For a long time now, I have been using a descriptive metaphor that may help us to understand it better. It can be helpful to look at the social economy as if it were a galaxy, made up of multiple constellations which, in turn, unpack into different types of entities that incorporate protagonists endowed with their own individuality. These constellations mingle dynamically, interacting with each other, just as the component entities do within each of them.

¹ In the Portuguese case, Article 4 of the Framework Law for the Social Economy (Law No. 30/2013) lists the entities that are legally recognised as being part of the social economy, namely:

- a) *Cooperatives;*
- b) *Mutual associations;*
- c) *Misericórdias (institutional charity organisation);*
- d) *Foundations;*
- e) *Private social welfare/charity organisations not covered by the preceding categories;*
- f) *Associations with altruistic purposes that work in the fields of culture, recreation, sports and local development;*
- g) *Entities in the community and self-managed subsectors that are constitutionally part of the cooperative and social sector;*
- h) *Other legally constituted entities that subscribe to the guiding principles of the social economy, as established in Article 5 of the above law, and are listed on the social economy database.*

2.2. In order to make the very most of the clarifying potential of this metaphor, we need to pay close heed to some of the key ideas it offers regarding the social economy.

I. The first involves recognising it as a whole whose parts are, however, clearly distinct from each other. Thus, the complexity and heterogeneity of the social economy is immediately underscored. We are talking about a system of constellations whose heterogeneity does not preclude a common overall dynamic. The complexity of this system is precisely this dynamic heterogeneity, which should never fade to the point of extinction nor be exacerbated to the point of becoming dissipative.

II. The second idea highlights the importance that an awareness of belonging to the social economy as a whole has in shaping the identity of each constellation, of each constituent entity. In other words, the dawning realisation in each constellation and each of its parts that they belong to a galaxy that encompasses and transcends them is part of a slow maturing process that transforms a *social economy in itself* into a *social economy for itself*.

III. Another key idea is that inter-cooperation serves to underpin and induce greater cohesion of the whole. Indeed, inter-cooperation forms a true symbolic connective tissue, not only of the whole galaxy in question, but also of each of its constellations. It is a core element of the respective way of being.

IV. A fourth key idea leads us to interweave full respect for the historical identity of each constituent constellation into the importance of their being an integral part of the social economy. If the social economy as a whole is to have internal balance, then integration must not involve any stripping out of character. This also acts as strong check on the trivialisation of the same, whether of the whole or of any of its parts.

V. A final key idea, closely related to the previous one, is that each constellation's autonomy is valued but the fact that it belongs to the galaxy in question is not disregarded. It could also be said that the autonomy of each of the parts is a key factor in the life of the whole.

We are, therefore, talking about each constellation's relative but irreducible autonomy, as, on the one hand, part of the galaxy that it represents and, on the other, as a unit of last resort that does

not erase the diversity that is intrinsic to it. This is how a complexity is generated; one that induces tensions convertible into a propulsive energy that is embodied in its own logic.

2.3. It is thus a predominantly organised space; an institutional space powered by cooperative, solidary and reciprocal energies. In order to have a clear reflective image of this, we use a metaphor to describe it. It should be stressed that the existence of a galaxy-wide dynamic objectively renders the constituent component autonomies relative. That is, after all, the way of being of this whole.

Autonomy and unity, therefore, go hand in hand. The identity of each star within its constellation and of each of these within the galaxy should be given their full value, without overlooking the fact that the components are also parts of the whole. There is a global dynamic that involves and is expressed by piecemeal dynamics. Dissipative impulses jostle with congregative ones, in a space populated by centrifugal and centripetal forces that are in a state of permanent interaction. The autonomy of the stars and their constellations feeds into the way in which they become part of the social economy. The whole is the sum of the parts, but each of the parts is reciprocally permeated by the logic, values and principles of the social economy as a whole.

2.4. It should be stressed that the metaphor we are using allows us to highlight the contradictory dynamics, the conflicting impulses that make themselves felt in the social economy. These can be sources of a propulsive energy. And if this is not to be forgotten, nor is the risk of exacerbating them to the extent that they turn into dissipative forces.

Indeed, these conflicting tensions help to avoid stagnation. Therefore, the non-dilution of each constellation in a hypothetical uniform fabric is an enabling factor for the galaxy as a whole. Moreover, the galaxy is only truly secured through the protagonism that each of the constellations actually takes on. It could be said that the social economy, at our current time in history, would not survive if it were converted into a uniform landscape, into a still life. At the very least, it would see its importance greatly diminished.

2.5. It is the identity of each of the social economy constellations that marks the limits of its own autonomy and the way in which it is materialised. Autonomy cannot go so far as to become self-exclusion.

Each constellation has, in turn, its own dynamics, which result from its specificity. Due to its nature, which is also complex, it comprises more circumscribed bundles of differentiated and more specific dynamics, in a chain of increasingly less generic levels, right down to unity.

2.6. To conclude, let us summarise and highlight the most important aspects of what we have just said. Excessive homogenisation and a forced erasing of the tensions that run through the social economy increase the risk of stagnation.

As we have stated, the autonomy of the various entities, at their different levels, is naturally relative and is, therefore, compatible with incorporation in the unity that materialises the cohesion of the whole. This cohesion is energised by its internal diversity. Therefore, the vitality of the whole is necessarily contingent on the vitality of the parts, of each constellation and, ultimately, of each individual entity.

Thus, the descriptive metaphor of the social economy as a galaxy, with its constellations, its star systems and its planets, allows us to better understand the conflation of unity and heterogeneity, the conflation of the movement of the whole with the piecemeal movements on its various levels, the conflicts that do not imply fragmentation, the contradictory impulses that do not provoke dissipation, the awareness of belonging to a galaxy that does not override an awareness of belonging to constellations, star systems and individual stars.

Finally, not only is the metaphor a helpful aid for understanding the social economy as a set of organisations, but it also allows room for the incorporation, as dispersed forces and flows, of social practices not anchored in organisations that specifically and globally correspond to them.

3.

THE VIRTUOUS ENERGIES OF THE SOCIAL ECONOMY

3.1. As we have already said, the collective action of human beings has been the main driving force behind their survival and their differentiation as a self-aware species. However, the gradual differentiation within this group gave rise to the formation of subordination and domination inducing hierarchies and powers that allowed exploitative relationships to be established between humans. Societies of exploitation subordinated the free-associative dynamics and community solidarities on which humanity was founded.

The energies in which these dynamics are embodied reflect the community-based logics that are inherent to the collective survival instinct of human societies. They are, to varying extents, present in their very beginnings, before the rise of the unequal and hierarchical social models inherent in societies of exploitation. Throughout history, they have survived in these societies as subordinate islands or archipelagos albeit to different and fluctuating degrees. In the capitalist mode of production, the enhancing of the hegemony of the latter's logic has only deepened the differences.

3.2. Of the types of energy that clearly indicate the specificity of the social economy, the most important are the cooperative, the reciprocal (or mutualist) and the solidary. However, as we have seen, there is another energy that has also driven the associative phenomenon as a whole and this cannot be ignored. It seems appropriate to call it associative energy.

We are dealing here with types of energy that conflate and combine with each other. Associative energy, however, corresponds to a broader and less differentiated space. It may be seen as a multidimensional force, diversified according to the contexts in which it functions and the realities it engenders. This differentiation may reach various levels that equate with autonomous types of organised protagonisms and even with specific legal categories.

In truth, this differentiation may translate into mere adjectivisations of the associative phenomenon into historically differentiated protagonisms that generate autonomous legal normativities, as is the case of mutualist associations. However, it can go even further, by giving rise to autonomous legal categories, as is the case of cooperatives.

In fact, cooperative and reciprocal energies are autonomous types within the class of associative energies. The relative autonomy of the former is less marked than that of the latter.

Entities that are structured with more solidary energy can take the associative form, although they can also be foundational in origin. Thus, the associative region does not fully occupy the solidary space, insofar as it must share it with the foundations, at least.²

² Article 82(3)(d) of the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic establishes that the solidarity subsector of the cooperative and social sector includes: *“the means of production owned and managed by non-profit collective entities whose main objective is social solidarity, namely entities of a mutual nature.”*

Furthermore, in the Portuguese case, the social economy is also rooted in a generic associative energy. This energy specifically drives those associations that, while not IPSS (private welfare organisations and charities), are covered by the LBES (framework law for the social economy), which differs as regards the types assumed by these types of association.

3.3. Let us reflect a little more on the types of energy we have been looking at.

Associative energy can be interpreted as an expression of humanity, the resonance of a fraternalism anchored in a communion of horizons, the root and condition for the survival of the species and a driver of progress. To this extent, it can be thought of as a community energy freed from the condition of territoriality. In fact, if we see in this last a primary sociability rooted in the land, associative energy can be viewed as a reproduction of its logic, but one that is subordinated to a freely assumed communion of objectives, devoid, or not, of territorial roots.

Cooperative energy, on the other hand, can be seen as a type of associative energy that results from an evolution that leads to a qualitative leap. A leap generating a new quality, rooted in an autonomous type of energy, inducer of a differentiated category. This is a type of energy that involves the imperative of ongoing mutual help between its protagonists. This help is, thus, a condition for the effectiveness and perpetuation of organisations whose dominant active principle is productive cooperation. It can be said that the fact that cooperatives are the expression of a symbiosis between an association and a company has objectively imposed the transformation of associative energy into cooperative energy. This type of energy is designed to give life to that symbiosis.

On the other hand, reciprocal energy, which underpins mutualism, represents a lesser degree of differentiation from the initial associative nebula. Although similar to cooperative energy, it reflects a lesser degree of differentiation, which is illustrated by the fact that mutualist organisations in Portugal are led by entities which have the legal form of associations.

It should also be remembered that, in Portugal, mutualist associations are covered by the IPSS statute. This not only evidences the solidarity aspect of mutualism but also shows how central it is to the dynamics and institutional design of the same.

Moreover, it is also possible to see solidary energy as a maturing of community energy. It results from a different evolutionary line from associative energy and can be seen as a community resonance subsisting in societies of exploitation.

These types of energy constitute an interactive space that generates synergies, but which should not be thought of as one-dimensional, since the various energies relate to each other through different planes.

3.4. Community, associative, cooperative, mutualistic and solidary energies give life to the social economy by coming together in a bundle that conflates them. In a way, they constitute the bundle's connective tissue. This is not a homogeneous connective tissue, in which they would all combine in the same way, contributing equally to the construction of the whole, but rather a vast heterogeneous fabric, whose diversity reflects the different contributions of the various types of energy. This heterogeneity is projected in the diversity of constellations found in the social economy.

Returning to the galaxy metaphor, it should be noted that community energy is predominant in the entities of the community sector enshrined in the Portuguese Constitution. In the associations, associative energy is dominant; in the cooperatives, the dominant energy is cooperative; in the solidary constellation, solidary and in the mutualistic constellation, mutualistic or reciprocal energy predominates. In fact, the existence of areas with differently predominant types of energy helped to shape the autonomy of the various constellations.

These energy sources, which give life to the social economy, are the active principles that most strongly influence it. They are the lynchpins of its structure and imbue its ethical dimension as values.

In commenting globally on these lynchpins, on these sources of energy, we can say that reciprocity is a space in which cooperation and solidarity overlap, since, to a certain extent, it can be seen as a specific form of cooperation. There is no reason why it cannot also be seen as a type of solidarity, when viewed from a different perspective. However, cooperation mainly makes itself felt through the way its protagonists work together, while solidarity is mainly reflected in the external objectives pursued by each organisation.

On the other hand, the historical rooting of all of them in community and associative energies, and the proximity thus engendered, operates as a favourable backdrop for an interactive conflation, even if this rooting is typologically diversified.

4.

VALUES AND PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL ECONOMY

4.1. The energies that kindle the social economy and the cloud of values and principles that envelop it generate a force field that gives it life. Thus, the process of transforming the *social economy in itself* into a *social economy for itself* involves an awareness not only of belonging to the galaxy as a whole, but also of the importance of these energies and of a set of principles and values that exist in harmony with them. These energies are not only compatible with and complementary to each other but can also be harmonised with a set of values and principles that guide them in an overall sense.

In fact, the life in the galaxy in question translates into a web of activities that fill its everyday life. These actions adhere to an ethic that is embodied in certain values and principles that imbue (or should imbue) the choices and behaviours of its protagonists. This force field naturally conditions the corresponding legal normativity, the public policies that affect it and the theories and doctrines that seek to understand it.

4.2. In the Portuguese case, the Framework Law for the Social Economy clearly³ stipulates what those values and principles are⁴. It begins by valorising its autonomous nature and the fact that its central objective is the direct or indirect pursuit of the general interest. It then explicitly sets out a number of guiding principles.

First of all, it enshrines the primacy of people. From this, it follows that, for social economy entities, the reproduction of capital is not an active principle, since they only use it as a tool. This primacy is written into their genetic code. It cannot be properly understood without considering it in conjunction with the primacy of social objectives that explicitly accompanies it. Indeed, the primacy of persons is in no sense selfish. On the contrary, it is imbued with an irreducible sociality which gives it an unequivocally collective dimension. In fact, individual protagonisms in the social economy always include the organised collective subjectivities that, ultimately, embody it, both primarily and institutionally.

³ Law No. 30/2013 (or Framework Law for the Social Economy—LBES) was published in the *Diário da República* on 6 June 2013.

⁴ See Article 5 of the LBES which details the “Guiding Principles” that are addressed here.

The next affirmation concerns the freedom and voluntariness of membership and participation in social economy entities. This means that the individual protagonists of this type of organisation should interact with them on the basis of an ongoing exercise of freedom. This is something that will always be disrupted by any breach of entity autonomy.

Thus, in practical terms, the value of democracy is embodied in the enshrinement of the democratic control of these bodies by their members. This structuring principle is clearly established as an irremovable value. Naturally, it synergises closely with freedom and voluntariness, but it will also lose practical resonance if it coexists with any weakening of autonomy.

It then establishes the need to reconcile the various types of interests at stake. On the one hand, there are the interests of the members, users or beneficiaries, depending on the type of entity, and, on the other, the general interest. The valorisation of this dichotomy, by stressing the need to prevent the general interest from being obscured by the absorbing consideration of other interests, should not mask the fact that the pursuit of the dichotomy is also, in itself, part of the general interest.

The enshrining of the autonomous and independent management of social economy entities makes their structural autonomy all the more robust, both as regards public entities and private entities that are not part of the social economy. This is how the structural and functional importance of autonomy for these organisations is clearly foregrounded.

A general guideline is then established for the distribution of surpluses, that is to say, of operating profits, of any surplus of revenues over costs. The general rule is that such surpluses should be allocated to the pursuit of the purposes of the social economy entities in accordance with the general interest.

However, this rule embodies a relative disregard for the specific nature of cooperatives and the distribution of their surpluses. These depend on the operations that took place during each period agreed between each cooperative and its cooperative members. They cannot, therefore, be treated as remuneration of capital. Therefore, the scope of this principle is clarified by implicitly referring to cooperative surpluses, whilst cases in which such exclusion results from the specific nature and substratum of any constitutionally enshrined social economy entity are excluded from its scope.

The same article that sets out the list of principles I have just mentioned enshrines respect for certain values as one of these principles. These values are listed: solidarity, equality with an emphasis on

non-discrimination, social cohesion, justice with a focus on equity, transparency, shared individual and social responsibility and subsidiarity.

4.3. The resonance of the cooperative identity is clearly seen if we analyse these principles and values as a whole. The lengthy process of bedding down this identity and its plurinational and multifaceted nature, as well as the complexity brought about by its explicit entrepreneurial dimension, reveal the reason for this resonance.⁵

It can also be seen that the energies that have been commented on specifically induce adherence to some of these principles and values and even shape the way of being for some types of entities. In at least two cases this is particularly noticeable.

In order not to restrict cooperation, which is the result of cooperative energy, and to aspire to maximum fruitfulness, such cooperation must be free and voluntary. It will also not be able to withstand any breach of autonomy or, concomitantly, any hetero-managerial pressure, without incurring severe damage. Without democracy, it would be difficult for this system of forces not to come off the rails and run the risk of dissipation. However, if it functions satisfactorily, it will, quite naturally, enact the primacy of people.

In the case of solidarity, the materialisation of solidary energy, in addition to being seen as a value in its own right, is especially congruent with the values of equality, social cohesion and justice. It gains consistency through its faithfulness to the instrumental values of transparency, the sharing of individual and social responsibilities and subsidiarity. All this favours and strengthens the pursuit of social objectives.

5.

CONCLUSION

The social transformation inherent in an exit from capitalism, naturally led by public institutions, does negate the need for a corresponding endogenous dynamic in civil society. In civil society, the

⁵ For a more detailed study of this issue, see, among others, Rui Namorado: *Os princípios cooperativos* (1995) (The cooperative principles), Coimbra, Fora do Texto. and *Cooperatividade e Direito Cooperativo* (2005) (Cooperativity and Cooperative Law), Coimbra, Almedina.

involvement of the social economy means that it plays a central role in this reformist process of democratic transition.

The intensity of this involvement naturally varies according to the circumstances and the historical differences between the various countries and continents. Globally, it is still at an embryonic stage and is manifesting itself along a range of different trajectories.

The social economy itself is still under construction, even where it is more mature. Its affirmation as an aspect of the strategy to overcome capitalism is still tenuous. However, it is increasingly clear that this relative fragility, far from being a problem just for the social economy entities themselves, is actually projected into the dynamics of society as a whole and this helps undermine it.

The affirmation as such of the social economy, in its most recent version, has been exceptionally notable in the European Union, particularly in such member countries as France. However, its most important components have long existed autonomously and have inserted themselves differently into their surrounding social milieu.

Globally, the imagination of the future of the social economy is embedded in its daily construction and is projected in the need for a permanent retrospective of the paths followed by each of the various constellations since their respective beginnings. This will help induce their growing involvement in the historical process and intensify their utopian ambition.

Its synchronic multidimensionality and diachronic vocation are eloquently manifested in the force field constituted by the energies that give it life.

Coimbra, 8 March 2022