Society of Design

Anna Mestres

Main topics

Abstract

The implication of design is more than something personal and collective, it is influenced and evolution, it is the act of creating. Design is the key to our species, since prehistoric times until today. All great evolution has always been accompanied by design. From a theoretical point of view, there are many ways of dividing a design. Always systematized, provoked by the human disdain to label everything. But, if we leave the subjective ideas behind, we can observe that everything around us is designed. Regardless of the author or its intention or value. That is why the action of creating is the most valuable tool when it comes to change. The nature in which we live demands change because of evolution. Design cannot and does not have the capacity to find a definitive solution. Precisely because of this same natural evolution of things.

Even though the definition of design seems to me to be not very resolute, not very delicate. Because it almost always falls into the error of generalising. Also, the duality of meanings makes us sinners of toxic reasoning. When the egalitarians are excluding the accuracy of words is in vain. And the fact is that the act of designing leads to new points of view, to open looks. Since the creation of one can be the improvement of the other. But if this connection between people does not happen. These moments of thinking and understanding will never happen, nor will they evolve.

Design can be involved as a form of power and control, but also as a form of equity. Giving personal or collective independence to creation. In the capitalist world, economic participation rules the system as an obligation of intentions. Thus, the design is made explicit as a tool to get it. As we see in marketing, packaging, or any product focused on a public with similar roles.

Provoking the participants, the exploited and the exploiters. That design is the fundamental basis for attracting and continuing to play the roulette of luck/unluck of capitalism.

Distributed design as an intention of bringing spaces of expression and autonomy. Would help in giving more freedom to individuals, as a power of automation, whether personal or collective. But it would still collaborate in the paradox of the capitalist exploiter. But the conscious design of a reaffirmation of a form of manipulation of the sense of care. It would be another form of control but being the step towards an improvement of distribution.

The label of the designer

Do you work or study? Within the first four questions you ask when you meet someone new. Accompanied by questions about the name, age, and nationality/where you live. Because this information helps us to specify what kind of person about whom we are talking. Whether it is the social class, interests, personality, knowledge, etc. Because it is necessary for the human being to have a classification to understand their needs and those of others. And it is this same classification that creates the system itself as a system.

The intention of describing yourself as a dissector implies a second question; what do you design? And it is that being without being is everything and nothing. Because I would have different prejudices. The first one, all of us without wanting or wanting to, we design, and therefore, this would mean that we are all designers. But this falls on the error of generalizing, therefore it is a fallacy. The second would be that it does not design something tangible or demonstrable, and that therefore the act of designing is invalid. Falling back into the same kind of fallacy. Also, the duality of meanings makes us sinners of toxic reasoning. When the egalitarians are excluding the accuracy of words is in vain.

Therefore, we must understand what design is and what is the designer. The involvement of design is more than something personal and collective, it influences and evolves, it is the act of creating. Design is the key to our species from prehistory until today. Every great evolution has always been accompanied by a design.

Nowadays, we could say that a person who considers himself a designer, is because consequently, they spends most of their time creating anything functional, or that however, their previous knowledge is based on it. Therefore, the involvement of specialization or practice for a certain time. Time as a subjective variable (work, self-learning) or imperative by society (accrediting, university degrees, masters).

Through another point of view, we can observe that design in many cases is a consequence of nature. As it is with the plants and animals with their form and geometry and colours. Also, with the houses of each specie. In which it

implies an evolution. Design is used as a tool for improvement, and survival. It is evident then that design is essential in life as an act of evolution of collective and personal performance.

With design we can create great connections between each other. With different intentions, you need past work to be able to do future work. This is what I mean, in the succession of knowledge. That successive evolutionary thought of the past, and that collectively, creates its essentials. That as in design and in other disciplines occurs and will occur. You do not create anything without creating something earlier. You need a close-up to create a second and a fifth.

Design as a control

Within this social order, which needs its own design. Social classes are formed by the roles that society impose, apart from economic classes. Creating the hierarchy of the design, where we can resort to different variants of control and manipulation. Understanding that design, being useful in all historical stages, is in part, always, a political tool.

When a designer acts without communication with the users or if more not, the collective linked to their proposition, they acts as God. As an omnipresent being who gives an object, useful to another collective or individual. Not only is all power given to the designer, but all direct actuators are excluded from the process. We must not confuse this act with wanting to do and design something that one wants, without intention of a proposition more distant, or not directly.

Apart from this movement where we see that all the control and power falls on the designer, we can see diverse types of control and movement during the design process. Very much in spite, often leaving the expert's voice away from the process or with a secondary voice, since the client takes possession, with the first fallacy explained above.

It is exceedingly difficult to execute a job correctly if the people without experience involved are commenting and changing all the plans. Among others, because their knowledge will not reach the magnitude of the

difficulty of the work. And it can therefore be imprudent. And to break the importance of the job well done.

The problem is that society feels exhausted and therefore does not want to work. Observes the work as an obligation, as a form of exploitation and exchange of money. Instead of a participation in the evolution of society. In addition, that in the work exists the collaborative part in society and therefore be useful for it. But we will not enter the debate about what is useful and what is useless. Although it is necessary to debate the topic to reformulate the conflict of the question; what we do here. It is not vital information for this writing.

It is thought that is essential that there be a hierarchy for work, to help in the execution of one's own. Now it depends on each situation and design. Not only in the process in which the designer feels comfortable, but what is best for the process of the design itself. Therefore, this hierarchy, if necessary, will depend on each situation. If respect, knowledge, and trust between people existed in work the hierarchy would not be essential.

From my point of view, the political factor creates a rift between the people and the government in terms of design. As many designs of cities are explicitly created to follow the rules of the government. Without meeting, in several cases, the needs of its population. As we see on the benches or curbs of buildings, designed for people who cannot lie down and avoid showing people sleeping on the street.

Design actions to be able to control how the users execute the actions. In which in many cases it is called creating intuitive acts for the common benefit. It causes these social barriers between some social classes and others. It is an irruption into the iteroparity of the evolution of the human knowledge. It is an imposition as a rule.

Because who decides such acts and who really benefits? It must also that in many cases the people are classified as mass. That consecutively it is understood as mass to the collective thought without theoretical base defined from a principle, since the popular speech comes from the gossip. And citizens in many cases do not act properly, because they do not have all

the knowledge of the situation, or the tools to reach the solution. But that does not give the right to attribute the truth in the facts to a group of people in front of others, but the arguments and scientific evidence does.

And the fact is that the act of designing leads to new points of view, to open looks. Since the creation of one can be the improvement of the other. But if this connection between people does not happen. These moments of thinking and understanding will never happen, nor will they evolve. Most importantly, among these connections is control, and therefore all participants share power. This leaves a much more effective and equitable design.

Design can be involved as a form of power and control, but also as a form of equity. Giving personal or collective independence to creation.

The implication within the liberal market

The liberal economic system within capitalism favours the privatized system, rather than giving opportunities to the most disadvantaged citizens. This state organization involves the way we think and live. The government must regulate the market price of products considered essential, not only according to consumption and demand. Considering, that the human being is predatory and that therefore the desire for empowerment is a natural behaviour. The consumption itself becomes more pleasant. So, the design that we find is focused on many points of view, on producing and consuming. As fast as you can to get the maximum benefit.

The creation of content is one of the fundamental bases of the new generations, where born in the "decline" of capitalism, give less authority when entering the commercial marketing. In the capitalist world, economic participation rules the system as an obligation of intentions. Thus, the design is made explicit as a tool to get it. As we see in marketing, packaging, or any product focused on an audience that has specific roles. Provoking the participants, the exploited and the exploiters. That design is the fundamental basis for attracting and continuing to play the luck/unluck roulette of capitalism.

The use of the rules of psychology in the evolution of marketing has provoked the control and manipulation of the things that we like or not. Making us children of the system and be the system, we are the paradox.

At this turning point, new forms of life, distribution and connection with nature have begun to emerge. It is essential to transform the world we live in and offer new opportunities. But once again we find the intangible variable of time.

In the case of Spain, cuts in social classes can be seen throughout the education system. Depending on their values, their attitude and aptitude, but above all their family and economic situation. Those who survive the preliminary stages then find both public and private universities. Few can get to the private universities, and almost all must face college with a part-time job. Having less time to rest or study. The body and mind of a 20-year-old with stress, depression, and broken dreams. Sounds catastrophic, doesn't it? But it is the reality of many young people, me included. Apart from work, transport is also a factor that takes up a lot of time. Those who live on the peripheries and depend on public transport, every day is an odyssey.

The time factor is essential to be able to have free time within all the exploitation seen in the system. Because in free time is when many times all those artistic projects are executed. But if you do not have time, because you have no money and you must work. After being tired of the whole situation. I assure you that as much as this person has the tools to build and create all the design, they is capable of, they will not do it. They is going to rest.

So, to think that distributive design will help new generations develop their full potential in the field is just an insignificant step in solving the real situation. Everyone who is a designer is therefore privileged.

Social responsibility

As a designer, you are the system, but you also create the system, and you also go against the system. Because you seek innovation with and for the past by society.

Previously we have talked about the control that design can exert on society, thinking that it is doing good. It must be considered that, although there is a lot of responsibility within designers. At least, those who have the same intention. They should not act alone. For the simple respect of the citizens and precisely to make things right. Therefore, the responsibility does not lie with them alone.

Social responsibility lies with everyone, or at least that is what we are led to believe. Because in the end our contribution to democracy seems to be more an illusion than an act. Because it is very easy to manipulate, as we have expressed above, human behaviour, especially in the masses.

But the main intention of this paper is to create a turning point. Giving rise to reflect to what extent designers can evolve the system or implement their ideas from this tool. As well as to make a fairer world where everyone can create using design and can be described as a designer if they wish. Without having the burden of time always on their shoulders, leaving them free to fulfil their creative desires. But once again this is nothing more than a utopia. Human beings need to be unjust to be able to continue with the virtue of their own desire in essence.

Distributed design as an intention of bringing spaces of expression and autonomy. Would help in giving more freedom to individuals, as a power of automation, whether personal or collective. But it would still collaborate in the paradox of the capitalist exploiter. But the conscious design of a reaffirmation of a form of manipulation of the sense of care. It would be another form of control but being the step towards an improvement of distribution.

We need a revolution of craftsmanship, which provides not only spaces but also opportunities, especially for young people. A space where privatisation is not involved, where time is spent on personal revolution and not on economic reward. But this can only be built with values, food, and rest. We must start reflecting on the privileges of the designer.