Review of: "Corralling a Chimera: A Critical Review of the Term Social Infrastructure"

Ernesto Adair Zepeda Villarreal

Thanks for the invitation to read and review Joshy & Aldrich's paper. The clarification of concepts and deep definition of conceptual frameworks are very important to achieve a more accessible and significant development in academics and social knowledge. I already read some other opinions and I strongly agree with what has been said.

Some point I could add:

a) Explain the relevance. It's very important to clear WHY a dark conceptualization must be enlightened. Why is a problem a phrase used indistinctively in so many areas should be better defined and simultaneous. This because normally, in different areas, the con concepts change because of the nature itself of the phenomenon observation. WHY a more universal and cohesive conception of 'social infrastructure' is useful, for WHO, and WHERE could be applied?

b) Social infrastructure in social context. As said previously, not only it's hard to understand a concept isolated by the only the words, but in social science context, is almost unthinkable. This is because normally a concept, specially used by politics, is chained to specific time-society context. The politics, economy and even personalities at charge, affects the usage of concepts and their meaning. Words are only words, but intentions, those really matter and explain the funny things in wrong use of concepts or intentional meanings to become mainstream.

c) Physical VS non-tangible infrastructure. By the author´s criteria, I think than infrastructure concept is only linked to physical places, objects and so. But in a more general thinking, are you very convinced that non-tangible infrastructure not exists? As example, social apps, forums, massive communitarian chats, and even social transference of knowledge (unformal talks, etc.) etc. Whys this matter, because the physical infrastructure of social infrastructure is very important, but only as the spaces to have some interactions. From a broader perspective, the social infrastructure could be understanding as a physical dotation of different assets (as the paper describe: health, communications, education, human development, etc.). But those spaces are linked with the other interactions of social members (social capital). And for more complexity, private and public spaces have their incidence too.

d) The art of divergence. Is really a problem than different, and some cases divergent, knowledge areas have a shaded definition of this concept? If yes, why, to whom and in what sense the clarification helps to achieve a higher development in knowledge and their effectiveness in societies.

e) Network. As economist, I like the social capital as key element in this concept, but gets limited by reality and other knowledge areas, as reviewed. Here happen the weakest part of the paper: the authors suggest the network spaces only

as physicals places and keep out some very important elements mixed with other categories and concepts, as: freedom, freedom to speech and reunion, low and civil rights (expression, participation), mental health (not only as providers and hospitals, but children right's, social assistance, long term development policies, and others).

Thanks for the reading, and specially for the opportunity of thinking outside the normal conception of social infrastructure, related to how and why we use the language and wording in the way we do normally. All the lucks for your work.