



When is it necessary to find a *sideway* ‘crab entry’ to work with a topic that has *ethical* entailments, *without* being manipulative (and hence unethical)? What are the entailment of *ethical* norms, that are regulated to be of legal consequence, when what they regulate are identities in liminal transition?

That is, when *vulnerability* is protected within the (now) legal framework of human rights: when ignorance and openness is a key to *connect*, yet yields a fragile knowledge-basis because nothing is stable, nothing is up for grabs, and the dangers of *disinformation* are rampant. What is ethical then?

When seeking collectively a *more* robust knowledge foundation is a needed to conclude—decide something—in a group-work setting, to avoid hostility, prejudice and ‘fake news’ to escalate. A possibility is to enter such topics *crabwise*: but then we run the risk of being manipulative. Catch 22.



This flyer is written after the ARW 21, in its wake: its function is to attempt a fold unto flyer #02 from last week. The concept of the ‘*crab list*’ was hatched by Ida Falck during another recent event, in a pedagogical zoominar on the freedom of expression, targeting new [communication repertoires](#).

It determines a list of things that we can do to move *sideways* into topics where a strong *ownership* in an audience—or, class—indicates that it cannot be raised without *somehow* asking for permission: such as gender/LGBTQ, group/BIPOC or age (ageism). It has to be *claimed* before raised.

Such topics that are public—or, in the orbit of public debate—but still not up for grabs (by enterprising artists, teachers, researchers etc.). This is indeed an ethical issue, but rarely the first on the list when we talk about ethics. This may be because we are assuming that ethics is goal-directed.

Indeed, if a list of smart approaches to raise topics “without” raising them—at least not directly—were applied *pedagogically* to the situations we have presently in mind, they would at best contribute to a chapter of contemporary rhetorics, at worst come out as a shrill example of manipulation.

Example—in a theory class I had on a previous occasion been criticised by an international student for speaking Norwegian to local students, even if not in formal teaching situations but in the class-room, during breaks. She saw this as a lack of respect for the international students, on the MA.

This was not a legal issue, but a *cultural* one (since KHIO is not an international school). It related to *custom*, and to what can be accepted as good conduct. And in this way to ethics. But then, ethics has raised to a level of legal by-laws in Norway, as in many other countries. For instance, Canada.

So, I wanted to see how a new MA class would respond to the incidents caused by [Lindsay Shepherd](#), in a class at Simon Fraser U., showing a clip with Jordan Peterson talking about Bill C-16 regulating discrimination against gender identity (and expression) under the human rights act.

We watched how it played out with the university institution, the students and the media. And also how it related to Jordan Peterson’s particular take on C.G. Jung’s psychology. I ended up by homing in on the fragility of subaltern identities, and the role of legal protection in a social transitions.

Since this was part of a workshop we run to kick off a course called *theory development*, that takes place in the spring term of the design MA, called the *snowflake workshop* because it is in the beginning of February. But since ‘snowflake’ has been used to determine sensitivity, *I asked*:

How do you envisage designing for—or, rather with—the so-called “snowflake generation”? *And then* a student from Slovakia said: *but that’s us!* Her statement of course determined the direction of the workshop, because the topic was not only about a sociological *trend*, but engaged *self-reflection*.