Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Tristan Schultz is an Aboriginal and Australian designer, strategist, and researcher examining intersections between decolonial thinking, ontological design, and sustainability. He holds a B. Design, M. Design Futures (Hons) and is a PhD Candidate, a lecturer in the Design Program at QCA, Griffith University, and founder of the design practice Relative Creative.
tristanschultz1@gmail.com

Danah Abdulla is a designer, educator, and researcher. Her research explores design cultures and possibilities of design education in the Arab world. She is a Lecturer on the BA (Hons) Design Management and Cultures at the London College of Communication, University of the Arts London.
d.abdulla@lcc.arts.ac.uk

Ahmed Ansari is a doctoral candidate in Design Studies at Carnegie Mellon University. He is currently working on reconstructing a South Asian philosophical genealogy of technics, and tracing histories of design education in Pakistan. He teaches seminar courses in systems thinking, critical and cultural theory, and philosophy of technology at CMU.
aansari@andrew.cmu.edu

Ece Canlı is a design researcher and artist, investigating the relationship between body politics and material practices from a decolonial queer feminist point of view. She recently completed her PhD in the Design program at University of Porto, fully funded by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT).
ece.canli@gmail.com

Mahmoud Keshavarz is a postdoctoral researcher at the Engaging Vulnerability Research Program, Department of Cultural Anthropology and Ethnology, Uppsala University. He has been a Visiting Scholar at Parsons School of Design and University of Gothenburg. He is the author of *The Design Politics of the Passport: Materiality, Immobility and Dissent*, forthcoming with Bloomsbury Academic.
mahmoud.keshavarz@antro.uu.se

Editors' Introduction

Tristan Schultz, Danah Abdulla, Ahmed Ansari, Ece Canlı, Mahmoud Keshavarz, Matthew Kiem, Luiza Prado de O. Martins and Pedro J.S. Vieira de Oliveira

After centuries of subaltern and decades of transdisciplinary gestation, decolonial thinking[1] has finally been incorporated into studies of materiality and – though belatedly – cohered as a question that can be posed directly both to and within the field of Design Studies. Some of the questions that come to mind in this formative moment for decolonial thinking in/and/as design include:

- What does the endeavor of decolonizing design mean?
- What does it mean for design to be thought of in relation to decoloniality and for decoloniality to be thought of in relation to design?
- How are ideas and practices of decolonizing design already emerging?
- What are its implications within and beyond the field of Design Studies?

These questions have brought us – the members of the Decolonising Design (DD) project and research collective – together and have influenced our efforts to build an online platform that supports and promotes thinking by similarly interested design scholars. Each member of DD operates and deals with such questions in distinct ways, and through engaging with issues

1 Design and Culture

Matthew Kiem is a Sydney-based designer, researcher, and educator. He has recently completed his PhD at Western Sydney University on the topic of the Coloniality of Design. His thesis examines the meaning of ontological designing in light of decolonial thinking, with a particular interest in the settler colonial dynamics of Australia.
mnkiem@gmail.com

Luiza Prado de O. Martins is a Brazilian researcher and artist. Her work looks at questions of gender, technology, and the body. She is one half of the artistic research duo "A Parede" and holds a PhD in Design Research from the University of the Arts Berlin.
luiza@a-pare.de

Pedro J.S. Vieira de Oliveira is a Brazilian researcher and artist in sound studies. He holds a PhD in Design Research from the University of the Arts Berlin, and is one half of "A Parede."
pedro@a-pare.de

such as politics of (im)mobility and migration, Indigenous Knowledge, class struggle, gender trouble, sexual diversity, dismantling structural racism, and the practice of relating respectfully with other human, non-human, and alter-human ways of being/becoming. Accordingly, this special issue of *Design and Culture* is intended as an experiment in addressing the questions above and to gain a sense of the diverse and complex forms of thinking that connect with the concept of "decolonizing design." Our objective is not to answer these questions once and for all, but rather to approach decolonization in a manner that is adequate to both the complexity of the concept and the stakes of its imperatives.

One of the main imperatives of decolonial practice is to acknowledge and pay respect to paths by which ideas, projects, and designs arrive within and relate to particular contexts. This approach recognizes that knowledge production is a situated and relational activity. Ideas are embodiments of a designerly effort to make sense of experiential situations, and the transfer of ideas into and across different contexts informs how they affect thinking and action. DD emphasizes relations that ontologically design[2] rather than focusing on an "understanding" that seeks to pacify, control, erase, or occupy (colonize) the situation from which the "other" speaks. To this end, we resist "common denominators" and singular frames of reference. Instead, we advocate for performative mapping and storytelling that design relations which respect the disclosure of ontological differences between bodies, geographies, and histories.

One of DD's major (but by no means exclusive) sources of insight has been the Latin American-based Modernity/Coloniality Project,[3] which ran as a series of conferences and symposiums from the late 1990s to the late 2000s. Participants in this project included theorists from different Latin American and Caribbean contexts and diverse disciplinary backgrounds, including philosophy, pedagogy, semiotics, literary criticism, anthropology, sociology, and gender studies. Some of the figures connected to the Modernity/Coloniality Project who have been influential to DD include the Peruvian sociologist Aníbal Quijano (2007), particularly for his concepts of *coloniality* and the *colonial matrix of power*; Colombian philosopher Santiago Castro-Gómez (2007) for his concept of *zero point epistemology*; Argentine-Mexican philosopher Enrique Dussel (2008) for his critical conception of the history of "Western" philosophy and the meaning of Latin American philosophy; Argentine semiologist Walter Mignolo (2011b) for the concepts of the *locus of enunciation*, *colonial difference*, and *border thinking*; Argentine philosopher María Lugones (2007) for her work on the *coloniality of gender and sexuality*; queer Chicana poet and critical theorist Gloria Anzaldúa's (1987) writings on *mestizaje* and *borderlands*; Colombian-American anthropologist Arturo Escobar (2017) for his work on the concept of *pluriversality* and *autonomía*; Puerto Rican sociologist Ramón Grosfoguel (2011) for his work on the relations between questions of gender, race, and the coloniality of knowledge; and Puerto Rican philosopher Nelson Maldonado-Torres (2007) for his work on the

coloniality of being. This list, along with the *Design in the Borderlands* (Kalantidou and Fry 2014) edited collection and recent *Design for the Global South* (2017) special issue of *Design Philosophy Papers*, provides some of the context to how DD conceptualizes decoloniality as it relates to design.

Decolonizing design involves more than just amplifying interests and concerns that have been marginalized within Design Studies' dominant discourses. While this is important, decolonizing design also involves challenging the dominant forms, conventions, grammars, and language through which knowledge about design is expressed and enacted in ongoing research and design work. In other words, it is a *radical* rather than reformist project, organized less around a struggle for the inclusion and representation of difference and marginality within colonial forms, than around the unsettlement and destabilization of forms – diffused, naturalized, and habitual – that instill colonial relations of power.

Each of the articles in this special issue reflects and emphasizes different dimensions of this basic idea. Dimeji Onafuwa opens this special issue with a review of a recent DD-organized symposium held at Malmö University, titled "Intersectional Perspectives on Design, Politics, and Power Symposium." One of the symposium's central questions was: Can design strategies re-articulate what design is in an intersectional context, and what tools exist to this end? Onafuwa focuses on discussions of allyship and, specifically, opportunities to de-link (decolonize) from our unsustainable present, and to re-link (recolonize) as allies and on behalf of "all" to other epistemologies.

In her article, a version of which was presented at the Malmö conference, Nadine Botha uses the design of the portable toilet to examine the politics of sanitation design in Cape Town, South Africa. While the portable toilet acts as a central object of the overall argument, Botha demonstrates that the question of sanitation design is ultimately a social rather than technical question, one that inevitably reflects the terms of colonial domination and its contestation. As Botha argues, infrastructure and utilities design encompasses more than just issues of brute materiality or "basic needs"; it also involves existential politics of human dignity. By considering design as an ontological agent in the context of decolonial struggle, Botha's argument provides insight into how designed things configure meaning and possibility in relation to systemic processes and power structures.

Ali Musleh's paper on the shifting nature of Israel's oppression of Palestinians also recognizes design as an agent that conditions the processes and ontologies of colonial struggle. Musleh examines the way the Israeli state relates to the figure of the Palestinian as a design problem, namely, as a figure that is configured as an object or barrier to the completion of the Zionist project. To do this, he focuses on the specific effects of Israel testing new technologies on Palestinians. Like Botha, Musleh highlights the way design acts as an agent of domination and exploitation in a context in which the question of difference has been configured as an either/or equation.

Uzma Rizvi's article explores the material culture of the Cafeteria in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) as a site of interaction for migrant workers. Rizvi examines the meaning and designs of these marginal spaces through concepts of "belonging" and "entanglement." In theorizing the Cafeteria as both a site and potential symbol of decolonial social designing, Rizvi points to the value of critical heritage studies to interrogate how narratives of origin and belonging may be negotiated and reconfigured through the designing agency of things and assemblages.

Norm Sheehan's paper on Australian Aboriginal conceptions of design serves as both an explanation of decolonizing design and a demonstration of it. Sheehan's prose is not conventionally academic. But the unusual form relates to the content he is communicating; the style is itself an embodiment of Indigenous Knowledge and serves as an example of Indigenous design. He uses this to present a complex reflection on the differences between Australian Indigenous conceptions of design and modern/colonial design traditions.

Finally, in the last paper, the DD members participate in a roundtable about what is at stake in the idea of decolonizing design. We conclude with reflections on the fact that it is impossible to be freed completely from the material and onto-epistemological subjugation of the Global North without constantly contesting our own positionalities and privileges within it.

While the diverse notions of design employed and articulated in these articles may vary, they all intersect in pushing for an understanding of the histories, locations, and relations of bodies within design and designing. Regardless of the geographies or the types of design and designing they address and discuss, these interventions in one way or another point to the necessity of acknowledging different bodies: those that design and shape the materiality of the world; those that are designed by such materialities; and those that are rendered as design problems or concerns. Thus, these interventions do not aim to give a novel definition of design, nor to expand the field as such. Instead they show how different designs exist, perform, persuade, extend, or remain within the colonial matrix of power due to specific historical, social, political, and economic reasons and rationalizations.

Going back to the four main questions posed above, we hope that this special issue not only address but expand those questions critically and reflectively. In relation to this, new sets of questions may arise that mark the possible paths that this initiative can take. For instance, what is involved in the premise that a relation between design and decoloniality is itself a coherent thing to think? In other words, what is involved in making the question of decolonizing design sensible, and for whose benefit? Further, how is the process of such questioning and reflection to be designed, and what does such a process of designing itself go on to design?

We would like to end this preface by thanking the editors of *Design and Culture* – particularly Elizabeth Guffey and Maggie Taft – for extending the invitation to the Decolonising Design initiative. Their support and

the work of the peer reviewers involved in this issue has made this collection of papers much stronger.

Disclosure Statement
No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes
1. By decolonial thinking – or decoloniality – we refer to epistemic and ontic detachment from Western modernity and, by extension, from Anglo-Eurocentrism, imperialism, and global capitalism. A particular source of insight has been Frantz Fanon (1952) 1986.
2. As per Anne-Marie Willis (2006, 70), ontological design is "a way of characterizing the relation between human beings and lifeworlds. … we design, that is to say, we deliberate, plan and scheme in ways which prefigure our actions and makings – in turn we are designed by our designing and by that which we have designed (i.e., through our interactions with the structural and material specificities of our environments)."
3. Modernity/Coloniality Project refers to the articulation put by Walter Mignolo (2011a).

References

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Castro-Gómez, Santiago. 2007. "The Missing Chapter of Empire: Postmodern Reorganization of Coloniality and Post-Fordist Capitalism." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2): 428–448.

Dussel, Enrique. 2008. *Twenty Theses on Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Escobar, Arturo. 2017. "Response: Design for/by [and from] the 'Global South'." *Design Philosophy Papers* 15 (1): 39–49. doi:10.1080/144 87136.2017.1301016.

Fanon, Frantz. (1952) 1986. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2011. "Decolonizing Post-Colonial Studies and Paradigms of Political-Economy: Transmodernity, Decolonial Thinking, and Global Coloniality." *TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1 (1). https://escholarship.org/uc/item/21k6t3fq#main

Kalantidou, Eleni, and Tony Fry, eds. 2014. *Design in the Borderlands*. New York: Routledge.

Lugones, María. 2007. "Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System." *Hypatia* 22 (1): 186–209. doi:10.1111/j.1527-2001.2007.tb01156.x.

Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2007. "On the Coloniality of Being." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2): 240–270.

Mignolo, Walter. 2011a. "The Collective Project Modernity/Coloniality/ Decoloniality." Accessed November 11, 2017. http://waltermignolo. com/the-collective-project-modernitycolonialitydecoloniality/.

Mignolo, Walter. 2011b. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. London: Duke University Press.

Quijano, Anibal. 2007. "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2): 168–178.

Willis, Anne-Marie. 2006. "Ontological Designing — Laying the Ground." *Design Philosophy Papers* 4 (2): 69–92.

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Allies and Decoloniality: A Review of the Intersectional Perspectives on Design, Politics, and Power Symposium

Dimeji Onafuwa

Dimeji Onafuwa is a PhD candidate in design at Carnegie Mellon University.
dimeji@cmu.edu

Check for updates

ABSTRACT   The Intersectional Perspectives on Design, Politics, and Power Symposium, organized by the Decolonising Design Group and hosted by Malmö University School of Arts and Communication in 2016, explored colonial oppression through overlapping theories and practices in design relating to gender, race, language, culture, and ethnicity. Over two days, participants examined intersectionality theory and debated how a myriad of forces might influence calls for epistemic decolonization in design. This conference review highlights some of the presentations and debates through the lens of the role of allies in resisting cultural oppression in design.

KEYWORDS: decoloniality, symbolic violence, colonial oppression, intersectionality

Design and Culture

7

Symbolic Violence, Modernity, and Colonial Domination

The Intersectional Perspectives on Design, Politics, and Power Symposium was comprised of three sessions interspersed with invited talks. The sessions covered topics as diverse as the exploitative mechanisms of smart high-tech products, intersectional perspectives on intimate products such as menstruation tracking apps and sex toys, and power dynamics embedded in "conflictual artifacts," which can be defined as speculative/critical design artifacts that reveal spaces of participation for individuals from intersectional perspectives. Other session topics included intersectional perspectives in the context of South Asia, exclusion and inclusion in the design practice for mental health, "decolonising the toilet" in southern Africa, and employing an intersectional approach in research on the designer's work. (Disclosure: I also participated in the conference.) The three talks explored different frames of decoloniality as well as actionable strategies for leveraging the historical relationship between design and politics.

While the conference did not begin with our presentation, I am convinced that the work I presented with Dr Joanna Boehnert entitled "Design and Symbolic Violence" is a useful starting point for this review, mainly because it allowed me to understand the conference through the conflicting role of design as an oppressive and a collaborative force. Our talk related certain unjust practices and norms to institutions that an oppressor might perceive as natural, and that might lead them to suppress difference with isms such as racism, sexism, colonialism, and imperialism. I shared a personal anecdote of how a designer's emotional carelessness might serve as a discriminatory force. Emotionally careless designers are often incognizant of ways their actions might be discriminatory. Tying this carelessness to the racial biases built into certain artifacts and algorithms, I referenced the pain and embarrassment my son experienced on realizing that he had to participate in "special photo sessions" after several yearbook photo attempts were unsuccessful due to the improper calibration of the photographer's camera. I related this problem to the Kodak Shirley cards of the 1950s and their proliferation of racial stereotypes through design (Roth 2009, 111). The Shirley card example, as well as my anecdote, cause us to reflect on what the term "normal" means. They strengthen the argument for de-naturalizing symbolic violence in design. The late Martiniquan postcolonial theorist Édouard Glissant challenged Western epistemologies on race and identity in the French Antilles by stating that exercising the right to be opaque is a form of resistance to colonial legacy since it pushes back against "creolization," which can be perceivable as a form of cultural absorption that inevitably leads to cultural erasure. Glissant's work draws the origins of creolization from the New World colonial legacies of domination. In design, we see effects much like creolization in "normalization" strategies perpetuated through symbolic oppression. Erasure tactics are revealed in the totalitarianism seen in Western-centric design, where designers make clear judgments about what they include as valid, as well as what they decide to exclude as Other (Murdoch 2015, 7).

Exclusions may be covert, or even unconscious, and they are embedded in cultural practice and designed into everyday life. The moniker "symbolic violence," initially conceived by Pierre Bourdieu (2001, 1), refers to these cultural exclusions that might be "gentle, imperceptible and invincible" forms of class distinctions. These are even imperceptible to some of the victims themselves. In our presentation at the Intersectional Perspectives on Design, Politics, and Power Symposium, Dr Boehnert and I tied symbolic violence in design practice to colonial domination and modernity, giving examples relating specifically to sexism (with a contribution from Dr Bianca Elzenbaumer), racism, classism, and ecoism. We initially presented these cases in a social justice conversation track at the Design Research Society conference in June 2016 in Brighton, UK (Boehnert, Elzenbaumer, and Onafuwa 2016).

"White Standard" and Erasure

Colonial domination continues to be visible in our contemporary world. For example, specific technologies – like the example we shared at the conference of the Google photo app confusing the images of darker-skinned people for those of apes – show the tendency to push non-Western aesthetic standards to the fringes. Márton Kabai shared some of the effects of hegemonic standards of beauty in his presentation "White Standard." Kabai explored standards of beauty and aesthetics perpetuated through the marketing of skin whitening creams all over the world. He shared advertising campaigns portraying whiteness as the norm to which women must ascribe. During the question and answer session, Kabai and other participants discussed the potential differences in motivations for female and male users of skin bleaching creams, how these motivations shift over time, and why the advertising examples Kabai shared were disproportionately geared towards women. He also acknowledged the limitation of his research as a privileged white European male. These limitations were evident in choices relating to his research area focus, which is on the use of bleaching creams specifically by females in the Global South, as well as his decision to exclude deeper gender dynamics such as the male-driven determinations of female beauty. These acknowledgments led to further discussion on the possibility of intersectionality as an anecdote to ethnocentrism. The way a problem is framed impacts the mode of intervention. As one of the participants mentioned in the question and answer session, framing the use of bleaching creams as a problem unique to the Global South alone ignores Western uses of beauty products for other purposes such as skin lightening and bronzing.

As discussed above, resisting platonic standards of beauty by exercising the right to be opaque is one way to challenge the industry's assumptions. By the same token, coloniality, modernity, and design are inextricably linked, and understanding their intersections might reveal ways to collectively resist what Walter Mignolo (2007, 41), quoting the Peruvian sociologist Aníbal Quijano, refers to as the "colonial matrix of

power." The reach of the colonial matrix of power spans four categories: land ownership and usage rights; institutional and authoritarian control; gender and sexuality; and control of knowledge (education, epistemology, and the creation of subjectivity). Mignolo (2007, 4) observes that coloniality is "the invisible, constitutive side of modernity, and is not merely derivative of modernity." Modernity itself emerged with Europeanism at its core, controlling discourse on the boundaries of normalcy and shaping what is perceived to be on the fringes of or outside those limits (Mignolo 2007, 5). For example, design researchers assume that design education and research invariably emerged from the West, providing little or no evidence of design's history existing anywhere in the Global South (Bonsiepe 2007, 26–27). As evidence, they point to the Bauhaus as well as the early stages of the Design Methods Movement (recognized for pivoting away from craft-based knowledge-making to more processual, transdisciplinary approaches). However, accepting this Western-centric paradigm undermines design's transdisciplinary claim. If design is truly transdisciplinary, then what is assumed to be the center of design culture would need to be decoupled from the colonial influences of modernity and relinked to pluriversal narratives representing multiple centers. Or, to paraphrase an Igbo proverb: *Until lions have their historians, the story of the hunt will always glorify the hunter*. Quijano refers to this de-linking and re-linking as an "epistemic decolonization" which results in the foregrounding of other epistemologies outside Western ones and presents different forms of universality outside the dominant one (Mignolo and Escobar 2013, 3).

De-linking and Re-linking Epistemic Thought

Epistemic decolonization is not an easy task (Grosfoguel 2007, 212). It requires participation from those who have traditionally been beneficiaries of the cultural hegemony. According to Paulo Freire ([1970] 1996, 60), a converted oppressor – one who undergoes a "profound re-birth" and now serves the cause of the oppressed – participates without prejudice in the systemic decoupling from these epistemologies that perpetuate such oppression:

> It happens, however, that as they cease to be exploiters or indifferent spectators or simply the heirs of exploitation and move to the side of the exploited, they almost always bring with them the marks of their origin: their prejudices and their deformations, which include a lack of confidence in the people's ability to think, to want, and to know. Accordingly, these adherents to the people's cause constantly run the risk of falling into a type of generosity as malefic as that of the oppressors.

The preoccupation by the oppressor to be the "executors of the transformation" from colonized to liberated has been discussed by many scholars. In a discussion about social innovation projects, Teju Cole (2012) labels this preoccupation the "white-savior industrial complex."

Displays of "false generosity," as Freire ([1970] 1996) puts it, are an attempt by the oppressor to emancipate while continuing to dominate the oppressed thereby perpetuating the oppression. Clive Dilnot raised this issue at the symposium by sharing that the notion of design as "all" – meaning design serving as an all-encompassing discipline – emerged with the social sciences of post-industrialism, and split the notion of design as a practice solely dependent on materiality. While this idea leads to a broader understanding of design as a capacity rather than skill, it unfortunately gives designers a false sense of invincibility, leaving them with the impression that all problems are solvable with design.

Respectful Design and a New "White Standard"

During her talk, Dori Tunstall expounded on Ontario College of Art and Design (OCAD)'s efforts to decolonize its curriculum in response to a university mandate. OCAD devoted a great deal of work to building Indigenous Knowledge into Canadian educational curriculums. It is important to note that Tunstall's account of decolonization was firmly rooted in a theory of decolonization as reparation (i.e. repatriating land/powers to sovereign tribes, the abolition of slavery in all its forms, and dismantling the imperial metropoles) and less in a decoloniality theory of de-linking and re-linking of epistemologies.

According to Tunstall, settlers are potential allies in the quest for decolonization. Drawing on Freire ([1970] 1996, 49), the mark of an ally is one who "enters the situation of those with whom one is solitary; it is a radical posture … [since] true solidarity means fighting at their side to transform the objective reality which has made them these 'beings for another'." The term "ally" historically and linguistically connotes partnership or solidarity in conflict – particularly political or military conflict. As Tristan Schultz mentioned at one point during the symposium, the term "ally" may be problematic since it implies an external situation to the oppression in question. Also, many critical pedagogies that theorize allying, including Freire's, are pervaded by the binary relationships between opposing terms. For example, the role of oppressor versus the oppressed, or friend versus foe, or ally versus opponent. These binaries suggest a potential downside to theorizing allies of decoloniality because it obfuscates intersectionality, a concept that inherently challenges binaries.

Tunstall introduced Respectful Design as her program's response to questions about the role of an ally in changing the culture of design. Respectful Design implies forgoing vast emotional experiences that validate privilege, and instead amplifying the voices of the oppressed by repatriating the ownership of aesthetic cultures instead of the over-simplification of how such cultures are represented through design. Tunstall also talked about creating identities of "whiteness" that are not reliant on white supremacy. She sees Respectful Design as a mode of creating new narratives of decoloniality that highlight the work of new allies – settlers with a different ethos – and begin to redefine "whiteness" as a new identity that is inclusive, and is shareable with others.

Intersectionality Through Participation

In her presentation, "Why People Do Not Rebel: Issues of Self-Marginalization in Design for Mental Health," Paola Pierri challenged the assumption of participatory design as inherently ethical. She pointed to research on the paradoxical nature of participation, since it starts from a power imbalance. She referred to the more internal forms of domination (as opposed to external forces alone) that make participation less egalitarian than is often imagined. Her work indicates that participation is not enough for allies. Struggles with participation are particularly evident in spaces where the power imbalances are more apparent such as spaces relating to mental health. From a few cases, Pierri drew some heuristics for dealing with issues of intersectionality pertaining to working alongside those with mental health issues.

Una Lee presented a case study about participatory efforts: "Feathers of Hope: Justice and Juries," which is a community development initiative focused on Indigenous youth and incarceration in Ontario, Canada. Lee's work was in the early stages of responding to one of the questions raised at the symposium: How might a designer trained under the auspices of Western aesthetics be able to work alongside the community affected by the power imbalances and ensure that their voices are also heard? Lee reflected on how, through co-design projects with Indigenous youth, her team highlighted the failures of the justice system with regards to the First Nations people in Ontario. Through storytelling and Indigenous aesthetics, young participants used their Indigenous perspective to present healing as an alternative to incarceration.

Nadine Botha juxtaposed the uncompromising tactics of social justice movements as epistemic intersectional challenges with regard to the politics of decolonizing a seemingly benign everyday object like the toilet. She touched on how the low-grade US camping toilets deployed in villages and shanty towns in Cape Town, South Africa were perceived as dehumanizing by those forced to use them, and who then took matters in their own hands to demand change.

Allies and Decoloniality (Workshop)

I shared "Allies of Decoloniality," a workshop series exploring the role of an ally that I created with Jabe Bloom. We devised this workshop series to engage designers in identifying what might be perceived as the discipline's forms of oppression. During its first installment, participants were asked to critically reflect on and respond to scenarios drawn from experiences relating to intersectionality in design: gender, sexism, racism, and xenophobia. They worked in groups to explore scenarios within three frames: activism, advocacy, and ally-ship. We mainly wanted participants to step back and reflect on the sense of difference with which they approached their responses, and how these differences relate to experiences as people in the world and as researchers in the field. As Rizvi (2017, 93) notes, "the act of research

becomes praxis through which critical awareness of one's own condition and the condition of others come into high relief … Intersectionality allows us to occupy that praxis and standpoint critically."

Another goal of the workshops was to build narratives from different facets of lived experience, using cases that might prompt insights into how de-privileging could be a lens for understanding decoloniality in design. We introduced the participants to tools that enabled better discussions around power imbalances. One was the Power Imbalance Matrix through which participants might categorize oppression into conscious and unconscious forms, as well as scale them from individual to systemic levels of intervention. We touched on how allies "within the colonial matrix of power" may be empowered to work with those at the fringes to highlight colonial oppression due to explicit (or conscious) as well as implicit (or symbolic) forms of erasure. We were aware that nuances might occur within and between these levels of intervention. Participants also used the Appropriation versus Allying Strategies Matrix which helped them map out a clear distinction between appropriation and ally-ship as well as understanding spaces where those lines might be blurred.

Workshop participants were encouraged to address questions relating to acceptance and rejection of allies in pursuing decoloniality, ideas on drawing alliances between individuals and groups to decolonize design, and how agency is managed or negotiated within political relationships, and the individual and collective responsibilities of designers (regarding advocacy, activism, ally-ship). We also asked questions about how future design communities might reflect more acceptable models of cohabitation. While insights from the workshops are still in the early stages, we are beginning to understand that much like intersectionality, privilege itself is multifaceted, and a privileged experience is one that does not require consideration of how one's race, or class, or ethnicity, or gender impacts one's work.

The Allies and Decoloniality workshop had several limitations, some of which we shared at the symposium. The most important limitation was the difficulty with distilling a complex and socially sensitive topic into simple design "tools" and "discussion aids." The tools we used to engage the participants were created within Western frames for a primarily Western audience. While we are aware of these limitations, we hope that the iterative workshop model might allow opportunity to further understand these topics.

Reflection

Decoloniality in design is a topic that has recently garnered a lot of interest. The current global political climate has led to entrenched positions. Disagreements exist between those who espouse the need to decolonize the discipline and those who reject any notion of design as a perpetrator of imperialism. According to Paulo Freire ([1970] 1996), colonial oppression is something that affects both the oppressor and

the oppressed. Those with power find it difficult to liberate themselves from the effects of the oppression they inflict. Only the power that emanates from the oppressed is sufficient to liberate both. Hence, the ally might serve as a bridge to ensure that those oppressed are able to liberate themselves and their oppressors. "This," Freire ([1970] 1996, 44) writes, "is the great humanistic and historical task of the oppressed: to liberate themselves and their oppressors as well."

I must admit that my perspective on the symposium reflects my bias which is rooted in "commons" literature on collectivism (Ostrom 1990). I am also aware of the cultural biases that may influence the epistemological frames used to think through decoloniality in design. However, commons literature is a meaningful way of understanding issues of exclusion and difference as well as tactics for engaging outsiders as allies. For example, allies ensure that the benefits they enjoy do not result in a downstream effect of exploitation of others. The selfish actions of some may become institutionalized and therefore difficult to circumvent. Oppression can occur in circles and is sometimes not the binary we assume. The oppressed should also be aware that they too might become oppressors when liberated from the throes of oppression. Freire ([1970] 1996, 45) discusses this circle of oppression by relating it to "sub-oppressions" as well, where the very structure of thought is conditioned by the "contradictions of the concrete, existential situation" by which we shape our world

Conclusion: Converting Insights to Strategies

A core question raised during the conclusion of the Intersectional Perspectives on Design, Politics, and Power Symposium was about the designer's role in challenging oppressive power. In the concluding talk, Clive Dilnot shared ten propositions for design and power. One of those propositions was a call for designers to "take the risk of making design(ers) invisible," by working with others to ensure that their "contributions disappear and emerge to the reconfiguration of 'what is'" (Dilnot 2016). The designer's role is to explore different perspectives on a problem and tell the story within the project. Designers have an imperative to exercise the confidence to work with others to redesign the discipline to one of small gestures, one of redirection. Embracing the potentialities of otherness not only allows us to denunciate cultural hegemony, but it also presents us with opportunities to de-link (decolonize) from our unsustainable present and to re-link (recolonize), as allies and on behalf of "all," to other epistemologies.

Disclosure Statement

The author participated in the conference reviewed in this article.

References

Boehnert, Joanna, Bianca Elzenbaumer, and Dimeji Onafuwa. 2016. "Design as Symbolic Violence. Design for Social Justice." Presentation at the Design Research Society Conference, Brighton, U.K., June 27–30.

Bonsiepe, Gui. 2007. "The Uneasy Relationship between Design and Design Research." *Design Research Bow*, edited by Ralf, Michel, 25–39. Berlin: Birkhäuser.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2001. *Masculine Domination*. Translated by Richard Nice. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Cole, Teju. 2012. "The White-Savior Industrial Complex." *The Atlantic*, March 21. https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/03/the-white-savior-industrial-complex/254843/

Freire, Paolo. (1970) 1996. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Continuum. Reprint, London: Citations refer to the Penguin edition Penguin.

Dilnot, Clive. 2016. "Ten propositions about design and politics." Presentation at the Intersectional Perspectives on Design Politics and Power Symposium, Malmö, Sweden, November 14–15.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2007. "The Epistemic Decolonial Turn: Beyond Political-Economy Paradigms." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2): 211–223.

Mignolo, Walter D., and Arturo Escobar. 2013. *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*. New York: Routledge.

Mignolo, Walter D. 2007. "DELINKING: The Rhetoric of Modernity, the Logic of Coloniality and the Grammar of De-Coloniality." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2): 449–514.

Murdoch, H. Adlai. 2015. "Glissant's Opacité and the Re-Conceptualization of Identity." In *Theorizing Glissant: Sites and Citations*, edited by John, Drabinski and Marisa Parham. *Caribbean Studies* 44 (1): 7–27.

Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rizvi, Uzma Z. 2017. "Decolonization as Care." In *Slow Reader: A Resource for Design Thinking and Practice*, edited by Carolyn Strauss and Ana Paula Pais, 85–95. Amsterdam: Valiz.

Roth, Lorna. 2009. "Looking at Shirley, the Ultimate Norm: Colour Balance, Image Technologies, and Cognitive Equity." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 34 (1): 111–136.

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The Portable Flush Toilet: From Camping Accessory to Protest Totem

Nadine Botha

Nadine Botha is an independent
design researcher and curator, who
completed her Masters at Design
Academy Eindhoven in 2017.
nadine.botha@gmail.com

Check for updates

ABSTRACT   In Cape Town, the sanitation shortage
has become politicized through the ongoing protests
and legal advocacy known as the toilet wars. Portable
flush toilets (PFT), originally designed for the leisure
market in the 1960s but now touted as an urban infra-
structure solution by the Cape Town municipality, are
central to the rallying cry for safe, dignified, and ade-
quate sanitation. By comparing the origins of the full
flush toilet (FFT) and how it has designed people's be-
havior and beliefs since colonialism, the paper argues
that a toilet has come to represent the humanizing
rights to privacy, dignity, safety, legitimation, inclusion,
and health, which a PFT cannot offer. Tracing the ur-
ban design of Cape Town back to nineteenth-century
sanitation policy, this paper shows how violation of
these rights is built into the city's urban planning and
infrastructure. This urban system, which relies on cer-
tain humans being classified as expedient, continues
to be replicated to this day through neoliberal urban
policy. The PFT has become a powerful totem of pow-

er relations, and is used by protestors, students, artists, and satirists to bring the unseen outskirts of Cape Town to the center of public discourse.

Thirty-year-old Nombathembu Seplani has lived in Cape Town her entire life. She has not once owned a private full flush toilet (FFT), nor resided within 20 meters of a public full flush toilet. The area of Khayelitsha where she is based is classified as an informal settlement although it has existed since before South Africa's first democratic elections in 1994. Since 2005 she has used a portable flush toilet (PFT) – known colloquially as *porta portas* or *laptops* – given to her by the municipality as a temporary measure, before which she used a nearby open field (Seplani 2016). She is one of the complainants in a class-action suit against the City of Cape Town municipality for discriminatory practices making adequate sanitation inaccessible to her because of race and socioeconomic class (Mlungwana 2016). This is not the first time the suitcase-sized luggable toilet (Figure 1) designed for the US leisure and camping market in the 1960s has been politicized.

In 2015, Chumani Maxwele emptied the contents of a portable flush toilet waste tank on the statue of Cecil John Rhodes in front of the University of Cape Town, sparking the global #Rhodesmustfall movement. The anonymous guerrilla group Tokolos Stencil Collective dropped a used PFT at two creative industries events during Cape Town's World Design Capital (WDC) 2014 program. Members of the Ses'khona People's Rights Movement have been throwing the feces from PFT waste tanks at the mayor's vehicle, the airport, and government offices since 2013, earning their appellation "the poo protestors." These, and other sanitation-related resistance and demonstrations that continue in Cape Town, have come to be known as the toilet wars.

Figure 1
Portable flush toilet, Khayelitsha Site C, Cape Town, 2017. Photo: Yoel Meranda.

This paper will consider how, through the toilet wars, the otherwise overlooked PFT has acquired a new use, function, and meaning by social, legal, political, and cultural design. It considers how the FFT has designed people's behavior and beliefs since colonialism. These beliefs, which have been embedded in Cape Town's urban design and infrastructure, partially explain how the shortcomings of the PFT have become so incendiary. Applying a design lens to these politicized events makes visible the perpetuation of otherwise unseen systems of infrastructure, and exposes how socio-spatial apartheid persists through urban design legacies. By centering activism around the PFT, activists have shifted focus from inadequate service delivery by the state, to the human rights injustices perpetuated by the state for as long as it continues to function using Apartheid logic and insufficient infrastructure.

My own interest in the PFT developed through my work as a design journalist and project manager. The complexities of the toilet wars first caught my attention when Cape Town's WDC 2014 program announced its intentions to address the city's sanitation shortage. As a privileged white South African, I have not experienced Apartheid's dehumanization, nor am I claiming to speak on behalf of anyone other than myself as a design scholar. By focusing on the PFT's manifestation and representation in the public sphere, my intention is to advance the efforts of individuals and organizations whose voices are represented in this paper through affidavits and personal interviews. As a design scholar, I hope to speak to design professionals who have for too long considered the global sanitation shortage (which affects over one third of the planet's population) from a purely technical perspective in high-profile initiatives such as the UN's Toilet Day and the Bill and Melinda Gates Toilet Challenge, without considering the political systems that create these conditions. Evaluating or proposing sanitation solutions and toilet alternatives are not within this paper's scope. Rather, the paper is about the PFT, and how its reception and use in the specific context of Cape Town highlights what is missing from a purely technical response to sanitation. The PFT in and of itself is neither framed as a problem to be solved, nor a design to be improved. The problem is the lack of dignifying infrastructure and meaningful post-Apartheid redress. The PFT facilitates the ongoing production of dispensable lives, on which basis the Cape Colony was founded, and it reveals the maintenance of beliefs and behaviors used to validate this production.

The paper is divided into three sections: the material conditions and desires embedded in the toilet that design people's behavior and beliefs; the spatial dimension of sanitation on an urban and political scale; and how these meanings accumulated by the PFT make it a useful totem in the postcolonial state.

The Design Ontology of the PFT

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa "has as its primary objective the protection and the restoration of human dignity; it means

simply that human beings be treated as human beings," ruled Judge Nathan Erasmus in the Western Cape High Court on April 29, 2011, stating that providing unenclosed toilets is in violation of constitutional rights (Erasmus 2011). Cape Town residents had sued the municipality for providing toilets without any walls or roof. The landmark ruling was the first time sanitation's role in the human right to dignity had been tested in a South African court of law. This emphasis on human dignity is significant in relation to the PFT.

This section considers how an object can imbue a subject with human status, and whether the PFT is such an object. It will use the significance of modern waterborne sanitation and the argument that the FFT has become the condition of the modern subject – or "human being" – to consider the ontology of the PFT. The human rights evaluated – discrimination, dignity, bodily and psychological integrity, privacy, health, sufficient water – are drawn from the Social Justice Coalition (SJC) sanitation case filed in 2016 and described in the paper's opening paragraph.

The rectilinear PFT measures roughly 40 × 30 × 40 cm, dependent on make and model. It consists of two interlocking tanks. The top tank contains the flush water and is molded with a recessed toilet bowl. The seat, lid, and flush mechanism are detachable. The lower, waste-holding tank clips onto the top tank. Connecting the two is a sliding trapdoor, which is opened before using the toilet bowl but otherwise closed. The waste-holding tank has a screw-top opening for pouring out the waste and an air valve can be released to facilitate emptying. Seals prevent smells and liquids from leaking.

The first patent for a PFT constituting two interlocking tanks was filed by Thetford Corporation of Ann Arbor, Michigan, US, in 1969 and granted by the US Government in 1976. At the time, Thetford filed patents for numerous other plastic-molded portable toilet typologies, however it is only this two-tank model, trademarked "Porta Potti," that endures among customers and is emulated by competitors. The customers, as self-identified on Amazon reviews and online forums, are recreational vehicle (RV) and truck drivers, campers, boaters, toilet training toddlers, people who are physically impaired, house renovators, 4x4 safari trekkers, and catastrophe preppers.

Nowhere in the publicity material of Thetford or Fiamma, the two brands used in Cape Town, is there any mention of bulk sales to municipalities or humanitarian organizations, though there is reference to their usefulness for personal emergency preparation. The PFT itself is also absent from academic and critical scholarship around sanitation, as well as mass-market toilet history publications – even though considerable scholarship has been generated around the toilet wars, most significantly by Steven Robins (2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Redfield and Robins 2016, 436–472).

In contrast to the glowing Amazon reviews of the Thetford and Fiamma PFTs, users in Cape Town's townships and informal settlements express their dissatisfaction with a product that leaks, stinks, and causes infections, by means of Youtube videos, SJC affidavits,

news reports, and social research surveys. That leisure camping equipment is not designed to endure regular daily use by large families, as is the case in Cape Town where people have been using the same PFT since 2005, is obvious. Just as many of the informal settlements in Cape Town that are more than twenty years old, are still classified as temporary, so too has the "temporary" measure of distributing the PFT become permanent. This perpetual temporary status allows the municipality to continue to defer taking responsibility for perpetuating Apartheid-era living conditions.

The most telling difference between the Cape Town users and the leisure users is access to an alternative private FFT. For leisure users with a FFT, using the PFT is a question of recreational convenience. The transgressions from social standards are part of the leisure activity, and users have access to suitable disposal locations, running water, and cleaning chemicals that enable self-maintenance and emptying. For Cape Town users without an FFT, using the PFT is still a choice. For example, Nosiphelele Msesiwe, who filed a supporting affidavit in the Social Justice Coalition Case, stopped using the PFT after three years because of privacy issues in her one-room house (Msesiwe 2016). However, for many it is a spurious choice, when the alternatives entail walking up to 200 meters to a communal public toilet that may or may not be functional, locked, or require fetching water for flushing; and leaving the house directly compromises personal safety.

Furthermore, in areas where there are no sewerage pipes, with only chemical toilets for communal use, emptying and self-maintaining the PFT in a way that prevents human contact with excreta is impossible. The UN defines "basic sanitation" as "facilities that ensure hygienic separation of human excreta from human contact" (United Nations 2013). Separating humans from their excreta has arguably been the world's biggest innovation in health, and "costs less than most other interventions, which is why toilets are regularly referred to by NGOs as 'the cheapest vaccine' or 'the cheapest medicine'" (Penner 2014, 3289). Suitable plumbing also prevents contamination of ground- and freshwater sources, ensuring the health of the environment. More than just sanitation is at stake, however.

For decolonial anthropologist Arturo Escobar (2012, 35), "every tool and technology is ontological in the sense that, however humbly or minutely, it inaugurates a set of rituals, ways of doing, and modes of being." The regulation of bodily functions has been an especially powerful tool for inclusion and exclusion. The continued demand for waterborne sanitation – often regarded as "Britain's greatest invention" – is evidence of the insidious nature of what political scientist Parker Thomas Moon called the "sanitary imperialism" of colonialism (Penner 2014, 339). Expanding on this point, Barbara Penner (2014) argues in her book, *Bathroom*, that the FFT constitutes both the object and the system, or what Escobar would term the tool and the technology. The technology or system requires water and pipes, both of which require residential legitimation, site allocation, and urban planning, to install in informal settlements.

Positioning the FFT within the broader discourse around the politics of infrastructure, Penner (2014, 129) writes that flushing a toilet "plugs us into a 'hard' network of pipes and plants [and] also plugs us into a 'soft' network made up of social attitudes and beliefs." The bodily and psychological integrity of the modern civilized subject is established by the "disconnect" from defecation being "plumbed into the developed world's water networks" (Penner 2014, 83). A private toilet allows us to perform the uncivilized act out of sight, as well as disappearing the excreta or indignant evidence that we might not be human subjects – "flush and forget" (Penner 2014, 84). The private self-regulating individual as supported by the state infrastructure has led to "the interiorization of sanitation and bodily waste as fundamental to individual well-being and to the broader project of societal improvement" (Chalfin 2014, 93).

South African poet Rustum Kozain (2013) expands this notion of the human subject's disconnect between body and waste to the racial disconnect on an urban and national scale, when he asks, "What does it mean to treat humans as shit, when we turn human beings themselves into the abject, into the thing that needs to be expelled?" Kozain goes on to trace the origins of treating humans as expedient to the "cattle class" of the Atlantic slave trade in which human beings were shipped as cargo, living in their own excrement for weeks at sea, and serving to distance the other from the European master. This racializing disconnect embedded in Cape Town's urban design will be further considered in the next section.

Reverting to the PFT, the Cape Town users' lack of sewage systems means that one to three times a week a janitorial service must collect full waste tanks, which stand piled up on the side of the road, and deliver empty waste tanks. Given the manufacturer's advice of emptying a PFT every two days per four users, and up to two families per PFT in Cape Town, the irregular weekly janitorial service is hardly sufficient. Overfull waste tanks are heavy and messy to carry. There are also frequent disruptions in these services because of inadequate protective gear and health inoculations for janitors, thereby preventing them from working due to health regulations. Because the municipality has tendered these services to private contractors, complaints are deferred to the contractors who are not accountable to public citizens, as Faranak Miraftab (2004b) notes in her paper on privatized waste removal services in Khayelitsha. Janitors have also gone on strike and instigated poo protests because of temporary contracts and limited working hours resulting in incomes below the minimum wage. Not even the minimum wage seems adequate for this job – for fear of humiliation, many janitors lie about their jobs to their family (Damba-Hendrik 2015).

Because the PFTs do not flush into the validating social system represented by the infrastructure of the sewer, they can come to resemble fancier versions of the Apartheid-era black-bucket system, which entailed massive buckets with seats in communal concrete shelters (see Taing et al. 2013). The PFT can offer some degree of privacy but, because of the smell, maggots, and flies, most users do not like having

it inside their home (Bebi 2016). Many cannot afford to build an outside shelter, and so use their PFT in full view of neighbors and passers-by (Seplani 2016).

Portable toilets have also played their own role in the history of racial discrimination. In the 1930s US, African Americans "regularly carried buckets or portable toilets in their car trunks because service station bathrooms and roadside rest areas were usually closed to them" (Sugrue n.d.). In the way that portable toilets erased the bodily needs of African Americans, so too does the PFT in Cape Town offer only conditional solace. While making it possible to do ablutions without leaving the safety of the home, the PFT does not offer privacy or dignity within one's own home, nor does it offer legitimizing flushing into the socializing system. The PFT does not have the ontological properties to confer the subject with humanizing rights to dignity, bodily and psychological integrity, privacy, health, and sufficient water. It is, simply, a potty; like many camping accessories, a diminutive toy-like version of permanent home fixtures.

The PFT takes on the System

In May 2008, a wave of xenophobic riots swept through South Africa. In Cape Town, a loose working group of civic organizations – later to become known as the Social Justice Coalition (SJC) – came together to investigate the underlying cause of the violence. It was clear that the extreme social and economic disparities that had increased in the fourteen years since the country's first democratic elections were driving people to desperate measures. Less obvious was the exacerbating condition: a lack of private toilets, and insufficient and unmaintained public toilets that made women, children, foreigners, and LGBTI in particular vulnerable to attack when they left their homes to heed the call of nature (Overy 2013). This is how in Cape Town the toilet came to represent not only intersectional inequalities, but interlinking systems of urban design.

The formation of the SJC is not typically regarded as part of the toilet wars. But the significance of the toilet as representing questions of safety and economic desperation is crucial to understanding them. In truth, sanitation-motivated political action in Cape Town is as old as the colony itself. This section will consider the "politics of shit" – a phrase used by Arjun Appadurai (2001, 37) and around which a growing body of scholarship has emerged in recent years – in a city whose very design can be traced back to sanitation policy. The fight for dignified toilets thus speaks both symbolically and practically to decolonizing the system.

For South Africa-based, Cameroonian philosopher Achille Mbembe, the post-colony is by nature excremental. His aesthetics of vulgarity builds from colonialism being "to a large extent about disciplining bodies with the aim of making better use of them" (Mbembe 2015, 113). In the post-colony, bodily transgression – such as the sexual and fecal obscene – becomes "a modality of power" used by both the regime

and dominated to ridicule each other (Mbembe 2015, 133). Rather than the typical binary hierarchy between dominator and dominated, Mbembe argues that the power relations in the post-colony are far more convivial and fluid.

The practice of using a lack of sanitation to racialize and discriminate against people in Cape Town dates back to Cecil John Rhodes' rule of the Cape Colony in the nineteenth century. The city had already witnessed its first toilet wars in the 1870s during an election standoff between the British and the Afrikaners, characterized by the media as the "Clean Party" and "Dirty Party" (Miraftab 2012, 289). Historian Maynard Swanson (1977, 400) coined the phrase the "sanitation syndrome" to describe how the fears of infectious disease and of the other were conflated in turn-of-the-twentieth-century Cape Town, classifying certain people, by race and gender, as out of place. This urban segregation based on sanitation was nationalized by the country's 1919 Public Health Act and 1920 Housing Act, forming the seedbed for the Apartheid-era urban design that was codified in the notorious Group Areas Act of 1950.

The inadvertent result was that those who refused to move to the townships built by the government for the purposes of segregation, formed informal settlements on the urban outskirts. Almost a quarter-century after the first democratic elections in South Africa in 1994, this ghetto-based urban design strategy not only persists but continues to be replicated. So-called "temporary relocation camps" of corrugated iron huts with insufficient sanitation, and no access to public transport, schools, or hospitals – even surrounded by barbed wire fences – continue to be built to this day.

Using the PFT in protests brings these unseen and unacknowledged urban fringes of Cape Town from the physical periphery to the center of both the city and public discourse. While the PFT's design does not match up to the ontology of a FFT, its detachable waste-holding tank is notably useful for transporting feces from these outskirts of Cape Town. As one Ses'khona poo protestor states: "[We said] no more should protest happen in the township, but in the CBD – it is that place that brought this legacy" (Mcfarlane and Silver 2016, 7).

Shortly after the first poo protests in 2013, when Cape Town announced its intentions to use the WDC 2014 program to redress the socio-spatial divides in the city, the SJC was called in to lead the toilet program. By collaborating with design industry bodies and NGOs, a series of design hackathons were planned in which community members, specialists, and designers would spend 24 hours brainstorming a solution. However, after the municipality decided to run WDC 2014 as an internal initiative, the SJC pulled out citing the questionable power relations of participatory design processes. As then-director Gavin Silber (2012) wrote, "the City has too much vested in promoting its own way of doing things to the exclusion of critics." This illustrates Faranak Miraftab's (2004a, 1) argument that Cape Town's neoliberal governance has co-opted the once "subversive, emancipatory tools of activists," namely "community participation, empowerment and social capital," to

become an ideological apparatus to facilitate "symbolic inclusion" and "material exclusion."

Richard Perez, who was appointed as embedded designer in the municipality during WDC 2014, says his team wanted to tackle toilets but were warned against it because it was too hot a political topic (Skype interview with author, October 31, 2016). With design thinking projects, there needs to be room for failure and experimentation, which was not tolerable in an election year. As the SJC also intimates with their oft-stated intentions to stop at nothing until every single resident of Cape Town has a private in-house FFT, on a more fundamental level the very notion of "hacking" together a solution needs to be interrogated. It is not appropriate to experiment with the basic living conditions of people who do not volunteer to be test subjects, especially when a failed experiment might be considered the end of a project.

The SJC have been criticized for their reluctance to compromise on their demands and "get the community to cooperate" (Sonnenberg 2015). Drawing from Rosalba Icaza and Rolando Vazquez's (2013, 683–684) argument that decolonial social struggles are epistemic struggles that "cannot be adequately understood through the same rationality that underlies the processes that they are breaking with," it is not in the SJC's interests to become the extended community arm of the municipality. "These are activisms that fight for dignified life-worlds," they write, "which act autonomously from the major institutional framework of modernity: the state and the market." In resisting the perpetuation of Cape Town's neoliberal policies that define some humans as expedient and needing only a PFT, the SJC's demands for a dignified FFT for everyone can only be met with a redesign of the urban and political system.

Sanitation, after all, is but one of the SJC's campaigns. The organization also campaigns for the rights of informal settlement residents to have access to an effective police and criminal justice system, and a fair and transparent municipal budget. The work further dovetails with sister organization Ndifuna Ukwazi (NU), which actively targets urban land justice and the municipality's lack of central city social housing. Instead of poo protests, which the SJC thinks is an infringement on other people's rights and only gets short-lived media attention, they have mastered the art of pushing the municipality's reactionary buttons with social audits on sanitation, the janitorial service, and security; mass resident submissions to the municipal budget; and peaceful poo-free protests. "It is not for us to come up with the solutions," said then-head of the local government program at the SJC, Axolile Notywala (Skype interview with author, November 9, 2016). Notywala argued that it was the municipality's responsibility because they have the experts. After all, it is a city that proclaims to be WDC 2014, yet continues to perpetuate Apartheid-style urban design.

It is particularly through the SJC's demand for FFTs being part of a bigger demand for safety and dignity that it becomes clear that the toilet wars in Cape Town are about far more than sanitation and that sanitation is not just toilets. Rather, sanitation is the root and signi-

fier of perpetuated spatial Apartheid, and a neoliberal infrastructure that depends on the ability to sweep away and disenfranchise certain humans. Undoing Cape Town's sanitation syndrome is not a technical equation of users, feces, grid, and budget, but a historical narrative about human beings, dignity, spatial justice, and inclusion. The toilet wars should thus be understood as an epistemic challenge to the dominant narrative perpetuated by Cape Town's political infrastructure.

The PFT as a Totem

On November 6, 2014, when the Tokolos Stencil Collective dropped off soiled PFTs at two prominent cultural locations in Cape Town, they had already established themselves as critics of urban design and the WDC 2014. This section will argue that the PFT has become a totem of the post-colony, as can be seen through its use by Tokolos and #Rhodesmustfall.

In the post-colony, writes Mbembe (2015, 103), colonial authority "seeks to institutionalize itself, to achieve legitimation and hegemony … in the form of a *fetish*" (original emphasis). Mbembe stipulates that he uses "fetish" in the African sense as an object that aspires for power, and argues that grotesque and obscene fetishes, talismans, and totems – terms that he uses interchangeably – are instruments for both the state and the citizen to ridicule each other. This two-way modality of ridicule, and the presence of the grotesque and obscene, are identifying characteristics of "postcolonial regimes of domination" (Mbembe 2015, 103). When a vulgar totem, such as an anus, or in this case a soiled PFT "that acts as a double to power is no longer protected by taboo; there is a breach in the wall of prohibitions" (Mbembe 2015, 112).

Indeed, Tokolos breached prohibitions by dropping a PFT at the Brundyn+ Gallery, which had invited the anonymous collective to participate in a group exhibition of artists who used informal urban interventions as a medium or subject of their art. Tokolos agreed to participate and made a sanctioned installation, but on the opening night also dropped the stinky PFT along with a slip of paper reading, "There are none as invisible as those who wish merely to be seen." For Tokolos, the PFT and its smell was "actual poverty instead of merely representations of that poverty" (Gedye 2014). The group sought to highlight the hypocrisy of an elitist art institution championing political engagement from within the comfort of its own building.

Then Tokolos placed a second soiled PFT at Church Square during Open City, a tactical urbanism placemaking event hosted by the Cape Town Partnership (CTP) during the monthly First Thursdays initiative when galleries and cultural organizations stay open late, inviting pedestrian exploration of the CBD. Open City was promoted as a platform where anyone could participate in placemaking, and it had gathered a small but dedicated following. The Tokolos PFT presented a dilemma for the organizer. If the PFT was removed, it would be going against the initiative's ethos, but the food trucks that had to be begged every

month to park on the quieter periphery of the First Thursdays mob threatened to leave because of the smell. Finally, a private security guard neutralized the smell with a chemical.

The Church Square PFT nevertheless highlighted the invisible infrastructures of power: the trendy food trucks representing the commercial interests and the security guard representing the conditional access to public space. Placing the PFT at an event by CTP, the organization that had won the successful WDC 2014 bid, stressed the CTP's complicity in pandering to these interests, and its historical role in shaping the neoliberal urban space of post-Apartheid Cape Town.

"There is a common goal," writes art theorist Luis Camnitzer (2014, 252), between the urban guerrilla and the traditional artist "to communicate a message and at the same time to change with the process the conditions in which the public finds itself." The difference is that the urban guerrilla creates a situation in which the public has no choice but to participate. The urban guerrilla also defies traditional art's "aesthetic of balance" that makes the observer passive and other to the subject Camnitzer (2014, 261). "The aesthetics of imbalance, the one that affects structures, that demands full participation or full rejection, does not allow for the comfort of alienation," Camnitzer (2014, 266) writes. This is echoed in Tokolos Stencil Colletive's (2014) statement about the PFTs: "Real art makes those with privilege feel awkward and self-conscious."

"This poo that we are throwing on the statue represents the shame of black people. By throwing it on the statue we are throwing our shame to whites' affluence," explained Chumani Maxwele after he used a PFT to douse the statue of Cecil John Rhodes in front of the University of Cape Town with feces on March 9, 2015. The incident sparked the #Rhodesmustfall student protests, which later spread to Oxford University in the UK, and have evolved into ongoing student protests in South Africa. The #Rhodesmustfall protests were not simply about dismantling a statue of a notorious British imperialist, but also the embedded racism and Eurocentricity of the higher education system globalized by British colonialism. Academia is one of the most powerful political technologies of modernity, in that it has designed our minds.

Using the grotesque PFT to deface these fetishes of privilege – the art gallery, the public square, and the Rhodes statue – "the fetish, seen for the sham it is, is made to lose its might and becomes a mere artefact" (Mbembe 2015, 108). By aspiring to this power, the PFT itself becomes a fetish or totem that has also become widely used by satirical puppet shows and cartoons. This fluidity of meaning is explained by Mbembe (2015, 108):

> Conflict arises from the fact that the postcolony is chaotically pluralistic, and that it is in practice impossible to create a single, permanently stable system out of all the signs, images, and markers current in the postcolony; this is why they are constantly being shaped and reshaped, as much by the rulers as the ruled, in attempts to rewrite the mythologies of power.

Leader of the Oxford #Rhodesmustfall movement, Sizwe Mpofu-Walsh, describes totemic activism as being "when you take a totem and strike it into the heart of the entire system. Then you realise that if you want to remove the symbol, you have to remove the system." Speaking during a conference about what decolonizing higher education in South Africa might mean, he observed how #Rhodesmustfall "collapsed all of those debates into a single system and then fought behind the system" – as captured by filmmaker Aryan Kaganof in *Metalepsis In Black* (2016).

Just as #Rhodesmustfall is about academic justice not just a statue, the toilet wars are about spatial justice not just sanitation. In both cases the PFT signifies the inclusion and exclusion, visibility and invisibility, public and private, dignity and shame, power and powerlessness, and clean and dirty, that manifest in the urban, social, and education systems of Cape Town. Removing the PFT would be impossible without removing the system of Cape Town, which functions using exclusion and invisibility. What makes the PFT such a potent totem is that, as Tokolos points out, it is "actual poverty" (Gedye 2014) not just a signifier. Its vulgarity ridicules state power in the post-colony.

In sum, this paper has considered the toilet wars and sanitation syndrome of Cape Town through the lens of the PFT, an object that has come to play a central role in the toilet wars but that previous research has not yet examined in and of itself. By charting the evolution of the PFT from benign leisure camping accessory to abject object and protest totem, it has been shown that sanitation is not only an engineering issue, but a question of legal, cultural, social, and political design.

As an object, the PFT has served a vital role in bending space-time to bring the reality of the unseen outskirts of Cape Town into full view. The portable and hermetic waste-holding tank makes it a potent symbolic and pragmatic protest object to represent causes – including both colonial sanitation, urban design, and education – that cannot simply be solved by replacing it with another object. In this manner, it has become a totem of the post-colony, speaking ridicule to power.

Disclosure Statement
No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

ORCID
Nadine Botha http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9447-2700

References
Appadurai, Arjun. 2001. "Deep Democracy: Urban Governmentality and the Horizon of Politics." *Environment & Urbanization* 13 (2): 23–44. http://www.ucl.ac.uk/dpu-projects/drivers_urb_change/urb_governance/pdf_democ_empower/IIED_appadurai_demo.pdf

Bebi, Lindela. 2016. *Supporting Affidavit, in The Social Justice Coalition and Others vs City of Cape Town*. https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/socialjusticecoalition/pages/225/attachments/original/1504553726/11._Annexure_PM6_-_Supporting_affidavit_of_the_Third_Applicant_%28224-229%29.pdf?1504553726

Camnitzer, Luis. 2014. "Contemporary Colonial Art (1969)." In *On Art, Artists, Latin America, and Other Utopias*, edited by Rachel Weiss, 169–267. Austin: University of Texas Press. Kindle.

Chalfin, Brenda. 2014. "Public Things, Excremental Politics, and the Infrastructure of Bare Life in Ghana's City of Tema." *American Ethnologist* 1 (1): 92–109.

Damba-Hendrik, Nombulelo. 2015. "It's no one's dream to clean bucket toilets." *Groundup*, July 31. http://www.groundup.org.za/article/its-no-ones-dream-clean-bucket-toilets_3171/

Erasmus, Nathan. 2011. *Ruling, in Beja and Others v Premier of the Western Cape and Others (21332/10)*. Southern Africa Legal Information Institute. https://www.escr-net.org/sites/default/files/case-law/full_decision_0.pdf.

Escobar, Arturo. 2012. "Notes on the Ontology of Design." In *Seminar on the Comparative Study of Cultures at University of California, David*, edited by John E. Sawyer. http://sawyerseminar.ucdavis.edu/files/2012/12/ESCOBAR_Notes-on-the-Ontology-of-Design-Parts-I-II-_-III.pdf

Gedye, Lloyd. 2014. "Fight the Power." *The Con*, November 28. http://www.theconmag.co.za/2014/11/28/fight-the-power.

Icaza, Rosalba, and Rolando Vázquez. 2013. "Social Struggles as Epistemic Struggles." *Development and Change* 44 (3): 683–704. doi:10.1111/dech.12039.

Kozain, Rustum. 2013. "A Brief History of Throwing Shit," *The Chronic*, December. http://chimurengachronic.co.za/shit-throwing

Mbembe, Achille. 2015. *On the Postcolony*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Mcfarlane, Colin, and Jonathan Silver. 2016. "The Poolitical City: 'Seeing Sanitation' and Making the Urban Political in Cape Town." *Antipode* 49 (1): 125–148. doi:10.1111/anti.12264.

Miraftab, Faranak. 2004a. "Making Neo-Liberal Governance: The Disempowering Work of Empowerment." *International Planning Studies* 9 (4): 239–259. doi:10.1080/13563470500050130.

Miraftab, Faranak. 2004b. "Neoliberalism and Casualization of Public Sector Services: The Case of Waste Collection Services in Cape Town, South Africa." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28 (4): 874–892. doi:10.1111/j.0309-1317.2004.00557.x.

Miraftab, Faranak. 2012. "Colonial Present: Legacies of the Past in Contemporary Urban Practices in Cape Town." *Journal of Planning History* 11 (4): 283–307. doi:10.1177/1538513212447924.

Mlungwana, Phumeza. 2016. *Notice of Motion and Founding Affidavit, in The Social Justice Coalition and Others vs City of Cape Town*. http://nu.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/sjc_v_cityofct_WCC17067_16NOMFA.pdf

Msesiwe, Nosiphelele. 2016. *Supporting Affidavit, in The Social Justice Coalition and Others vs City of Cape Town*. http://nu.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/PM7.pdf

Overy, Neil. 2013. "The Social Justice Coalition and Access to Basic Sanitation in Informal Settlements in Cape Town, South Africa." *International Budget Partnership: From Analysis to Impact, Study No. 11*. March. https://www.internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/LP-case-study-SJC1.pdf

Penner, Barbara. 2014. *Bathroom*. London: Reaktion Books. Kindle.

Redfield, Peter, and Steven Robins. 2016. "Toilets for Africa: Humanitarian Design Meets Sanitation Activism in Khayelitsha, Cape Town." In *World Anthropologies in Practice: Situated Perspectives, Global Knowledge*, edited by John Gledhill, 436–472. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Robins, Steven. 2014a. "Poo Wars as Matter Out of Place: 'Toilets for Africa' in Cape Town." *Anthropology Today* 30 (1): 1–3. doi:10.1111/1467-8322.12081.

Robins, Steven. 2014b. "Slow Activism in Fast Times: Reflections on the Politics of Media Spectacles after Apartheid." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 40 (1): 91–110. doi:10.1080/03057070.2014.889517.

Robins, Steven. 2014c. "The 2011 Toilet Wars in South Africa: Justice and Transition between the Exceptional and the Everyday after Apartheid." In *Transition and Justice: Negotiating the Terms of New Beginnings in Africa*, edited by Gerhard Anders and Olaf Zenker, 85–111. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons. doi:10.1002/9781118944745.ch5.

Seplani, Nobathembu. 2016. *Supporting Affidavit, in The Social Justice Coalition and Others vs City of Cape Town*. http://nu.org.za/law-centre/#1460396155691-5b824c44-26 cd.

Silber, Gavin. 2012. "Cape Town: How Good Design Could Help the Poor." *Politics Web*, February 21. http://www.politicsweb.co.za/news-and-analysis/cape-town-how-good-design-could-help-the-poor

Sonnenberg, Ernst. 2015. Transcript of Cape Talk Interview. May 27. http://nu.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/PM12.pdf

Sugrue, Thomas J. n.d. "Driving While Black: The Car and Race Relations in Modern America." *Automobile in American Life and Society*. Accessed 18 December 2017. http://www.autolife.umd.umich.edu/Race/R_Casestudy/R_Casestudy.htm

Swanson, Maynard W. 1977. "The Sanitation Syndrome: Bubonic Plague and Urban Native Policy in the Cape Colony, 1900–1909." *The Journal of African History* 18 (3): 387–410. doi:10.1017/s0021853700027328.

Taing, Lina, Neil Armitage, Nangolo Ashipala, and Andrew Spiegel. 2013. "TIPS for Sewering Informal Settlements: Technology, Institutions, People and Services," report to Water Research Commission, K5/1827. http://www.academia.edu/8917403/TIPS_for_sewering_informal_settlements_Technology_Institutions_People_and_Services

Tokolos Stencil Collective. 2014. "Sticking Art to Privilege." *The Con*, November 14. http://www.theconmag.co.za/2014/11/14/real-art-makes-the-privileged-uncomfortable/

United Nations. 2013. *International Decade for Action 'water for life' 2005–2015*. Accessed 21 February 2017. http://www.un.org/waterforlifedecade/sanitation.shtml

ROUTLEDGE
Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Designing in Real-Time: An Introduction to Weapons Design in the Settler-Colonial Present of Palestine

Ali H. Musleh

Ali H. Musleh is a PhD student at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa. He teaches Political Design and Futuristics in the Department of Political Science at UHM. His research is focused on the automation of settler colonialism in Palestine.
amusleh@hawaii.edu

Check for updates

ABSTRACT   Israel is one of the world's ten biggest exporters of weapons. Its military industry promotes rapid iterative design and real-time testing in the occupied territories as national capabilities ensuring the survival of the state and its status as a laboratory for innovating cutting-edge, battle-proven weapons for the future battlefield. This essay shows how weapons design is deployed in the theaters of military occupation in Palestine. It traces how design practices, national narratives, and ideology are entwined to produce and sustain the world of permanent war in which the Israeli military industry operates. In the process, I show how Israeli designers and design practices inhabit Zionism's universe of reference and draw on its folk ontologies to produce individual and collective settler subjectivity. My aim is to provide an introductory map to weapons design as a feature of the

Design and Culture

33

settler-colonial present of Palestine and emphasize the role of design practice in organizing and shaping the ongoing nature of settler colonization in the age of neoliberal globalization.

KEYWORDS: weapons design, settler colonialism, ideology, laboratory, military industry, neoliberalism

War Entrepreneurs

> We [Israelis] are world champions of occupation, and we've brought it to an art form. –Gadi Shamni[1]
> If Israel sells weapons they've been tested, tried out. –Binyamin Ben-Eliezer[2]

Disaster Capitalism and Destroying to Replace: Positioning the Israeli Military Industry

Israel is the world's single largest exporter of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) and is in control of about 70 percent of that global market (Gordon 2009, 33). In 2013, aerial drone sales accounted for 10 percent of Israel's total military exports (Frost and Sullivan 2013). Since then, this percentage has grown exponentially with more than forty-five military drones in development (O'Gorman and Abbott 2013, 82) and forty Israeli start-ups entering the drone market, with the overwhelming majority of them launching in the last four to five years (Leitersdorf, Schreiber, and Reznik 2016). The military industry designing and manufacturing these weapons holds a position among the ten biggest exporters of arms in the world with an annual export average of US$6.5 billion in the last decade (Ahronheim 2017). Comprised of 1,000 defense companies as of 2012 (Katz and Bohbot 2017, 8), this industry is one of the biggest employers in the country and is by far its largest economic sector, accounting for 25 percent of all annual exports (Denes 2011, 171). Moreover, the industry plays a leading role in the development of the country's industrial and technological capabilities, including through civilianizing military technologies and transferring know-how for nation-building in other sectors. To have this vital role in the national economy and strategic position within the Israeli state system, the military industry is based on an outward-oriented industrialization model with more than 80 percent of weapons production geared for export (Denes 2011, 171).

The Israeli military-security industry is one of the biggest benefactors from the state's strategic investment in the political failure of the peace process. As Naomi Klein (2008, 428) shows in *The Shock Doctrine*, this industry has been at the center of the Israeli nation-building project to craft an economy that thrives on permanent war and the models

and techniques of military occupation Israel has been practicing on Palestinian land for decades. This has turned the occupied territories into "laboratories where the terrifying tools of our security states are being field-tested," Klein (2007) adds. To David Lloyd and the late Patrick Wolfe (Lloyd and Wolfe 2015, 116), this project has made Israel function as "a program for contemporary state form … [that] highlights the continuities between the logics of settler colonialism and those of the neoliberal state globally." Indeed, Israel today is a fusion of disaster capitalism (Klein 2008) and a project that "destroys to replace" an Indigenous people to realize a Jewish nation-state in Palestine (Wolfe 2006, 388). This combination has intensified the ongoing *Nakba* (catastrophe) for Palestinians and exposed them to the volatility and instability of the neoliberal globalization of settler economies of violence. The Israeli military-industrial complex takes this instability as its natural condition due to the state's strategic decision to make weapons export success "a necessary condition for the continued existence of the entire system" (Hania 2016, 46). This export reliance has exacerbated anxieties around the strategic role of the military industry – which is to secure the state's sovereignty – and extended them to settler-colonial anxieties around the continued existence of the Israeli state.[3] As Brian Massumi (2015, 53) notes regarding the productive role of instability and the anxieties associated with it, "Faced with the specter of catastrophe, [the neoliberal economy] does not turn self-protectively inward. It fully assumes the risks of its ontogenetic outside … [and] positively embodies instability." In the Israeli case, the military-industrial complex makes this pursuit ontologically dependent on meeting Palestinian bodies in a state of total war organized as a weapons design experiment exportable to the world. Design, in the process, has become a dominant way of formulating the problems of settler colonialism. Indeed, in the existential sphere of the Israeli military industry, the settler-colonial binary of colonizer and colonized has been re-instituted in a binary of settlers as weapons designers and the Indigenous as design problems whose solutions are applicable the world over. To Israel, weapons design is nested within the settler-colonial project as a practice imbued with Zionism and inhabiting its "universe of reference" (Guattari 1995), that is, the "folk ontologies" shared by its adherents (Bryant 2006). My aim is to provide an introductory map to this practice as a feature of the "settler colonial present" of Palestine (Salamanca et al. 2012; Veracini 2015) and emphasize the role of weapons design in shaping the ongoing nature of settler colonization.

"Indigenous Industry" and Exporting the "Zionist Experience"

As Wolfe (2006, 388–390) explains, making use not only of genocide to empty territory for foreign settlement, settler colonialism is "a continuity through time" constituted and continuously re-activated through various manifestations of the "logic of elimination" which serves as settler society's "organizing principle." The Israeli military-security industry organizes its

operations at all those sites where the logic of elimination manifests in militarized and securitized forms – sites such as Gaza wherein nation-building takes shape in what Allen Feldman (2014) calls the "new forms of imagery, discourse, war, security and state right being carved out of the bent backs of Palestinian civilians." As Eyal Weizman (2007, 6) showed in *Hollow Land*, the Israeli settler-colonial structure is verticalized in its organization and "splintered into a multitude of temporary, transportable, deployable and removable border-synonyms … that shrink and expand the territory at will." This organization of space is the mass proliferation of violent frontiers for weapons design and innovation at which the Israeli military, the state's research and development infrastructure (including universities), the high-tech sector, and the arms industry converge to produce a wide spectrum of "cutting-edge" weapons systems and security devices. The result, in Achille Mbembe's (2003, 27) terms, is a "contemporary colonial occupation" – the "most accomplished form of necropower" today – furnished with the most advanced technologies of "disciplinary, biopolitical, and necropolitical" power to establish "absolute domination" over Palestinians.

In the hands of Israeli export agencies, this settler-colonial occupation is presented as a catalogue of "field-tested" and "combat-proven" products and models that, against overwhelming odds, have "evolved over three generations" of nation-building to address the "unique security requirements" of the Israeli state (IEICI 2012). Every marketing effort emphasizes how these weapons and security devices, with their "domestically developed, matured and tested capabilities" (IEICI 2012), emerge from the "Zionist experience" (Denes 2011, 173) or the "Israeli experience" (Graham 2010). Therefore, the Israeli state is not simply selling weapons but is marketing its brand of settler colonialism as an exemplar of twenty-first-century warfare. Israeli promoters of this "offering" present design as the practice of "wizards" realizing an "indigenous weapons industry" whose story is a "new layer" to the "tale of how a weak and ancient people returned to their homeland, established a state and, against all odds, not only survived but prospered" (Katz and Bohbot 2017, 26).[4] Inhabiting Zionism's universe of reference, weapons design is imbued with this narrative arc and sense of wonder as a process of becoming, conferring on it an ontological dimension. Here, weapons design is at once the outcome of the "unique" story and circumstances of Israel and the process through which this story of becoming is realized in "return." Indeed, to Israel, weapons design is a practice involved in erasing Indigenous presence from the land and indigenizing the settler. A whole arsenal of geographical and racial imaginaries, images of enemy-others, and narrative myths are brought to bear on the design process, including "research," "proto-typing," "testing," and so on, whereby these practices come to index experiences of weakness and ultimate historical triumph concordant with the Zionist story. For example, Israel boasts the fastest R&D-to-tests cycles in comparison with other military industries (Denes 2011, 179). This capability is often portrayed as a response to being uniquely imperiled whether because of being "surrounded by millions of Arabs"

or having to constantly "fight for survival" as an ontological condition of the national content of the Israeli state.[5] "Testing in real-time" (on Palestinians) is promoted as one of Israel's main "capabilities," a rapid iterative design process which simultaneously ensures "competitive advantage" in the global market and the "survival" of the settler-state.

The "Zionist experience" extends from the "unique" design capabilities of the state to its product. As Klein (2007) notes, "Israel has learned to turn endless war into a brand asset, pitching its uprooting, occupation and containment of the Palestinian people as a half-century head start in the 'global war on terror'." In this pitch, occupation is not an obstacle to peace but an accomplishment resulting from a prolonged experience of domination. The outcome, Jeff Halper (2015, 71) notes, is a model applicable to other situations all over the world: "a global Matrix of Control arising from [Israel's] occupation." For example, with the intensification of the so-called refugee problem in Europe, Israel promoted its "border wars" to keep Palestinian refugees from returning or to hold them in incarceration camps (like Gaza) as a model applicable to Europe. In these wars, Jewish Israelis are always presented as "returnees" who have been invaded by "infiltrators" and "illegal immigrants" since 1948 (see Shalhoub-Kevorkian 2015a). Israel Aerospace Industries (IAI) headed the transfer and application of Israeli homeland security models to European borders and boasted that their approach "covers everything" (Lappin 2015). These technologies and models are also moving to the United States; the Israeli companies Elbit and Magal have been contracted to build Donald Trump's wall between the US and Mexico (Ferziger 2017).

In exporting the "Zionist experience" of ethnic cleansing as "tailored operational solutions [that] ensure that you detect, locate and target terrorists, smugglers, illegal immigrants and other threats to public welfare" (Israel Aerospace Industries n.d.), Israel is aligning and reconnecting its model of enmity with economies and models of violence and exclusion throughout the world. In the process, Palestinianess is fractured into all sorts of categories intended to dismantle it while also becoming materially connected to other struggles. Meanwhile, the Israeli weapons designer is indigenized as he goes about the process of conceptualizing, prototyping, and "testing" his designs in the "field."

The New Pioneers

Weapons design is understood by the Israeli military establishment to be the vocation of the "post-exilic" Jew. This designer combines Theodor Herzl's science and modernity with what Menachem Begin (2007, xxv) described in his terrorist memoir as "a specimen completely unknown to the world for over eighteen hundred years, 'the Fighting Jew'." Most of the designers and innovators behind the industry's catalog of weaponry are or were themselves in military uniform conducting operations in the West Bank, Gaza, and beyond. Whether they be engineers, entrepreneurs, or university students and professors, they

are presented by the Israeli Ministry of Defense as "a skilled and militarily experienced multi-disciplinary workforce" designing the "pioneering, operationally-proven" weapons of the Israeli military industry (SIBAT 2011). Embodying the fusion of soldiering (the "conquest of defense") and pioneering (the "conquest of labor") has always been seen as the preserve of the ideal Zionist type, the "New Man" who, with "a weapon in one hand and a tool in the other," would conquer the land and build settlements in the frontier (Neumann 2011). In the era of "High-tech Zionism" however (Kuntsman and Stein 2015, 9), this figure is embodied in the weapons designer and the security entrepreneur as the "New Pioneers" who turn "swords into silicon chips," according to Benjamin Netanyahu (Stockmarr 2015), to build a militarized "start-up nation" (Senor and Singer 2011) and, as Katherine Natanel (2016, 27) has put it, "fulfill the masculinized role of protection, ensuring collective safety in ways perhaps now more expedient than hand-to-hand combat."

Weapons design occupies a place in the symbolic and material life of Zionism in Palestine wherein, in the words of those crafting the brand image of this industry, "innovation and technology are the twenty-first-century version of going back to the land" (Senor and Singer 2011, 228). In this universe of reference, the "Zionist experience" produces a "unique" weapons design process, "unique" offers, and "unique" designers. This exceptionalism, however, seems to lend itself very easily to a universalism imagined in civilizational enemies and realized through the exports of a settler-capitalist enterprise dependent on foreign sales for its existence.

Going forward, I will trace more closely how the weapons design process and the narrative arc of Zionism are enmeshed through iterative performances of rapid design and testing "in real-time" on the theaters of occupation. My approach is indebted to Katherine Natanel's (2016, 28) *Sustaining Conflict*, in which she talks about how in Israeli society "ideology and practice, narrative and materiality, become entwined through acts of repetition, producing and maintaining a world particular to Zionism." It is especially urgent to understand the settler-colonial logics that sustain the investment in testing weapons on Palestinians and promoting them as "combat-proven," including the rationalist investments of neoliberal capitalism and the ontological and identity-based investments of Zionism. Therefore, it is also important to resist the dominant narratives that normalize the "Zionist experience," and look more closely at how performative acts of design produce individual and collective settler subjectivity (rather than assuming that design is derived from fixed identities). This is particularly urgent because of the industry's instrumentalization and essentializing of "Jewishness" and Jewish histories to explain its practices and to immunize its violent project against decolonial futures led by Palestinian and Jewish movements. To do this work, I will first introduce Israeli conceptions of the design process and how Palestinians are produced as "design problems." My focus will be Gaza.

Designing in Real-Time

> In the history of human experimentation, the dominant form of acquiring bodies has been the debasement (avilissement) of the subjects of the experiment, whether this debasement was initiated by the experimenter or pre-existed experimentation as an available externality which the experimenter could leverage.
> –Grégoire Chamayou 2011a[6]

Testing, Testing, Testing

After Israel completed its withdrawal from Gaza in September 2005, it turned the Strip into a hermetically sealed "high-tech enclosure" (Tawil-Souri 2012) serving as a laboratory for a military-industrial complex "moving into the robotic era" (Levinson 2010). In the years since, Israel has deployed a series of drone and robotic unmanned weapons against Gaza in regular, day-to-day operations and in large-scale assaults, which are described as "tests" that are part of an iterative design process. In an interview for *Der Spiegel*, Avner Benzaken, head of the technology and logistics division in the Israeli army – a unit which is "mostly comprised of academics who serve as officers" – explained this process as follows:

> If I develop a product and want to test it in the field, I only have to go five or 10 kilometers from my base and I can look and see what is happening with the equipment … I get feedback, so it makes the development process faster and much more efficient. (Becker 2014)

Gaza is the site for "testing" formations of unmanned war, what many in Palestine refer to as "remote-control occupation" (Gordon 2009; Hanafi 2012; Salamanca 2011; Weizman 2007). According to Israel, the purpose is to explore and optimize integrations of "operational concepts" and weapons development – a process Israeli military planners refer to as "technological force design" (Hania 2016, 73). This "design process," which operates in "real-time," is pursued under the heading of the "Future Battlefield" and is managed by MAFAT, the defense ministry's R&D directorate. The "Future Battlefield" is a scenario-based construct through which design problems are captured and articulated for the weapons manufacturers, universities, and SMEs to organize the design and development of solutions for future "operational requirements." Remote-control occupation in Palestine is located at the evolutionary end of what Grégoire Chamayou (2011b, 4) calls cynegetic wars: wars that bear "an ideal of non-confrontation with death, and of domination without real combat." This aligns with the basic strategy behind the drone as explained by the commander of the Israeli Air Force's UAV training center: drone operators can "make life and death decisions"

while they "sit in a safe room and their personal level of danger is the same as of someone on the beach in Tel Aviv" (IDF 2014). Looking to multiply this power, Israel's official plan is to increase the population of these "soldiers" and diversify them to eventually unman two-thirds of the Israeli air force (Berger 2015) and a third of Israel's ground machinery (Levinson 2010) in the next five to ten years. According to Israeli ground forces technology division, the induction of these machines into the army will create a future where "autonomous soldiers could carry the weight in the war" (IDF 2015).[7] To realize their plan, Israel has carried out the following tests among many others.

During "Operation Cast Lead" of 2008–9, the Israeli military tested the extensive use of 60 ton remote-controlled bulldozers designed for "urban warfare" by the IAI (Katz 2009). A total of 11,000 civilian homes were destroyed or damaged during this three-week assault, 12 percent of them by bulldozer (Al-Haq 2009). In an operation conducted in 2012, the military shifted its focus from ground drones to test the "massive" use of aerial drones for "surgical warfare" over Gaza. Called "Pillar of Cloud," that operation was deemed a "milestone in the history of aerial combat" (Dobbing and Cole 2010). Two years later during "Operation Protective Edge" in 2014, the army tested the integration of hand-launched Skylark aerial drones into ground battalions; the Hermes 900 autonomous drone in collaboration with Elbit systems, one of the suppliers of drones to the Israeli military (Khalek 2017); and the use of subterranean robots designed by an Israeli start-up called Roboteam (Orpaz 2015). A figure of 872 drone strikes were conducted during the operation (Amnesty and Forensic Architecture 2014). Over 2,219 Palestinians were killed (Al Mezan 2015) including 547 children, 30 percent of them by drone strikes, according to Defense for Children Palestine (DCIP 2015). Amnesty International also reported that 18,000 homes were destroyed or rendered uninhabitable (Amnesty 2014). After the fifty-one days of "Protective Edge," the United Nations reported that Gaza's life supporting systems could completely collapse in less than five years rendering the Strip uninhabitable (UNCTAD 2015). A few months after the 2014 operation, the Israeli army started testing new urban warfare concepts that integrated ground robotic capabilities (Opall-Rome 2015).

These horrific events took place in "cycles" of violence that occurred every two to three years. Israelis give these cycles the "operative metaphor" of "'cutting the grass' [or 'mowing the lawn'], meaning a task that must be performed regularly and has no end" (Bronner 2012). In each assault the death ratio was one to three Israelis killed to every 100 Palestinians killed (BBC 2014).[8] The tests took place during periods of high visibility that turned Gaza into a showcase, not only of Israeli designs but also of Israeli "in real-time" designing capabilities. In 2014, Udi Adam, the chair of the state-owned Israel Military Industries who today serves as Director-General of the Israel Ministry of Defense, made clear that the "defense industry is in a perpetual learning mode together with the IDF and the Defense Ministry" to analyze and evaluate newly introduced weapons and other systems in operation (Sadeh 2014). This "perpetual learning mode" is portrayed as a national capa-

bility unparalleled elsewhere in the world. Quoting Ran Galli, corporate vice-president of major campaigns for Elbit Systems (one of Israel's biggest private weapons manufactures), Neve Gordon (2011, 161) had written that "no other country has Israel's extensive hands-on experience in fighting terror, including the development of new systems, testing them in real-time and adapting and fine-tuning following feedback from performance in the field." Adding to this "design experience" an element of speed, Nissim Hania (2016, 46) writes: "the operational friction that the IDF 'provides' for the weapons systems developed by the industry allows it to shorten the systems' development and maturation cycles." Because Israeli military operations accelerate Israeli weapons design cycles, operations are also seen as the "opportunity to cut red tape" (Sadeh 2014). Amir Rapport says, "new products were introduced for the army's use … [and] weapons systems that have long been under development suddenly became operational during the course of the fighting" (Sadeh 2014). Overall, the acceleration of the design cycle is boasted as a national capability that allows weapons to "receive the 'stamp of approval' of operational experience at a far higher rate than others in the market" (Hania 2016, 46), thus turning the occupation into a kind of high-volume production site for Israel's export-oriented industry.

The state aggressively markets its "field-tested" weapons as the "Israeli advantage" and the "brand promise" in the global defense and security markets. Each test can produce one or more of these outcomes: validate a new weapons system with a "stamp of approval"; move the weapons development process forward towards further refinement; modulate the speed of the development process; and "[generate] new requirements in order to supply for the next battle," in the words of the chief scientist of Elbit Systems (Denes 2011, 181). All these outcomes reactivate the process and generate more design incursions into Palestinian bodies. Indeed, while reports of war crimes were being crafted by local and international investigative bodies after "Protective Edge," MAFAT was putting together a design brief for the "new requirements" needed after "lessons learned" from the operation. The result is an armored fighting vehicle for "urban warfare" in "the future battlefield" designed to fight in the "narrow streets and alleys" of Gaza and equipped with 360-degree viewing, a remote-controlled machine gun, and a missile launcher (Ahronheim 2017) (Figure 1).

Avilissement: The Indigenous as a Design Problem

Writing about Israel's "colonial experiments in Gaza" since 2006 Samera Esmeir (2014) noted that the "horror is in the careful and measured instrumentalization of the Palestinian population and in the logic that the colonized are expendable for any end." She notes that this instrumentalization is made possible "by imposing on [Gaza] different forms of confinements." Deployed in this manner, mechanisms of confinement should be understood as what Chamayou calls "vilization

Figure 1

"CARMEL Future Combat Vehicle" (multiple screenshots from original video). Representation of Gaza as "*the future battlefield*" created by MAFAT, the Israeli military R&D directorate. Video published by the Israeli Ministry of Defense (2017).

[or debasement] technologies" (technologies d'avilissement) (Lambert 2015). A subset of exploitation technologies, they include discursive and physical mechanisms that "serve to produce the type of 'vile' body needed for practices of experimentation to unfold" (Jacobsen 2017, 47). These technologies acquire this classification, Chamayou states, because bodies, especially en masse, are not legitimately available for experimentation. Through different mechanisms, divisions must be established that constitute one body as "worthy" and the other as "vile" and of little importance. In this scheme, the latter is to be captured and produced in typologies that render them suitable for the experiments to be conducted on them. Key, Chamayou says, is decreasing those bodies' "acquisition price" by lowering their "power of acting" (Lambert 2015) to ultimately make them serve the "crucial function … of aiding sovereign power in its ceaseless transformations, including the invention of new technologies of power" (Jackobsen 2017, 47).

As Esmeir (2014) notes, the relentless testing since 2006 has revealed once and again "[Gaza's] particular fragility and its susceptibility to Israeli experimentation more so than other parts of Palestine." The production of this vulnerability is at the heart of Israeli weapon design. Vilization technologies, in other words, are the condition of possibility for its exercise. Indeed, the production of the Palestinians as a design problem is the active process of making their life available to the forces and possibilities of Israeli design. This involves varied techniques from mass internment to collective punishment (Khalili 2013), the "'asphixatory' application of power" (Salamanca 2011, 30) to mass debilitation (Puar 2017), and governing Gaza by "the standards of the humanitarian minimum … by reducing them to the limit of bare physical existence" (Weizman 2012, 5). This has given the occupation a temporality punctuated by the ballistics of the Israeli "humanitarian agenda" where "each Israeli attack on Gaza," Feldman (2014) says, "is simultaneously and implicitly recast by

state subtext as a *desistance from genocide.*"[9] Jasbir Puar (2017, 139) has said that the "temporalities of living and dying" have been reworked, leading to "[t]he stretching of the horizon of life (what can bare life bear?) and the finality of death into perverted versions of life [that] seem and feel like neither life nor death, not even attenuated death."

Gaza's unlivability produces for Palestinians a life without telos or finality that endlessly serves to structure the advancement of Israeli weapons design. What emerges is an occupation in permanent beta-phase. Every cycle of hellish violence brings forth new iterations of "vile" life on which weapons may be tested. These logics are inscribed in the micro-politics of Israeli design practice wherein incorporating "feedback from the field" into the design brief reinstates the zero-sum logic of settler colonialism. In the process, Palestinian life is reproduced as a technical design problem while eliminating any possibility for the Indigenous to be otherwise. Genocide, mediating the completion of settler colonialism, is replaced with cyclical and iterative design logics wherein the "real-time testing" of a weapon prototype signals the "humanitarian" nature of the Israeli designer's mission. Genocidal desistance is economically and ideologically profitable because the suspension of settler-colonial finality displaces the limits to the capitalist operation of the Israeli military industry while showing the "restraint" of the "most moral army in the world" towards a people who otherwise should be disposed of. The ontological presence of the Indigenous thus re-institutes the "state of emergency" where the weapons designer must remain vigilant and prepare for "the future battlefield." In all this, what Israeli design terms seek to conceal is the "ontological investments," to borrow from Michael J. Shapiro (1997), involved in creating such a world of permanent war in which the Israeli military industry operates.

By deploying different kinds of vilization technologies, Israel has managed to turn its war against Gaza into an iterative design abyss from which it can endlessly extract value while securing this capitalist process behind a shield of Israeli humanitarian credentials as a self-declared "post-genocidal state." As I will show, by enmeshing ideology and practice, this process is also recast by the Israeli state as one of survival and overcoming overwhelming odds. In this recasting, however, the Palestinian is not only made available for the instrumentalist ends of Israeli settler colonialism but also for producing settler subjectivity through iterated performances on the theaters of occupation that entwine material practice with folk ontologies of *becoming*.

The Few Against the Many: The Making of Battle-Proven Designers

Israel is a laboratory and we have people who have experience. –Guy Zuri[10]

The appearance of Indigenes reconstitutes the conqueror's self-image even more than the desire to expropriate new lands and resources. –Steven Salaita[11]

A year after the 2008–9 "Operation Cast Lead," *The Wall Street Journal* interviewed Thomas Tate, a former US Army lieutenant who was then involved in US–Israeli military cooperation, about the Israeli robots "remaking the battlefield." Noting that it is not technological know-how that makes Israel a pioneer in the robotization of military violence, he emphasized Israel's rapid design capabilities: "The Israelis do [military robotics] differently, not because they're more clever [sic] than we are, but because they live in a tough neighborhood and need to respond fast to operational issues" (Levinson 2010).

The geopolitical imaginary of a state located in a "tough neighborhood" combines discursive formations and geographic and racial ontologies that are key to Israel's iterated performances of rapid design. Indeed, as Puar (2017, 136) notes, Israeli "[a]ccelerationist logics map speed … as an assemblage of racial ontologies." These assemblages inhabit Zionism's universe of reference through myth and practice. As Naomi Klein (2007) notes, many in the military-security industry use the geography of "a fortressed state, surrounded by furious enemies, as a kind of twenty-four-hour-a-day showroom – a living example of how to enjoy relative safety amid constant war." This image of maximum securitization is one remake of the nineteenth-century Herzlian vision of Israel as an advanced post of Europe in Asia and a rampart of civilization against the Orient. Today, this vision is reconfigured as a twenty-first-century high-tech settler colony located at the frontline of the "global war on terror." Attendant to this geopolitical imaginary is a racial imaginary of "the few against the many" who have to overcome unimaginable odds in order to survive. "The few against the many" is "the founding ethos of the Israeli security concept" (Hania 2016, 44). It dictates that to overcome a situation of incredible asymmetry, the Israeli state and its army must develop and maintain a "qualitative edge" over the enemy. As Nur Masalha (2007) notes, the "few against the many" is a key narrative in Israeli Zionist culture and is based on the biblical story of Joshua's conquest of Palestine. This story has been adopted and reinterpreted in post-1948 Zionist discourse to portray the ongoing Palestinian Nakba as a reenactment of ancient battles and wars where "a desperate, heroic and ultimately successful Jewish struggle against overwhelming odds" is achieved against Palestinians and Arabs who are the "embodiment of various ancient oppressors" (Masalha 2007, 56). The adaptation of Zionist mythologies to establish security concepts is a phenomenon Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian (2015b, 15) has described as Israeli "security theology" wherein the "discursive collapse of biblical and security claims works to exonerate [racist structures] … [and] mask state violence" towards Palestinians to ultimately make them disappear. This formulation erases Palestinian presence in the land and locates them in their "Arabness" as exterior to Israel's "Jewishness." In deploying these racial categories, it also ejects Palestinians from colonial captivity onto an amorphous outside-surround numerically overwhelming a beleaguered Jewish state. In this phantasmagoria, rapid design and development capabilities are understood as Israel's "qualitative edge" in a war of "the few against the many." In the

manner of Israeli "security theology," this image of a struggle between unequals where Israel realizes an improbable and miraculous victory invokes the biblical story of David's sling against Goliath. Here, though, it is reinterpreted as a parable, one that serves as a design theory of settler national security.

Iterated performances of rapid design enact this security theology to produce the world of Zionism in which the operations of the Israeli military industry acquire their meaning. These performances become lived reenactments of Israeli weapons designers overcoming a desperate, almost impossible situation and fulfilling the Zionist trajectory from historical weakness to ultimate triumph, embodied in the now combat-proven designer. In this performance, the weapons "test" becomes the climactic point. Each time a "test" establishes a weapon prototype as "combat-proven," it comes to validate the entire process and system that brought it into being, thus producing Israel as a "battle-proven laboratory" (Ettinger 2011). Heeding these performances, one is reminded not to "begin with the state as a universal phenomenon and ask how it acts but instead [inquire] into how various enactments have created what constitutes the mobile, constantly changing phenomenon known as the state" (Shapiro 2015, 21). Keeping in mind this insight, practices of security theology produce the image of what Edward Said (2003, 166) called the Israeli "survivor state," which, in the words of Feldman (2015, 157), is "a political ark in which citizenship is identical with universal catastrophe past, present, and future; a state that conceives of its existence in the zero-sum game of minimal survival as a political ultimacy." To this sovereign who monopolizes violence and victimhood, "the Native repressed continues to structure settler-colonial society" (Wolfe 2016, 33) by undermining the narrative of "progress" in which the phantasmagoric completion of settler colonialism is imagined in the disappearance of the Indigenous.[12] Israel presents the alternative image of the "survivor state"; its continued existence requires innovation and adaptation on the edge of neoliberal market dynamics of shock and disequilibrium. In this state of "enterprise emergency" (Massumi 2015, 52), the nonlinear and iterative design process which structures occupation becomes a performance of

> an updated vision of Zionism, a belief draped in drones and rainbow flags, [which] does not aim at the goals of its origin – a sovereign state and guaranteed safety for the Jewish people – but rather becomes an endless iteration of its founding narrative: persecution, trauma, perseverance, and triumph. (Natanel 2016, 27)

This performance, punctuated by weapons tests, is the Israeli state's formula for value extraction from Indigenous bodies in Palestine.

Conclusion: Decolonizing Design
As Linda Tabar and Chandni Desai (2017, i–xix) powerfully state, "Decolonization is a global project." While I was writing this article, I

read that Magal, the Israeli company that built the fences around Gaza, has been awarded contracts for "security solutions" for correctional facilities in North America. Magal has been participating in the American carceral state through designs it developed in Palestine while building on accumulated experiences of internment and mass incarceration in the United States, from the ongoing Indian wars to the New Jim Crow (Alexander 2012). These projects of control are connected. The violent designs emerging in one site proliferate in the other, and so do the techniques of designing. These states have exchange programs. They coordinate and co-operate on joint projects and often exchange technology and design know-how. The struggles of Palestinian, Black, and Indigenous bodies are similarly connected.

In 2005, Palestinian civil society issued a global call for solidarity with their struggle for freedom and justice and launched the international campaign to boycott, divest, and sanction (BDS) Israeli and international institutions complicit in colonization. Many around the world, including The Movement for Black Lives (M4BL), decided to honor BDS. The Palestinian international movement has also committed itself to the M4BL and to stand in solidarity with Indigenous movements in Standing Rock, the Pacific, and beyond. These solidarities can be seen as an acknowledgement of the interconnected nature of colonial projects and the need to commit to, in the words of Steven Salaita (2016, ix), "mutual liberation based on the proposition that colonial power must be rendered diffuse across multiple hemispheres through reciprocal struggle."

The struggle to decolonize design must inhabit these spaces and worlds through networked solidarities and the relations of kinship that must be nurtured in the course of struggle. It must ground itself in the fields of encounter between the bodies of the oppressed and the violent designs circulating in the colonial world. This kind of engagement connects struggles through practice, displaces the centers of gravity in the design world itself, and relocates the modes of production to inhabit the universes of reference of decolonial struggle. My entry into these decolonial relations helped me recognize and unlearn the design education I received in US design institutions. I was taught that, as a design strategist, I inhabit what the US military calls a VUCA world – Volatile, Uncertain, Complex, and Ambiguous – which describes its "theater of operations" in its "global war on terror." I was also taught to apply Donald Rumsfeld's "unknown unknowns" to design strategy – a construct that is both epistemological and ontological that organizes preemptive warfare. For prototyping, I was told to "shoot then aim" instead of "aim then shoot," a lesson learned from the Vietnam War. My commitment to my people in Palestine and the commitment to struggles in the lands I live in today taught me to see how "the soldier mode of thinking and acting integrates with a civilian mode of thinking and acting and vice versa," in those spaces where war is seen to "be an integral and sustaining (rather than destroying) part of sociocultural reproduction" (Whitehead and Finnström 2013, 13). Part of decolonizing design is to understand the universes of reference designers

inhabit and the worlds they shape. Decolonization must disorder these worlds and "the territories of colonial occupation – mentally, physically, spiritually, emotionally, imaginatively, economically, sexually, and intellectually" (Salaita 2016, 70). The goal is to dismantle relations of war and bring about new ways of being in the world.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes

1. Quoted in (Landsmann 2016).
2. Former Israeli minister of Industry, Trade and Labor Interviewed in (Feldman 2013).
3. While these anxieties do exist due to the role of the military industry in the economy and the occupation, it is important to remember that Israel is not completely reliant on its own military industry to ensure the survival of the state. The United States provides Israel with a huge military aid package every year to sustain Israeli military operations and upgrade the army's capabilities. Under Obama's presidency, the US agreed to provide Israel with US$38 billion in new military aid until 2028 (Keinon 2017).
4. Zionist representations of Jews outside Palestine as "weak" or "deficient" instrumentalize European anti-Semitic typologies to show the significance of the Zionist movement and its role in transforming the "exilic Jew" into a "New Jew" in Palestine. These representations can be found in the works of the "founding fathers of Zionism", including Max Nordu, Leo Pinsker, Theodor Herzl, and Ze'ev Jabotinsky. For example, Jabotinsky, the founder of the revisionist Zionist Betar movement, wrote that, "of all the goals for which Betar was established, none is more honorable [than] to transform the Jewish people from a flock of battered slaves into a nation that knows the rifle" (Naor 2011, 141).
5. It is worth noting that Israel differentiates between citizens and nationals. As a self-declared "Jewish State," it confers national rights on Jews – and Jews only – regardless of place of birth. Narratives of state formation and survival exclusively reference the national content of the state as the life to be protected and secured. This exclusivity is based on the "Law of Return" which states that any Jew recognized by Israel can become a citizen of the state (Adalah n.d.). Palestinian refugees, on the other hand, are not allowed their right to return to their land and Palestinians who survived ethnic cleansing and are citizens of the state are subject to a different set of laws than those to which Jewish Israelis are subject. The Legal Center for Minority Rights in Israel provides documents that elaborate on these articles in Israeli basic law. On Citizenship Law, see https://www.adalah.org/en/law/view/536. On Law of Return, see https://www.adalah.org/en/law/view/537.

6. In his translation of excerpts from Grégoire Chamayou's book *Les Corps Vils*, Léopold Lambert used "vilization" for the French term "avilissement"; i.e. the creation of vile bodies (Lambert 2015). Avilissement can mean to abase, debase, or degrade, or more generally to lower the value or condition of someone in order to make them available for experimentation. I expand on this concept below.

7. These plans are also intimately tied to the global unmanned weapons market and the demands of maintaining Israeli dominance in this sector. The global military UAV market stood at US$8.5 billion in 2016, and is expected to grow to US$13.7 billion by 2026 (Strategic Defense Intelligence 2016). Israel is also anticipating that ground systems will become a huge market, with IAI forecasting that 70 percent of vehicles in the "battlefield" will be robotic (Ben-Dov and Yariv 2015).

8. The BBC collected the results of all Israeli operations since 2008 in one accessible page where the numbers of Palestinian and Israeli fatalities are available. "Gaza crisis: Toll of operations in Gaza" (BBC 2014). http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-28439404

9. In *Time in the Shadows*, Laleh Khalili (2013) makes a similar argument concerning colonial representations of replacing genocide with regimes of internment and mass incarceration as a humanitarian act. This act of desistance, she notes, also created the conditions of possibility for sustainable war: "What I want to argue is that the tactics of war – whether mass slaughter or carceral techniques – are also the condition of possibility of a politics in the metropolis. If policy makers think that war can be waged more humanely, they may choose to wage war more often. The paradox, of course, is that the carceral regime of counterinsurgency was crafted precisely because mass slaughter as a routine colonial technique of warfare was challenged by anticolonial domestic constituencies, humanitarian monitoring and legislation, and the resistance of the colonized themselves" (Khalili 2013, 7).

10. Quoted in (Gordon 2011, 162).

11. (Salaita 2006, 77–78).

12. *American Progress*, the 1872 painting by John Gast of Columbia leading techno-civilization westward to realize "Manifest Destiny" is a dominant representation of settler-colonial linearity.

References

Adalah: The Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel. n.d. *Discriminatory Laws in Israel Database.* Haifa. Updated September 2017. Accessed December 9, 2017. https://www.adalah.org/en/law/index?page=3

Ahronheim, Anna. 2017. "Military Exports Rise to $6.5 Billion." March 30. Accessed September 28, 2017. http://www.jpost.com/Israel-News/Politics-And-Diplomacy/Military-exports-rise-to-65-billion-485574

Al Mezan Center For Human Rights. 2015. *Operation Protective Edge in Numbers.* Gaza. Accessed October 19, 2017. http://mezan.org/en/post/21255

Alexander, Michelle. 2012. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: New Press.

Al-Haq Human Right Organization. 2009. "'Operation Cast Lead': A Statistical Analysis*.*" Ramallah. Accessed October 21, 2017. http://www.alhaq.org/attachments/article/252/gaza-operation-cast-Lead-statistical-analysis%20.pdf

Amnesty International & Forensic Architecture. 2014. *The Gaza Platform.* Accessed October 24, 2017. https://gazaplatform.amnesty.org/

Amnesty International. 2014. "Israeli Forces Displayed 'Callous Indifference' in Deadly Attacks on Family Homes in Gaza." November 5. Accessed October 20, 2017. https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2014/11/israeli-forces-displayed-callous-indifference-deadly-attacks-family-homes-gaza/

BBC News. 2014. "Gaza Crisis: Toll of Operations in Gaza." September 1. Accessed October 25, 2017. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-28439404

Becker, Markus. 2014. "Factory and Lab: Israel's War Business*.*" August 27. Accessed October 2, 2017. http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/defense-industry-the-business-of-war-in-israel-a-988245.html

Begin, Menachem. 2007. *The Revolt*. Translated by Samuel Katz and edited by Ivan M. Greenberg. Bnei-Brak: Steimatzky.

Ben-Dov, Meital, and Avi Yariv. 2015. "The Future of Robotics: Israeli UGVs*.*" February 13. Accessed October 6, 2017. https://i-hls.com/archives/28580

Berger, Nada. 2015. "UAV Squadrons Look to the Future*.*" May 27. Accessed September 13, 2017. http://www.iaf.org.il/4421-45122-en/IAF.aspx

Bronner, Ethan. 2012. "As Battlefield Changes, Israel Takes Tougher Approach." November 16. Accessed October 14, 2017. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/17/world/middleeast/israel-sticks-to-tough-approach-in-conflict-with-hamas.html

Bryant, Levi R. 2006. "On the Concept of a Universe of Reference." December 23. Accessed September 14, 2017. https://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2006/12/24/on-the-concept-of-a-universe-of-reference/

Chamayou, Grégoire. 2011a. *Les Corps vils: Expérimenter sur les êtres humains aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles* [Vile Bodies: Experimenting on Human Beings in the 18th and 19th Centuries]. Paris: La Découverte.

Chamayou, Grégoire. 2011b. "The Manhunt Doctrine." *Radical Philosophy* 169: 2–6.

Defense for Children Palestine. 2015. "Operation Protective Edge: A War Waged on Gaza's Children." Ramallah. April. Accessed Octo-

ber 12, 2017. http://www.dci-palestine.org/operation_protective_
edge_a_war_waged_on_gaza_s_children

Denes, Nick. 2011. "From Tanks to Wheelchairs: Unmanned Aerial
Vehicles, Zionist Battlefield Experiments, and the Transparence of
the Civilian." In *Surveillance and Control in Israel/Palestine: Popu-
lation, Territory and Power*, edited by Elia Zureik, David Lyon, and
Yasmeen Abu-Laban, 171–196. London: Routledge.

Dobbing, Mary, and Chris Cole. 2010. *Israel and the Drone Wars:
Examining Israel's production, use and proliferation of UAVs*. Oxford:
Drone Wars UK.

Esmeir, Samera. 2014. "Colonial Experiments in Gaza." July 13.
Accessed October 27, 2017. http://www.jadaliyya.com/pages/
index/8482/colonial-experiments-in-gaza

Ettinger, Yoram. 2011. "The Mutually-Beneficial Bottom-Up US-Israel
Relations." December 10. http://www.theettingerreport.com/OpEd/
General/The-Mutually-Beneficial-Bottom-Up-US-Israel-Relati.aspx.

Feldman, Allen. 2015. *Archives of the Insensible: Of War, Photopolitics,
and Dead Memory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Feldman, Allen. 2014. "Genocidal Desistance in Gaza." *Social Text.*
https://socialtextjournal.org/genocidal-desistance-in-gaza/.

Feldman, Yotam. 2013. *The Lab*. Produced by Yoav Roeh and Aurit
Zamir.

Ferziger, Jonathan. 2017. "Israeli Company That Fenced in Gaza
Angles to Help Build Trump's Mexico Wall." January 29. Accessed
September 21, 2017. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/arti-
cles/2017-01-29/israel-s-magal-pushes-for-mexico-wall-deal-as-
trump-buoys-shares

Frost & Sullivan. 2013. "Israel is Top Global Exporter of Unmanned
Aerial Systems with a Continued Positive Outlook Ahead." May 20.
Accessed September 16, 2017. http://www.frost.com/prod/servlet/
press-release.pag?docid=278664709

Gordon, Neve. 2009. "The Political Economy of Israel's Homeland
Security." *Surveillance Project: New Transparency: Surveillance and
Social Sorting* (Surveillance Studies Centre (SSC)), 1–67.

Gordon, Neve. 2011. "Israel's Emergence as a Homeland Security
Capital." In *Surveillance and Control in Israel/Palestine: Population,
Territory and Power*, edited by Elia Zureik, David Lyon, and Yasmeen
Abu-Laban, 153–170. London: Routledge.

Graham, Stephen. 2010. "Laboratories of War: United States-Israeli
Collaboration in Urban War and Securitization." *The Brown Journal
of World Affairs* 17 (1): 35–51.

Guattari, Félix. 1995. *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm*.
Translated by Paul Bains and Julian Pefanis. Bloomington: Indiana
University Press.

Halper, Jeff. 2015. *War Against the People Israel, the Palestinians and
Global Pacification*. London: Pluto Press.

Hanafi, Sari. 2012. "Explaining Spacio-cide in the Palestinian Territory:
Colonization, Separation, and State of Exception." *Current Sociol-
ogy* 61 (2): 190–205.

Hania, Nissim. 2016. "Transformations in the Israeli Defense Development and Production System, and the Contemporary Relevance." *Dado Center for Interdisciplinary Military Studies* 6: 44–103.

Israel Aerospace Industries Ltd. n.d. *Homeland Security (HLS).* Accessed November 10, 2017. http://www.iai.co.il/2013/16130-en/Business_Areas_HomelandDefense.aspx

Israel Defense Forces. 2014. "Army of the Future: The IDF's Unmanned Vehicles." July 6. Accessed September 18, 2017. https://www.idf-blog.com/2012/02/28/army-future-idfs-unmanned-vehicles/

Israel Defense Forces. 2015. "Will Robots be the Soldiers of the Future?" October 6. Accessed September 19, 2017. https://www.idfblog.com/2015/05/28/will-robots-soldiers-future/

Jacobsen, Katja Lindscov. 2017. *Politics of Humanitarian Technology: Good Intentions, Unintended Consequences and Insecurity*. S.l.: Routledge.

Katz, Yaakov. 2009. "'Black Thunder' Unmanned Dozers to Play Greater Role in IDF." March 30. Accessed October 2, 2017. http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Black-Thunder-unmanned-dozers-to-play-greater-role-in-IDF

Katz, Yaakov, and Amir Bohbot. 2017. *The Weapon Wizards: How Israel Became a High-tech Military Superpower*. New York: St. Martins Press.

Keinon, Herb. 2017. "US Increased Military Aid to Israel Ahead of Trump Visit." May 25. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.jpost.com/Israel-News/Politics-And-Diplomacy/US-increases-military-aid-to-Israel-in-the-wake-of-Trumps-visit-493865

Khalek, Rania. 2017. "Israeli Drone Conference Features Weapons Used to Kill Gaza's Children." February 11. Accessed October 18, 2017. https://electronicintifada.net/blogs/rania-khalek/israeli-drone-conference-features-weapons-used-kill-gazas-children

Khalili, Laleh. 2013. *Time in the Shadows: Confinement in Counterinsurgencies*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Klein, Naomi. 2007. "Laboratory for a Fortressed World." June 14. Accessed September 15, 2017. http://www.naomiklein.org/articles/2007/06/laboratory-fortressed-world

Klein, Naomi. 2008. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. London: Penguin.

Kuntsman, Adi, and Rebecca L. Stein. 2015. *Digital Militarism: Israel's Occupation in the Social Media Age*. Standford: Stanford University Press.

Lambert, Léopold. 2015. "# HISTORY /// The Body as a Terrain of Experiments: Medicine and Vile Bodies According to Grégoire Chamayou." September 11. Accessed October 4, 2017. https://thefunambulist.net/history/history-the-body-as-a-terrain-of-experiments-medicine-and-vile-bodies-according-to-gregoire-chamayou

Landsmann, Carolina. 2016. "The Art of Occupation, According to Israeli General Gadi Shamni." October 15. Accessed October 3, 2017. https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium.

MAGAZINE-the-art-of-occupation-according-to-one-israeli-gen-eral-1.5449220.

Lappin, Yaakov. 2015. "European States in Talks With IAI to Find Border Security Solution." December 24. Accessed September 26, 2017. http://www.jpost.com/page.aspx?pageid=7&articleid=438251

Leitersdorf, Yoav, Ofer Schreiber, and Iren Reznik. 2016. "The Drone Race is Off and Running, with Israel in the Lead." September 9. Accessed September 17, 2017. https://techcrunch.com/2016/09/09/the-drone-race-is-off-and-running-with-israel-in-the-lead/

Levinson, Charles. 2010. "Israeli Robots Remake Battlefield." January 13. Accessed October 3, 2017. https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB126325146524725387.

Lloyd, David, and Patrick Wolfe. 2015. "Settler Colonial Logics and the Neoliberal Regime." *Settler Colonial Studies* 6 (2): 109–118.

Masalha, Nur. 2007. *The Bible and Zionism: Invented Traditions, Archaeology and Post-colonialism in Palestine-Israel*. London: Zed Books.

Massumi, Brian. 2015. *Ontopower: War, Powers, and the State of Perception.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mbembe, Achille. 2003. "Necropolitics." *Public Culture* 15 (1): 11–40.

Naor, Arye. 2011. "Jabotinsky's New Jew: Concept and Models." *Journal of Israeli History* 30 (2): 141–159.

Natanel, Katherine. 2016. *Sustaining Conflict: Apathy and Domination in Israel-Palestine*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Neumann, Boaz. 2011. *Land and Desire in Early Zionism*. Translated by Haim Watzman. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press.

O'Gorman and Abbott. 2013. *Remote Control War: Unmanned Combat Air Vehicles in China, India, Iran, Israel, Russia and Turkey*. London: Open Briefing.

Opall-Rome, Barbara. 2015. "Israel Debates New Ground Warfare Concepts." August 8. Accessed October 4, 2017. https://www.defensenews.com/land/2015/05/13/israel-debates-new-ground-warfare-concepts/

Orpaz, Inbal. 2015. "The Israeli Startup Putting Robots in the Battlefield." December 4. Accessed October 7, 2017. https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/business/.premium-1.690041

Puar, Jasbir K. 2017. *The Right to Maim: Debility, Capacity, Disability*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Sadeh, Shuki. 2014. "For Israeli Arms Makers, Gaza War is a Cash Cow." September 16. Accessed October 13, 2017. https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/1.609919

Said, Edward W. 2003. *The Politics of Dispossession: The Struggle for Palestinian Self-determination, 1969–1994*. New York: Vintage.

Salaita, Steven. 2006. *The Holy Land in Transit: Colonialism and the Quest for Canaan.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Salaita, Steven. 2016. *Inter/nationalism: Decolonizing Native America and Palestine*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Salamanca, Omar Jabary. 2011. "Unplug and Play: Manufacturing Collapse in Gaza." *Human Geography* 4 (1): 22–37.

Salamanca, Omar Jabary, Mezna Qato, Kareem Rabie, and Sobhi Samour. 2012. "Past is Present: Settler Colonialism in Palestine." *Settler Colonial Studies* 2 (1): 1–8.

Senor, Dan, and Saul Singer. 2011. *Start-up Nation: The Story of Israels Economic Miracle*. New York: Twelve.

Shalhoub-Kevorkian, Nadera. 2015a. "Criminalizing Pain and the Political Work of Suffering: The Case of Palestinian 'Infiltrators'." *Borderlands e-Journal 14* (1): 1–28.

Shalhoub-Kevorkian, Nadera. 2015b. *Security Theology, Surveillance and the Politics of Fear*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shapiro, Michael J. 1997. *Violent Cartographies Mapping Cultures of War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Shapiro, Michael J. 2015. *War Crimes, Atrocity, and Justice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Stockmarr, Leila. 2015. *Turning 'Swords into Silicon Chips': The Israeli Homeland Security Industry and Making of Jewish Nationhood*. Roskilde: RUC Roskilde University.

Strategic Defense Intelligence. 2016. "The Global Military UAV Market 2016–2026." June. Accessed October 17, 2017. http://www.reportsnreports.com/reports/602020-the-global-military-uav-market-2016-2026.htm.Tabar

Tabar, Linda, and Chandni Desai. 2017. "Decolonization is a Global Project: From Palestine to the Americas." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 6 (1): i–xix.

Tawil-Souri, Helga. 2012. "Digital Occupation: Gaza's High-Tech Enclosure." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 41 (2): 27–43.

The Israel Export & International Cooperation Institute. 2012. "Israel Homeland Security Industry." *Tel Aviv*, 8. http://www.export.gov.il/uploadfiles/11_2012/cyber%20security_pages.pdf

The Israel Ministry of Defense and SIBAT - International Defense Cooperation. 2011. "Israel Defense and Homeland Defense Directory 2015/2016." *Tel Aviv*, 168. http://www.sibat.mod.gov.il/Industries/Directory/Documents/Homeland%20Defense%20Directory.pdf.

UNCTAD, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. 2015. "Gaza Could Become Uninhabitable in Less than Five Years in Wake of 2014 Conflict and Ongoing De-development, According to New UNCTAD Report." September 1. Accessed November 3, 2017. http://unctad.org/en/Pages/PressRelease.aspx?OriginalVersionID=260

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2015. *The Settler Colonial Present.* Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weizman, Eyal. 2012. *The Least of all Possible Evils: Humanitarian Violence from Arendt to Gaza*. London: Verso.

Weizman, Eyal. 2007. *Hollow Land*. S.l.: Verso.

Whitehead, Neil L., and Sverker Finnström. 2013. *Virtual War and Magical Death Technologies and Imaginaries for Terror and Killing*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4): 387–409.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2016. *Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race*. London: Verso.

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Critical Heritage and Participatory Discourse in the UAE

Uzma Z. Rizvi

Uzma Z. Rizvi is Associate Professor of Anthropology and Urban Studies at Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, NY.
urizvi@pratt.edu

Check for updates

ABSTRACT   Decolonization is not imagined in the same way around the world. Indeed, the recognition that colonization did not happen in a similar fashion in a global context is key to envisioning futures that free the binds of colonial rule and neocolonialism. A desire to decolonize requires close attention to these specific histories, and the manners by which populations of people in the same place were impacted differently. Uniting these varied experiences are strategies and tactics to undo the processes of colonialism and imperialism. At its core, however, any such endeavor must have epistemic clarity. The history that anchors decoloniality is not only one of future orientation, but rather a constant desire to have some clarity on past events, or maybe even to claim them as reparative. It is in those spaces that decoloniality enters critical heritage discourses. This article focuses on the past and the present moment of negotiation and participation in the two Emirates, Sharjah and Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Design, in this context, informs critical heritage discourse and provides a platform for participatory discursive action – not in the

Design and Culture

55

service of democratic idealisms, but rather as a threshold at which decolonization occurs and problematizes contemporary inequity.

Decolonization is not imagined in the same way around the world. Indeed, the recognition that colonization did not happen in a similar fashion in a global context is key to envisioning futures that free the binds of colonial rule and neocolonialism. A desire to decolonize requires close attention to these specific histories, and the manners by which populations of people in the same place were impacted differently. Uniting these varied experiences are strategies and tactics to undo the processes of colonialism and imperialism, partially through recognition (by making visible the invisibility of power) and partially through some sense of varied reparations. Each of these modes includes being critical of racism, patriarchy, capitalism, and forms of modernity that prescribe progress in specific ways. Decolonization can be realized through undoing ways of being and claiming history (Trouillot [1995] 2016), or in participatory, engaged, and dialogic forms that exist in between communities, ethnicities, classes, etc. (Atalay 2012). These strategies aim at providing what was taken away through the colonial apparatus: a sense of self-determination and, linked to that, a discursive autonomy (Smith 1999). At its core, however, any such endeavor must have epistemic clarity, or, in other words, a critical understanding of how knowledge and the political are designed to perpetuate normative frameworks that have deep colonial histories (Keshavarz 2016; Medina 2012). Epistemic clarity presumes an awareness of epistemic injustice and violence and its relationship to the construction of a colonial hermeneutic (Fricker 2007; Rizvi 2015). An epistemic inquiry can be argued to be one of history, of excavating forms of knowledge production and reiteration. As a decolonial stance requires a clarity of such history, any such impetus looks to a colonial past to construct a decolonial future. It is thus, in some iterations, future-oriented and optimistic. In other instances, the history that anchors decoloniality is not one of future orientation, but rather of a constant desire to have some clarity on past events, or maybe even to claim them as reparative. It is in those cases that it becomes critical heritage discourse, which critically contends with the contemporary moment by negotiating the past (Harrison 2013). This article focuses on the past and the present moment of negotiation and participation in the two Emirates, Sharjah and Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Design, in this context, informs critical heritage discourse and provides a platform for participatory discursive action – not in the service of democratic idealisms, but rather as a threshold at which decolonization occurs as a way to problematize contemporary inequity.

   One of the most steadfast critiques of colonialisms emerges from investigations of bureaucracy and the ways in which knowledge about

people is controlled (Cohen 1996; Mignolo 2000). But it is never just people who are managed; rather, it is all forms of expression that are also organized and dictated, including design. Such neocolonial holds over forms of articulation continue to be seen in the Gulf, "a region where designers are working towards a much-anticipated renaissance, [while] efforts are engulfed by the restrictions of the system at large" (Al-Kazemi 2017, 76). These bureaucratic forms of control are often restrictive in seemingly arbitrary ways for contemporary forms of governance, which suggests holdover regulations from previous forms of governance. To make the neocolonial frameworks within which social practice emerges more explicit, this article will look to the work of two design studios from the UAE: a project by Fikra Design Studio for Dubai Design Days (2016) and the other a series of invited public interventions by Mobius Design Studio (2017) – both of which broadly focus on the middle to low income cosmopolitan spaces of the UAE.

Due to the high-income nature of the UAE as a post-colony, the neocolonial apparatus manifests in the maintenance and creation of class-based divisions. Therefore, the issue of class must be prioritized within any discourse of decolonization. Moreover, the racialized and gendered forms of transnational labor and its colonial history explicitly shape the ways in which certain bodies are understood, interacted with, and utilized in emancipatory discourses. With issues of race, gender/sexuality, and class at the forefront of decolonization in these narratives, efforts to dismantle colonialism are daunting even as they overlap with more general discourses related to democratizing futures. It is important to maintain some distinction between those discourses as the UAE is not a democracy, nor was it a colony per se. The contemporary landscape that is called the UAE was under the protection of the British; this meant that as members of the Trucial States, the Emirates entered into "Exclusivity Agreements" with the British, whose economic interests were at the forefront. It was an explicit, matter-of-fact, corporate, and unmasked form of colonial control, and this blatant economic and social form persists in the matter-of-factness of segregated sociality in the UAE. Given these histories, it is no surprise that discourses of decolonization and design appropriately hover in liminal and unresolved spaces, occupying forms that are at the thresholds of many other discourses. Among these is a heritage discourse, which incorporates memory, nostalgia, and the past. In other words, I am arguing that critical design has the capacity to inform tactics of decolonization within critical heritage discourse.

The UAE is often perceived as elitist, rich, and superficial. That viewpoint is lazy, not to mention potentially colonial and racist. It assumes that the only people in the UAE who matter are the elite, and in that stance it reinscribes invisibility to a vast majority of the population. It is the *affect* of the high-income post-colony that makes the location complex, a subtle entanglement of power in which decolonization seems to be a far more nuanced and careful practice.[1] Engaging in participatory design in a highly regulated society is a careful and nuanced intervention.

Nuances are significant in spaces in which a diversity of voices receive differential treatment. Within the politics of amplification, the idea that there is a purity to any sound creates a hegemonic logic. Each sound has a color, a timbre, and forms of complex information that contextualize it, if you know what you are listening for, and know how to hear it. If a diverse heritage is being negotiated, one has to strive to listen because often only authorized heritage is amplified (de Oliveira 2016). In some sense, sound contests the position of *a priori* knowledge: if you do not know what you are listening for, how might you know what to listen for? It is interesting to see these sorts of nuances reflected in daily life. For example, in contrast to Modern Standard Arabic, Emirati sounds are less pronounced – the fluctuations in sound and tone are subtle and can seem flat to the non-native speaker (Boyle 2012, see also Vora 2012). It requires a nuanced listening, and a nuanced contextual knowledge of the Arab landscape. Knowing those very precise and historically variable fluctuations in sound distinguishes one as a native speaker (Boyle 2012, see also Vora 2012). And as sonic forms are used for distinguishing nativity and belonging, there is a certain form of quietness that informs much of non-Arab language in that context. That relationship between such quietness and the everyday in such restrained environments is captured beautifully by Tina Campt (2017, 4):

> Quiet is not an absence of articulation or utterance. Quiet is a modality that surrounds and infuses sound with impact and affect, which creates the possibility for it to register as meaningful. At the same time, the quotidian must be understood as a practice rather than an act/ion. It is a practice honed by the dispossessed in the struggle to create possibility within the constraints of everyday life.

When quietness becomes a resonant form of belonging, the space and time within which decolonial strategies can be documented are fleeting, ephemeral, and often inaccessible to those who cannot discern the sound that separates one as from here and another from elsewhere. With the many layers of colonization, the undoing of colonial forms happens in different strata, with various modes of critical engagement, in unique ways, and each has its own place and significance within the newly developing discourses of decolonization. The negotiations of form that occur at thresholds of theory, aesthetics, and design importantly produce critical heritage discourses of the region, and shape how participatory action unfolds (Rizvi 2017).

On Locating the Colonial

The act of decolonization presumes a certain ability to locate the impact of the colonial framework over time. Insofar as we consider critiques of racism, patriarchy, modernity, capitalism, and general oppressive frameworks to be constitutive of colonialism, decolonization then aims

to dismantle such systems of inequity through, for example, epistemic critique, dismantling power structures through equitable process, and renegotiating materials and forms through which aesthetics may be charted. This is complicated in the UAE because the Trucial States were never a colony nor a protectorate, and yet due to their highly entangled relationship of protection with the British Empire, the impact of colonialism is imprinted on the landscape (Onley 2009).

The perversity embedded in the violence of colonialism is felt acutely in the UAE. It is at once a landscape that held colonial infrastructure and military supported by labor from other colonies and, as of 1971, a home to a rebranded elite resulting in what is called a high-income post-colony. The usual binary formed through the relationships between the colonial power and local/Indigenous population was complicated by a third population of non-British migrant workers to the colony/non-colony (Boyle 2012). This included non-Gulf Arabs, South Asian, and Filipino immigrants, initially arriving for blue-collar positions such as manual and domestic labor and then through the transnational flows of labor in professional positions as well (Hosoda 2013; Leonard 2003). This was further complicated by the preexisting Indian Ocean mercantile communities that had been based in the Gulf over time (Vora 2013). In this contemporary post-colony, the usual fetish of the anti-colonial is not easily locatable.

Understanding citizenship in this complex landscape is also contingent upon understanding past negotiations of protection and hierarchy which we see replicated in contemporary state forms. Ahmad Kanna (2011, 50) deems this ruling bargain "a construction of citizenship based on notions of protection, hierarchy, and charity. In this logic, the state controls the national wealth and citizens can only access it at the pleasure of the state." The ruling bargain between the rulers and the *khaliji* sets up an ethnocracy that muddles the usual formula of colonialism and its affects. The members of the ethnocracy are those permitted to claim citizenship status to the Emirates through descent and ethnicity, and are called Emirati (or colloquially, locals) (Kanna 2011; see also Al Qassemi 2011; Cooke 2014). All other communities of people break down along racial, ethnic, and class lines, hailing from different areas around the world. Significant in this mix, however, is the consistently colonial relationship that seems to emerge between the white British expats and South Asian and Filipino communities within the major cities of the UAE (Coles and Walsh 2010). This suggests that within the social and cultural spaces of the UAE, colonial traces neatly overlap with a neocolonial social framework. In an odd twist of history, the remnants of colonial rule most visible in the UAE then becomes the elite social space of white expatriate life and the structural reliance on racialized postcolonial labor set in place to maintain and reiterate the rule of law. This sets up uniquely awkward entanglements and contradictory relationships between expatriates, which break down according to race and class and set up impossible scenarios for racialized solidarities across a colonial landscape.

Decolonization in the UAE must thus bring to the forefront multiple issues of *otherness* in order to adequately address and contend with murky, racialized, and classist colonial pasts. The two design studios presented in this article take on the task of confronting *otherness* on its own terms. Both seek to bring attention to the complexity of those engagements and relationships between the UAE and the world, as well as the many forms of coloniality that persist in the landscape. These interactions and engagements are necessarily awkward, slightly stilted, uncertain, and lack finesse. Nevertheless, they confront layers of colonial history and neocolonial and imperial presents, engaging and designing critical heritage and participatory discourses in the service of decolonization.

Designing Stratigraphic Records of Being and Belonging

Design House was founded in 2013 by Mobius Design Studio as a center for multidisciplinary design projects within a curated space, and was envisioned as a platform for the public to experience and consider design beyond the commercial. For the fourth edition of *Design House* (Mobius Design Studio 2017), Hadeyeh Badri, Hala Al-Ani, and Riem Hassan commissioned seven projects that were specifically aimed at engaging communities and creating arenas for participatory design. *Design House: Change, Coordinates, and Someone Else* simultaneously acts as a moment of design self-reflexivity and a call to social engagement. In an essay titled "The State of Things," the studio clearly stated the impetus behind the project:

> The state of things today poses the question of valid methodologies to instigate change. It begs a growing sensitivity and intellect towards specific, more local affairs, most of which originate from broader, more globalized issues of displacement, instability and sheer complexities of the socio-political and economic situation. There is an attempt at subversion, an act of subtle rebellion, in addressing today's state of things. It is a statement of accountability and an action to take the lead. It gives us a strong sense of possibility; a changing world to be reimagined, rediscovered and remade. (Mobius Design Studio 2017, 26)

Mobius Design Studio commissioned projects in Sharjah and geared all of them to the urban local, bringing to the fore questions of social change, engagement, and community-based participatory practices. As is often the case, some projects were more engaged than others, but all were centered on human concerns within a specific local space. The designers worked with people of multiple ethnicities, nationalities, and age groups. When the projects were exhibited at 1971 Design Space, the designers advanced the spirit of community-based engagement by inviting observers to interact with, reflect, and provide feedback on the projects, which the designers continue researching and developing throughout the course of the exhibition. Such a direct feedback

loop builds stakes in local environments and promotes social cohesion. Though all of the seven projects had elements of social engagement and participatory design, I will discuss just three because they illustrate different modes of engagement that are indicative of an epistemic shift in how something is either remembered, represented, or repurposed. The project *Little Ambassadors* by Mays Albeik considers the links between storytelling and empathy. This project was based on her own experience of going to school in Sharjah, her memories of difference, and how through experiencing various schools she was able to empathize with diverse communities. For this project, she organized two workshops during which she engaged with schoolchildren from distinct social, ethnic, and economic circles. The workshops enabled "a shared experience and point of reference that would help for social engagement" (Albeik 2017, 151–152). Through collaborative exercises

Figure 1
Al Abyad Saloon. From Design Studio Project *Wajha* (Façade). Image by Author, 2017.

of designing books, images, and stories, the students constructed new social worlds and stories to fill them.

In 2012, designers Hussein Alazaat and Ali Almasri started *Wajha* (Façade), an independent social initiative offering pro-bono design services in Amman. For the Design House project, Alazaat and Almasri created workshops, collaborating with local designers to rebrand stores in the old center of the city, called the Heart of Sharjah. Four shops were selected, and two designers were assigned to work with each shop owner on rebranding. The shops included an embroidery shop, a tailoring and embroidery shop, a barber shop, and an antiques shop (Figure 1). The shops were located in multiethnic and multiclass neighborhoods. (The project skirts around the issue of gentrification of a heritage area through design, but it's notable that the stores are independently, rather than corporate, owned.) In many of the rebrands, traditional lines and forms were replicated, and calligraphic elements incorporated based on the specifications of the shop owner. This sort of client-based social initiative is well documented in Western contexts but not often seen in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region.

The design group Caravan (2017, 216) (Ivan Paraxi and Emanuela Corti) presented *EmptyLess*, a project that "works alongside mid/low-income communities, municipalities, private/public companies and volunteers to map, design, execute and manage self-sustained public spaces within the suburbs of Sharjah." Intertwining co-operation and collaboration, the Caravan workshops enabled participants to activate urban space through design in thoughtful, dialogic (with local residents), and sustainable forms that emerged as installations in "empty" blocks that could be reworked at any time by any*body*. Engaging residents in placemaking, particularly in ways that engender feelings of agentive design in places where the status quo is often highly regulated, is a critical intervention that reverses power.

These three projects illustrate different modes of engaging with communities. By co-designing spaces the communities were recognized as significant. In acknowledging and witnessing the significance of those communities within those contexts, the projects provided ways by which communities felt an explicit connection to a place, which engendered feelings of belonging. In a landscape where belonging is contingent and precarious, such projects provide stakes and reveal how communities make commitments to place in spite of their political or social condition.

Designing Spaces in between Neoliberal Agendas and Late Capitalist Landscapes

When Fikra Design Studio was commissioned to do the UAE Pavilion for the 2016 Dubai Design Week, they represented the Cafeteria, or the small shops that specialize in *karak* (strong milky tea), juices, and quick sandwiches. In their brief, curators Salem Al-Qassimi and Maryam Al Qassimi (2016, 1) (of Fikra Design Studio) explained their choice of the Cafeteria:

Cafeterias are ubiquitous and have somehow become an integral element of the Emirati cultural experience. Moreover, the cafeteria is a cultural concoction – a mélange of disparate tastes, visuals, and ideas coming together to form a multicultural singularity. The UAE Pavilion draws inspiration from the cafeteria in an attempt to highlight the many layers of this cultural phenomenon.

The Cafeteria's spatial organization presumes a car culture, in which there is little expectation that patrons will get out of their cars. Instead, the wait staff shuffle between cars and the store, taking and filling orders. The privacy of the car permits distant engagements among a variety of social strata, ethnicities, genders, and cultures. Most people I have spoken to in the UAE, irrespective of their citizenship, claim the Cafeteria as their space, have memories of it from their youth, and consider it very much a part of their world and worldview (Al Gergawi 2016; Al Qassimi 2013). In its ability to be claimed by all, the structure, concept, design, experience, and existence of the Cafeteria space allows it to circumvent the usual political concerns about citizenship and instead focus on discourses of belonging. When the Cafeteria is produced as a representation, however, it becomes a space of contested meanings, heritage, and claims of authenticity.[2]

The Pavilion was called *Afaaq Al Mustaqbal* (Future Horizons), a reference to the naming devices that many cafeterias utilize and recognition of a future in which multiculturalism could serve as a cornerstone to understanding the Federation. Cafeterias specialize in either direct marketing of food through their naming practices, such as Eat and Drink Cafeteria; or they might be inspirational, such as Jalab Al Noor (Mountain of Light) or Al Mallah (the movement of birds wings) (Figure 2). Keeping

Figure 2
New Mallah Cafeteria, Al Wadha Road, Sharjah. Image by Author, 2017.

in mind the Cafeteria aesthetic, the project space itself was designed by architect Tarik Zaharna, the photogrammetry/3D prints of food items and juice by Salem Al-Mansoori, and images related to forms of cafeteria signage and urban space by Ricardo Hernandez. All of these features, along with futuristic prints, provided an immersive sense of the cafeteria's design, which is often overlooked (Figure 3). Importantly, the Pavilion also served *karak*. By integrating taste, smell, and experience into the space of design, the Pavilion became a threshold space in which it was neither a ubiquitous cafeteria, nor simply a representation of one.

In order to give traction to the authenticity of such fast food, the pavilion was accompanied by a book that utilized default systems design to demonstrate fast design (Giampietro and VanderLans 2003). By representing a democratic/accessible-to-all system, the Pavilion celebrated a multicultural aesthetic and space within an otherwise socially segregated city. Design quietly finds itself placed within a broader social context – one that is authored by the memory of a local aesthetic and is made authentic as it follows the lead of the Cafeteria designers and their constantly changing menu. In the same way that cafeterias name their drinks and sandwiches in response to contemporary things and desires (like a WhatsApp or Snapchat drink), the Pavilion and accompanying book emerged as a form inspired by a local aesthetic different from the usual nostalgic heritage focus on traditional crafts. The Pavilion adopted a local aesthetic that signified a multicultural cosmopolitan space. Experiencing the design of such a space contributes to an empathetic sense of belonging, a point which was emphasized in the reprint of two previously published essays: Mishaal al Gergawi's (2016,

Figure 3
Interior Space with Pineapples, Pomegranates, and Karak Chai. Afaaq Al Mustaqbal (Future Horizons), Dubai Design Week, 2016.

26–31) "An Ode to Dubai's Ubiquitous Cafeterias" and Alia Al-Sabi's (2016a, 94–95) "Neon Lights, White Foam Cups."

These pieces of nostalgia were interspersed with interviews of South Asian and Filipino men who produce the Cafeteria experience through their labor as both waiters and designers. Ahmad Alanzi conducted interviews with patrons at Dubai Cafeteria and Alia Al-Sabi with design firms that produce the menus for Sharjah Cafeteria. These interviews bring attention to the voices of a sector of society that is still mediated and expressed through the experience of another (Al-Sabi 2016b). This maps on to narratives of class hierarchies as well: the memories of one are possible through the labor of another. The book amplified distinct voices, albeit edited and represented by the designers, in awkward, uncertain, and politically messy ways, but also made clear the possibility of a decolonial gesture within a threshold context. In spaces where it is difficult to maneuver, any attempt to hear, listen, and understand the quiet shifts into a different hermeneutic – in particular when one is making that shift while at an International Design Fair.

On the Necessary Ephemeral and Inaccessible: Thresholds as Spaces of Criticality

In focusing on the threshold, form itself has the capacity to engender spaces of marginal subject positionality and consider the impact such a position makes on subsequent aesthetic forms and critical heritage discourse (Rizvi 2017). This threshold can be thought of as the melding of practices, the specific vagaries of the Internet, transdisciplinary approaches to understanding contemporary heritage practice, or, metaphorically, as the coast, gulf, and straits (Vali 2012). Locating practice and thought at thresholds shifts conversations from being on the margins to occupying the multiple spaces in between: the threshold breaks down binaries and forces open multiple spaces of contention. Thresholds of form allow for a fluid subject position to exist organically, representing multiples as possibilities, providing the form as a potential universal (Goss and McInerney 2016; Makia 2016; Rizvi 2017). The condition of being of here and elsewhere becomes a valid criterion of belonging and, as such, *other* claims of authenticity can be anchored within states of fluidity. Such a standpoint is critical in a space such as the UAE where the colonial traces are difficult to locate, the postcolonial critique is slippery, and decolonization only seems to occur in moments. Some of the most interesting, critical, and important work happening within the context of a threshold is necessarily ephemeral and inaccessible. And yet, it is inhabited as a state of passing through or over. It is the invisible space that is never thought of as a place. It is diasporic without leaving its home. One might argue that there is no way to get to/into/out of such a place (or work/design/etc.) – one either is or is not within it.

In Sharjah and Dubai, this emerges in the very sharp and thin sliver of time that exists before an idea or critique is launched and it is either co-opted or appropriated for commercial or consumable culture. Most

design emerging from the region is heavily commercial and the market seems to vacillate between hipster-nostalgia to the use of traditional forms (like waves and sails). From the perspective of one studying heritage, both are valuable for understanding how cultural heritage is represented in the design world. The relationships between design and culture have a history in Western scholarship, linking the primacy of visuality to the emergence of design culture (Julier 2006). The shift from understanding the culture(s) of design and design culture is a relatively recent one and has slightly more relevance in the UAE (Manzini 2016). Specifically, the focus on dialogic design recognizes participatory and ethnographic forms of practice as being an important facet of contemporary design (Binder et al. 2015; Blair-Early 2010; Derderian 2017).

As contemporary design finds itself shifting from insisting on Western visual primacy to a more immersive, participatory model of making and experiencing that is culturally specific, it runs the risk of claiming to author authenticity. At the same time, for design studios emerging in the context of the Global South, engaging in transdisciplinary collaborations and practices that aim to create experiences must also question traditional design (including Western design/Western expectations of Eastern design/Eastern expectations) and design theory that defaults to a Western epistemic through form, material, and color. Thus, any criticality finds itself wedged between worlds, trying to hold global racism at bay while contending with hegemonic forces in the home space. It is then in the threshold that criticality finds itself, its methods and its tactics necessarily ephemeral and inaccessible.

Conclusion: On Zombies, Aliens, Vampires, and Dinosaurs

I borrow my concluding subtitle from a note hidden inside Mobius Design Studio's (2017) *Design House: Change, Coordinates, and Someone Else*. On the book's inner spine and legible only when the book is dismantled, the note reads: "Warning: this publication occasionally contains ridiculous thoughts (which may be unsuitable for children), peculiar suggestions (which may be unsuitable for adults) and should only be taken seriously by zombies, aliens, vampires and dinosaurs." I was taken aback when I first read this note, and then thought that perhaps the only way to engage with such criticality when writing from a highly regulated society is to maintain a sense of childlike humor, naive and unknowing, like dreamers who laugh at themselves for even dreaming. But to dismantle the book is an important gesture. It is not just a matter of fun design. In the playfulness is a politics (Vali 2017).

Design informs the ways in which critical heritage discourse unfolds, and it provides a platform for participatory discursive action within a threshold at which decolonization problematizes contemporary inequity. This is significant given the high-income nature of the UAE as a post-colony with the issues of class upfront, embedded within which

are the racialized and gendered forms of transnational labor (both blue and white collar). This is not about taking to the streets. It is about maintaining a space of criticality within deep stillness and a quietness. It is about decolonizing moments and slow change. Both Fikra Design Studio and Mobius Design Studio utilized and focused on spaces and projects located within cosmopolitan marginality. Both projects forged connections between ideas of the past and contemporary concerns. And both bridged some gap in the equity of voices heard and engaged through design. In these projects, decolonization is not about the act of dismantling the colonial apparatus; it is about identifying why and how structural inequities are embedded within historical narratives, and how constructions of history might be restructured to allow for a different relationship between and for those at the thresholds.

Disclosure Statement

Funding

Notes

1. I find decolonizing methods in the UAE to be far more precarious and precise, as compared to work that I have done in India (see Rizvi 2006, 2008). India, being a democratic post-colony, allows and expects a different form of interaction, and presumes civic participation as part of the decolonial method. The UAE, being an ethnocratic federation that is primarily based on patronage, cannot and should not have the same presumptions of what decolonization might look like because the framework within which action unfolds is distinct.
2. It is interesting to think through how and when the Cafeteria enters into the realm of critical heritage discourse and aesthetics. One of the first productions of it can be seen in Lantian Xie's piece, *Woodland Fern No. 4*. Curator Murtaza Vali (2015) says the piece "is a modest monument to this unheralded space of local multiculturalism, a 1:1 recreation of an accent wall found at Xie's neighborhood Eat & Drink Cafeteria, its enigmatic title a reference to the wall's exact shade of green. Extracted from its original architecture and imported into the gallery, the wall becomes a multivalent symbol: a monochrome mural, a Chinese spirit wall, and a chroma key green screen, a mutable background that, like the cafeteria that inspired it, can comfortably accommodate the whole world."

References

Albeik, Mays. 2017. "Little Ambassadors." In *Design House: Change, Coordinates, and Someone Else*, edited by Mobius Design Studio, 146–169. Sharjah: Maraya Art Center.

Al Gergawi, Mishaal. (2009) 2016. "An Ode to Dubai's Ubiquitous Cafeterias." In *Afaaq Al Mustaqbal*, 26–31. Dubai: Tashkeel, Arabian Printing Press.

Al-Kazemi, Nawar N. 2017. "The Bureaucracy of Design." In *Design House: Change, Coordinates, and Someone Else,* edited by Mobius Design Studio, 73–79. Sharjah: Maraya Art Center.

Al Qassemi, Sultan Sooud. 2011. Gulf Majlis Culture Forms Fabric of Society. *Gulf News*, May 2. http://gulfnews.com/opinion/thinkers/gulf-majlis-culture-forms-fabric-of-society-1.801872.

Al Qassimi, Salem. 2013. Life and times at the Capitals Cafeterias. *The National*, May 3. http://www.thenational.ae/lifestyle/food/life-and-times-of-the-capitals-cafeterias.

Al Qassimi, Salem, and Maryam Al-Qassimi. 2016. *Pavilion Title*. Afaaq Al Mustaqbal. Accessed December 15, 2017. http://www.dubaidesignweek.ae/archive/2016-projects/abwab/united-arab-emirates/

Al-Sabi, Alia. 2016a. "Neon Lights, White Foam Cups." In *Afaaq Al Mustaqbal*, 94–95. Dubai: Tashkeel, Arabian Printing Press.

Al-Sabi, Alia. 2016b. "Interviews with Designers." In *Afaaq Al Mustaqbal*, 26–31. Dubai: Tashkeel, Arabian Printing Press.

Atalay, Sonya. 2012. *Community Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. Berkeley, Los Angles, and London: University of California Press.

Blair-Early, Adream. 2010. "Beyond Borders: Participatory Design Research and the Changing Role of Design." *Visible Language* 44 (2): 207–218.

Binder, Thomas, Eva Brandt, Pelle Ehn, and Joachim Halse. 2015. "Democratic Design Experiments: Between Parliament and Laboratory." *CoDesign* 11 (3–4): 152–165.

Boyle, Ronald. 2012. "Language Contact in the United Arab Emirates." *World Englishes* 31 (3): 312–330.

Campt, Tina M. 2017. *Listening to Images: An Exercise in Counterintuition*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Caravan. 2017. "EmptyLess." In *Design House: Change, Coordinates, and Someone Else,* edited by Mobius Design Studio, 214–227. Sharjah: Maraya Art Center.

Cohen, Bernard. 1996. *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Coles, Anne, and Katie Walsh. 2010. "From 'Trucial State' to 'Postcolonial' City? The Imaginative Geographies of British Expatriates in Dubai." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36 (8): 1317–1333.

Cooke, Miriam. 2014. *Tribal Modern: Branding New Nations in the Arab Gulf*. Los Angles: University of California Press.

Derderian, Beth. 2017. Design as Ethnography: Experiments with Process and Product. In *Design House: Change, Coordinates, and*

Someone Else, edited by Mobius Design Studio, 42–49. Sharjah: Maraya Art Center.

Fikra Design Studio. 2016. *Afaaq Al Mustaqbal*. Dubai: Tashkeel, Arabian Technical Printing Press.

Fricker, Miranda. 2007. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. London: Oxford University Press.

Goss, Rachael, and Robert McInerney. 2016. "Becoming Threshold Researchers in the Community." *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 56 (3): 286–308.

Giampetrio, Rob, and Rudy, VanderLans. 2003. Default Systems in Graphic Design. *Lined and Unlined*. http://blog.linedandunlined. com/post/404940995/default-systems-in-graphic-design.

Harrison, Rodney. 2013. *Heritage*. Critical Approaches. London: Routledge.

Hosoda, Naomi. 2013. "*Kababayan* Solidarity? Filipino Communities and Class Relations in United Arab Emirates Cities." *Journal of Arabian Studies.* 3 (1): 18–35.

Julier, Guy. 2006. "From Visual Culture to Design Culture." *Design Issues* 22 (1): 64–76.

Kanna, Ahmed. 2011. *Dubai, the City as Corporation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Keshavarz, Mahmoud. 2016. *Design Politics: An Inquiry into Passports, Camps, and Borders*. PhD Thesis. Department: School of Arts and Communication, K3 Malmö University.

Leonard, Karen. 2003. "South Asian Workers in the Gulf: Jockeying for Places." In *Globalization under Construction*, edited by R. W. Perry and B. Maurer, 129–170. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Makia, Ahmad. 2016. Treading Gulf Waters, *Ibraaz*, February 25. http:// www.ibraaz.org/essays/142.

Manzini, Ezio. 2016. "Design Culture and Dialogic Design." *Design Issues.* 32 (1): 52–59.

Medina, José. 2012. *The Epistemology of Resistance: Gender and Racial Oppression, Epistemic Injustice, and Resistant Imaginations*. London: Oxford University Press.

Mignolo, Walter. 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mobius Design Studio. 2017. "The State of Things." In *Design House: Change, Coordinates, and Someone Else,* edited by Mobius Design Studio, 24–40. Sharjah: Maraya Art Center.

de Oliveira, Vieira, and J. S. Pedro. 2016. "Design at the Earview: Decolonizing Speculative Design through Sonic Fiction." *Design Issues* 32 (2): 43–52.

Onley, James. 2009. *Britain and the Gulf Shaikhdoms, 1820–1971: The Politics of Protection.* Center for International and Regional Studies Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar. Occasional Paper 4. Qatar.

Rizvi, Uzma Z. 2006. "Accounting for Multiple Desires: Decolonizing Methodologies, Archaeology and the Public Interest." *India Review* 5 (3–4): 394–416.

Rizvi, Uzma Z. 2008. "Decolonizing Methodologies as Strategies of Practice: Operationalizing the Postcolonial Critique in the Archaeology of Rajasthan." In *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*, edited by M. Liebmann and U. Rizvi, 107–127. Archaeology and Society Series, Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Rizvi, Uzma Z. 2015. "Decolonizing Archaeology: On the Global Heritage of Epistemic Laziness." In *Two Days after Forever: A Reader on the Choreography of Time*, edited by O. Kholef, 154–163. Reader for the Cyprus Pavilion, 56th Venice Biennale. Berlin: Sternberg Press.

Rizvi, Uzma Z. 2017. "Sea/Wind/Sand: On Fluid States and the Aesthetics of Critical Heritage Discourse in the United Arab Emirates." In *Rock, Paper, Scissors: Positions at Play, Reader for the UAE Pavilion, 57th Venice Biennale*, edited by H. Nasar, 42–48. Abu Dhabi: UAE Pavilion.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Boston: Zed Books.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. (1995) 2016. *Silencing the past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Vali, Murtaza. 2012. Gulf Studies. *ArteEast Quarterly*. Fall 2012. http://arteeast.org/quarterly/gulf-studies/?issues_season=fall&issues_year=2012

Vali, Murtaza. 2015. Searching for the Voice of Difference. *Nafas Art Magazine*, April 2015. https://universes.art/nafas/articles/2015/accented/.

Vali, Murtaza. 2017. "Objects at/of Play." In *Rock, Paper, Scissors: Positions at Play, Reader for the UAE Pavilion, 57th Venice Biennale*, edited by H. Nasar, 28–41. Abu Dhabi: UAE Pavilion.

Vora, Neha. 2012. "Free Speech and Civil Discourse: Producing Expats, Locals, and Migrants in the UAE English-Language Blogosphere." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 18: 787–807.

Vora, Neha. 2013. *Impossible Citizens: Dubai's Indian Diaspora*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

On Country Learning

Uncle Charles Moran, Uncle Greg Harrington and Norm Sheehan

Uncle Charles Moran is an Elder of the Bundjalung Nation. He has chaired both Boards and Advisory groups for a medical service, a housing co-operative, a national newspaper, an Elders' corporation, and education groups from kindergarten to university level.

Uncle Greg Harrington is an Elder of the Bundjalung Nation and member of the Gnibi Wandarahn Elders' Group who has spent his life serving his community. He has been integral to the successful development of the Southern Cross University Reconciliation Action Plan and the Widjabal/Wiyabal Dreaming Student Leadership Initiative.

Professor Norm Sheehan is a Wiradjuri man born in Mudgee, NSW whose PhD was awarded the N.V. Varghese Prize for Comparative Education in 2004. He is currently Head of Gnibi Wandarahn School of Indigenous Knowledge at Southern Cross University. Norm.Sheehan@scu.edu.au

Check for updates

ABSTRACT   Colonial successes and the wealth gathered over centuries has benefited many, but it has also situated disregard, denial, and exploitation as primary to the epistemology of development. Thus, colonization is not a past doctrine; its violations and intrusions are embedded systematically in the assumptive framework of modern societies. Regardless of its power, colonialism is just one of many possible genres of social design. From an Indigenous Knowledge perspective, decolonizing social design commences with the interactions that result from building relationships with knowledge outside the human mind because Knowledge lives in Country and has partnered with human designers since the beginning.

KEYWORDS: respectful design, Indigenous Knowledge, relational theory

My origins are Wiradjuri but I live and work on Bundjalung Country, so I speak with Bundjalung Elders often and I listen well. Uncle Charles tells me to observe closely, listen well and speak softly (Moran 2004). In our last conversation, Aunty Bertha Kapeen told me that Goori peoples learn laterally – we learn through our connections and from the ways that things connect.

Design and Culture

71

When I was beginning my career as a teacher, these Elders were leading our Aboriginal community and I am honoured to have relationships with these men and women. My task is to try and understand their teachings and to enact them in my own way as best I can. In striving to do this I need all the help I can get. Aunty Irene introduces each discussion in Wigibal/Wybal dialect. Aunty Bertha says, "Wana werlu – be yourself" (Kapeen 2009, ii), Uncle Charles says, "Remember each step," and then Uncle Greg asks me if I need a lift (this always makes me laugh).

Working between the university and the community is complex. I have difficulty remembering in this human-filled world where tiny differences become divisive campaigns, and deep theoretical concepts become mannerist tags – "a hodgepodge of worn-thin narrative and pictorial tropes" that are dispossessed of their origins (Saltz 2013, 2). On Country, remembering my origins is not difficult, so I am grateful I have the advantage of people who will tell me who I am by telling me to just be.

Others do not have this advantage, so I have concerns. If design starts to operate with de-colonial theory will this become just another label applied to attract attention, to build a career, or to establish a brand? We live in the proximity of so many designed concepts and products that reform and reorientate and resituate, does design really need another (decolonized) tag?

Meanwhile I fear that the things that actually show us who we are and the places where memorable steps can really be made are disappearing. Truly memorable steps in places are being crowded out by a mass of people who organize their activities just to create an image of themselves and post a new Facebook moment.

The Continual Colonial

Colonial successes and the wealth gathered over centuries has benefited many, but it has also situated disregard, denial, and exploitation as primary to the epistemology of development. Thus, colonization is not a past doctrine; its violations and intrusions are embedded systematically in the assumptive framework of modern societies. Colonizing design is silently enacted and is so prevalent among modern societies that it is often invisible. A contemporary example of colonizing design being invisible to the majority of Australians can be found in meanings attached to Australian swans.

The term "black swan" was common in early Europe. Everyone knew swans were white, and black swans did not exist, so the term came to mean something impossible. However, in the seventeenth century, Europeans found black swans in Australia. Black swans were no longer an impossibility, and the meaning of "black swan" changed. Over time this became a *black swan theory* in the North to describe an event that deviates from expectations (Taleb 2007). *Gnibi* means black swan in the Bundjalung language. It is also the name given to the Southern Cross constellation which shows that one cultural image,

"the cross," can be another, "*Gnibi*" (black swan flying). If North was not always *up* in the invisible mindset of colonizing design the cross would be the *Gnibi*.

When Aboriginal people speak about continuing colonial impact we are often met with denial, and our knowledge is disregarded. This disregard is now becoming familiar to many theorists because crucial issues such as climate change are simply denied when such considerations are economically inconvenient (Denness 2017). Indigenous Knowledge recognizes these issues through experiences at the cutting edge of violation, appropriation, and destruction. We see colonial acts repeated in every war, reprised in every social dislocation, and replayed in each act of environmental destruction.

Because colonization has always intruded into and reformed people's minds and behaviors, it has become an assumptive frame that convinces us to adopt a regard for the self at the expense of others. In this formulation, design is separated from the producer and becomes a servant of production. At its core, colonization strives to eliminate the natural, humane properties of human groups. Design is significant to culture because of its collective and relational influence and so control of design is pivotal to colonization. When we conceive of colonization as a social disregard for others and environments, then design that disregards contexts comes into view as a lead player in a denaturing project (Sheehan et al. 2010). Designers will be rewarded greatly by this project and, like individuals, swept along in colonizing frenzies because they know that their violations will be disregarded. Perhaps like settlers past, they will also come to believe that everyone is safe from consequences. In direct contrast to this movement is design which I (among many fellows) conceive as a natural and naturalizing agent.

Colonialism started as an absolutely superior (male) self-regard driven by the search for resources, and it became a philosophy based in materially rewarding disregard for human, biological, and environmental diversity. Now, techno-colonialism carries the project further by seeking to occupy all knowledge spaces and control these essential connections. This new enlightenment is a final stage of colonization that envisions a solely material consciousness built to situate ethical vacancy as essential to human advancement. But the underlying aim remains to the same: social and environmental exploitation.

Colonization is a denaturing project that can be identified by the patterns of disregard and self-regard that fuel exploitive social machinery. The features of this underlying denaturing project of advancement open up a way for understanding decolonization.

Indigenous Knowledge operates upon the assumption that design is a natural and naturalizing power because it is common across all human cultures, is often evident in the actions of other species, and is a constant power in environments. Design is how all living beings co-operate to co-create. By contrast, colonizing design tends to singularize to attract attention and compete or establish hierarchies to disrupt co-operation.

Social Design: A New Introduction

Regardless of its power, colonialism is just one of many possible genres of social design. If I have brain surgery, I definitely want an evidence-based surgeon but if I am traveling in a fast car the last thing I want is an evidence-based driver. Colonial social regard promises immunity but only if we all agree to look the other way and this way is usually towards information and the evidence.

We are all traveling very fast in a powerful culture driven by evidence, so any ameliorative practices are patches applied to the damage we leave behind. Meanwhile, the social machinery continues to operate at the same speed in the same direction. Colonized peoples know this scenario so well and now everyone is beginning to experience the abject disregard built into every level of human engagement that enables maximum exploitation.

Both futuring in Western design (Fry 2010) and settler design from the South strive to adjust this vehicle from within. To me, these approaches have value because in the end they are focused on wicked problems, reforming conceptions of design to improve analysis, and (in my view) promoting sustainment as a series of post-event patches. To extend the metaphor, these approaches present alternative windows for the driver to look out of, but the problem is that the driver remains invisible.

The idea of cultures of repair has arisen in the design field and quickly departed because critical Indigenous theory and outsider cultural analysis provide more positive answers. Generally, I see these repair theories as attempts to "get out" of the vehicle. Once out, we begin to feel the vastness of the destruction and if we survive this trauma we may finally get a glimpse of the driver. Then, dear fellows, we are close to the Indigenous life world where generational responses to this vision of a world destroyed provide support and there is a good view of the driver.

As an Aboriginal academic, I perceive the driver in the concept of the Anthropocene. We are told we are entering an epoch where humans predominate. If that is so then what about the more than 60,000 years of Aboriginal cultural predominance in Australia? This human ascendency over thousands of generations is not considered an Anthropocene perhaps because of the concept of being human that defines the epoch. Human influence over environments defines the Anthropocene and so the conception of being human is one that mirrors the ontology of the West. This ontology is the assumption that humans must interfere with natural systems to survive and that all human beings automatically have authority to change environments to reap benefit and reward. Essentially, if you are not interfering and disrupting environments then you are not human. Within this ontological frame, decolonized design is at best a trope that enhances the shape of our speeding colonial vehicle.

My assertion is that an interrogation of ontologies is essential to any decolonizing movement. Given that ontology is concerned with the nature of being itself, the purpose is less to define problems than to begin to open up relationships with knowledge itself as it exists in the

world. In this project we must assume that decolonization is just like colonization; it is a social design project that aims to teach us how to situate our self-regard and the ways we regard others within the reality of being. Indigenous Knowledge is situated with the being that is Country, and the Aboriginal concept of Country is not adequately translated as an "environment."

> Country is an area of land that is directly related to a group of Aboriginal people through ancestry culture and language. The relationship between a people and their Country extends beyond time and is recorded in stories laid down in Country that are the spiritual source of knowledge essential to generations. Country is alive and intelligent providing everything that its people need. As a conception Country exists outside as a living vital place that we inhabit and through learning culture and respect it also exists inside as a model for being human in a proper way. Country provides everything we need. (Southern Cross University 2017)

Decolonizing social design commences with the interactions that result from building relationships with knowledge outside the human mind because Knowledge lives in Country and has partnered with humans since the beginning. Our consciousness originated on Country so learning on Country is a consciousness enhancing program that we teach all peoples. If we are seeking consciousness that is a being in the stars, then we already have it; we just have to look up at night and see knowledge reflected in the Country of the universe.

Gnibi: Knowledge from Country

In an antipodean Aboriginal perspective, colonization is a feature of the Global North that succeeded in the Global South by eliminating peoples and stealing all that was valuable to colonists. In this rapacious destruction, the most valuable things such as a great weight of human knowledge gathered from millennia of association with Country that Aboriginal nations possessed were largely overlooked until very recent times.

Aboriginal peoples in Australia present our human commonality and affirm that the only difference between us and the North is that we existed in the South long before the disregard for life that gave rise to colonization emerged. This also means that there are understandings here that have never been held in the North. I contend that the cultures of the North and South do not share a standpoint on philosophy or design. Indeed, the same can be said of our own Aboriginal cultures because each arises independently from Country.

The intelligence of living environments is essential to our world because we learn from the patterns written into the earth and we share in ways that fit with these earthly cognitions. This is, after all, the place where our being and consciousness originated and so even though it

has suffered extreme disruption, our design has always been nurtured and informed by this natural intelligence.

Living in intelligent environments, it is obvious that things of all kinds have always gathered, shared, and decided their best way to be and to do things. These gatherings continue regardless of human beings. We respect this already existent design where knowledge lives in a peopled landscape. We do not stand alone and in confrontation with other beings because we are companions with the beings of Country and so we are respectful. Respectful Design is founded on the understanding that design is ancestral and alive in Country. We have a sound ontological framework based in an intelligent world, so we can state that design is simply *action in relation* and that everything on earth and in the universe is thus a designer.

When diverse things act aware of and in relation to each other, they design environments that become replete with life as more things (entities, materials, artifacts, understandings, etc.) emerge and contribute to the design. In this way, Respectful Design seeks to identify the knowledgeable practices written into Country, engaging with learning environments and reactivating the cultures of repair.

Taking an Indigenous Knowledge approach, when peoples and intelligent others work together to repair environments, the knowledge offered by the environment itself will also repair human culture. This is a relational epistemology where recognizing the agency of all forms of life redirects companionship with the world. Respect is a key and moderating conception for this process.

Country and place have different meanings, being on Country means being enveloped in the outside mind through being engaged in the relationships of Country. Holding this knowledge is a huge responsibility that is critical to the purpose of being. Knowledge is a way of being when we know and are accepted by Country. Place is somewhere human minds deem to be significant, while Country is itself an agent.

Knowledge lives in Country and has partnered with humans since the beginning. Our consciousness originated on Country so learning on Country is a consciousness enhancing program that we teach all peoples. If we are seeking consciousness that is a being *at the stars*, then we already have it; we just have to look up at night and see knowledge reflected in the Country of the universe.

On Country Design

The smell of red meat ants hangs in the air in late summer. The red meat ant lives on arid planes often near waterholes. It can clean up dead animals very quickly making sure that water is not poisoned. Red meat ants are voracious; they protect their territory and control every living thing in this territory. Their nests spread connected by busy highways over hundreds of meters. They have boundaries established by ritual where other red meat ants will not intrude. They keep slave ants to care for their eggs and they farm other insects for food. Their story has ancient origins in warfare and violence that they enacted when

they were human. The red meat ant story is about colonization written into Country eons ago. The story tells of violence, fire, destruction, and healing. The red meat ant tribe engaged in murder and enslavement and used the power of fire which in the end killed all the adults, leaving the children transformed as ants forever cleaning up the dead and toxic remains. The red meat ant story shows how violation is dealt with by the law that resides in Country.

If you are wounded, red meat ant scent is an antiseptic that will heal and protect against infection. Earth from red meat ant nests can make a floor that will bind strongly, repel other insects, and keep a house clean and its inhabitants healthy. In this we may see why Aboriginal peoples rely upon and revere Country.

I ask some simple questions about design, not the products but about each individual person who designs and the locus of your design so we can begin to understand this decolonizing idea:

- What kind of being is your design? How does it move?
- What color is it?
- Where does your design live? Where does it belong?
- What does your design say?
- What does it eat and what others does it sustain?
- Where does your design fit with other designs? To whom and to what is it related?
- How does your design grow and reproduce?
- When your design dies what remains does it leave behind?
- How are you related to the being of your design?

We, along with everything else, exist in patterns of relation with Country. We may say that we are separate, superior, and entitled, and we can continue to intrude and violate regardless because we can dominate knowing. The colonial idea that we discover knowledge situates knowing as an entirely human possession. It allows us to systematically undermine knowledge if we choose. But such action begets social disregard and compliance. Western ontology allows us to assume we are safe in doing this because everything else is mere matter that exists for our use and experience. No part of the human-centered worldview sees outside into the thinking of the other – the alive and thinking environment, the intelligent and governing Country. Such perspectives are disregarded.

If we learn to perceive our patterns of relationship to Country, then knowledge alive in Country resituates us. In this simple turn of awareness there is potential for true redirection. There is great potential in the understanding that knowledge is not just in our heads. This potential is not based in evidence or science or politics. It is rooted in the simple and direct axiom that actions play out differently when we regard ourselves as reliant on the knowing that lives within environments because we too are embedded within and totally dependent upon them. Truth in Indigenous Knowledge is evident in the way things play out over generations. Thus, if we can learn to be our authentic being, listen well,

and speak and act softly, we begin to be truly informed about how we can look ahead. We can discern how what we might do now plays out generationally.

Conclusion

I have the honor of sitting with Uncle Charles Moran, Bundjalung Senior Man, and talking about life. Uncle tells a story of the native bee, saying that when the native bees leave the flowers and they circle around flying higher and higher then you know the nest is a distance away. Then Uncle starts telling stories in repeated cycles and you know that in this relationship of revisitation through repetition he will lead us on a long journey to a knowledge of much greater significance.

Uncle tells us that native bees are very small and hard to see, let alone follow. The two native species produce different honey. One is sweet, the other tart and bitter, and there is no way of telling which one you are following but the bitter honey nest is much easier to find. His story tells us how significant perceptual learning is and as the story is repeated we can apply this simple metaphor of revisitation to understand and recall every detail and to get a glimpse of the depth of knowledge that lives with just one tiny element of Country.

Revisitation is an important learning event. When you go back to a past story it is unchanged but you are different, so you get a new view of what the story means because of who you have become. The redirection that comes from living awareness of the whole of life is key to decolonization. The intelligence of Country reveals itself to us if we listen well, observe these connections closely, speak softly, and be ourselves.

Disclosure Statement

The Indigenous Knowledge presented here is integral to scholarship that underpins Gnibi Wandarahn School of Indigenous Knowledge at Southern Cross University. Wherever the first person is used in the article it indicates the voice of Norm Sheehan and out of respect for the eldership of Uncle Charles Moran and Uncle Greg Harrington their words are referenced by name.

References

Denness, Callum. 2017. "Donald Trump 'Isolated' on Climate Change: Al Gore Says Rest of World Moving on without US President." ABC News, July 10. http://www.abc.net.au/news/2017-07-10/donald-trump-isolated-on-climate-change-says-al-gore/8693806

Fry, Tony. 2010. *Design Futuring: Sustainability, Ethics and New Practice*. Oxford: Berg.

Kapeen, Bertha. 2009. *Werlu Wana: Be Yourself*. Lismore: Lismore City Printery.

Moran, Charles. 2004. *Talk Softly, Listen Well: Profile of a Bundjalung Elder, Charles Moran*. Lismore: Southern Cross University Press.

Saltz, Jerry. 2013. "Jerry Saltz on Art's Insidious New Cliché: Neo-Mannerism." *Vulture*, October 10. Accessed December 19, 2017. http://www.vulture.com/2013/10/jerry-saltz-on-arts-insidious-new-clich.html

Sheehan, Norm, Janine Dunleavy, Tamar Cohen, and Shawn Mitchell. 2010. "Denatured Spirit: Neo-Colonial Social Design." In *The Havoc of Capitalism: Publics, Pedagogies and Environmental Crisis*, edited by Gregory Martin, Donna Houston, Peter McLaren and Juha Suoranta, 99–116. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Southern Cross University. 2017. *Reconciliation Action Plan*. https://www.scu.edu.au/media/scueduau/about/documents/Gnibi-Wandarahn-Reconciliation-Action-Plan-2017-2020.pdf.

Taleb, Nassim. 2007. *The Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable*. Camberwell: Allen Lane.

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Tristan Schultz is an Aboriginal and Australian designer, strategist, and researcher examining intersections between decolonial thinking, ontological design, and sustainability. He holds a B. Design, M. Design Futures (Hons) and is a PhD Candidate, a lecturer in the Design Program at QCA, Griffith University, and founder of the design practice Relative Creative.
tristanschultz1@gmail.com

Danah Abdulla is a designer, educator, and researcher. Her research explores design cultures and possibilities of design education in the Arab world. She is a Lecturer on the BA (Hons) Design Management and Cultures at the London College of Communication, University of the Arts London.
d.abdulla@lcc.arts.ac.uk

Ahmed Ansari is a doctoral candidate in Design Studies at Carnegie Mellon University. He is currently working on reconstructing a South Asian philosophical genealogy of technics, and tracing histories of design education in Pakistan. He teaches seminar courses in systems thinking, critical and cultural theory, and philosophy of technology at CMU.
aansari@andrew.cmu.edu

Ece Canlı is a design researcher and artist, investigating the relationship between body politics and material practices from a decolonial queer feminist point of view. She recently completed her PhD in the Design program at University of Porto, fully funded by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT).
ece.canli@gmail.com

Mahmoud Keshavarz is a postdoctoral researcher at the Engaging Vulnerability Research Program, Department of Cultural Anthropology and Ethnology, Uppsala University. He has been a Visiting Scholar at Parsons School of Design and University of Gothenburg. He is the author of *The Design Politics of the Passport: Materiality, Immobility and Dissent*, forthcoming with Bloomsbury Academic.
mahmoud.keshavarz@antro.uu.se

What Is at Stake with Decolonizing Design? A Roundtable

Tristan Schultz, Danah Abdulla, Ahmed Ansari, Ece Canlı, Mahmoud Keshavarz, Matthew Kiem, Luiza Prado de O. Martins and Pedro J.S. Vieira de Oliveira

ABSTRACT This roundtable was conducted by the eight founding members of Decolonising Design Group in October 2017, using an online messaging platform. Each member approached design and decoloniality from different yet interrelating viewpoints, by threading their individual arguments with the preceding ones. The piece thus offers and travels through a variety of subject matter including politics of design, artificiality, modernity, Eurocentrism, capitalism, Indigenous Knowledge, pluriversality, continental philosophy, pedagogy, materiality, mobility, language, gender oppression, sexuality, and intersectionality.

KEYWORDS: Design Studies, decoloniality, ontological designing, pluriversality, Global South

Design and Culture

**Matthew Kiem is a
Sydney-based designer,
researcher, and educator.
He has recently completed
his PhD at Western Sydney
University on the topic of
the Coloniality of Design.
His thesis examines the
meaning of ontologi-
cal designing in light of
decolonial thinking, with
a particular interest in the
settler colonial dynamics of
Australia.
mnkiem@gmail.com**

**Luiza Prado de O. Martins
is a Brazilian researcher
and artist. Her work looks
at questions of gender,
technology, and the body.
She is one half of the artis-
tic research duo "A Parede"
and holds a PhD in Design
Research from the Univer-
sity of the Arts Berlin.
luiza@a-pare.de**

**Pedro J.S. Vieira de Oliveira
is a Brazilian researcher
and artist in sound studies.
He holds a PhD in Design
Research from the Univer-
sity of the Arts Berlin, and
is one half of "A Parede."
pedro@a-pare.de**

Matthew Kiem

Let's begin by discussing what each of us understands to be at stake in the idea of "decolonizing design." In some of our private discussions we have noted that the concept of "decolonization" is gaining currency within the academy generally and in various ways throughout the field of design. While I am sure most of us would agree that a growing awareness of and interest in the issues associated with coloniality is generally welcome, there is nevertheless a lot that hinges on the way this occurs. Our conversations have included, for instance, a concern with the tendency of political terms such as "decolonization" to be hollowed out by a pluralistic mode of engagement (see Fry 2011).

Academics and designers are adept at mimicking the representational dimension of movements – "political or otherwise" – without necessarily generating or supporting the substantive changes that political concepts are designed to bring about. This is less a problem of individual failing than it is design of the institutions that we work for. In most academic contexts, it is all too easy for people who possess a great deal of cultural capital to make the token gesture of learning a new set of terms or adding a few different texts or examples to the curriculum. While change must begin somewhere – and token inclusion is perhaps better than no inclusion at all – the problems connected to the concepts of modernity/coloniality/decoloniality and, I would add – invoking Tony Fry's term – defuturing, demand a sense of purpose and dedication that implies a far more radical and substantive redesigning of the dominant cultures of design practice, research, and education than most people have been able to register or enact.

This problem is related to Cameron Tonkinwise's (2015) critique of the proliferation of qualified versions of design, which prompts us to consider the utility of articulating the kind of difference represented in "decolonizing design." With this in mind, it is important to clarify how "decolonizing design" aims at something quite different from an additive inclusion into Design Studies as it already exists. By my reading, "decolonizing design" is not a "new" or an additional form of design but a political project that takes design as such – including its theorization – as both an object and medium of action. Considering this, it would be a mistake to assume that "decolonizing design" represents some kind of service offering, as though the field could undergo a procedure by which the "bad" colonial bits could be isolated and removed without disturbing the core business of what "design" and "Design Studies" is supposedly all about. In this sense, "decolonizing design" is not a question of improving the status quo but a question of learning to differentiate between designs that facilitate the productivist drive towards devaluing and appropriating human and non-human natures, and designs that facilitate a process of delinking and redirection into other modes of being/becoming.

As writers such as Angela Mitropoulos (2006) and Walter Mignolo (2011) have said in their own ways, the political substance of this lies less in the content of any discussion – a question of saying or including the right things – than in the terms under which the discussion is

conducted. In other words, it is a question of who controls, profits from, or is protected (or not) by the ways in which intellectual and other forms of re/production and consumption are organized. This introduces an imperative to assert the difference of "decolonization" as a specific and fundamentally radical political project vis-à-vis the "business as usual" of the design and academic professions. Frantz Fanon (1971, 27) for one was very clear on this point: insofar as it sets out to change the "order of the world," decolonization is "a programme of complete disorder," that is to say, something that seeks to challenge, upset, and reconfigure modern/colonial institutions rather than fit comfortably within them. The imperative here is not so much to defend the singular or ahistorical "truth" of "decolonizing design" but, rather, to design meaningful material-symbolic change that is neither pacified nor disabled by the colonial designs of academy.

Ahmed Ansari

I would agree with Matt insofar as "decolonizing design" is primarily a political project, but then all projects and designs are, even when they claim to be apolitical or politically neutral. However, I would like to draw attention to the fact that we are engaged in this project *as designers*, and therefore any engagement with articulating a relation between decoloniality and design necessitates articulating the relation in terms both *poietic* and *praxical*. For me, this means engaging with the nature of what design practice helps bring into being. Design brings into being new ontologies and ontological categories and their corresponding subjects and subjectivities. This occurs through the construction of artifice and artificiality, which is inextricable from the fact of our humanity, and is now both the medium we live in, determining the nature of our existence on the planet, and the primary determinant of our horizons insofar as we interpret our reality in the present and dream about possible and plausible realities in our futures (Arendt 1958; Dilnot 2015).

In the canon of decolonial theory (Mignolo, Quijano, Grosfoguel, etc.), the current incarnation of the project of continued Western coloniality over the rest of the globe through the mechanisms of globalization and neoliberalism, there is little attention to the development of *artifice as a necessary condition of modernity*. In other words, decolonial theory lacks any substantial theoretical reflection on the history of the artificial as it developed after the Industrial Revolution from regionally bound, culturally specific technical trajectories into a global technical system; the role that artifice has played in giving shape to and sustaining and perpetuating forms of colonial power; and the nature of the artificial especially as it relates to ontological differentiation. Apart from Arturo Escobar's (2012) *Notes on the Ontology of Design*, Mignolo, Quijano, and other decolonial scholars have instead traced histories of power. As a result, designers have very little to go on in the way of thinking about design's relation to the problem of modernity.

I would add that there has been some considerable work on modernity, artificiality, and on specific manifestations of colonial power through artifice in academic disciplines like material culture, anthropology, science and technology studies, and development studies. But design discourse has done little to incorporate these accounts. As I see it, the present project of decolonizing design requires a threefold move. *We first need an account of the artificial and of the condition of artificiality*, an account which can explain the different sociotechnical trajectories that various civilizations exhibit up until modernization through colonialism and globalization. We must then *situate this account in relation to the problem of modernity* and the modern world system, in order to develop it into something that explains what the technical foundations of modernity are. Finally, we can turn to *the consideration of other, possible artificials* – of alternatives to the systems of technics we have today. This is the nature of the project that I have undertaken over the past few years.

This task cannot be undertaken solely through the lens of contemporary Western thought, even if this lineage of thought has problematized the very modernity it birthed. It must be thought through looking from the lens of the more marginal perspectives of: the *ex-colonized* (i.e. new, hybrid subjects that so eagerly embrace globalization); the *extra-colonial*, (i.e. those rare Indigenous peoples that live on the outskirts of the world-system and tenaciously preserve ways of being that have otherwise died out in the world); and the *subaltern castes* (i.e. those who have been "left behind" by modernity, never sharing in the privileges and spoils of becoming modern while nevertheless forming the living reserve that fuels the mechanisms of the neocolonial world-system). To think beyond modernity from within modernity is not an easy task. But it is only when we incorporate these marginal perspectives into a reflection on the nature and history of modernity and of artifice to try and understand how it is that plural cultures were drawn into the binary of center and periphery, that we can then begin to tackle the productive task, from each of those peripheries, of designing plurally again.

Tristan Schultz

I too have noticed the currency of the term "decolonizing" being reduced to a hollow gesture. I fear it is traveling in a similar direction to the way the term "sustainability" was co-opted for neoliberalist means in design. In the last few years, decolonizing practices and movements have proliferated, with some fitting the kind of decolonizing design praxis I would describe as a political ontological design of plurality for sustainment, and others not. The latter are, at best, a token gesture of learning a new set of terms. They perpetuate neoliberal globalizing and homogenizing ambitions by pandering to an ontological elimination design event of the technological colonization of imagination. Because of the industrialization of memory through socio-communicative digital technologies, people's abilities to imagine being otherwise is being

eliminated (Escobar forthcoming; Fry 2012, 2017; Stiegler 2009; Virilio 2008, 2012).

There is currently not enough critical reflection on this in the interrogation of coloniality in design, nor is there enough self-reflection on the techno-mediating methods through which "decolonizing" design is explored. In late 2016, I collected a list of invites and call for papers that proposed decolonizing modernism, theology, computing, technology, the arts, love, gender, and, of course, "all things." There have been several summer schools, book series, and efforts to decolonize design thinking too. Of course, our own platform, decolonizing design, is part of this phenomenon.

Arturo Escobar (2017) writes that the ontologically designing techno-mediation of worlds has now become a question of survival for the autonomy of all those people who never signed up to "being" culturally commodified universalized hyperrealities (Virilio 2012). This leads me to wonder if we might use design education that takes seriously the destruction of biophysical worlds (sustainable design, eco design) as a model for design education that takes seriously the destruction of human lifeworlds and autonomy from excessive techno-mediation. Can design education take an ontological turn to squarely focus on techno-mediations as they relate to designing autonomy and plurality and to futuring? Decolonizing design, as Matt suggests, demands an urgent recognition of the threat defuturing techno-mediation poses to our sheer existence as a species (Fry 2017). All this amounts to a task no smaller than locating how designers can *be* decolonized, enabling an aptitude to prefigure, project, and future *being* human. It invokes a politics no smaller than the Enlightenment, even though the hegemonic ambitions of the Enlightenment are precisely what decoloniality must reverse.

This connects with Ahmed's "threefold move" proposition. But I would say that to situate problems in relation to modernity and consider alternative systems to the technics we have today requires breaking free of the rationalistic Cartesian worldview that colonizes all of "our" minds and places us on a spectrum of ontologically conditioned modern world system beings. As Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2014) has noted, we are facing modern problems for which there are no modern solutions. We lack the ability to organize thoughts in such a way that we can comprehend, in different modalities of temporal and spatial scale, our situatedness amongst a maelstrom of ontological plurality. Even worse, we designers with our designerly tools, methods, and mapping techniques risk *un-mapping* plurality. What I mean is we risk doing the reverse of what Escobar (2015, 15) calls the mapping of "multiple transition narratives and forms of activism … veritable cultural and ecological transitions to different societal models, going beyond strategies that offer anthropocene conditions as solutions," by mapping social messiness into rationalist Cartesian and instrumental typologies of convenient commensurability to modern world-system minds. Decolonizing design first requires unlearning defuturing mapping traps in order to learn mapping relational worlds. This relates to Matt's point

about "learning to differentiate" relationally. As Auntie Mary Graham (2017) speaks of Aboriginal relationality, from where she is located, as a Koombumerri Aboriginal Elder (Australia), there is no Aboriginal equivalent to the Cartesian notion of "I think therefore I am" but, if there were, she says, it would be *I am located therefore I am*. For Mary, location – or more poignantly Place – equals Dreaming. There are multiple Places so there are multiple Dreamings, so there are multiple Laws that equal multiple Logics that equal multiple Truths. All Perspectives (Truths) are valid and reasonable. This is not relativism because there is still judgment emanating out of a locality in a reciprocal relation with land, place, ethics, balance, and autonomy. For me, this intelligible Aboriginal philosophy is 65,000 years older than the core condition Tony Fry (2009) argues for – a limitation of freedom within sustainment. Mapping and amplifying the futuring and eliminating the defuturing techno-mediations and socio-technical systems performing on these kinds of Aboriginal relational worlds could be an immensely significant contribution to decolonizing design because it is a contribution to futuring humans (in all ontological pluralities) and the biophysical worlds upon which humans depend.

Matthew Kiem

Tristan mentions the significance of distinguishing the concept of plurality from both relativism and pluralism. This strikes me as a key part of what decoloniality means as a mode of designing. In this regard, I can appreciate something of Ahmed's dissatisfaction with how decolonial theorists have understated the significance of technics, particularly as there is a specific way in which a designerly interest in the politics of material-symbolic configurations forces important and inescapable questions of decision, direction, and relation. Indeed, I have often wondered about the emphasis that decolonial thinkers have given to questions of epistemology over ontology. I do not want to overwork this distinction – it is after all but one of many ways of organizing (designing) a line of questioning – but in the context of my interest in thinking about ontological designing in light of decolonial thinking, it does strike me as significant.

The largely ambivalent and sometimes hostile treatment that the concept of ontology receives in the work of such thinkers as Dussel (2003) and Maldonado-Torres (2007) is at least in part related to the strong stance that Levinas took against aspects of Heidegger's thought that Levinas understood to be indivisible from Heidegger's fascist politics. Connecting the question of theory to politics and personal relations in this way does nothing to undermine the significance of what is it stake for either Levinas, Dussel, or Maldonado-Torres but, on the contrary, provides a clue to what they are trying to accomplish through the critique of concept that has otherwise been significant to theorists of ontological designing (Willis 2006, n.d.), decoloniality (Escobar 2012), and Indigenous design philosophy (Sheehan 2004).

In the face of these differing positions on some of the philosophical fundamentals, I have found it useful to consider plurality as a materialist concept, that is to say, that plurality "is" and affects (designs) "us" in excess of the representational terms through which it is thought (Deleuze 1995, Sheehan 2004). This is not to say that ideas are not important but that their agency is best understood in material terms (Mellick Lopes 2005; Rooney 1989). Whereas the philosophical idealist sees danger in the expression of a difference that refuses to fit within (their materially specific) mode of configuring representational thought, a materialist conception of plurality shows that political contestation is grounded in the ways that things and relations are designed (Sheehan 2004). While the question of distinguishing colonizing designs from decolonizing designs is necessarily a question of situational and perspectival discernment, what I am trying to suggest here is that: 1) situational epistemologies/ontologies are relational, not relativist; and 2) the question of the pluralism is an issue of anti-relational (colonial) designing that can be addressed by learning to discern the presence and possibility of designs for relational plurality. To my mind, these are the terms by which the works of Indigenous philosophers such as Graham and Sheehan show up as expert expressions of designing otherwise and beyond the coloniality of knowledge, as opposed to having their work rendered as exoticized targets of the pluralist desire for inclusion, alias assimilation.

Ahmed Ansari

Matt's observation that ontological questions are received with somewhat more suspicion in Latin American scholarship is interesting and, perhaps regionally specific – I can certainly trace subtle but important differences between the scholarship coming out of Central and South America and, say, South and East Asian authors. I do think that the very different ways in which colonialism arrived and then perpetuated between various regions of the world have led to very different framings of the problem of coloniality/modernity. This means that there is no *one* approach to a decolonial politics but, as both of you have pointed out, a plurality, many possible politics.

For example, unlike the first *conquistadores* in Latin America, who arrived as military men backed by Spanish guns, cannons, and clergy, the British and Dutch arrived as traders not conquerors in India, China, or the Southeast Asian kingdoms. Nor did colonial conquest proceed in the same way, one of the key differences being that there were no mass genocides and subsequent displacements by white settlers or extensive interbreeding between the settler and local populations (subsequently, one finds racial hierarchies based on different genealogies in Latin America, whereas these are noticeably absent in South Asia, where ethnicity, religion, and caste still dominate social hierarchies).

One can theorize that this form of total rupture, this total break from the Pre-Columbian past, has influenced the way that modern Latin American postcolonial identity is framed and constructed. To drive the

point home, colonialism and modernity mean different things to different peoples and cultures, and therefore lead to different questions, concerns, and politics. The *what you can reach to* as the means of constructing alternatives is also regionally and historically contingent: can you reach back into a precolonial past, or is the rupture so great that this is impossible; are there Indigenous ways of being in the present that you can study, or have those cultures ceased to exist? It is therefore imperative, I believe, that designers committed to a decolonial politics do the work of delving into their own civilizational histories.

Moreover, it is worth noting that, in South and East Asian scholarship, at least, both questions of ontology and technics have received a great deal of attention, partly as a history of responses to European continental philosophy, and particularly in the early twentieth century, the German continental tradition, the influence of which on pan-Asian thought has been, I think, greatly overlooked and underrated (for example, Tetsuro Watsuji and Nishado Kitara and the Kyoto School were responding directly to Heidegger in their theorizing Japanese phenomenology and technics). Like I've emphasized before, it's not that this work is missing – it is that it has received scant attention, especially within the community of design historians and Design Studies scholars, and this is because we do not have the equivalent of the highly specialized scholars in the humanities who can work in multiple languages and immerse themselves in the histories and texts of different cultures.

This has always been one of the great failures of design history and theory – unless both can reform themselves as disciplinary practices, training a new generation of scholars who will be able to recover, derive, translate, and build canons that aren't Anglo-European, I fear that both design history and Design Studies will continue to be severely constrained in their ability to offer useful prescriptions to feed into contemporary practice. As Clive and Tony have pointed out in *Design and The Question of History*, design schools today only teach token history courses that focus on individual movements and their aesthetics rather than trying to build a nuanced understanding of how modern technical systems came to mold and shape modern humans (Dilnot, Stewart, and Fry 2015). It is therefore no surprise that design practice today is like a headless chicken, flailing about, trying to reconcile its own structural complicity with mechanisms of the modern world-system with the urgency of dealing with the monsters it has helped birth.

I would modify their assessment of the present situation by further stating that practice is doomed to fail because the horizons of what it knows are neither deep enough nor wide enough, i.e. it does not go far enough back in time, nor does it span space and place. Design practice has no alternatives because it lacks the very thing that makes alternatives possible: the understanding of historical and contextual difference. This is, in part, because of the failure of Design Studies and design history in both informing practice as well as in widening, deepening, and critiquing its horizons. We need to think beyond design practice *to what it can be other than what it is*, but we cannot do this

without a massive shift in making history and theory relevant again, and in decolonizing Design Studies and design history.

Danah Abdulla

Matt and Tristan mention the risk of decolonizing design becoming just another design descriptor and following the same route as sustainability. This is important. Several months ago, while discussing my involvement with Decolonising Design, someone said to me "I'm going to decolonize my breakfast, it's a word you can use in front of anything." The scene reminded me of a running joke we had in graduate school when everyone was using the word "curate," and one of my colleagues once told me he was going to "curate" his breakfast. Are we at the point where decolonizing is used as lightly as "curate?" Has the term become some meaningless buzzword that can be thrown in front of anything, emptying it of its urgency?

Our task is to make sure people understand decoloniality for what it is: a subversion and transformation of Eurocentric thinking and knowledge; a knowledge produced *with* and *from* rather than *about*. Why then is this term not serious for others? I would like to question this. The "doing good" movement in design (social design, design activism, humanitarian design, etc.) has brought about an important questioning for designers and an interesting starting point, but has done very little in the way of transforming design education, thinking, and practice. Despite these efforts and the newfound importance attached to design, designers often remain uncritical service providers, and design itself part of a competitive business strategy. The "doing good" movement has contributed to what I call the morality aesthetic – a "style" born out of corporate social responsibility and conscious consumption. It means Adidas invites you to break the status quo, Ray Ban wants you to pitch your world-changing ideas in their #Campaign4Change, and Doc Martens calls on you to #Standforsomething. Other brands are jumping on the moral purity bandwagon through action hashtags and preachy copy. Like Tristan, I fear that decolonizing design is going in this direction and becoming a synonym for "improving things."

The morality aesthetic risks simplifying decoloniality and stripping it of its criticality. Just imagine: "The Decolonizing Design Toolkit" (featuring Venn diagrams, bite-size lines of inspiration, and witty one liners, set in Champion and Bryant and poppy colors) provides a step-by-step method on how to decolonize design. Or: "Now you too can Decolonize Design in six weeks! Sign-up to our new class online." Or: "Announcing a two-week summer school where designers can decolonize their designs. Location: an independent art college. Price: £2,000 without accommodation or travel." We must be careful not to move into what Tuck and Yang (2012, 3) call the "too-easy adoption of decolonizing discourse (making decolonization a metaphor)."

The danger of decolonization becoming a metaphor is that it will be rendered obsolete. In the Global North, and specifically in the UK, most

universities claim that statistically what they term "Black Asian and Minority Ethnic (BME)" students underperform. Some argue for diversifying the content, while most attempt to address the issue through more tutorials and face-to-face time. However, the mere token inclusion, as Matt says, is not addressing the causes of issues. Why are these students not performing as well as others, and why do they fail to connect with the content? It is not only a content issue, but also a matter of *who* is teaching and *how*. Universities should not only look at their content, but address their hiring practices by recruiting faculty that better represents the students.

The morality aesthetic is now being implemented in design programs and design practice across the Global South. In the Arab region for example, largely middle-class design students are looking to "serve" the needs of poor communities composed of people with very different backgrounds from their own, or designing for refugees, where countries like Lebanon and Jordan have over 1 million refugees living there. Designers aim to provide a "voice" for the disenfranchised, using aid discourse, and maintaining dominance over the production of knowledge by using these communities for their school projects. These ideas and methods, disguised as "universal" have traveled, carrying with them the structures of Western thinking, and continuing to reproduce the cycle where the Westernized universities are reliant on knowledge produced elsewhere. The Westernized university features the same curriculum, the same authors, and the same disciplinary divisions that dominate universities in the West. These structures remain unquestioned: as Grosfoguel (2013) says, they become "commonsensical." This unquestioning means ideas are copy-pasted into a curriculum where knowledge and truth are masked as universalism, defined by a canon composed of works of males from five Western countries (Grosfoguel 2013), that represents 12 percent of the world's population. This is most clearly illustrated in the divisions of art history courses where Westernized universities located in Arab countries have course divisions such as "Islamic Art" and "History of Modern and Contemporary Art." Within design, we see the differentiation between "Typography" and "Arabic Typography." But are these Muslim cultures, beliefs, and institutions, as Sami Zubaida (2011) asks, so alien that they require special study and understanding? Why, then, is there a course in "Arabic Typography" or "Islamic Art" within a university located in the Arab world? Why is it not simply "Typography" or "Art History?"

I propose that to decolonize, we begin in the Westernized university, where we can begin to think of an epistemic pluriversality rather than a universal set of solutions. As Ahmed mentioned, we can not only "look through the lens of contemporary Western thought." We need to take the epistemic traditions of the Global South seriously and begin to shift the direction and decolonize "institutions appropriated by Eurocentred modernity" (Grosfoguel 2013, 88).

Mahmoud Keshavarz

For me the urge to think decoloniality starts from two very specific and intertwined premises – my personal trajectory and my work trajectory. I will start with the first because I believe it is important for us in Decolonising Design to clarify how we have arrived at this point, in feeling the urge to start this platform of intellectual exchange and discussion.

My working and thinking has been primarily inspired by continental Western philosophy. I am trained in industrial design and grew up in Iran during the reformist era. This post-revolution era was defined by a series of student, feminist, and worker movements. Many newspapers were dominated by liberal agendas, and a number of Western liberal and continental philosophers were invited to give lectures. Their works were largely translated and published. Sometimes there was more than one translation of the same book of philosophy being published in one year! As time passed, New Left philosophers were also translated. Theoretical works produced in Europe shaped my perspectives on politics at the same time that I was trying to make sense of the street politics and how "ordinary" people push their politics in everyday life in Iran (Bayat 2013).

When I was in Iran, I read primarily Western thinkers. Later, when I moved to Sweden, I read primarily non-Western writers. This experience is not entirely unique. Famously, when Frantz Fanon, a middle-class Martinican, went to Paris to continue his studies, he was struck by an encounter which later would form the basis for one of his chapters in *Black Skin, White Masks*. After completing his studies in Lyon, Fanon was boarding a train to Paris and noticed a little white boy who stares at him and tells his mother: "Mamma, look! A negro. I am freightened," [sic] and the woman turns towards Fanon: "Take no notice, sir, he does not know that you are as civilized as we …" (Fanon 1986 [1952], 111). For Fanon, this encounter points to different levels of racism as a structural drive as well as a product of colonialism and the benefits and privileges it provides for certain groups in the world. Fanon tells this story to locate his body in a world that bars him from participating in it in the way he desires or imagines. To be part of French society, he must either mimic the white body or behave like a black man as construed by French colonialism's social imaginary. Fanon (1986 [1952], 109) writes: "I came into the world imbued with the will to find a meaning in things … and then I found that I was an object in the midst of other objects." What's more, I was struck by Fanon's willingness to share this personal experience. Such stories and lived experiences were missing from the majority of the Western scholars I had been reading. While living in Europe, I had a hard time understanding universal analysis and theorization of white Western scholars. Often posed as universal facts without bodily locations, these epistemologies persistently locate the other while failing to account for the geographical, historical, and corporal locations of the producers. Migration pushed me to read scholars who constantly locate themselves in the world. This was my personal path.

My research has also shaped my trajectory. My doctoral research project explored the material practices that shape and are shaped by

conditions of undocumentedness, conditions of being deprived of the basic civil rights due to lack of residential permits or not having the "right" papers in crossing borders, and residing in a territory. My interest was to locate design as a specific historical and material practice that produces violent conditions of mobility and, consequently, immobility and undocumentedness. It seems imperative to think of the colonial legacies of migration, of how the current understanding and policies around migration are shaped by various colonial practices around organization of mobility. However, and surprisingly, there are very few works addressing the coloniality of the politics of movement and mobility. This is due to a form of "methodological nationalism" (Glick Schiller and Wimmer 2002) being embedded in social sciences as a specific strand of the Enlightenment. Such an attitude dominant in much of the scholarship produced by Western institutions tackles the issues of migration and mobility as an incoming phenomenon. This happens by taking the nation-state or recently a more expansive nation-state (the European Union) as the given territory from which others, their acts and agency can be interpreted. For instance, writers in the Global North have produced a massive body of knowledge about "why they come here." This perspective positions the institutions and their researchers at the center of knowledge production. This formulation selectively highlights the act of coming here as the focus of research on non-white bodies, thus producing knowledge by and for white institutions. But in reality, the process of migration contains various localities, simultaneous leaving and arriving, transition and transformation. Others have noted the coloniality of knowledge, and it is indeed true that certain epistemologies designed and continue to design themselves out of history, reserving a high ground from which other epistemologies can be seen, compared, judged, and interpreted.

As I was finishing my research, I realized that discussing the politics of design and the design of politics without discussing their colonial histories is a partial project. While it is important to account for how design and designing have shaped the way in which Europe and European citizens assume certain bodies as "legal" border crossers and others as "semi-legal" or "illegal" border crossers, it is also urgent to consider whose design (i.e. from what time and position and from where) has made and sustained the current hegemonic order of movement. Think, for example, of the Western notion of design as a task of "problem-solving." This idea assumes a universal truth in addressing the complexity of the world as a series of problems to be solved. Moreover, it assumes the position of center for itself as given, and approaches other epistemologies from that given center, trying at best to collaborate with or at worst to assimilate them.

Pedro Oliveira

I see the necessity of a decolonizing ethos within design as a process of accounting, first and foremost, for the historicizing of the field itself. The world as problem, as Mahmoud notes, which is to be "solved"

from a single, universal "locus of enunciation" (Mignolo 2011), must be problematized in itself. Such a pre-packaging and systematization of complexity in terms that might be tackled by a single approach of "making" or "thinking through making" assumes a "solvability" which is immediately assigned to a mode of shaping the world into a certain "order": designing (which places practices stemming from industrial development as its starting point). If we recontextualize the emergence of design as a discipline within the wealth accumulated by and through the invasion and pillage of land and its resources, the erasure of Indigenous peoples and their cultures, and the forced displacement of populations and their resignification as commodities, we grasp a fuller understanding of the worldview promoted by designerly discourse. I believe that a decolonizing practice begs to directly challenge what it means to act within a set of skills, methods, and research imperatives that, by definition, stem from this colonial framework. A decolonizing ontological framework must see design as a socio-technical mechanism of inquiry, re-enunciation, and re-narration. It is a project of looking back and re-framing certain material practices, and also a project of understanding the relationality of things beyond their mere objecthood.

For me, this brings into the fore the need to position decolonizing design as a *doing* in both praxical *and* poietic terms (to recall Ahmed's point). What exactly this *doing* entails needs to be articulated from different standpoints. The first is to think of the designing of time: this process unfolds slowly and as a constant struggle, without necessarily reaching a "pivotal point" of a "decolonial" or "decolonized" design (Dilnot, Stewart, and Fry 2015). A decolonizing project dwells on time and moves at a different pace. It rejects the impositions of neoliberal academia and the colonial framework of result-driven, well-defined, problem-solving design. This, I think, is why we refer to it as "decolonizing" design rather than "decolonial" design. The term suggests a process, a movement without a set ending point.

The second element of this doing follows from the first. It entails decolonizing our roles in the spaces *upon which* we act, namely where we teach, exchange, think, and practice design. The spaces from which we think and practice design – spaces like the privileged site of academia – must represent the interests of the population whose life is most threatened by the designed engines of colonization. Decolonizing design thus becomes a question of breaking down segregated spaces within and beyond the classroom and academic circles, allowing for a "*mundo donde quepan muchos mundos (a world where many worlds fit)*", as the Zapatistas say (Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional 1996). One way to do this is to confront the question of language, so that we learn how to speak differently and develop new "designerly" languages. There is a gap between decolonial theories and designerly work that a project of decolonizing design should address, even if it ultimately means rethinking and redesigning our relationship with designing altogether. In other words, *a project of decolonizing design speaks from and fosters spaces in which many border languages emerge.*

Gloria Anzaldúa (1987, 2015) theorizes on the production of such border languages. She observes that there cannot be a conversation that seeks to decolonize our onto-epistemologies if the poetic, the artistic, the spiritual, and the subjective are not accepted as cogent methods of knowledge production. We need this in order to unlearn and break down the engines of colonization beyond the theoretical and academic. Anzaldúa (1987, 80) reminds us that "because we internalize how our language has been used against us by the dominant culture, we use our language differences against each other." In adapting our language, in becoming fluent in several "wild tongues" (1987, 76), we invite others in, exchange our different knowledges, and decolonize discourses at the moment of their very enunciation.

Decolonizing is also a *prescriptive doing*. Paulo Freire reminds us that prescription is a key element in the articulation of power. He argues that "every prescription represents the imposition of one individual's choice upon another, transforming the consciousness of the person prescribed to into one that conforms with the prescriber's consciousness" (Freire 2000 [1970], 46–47). Design normalizes these prescriptions, and the work of design, even when practiced with a supposedly "socially-conscious" mindset, ultimately follows "the guidelines of the oppressor," teaching designers to assume the world as a well-defined set of problems to be solved. Instead, designers must understand that the very notion of the "world-as-problem" is an assumption worth challenging.

I see decolonizing design as a project that promotes an ontological change in how design is understood. Decolonizing design does not aim to create an opposition between "decolonized" and "colonized" designers or design practices. Rather, it promotes the ontological changes that will allow us to design more time for ourselves in this world. It is a project of incompleteness, of persistently un-learning and re-learning to see the world. We must constantly interrogate not only the field but also ourselves and our own practice; in so doing, we move beyond inquiring who is offered "a seat at the table" (to use Solange Knowles' language; Knowles 2016) but also the very terms used to set this "table."

Tristan Schultz

Pedro notes that the project of decolonizing design dwells on time and moves at a different pace, which rejects the impositions of neo-liberal academia and the colonial framework of result-driven, well-defined, problem-solving design. This is important. As Fry (2009) has mentioned, the university can be traced back to the fifth century with the Nalanda University in Patna, India, one of five Buddhist centers of learning. From a Western perspective however, the university began in Bologna and is less than 1,000 years old. Apart from a rich discussion to be had here related to modernity appropriating the locus of the birth of ideas and knowledge, what I would like to bring in to focus is the sheer amount of time it took for the university as it is currently known to mature and become a defuturing institution. Can paths shift such that

the university becomes a futuring institution within the next hundred or so years? There's a tension here: on the one hand, the re-making of the university, *urgently* needs to unfold; on the other, this remaking needs to *patiently* unfold over an indefinite period of time.

An *urgent patience* in which people (particularly in the Global North) require giving over to a condition beyond the modern rational appetite to become, and give in to a becoming, an always moving, a working with what remains, while never arriving anywhere new. How can we, as designers, balance this *urgent patience* with the imperative of acting (designing or eliminating designs) swiftly toward the establishment of ontological designs that perform directionally toward viable human futures before "we" (humans) anthropocentrically accelerate our demise?

Luiza Prado

Ahmed and Danah point out that we cannot look only through the lens of contemporary Western thought. How are we, as scholars invested in the decolonial project, immersed in the very structures we want to challenge? How does this often manifest in insidious ways, and in our own discourse?

In the struggle for decolonizing design, I believe it is fundamental that we acknowledge and challenge the ways in which coloniality's hierarchical classification of subjectivities shapes our perception of which subjects are permitted to enunciate and produce knowledge. Ramón Grosfoguel (2011, 71) points out that the global gender hierarchy and the global race hierarchy established by coloniality cannot be thought of separately; it is through the intersection of these facets of the colonial project that white women come to "have a higher status and access to resources than some men (of non-European origin)."

Maria Lugones (2007) argues that the emergence of a colonial/modern gender system is foundational to the enactment of colonial power. She identifies within this system a "light" side and a "dark" side. The "light" side concerns itself with hegemonic constructions of gender and sex/sexuality, and pertains to "the lives of white bourgeois men and women" (2007, 206) while simultaneously constructing these very categories. The "dark" side regulates the lives of those subjects that exist outside or at the margins of the white, bourgeois, heteronormative patriarchy. Although both "light" and "dark" sides of the modern/colonial gender system are violent, Lugones stresses that this violence is manifested and enacted in fundamentally different ways. The gender system positions all women as closer to the realm of nature than to that of culture. White womanhood is associated with innocence and respectability, and white women are charged with the task of perpetuating the white race within the nuclear, heterosexual family, while non-white womanhood is animalized, "marked as female but without the characteristics of femininity" (2007, 202–203). Non-white women thus come to be associated with sexual perversion, so validating the rape and sexual exploitation of non-white women within the modern/

colonial gender system. Inevitably, the violence imposed by this gender system spills into how design engages with the body: its articulation of modes of being made by and in the world – what Anne-Marie Willis (2006) calls ontological designing – is, after all, also implicated in the articulation of how gender is made, performed, and embodied in the world. It is in provisional acts of materialization, of *mattering* (Ahmed 2008, 33) – a process inextricably entangled with the material world – that gender comes into being, and "becomes worldly."

Scholarship on precolonial social structures provides useful glimpses beyond this modern/colonial gender system. Feminist scholar Oyèrónké Oyěwùmí (1997), for instance, remarks that gender was not a structuring principle in Yorùbá society prior to the contact with European colonizers: language and given names were gender neutral, and there was no concept of opposing, binary, hierarchical genders. Yet, European colonizers, presuming the universality of their own mode of social organization, described Yorùbá society as if gender were, indeed, perceived along patriarchal, dimorphic lines. This triggered profound changes in Yorùbá society; it is in response to European biological determinism that the "body-reasoning" (Oyěwùmí 1997, 5) of Yorùbás shifted, and bodies marked as feminine came to be coded as hierarchically inferior, subaltern.

Lugones (2007, 188) reminds us, however, that such a profound shift cannot occur without the strategic indifference that "men who have been racialized as inferior, exhibit to the systematic violences inflicted upon women of color," and that the theorization of "global domination continues to proceed as if no betrayals or collaborations of this sort need to be acknowledged and resisted." I bring this up because I believe that decolonization *must* emerge from an engagement with feminist and queer theories, and Lugones' critique is unfortunately very apt; the contributions of feminist scholars of color are still often overlooked, even within our group. Modern/colonial gender arrangements are also manifested in the ways in which we opt – and I use this word with an acute awareness of its weight – to engage with decolonial theories: with whose and which ideas we choose to engage, and whose and which theories we choose to highlight in our work. Who gets a seat at the table, as Pedro mentioned. Design historian Cheryl Buckley (1986, 5) emphasizes that the division of labor within Western design has historically been organized along the hegemonic gender binary, where women are presumed to have "sex-specific skills" that make them especially suited for work in the decorative arts, and in fields associated with domesticity such as embroidery, weaving, knitting, pottery, or dressmaking. On the other hand, fields like architecture or graphic design have historically been male-dominated. At the famed Bauhaus school, it was feared that the presence of women practitioners in these fields could "weaken" these disciplines (Ray 2001). This division of labor trickles down to the production of knowledge in design, too: male theorists still enjoy disproportionate visibility, opportunities, and respect in design academia.

It is not enough to shift our focus from a Northern- and Western-centric perspective to one that is Southern-centric. We must also address the masculinist structures of power that govern knowledge production in design. The work of decolonization requires a profound consideration of how gender hierarchies established by coloniality affect our perception of what counts as valid knowledge, and who generates that knowledge. Decolonization is a daily practice, one that encourages us to be critical of our own, preestablished modes of acting and thinking; one that requires us to challenge how we speak, to whom we are speaking, and how. We must challenge our own standard citational politics and reflect upon whose work we choose to highlight. A decolonial politics must be a feminist politics; otherwise, we risk reinforcing the same structures that we set out to deconstruct.

Ece Canlı

Mahmoud's emphasis on personal trajectories resonates with Ahmed's suggestion of delving into our own complex civilizational histories. To this I would add that we cannot thoroughly make sense of the ongoing effects of coloniality and its material politics without digging into our own cultural, historical, ancestral, and colonial pasts, and situating our present selves within a greater temporal and geographical context. Doing this helps us not only map relational worlds and subjectivities (as Tristan says), but also uncover, contest, and even deconstruct a myriad of identities introduced and stamped on us by the modern, colonial, capitalist world system. This approach allows us to see how our identities as, in Luiza's words, hierarchically classified subjectivities imposed by colonialism are continuously reinforced and reproduced by material practices (aka designing). Therefore, a journey towards one's own individual and collective history is also imperative for design researchers who seek to investigate socio-corpo-material conditions constituted and perpetuated by coloniality. Queer feminist thinking has taught us that this is not an easy task. It entails a great deal of self-reflection, self-redirection, and incessantly challenging one's own knowledge, subjectivity, and privileges, as well as the epistemic and ontic foundations from which these subjectivities derive. But it is worth it if it allows us to undermine insidiously manifested partialities, immunities, and relations with various axes of power.

I stress the importance of this task to amplify Luiza's points on how, although one of the main premises of decoloniality is to overthrow the hierarchical order that segregates bodies and knowledges, this order persists at both material and discursive levels, threatening to undermine our decolonizing effort. One of the threats resides in the politics of citationality. In continental philosophy and in design scholarship formed and taught by the West, "white men cite white men" (Ahmed 2014), excluding gendered, sexualized, and racialized bodies from the main philosophical and methodological discussions (Clerke 2010). But this cannot be tolerated in decolonial thought. If our desire is to avoid the discriminatory traditions of knowledge-making, we should

constantly retrace and reformulate our own reasoning about whose voice is heard, whose knowledge is valid, and whose privileges cause others' oppressions.

Decolonizing design is also threatened by a tendency to inhabit, see, and make the world through the lens of the binary logic (i.e. man/woman, male/female, black/white, inferior/superior, primitive/civilized, culture/nature, ontology/epistemology, West/East, etc.). A decolonial approach must undermine stark oppositions that marginalize the subjectivities and epistemic traditions inferiorized by modernity. A decolonial approach must uncover other ways of being, such as in-between or on the borderlands, as Pedro suggested. However, even we researchers with decolonial agendas tend to repeat these binaries. For example, we regard the relationship between the colonized and the colonizer as though there is one external malevolent colonizer from the Global North and one exploited yet benign colonized of the Global South. The story, as we know, is much more complicated. We cannot ignore the complicities and power interests of the colonized, nor many different forms of subjugation between the oppressor, oppressed and *inter se*, especially when it comes to gendered and racialized bodies residing at the lowest levels of the hierarchical power. In the prologue of the documentary film *Concerning Violence* (Olsson 2014), Gayatri Spivak similarly speaks of how gender oppression has been overlooked in the discourse of decoloniality and how in the violent process of gendering, the colonizer and the colonized act(ed) as allies. Her utterance evokes similar queer, decolonial critiques of how Western-oriented gender and sex categories have benefited not only the white colonizer man, but also the colonized man who savors the privileges of heteropatriarchy and heterosexism introduced to him (Lugones 2007; Oyewùmí 1997). At the same time, the gendered and racialized body is dominated by its Western counterparts (i.e. "whitestream" neoliberal queers, women, feminists) through altruistic attempts to save the latter from "monstrous" and "uncivilized" non-Western males (Petzen 2012). What's more, by dooming subaltern knowledges, agencies, and materialities to inferior status, there is a perception that they must be validated by the West (in this case Western gender and sexuality discourse). Otherwise, as Danah mentioned, their struggles and wills are deemed illegitimate (Abu-Lughod 2001). As decolonial researchers, we need to be aware of if and how we trigger structures of dominance in our professional and personal lives.

We might thus think of decolonizing design praxis, research, and pedagogy not only as a form of "doing" (as Pedro suggested) but also as form of "undoing," as an act of passivating, unravelling and *no longer contributing* to material-discursive configurations that privilege certain bodies while oppressing and dehumanizing others. Such efforts to undo can be understood as both a precondition for and consequence of *unlearning*. And for us, as designers and researchers, this unlearning can only arrive through "de-linking" not only from the ideas and methods taught by the holders of material and epistemic power, but also from the humanitarian design endeavors that *other the others*

further and replace a multiplicity of voices with tokenism and diversity. We cannot be freed from the material and onto-epistemological subjugation of the Global North without constantly contesting our own positionalities and privileges.

This, together with the previous accounts in this roundtable, might answer one of Matt's initial questions on how "decolonizing design" would be different from being yet another additive category in Design Studies. If we cannot fulfill the imperative tasks we have hitherto propounded, not only the term but also the effort of "decolonizing" is doomed to be hallowed, forgotten, and replaced by other newcomer labels for design.

Disclosure Statement
No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 2001. "Orientalism and Middle East Feminist Studies." *Feminist Studies* 27 (1): 101–113.

Ahmed, Sara. 2008. "Open Forum Imaginary Prohibitions: Some Preliminary Remarks on the Founding Gestures of the New Materialism." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 15 (1): 23–39.

Ahmed, Sara. 2014. "White Men." *Feministkilljoys* (Blog), November 4. https://feministkilljoys.com/2014/11/04/white-men/.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 2015. *Light in the Dark/Luz En Lo Oscuro: Rewriting Identity, Spirituality, Reality*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bayat, Asef. 2013. *Life as Politics: How Ordinary People Change the Middle East*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Buckley, Cheryl. 1986. "Made in Patriarchy: Toward a Feminist Analysis of Women and Design." *Design Issues* 3 (2): 3–14. https://doi.org/10.2307/1511480.

Clerke, Teena. 2010. "Gender and Discipline: Publication Practices in Design." *Journal of Writing in Creative Practice* 3 (1): 63–78.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1995. *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dilnot, Clive. 2015. "The Artificial and What It Opens towards." In *Design and the Question of History*, edited by Clive Dilnot, Susan Stewart and Tony Fry, 165–203. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Dilnot, Clive, Susan, Stewart, and Tony Fry, eds. 2015. *Design and the Question of History*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Dussel, Enrique. 2003. *Philosophy of Liberation*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers.

Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional. 1996. "Cuarta Declaración de La Selva Lacandona." *EZLN*. http://palabra.ezln.org.mx/comunicados/1996/1996_01_01_a.htm.

Escobar, Arturo. 2012. "Notes on the Ontology of Design." http://sawyerseminar.ucdavis.edu/files/2012/12/ESCOBAR_Notes-on-the-Ontology-of-Design-Parts-I-II-_-III.pdf.

Escobar, Arturo. 2015. "Transiciones : A Space for Research and Design for Transitions to the Pluriverse." *Design Philosophy Papers* 13 (1): 13–23.

Escobar, Arturo. 2017. "Response: Design for/by [and from] the 'Global South.'." *Design Philosophy Papers* 15 (1): 39–49. doi:10.1080/14487136.2017.1301016.

Escobar, Arturo. Forthcoming. *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press. March 2018. https://www.dukeupress.edu/designs-for-the-pluriverse/?viewby=title.

Fanon, Frantz. 1971 (1961). *The Wretched of the Earth*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.

Fanon, Frantz. 1986 (1952). *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.

Freire, Paulo. 2000 (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Berman RamosNew York: Continuum.

Fry, Tony. 2009. *Design Futuring: Sustainability, Ethics and New Practice*. Oxford: Berg.

Fry, Tony. 2011. *Design as Politics*. Oxford, England: Berg.

Fry, Tony. 2012. *Becoming Human by Design*. London: Berg.

Fry, Tony. 2017. *Remaking Cities: An Introduction to Urban Metrofitting*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Glick Schiller, Nina, and Andreas Wimmer. 2002. "Methodological Nationalism and beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences." *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs* 2 (4): 301–334. doi:10.1111/1471-0374.00043.

Graham, Mary. 2017. "Sovereignty of Indigenous Knowledge." Symposium Talk presented at the Sovereignty of Indigenous Knowledge, Ballina, New South Wales, Australia.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2011. "Decolonizing Post-Colonial Studies and Paradigms of Political-Economy: Transmodernity, Decolonial Thinking, and Global Coloniality." *TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1 (1). http://escholarship.org/uc/item/21k6t3fq

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2013. "The Structure of Knowledge in Westernized Universities: Epistemic Racism/Sexism and the Four Genocides/Epistemicides of the Long 16th Century." *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self- Knowledge* 11 (1): 73–90.

Knowles, Solange. 2016. *A Seat at the Table*. Record. Los Angeles: Saint Records and Columbia Records.

Lugones, María. 2007. "Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System." *Hypatia* 22 (1): 186–209. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2007.tb01156.x

Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2007. "On the Coloniality of Being." *Cultural Studies.* 21 (2–3): 240–270.

Mellick Lopes, Abby. 2005. *Ecology of the Image*. PhD dissertation. University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

Mignolo, Walter. 2011. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. London: Duke University Press.

Mitropoulos, Angela. 2006. "Precari-us." _Mute_ 1 (29). http://www.metamute.org/editorial/articles/precari-us.

Olsson, Göran. 2014. *Concerning Violence*. Documentary. Dogwoof

Oyewùmí, Oyéronké. 1997. *The Invention of Women: Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourses*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Petzen, Jennifer. 2012. "Contesting Europe: A Call for an Anti-Modern Sexual Politics." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 19 (1): 97–114.

Ray, Katerina Rüedi. 2001. "Bauhaus Hausfraus: Gender Formation in Design Education." *Journal of Architectural Education* 55 (2): 73–80. doi:10.1162/104648801753199491.

Rooney, Ellen. 1989. *Seductive Reasoning: Pluralism as the Problematic of Contemporary Literary Theory*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Sheehan, Norman. 2004. *Indigenous Knowledge and Higher Education.* PhD dissertation. The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

Sousa de Santos, Boaventura. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Stiegler, Bernard. 2009. *Technics and Time 2: Disorientation*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Tonkinwise, Cameron. 2015. "Just Design: Being Dogmatic about Defining Speculative Critical Design Future Fiction." *Cameron Tonkinwise* (Blog), August 21. https://medium.com/@camerontw/just-design-b1f97cb3996f#.4725ehd06.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (1):1–40.

Virilio, Paul. 2008. *Open Sky*. Translated by Julie Rose. Radical Thinkers. London: Verso.

Virilio, Paul. 2012. *The Administration of Fear (Intervention #10)*. Translated by Ames Hodges and Bertrand Richard. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Willis, Anne-Marie. 2006. "Ontological Designing — Laying the Ground." *Design Philosophy Papers* 4 (2): 69–92.

Willis, Anne-Marie. n.d. "Ontological Designing." *Design Philosophy Papers*. Accessed March 23, 2017. https://www.academia.edu/888457/Ontological_designing.

Zubaida, Sami. 2011. *Beyond Islam: A New Understanding of the Middle East*. London: I.B. Tauris.