



Response: Design for/by [and from] the 'global South.'

Arturo Escobar

To cite this article: Arturo Escobar (2017) Response: Design for/by [and from] the 'global South.', Design Philosophy Papers, 15:1, 39-49, DOI: [10.1080/14487136.2017.1301016](https://doi.org/10.1080/14487136.2017.1301016)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14487136.2017.1301016>



Published online: 21 Apr 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 25



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Response: Design for/by [and from] the 'global South.'

Arturo Escobar

Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, USA

ABSTRACT

This paper is intended as a contribution to the development of a framework for design for, by, and from the Global South. After discussing briefly the need for such a framework, the paper outlines the rudiments of a specific subset of this sub-field, drawing on the conceptualization and struggles for autonomy by some Latin American social movements. Key to the conceptualization of this *design for autonomy* perspective are renewed notions of the communal and relationality, and the growing emphasis on the need for significant cultural and ecological – in some versions, civilizational – transitions between patriarchal capitalist modernity. Design for autonomy and transition design are presented as parallel and interconnected projects for both the South and the North.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 20 November 2016
Accepted 28 January 2017

KEYWORDS

Design; global south;
autonomy; the communal;
civilizational transitions

The constitution of a field of 'design for/by the global South' (D/S), as Fry says, 'from its existing scatterings' (2017, 1), is a very welcome and timely call. The timeliness of the project is well established in Fry's position paper on the subject. It stems from the 'ongoing ruination' and defuturing effected by colonialism, modernity and development and its intensification with globalization. It is welcome for two main reasons: because much of what goes on under the banner of 'design' in the global North is not appropriate for design in the South (and, increasingly, is inappropriate for a North in crisis as well); and second, because there is great potential in design's reorientation to serve a range of theoretical and political projects from the South. Design for/by – and, as I will argue, from – the South may get to constitute a critical praxis for social transformation and alternative world-making, not only for the South but for the North as well.

Part I of this short paper traces the main elements and insights in Fry's D/S proposal. Part II presents the rudiments of a specific subset of D/S that brings together autonomy and design, drawing on the conceptualization and struggles for autonomy by some Latin American social movements. Key to the conceptualization of 'design for autonomy' (D/A) are renewed notions of the communal and relationality. Connected with the question of D/A is the growing emphasis on the need for significant cultural and ecological – in some Latin American versions, civilizational – transitions as the only theoretico-political project that makes full sense in the face of the devastating crisis of climate, poverty, environment and meaning. D/A and transition design thus emerge as parallel projects in both the South and the North, with their respective specificities.

Design for/by the global South in Tony Fry's work

First, a few words about Fry's vision and argument for D/S (in this issue), which is no doubt grounded in Fry's long-time project of developing an ontological approach to design, one that challenges and destabilizes naturalized understandings of design, including its relation to politics. The vision's opening statements are completely warranted: The 'South' is indeed powerfully plural, inhabited by radical difference of all kinds – cultural, social, ethnic and, in the last instance, ontological. To the same extent as the North, if not more so, the South is made up of multiple worlds, a pluriverse. Hence, there cannot be a unified subject for the D/S project. The South has been deeply affected by modernity – robbed of its futuring ability and of its long-standing practices for truly inhabiting its multiple worlds by the ongoing destruction wrought by relentless techno-economic intervention and domination. At the basis of all this is the constitutive anthropocentrism of the modern with its unrelenting defuturing effects – hence the need, worldwide, to undertake futuring measures, and design's role in this process could be momentous. To make matters more difficult, this visioning and conceptualization takes place in the space created by the gap between the complexity of the problems 'we' ('the world,' the planet) face and 'our' ability to understand it.

Fry situates the project of building D/S within the modern/colonial capitalist world system, from the rise of Western modernity and modernity/coloniality to globalization. This, in his view (and in this author's view) is the appropriate context for the reorientation of design under the D/S rubric. It might seem unwise to place design's reorientation within such a long historical background, but the fact is that design's historicity needs to be understood thus, given that the processes unleashed by modernity/coloniality continue to be *effective forces today*.¹ D/S is also framed within the planetary ecological crisis and the multiplicity of world-making practices, particularly those modern forces most responsible for constructing 'the world-within-the-world' of today's human habitation. Finally, Fry conceptualizes his project from 'the borderlands' created by the expansion of the capitalist modern/colonial system, understood as 'as an intermediate space of thought and action centrally based upon politically and pragmatic acts of appropriation and bricolage... an intercultural zone of encounter and discussion where information is exchanged, lifeworlds are translated, solidarity is built and friendships forged' (18). That these borderlands, themselves, need to be 'designed' for D/S, in place, is an insightful proposition that adds to established decolonial thinking. This design task might be most radically approached conjuncturally from those subaltern forms of border thinking that most significantly challenge Eurocentric epistemologies. It will require an active epistemological stance, a sort of 'observation of observation,' akin to that of second-order cybernetics. (I believe some social movements are arriving at a somewhat similar conclusion.)

As a locus of 'reconstituted designing,' the borderlands are the space par excellence for the reconstitution of an ontology, ethics and praxis of care in relation to what ought to be designed, and how. Against the destruction of attention – the loss of the *hic et nunc* of social action, of the place-basedness of existence, of the ability to be present to the present, and in light of massive delocalization fostered by digital technologies and ICTs (Virilio 1997, 2012) – there arises the need for this ontology and praxis of care that is capable of redressing the defuturing ontological designing that goes unquestioned. This would also be an ontology of repair of the broken beings and broken worlds that have been the result of centuries of defuturing designing, and of its alleged result, the Anthropocene. This, in Fry's vision, is the

task of Sustainment, as ‘a vital intellectual, political and pragmatic project of discovery marking a vital turn of “humanity”’ (28). Herein lies the possibility, and ground for, the reconstitution of design in the South as D/S, not as a total rejection of design but as ‘critical selection and local innovation’ (46) involving the creation of structures of care towards the Sustainment:

The central issue and project for design of/by and for the South is another kind of ontological designing – one based on the creation of structures of care able to constitute Sustainment (53). ... How can a designer be designed to be a provider of care via the designing of things that ontologically care? The answer to this question requires acknowledging that a new kind of designer depends upon the arrival of a transformed habitus. ... [It requires an] understanding of design’s implication in the state of the world and the worlds within it. To gain this understanding means fully grasping the scale and impact of design as an ontological force of and in the world in its making and unmaking (54). ... Acquiring such knowledge leads the proto-designer to learning how to read what is brought into being by design causally. Design as it now appears for such a designer is an anthropocentrically aware exercise of responsibility accountable to Sustainment. Thereafter, what design serves is the creation of a future with a future. It is from such an induction into design that the possibility of ontologically designing ‘things’ (social, material, organisational, cultural and so on) that care can be broached and a path of discovery opened (55).

A different, situated way of conceiving of projects is essential to this process, for instance, a way of rethinking retrofitting and reverse engineering to achieve a genuine reorientation of design approaches. Crucial to D/S is also a different praxis of design education, one capable of destroying the idea of design so it can be remade.

So far I have purposefully summarized the thrust and contents of Fry’s vision. In what follows, I suggest some additional ideas for how to advance the D/S project.

Design for autonomy: A ‘special case’ of design for/by/from the South²

I am not suggesting that all that goes on under the provisional category of D/S has to be D/A. Rather, D/A might be considered a special case of D/S. It might also constitute, however, and to play with words, a special case in a special way, for the attempt at placing autonomy squarely within the scope of design elicits unique insights into D/S, as I will try to show.

The argument

As in the case of D/S, D/A springs out of an ontological design framework. The argument can be summarized as follows:

1. The contemporary conjuncture of widespread ecological and social devastation summons critical thought to think actively about significant cultural and ecological transitions. Three interrelated forms of transition thinking within design theory and practice are attuned to this conjunctural task: D/S; design for transitions, with a broad view of transition (‘civilizational,’ or ‘the great transition’); and D/A, centered on the struggles of communities and social movements in defense of their territories and worlds from the ravages of the neoliberal globalization.
2. To reclaim design for other world-making purposes requires creating a new, effective awareness of design’s embeddedness in this history. At the social level, design’s historicity can be discussed with reference to the patriarchal capitalist modern/colonial world system; and philosophically, from the perspective of the rationalistic epistemology and the dualist ontologies that have become dominant with such system.

3. Thinking ontologically about the conjuncture implies examining the contemporary crisis as the result of deeply entrenched ways of being, knowing, and doing. Designing this understanding involves both examining critically the dualist ontology of separation, control and appropriation that has progressively become dominant with patriarchal capitalist modernity, on the one hand, and on the other inquiring into existing and potential rationalities and modes of being that emphasize the profound relationality and interconnectedness of all that is. D/A, in this way, starts with a decided statement on the side of the relational ontologies of those subaltern groups for which relational modes of being, knowing and doing are still socially important.
4. More concretely, to nourish design's potentiality to support subaltern struggles for autonomy, on the one hand, and civilizational transitions, on the other, requires a significant reorientation of design from the functionalist, rationalistic, and industrial traditions from which it emerged, and within which it still functions at ease, towards a type of rationality and set of practices attuned to the *relational* dimension of life. Major sources for reorientation of the rationalistic tradition lie within the nondualist and relational understandings and forms of life that are effectively present among many of the peoples engaged in territorial struggles against extractive globalization. These struggles evince the strong communal foundations that are still present at the basis of their social life. Relationality is also present, in the last instance, in the Earth itself, in the endless and ceaselessly changing weave of life on which all life depends. From this perspective, what we are witnessing with these struggles is a veritable 'political activation of relationality.'³
5. The D/A framework may be considered a Latin American contribution to the transnational conversation on design and D/S; that is, a contribution that stems from contemporary Latin American epistemic and political experiences and struggles. In this sense, it is *for/by* and *from* Latin America – that is, from the epistemic space that is *de facto* carved out by subaltern struggles – what decolonial feminist theorist Maria Lugones calls the fractured locus of enunciation (2010a, 2010b).

A word about the concepts of transition and transition design before the relation between autonomy and design is tackled. There has been a rich production, over the past decade, of cultural and ecological transition narratives and discourses in both the global North and the global South. In the North, they include concepts and movements such as degrowth, commoning, conviviality, transition towns and a wide array of transition initiatives (see Escobar 2015a, 2015b for detailed discussion of these transition visions). For the global South, the main transition narratives and radical alternatives to 'development' include *buen vivir* (collective wellbeing), rights of nature, communal logics and civilizational transitions, particularly as they are taking place in some Latin American countries. These transition imaginations, which posit the need for radical transformations in the dominant models of life and the economy, might constitute the most appropriate framework for an ontological reframing of design. They can be seen as instances of the pluriverse re/emerging. In the design world, these include two high-profile reframings: the evolving 'Transition Design' framework that is being developed as a graduate training and research program at Carnegie Mellon University's School of Design; and Ezio Manzini's (2015) conceptualization of design for social innovation and transition to a new civilization.⁴

Autonomy and design

'La tierra manda, el pueblo ordena, y el gobierno obedece. Construyendo autonomía' ('The earth commands, the people order, and the government obeys. Constructing autonomy'). This Zapatista slogan, which is included at the end of the 'Ten principles of good government' at the entrance of Zapatista autonomous communities, summarizes well the thought of autonomy that has been forcefully emerging, particularly among indigenous, Afro-descendant, and some peasant and urban movements over the past three decades.⁵ Herein lies the main inspiration for placing autonomy and the communal at the center of D/S inquiries.

If the conditions ever existed for constructing a design agenda from within the theoretico-political space of the social struggles of the day, that moment is today. Since 2001, the World Social Forum (WSF) already announced this historical possibility in the Brazilian city of Porto Alegre; its call to action still reverberates: *Another world is possible*. The WSF echoed what the Zapatista of Chiapas had already voiced with amazing lucidity and force: *Queremos un mundo donde quepan muchos mundos* ('We want a world where many worlds fit'). Is it possible to read in these popular slogans – which are actually inspiring instances of subaltern political thought – the seeds of a radical design imagination? *Queremos ser nosotros los que diseñemos y controlemos nuestros proyectos de vida* ('We want to be ourselves, those who design and control our life projects'), says the Mapuche poet Elicura Chihuailaf (cited in Rocha 2015, 97). One can see instances of this determination up and down the continent, from the Zapatista of Chiapas and the autonomous communities in Oaxaca, to the Nasa and Misak in Colombia's southwest and the Mapuche in Chile, but also among a growing number of *campesino* and Afro-descendant communities in a number of countries.

The notion of 'autonomous design' is a particular ontological design approach that is in synchrony with the D/S and transition frameworks. The basic insight is seemingly straightforward: that every community practices the design of itself. This was certainly the case with traditional communities (they produced the norms by which they lived their lives largely endogenously), as it is today with many communities, in both the global South and the global North, that are thrown into the need to design themselves in the face of ever-deepening manifestations of the crises and the inescapable techno-economic mediation of their worlds. In other words, if we accept the thesis – voiced by social movement activists, transition visionaries and some designers – that the current crises point at a deeper civilizational crisis, autonomously designing new forms of life and people's own life projects appears to many communities as an eminently feasible, perhaps unavoidable, theoretico-political project. For some, it is even a question of their survival as distinct worlds.

Theoretically, the question of autonomy in relation to design can be grounded in the view, best articulated by Maturana and Varela (1980, 1987), that autonomy is the most fundamental feature of the living; in these authors' jargon, autonomy is key to the *autopoiesis*, or self-creation, of living systems. This proposition serves as partial anchor for autonomous design. As Varela says, *In fact, the key to autonomy is that a living system finds its way into the next moment by acting appropriately out of its own resources* (Varela 1999, 11). This resonates with Gustavo Esteva's definition of autonomy, based on the Zapatista experience, as the ability to create the conditions that enable a given community to change its norms from within, or the ability to change traditions traditionally (2005, 2015). It might involve the defense of some practices, the transformation of others, and the veritable invention of new practices.

There is a range of forms of *pensamiento autónomo*, or autonomous thought, in Latin America at present. Together with the recrafting of communal forms of knowing being doing, these notions –*autonomía* and *comunalidad* – and their associated practices may be seen as laying down the ground for a new design thought. Buen Vivir and transitions to post-extractivism, it can be argued, are expressions of such thought, and so are the *planes de vida* (life projects) that, as already mentioned, constitute the alternatives to development envisioned by indigenous, Afro-descendant, and peasant communities. These are not the only experiences embodying the search for autonomy, which can be witnessed in almost every corner of the subcontinent – certainly in any location where brutal forms of extractive globalization are taking place: in struggles for the defense of seeds, commons, mountains, forests, wetlands, lakes and rivers; in actions against white/mestizo and patriarchal rule; in urban experiments with art, digital technologies, neo-shamanic movements, urban gardens. Taken as a whole, these expressions of multiple collective wills manifest the unwavering conviction that another world is indeed possible.

It is important to mention that in the context of many grassroots communities, design would take place under conditions of ontological occupation. The concept of autonomous design should thus be seen in terms of ontological struggles for the defense of their territories and life-worlds by communities and movements. The question becomes: Is it possible to think about design under conditions of repression and violence that often affect such communities? It is precisely in those cases where the idea of autonomy is flourishing and where the hypothesis of D/A takes on meaning. Finding one's way into the next moment by acting appropriately out of one's own resources (Varela's definition) applies as much to organisms as to persons and communities, or even worlds. For communities under ontological occupation, while this principle reveals the dire conditions under which their struggle takes place, since those resources are precisely what the occupation seeks to destroy, it might also become a guiding notion for strategies for survival and flourishing.

This does not mean that this hypothesis is beyond questioning. Is autonomous design not an oxymoron? To state it prospectively, the possibility I am trying to ascertain is whether ontologically oriented design, particularly in the context of D/S, could be design for, and from, autonomy. To restate the case, this would require extricating design from its dependence on modernist unsustainable and defuturing practices and redirecting it towards those world-making projects that are agreed upon collectively by communities, in all of their heterogeneity and contradictions. This entails investigating the design of tools, interactions, contexts and languages in ways that fulfill the ontological design principle of changing the ways in which we deal with ourselves and things so that futuring is enabled (Fry 2012; Winograd and Flores 1986).

A fundamental aspect of autonomous design is the rethinking of 'community,' or, more appropriately, the communal; this rekindled concern with the communal is in vogue in critical circles in Latin America and in transition movements in Europe. In this way, *realization of the communal* can be said to be the most fundamental goal of autonomous design. Communal thought is perhaps most developed in Mexico, based on the experiences of social movements in Oaxaca and Chiapas. For Esteva, *la comunalidad* (the condition of being communal) 'constitutes the core of the horizon of intelligibility of Meso-American cultures ... it is the condition that inspires communitarian existence, that which makes transparent the act of living; it is a central category in personal and communitarian life, its most fundamental *vivencia*, or experience' (n.d., 1).

Autonomía thus involves the ontological condition of being communal. *Autonomía* is exercised within a longstanding historical background, which has led some researchers to argue that, particularly in cases of indigenous-popular insurrection, such as those that have taken place in southern Mexico, Bolivia and Ecuador over the past two decades, it would be more proper to speak of societies in movement, rather than social movements. We can go further, and speak about *worlds in movement*. These societies/worlds in movement are moments in the exercise of cultural and political autonomy – indeed, of ontological autonomy.⁶ It can be added that autonomous struggles occur in the borderlands between non-capitalist, nonliberal, and non-State forms of thought and social organizations by communities and the capitalist, modernist and statist forms that necessarily also find their way into the communities, and that often gain the upper hand. Herein lies an important D/S design principle.

Autonomía often has a decided territorial and place-based dimension. It stems from, and re/constructs, territories of resistance and difference, as the case of black and indigenous movements in many parts of the Americas show (see, e.g. Escobar 2008 for the case of the Afro-descendant movements in the Colombian Pacific); however, this applies to rural, urban, forest and all kinds of territories in different ways, as in the case of the well-known movements of the unemployed in Argentina following the crisis of 2001, for whom the exercising of autonomy included both a critique of capitalism and the creation of new forms of life; it involved the creation of noncapitalist spaces and new forms of territoriality. The place-based dimension of *autonomía* often entails the primacy of decision making by women, who are historically more likely than men to resist heteronomous pressures on the territories and resources and to defend collective ways of being. There is often, in *autonomía*-oriented movements, the drive to re/generate people's spaces, their cultures and communities, and to reclaim the commons. Some say that *autonomía* is another name for people's dignity and for conviviality; at its best, *autonomía* is a theory and practice of inter-existence and inter-being, a design for the pluriverse.

A few features of autonomous design

From this brief theoretico-political discussion we can propose the following elements for thinking about autonomous design (again, particularly for the Latin American context).

Autonomy-oriented design:

- Has as its main goal realization of the communal, understood as the creation of conditions for the community's ongoing self-creation and successful structural coupling with their 'increasingly globalized' environments.
- Embraces ancestrality, as it emanates from the history of the relational worlds in question, and futurity, as a statement about futures for communal realizations.
- Privileges interventions and actions that foster nonliberal, non-State-centered, and noncapitalist forms of organization.
- Creates auspicious spaces for the life projects of communities and the creation of convivial societies.
- Always considers the community's engagement with heteronomous social actors and technologies (including markets, digital technologies, extractive operations and so

forth) from the perspective of the preservation and enhancement of the community's autopoiesis.

- Takes seriously the transition design imperatives of place-building, relocalization, renewed attention to materiality and nonhumans, and the creation of inter-epistemic collaborative organizations.
- Gives particular attention to the role of commoning in the realization of the communal; conversely, it devises effective means to foster diverse economies (social and solidarity economies, alternative capitalist and noncapitalist economies).
- Articulates with the South American trends towards *buen vivir* and the Rights of Nature and with related trends elsewhere (e.g., degrowth, commons).
- Fosters pluriversal openings; it is, in this regard, a form of design for the pluriverse, for the flourishing of life on the planet.
- Thinks deeply about, and creates spaces for, strengthening the connection between realization of the communal and the Earth (its relational weave at every place and everywhere), in ways that enable humans to relearn how to dwell in the planet in mutually enhancing manners with nonhumans.
- Takes seriously the inquiry into, and design of, borderlands as the spaces *par excellence* where novel understandings and practices of design from ontological and *autonomía* perspectives might most effectively and radically take place.
- Gives hope to the ongoing rebellion of humans and nonhumans in defense of nondualist, relational life principles, those that are not predicated on the separation of humans and nonhumans, person and community, knowing and being.

Conceived in this fashion, autonomous design can be considered a response to the urge for innovation and for the creation of new forms of life arising out of the struggles, forms of counter-power, and life projects of politically activated relational and communal ontologies. This is, indeed, too much to place at the doorstep of any given theoretico-political imaginary. To restate, what is stake here is not so much, or not only, how things are, but how things can be. As Esteva is fond of saying, hope is not the conviction that something will happen, but the conviction that something makes sense, whatever happens (personal conversation).

Conclusion

These are the main themes of the D/A hypothesis: cultural, civilizational and ecological transitions; an ontological approach to design and design for transitions; and the relation between autonomy, design and the political activation of relational and communal logics at the center of the transitions. Can design's modernist tradition be reoriented from its dependence on the life-stifling dualist ontology of patriarchal capitalist modernity towards relational modes of knowing, being and doing? Can it be creatively reappropriated by subaltern communities in support of their struggles to strengthen their autonomy and perform their life projects? Can ontologically oriented design play a constructive role in transforming entrenched ways of being and doing towards philosophies of wellbeing that finally equip humans to live in mutually enhancing ways with each other and with the Earth? Such are the overall questions explored from the vantage point of the hypothesis that design can indeed be ontologically and politically reoriented to support struggles for autonomy.

From this provisional discussion we can rearticulate the question in a way that applies to communities and social groups in many parts of the world: How do we make *effective weavings* and foster mutually enhancing entanglements of worlds *in the face of the catastrophe* visited upon the planet by the current global capitalist one-world order? Earth's territories, including cities, is where we, humans and not, go on weaving life together. *Design can thus become an open invitation for us all to become mindful and effective weavers of the mesh of life.* To do so, design needs to contribute to creating conditions that dampen our obligation to think and act like modern individuals in favor of an ethics of autonomous inter-existence, albeit without negating our capacity to operate in modern worlds at the same time – this, too, might be a question of survival. This entails designs that foster convivial reconstruction beyond the cultures of expertise and that instead promote 'healthy and enabling instrumentalizations' for behaving responsibly towards 'the assemblages in which one finds oneself participating' (Bennett 2010, 12, 36).

For some indigenous and other subaltern peoples in Latin America, the great transformation is none other than a *pachakuti*: a profound overhaul of the existing social order, not as a result of a sudden act or a new great synthesis of knowledge or novel agreements, but of an expansive and steady, albeit discontinuous, effort to permanently unsettle and alter the established order. The *pachakuti*, or the great cycles of the Mayan calendar, are long-standing concepts of peoples that are strictly contemporaneous; that is, peoples for whom 'there is no "post" nor "pre" because their vision of history is neither linear nor teleological, it sketches a path without ceasing to return to the same point' (Rivera Cusicanqui 2014, 6). The *pachakuti* 'evokes an inversion of historical time, the insurgency of a past and a future that might culminate in catastrophe or renewal. ... What is experienced is a change of consciousness and a transformation in identities, modes of knowing, and modes of conceiving of politics' (6). So with design?

Perhaps we can hear the rumblings of the *pachakuti* in the transition initiatives and grass-roots struggles for autonomy in so many parts of the world, as in Arundhati Roy's poetic evocation of it, '*Another world is not only possible, she is on her way. On a quiet day, I can hear her breathing.*'⁷ For this dynamic to take off on a surer footing, albeit in unpredictable directions, the modern/colonial dream of fitting all worlds into one has finally to be put on hold. As the papers in this issue attempt to show, this is a goal to which design for/by and from the South might be well positioned to contribute.

Notes

1. Moreover, this historicity could be traced back to the development of patriarchy, since it was patriarchy that started the steady erosion of the place-based and relational life ontologies; see Escobar 2016 for a summary of this argument.
2. I develop this argument at length in a recent book, *Autonomía y diseño: la realización de lo comunal* (2016) A version of this book should be published in English at the end of 2017 by Duke University Press This section is based on Chapter 6 of the book
3. Insights for thinking about relationality are also found within certain post-dualist trends in academic circles of late, often described as 'the ontological turn.' I will not deal with these in this short paper, but see *Autonomía y diseño* for a full discussion of the literature.
4. The constitution of transition design as a new area of design research and practice is a pioneering project that is currently being discussed and implemented as a doctoral area of study at Carnegie Mellon's Design School, led by Terry Irwin, Cameron Tonkinwise, Gideon Kossoff, and Peter Scupelly. The CMU and Manzini's frameworks are discussed at length in Escobar (2016,

Chapter 5). See, for instance, <http://design.cmu.edu/content/program-framework>. I will not discuss transition design further here.

5. See <http://www.cgchiapas.org/denuncias-juntas-buen-gobierno-denuncias/jbg-morelia-denuncia-ataque-orcao-con-arma-fuego-bases>.
6. The theoretico-political expressions of autonomy and the communal stem from a variety of grassroots collectives and movements first of all. This is being conceptualized by a number of intellectuals and activists, including Gustavo Esteva, Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar, Xochitl Leyva, Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, Raúl Zibechi, Manuel Rozental, Vilma Almendra, Patricia Botero, Astrid Ulloa, John Holloway, Carlos Walter Porto Gonçalves, el Colectivo Situaciones, Luis Tapia, Catherine Walsh, Janet Conway and Jérôme Baschet; the *aymara* intellectuals Pablo Mamani, Julieta Paredes, Felix Patzi and Simón Yampara; and the diverse group of researchers, intellectuals and activists centered in the city of Popayán around the interdisciplinary graduate program in development studies at Universidad del Cauca, with the active participation of indigenous and Afro-descendant communities from the larger region. Many of these actors converged at the recent meeting in Puebla, Mexico, the First International Congress on Comunalidad, convened by Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar and collaborators. Ver: <http://www.congresocomunalidad2015.org/>. The doctoral program in Latin American cultural studies at the Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar in Quito, headed by Catherine Walsh – a bastion of decolonial thought – is also important in this regard. See Escobar (2016) for a full list of sources.
7. Cited in Macy (2007, 17).

Notes on contributor

Arturo Escobar is Professor of Anthropology at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. His main interests are: political ecology, design, and the anthropology of development, social movements, and technoscience. Over the past twenty-five years he has worked closely with several Afro-Colombian social movements. His most well-known book is *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (2nd Ed. 2011). His most recent books in English are *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes* (2008), and *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds* (Duke University Press, in press).

References

- Bennett, Jane. 2010. *Vibrant Matter. A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2008. *Territories of Difference: Place~Movements~Life~Redes*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2015a. "Transiciones : A Space for Research and Design for Transitions to the Pluriverse." *Design Philosophy Papers* 13 (1): 13–23.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2015b. "Degrowth, Postdevelopment, and Transitions: A Preliminary Conversation." *Sustainability Science* 10: 451–462. doi:10.1007/s11625-015-0297-5
- Escobar, Arturo. 2016. *Autonomía y diseño: la realización de lo comunal* [Autonomy and Design: The Realization of the Communal]. Popayán: Editorial Universidad del Cauca.
- Esteva, Gustavo. 2005. "Celebration of Zapatismo." *Humboldt Journal of Social relations* 29 (1): 127–167.
- Esteva, Gustavo. 2015. "The Hour of Autonomy." *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* 10 (1): 134–145.
- Esteva, Gustavo. n.d. "La noción de comunalidad [The Notion of Communality]." Unpublished manuscript, Oaxaca.
- Fry, Tony. 2012. *Becoming Human by Design*. London: Berg.
- Fry, Tony. 2017. "Design for/by 'the Global South.'" 15(1).
- Lugones, María. 2010a. 'The Coloniality of Gender.' In *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*, edited by Walter Dignolo and Arturo Escobar, 369–390. Routledge: London.
- Lugones, Maria. 2010b. "Toward a Decolonial Feminism." *Hypatia* 25 (4): 742–759.

- Macy, Joanna. 2007. *World as Lover, World as Self. Courage for Global Justice and Ecological Renewal*. Berkeley: Parallax Press.
- Manzini, Ezio. 2015. *Design, When Everybody Designs. An Introduction to Design for Social Innovation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Maturana, Humberto, and Francisco Varela. 1980. *Autopoiesis and Cognition*. Boston, MA: Reidel Publishing Company.
- Maturana, Humberto, and Francisco Varela. 1987. *The Tree of Knowledge. The Biological Roots of Human Understanding*. Berkeley: Shambhala.
- Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia. 2014. *Hambre de huelga. Ch'ixinakax Utxiwa y otros textos* [Hunger for the Strike. *Ch'ixinakax Utxiwa* and other texts]. Querétaro, México: la mirada salvaje.
- Rocha, Miguel. 2015. *Textualidades oralitegráficas y visions de cabeza en las oraliteraturas y literaturas indígenas contemporáneas en Colombia* [Oralitographic Textualities and Head-up Visions in Contemporary Indigenous Oraliteratures and Literatures in Colombia]. PhD dissertation, Department of Romance Studies, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Varela, Francisco. 1999. *Ethical Know-how: Action, Wisdom, and Cognition*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Virilio, Paul. 1997. *The Open Sky*. New York: Verso.
- Virilio, Paul. 2012. *The Administration of Fear*. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).
- Winograd, Terry, and Fernando Flores. 1986. *Understanding Computers and Cognition*, 163–179. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.