

# Planet-Oriented Design: a proposal for new ethical transitions in design education

Tironi, Martín<sup>\*a</sup>; Chilet, Marcos

<sup>a</sup> School of Design, Faculty of Architecture, Design and Urban Studies, Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, Santiago, Chile

\* martin.tironi@uc.cl

[doi.org/10.21606/iasdr.2023.506](https://doi.org/10.21606/iasdr.2023.506)

We live through a socio-environmental, socio-political and socio-technical crisis that forces us to ask ourselves urgent questions about our planet. The article explores the need to transition from human-centred Design to forms of Design with a terrestrial focus. Based on the experience of the School of Design of the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, it explores the potential of Planet-Oriented Design as an articulator of new practices and a new ethic of teaching and doing Design. The recent social phenomena - such as the Chilean social uprising of 2019 - added to the planetary crises in which we live opened the question for new coordinates that orient the sense of a Design school in a future less dependent on the needs of the market and more in tune with an ethical turn of the practice of Design. The planet-oriented Design would propose to displace the human from the absolute centre of the design question and promote an approach based on the deep interdependencies between more-than-human actors. The article explores these arguments as a possible way out of the recent crises that have engulfed Design locally and globally.

**Keywords:** *planet-oriented design; human-centred design; design ethics; design education*

## 1 Introduction

The current crisis we have witnessed in recent years, at social-political, environmental and technological levels, has made the question of how we want to inhabit the planet urgent. The premises and principles on which the social order rested in Chile, and the world is changing. Still, profound disorientation and impotence exist around creating new visions, practices and worlds. The traditional systems of reference and thought; that provided societies with certainties and have structured our ways of approaching the world and design practices are being challenged by a series of local and planetary disruptions. As a form of doing and knowing, Design could become an increasingly relevant agent in creating paths for social, political and cultural transformation. However, this requires pertinent changes in practice and theory (Boehnert, Sinclair & Dewberry, 2022). Through the case of the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile (PUC) Design School, we will develop the socio-technical and



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International Licence](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

political tensions resulting in the need for a proposal of a planet-oriented design as a possible future path for our educational practices.

Following this line of thought, the methods and practices for designing our existing ways must be scrutinised and revised. It is indispensable to situate Design practice –particularly Design education– in this historical destabilisation of managerial discourses and problematic notions around innovation and good Design. Many of the premises and values of contemporary Design are still anchored to a project of society that today, in the face of the socio-environmental crisis, is unviable or defuturing (Fry, 2009). In other words, a specific design culture persists that is out of step with the values and phenomena that today demand recognition.

The fact is that there are "many pioneer design activities that de-center the human and rethink the relationship among different material actors, in response to a post-anthropocene time" (Zhou et al., 2022, p.2). The destabilisation of design culture is framed in processes of change at a planetary level, which touches in various ways on multiple social dimensions. In this sense, we recognise three modes of destabilisation critical to thinking about changes in design practice and theory.

### **1.1 Socio-environmental**

On the one hand, we are witnessing an environmental crisis on a planetary scale, which many authors have linked to the advent of the Anthropocene. For the first time, human lifestyles threaten the sustainability of the many species that inhabit the earth, leaving irreversible scars. Phenomena such as environmental degradation, drought, desertification, biodiversity loss and atmospheric pollution have become the hallmarks of this multi-systemic crisis, progressively becoming a human rights issue due to the inequalities it generates (Latour, 2017). The climate crisis is not only a climate crisis but fundamentally a problem of our imagination to go beyond the anthropocentric and productivist worldview that has underpinned our ways of relating to the other entities that inhabit the earth, based on overpopulation, the idea of unlimited growth, overconsumption and the uncontrolled exploitation of natural resources. From a design education point of view, it is a challenge to develop exercises that see their purpose no longer in the exclusive welfare of an individual consumer but in collectivities made up of humans and nonhumans –or expressed non-dualistically: more-than-than-human collectivities–.

### **1.2 Socio-political**

The world is undergoing significant transformations of the social order, with renewed ethical and social demands for further deepening democratic values linked to dignity and the common good. This concern is reflected in an erosion of democracy and rising levels of inequality in the world (Piketty, 2019), as well as a felt experience of inequity in relations of privilege and domination linked to the gender, ethnic and class hierarchies that shape our societies. It is difficult for today's democratic regimes, with their conventional mechanisms of representation and participation, to recognise the plurality of identities and expectations of an increasingly heterogeneous, interconnected and digitised citizenry. Everything indicates a challenge in ensuring that all can realise and live the values of a dignified life - solidarity, participation, equality, respect, freedom, tolerance, etc. As we will explain below, this political destabilisation has been particularly visible in the Chilean reality and, in many ways, has catalysed the search for new ways of exercising Design for the future.

### **1.3 Socio-technical**

We are witnessing the advent of a fourth industrial revolution (Schwab, 2015), marked by technological innovations in robotics, artificial intelligence, nanotechnology, quantum computing, biotechnologies, the internet of things, geoengineering, autonomous vehicles, big data, and automation. This technological irruption, accelerated by the processes of digitalisation precipitated by the recent pandemic, generates particular interest in understanding the social implications of the advance of artificial intelligence, automation and digital datafication on how we live, work, make decisions and imagine the world (Elliott, 2019). Lifestyles and systems will characterise the digital revolution, increasingly assisted/delegated by algorithms and merging technologies that blur and overlap the physical, digital and biological spheres (Schwab, 2015), automating tasks defined as non-routine in different spheres of society. Faced with these uncertain futures generated by the advance of these technological innovations and the datafication of our culture, other nations and international organisations are developing plans and strategies to face the challenges of digital automation, as well as the social, environmental and ethical impacts associated with the dizzying development of these technologies in shaping our lifestyles.

### **1.4 The need for a critical review of design education**

The events arising from these destabilising scenarios - and subsequently made more complex by the COVID-19 pandemic and particularly the Chilean social uprising of 2019 - accelerated within the Pontifical Catholic University (PUC) School of Design the question of the ethical thinking and doing of Design: how can design education be interwoven with the socio-technical imaginaries that are emerging today? Moreover, whether it is possible - in a context of profound commodification of higher education - to articulate discourses and practices that manage to situate design education in a debate about the planet from the south, about the conditions of our co-existence from a decolonising agenda; and from pluriversality perspective (Escobar, 2018) allowing us - as Latour would say - to survive in critical zones (Latour, 2017).

This need raises the importance of a critical review of design education in the face of the challenges facing the Southern Cone, particularly from the point of view of an academic community in a country with Chile's social, political, economic and geographical characteristics, Design has "exploited more nonhuman species and the materials we mine for and reduce to human use" (Zhou et al., 2022, p.2). What are the most appropriate concepts for understanding - and then - articulating design education practices in tune with the new scenarios? How to do so from a School of Design located in the South? How can the design practice become a catalyst for social and environmental transitions that contribute to co-designing more sustainable and just relationships, products and worlds? What knowledge and tools can design practice make available for constructing new ways of relating in and with the environment, opening paths towards more ethical and responsible futures?

The argument we wish to explore is the following: to address these questions of emerging planetary disruptions is necessary to connect design practice with its planetary dimension at the design education and design practice level. The proposal is to replace an anthropocentric and individualistic perspective of design education with one that recognises deep interdependencies and places our planet as the ontological articulator of design education. As Zhou, Brück & Holzbach point out, "ideas of a de-centering human, designing-with the nonhuman seems like a way to think beyond the so-

called Anthropocene" (Zhou et al., 2022, p.2). We will explore these ideas in the context of the recent curricular and educational challenges in the PUC School of Design.

## **2 The ethical turn: the demand for an epistemic transition at the PUC design school**

Before delving into the non-anthropocentric or more-than-human turn and the need to reorient the focus of design education from the user and the individual to the planet and interdependencies, we need to situate specific events and trajectories of the PUC School of Design, which are comparable to those experienced by many design schools in Latin America in the last two decades, and that can help us to understand the profound break that gives rise to the need to rethink the philosophy of Design that underlies the practices and challenges of this school.

What makes this line of questioning unique is that –as Boehnert, Sinclair and Dewberry explain in their paper *Sustainable and Responsible Design Education: Tensions in Transitions*– higher education institutions have constraints in implementing paradigm shifts: disciplinary fragility, institutional inertia, etc. (Boehnert, Sinclair & Dewberry, 2022). While this continues to be true for Chilean higher education and, in particular, the PUC School of Design, the recent and generalised institutional fragility and the systemic risk that many institutions have faced constitutes –at the same time– a survival challenge for centuries-old institutions (like the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile) and an opportunity for a deep inquiry between the relation of emerging ethics of de-centring humans and the future paths for design education. The context of Chilean political instability makes this line of questioning potentially valuable and different from previous and essential work in non-anthropocentric design.

### **2.1 Abandoning formalism: The human-centred turn**

Since the beginning of the century, the PUC School of Design has been highly influenced by visions of Design coming from the global North, such as Design Thinking, and by the need for a shift from a formalist or modernist idea of the role of Design in our society towards design education based on a human-centred world view and with an aim for insertion of the students in managerial and business contexts. As expressed in the book *Cincuenta Años Escuela de Diseño UC*, what was sought at that time was to facilitate the incorporation of designers into the management staff of companies, orienting students towards the profile required in project management (Álvarez, 2019). The vision of the school installed in the PUC School of Design was based on the disciplinary solution and integration in evident tension with a formalist –modern– past and disciplinary silos. As Alex Blanch - the director of the PUC School of Design from 2003-2006 - pointed out at the time, Design is undergoing a process of paradigm change, whereby its focus is shifting from the product as such to the problem to be solved (Blanch et al., 2007). The epochal turn consisted of shifting Design from creating objects to solving problems -independent of their formal qualities. The problem addressed required an articulating axis: the human, the individual, the user, and the consumer.

This vision was expressed in a curricular change; this shift of the PUC School of Design in 2004 took place in a cultural and political scenario influenced by the entry of the Internet into all spheres of life and the consequent challenge of digitalisation at all levels of Chilean society. This change co-occurred with the birth of platforms such as Facebook and the expansion of the start-up culture, the growth of

the discourses of competitiveness, innovation and entrepreneurship as an articulator of economic and social progress. The premise at that time was to distance oneself from formalist legacies and to connect design education with the opportunities emerging from the -apparent- dematerialisation of design and technology in the information age. The influence of this change has extended over more than 15 years in the classrooms and the professional development of the students.

## **2.2 Political uprisings & the Anthropocene: the ethical turn**

Chile's recent history is marked by deep political tensions that led to the social mobilisations of October 2019. Those tense October days gave rise to a trajectory that began with the uprising of significant social demands, continued with a constituent process never before tried in Chilean history, and ended with the electoral rejection of the constitutional proposal and the consequent cooling of the revolutionary spirit that swept the country's streets. With its strong expressions of discontent, the Chilean social outburst destabilised the tacit agreements on which an imperfect co-existence operated within Chilean society for decades. Socio-environmental destabilisation, Socio-political destabilisation, and Socio-technical destabilisation became a problem of the Chilean development model. It substantially impacted the student and academics, initiating a process of rethinking the role of education and design education. During the final months of 2019, the students asked to stop the regular academic courses and new spaces were created to think about the role of Design in the political process that was taking place at that time. An apparent demand arose to articulate a preliminary narrative that would commit the PUC School of Design to a model of society different from the one of that moment<sup>1</sup>.

With the advent of the Anthropocene as a determinant factor in the future of Design, the PUC School of Design engaged in a new curricular shift in 2019, but the context was significantly different from 2004; several of those early 2004 ideas about the future have now become the centre of critique: First, the illusions of direct digital democracy that arose at the beginning of social networking platforms were quickly dashed and turned into what Nick Couldry and Ulises Mejias (2019) call –in their book *The Cost of Connection*– data colonialism which "expands by appropriating for exploitation ever more layers of human life itself" (Couldry & Mejias, 2019, p.5). Second, the promise of economic development of start-up culture and endless innovation failed to deliver on its promises of changing the national productive matrix and, in many cases, generated defuturing designs<sup>2</sup> (Fry, 2020). Third, the notions of immaterial Design were countered with solid critiques of the impact of mining and extractive industries on creating new products for the global market at the expense of local communities –a delicate topic in Chile–. Fourth, the idea of Design as a creator of quality of life has been questioned, mainly because it perpetuates discriminatory biases towards historically

---

<sup>1</sup> During those days in late 2019, the PUC design school community demanded a public commitment to re-orient the school's practices. As an example, this commitment stated: "We recognise the relevance of rethinking the values and principles that govern our coexistence. Our discipline has much to contribute in this regard, especially through co-participation tools and design for transitions. We will make every effort to make these tools known and used by organisations working on the creation of a new social contract, one designed for dignity, justice, solidarity, equity and well-being for all".

<sup>2</sup> It also promoted imaginaries around entrepreneurship as a form of aspirational labour (Duffy, 2017) that in many cases led to forms of labour precarity.

marginalised sectors of society; these issues have been extensively explored by authors such as Sasha-Costanza-Chock (2020) in her book *Design Justice*.

One of the axioms that have most strongly marked design practice in recent years is the idea of user-centred Design. Much of contemporary design practice has been informed by the principle that Design should respond to the user's needs, concerns and desires, assisting them through user-friendly products, services or solutions that address their concerns. Although the user-centred Design has created essential contributions and innovations - by paying particular attention to how users perceive and think about reality before projecting solutions, under the need for a new ethical perspective for Design, it seems that this paradigm can be questioned in the context of the environmental and social crisis, and the technological digitalisation that is increasingly shaping our culture. The complexity of the current challenges indicates that the notion of human-centred Design - and its focus on human protagonists - is insufficient to think about and face the challenges of the advent of the Anthropocene and the digital society, making it necessary to start designing from relational and ecological approaches.

### **3 Planet-Oriented Design: designing through interdependences**

In the context of changing political and epistemic instability and the concrete demand for an ethical turn in design practices, the need arose to identify narratives, concepts, methods and actions that would allow post-anthropocentric futures to materialise (Tironi, Albornoz & Chilet, 2022) and to "think about the nonhuman part of the environment, even though the complete detachment from the human point of view is impossible" (Zhou, Brück, Holzbach, 2022). This need was channelled - by some academics from the PUC School of Design - as a critique of the limits of human-centred-design (Tironi & Hermansen, 2018) and the need to explore an alternative transition to a Planet-oriented-design stance (Tironi & Hermansen, 2018; Tironi et al., 2023). From the end of the last century to date, human-centred Design has become the epistemological and methodological basis on which design education programmes have been developed in schools worldwide and has consequently become synonymous with good design practice. Although the contribution of approaches such as user-centred-design (Norman, 2013) in overcoming a merely formalist understanding of Design is undeniable, the complexity of today's challenges –and its wicked problems (Rittel & Webber, 1973)– demands a vision that overcomes human/nature dualisms, and allows for a plane of analysis that accounts for the interrelationships and co-dependencies between more-than-human agents.

From within the PUC School of Design emerged the proposal to develop the question around a paradigm of planet-oriented design education for our students, that is, a design no longer oriented towards stable and discrete human entities but open to the composition of relational worlds, where the focus is on the ecology of human and nonhuman interrelationships that sustain the diversity of life. Considering that the notion of Design has been mainly based on an individualistic and utilitarian logic, the aim is to take seriously the question of how to project a post-anthropocentric design oriented by an ethic of coexistence between the diversity of experiences, materialities and beings that inhabit the planet (de La Bellacasa, 2017; Latour, 2012). A design that invites us to move from a rationalist logic, which understands beings as static, to a sense of becoming (Ingold, 2017), where the value is placed on the web of interdependencies and interconnections that make up the problem. Transitioning from human-oriented to planet-oriented Design is not a challenge to forget about

human issues. On the contrary, it opens the possibility to explore the complex challenges of today's world, where humans and nonhumans, technologies and plants, tsunamis and animals are involved. It is an invitation to design with the plurality of scales and beings that make up our ecosystem and to create innovations and initiatives conscious of the responsibility of Design to sustain life on the planet. It is a call to reconfigure and materialise a design ethic at the height of contemporary ecosystemic challenges, where technological developments and ongoing ecological disasters challenge the very notion of humanity<sup>3</sup>.

From an educational point of view, the proposal of a post-anthropocentric design with a planetary orientation impacts key definitions regarding the discipline; firstly, the idea that technology - and by extension design - is not an exclusively human activity (Coccia, 2018), but rather a practice of co-constitution of shared futures between geological, animal, plant, technological, human, etc. agencies. Secondly, it seeks to dismiss the idea that design methodologies can be applied as cookie-cutter processes (Forlano, 2016) and that they possess universalistic qualities (Forlano, 2016; Simonsen et al., 2014). This idea implies that design practice is situated in an ethical horizon that understands that "nothing comes without its world" (Haraway & Goodeve); as De La Bellacasa (2012) points out ", that knowledge is situated means that knowing and thinking are inconceivable without a multitude of relations that also make possible the worlds we think with" (p. 198). Consequently, the framework under which Design should be taught understands a re-territorialisation of its practices in a context of planetary interdependencies. The material-centric workshop is an exciting example of these emerging approaches (Zhou, Brück, Holzbach, 2022). Thirdly, it is necessary to prepare a way of being a designer in the world that is not predetermined by the logic of growth and the satisfaction of the new (Tironi, Albornoz & Chilet, 2022); there is a comprehensive academic discussion (Fry, 2009; Bonnet et al., 2019; Latour, 2020; DiSalvo, 2022) that advocates a change in Design, where it not only produces innovations and products to a saturated market, "but it is rather committed to experiencing practices of unmaking and deceleration that contribute to decreasing the human footprint on the Planet" (Tironi, Albornoz & Chilet, 2022).

#### **4 A vision for Design education in need of ecosystemic transitions**

Faced with these planetary challenges posed by climate change, increasing social inequalities and digital automation, it is pertinent to ask ourselves: What role is the PUC School of Design called to play as a space for training, transformation and knowledge generation? The question of Design's social engagement concerns the politics of Design and our disciplinary understanding of our ontological setting.

As design theorist Cameron Tokinwise (2019) points out, "It is essential for designers to realise that (a) they are only ever designing within wider ontological settings and that (b) everything they design reinforces that ontology if it is not an explicit struggle to redirect it." (Tokinwise, 2019). Following this line of thought at a time when higher education institutions have recognised that they must deal with

---

<sup>3</sup> The PUC design school has received two very important visits in the light of discussing more just modes of design, and a post-human understanding of technology. We received the visit of philosopher Emanuele Coccia who allowed us to understand a broader vision of technology, and Sasha Costanza-Chock who allowed us to discuss the politics of technology.

a planetary displacement (Latour, 2021), it becomes unavoidable to think about the ontological condition of the Design.

Below, four dimensions are developed that can potentially guide the present and future vision of the PUC School of Design and its commitment to social and environmental transitions. These are tentative and exploratory dimensions, but like an open prototype, they seek to open a conversation of possibilities.

#### **4.1 World-integrating Design**

Design is usually conceived as a subsidiary knowledge at the service of other knowledge (computing, economics, engineering, education, history, etc.) at the PUC School of Design; we believe that one of the main attributes of the practice of Design is its capacity to integrate diverse disciplinary fields, incorporating heterogeneous methods, artefacts, strategies, communities and knowledge. The forms, devices or systems created by Design do not simply seek to attract users with new functionalities but have the sensitive and strategic capacity to operate as a support for the translation of heterogeneous socio-technical worlds (Latour, 2005; Yaneva 2017). Thinking of Design as a platform that allows for the integration and reception of knowledge and points of view that are often divergent opens up the possibility for a design involved in the processes of change, multiplying the possible worlds instead of unifying them (Escobar, 2018). For the PUC School of Design, design practice goes beyond creating tangible or intangible objects. Its commitment is increasingly linked to its potential to mediate, enable and lead change processes at multiple levels, sectors and horizons of society.

Articulating, visualising and making diverse and necessary expertise coexist to creatively approach the understanding of a problem and the environment in which it is inscribed is a design challenge in itself, that is, a matter of Design: it involves not only the elucidation of the interrelations, experiences, interests and materialities that make up the problematic situation but also knowing and designing the emerging and speculative scenarios that arise from the web of interactions and experiences in play.

An integrative design is an invitation to develop disruptive and inclusive design methods that allow learning from and with problems, recognising they are situated, dynamic, and historical (Haraway, 2016). To integrate is to create and propose design devices to foster an epistemic culture oriented by co-creating knowledge and identifying emerging possibilities, which would only exist with the crossover between, for and through considerable knowledge, whether expert or lay.

#### **4.2 World-making Design**

At the PUC School of Design, we resist reducing the practice of Design to being driven exclusively by the dynamics of the consumer society. Although Design has been heir to and, in a certain way, guided by a capitalist-colonial tradition that revolves around the production and accumulation of objects that lose their use value shortly after being consumed through programmed obsolescence (Bonsiepe, 1975; Flusser, 2002), at the PUC School of Design we believe in the need to go beyond the unsustainable paradigms of the present - often naturalised in the discipline - to defend a design committed to its ontological capacity to make-worlds (Flores & Winograd, 1986; Fry, 2017). Design is not reduced to a mere object and is increasingly involved with proposals in articulating complexity and uncertainty in different sectors and strategic services of society (Irwin, 2015). Design produces realities and configures subjectivities, organisations and imaginaries. It is impossible to ignore that, directly or indirectly, the world we design designs us. Therefore, Design is not about setting the world but



knowing and transforming it. Its catalytic vocation can propose and generate eco-systemic transitions towards more collaborative, inclusive and sustainable futures (Escobar, 2018).

Design has the ethical duty to explore hitherto unrealised possibilities that allow us to de-design unsustainable and hegemonic models, projecting plural ways of feeling-thinking that would enable humans to re-learn to co-inhabit and sustain life on the planet.

### **4.3 Latin-American worlding through Design**

It is indisputable that Design has been part of the dynamics of globalisation and universalisation of certain symbols, technologies, merchandise and lifestyles characteristic of industrialised and computerised capitalism. This has often led to Design being configured by certain value limits imposed by a modernising global ethos based on models of development that celebrate the figure of the universal consumer rather than respect for the past and local ways of being and doing. The PUC School of Design aim to develop a design that operates as a channeller of the encounter between worlds, such as the multiple traditions, histories and local cosmologies, contributing to projecting pluriversal ways of life (Escobar, 2018). Design has historically been one of the tools through which territories have been colonised and homogenised, expanding specific ways of life - specifically consumption - at the PUC School of Design; we advocate a Design that acts as a laboratory for imagining and prototyping alternative futures from Latin America, that operates as a platform for (re)making worlds, in which many worlds have a place. Design as a generative space for meaningful transitions cannot continue reproducing the same universalist, Europeanising and anthropocentric assumptions with which the discipline has expanded.

It is recognising and making visible the potential of the local environment does not mean museifying the past but rather making it present to deactivate the process of defuturisation (Fry, 2017), where certain hegemonic futures cancel the possibility of alternative futures being able to unfold. A decolonial design from the Global South must not only develop a critical gaze and destabilise the uniformizing canons of the present but also use its projective capacity to speculate and propose projects that improve living conditions, fostering a culture of repair and sustainability (Tironi et al., 2023). A design from the Latin American reality is an invitation to restore dignity to the worlds that have been forgotten or instrumentalised by a specific globalising narrative (Gutiérrez, 2015), recognising in the otherness and multiplicity of knowledge/doings an opportunity to project more inclusive horizons. To this end, Design must re-imagine new tools and methods that allow for deploying more sustainable and inclusive ways of life, redirecting the discipline beyond the dominant frameworks of the North. A Design from the Global South does not imply renouncing the advances of modernity or returning to a pristine past, but instead generating the conditions for a local-global design that makes and thinks situationally from the often-discarded longings and knowledge systems.

### **4.4 Design as a producer of knowledge for pluriversal futures**

Designing is not reduced to a logic of 'problem-solving'. When we design, we do not close problems but move between incomplete and unfinished forms of knowledge, that is, open to possible futures, to 'what might become' (Dunne & Raby, 2013). However, it is also a form of enquiry, experimentation and exploration of our planet, making new realities and possibilities emerge (Marres et al., 2017). Design's capacity is not limited to packaging the world for consumption; it has the potential to generate open and experimental knowledge, enabling processes, artefacts, or systems for social transitions towards more just and sustainable societies. Design as a platform for knowledge

production opens up possibilities for activating forms of research in, for and through Design (Cross, 2007), producing answers to problems and questions and speculations that allow for forecasting future scenarios. Recognising the potential of researching and creating by the act of designing is a way of going beyond the dualism between doing and thinking and fostering interdisciplinary dialogues where natural sciences, humanities, spirituality, computing, art, and biology, among others, converge to generate new knowledge, involvement and responsibilities.

The processual and iterative activity of Design is invested with a certain transformative vitality that challenges the conviction of having to think that things are as they are and invites the development of creative and experimental methods (Lury et al., 2018; Wilkie et al., 2017), necessary to create futures with futures and to rise to current challenges. At the PUC School of Design, we want to develop the tools and knowledge that allow students to imagine possible worlds, experiment from material practice, empirical work or theoretical reflection, promote design projects of excellence that push the limits of the discipline, produce new alternatives for the creation and scientific research.

## **5 Conclusion: Design from the South?**

Since the social uprising of 2019 in Chile, the possibility of discussing the social foundations of the country has opened up, and this has also impacted the PUC School of Design. The political, environmental and social crises at both local and national levels have led to a profound reflection on the role of Design in the future. The socio-environmental, socio-political and socio-technical destabilisation has put in check multiple current practices of design education. It has demanded the exercise of testing alternative discourses that could give rise to a design perspective from the south.

Although the reconfiguration of Design in the face of the planetary crisis is still uncertain, this paper attempts to reflect a vision of Design and its potential to become an epistemological articulator, but one capable of being transformed into concrete practices for future design students. This project is still in configuration and will depend on the community's openness to consider the ethical dimension of Design as one of the fundamental challenges of design education. This article attempts to offer the idea of a planet-oriented design as a viable alternative for a post-anthropocentric design by exposing what could be the foundations of this proposal and trying to tell the role that a perspective other than human-centred-design could have in rearticulating the exercise of Design in the care and repair of the damage we have incurred as a species.

The modern-capitalist Design has been based on a globalising and universalising narrative, becoming a material articulator of conceptions about the earth and its inhabitants. When Design is controlled by the limits imposed by modernity/coloniality, it becomes a "negative ontological design" (Tlostanova, 2017), generating obsolete and unsustainable futures. We want to ask what kind of design education we can offer from the South.

A design from the South can contribute to generating new and speculative narratives for a planetary cohabitation, problematising the modernising and anthropocentric project of the world. When we recognise that the question of habitability no longer only depends on human interests but also on alliances and collaborations with the terrestrial actors that cohabit with the planet, an ethical responsibility arises for a design from the South that consists of activating forms of mutual care with all the entities that design the planet.

## References

- Álvarez, P.(Ed.). (2019). *Cincuenta años Escuela de Diseño UC*. Ediciones UC.
- Boehnert, J., M.S., & D.E. (2022). Sustainable and Responsible Design Education: Tensions in Transitions. *Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031530>
- Bonsiepe, G. (1975). *Teoría y Práctica del Diseño Industrial*. G.Gili.
- Bratton, B.H. (2016). *The stack: On software and sovereignty*. MIT Press.
- Blanch, A., Sato, A., & Tejeda, G. (Eds.). (2007). *Diseño*. Ediciones UC.
- Coccia, E. (2018). *La vie des plantes: une métaphysique du mélange*. Éditions Rivages.
- Costanza-Chock, S. (2020). *Design justice: Community-led practices to build the worlds we need*. The MIT Press.
- Cross, N. (2007). From a design science to a design discipline: Understanding designerly ways of knowing and thinking. In *Design research now* (pp. 41-54). Birkhäuser Basel.
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonising human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
- De La Bellacasa, M. P. (2012). 'Nothing comes without its world': thinking with care. *The sociological review*, 60(2), 197-216.
- De La Bellacasa, M.P. (2017). *Matters of care: Speculative ethics in more than human worlds (Vol. 41)*. U of Minnesota Press.
- De la Cadena, M. (2017). Earth beings: Ecologies of Practice Across Andean Worlds. *Universitas Humanística*, 83, 403-412.
- Duffy, B. E. (2017). (Not) *Getting Paid to Do What You Love: Gender, Social Media, and Aspirational Work*. Yale University Press.
- Dunne, A., & Raby, F. (2013). *Speculative everything: Design, fiction, and social dreaming*. MIT Press.
- Elliott, A. (2019). *The culture of AI: Everyday life and the digital revolution*. Routledge.
- Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds*. Duke University Press.
- Forlano, L. (2016). Decentering the human in the Design of collaborative cities. *Design Issues*, 32(3), 42-54.
- Fry, T. (2012). *Becoming Human by Design*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Fry, T. (2020). *Defuturing: A New Design Philosophy*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Flores, F. & Winograd, T. (1986). *Understanding Computers and Cognition: A New Foundation for Design*. Addison-Wesley.
- Flusser, V. (2002). *Filosofía del diseño. La forma de las cosas*. Madrid, España: Síntesis
- Gutiérrez Borrero, A. (2015). Resurgimientos: sures como diseños y diseños otros. *Nómadas*, (43), 113-129.
- Haraway, D. & Goodeve, T. (2000). *How Like a Leaf: An Interview with Thyrza Goodeve*. Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2017). On human correspondence. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 23(1), 9-27.
- Irwin, t. (2015). transition design: a proposal for a new area of design practice, study, and research. *Design and Culture*, 7(2), 229-246.
- Jönsson, L., Tironi, M., Hermansen, P., & Wilkie, A. (2022). Editorial: Doing and Undoing Post-Anthropocentric Design. DRS2022: Bilbao, 25.
- Latour, B. (2005). An introduction to actor-network-theory. Reassembling the social.
- Latour, B. (2017). Facing Gaia: Eight lectures on the new climatic regime. John Wiley & Sons.
- Latour, B. (2021). After lockdown: A metamorphosis. John Wiley & Sons.
- Lury, C., Fensham, R., Heller-Nicholas, A., Lammes, S., Last, A., Michael, M., & Uprichard, E. (Eds.). (2018). *Routledge handbook of interdisciplinary research methods*. Routledge.
- Marres, N., Guggenheim, M., & Wilkie, A. (2018). *Inventing the social*. Mattering Press.
- Morizot, B. (2017). Nouvelles alliances avec la terre. Une cohabitation diplomatique avec le vivant. *Tracés. Revue de sciences humaines*, (33), 73-96.
- Norman, D. A. (2013). *The Design of Everyday Things*. Basic Books.
- Piketty, T. (2014). El capital en el siglo XXI. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Rittel, H.W., & Webber, M.M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy sciences*, 4(2), 155-169.
- Schwab, K. (2017). The Fourth Industrial Revolution. Crown
- Yaneva, A., & Zaera-Polo, A. (2017). *What is cosmopolitical Design? Design, nature and the built environment*. Taylor & Francis.
- Tonkinwise, C. (2019). Cameron Tonkinwise on Speculative Design Education. SpeculativeEdu. Recuperado el 16 de abril de 2023, de <https://speculativeedu.eu/interview-cameron-tonkinwise/>

- Tironi, M., Chilet, M., & Albornoz, C. (2022). Problematizing Human-Centred Design: Notes on Planet-Oriented Design. *diid—disegno industriale industrial design*, (77), 12-12. <https://doi.org/10.30682/diid772022c>
- Tironi, M., Hermansen, P., Chilet, M., & Ureta, C. (Eds.). (in press). *Design for More-Than-Human Futures: Towards Post-Anthropocentric Worlding*. Routledge.
- Zhou, Z., Brück, V., Holzbach Markus. A material-centric approach in non-anthropocentric design. DRS 2022. <https://doi.org/10.21606/drs.2022.518>

### **About the Authors**

**Martin Tironi:** Sociologist, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, 2006. Master in Sociology, Sorbonne V, 2010. PhD, Center de Sociologie de l’Innovation, École des Mines de Paris, 2013. Post-doctorate, Center de Sociologie de l’Innovation, École des Mines de Paris, 2014. Visiting Fellow, Center for Invention and Social Process, Goldsmiths, University of London, 2018.

**Marcos Chilet:** Designer, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, and MA in Critical Theory, Goldsmith College, University of London. Teacher of Speculative Design, School of Design, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. His practice and research areas are critical design, the relation between politics and designers, and media technologies.

**Acknowledgement:** This work was supported by the National Fund for Scientific and Technological Development (Fondecyt), Ministry of Education, Government of Chile, Fondecyt Grant No. 1210006.