Ideas of *Autonomía*: Buzzwords, borderlands and research through design

Ann Light

ann.light@sussex.ac.uk

University of Sussex, Falmer, East Sussex, BN1 9RH, United Kingdom

I am reading Arturo Escobar's response to Tony Fry on designing for/by the global South (2017)[1]. Escobar is a radical anthropologist and Fry is a political design theorist but they are partners in conceiving change. I detect kinship too with some work I have been doing on grassroots design[2]. Like them, I think we need to reinvent design to make it relevant, inclusive and responsive and see most hope in initiatives outside the mainstream. Like them, I have a particular take on what the priorities are.

Escobar seeks "to reclaim design for other world-making purposes" (2017). I hear an appeal both for other worlds and for design to be used for other weighty purposes. He talks of *Autonomía*, which has its main goal as "realization of the communal, understood as the creation of conditions for the community's ongoing self-creation and successful structural coupling with their "increasingly globalized" environments" (Escobar, 2017, p. 45).

I do not come at these challenges as someone from the global South, as Escobar does. He claims *Autonomía* for the people of Latin America and I recognize it for the people without the upper hand across the neoliberal and profit-obsessed landscapes of Britain. My interest is structuring future relations (Light and Akama, 2014) and using creative practice to promote sustainability during a period when many of our leaders seem constrained by the short-termism of democratic process into refusing to tackle problems that require long-term thinking. In the mess that organized politics is making, taking things into one's own hands is a necessary step if we are to develop (in Escobar's words): "a significant reorientation of design from the functionalist, rationalistic, and industrial traditions from which it emerged, and within which it still functions at ease, towards a type of rationality and set of practices attuned to the *relational* dimension of life" (2017, p. 42). It is also an acknowledgment that we have moved, as a planet, into a period when there are no certainties and experimentation in living together is a much needed corrective to old negligence and lack of care.

For me, the question is how we transform effectively and creatively and so that more of us are included in the learning that comes from being part of the transformation. I would add that a critical part of making change, for me, is the nature of the journeying itself and finding fluid ways of being, which focus on the "world-making" and not the world(s) to be made. It builds on work to keep values open and evolving as we create new infrastructure (Light, 2011a) and to keep these infrastructures flexible. I would argue that crafting a more accommodating and creative set of futures is an end in itself, in which people can find their meaning as co-producers instead of aspiring to a replacement set of materialistic goals. I am indebted to the idea of *becoming* in my research, because it both honours the creative impulse that informs human practices (cf. Stiegler, Derrida) and respects the socio-ecological uncertainties that destabilizing our environment has introduced. We need to be light on our feet in unstable worlds and welcoming to newcomers displaced by the impacts of these instabilities. We need to make this state of affairs safe enough to be fulfilling.

Now Escobar has written a book about how people design (2018). He has embraced Ezio Manzini's (2015) thesis that everyone designs and politicized it further. Perhaps I go further still. I understand design as a human birthright:

Chiara Del Gaudio commented on "world-making":
I do share this, mostly in terms of the power of the process and of focusing and staying in the process. Staying in the process, staying in the present. The power of staying in the present in meditation, and so the power of staying in the process, in a design process in the present, a process for the process itself. It might seems confused… I haven't found a better way to define this idea yet…

Arturo Escobar commented on "I would argue that crafting a more accommodating and creative set of futures is an end in itself, in which people can find their meaning as co-producers instead of aspiring to a replacement set of materialistic goals":
Great idea. We have become the latter, hence the need to ontologically and politically affirm the former.

---

[1] Andrea has invited me to consider the idea of *Autonomía*, and she will probably not be surprised to learn that I like the ideas behind it a great deal.

[2] I will be listing some of these crossovers as part of my work to understand how our views correspond. I am not normally given to citing myself more than anyone else in a piece of text.

Figure 1. A counter-factual worlds generator – a prop to help people conceive of a different way of being (Mason and Light 2017).

Source: Photo by Deborah Mason.

literally, in that it defines homo sapiens; figuratively, in that, in making our worlds, we site the fate of democracy in our designing. Inevitably, the three of us understand how and why everyone designs in a slightly different way. My current focus is dealing with the "increasing uncertainty about how to have the right impact as change escalates, linked to questions about our agency as people with an ethically progressive agenda at a time of populist heroes and villains" (Light, 2018a, p. 37).

And, like Escobar, I am also engaged in going outside the norms of social innovation to find something locally more significant, "choosing responsiveness to environment and commitment to experience as encounter [in the] hope that we not only find something relevant but also anticipate a little of the impact that might come from our interfering, our research through design" (Light, forthcoming).

I too have been working on the theory and practice of "other world-making" as a design researcher. It has inspired me to describe the existential crisis we are living

through in the Global North[3] and ask design communities to respond with more attentiveness for all our sakes (Light *et al.,* 2017b, 2017c). It underlies the related idea of *Framing Wonder* as design's mission (Light, 2017), looking for ways of changing the cultural mood fast enough to slow or turn the social and ecological devastation that dominant cultures are inflicting on the world. Alongside this, I have been running a series of "world" workshops[4] (Figure 1) that promote ecological thinking and (what my colleagues in Malmö[5] call) collaborative future-making. I have spent a decade looking at specific instances of how to dwell together well and how we might do so better, focusing on the ad-hoc designing of grassroots activism, especially as it relates to place-shaping (e.g. Akama and Light, 2018; Light and Miskelly, 2008, 2015; Light *et al.,* 2008; Light and Akama, 2012, 2014; Light, 2014, 2015, 2018b, forthcoming; Light *et al.,* 2015; Light *et al.,* 2017a; Light and Boys, 2017; Light and Briggs, 2017). So I read about Arturo Escobar's concept of *Autonomía* with interest and wholehearted fellow-feeling.

But what kind of world is the concept of *Autonomía* being born into[6]? To situate my concerns, I will look at some of the challenges I see in mainstream design practices around me.

Situated concerns

As Escobar (and Fry and others) note, design has a problem. The activity of designing emerges as a distinct pursuit with the Industrial Revolution in Europe and North America, irrevocably linked with the start of the Anthropocene era and short-sighted and unsustainable ways of life. Now, what looked like the clever subjugation of natural phenomena, enabled by the rapidly developing disciplines of science, has come to be seen as bad husbandry and poor justice. And the 20th century ideal of democratic mass consumption has been recast as ruinous, from the generation of cheap plastics to the cultivation of unnecessary purchasing.

Anusas and Harkness (2014) describe the focus of mainstream design as: "a close-present: the present of a recent yesterday, limited now and almost tomorrow", involving "a skilful utilisation of a level of ignorance which places material concerns of the far past and far future to one side in order to enable the creative practitioner to pretend that they are starting from a clean slate and thus attain an ethical comfort with the idea of projecting a new object into

> **Alfredo Gutierrez Borrero commented on "and commitment to experience as encounter":**
> Great point this brings to my mind the idea of enmeshed worlds permanently colliding and overlapping, never mixing completely.

---

[3] I acknowledge this crisis can sound self-indulgent when dealing with more immediate crises, but its impact is widely felt and counter-productive.

[4] "World Machines" (Light *et al.*, 2015) and "On Some Other World" (Mason and Light, 2017) are live and I am working on another about "Worlds of/that Matter".

[5] With thanks to Per-Anders Hillgren and colleagues for a chance to codesign the term.

[6] Or course I cannot do justice to the many and varied arguments in Escobar's book, but that is, of course, understandable in a few thousand words. It is also symptomatic of the trouble with books.

an unknown future" (Anusas and Harkness, 2014, p. 4). These practitioners are deliberately operating with a small horizon.

But world-makers have to think for the long-term and reflect the priorities of those living with the long-term effects of design. Communities are mindful about climate change, not sales, and air quality, not upgrades. They think in generations (~17 years) and lifetimes (~80 years) as well as in weeks and months. They may not feel any control over their environment, but nonetheless campaign for the good of their children. The temporal scale on which grassroots activists operate may be very different from that of business professionals and elected politicians, offering an alternative source of leadership for the planning and scaling that is missing from design narratives. Being unplugged from commercial issues, even for a few hours a day, opens up horizons and gives life to a wider range of issues.

In other words, timescales and the temporal nature of judgment need revisiting. Temporalities are culturally constructed, varying by context, which makes them possible to change. The potential for new creative intersections arises in acknowledging the multiplicity of ways one can relate to time in different cultures and situations. There is the need, but not the practice[7], of looking carefully at long-term dynamics, without designing for either empire or obsolescence.

Meanwhile, unbounded grass-roots and ad-hoc design thrives all around us in other worlds, revived in a generation of politics-by-example: in craftivism protests, makerspaces, street markets, social prescribing, the purchase and configuration of community assets, micro-libraries, communal gardens, land and/or time share initiatives, festivals, environmental campaigning and commoning. In the UK, this activity has been reinvented for an age of digital communications and low budgets, after many years of civil society support. Platforms are replacing community centres; the community practitioners whose job was to join up these initiatives are getting thin on the ground. Despite this, small pockets of passion and resistance persist and new ones are always being spawned. In the *Effectiveness in Action* project, a group of academic and community-based researchers looked closely at what brings together and sustains social activists interested in their locale and identified two triggers: "the sudden escalation of threat, forcing the issue in a way that resembles problem-solving, and recognition or acquisition of suitable tools and/or materials, which closely resembles a more opportunistic, exploratory designing" (Light, 2015, p. 86). Is this design? I think so.

The same ethos is starting to appear among the design students I teach. But, if we turn to design training, we find horizons shrink again. Design syllabi largely exist to deliver what commercial employers want, not what society needs. Design schools are being forced by neoliberal economic models to work with a temporal horizon akin to their market of students hoping for jobs. Students are at university for 3-4 years in most parts of the world. Most companies still work to a 5-year plan in considering trends and have to find a means to pay dividends on a yearly ba-

sis. This is the short-term thinking that keeps discussion of *circular economies* and *building the commons* to a single module in a traditional undergraduate curriculum.

The design business itself is full of shifts and movements, some of which are benign and forward-looking, but most of which lack analysis. Instead, we have the lionizing of new design tropes and a reduction in the force of the ideas behind them as they spread. (We need only look at the dilution of the politics of *Participatory Design* as it hit business and became *User-Centred Design*, without its political teeth or commitment to including people in the design phase (Kyng 2010), or what has happened to the term "design thinking"). Design is, as currently enacted, fashion-oriented and many ideas are used merely to inspire the market or claim a space in the research pantheon.

However, there are signs of change. *Research-through-Design* (RtD) and *Service Design* have become notable themes in how design is taught. A third development is *social design* and the related themes of DESIS and social innovation. I suspect these concepts are emerging now as a response to broad societal currents, even if the people invoking them do not perceive themselves to be involved in epic epistemological shifts.

In 2016, I co-hosted a doctoral consortium in which 8 of the 9 PhD students showing their work called their method *Research through Design*. A few years ago, when researchers referenced this kind of approach, we had to cite Frayling (1993) even to argue that putting an artifact into the world was a valid way to conduct an inquiry. Not so now. When quizzed, each student was confidently doing practice-based study, each using a different kind of interventionist research process.

Despite their claims, I would argue that the term RtD does not point to a method as such, but a relationship acknowledging a wider turn to performativity that legitimates *action research* approaches (i.e., research where

---

Alfredo Gutierrez Borrero commented on "recent yesterday […] clean slate":
According to what you write: the scale of time should be revisited and valued, according to the multiplicity of ways of relating to the times of people in different cultures, what you propose involves carefully taking on very long-term dynamics.

Arturo Escobar commented on "unbounded grass-roots and ad-hoc design thrives all around us in other worlds":
To many, this reinforces the claim by many transition advocates that the transition (however partially and contradictorily) is already happening…

Andrea Botero commented on "I suspect […] epistemological shifts":
This paradox reminds me of what Lucy Suchman —referring to another feminist scholar whose name I can't remember— refers to as the problem of "hardening of categories". For example, when participatory design with small letters becomes PD or when user centered, service, transition this and that, all became BIG LETTERS and almost as brands… Can one still have strategic concepts? or is that always possible to co-opt?

---

[7] Though see work on longer-term design thinking by Daisy Yoo and Batya Friedman.

the learning comes from making change and reviewing it, see, Reason and Bradbury, 2000). In science disciplines, it is now acknowledged that something other than the simple investigation of natural laws takes place; there is a synthetic socio-technical process shaped by tools and credited with contributing to the effects it discovers (e.g., Barad, 2007; Latour and Woolgar, 1979, etc.). Science has become post-normal (e.g., Dankel *et al.,* 2017). Sciences can now be seen as methodology shaped by human needs rather than absolute truth, albeit remaining a fundamental means to understand our impact and the planet's future. Design's applied intention of finding *fitness for purpose* rather than producing objective and dispassionate knowledge is looking increasingly salient. It includes the specific need of judgment. This repositioning puts science in the service of design as an activity that shapes our world using the wisest knowledge of the moment. In considering *RtD*, one might argue that testing change on the world to learn its effect is a necessary precaution before engaging in further Anthropocene activities. It is an ethical commitment, even if most people using the term are not interested in the philosophy of science. Just because the concept is employed loosely as a badge, not a defining principle of realignment, does not remove this undercurrent.

A different ethical journey is accompanying the evolution of *Service Design*. The term first came into my (design agency) circles in a very functionalist way: "The things organisations create are becoming increasingly intangible and complex, and people's interactions with them take place through multiple "interfaces" and over time. These interactions will shape their overall quality of experience, and from their point-of-view the organisation may *be* the product (as has long been the case in intangible services such as banking). This is the realm of service design" says Macdonald (2003), providing an early definition for industry. By this definition, service design includes a bank streamlining its touch-points as well as Irwin and Tonkinwise' transitions in society (2015). It refers to designing process, rather than product, i.e. a formal distinction. Yet, many students take service design courses in order to learn caring collaborative design skills and some design researchers understand it only in the form of helping with local government provision and so on. It is seen as virtuous. Perhaps this is not surprising. The word *service* denotes a voluntary act of goodness, obeisance to a greater calling and long-term dedication, all of which suffuse a design term that started out solely making the technical distinction between designing a single element and a system of engagement. This is heartening on one hand; it gives expression to a desire to cherish resources in the business of, say, turning cars into ride-sharing services. On the other, it often comes with a lack of curiosity about economics and politics, such as little reflection on the difference between promoting environmental efficiency by helping a global car-hire juggernaut rebrand its fleet and supporting neighbours to co-own a vehicle or find another means of transport[8]. Perhaps the rosy glow of *service* hides the socio-economic realities. But, again, the underlying trend may have more potential

than its current manifestation, since *service design* stresses temporal elements and processual qualities − creating situations that can be remade, rather than producing material objects.

Social design more directly points to an increasing engagement with diversity, quality of life and sustainable ways of living (though commentators note it is also prone to naïve saviour ambitions and the "God-trick", Haraway, 1988). There is a rise in numbers of designers directly addressing the implications of global North lifestyles, poor resource use and the underlying challenge of climate change. There *is* a growing interest to design more environmentally-sustainable futures. Some of the thinking is patchy and un-systemic and the emerging praxes are not without their critics (see, Brynjarsdóttir *et al.,* 2012; DiSalvo *et al.,* 2010; Dourish, 2010, etc., and indeed Escobar), but these ambitions must be recognized as important. However, an overall lack of joined-up thinking becomes particularly visible as we look at these goals, even before Escobar's ontological considerations (2018).

These new priorities are, for the most part, building new circles of research and practice rather than infiltrating existing ones. For example, if we look at critical initiatives on automation and the prospect of artificial intelligence, we see the future being articulated is a simple continuation of the present changed only in respect of how technology is deployed. People are asking what will happen when machines take over millions more jobs and render more occupations redundant − another use of the term "autono-

Alfredo Gutierrez Borrero commented on "Science can now […] planet's future":
Dear Ann, in a very shy way, I'll break the ice, to relate to what you point out here, and I'll highlight it (by mere free association in my first read) with the idea of the Post-normal science (PNS) by Funtowicz and Ravetz, to them: "PNS provides a response to these crises of science and philosophy, by bringing "facts" and "values" into a unified conception of problem-solving in these areas, and by replacing "truth" with "quality" as its core evaluative concept. Its principle of the plurality of legitimate perspectives on any problem leads to a focus on dialogue, and on mutual respect and learning, wherever possible". There is a passage in the text to which I refer, where they related this idea of "extended peer community", consisting not merely of persons with some form or other of institutional accreditation, but rather of all those with a desire to participate in the resolution of the issue see… if you wish… Funtowicz, S.; Ravetz, J. 2003. Post-normal science. International Society for Ecological Economics. Online Encyclopedia of Ecological Economics (http://www.ecoeco.org/publica/encyc.htm). As I said before, only in a first and free association, but PNS was what came to mind when I read what you wrote here.

Andrea Botero commented on "Social design more directly points to an increasing engagement with diversity":
Or it can also point out to naïve interest to go and "save" others that can't save themselves.

Chiara Del Gaudio added:
Or to a "god" complex… :P

---

[8] Only the second builds "relational assets" (Light and Miskelly, 2015).

mous" that points in a very different direction[9]. Even though these commentators are unhappy with the outlook they envisage, their language largely paints these technological changes as unavoidable, ignoring the potential mediation of a far wider set of factors in how automation will develop. The conversation persists in a silo. And this particular silo is generated and protected by considerable industrial funding and a technocentric neoliberal vision, so it is worth also considering as a form of colonization.

The examples above may seem a long way from our consideration of *Autonomía* and designing. But it is into this contrary and unpredictable context that the concept comes north. It is these undercurrents that might be supported by a more politically charged understanding of change, even while we wait for the mainstream to embrace the full meaning of such momentum and challenge the dominant technocratic rhetoric.

Autonomía

Autonomía is intended to challenge colonization and comes with Escobar's radical pedigree in this area. It is a recipe for one part of the world that could be adopted by others and, in the doing, challenge the colonization of global North design trends (e.g. Akama and Yee, 2016) as well as individual colonizing beliefs and approaches. It is a powerful argument for diverse ways of living and for support for the people with the wisdom to create these ways of living from within.

Escobar invokes Fry's "Borderlands" and offers de-sig*ns* for the *Pluriverse* (Escobar, 2018), taking a position at the fringes[10]. Even Escobar's professional position as anthropologist, i.e., outside design, puts him at a border relative to the material he is considering[11]. The radical politics he espouses are thoughtful and nuanced and highly attuned to the domination of market agendas. So it is important that the ideas Escobar is promulgating do not themselves become detached from their commitments, to become yet another buzzword, case of lip service or an excuse for a failure to act considerately, radically or with significance.

It is well known that much designing exists in the world independent of designers and effective on its own terms. But there continues to be a story to tell the advocates of collaborative work to demonstrate that designers are sometimes an adjunct to history, not its moving force; that groups of people worldwide can, and sometimes do, make their own futures. Sometimes they enlist a professional to help (Light *et al.,* 2013). But, many times, they act, life changes and no one in the design world is much

the wiser (Light and Miskelly, 2008). We need to tell this story because there is still a prevalent belief, despite extraordinary initiatives like the Transition Towns Movement (e.g., see Macy, 2007), that things start exogenously with someone who has training, status, authority or another form of design-power (Light *et al.,* 2013). Even in the field of Participatory Design, which used to lead design practice in having political vision, the separation between designers and lay experts in the literature speaks to an Othering of lay partners – the very concept of participation presupposes there is something going on beyond you to which you can be invited (Light, forthcoming). And, if we have to act to include someone, then they are being perceived, at outset, as outside, marginal, excluded. Looked at another way, they may just be doing something else with a different centre of attention and their own priorities – they are world-making. This is not just a global South phenomenon. We do it here, but differently.

But is the fact that there is now a special issue on the topic of *Autonomía* already a step towards a new fad?[12] In our commercial world, anything and everything can be co-opted. *Autonomía* involves a belief in local organization, adaptation to the situation and people acting for themselves. The irony would be great if it became yet another tool for/of appropriation. And yet it is what scholars in these patriarchal neoliberal times are supposed to deliver to enhance their value on the market - a branded product that stakes a claim to a domain. I note that successful feminist scholars such as Anna Tsing, Lucy Suchman, Maria Puig de la Bellacasa and Rebecca Solnit seem able to produce a discursive form of contribution that avoids land grab and am mindful that colonization can be intellectual too.

In another world (and one that I prefer), the arrival of a book that captures examples of what can be achieved and shows the transitions needed in detail is a means to support joined-up thinking[13]. Initiatives can and do jump between contexts (Botero *et al.,* 2016) and/but a theoretical analysis

> **Andrea Botero commented on "But is the fact that there is now a special issue on the topic of Autonomía already a step towards a new fad?":**
> This is an important comment indeed.
>
> **Arturo Escobar added:**
> Yes, very important and necessary. I have often thought that the only relatively safe antidote to cooptation is to infuse all we do with a radical politics and respond to the attempts from that perspective. A radical politics, in this context, is a politics of autonomy. Yet when we are talking about this politics itself, is it enough?

---

[9] Escobar himself uses three related terms to speak of *Autonomía* in English: autonomous design, autonomy-oriented design and design for autonomy (2017). I like only the last of these. The first is easily confused in a world that is being presented with autonomous cars and panicking about autonomous agents. *Design for autonomy* is purposeful and less easy to mis-define.

[10] I find learning of this material uncanny. I have just finished a piece called "Design and Social Innovation at the Margins: Finding and Making Cultures of Plurality' (Light, forthcoming).

[11] "Is it important we recognise it as anthropology? No, not at all; the term "anthropology" is only a name. Equally, it is not important if we maintain that it is "design". What is important is that these processes, evolved and tested over time, are recognised and effort is made to understand how and why they work" (Light, 2015, p. 92). What stands between me and Escobar, as well as considerable immaterial culture and many personal qualities, is an infrastructure of journals, conferences, assessment exercises, appointment panels and funding decisions, all of which serve to keep us in place.

[12] I ask this with apologies to the editors, as I too am a fan of the ideas.

[13] Because I do not read Spanish, it is with the English version of *Designs for the Pluriverse* (2018) that I can fully understand how closely Escobar's work speaks to mine. I find the recognition of closeness exhilarating and difficult as a scholar. My work is now in relation to this body of thinking when, days ago, it was situated in a different constellation of ideas. It is with great anticipation but the limited time and energy of a worker in the neoliberal university that I approach the re-assembling of what I know and its reference points.

of effective tactics promotes this groundswell. Where localities determine their own needs, learning between regions may diminish; every effort is needed to ensure that good initiatives spread. The advent of networked technology can help here; as can public institutions and traditional spaces of learning. So will well-reasoned documentation of the crisis in the design field and the alternatives we need. Escobar links *Autonomía* with *radical interdependence* (2018), coming back to the notion of relationality and making clear that, along with Puig de la Bellacasa (2012) and others[14], this is a call to recognise our primordial interconnectedness and not a bid for independence. It is, says Escobar, a reconceptualization of autonomy as an expression of radical interdependence, rather than its negation (2018).

We have no time for going it alone.

The scale of the global world's problems has become apparent to most of us[15]. These problems drag those of other worlds along with the world that set this course and cultivated power and profits at the expense of other people, species, landscapes and ways of being. We do not have the luxury of arguing about how change should be made. We are not being foolish in working to make the change we want to see before we know how it will play out. It is the approach at hand; we will never know better. As well as pluralism, we need a creative response to our environment(s) and a will to live with change, drawing on what we believe can work, testing this theorizing out and sharing what is learnt. We need to take in all kinds of newcomer, from migrants and refugees to the temporary cities that are growing faster than other kinds of urban area. We need to question all frontiers and borders in scoping this work, to stay situated yet open. This is a form of prefigurative politics, or politics-by-example. This is Research through Design. This is why we cannot be trendy or partisan now, but must make our experiments inclusively, using the tools at our disposal: science, radical anthropology, transition literature, design, pluriverses and world-making. This is not to ignore other initiatives or to believe that we have the exhaustive list, but to provide new impetus, to stay political and to help everyone along a path of action and reflection… whatever path that may be in their act of other world-making. That path and our journeying is all that we have.

Acknowledgments

References

AKAMA, Y.; LIGHT, A. 2018. Practices of readiness: punctuation, poise and the contingencies of participatory design. *In:* Participatory Design Conference 2018, Hasselt & Genk, Belgium, 2018. *Proceedings...* Association for Computing Machinery. Available at: http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/76021/. Accessed on August 17th, 2018.

AKAMA, Y.; YEE, J. 2016. Seeking stronger plurality: Intimacy and integrity in designing for social innovation. *In:* C. KUNG; A. LAM; Y. LEE (ed.), *Proceedings of Cumulus Hong Kong 2016.* Hong Kong, Hong Kong Design Institute, p. 173-180.

ANUSAS, M.; HARKNESS, R. 2014. Things could be different: design anthropology as hopeful, critical and ecological. *In:* Research Network for Design Anthropology: Ethnographies of the Possible. Aarhus Universitet, Moesgård. Available at: https://kadk. dk/sites/default/files/8._anusas_harkness_2014_things_ could_be_different_0.pdf. Accessed on August 17th, 2018.

BARAD, K.M. 2007. *Meeting the universe halfway: quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning.* Durham, Duke University Press, 524 p.

BOTERO, A.; LIGHT, A.; MALMBORG, L.; MARTTILA, S.; SALGADO, M.; SAAD-SULONEN, J. 2016. Becoming Smart Citizens. How Replicable Ideas Jump. *In:* Workshop at the Design and the City conference, Amsterdam, 2016. Available at: https://designandthecity.eu/programme/workshop/becoming-smart-citizens-how-replicable-ideas-jump/. Accessed on August 17th, 2018.

BRYNJARSDÓTTIR, H.; HÅKANSSON, M.; PIERCE, J.; BAUMER, E.; DISALVO, C.; SENGERS, P. 2012. Sustainably Unpersuaded: How Persuasion Narrows Our Vision of Sustainability. *In:* CHI '12 SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Austin, 2012. *Proceedings...* New York, ACM, p. 947-956. https://doi.org/10.1145/2207676.2208539

DANKEL, D.J.; VAAGE, N.S.; VAN DER SLUIJS, J.P. 2017. Post-normal science in practice. *Futures,* **91**:1-4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2017.05.009

DISALVO, C.; SENGERS, P.; BRYNJARSDÓTTIR, H. 2010. Mapping the Landscape of Sustainable HCI. *In:* SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 2010, Atlanta. *Proceedings...* New York, ACM, p. 1975-1984. https://doi.org/10.1145/1753326.1753625

DOURISH, P. 2010. HCI and Environmental Sustainability: The Politics of Design and the Design of Politics. *In:* DIS '10 ACM Conference on Designing Interactive Systems, 8, Aarhus, 2010. *Proceedings...* New York, ACM, p. 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1145/1858171.1858173

ESCOBAR, A. 2017. Response: Design for/by [and from] the "global

Barbara Szaniecki commented on the overall paper:
I found the reflections very provocative. It is a point of view situated ("I do not come to these challenges as someone from the Global South") but it objectively places what unites us here ("the question is how we transform effectively and so creatively more of us are included in the learning that comes from being part of the transformation"). It is important for us to be many, from the North and the South.
I also share concerns about buzzword dilutions of the politician in the transformation, for example, of Participatory Design in User-Centred Design among other cases (service design and social design). So I understand the concern that autonomy, and more specifically, the proposal of an autonomous design, can also be co-opted. It is a valid concern on the part of Light, but it is this that makes me reaffirm the question of the struggles and subjectivities that lead them in the contemporary world: in the South, they are certainly those of Indians, afro-descendants and peasants. In the Global North, wouldn't it be those of migrants and refugees? How to think about a RtD agenda with these subjects, subjects that cross all boundaries?

---

[14] I also ventured into this territory (Light, 2011b).
[15] Barring those with a political interest in pretending that we can go on as usual, but see Light *et al.* (2017b, 2017c) for a discussion of Harari's Ark project (2016).

South". *Design Philosophy Papers*, **15**(1):39-49. https://doi.org/10.1080/14487136.2017.1301016

ESCOBAR, A. 2018. *Designs for the pluriverse: radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds.* Durham, Duke University Press, 290 p.

FRAYLING, C. 1993. Research in Art and Design. *Royal College of Art Research Papers*, **1**(1):1-5.

HARARI, Y.N. 2016. *Homo deus: a brief history of tomorrow.* London, Harvill Secker, 440 p.

HARAWAY, D.J. 1988. Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, **14**(3):575-599. https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066

IRWIN, T.; TONKINWISE, C. 2015. Service Design for/in Transition. Available at: https://www.slideshare.net/sdnetwork/service-design-forin-transition-cameron-tonkinwise-terry-irwin-carnegie-mellon-university. Accessed on August 17th, 2018.

KYNG, M. 2010. Bridging the Gap between Politics and Techniques: On the next practices of participatory design. *Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems*, **22**(1):49-68.

LATOUR, B.; WOOLGAR, S. 1979. *Laboratory life: the construction of scientific facts*. Los Angeles, Sage, 513 p.

LIGHT, A. 2011a. HCI as heterodoxy: Technologies of identity and the queering of interaction with computers. *Interacting with Computers*, **23**(5):430-438.

LIGHT, A. 2011b. Digital interdependence and how to design for it. *Interactions*, **18**(2):34-39.

LIGHT, A. 2014. Citizen Innovation: ActiveEnergy and the Quest for Sustainable Design. *In:* M. BOLER; M. RATTO, *DIY Citizenship: Critical Making and Social Media*. Cambridge, MIT Press, p. 259-268.

LIGHT, A. 2015. Troubling Futures: can participatory design research provide a constitutive anthropology for the 21st century? *Interaction Design and Architecture(s) Journal*, **26**:81-94.

LIGHT, A. 2017. Framing Wonder: A New Mission for Design. Medea Talk, Malmo, Sweden. Available at: http://medea.mah.se/event/medea-talks-ann-light. Accessed on August 17th, 2018.

LIGHT, A. 2018a. Introduction. *Interactions*, **25**(1):34-45.

LIGHT, A. 2018b. The place in our hands: the grassroots making of cultural heritage, *In:* D. STUEDAHL; V. VESTERGAARD (eds.), *Media innovations and design in cultural institutions.* Gothenborg, Nordicom.

LIGHT, A. [Forthcoming]. Design and Social Innovation at the Margins: Finding and Making Cultures of Plurality. *Design and Culture.*

LIGHT, A.; AKAMA, Y. 2012. The Human Touch: participatory practice and the role of facilitation in designing with communities. *In:* PDC '12 Participatory Design Conference: Research Papers, 12, Roskilde, 2012. *Proceedings...* New York, ACM, **1**:61-70. https://doi.org/10.1145/2347635.2347645

LIGHT, A.; AKAMA, Y. 2014. Structuring Future Social Relations: The Politics of Care in Participatory Practice. *In:* PDC '14 Participatory Design Conference: Research Papers, 13, Windhoek, 2014. *Proceedings...* New York, ACM, **1**:151-160. https://doi.org/10.1145/2661435.2661438

LIGHT, A.; AKAMA, Y. 2018. The Nature of "Obligation" in Doing Design with Communities: Participation, Politics and Care. *In:* T. FISHER; L. GAMMAN (eds.), *Tricky Design: ethics through things*. London, Bloomsbury.

LIGHT, A.; BOYS, J. 2017. Collaborating across Difference: Learning At/With/From The Edges *In:* E. DISALVO; J. YIP; E. BONSIGNORE; C. DISALVO, *Participatory Design for Learning*. London, Routledge.

LIGHT, A.; BRERETON, M.; ROE, P. 2015. Some Notes on the Design of World Machines. *In:* OzCHI '15 Annual Meeting of the Aus-

tralian Special Interest Group for Computer Human Interaction, Parkville, 2015. *Proceedings...* New York, ACM, p. 289-293. https://doi.org/10.1145/2838739.2838832

LIGHT, A.; BRIGGS, J. 2017. Crowdfunding Platforms and the Design of Paying Publics. *In:* CHI '17 Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Denver, 2017. *Proceedings...* New York, ACM, p. 797-809. https://doi.org/10.1145/3025453.3025979

LIGHT, A.; HANSEN, N.B.; HALSKOV, K.; HILL, K.J.; HACKNEY, F.; DALSGAARD, P. 2013. Exploring the dynamics of ownership in community-oriented design projects. *In:* C&T '13 International Conference on Communities and Technologies, 6, Munich, 2013. *Proceedings...* New York, ACM, p. 90-99. https://doi.org/10.1145/2482991.2482998

LIGHT, A.; HOWLAND, K.; HAMILTON, T.; HARLEY, D. 2017a. The Meaning of Place in Supporting Sociality. *In:* DIS '17 Conference on Designing Interactive Systems, Edinburgh, 2017. *Proceedings...* New York, ACM, p. 1141-1152. https://doi.org/10.1145/3064663.3064728

LIGHT, A.; MISKELLY, C. 2008. Brokering between Heads and Hearts: an analysis of designing for social change. *In:* Undisciplined! Design Research Society Conference 2008, Sheffield, 2008. *Proceedings...* Sheffield Hallam University, 423/1-423/15. Available at: http://shura.shu.ac.uk/495/1/fulltext.pdf. Accessed on August 17th, 2018.

LIGHT, A.; MISKELLY, C. 2015. Sharing Economy vs Sharing Cultures? Designing for social, economic and environmental good. *Interaction Design and Architecture(s)*, **24**(1):49-62.

LIGHT, A.; MISKELLY, C.; THOMPSON, S. 2008. An Analysis of Building Habitat with Networked Tools. *In:* Australasian Conference on Computer-Human Interaction: Designing for Habitus and Habitat, 20, Cairns, 2008. *Proceedings...* Sheffield Hallam University. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-03658-3

LIGHT, A.; POWELL, A.; SHKLOVSKI, I. 2017b. Design for Existential Crisis in the Anthropocene Age. *In:* C&T '17 International Conference on Communities and Technologies, 8, Troyes, 2017. *Proceedings...* New York, ACM, p. 270-279. https://doi.org/10.1145/3083671.3083688

LIGHT, A.; SHKLOVSKI, I.; POWELL, A. 2017c. Design for Existential Crisis. *In:* CHI EA '17 Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Denver, 2017. *Proceedings...* New York, ACM, p. 722-734.

MACDONALD, N. 2003. Service Design' AIGA Experience Design London – Wednesday 23 April 2003 (London). Available at: http://spy.typepad.com/reporting/2004/03/32nd_aigaed_lon.html. Accessed on August 17th, 2018.

MACY, J. 2007. Joanna Macy and the Great Turning. Available at: http://www.joannamacyfilm.org. Accessed on August 17th, 2018.

MANZINI, E. 2015. *Design, When Everybody Designs An Introduction to Design for Social Innovation.* Cambridge/London, The MIT Press, 256 p.

MASON, D.; LIGHT, A. 2017. Generating Counter-Factual Worlds. Climate Cultures. Available at: https://climatecultures.net/speculative-worlds/generating-counter-factual-worlds/. Accessed on August 17th, 2018.

PUIG DE LA BELLACASA, M. 2012. Nothing comes without its world: thinking with care. *The Sociological Review*, **60**(2):197-216. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2012.02070.x

REASON, P.; BRADBURY, H. (eds.). 2000. *Handbook of action research: participative inquiry and practice*. London, Sage, 500 p.