

Introduction

For most of us, design is experienced at a level of attending to the everyday, exposing the ordinariness of repeated, daily interactions. In privileged Western society, we set the alarm clock to get us up in the morning, cook our breakfast in non-stick pans, and dress ourselves according to forecasted weather conditions, before heading off to work in electric cars to spend out our day in open plan offices. Design can operate tactically; equally, design is encountered, experienced, and negotiated tactically as part of everyday life. As Michel de Certeau asserts, tactics may be “regulated” or “improvised” as a means through which decision-making is undertaken to “make our lives liveable.” In a time when the big design challenges dominate (e.g., climate change, health, and social inequalities), it remains vital to consider the role of design in relation to exercising agency in everyday life including the popular social media and cultural or community expressions that populate our lives. The articles contained in this *Design Issues* (vol. 38, no. 3), offer methodological insights into “tactics” and how human-object relations may shift or transform in response to different historical, spatial, or imaginary practices.

We begin this issue with Manol Gueorguiev and Adrian Anagnost’s timely article “Pandemic Design: Art, Space, and Embodiment,” underscoring an emerging area of research in pandemic design and its tactics. COVID-19 presents urgent, complex, spatial, and graphic design challenges for responding to new kinds of “health and safety” behaviors. The role of spatial tactics in interior and graphic design is explored through three minority- and women-owned, small-scale shops located in the United States. These specific examples shed light on the importance of our understanding of the pandemic’s effect on the local (and hyperlocal) and suggest “micro-scale design tactics...[to] propose new arrays of gathered bodies.” Gueorguiev and Anagnost argue these microbusinesses are “exemplary sites of everyday design tactics” to “direct the spatial narratives their customers navigate when entering the establishment and conducting business.” If official government and corporate guidelines for signage and navigational systems result in one kind of regulated tactic, then as the authors suggest, it is the “unrefined materiality” of do-it-yourself pandemic design tactics which brings new insights to the day-to-day experiences of embodiment. Homemade design tactics include the use of colored tape and

X-shaped markings on the floor to delimit the safety of social distancing alongside the posting of DIY information signs instructing customers to wear masks. Design tactics may also have unintended consequences. For example, the authors note the adverse effect of using opaque shower curtains instead of plexiglass for the purpose of distancing customers, and how this led to a situation where speech was muffled—meaning that customers had to draw closer rather than keeping their distance.

The article goes on to draw upon art historical examples, to explore barrier-making. Historical precedent in the gallery works of 1960s avant-garde artists such as Carl Andre, Antonio Dias, and Dan Graham are offered to exemplify ways to critically interrogate how everyday materials were used to create “graphic and planar interventions.” Their artworks were disruptions for “bodily behavior” to be directed toward institutional critique (in the same way that women artists and artists of color “foregrounded the relationship of marked bodies to the spaces of the art world”). The politics of space is a politics of “ambiguous accessibility.” Navigating experiences of collective spaces is a “common one for many women, people of color, queer people, and people with disabilities,” though, as Gueorguiev and Anagnost argue, the pandemic changed behaviors “from everyone who would enter a collective space.”

Food is the basis for another example of behavior regarding an everyday lived experience. In the Global North we have seen an increased visibility of the public’s love of everything food-related: TV food networks, devoted café Instagram sites, and fandom focusing on the rise of celebrity chefs. Mailin Lemke and Bas de Boer’s article, “Setting the Stage: Disgust as an Aesthetic Food Experience” brings another perspective to this as an emerging field of study, rooted in food design. They set out to explore the ways in which “the emotion of disgust” “can facilitate rich food experiences.” Disgust is considered as fostering “ambivalent experiences” (it both “repels and attracts”), such as in the design of bright orange candy at Halloween time—a disgusting treat for a ghoulish palette. The authors propose “aesthetic disgust” as manifesting “a visual, experiential, and spatial composition of performance” facilitated through the “staging of food experiences.” Lemke and de Boer go so far as to establish three main categories of the “different ways to design for aesthetic disgust.” These include carnivalesque occasions (such as carnivals and birthdays) and the design of cultured meat (by in-vitro cell cultures) often staged in the context of speculative and critical design practice as part of fictional narratives. The third category is fermented food items (i.e., the process of fermentation)

best exemplified by creating a scent of cheese “made with molecules...collected from sweaty sneakers owned by David Beckham.” Coupled with the authors’ scoping of historical predecessors of aesthetic disgust as seen in plays, paintings, movies, and books, this article brings new aesthetic meaning to our dining experience.

Anika Sarin’s article introduces “The Kolam Drawing: A Point Lattice System” and brings attention to the 5,000-year-old artistic Kolam practices by the Dravidian women of South India in the making geometric floor drawings with rice flour. Kolam drawings appear at the threshold of the house and are “made to fulfill the daily obligation of a Hindi household, ‘to feed a thousand souls.’” This ethnographic study develops a formal analysis of “Puli Kolam drawings”—“where only points and lines are used to create geometric patterns.” This is underpinned by an introduction to the history of Kolam patterns, providing a contrast to Western ideals of universality based in the visual organization of the modernist grid (Karl Gertsner and Massimo Vignelli, in particular). She asks: “How do we define Modern Indian Design and its roots?” Sarin argues for the ways in which Kolam as a traditional point lattice system for visual organization can be “a new inside-out method to compose form” for contemporary graphic design practice.

The penultimate article for this issue is an intriguing look at the politicization of toy design during Italy’s Fascist period. Diana Garvin’s “Paper Soldiers on the March: Colonial Toys for Imperial Play” extends the scholarship on Italian colonialism by situating the research in design history to focus on the objects of study: toys and games manufactured under Benito Mussolini’s Fascist regime. The expansion of colonial power was discernable through colonial toys including those which “were designed to prompt imperial play that actively marketed the East African occupation to Italian children.” Toys included paper Askari and Dubat soldiers, colonial boardgames promoting military conquests, and children-size colonial breakfast dishware. Through this research, and tracing from “design to distribution,” Garvin reveals a process of “miniaturizing the world of Fascist adults,” actively instilling adult behaviors in children. The paper soldiers, for example, were highly detailed and accurately reflected the uniforms, as well as the soldiers’ martial ranks and national origins.” Young boys were viewed as “recruits” with the expectation of learning about military protocols and tactics through play. Whether through colonial board games (e.g., *The Conquest of Abyssinia*), or through food packaging coupons in exchange for illustrated picture cards (e.g., *concorsi* albums), children (and their parents) were collecting the colony, as an “act of patriotic consumerism.”

The final article in this issue “On the Politics of Design Framing Practices” seeks to contribute to our understanding of design framing as a socio-materially generative design practice and to counter its interpretation as historically constructed “in relation to its genesis in white male Western scholarship.” How do we critique design frames as they are understood in “relation to societal processes of change,” and by doing so, challenge “social positions”? Sharon Prendeville, Pandora Syperek, and Laura Santamaria argue that one answer resides in a process to “revitalize” an understanding of design framing “for design spheres characterized by disension.” By foregrounding materiality and rooting the critique “within the context of social movements, collective action, and grassroots organizing,” the authors unfold new ways of conceptualizing design framing. They offer two case examples of activist collectives—the Open Source Circular Economy and the Transition Network—to elucidate ways in which “counter-framing” challenges the institutionalized frames and their dominant values and biases. These networks place emphasis on emerging forms of community resiliency leading to a need for the “re-articulation of design framing.”

Bruce Brown
Richard Buchanan
Carl DiSalvo
Kipum Lee
Ramia Mazé
Teal Triggs