

Society of Design

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 we're talking about. 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, he spends most of his time creating anything functional, or that however, his 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. In which it implies an evolution. It 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 don't create anything without creating something earlier. You need a close-up to create a second and a fifth.

Within this social order, which needs its own design. Social classes are formed, apart from economic classes. Creating the hierarchy of the design, where we can resort to many 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 his proposition, he acts as God. As an omnipresent being who gives an object, apparently and probably useful to another collective or individual. Not only is all power given to the designer, but all direct actuators are excluded. 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 different 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.

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 many 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 an action is executed, in which in many cases it is called creating intuitive acts for the good of all. 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's an imposition as a rule.

Because who decides such acts and who really benefits? It must also be recorded that in many cases the people are classified as mass. That consecutively is understood as mass to the collective thought without theoretical base defined from a principle, since the popular speech comes from the gossip. 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.

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. And more importantly, between these connections lies control, and therefore power is shared. 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 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.

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.