

HOW CAN WE COME TO CARE IN AND THROUGH DESIGN?

LI JÖNSSON
MALMÖ UNIVERSITY
LI.JONSSON@MAU.SE

ANN LIGHT
MALMÖ UNIVERSITY/
UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX
ANN.LIGHT@SUSSEX.AC.UK

KRISTINA LINDSTRÖM
MALMÖ UNIVERSITY
KRISTINA.LINDSTROM@MAU.SE

ÅSA STÅHL
LINNÆUS UNIVERSITY
ASA.STAHL@LNU.SE

MATHILDA THAM
LINNÆUS UNIVERSITY/
GOLDSMITHS UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
MATHILDA.THAM@LNU.SE

ABSTRACT

On a generic level, caring can be described as "everything that we do to maintain, continue, and repair our 'world' so that we can live in it as well as possible" (Fisher and Tronto, 1990). This paper asks how we as design researchers in Scandinavia come to care, for our world and more specifically for the local NORDES community. We do this by describing how we have maintained, continued and added (as a practice of repair) in relation to the most recent NORDES summer school (2018). The summer school invited students to work with tensions between *despair*, in a site marked and *haunted* (Tsing et al., 2017) by the aftermath of industrial design practices and *hope*, by making time for soil (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017) in a community-supported agricultural scheme. The paper invites you to share some cruxes and insights that emerged, and to imagine teaching *with care* as a collective process that attempts to bring things together, not as oppositions, but as generative and productive relations.

INTRODUCTION

This paper celebrates the theme of care and what it can mean for design research by focusing on one specific event: the NORDES Summer School of 2018, entitled Design and Care. We are using the summer school as focus for a reflection on some trajectories design has taken over the last decades, and to describe how we, as individuals and a community of design researchers, have come to care. Because of this closely-knit community, it is possible to trace the emergence of key discourses, cultures, methodologies, epistemologies and ontologies. We are using another summer school, which took place eight years ago, as a reference point for this unfolding. Three of the authors, this time co-organisers of the doctoral summer school, participated at that time as PhD students.

Before sending out our call to the summer school on Design and Care, we asked for feedback from previous organisers. One of them replied that our call felt less finished, or less framed as part of design research in comparison to those of previous years. This was true. We did not rely on one specific design research text, and the questions we asked were tentative. We had made a reading list consisting of three recently published books that mattered to us in different ways (Haraway, 2016; Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017; Tsing et al., 2017). The selected literature was not written by or explicitly addressing designers, but was chosen because we thought it could bring important challenges to design research at this moment, when we are facing urgent environmental concerns, interdependent with socio-cultural and financial concerns.

In hindsight, the summer school of 2018 emulated some significant shifts in design research, in both planned and spontaneous ways. For example, our very becoming as a

team was exploratory and under the auspices of negotiation, rather than the result of a fixed programme. That emergence mirrored the turn in design towards being-with and staying-with, rather than finding solutions (e.g. Rosner, 2018; Juul Söndergaard, 2018; Paxling, 2019). More explicitly, we wanted to weave in and draw from previous NORDES conference themes, discourses and agencies, asking ‘how can we care for Design Ecologies and Design and Politics in Design and Care?’ While we did not seek definitive answers, implicitly the themes were with us in discussions, interwoven in fieldwork and performances. Perhaps the most lasting impression of the days we shared during the summer school (and the subsequent papers from the doctoral students) is the courage to work with – stay with and care for - the complexity that the lens of design and care can bring.

The paper is organized in four parts:

- NORDES summer school 2010 - Design Things.
- Designerly trajectories - from matters-of-concern to matters-of-care.
- NORDES summer school 2018 - Design and Care.
- Discussion - what can ‘care’ bring to design research and pedagogy?¹

We hope this paper can be of value for design educators and researchers who are interested in working with design and care, as a topic and as a way to be, think and do design research.

PART 1: NORDES SUMMER SCHOOL 2010 – DESIGN THINGS

In the summer of 2010, the NORDES summer school was held in Pukeberg Glassworks, Sweden, on the topic of “(The doing of) Design Things”². The course literature was a book manuscript (Binder et al., 2011) with the same title, co-authored by several of those organizers. The book and the summer school were heavily influenced by Latour’s work on matters-of-concern (2005a), which is an opening to understanding things and objects not as stable, but as a space for negotiation. Latour calls for an assembly of assemblies, or *Things*, that gather both human and non-human actors - those concerned and the causes of their concerns. The summer school held in Pukeberg could be understood as an invitation to bring the figure of the Thing into a design context (Binder et al., 2011). In other words, the summer school became a call to design things, gatherings and socio-material assemblies where design is negotiated, rather than designing discrete objects.

The PhD students formed groups, for example, working with controversies and giving form to gatherings where

‘thinging’ could take place. One group worked with the controversies around lingering industrial pollution and how to go on living with it. The group zoomed in on the building of a new housing area on top of former industrial land and a dump, in southern Sweden, and tried to speculate on what everyday negotiations would be and look like there – and what designers could contribute with in such a situation. Building there was so controversial that, in order not to risk the health of the new residents, soil had to be brought from elsewhere and restrictions were imposed on how much one could eat from one’s own garden. Although Pukeberg, where the summer school was held, is a former glass factory with high levels of pollution, the group was not working with the controversies at hand, but turned to another part of Sweden for its focus. The summer school was thus held on top of controversies, but it wasn’t situating itself in the location.

Nevertheless, this conceptual and practical call to design disputable things, rather than stable objects, has been influential also beyond that summer school (c.f. Ehrnberger, 2017; Jönsson, 2014; Lindström and Ståhl, 2014; Seravalli, 2014). When the concept of design things travelled, it also moved beyond the context of participatory design, where it was first conceptualized (Binder et al., 2011), and was put to work in relation to design research fields such as critical and speculative design. Indeed, together design Things, speculative design and critical design have occupied a significant part of design discourse in the last decade, forging new acceptances for design as host, facilitator, discussion opener, provocateur etc. in the remit of organisations (e.g. Mazé and Redström, 2009; Tham, 2008) and galleries (e.g. Dunne and Raby, 2013). Design thinging marked a milestone in a growing confidence to reimagine design and allow for different design research practices to work together, be merged and practiced as both a meeting and a matter (Jönsson, 2014; Lindström and Ståhl, 2014). This took place as the ecological imperative put pressure on and inspired designers to reconceive the designer role, processes and agencies.

In relation to the transition between “Design Things” and “Design and Care”, Puig de la Bellacasa (2017) tells us that “matters of care aim to add something to matters-of-fact/concern with the attention of not only respecting them but of getting further involved in their becoming” (p. 66). In other words, the notion of matters-of-care is less about unveiling, deconstructing or explaining matters-of-fact, but a suggestion to “engage with them so that they generate caring relationalities” (ibid). This points to the challenges within a broader ontological turn in social science, but

¹ Because of this focus, we are not presenting a formal section on previous related work, but draw the reader’s attention to the literature referenced throughout.

² The summer school was held in the in Pukeberg Glassworks, Nybro, Sweden. It was organised by the Design Faculty, the then active

National Centre for Design Research in Sweden. The facilities that were used were next to a furnace in use, and part of the former glass industry, at the time partly hosting design education at the Linnaeus University.

we are, of course, interested to develop and incorporate such insights into a pedagogic programme in design.

PART 2: DESIGNERLY TRAJECTORIES

Clearly, a possible shift from matters-of-concern to matters-of-care is neither linear nor abrupt. Important to note, within the attempt to engage with or turn towards design things and matters-of-concern, is that other forms of gathering have emerged and been articulated, not as a radical break, but rather as a way of thickening the story, or generating difference. Within design research, this is articulated through the figure of publics-in-the-making, (Lindström and Ståhl, 2014) that has drawn attention to gatherings that are driven by and generate care and curiosity, rather than a shared urgent concern. Jönsson (2014) has suggested the design event as a gathering and way to involve and invite more-than-humans, such as feral animals, into the design process. Light and Akama have paid attention to the role of care in designing with communities and dealing with the contingencies these bring (Light and Akama, 2014; 2019), noting the tensions in how the politics of care contrasts with the politics of rights and responsibilities. In the field of metadesign, Tham (2008) has argued for a more explicit positioning of personal values, and a blurring of personal and professional boundaries in design research and practice.

The notion of matters-of-concern suggests a distance between the concerned and the matter, and 'mere' intellectual engagement. One of the most significant shifts in design ontologies during the last decade is the notion that design and designers are not separate from matters of concern but deeply intertwined – in their unfolding and, hopefully, in forging more sustainable pathways ahead. Acknowledgment of design and humankind as "problem causer" is, of course, enforced by the formal acknowledgement of an 'Anthropocene', an era where human activities drive negative changes to vital earth systems (Crutzen et al., 2007). With positioning one's professional and personal self as problem and solution holder, intellectual detachment is harder to maintain, giving way to relating with agency. This is central for the notion of care. "Thinking in the world involves acknowledging our own involvements in perpetuating dominant values rather than retreating to the sheltered position of an enlightened outsider." (Puig de la Bellacasa 2017, p. 10) 'Care' also marks a turn from a *solution* focus to attention to feminist ideas, seen in the focus on emerging relations and through continuous work on repair and maintenance. The literature we draw upon (Haraway, 2016; Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017; Tsing et al., 2017) originates from a feminist technoscience perspective, which has a speculative commitment to 'figure out' how things could be otherwise. Another important turn, also embedded within these expanded notions of care, is that

of kinship with a plurality of species. This profoundly challenges both the anthropocentrism that has given cause to environmental damage, and anthropocentrism (and adjacent Western hegemony, patriarchy, dominant growth logic) in pursuits of reversing this damage (Tham, 2014). If Latour's Actor Network Theory (ANT) (2005b) charts 'matters-of-concern', the humble and always changing cat's cradles (string figures) of Haraway (1994) – rooted in child play across cultures and times – trace 'matters-of-care'. A core theme of Puig de la Bellacasa's book (2017) is that of *it depends*. It is not universally this or that, but specific to the situation. In Haraway's terms: "The partners do not precede the meeting; species of all kinds, living and not, are consequent on a subject- and object-shaping dance of encounters" (Haraway, 2008, p. 4).

In other words, the conceptual apparatus that developed between the two different summer schools, moved from an ANT-inspired composition of things much focused on participation through design - towards an 'interventionist Anthropocene-inflected feminist technoscience', much focused on repair and maintenance as a pedagogic programme in design, rather than a research programme through design (Brandt, et al., 2011).

PART 3: NORDES SUMMER SCHOOL 2018 – DESIGN AND CARE

The NORDES summer school of 2018 was organized by Linnaeus University, Malmö University and the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Design on the topic of care and design - as a doing and weaving between hope and despair. The invitation asked students to consider: 'What can care do? And what does it mean to care? And how might it relate to design?'³

SITUATING AND FRAMING CARE

The summer school focused on designerly and speculative approaches to caring in more than human worlds. These were presented as interdependencies across actors as well as technoscientific and natureculture entanglements. We worked with tensions between despair and hope in sites marked by the aftermath of industrial design practices and where care is enacted in different ways. One field visit was to Glasriktet (Kingdom of Crystal), haunted by pollution as well as multispecies' relational becoming (Tsing et al., 2017). Another field visit was to a community-supported agriculture scheme (CSA) that takes the living and dying of many entities into daily account (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017). We saw these as an attitude and practice for "staying with the trouble" in such contexts (Haraway, 2016). Particularly we drew on three dimensions of care that Puig de la Bellacasa

³ The call for participation in the summer school 2018 was distributed in various ways. See for example here:

<https://codesignresearch.com/2018/03/21/call-for-participation-design-care>

(2017, p. 5) states are in constant tension: labour/work, affect/affections, ethics/politics.

As we suggested to the students, in times and worlds of interdependent environmental, sociocultural and economical urgencies, slow violence as well as catastrophes are experienced and projected unevenly. We set up the summer school to attend to points where imbalances of power were apparent and to intervene in them, using designerly means towards new materialities, relations, narratives and practices.

Additionally, we drew on Lenz Taguchi (2012) to provide a pedagogical reference that articulates care for different designerly and pedagogical choices that make up a learning environment. She suggests that pedagogics move into a thought-figure that she calls “interwoven becomings”. It highlights that a learning situation is characterised not only by human agency and capacity to make things happen, but also that the whole situation with materials and more-than-human actors shape what is becoming. It is particularly helpful in recognising that learning is a situated process where the self and the situation, including the site, concepts and materials that are introduced, are mutually becoming with each other.

ORGANISATION AND PLANNING

The 2018 summer school was organized by five women that represent the fields of participatory and speculative design and metadesign. It gathered twenty doctoral students and two master students from a broad range of design disciplines. Students were asked to relate their individual research topic to the notion of care in their application for the course. To gain credits for the course, some weeks after the summer school, students had to submit a short paper on how their own research project had been affected by the lens of design and care. During the summer school, students were asked, in groups, to: articulate and materialize a matter of care through a performance, event, or object that relates to Puig de la Bellacasa’s (2017) soil community, or Tsing et al.’s (2017) figures of ghosts and/or monsters. They were also asked to show how their work related to the tensions between labour/work, affect/affection, ethics/politics.

The summer school programme consisted of:

- Day 1. How we come to care? Presentations from organizers and doctoral students and forming groups using open space methodology.
- Day 2. Soil communities. Visit to local community supported agricultural farm. Presentations, group work, literature seminars and work on the field.
- Day 3. Aftermath of industrialization. Visit to polluted site of previous glass works with presentation from scientists, literature seminars and group work.
- Day 4. How we come to care now? Group presentations and discussions. Embodied digestion through making one’s own smoothie with food waste.

CARE IN ACTION

We sought to imbue the days with care. For example, the predominantly vegan food was locally grown and prepared and served with special rituals for care (such as, in silence, serving just the right amount to a peer). We visited the Feminist Farming Project, a student-led farm just off campus of the hosting institution. We also invited participants, right at the beginning of the course, to co-create principles of engagement with the view to create a caring environment. These were revisited at the end. We framed the school through each organiser positioning herself in design and care, making explicit how we each come to care, our respective (and sometimes differing) ontological and epistemological positions. Another example of care was how we flexed our expectations of the flow of the week (as it progressed) to allow students to find reflective time in it.

The summer school worked to ‘plan’. The participants were thoughtful in forming groups, supported by the open space method, and took responsibility for their work. Despite the openness of the theme, questions and briefs, the difference in previous knowledge and experience of participants, there were few wobbles during the days together. Value explicitness and the shared focus on sustainability in the relational guise of care arguably created an immediate sense of community. Fine summer days (ominously fine) and good food added to the conviviality. Would a lens of care make for less friction and weed out healthy argument, we slightly worriedly wondered? But the field visits took some of the cosiness out of care, and almost brutally situated some of the text material.



Figure 1: Groups and matters to care for starting to take shape

Day 2, we arrived at the community-supported agricultural farm, the students were split into two groups and spent half of the day in the field, engaging with work of maintenance needed at this particular time, such as planting, weeding and harvesting. The other half of the day was spent on relating their experiences to the assigned texts. This attempt to situate the texts in a specific location, and with specific practices, led us to, for example, discuss the (real and metaphorical) nuances of weeding, with carrot leaves seemingly indistinguishable from weeds. It also led us, while

standing on the earth at the edge of the field, to discuss how to care for our bodies so that they will become good soil. Friction in relation to what and whom to care for emerged when one of the groups encountered a snail, considered to be an invasive species. It became a reminder that caring is not innocent, and that caring for something, such as crops, might involve making cuts that deal with life and death – in this case literally cutting a snail into two halves.

The day spent with community-supported agriculture was excellent in providing concrete examples of kin and kinship in soil communities, care in relation to labour and work, permaculture in action, to experience what situated care can mean. The farmer made the conditions of livelihoods of farming very real, relating it to seasons, yields, land area and weather very concretely. For example, she told us that, although it would be possible to expand the agriculture, she would refrain from doing so since she wants to have a period in the winter for reflection and resting. She thereby expressed how business opportunities can be balanced with self-care.



Figure 2: Getting ready to engage in weeding and planting

Day 3 took the theme of care to spikier territories as we visited the polluted site of a former glassworks. With the dawning awareness of real dangers to humans of polluted soil, came unease and even fear. Some women of the group were excluded from physically caring for the soil: pregnant or breast-feeding women were advised to stay away from areas, due to immediate risk and care for future generations. Far from the easy handling of carrots and weeds the day before, the remaining participants would instantly drop a piece of

glass, picked up for its shimmering qualities, as our scientist guides demonstrated the arsenic, cadmium and lead contents that they had detected through their scanners. The non-innocence of past practices cast tangible ominous shadows of pollution.

The site is now dedicated to producing and showing glassworks made locally and on a small-scale, as well as showcasing the possibilities of phytoremediation, the use of living plants to remove contamination in the soil. The site is therefore simultaneously a monument to a splendid past for these glassworks – an important income for the region - and to issues of industrialization and how it may be possible to care into a future. At its heart is a park showing the plants, such as sunflowers, that can be used to collect heavy metals from the soil before being incinerated.



Figure 3: Getting in touch with shimmers of the past

Another crux arose in our group's encounter with our guiding scientist. The hosts expected the students to perform classic design roles (making promotional videos and other practical marketing). It appeared that our hosts' expectations of design were entwined with the project of modernity and industrialization – some problems of which were evident in the site. These expectations were a break both with the dominant ideas of design within the group, and with the 'contract' of care explicitly and implicitly set up within the summer school.

Day 4 was led by the students for the most part, since it involved their presentations and a discussion of each in the rest of the group. This included our feedback but was broader in tone; necessarily, it seemed, for the work forced us into encounter with the key themes of the week in an affective fashion. For instance, one group had us huddling with our eyes closed for minutes in the cool of the early morning sun. Another formed a long procession to the bare strip of land by the design school and made us plant sunflower seeds in a silent ceremony that began by pouring soil into each other's hands - from cups labelled 'lead', 'arsenic', 'cadmium' after the toxins found in the Kingdom of Crystal. All had a performative element that entailed risk to both the initiators and the group being led; it is testimony to the

camaraderie built across the week that we were able to experience these encounters with - not unquestioned, but trusting - engagement. The vividness of the experiences with the soil in the first three days was just as present in the work shared on the last. And, while the thrall of the experience was profound in each case, the analysis that followed in discussions was rich, reflexive and critical across many dimensions. We all got an education. The courage of the performances was memorable.

EMERGING MATTERS

We have described how we explored the possibility of a care-ful pedagogic design teaching programme and we continue by pointing towards some of the difficulties and tensions that played out and emerged during the field visits.

The soil became, both through our readings and practice, the main material during the summer school. During the pleasurable visit to the community-supported agricultural centre, the 'soil-ful' practices of planting, weeding and harvesting were experienced, making us wiser on what situated care can mean. However, some frictions were carried through the soil, as exemplified through the meeting with the invasive snail. (This was a meeting and a cut, that, in hindsight, looks mundane compared to some of the 'soil-issues' that appeared at Kingdom of Crystals.)

The snail might be seen as representative of the ghost figure of Tsing et al. (2017) With the ghost figure, Tsing envisages ecologies of damage, where the pasts are always there haunting presents. The snail's slow movements remind us of our speedy human-inflicted non-innocence. Shipping goods between countries bears huge effects into our own micro-milieus. It is experienced in our own back gardens - where the invasive snail is munching away on the homegrown crops; where it has now made itself at home. An invasive snail can both be seen as a conqueror of new better lands for its own survival and as a disturbing threat from another. Both the snail and the weed mimicking a carrot leaf became more than human figures for us to discuss, think-with and touch. Nonetheless, discussions remained quite abstract in connecting the concern and the matter in designerly ways.

Looking back, the mundane maintenance of the healthy, rich and moist cared-for soil generated knowledge of how to continue and maintain things. In addition, we had been challenged in practicing how designers might become better at the art of noticing (Tsing, 2017) not only human configurations, but socio-ecological networks. The snail was a guide, a pedagogical device, for continued situated noticing that traces relations in and with the soil *here* to wider norms, narratives and epistemologies.

In contrast to the smoothness of the well-cared-for soil of the farm, the Kingdom of Crystals soil lent itself

better to issuefied (Marres, 2012) design explorations. At this site, the need for repair was very much present. The soil that many participants did not feel able to touch was also filled with histories of human practices, which made us collaboratively deeply implicated in the soil matter(s) we set out to explore. At this site, unlike the last one, we were standing without dirt under our fingernails - it was too toxic to risk such a thing. This opened up commitment to care as a speculative effort to imagine how things could be different, and had to become different. The soil became a controversial design matter, beyond a design thing, to gather actors around. It called for longer temporal horizons in all design endeavours and it also called for hesitations and perhaps even refraining from designing. How can this be integrated in the training of designers?

As we collaboratively tried to deal with such questions of care and the ghosts of our own practice situated at hand (see fig.3), a second (design) ghost showed up in the form of the scientists' expectations of what design/ers should do in this situation: to help promote the site. It might be tempting to argue that those expectations were a misinterpretation of what we (as design researchers) were bringing to the site. As organisers, we could see little or no potential for how this brief might support us explore better caring design experimental knowledges within the pedagogic frame we had set up. Like the students, we were reluctant to use design for such promotion. But allow us to linger on the scientists' expectations of design...

If we had stayed with the trouble of facing the invitation to compose the brochure, we could have seen: the many hours of mapping to find the contaminated land; the many hours of interviews with old glass blowers who had to recall where they would dump glass generations back in the local forest; the excavating of the contaminated sites; experimenting with ways of healing the damaged soil through phytoremediation. Worth noticing is that all this kind of labour performed by the scientists is done in the aftermath of our industrialized design practice.

What slipped the frame once again was the daunting question of repair, which was not only connected to the soil, but also a question of whether we, as belated relatives of the glass-makers (who had chosen the career path as designers), actually owed the region to respond politely to the question of making a promotional brochure and agree. Could we repair the notion of a promotional brochure?

Perhaps not so clear in the situation, these many layered questions of responsibility, temporality, labour and disciplinary engagements stirred up a smaller crisis. As organisers we had to withdraw shortly and discuss some tactics for responding to this invitation. We could clearly see unease among the students about agreeing. At the same time, we were responsible to the scientists and in need of their competences and knowledge about the damaged soil. In this controversy, our humble

attempt to care for the situation was by ‘staying with the trouble’ to see where the situation took us. Hence, we did not fully reply to the troubles of the students, nor did the students reply fully to the scientists’ brief. This was a way of allowing friction to unfold at the same time as we were, among ourselves, discussing how to intervene in this situation, where we were both hosts and guests.

In the evaluative closing discussion, it emerged that some students felt *uncared for* in this situation. This led us to reflect on our role as educators and facilitators in the context of care: Can we be allowed to fail as carers in the pursuit of exploring care? Does an experience of feeling uncared for mean that the labour of care has not been distributed appropriately across a community? In particular, it prompted reflections on whether a caring pedagogy is about avoiding frictions, or preparing people to be able to handle frictions - and, in the pursuit of taking ‘interwoven becoming’ (Lenz Taguchi 2012) seriously, to incorporate time for adjustments and debriefings.

The point is not only to expose or reveal invisible labours of care, but also to generate care.

DISCUSSION

Looking back at these four days, we can see how the summer school not only had care as a theme for studying, but also in other respects. Care, in and through the teaching, taking the specificities of each situation into account, became a central challenge in the planning of the course and continued to be so as it unfolded. Influenced by Puig de la Bellacasa’s writing on “thinking with care” (2017) we are invited to imagine *teaching with care* as a collective process that attempts to bring things together, not as oppositions, but as generative and productive relations; hope and despair; cuts on life and death. In this case, we sought to bring together different understandings of care, with different sites, practices, reflections on design and more.

As mentioned in the introduction, we did not start off with a pre-set definition of how care comes to matter in and through design (although we had food, soil and embodied digestion as planned parts of the programme). Instead, this was something that had to be negotiated and situated throughout the course. Matters emerged that were different from one place to another, and, as the students experienced, this allowed diverse reflection on how to design with care – in each place, the tension between labour/work, affect/affections, ethics/politics has to be handled differently.

We come to care about the world through observation over time. Details change imperceptibly and suddenly our orientation is different and matters connect in new pathways. Part of staying with the trouble (Haraway, 2017) is to notice these transitions and appreciate them as clues to ourselves in evolution and our world in its becoming.

In this paper, we have brought a temporal perspective to the issues that developed between the summer schools of 2010 and 2018. It became our temporal frame for understanding our context, reviewing our literature and describing our practices as researchers and teachers. It is, as Akama and Light suggest (2018), a way of being designers who ready themselves, coming from somewhere (Suchman, 2002) and *somewhen*.

The summer school of 2018 was experimental in a way that liberated it from expectations of production, rather situating the work in *thought for* and *care of* the situations we found ourselves in. However, we were also highjacked back into having to deal with questions of production and at times unable to know how to care for situations. Perhaps those were the most rewarding moments, when we could not analyse the notion of care, but practice how to carefully acknowledge those we do not necessarily agree with.

The students responded to the space that our uncertainties had opened up. Their groupwork was not only creative, but designed to be care-provoking and arresting (both in shocking us and in giving us a remix of the week in an evocative form). In all these ways, we were moving into matters-of-care, strengthening the feminist perspective and finding a way of being and a vocabulary for the future of design as well as paying respect to its past.

As the design discourse matures, and as we rehearse our relationship as designers to the world through design thinging, design ecologies, design and power, design and care, we are also acknowledging the interplay of design as ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, things, technologies, practices and procedures. We hope, in this pedagogic framework, to be able to care enough for our practice and discipline that we have the courage and energy to take on the friction that appears, and seek new learning-opportunities where we can become-with in generative new directions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We’re very grateful for the generosity from the students, the ones hosting and guiding us during this summer school, as well as for those who have gone before us. A particular thank you to Juliana Restrepo, and credits go to her for figure 2. We’d also like to thank Zeenath Hasan and the work she and students do at Linnaeus University on design, food and care.

REFERENCES

- Akama, Y. and Light, A. (2018). Practices of Readiness: Punctuation, Poise and the Contingencies of Participatory Design, in *Proceedings of the Participatory Design Conference (PDC’18)*.
- Binder, T., De Michelis, G., Ehn, P., Jacucci, G., Linde, P. & Wagner, I. (2011). *Design Things*. Cambridge and London: MIT Press.
- Brandt, E., Redström, J., Eriksen, M. A., & Binder, T. (2011). XLAB. Denmark: The Danish Design

- School Press.
- Crutzen, P. J., W. Steffen and J. R. McNeill. (2007). The Anthropocene: Are Humans Now Overwhelming the Great Forces of Nature?. *Ambio* 36 (8): 614–621. [https://doi.org/10.1579/0044-7447\(2007\)36\[614:TAAHNO\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1579/0044-7447(2007)36[614:TAAHNO]2.0.CO;2)
- Dunne, A. and Raby, F. (2013). *Speculative everything: Design, Fiction and Social Dreaming*. Cambridge, USA: MIT Press.
- Fisher, B. & Tronto, J.C. (1990). Toward a Feminist Theory of Care. In: Abel, E.K. and Nelson, M. K. (eds.). *Circles of Care: Work and Identity in Women's Lives*. State University of New York Press, 1990.
- Ehrnberger, K. (2017). *Tillblivelser - En trasslig berättelse om design som normkritisk praktik*. Ph.D. thesis. Royal Institute of Technology.
- Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble. Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Haraway, D. J. (2008). *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Haraway, D. (1994). A Game of Cat's Cradle: Science Studies, Feminist Theory, Cultural Studies. *Configurations*, 2(1), 59-71.
- Juul Søndergaard, M. L. (2018). *Staying with the Trouble through Design. Critical-feminist Design of Intimate Technology*. Ph.D. thesis, School of Communication and Culture. Aarhus.
- Jönsson, L. (2014). *Design Events. On exploration of a non-anthropocentric framework in Design*. Ph.D thesis. The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Art, School of Design.
- Latour, B. (2005a). From Realpolitik to Dingpolitik or How to Make Things Public. In: B. Latour, & P. Weibel (eds.), *Making Things Public: atmospheres of democracy* (pp.14–41). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Latour, B. (2005b). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2012). *Pedagogisk dokumentation som aktiv agent. Introduktion till intra-aktiv pedagogik*. Malmö: Gleerups.
- Light, A. and Akama, Y. (2014) Structuring Future Social Relations: The Politics of Care in Participatory Practice, *Proc. ACM PDC 2014*, pp151-160
- Light, A. and Akama, Y. (2019) The Nature of 'Obligation' in Doing Design with Communities: Participation, Politics and Care (eds) Fisher, T. and Gamman, L. *Tricky Design: ethics through things*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Lindström, K. & Ståhl, Å. (2014). *Patchworking Publics-in-the-Making: Design, Media and Public Engagement*. Ph.D. thesis, Malmö University.
- Marres, N., Harvey, P., Casella, E. C., & Evans, G. (2014). The environmental teapot and other loaded household objects. *Objects and materials: A Routledge companion*, 260.
- Mazé, M and Redström, R. (2009). Switch! Energy Ecologies in Everyday Life, *International Journal of Design*, 2 (3): 55-70.
- Paxling, L. (2019). *Transforming Technocultures: Feminist technoscience, Critical Design Practices and Caring Imaginaries*. Ph.D. thesis, Blekinge Institute of Technology.
- Puig de la Bellacasa, M. (2017). *Matters of Care: Speculative Ethics in More Than Human Worlds*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rosner, D. K. (2018). *Critical Fabulations: Reworking the Methods and Margins of Design*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Seravalli, A. (2014). *Making Commons*. Ph.D. thesis, Malmö University.
- Suchman, L. (2002). Located accountabilities in technology production. *Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems: Vol. 14 : Iss. 2 , Article 7*. Available at: <http://aisel.aisnet.org/sjis/vol14/iss2/7>
- Tham, M. (2008). *Lucky People Forecast: a systemic futures perspective on fashion and sustainability*. Ph.D. thesis, Goldsmiths, University of London.
- Tham, M. (2014). Creative Resilience Thinking in Textiles and Fashion. In Jefferies, J., Clark, H. and Wood Conroy, D. (eds.) *The Handbook of Textile Culture*. London/New York/Sydney: Bloomsbury.
- Tsing, A., Swanson, H, Gan, E, and Bubandt, N. (2017). *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.