Kristin Sæterdal, *Surveillance* (tapestry, 2018)

A contemporary tendency is that *everyone has a story to tell*, and have our ear in this aspect: whether we are talking across generations, engaging in democratic debates, follow our ways as alt-right activists, are committing as Islamists, or are ruthless exploiters of the world resources with a racial bias.

An alternative view—which may be a professional assumption of design—is that *not everyone has a story to tell* and we need to change that, based on the alternative hypothesis that if you work for it, there is a pool of people and knowledges out there, that can help you "to become that person".

The commercial society is largely based on this assumption. If you have the money, the desire and are willing to put in some work, you can achieve such aspirations/dreams. We can also work for a maximum of people to have this option available. But how radical can it be, and still offer real life-options?

Ma ligne SNCF

Mereology is the study of the relations between part and whole. Its potential interest for design practitioners is somewhat self-evident. On the other hand, if we are interested in the part-whole relationship as the *animating principle* of design, we are opting for a different *scope* and *approach*.

Firstly, to scope this statement we have to go back to renaissance architect and artist [Giorgio Vasari](), who claimed that design (*disegno*) is the *animating principle of all creative processes*. This not only widens our historical scope (from modernism to renaissance) but also attributes a *firstness* to design.

Not in the sense of Trumpian *design first! design first!* but in determining the potential of design to discern in which aspects the artefacts we have from the past partake of a *public* visual—or, sensorial—*culture*. Obviously, this is made up: whether the makers are professional designers, artists or people.

But what we are interested in here—in terms of approach—are those aspects of making which is not simply the opportunity for each and every-one to *tell their story*, or have their stories told, independently from the marks left in the public realm by the way we live and act. Our responsibility.

This is evidently a slippery question: how do we conceive *responsibility* in a democratic societies without becoming authoritarian. The French philo-sopher Derrida famously expressed: "responsibility also writes the ability to respond." How do we impact other people's ability to express themselves?

The liberty of expression *festoons* all democratic societies, while often being reduced by how people express themselves through consumer-choices. And, for a long time, not so much through public debate. That is, not until social media provided everyone with this liberty at their fingertips.

Oddly, the question "where do you go shopping?"—as an expression of liberty in the US gone global—now is coupled directly to expression and discussion in other areas of life, on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram etc. So, making the connection between the two is highly relevant. Mass media.

If we go back in time, the ratio between discussion/debates and ads was a different one: but it certainly was there. So, at this level, the social media have not invented anything. But what is really quite different is that posting is part of one's current life—daily business—not really a *present* one.

The reason for making *this*—and other—flyer-series is because they do a job which is not part of daily life on social media: namely, raising our concerns to a level where they are *present* to us. Why is that important? It is not more/less important than working with design (in a narrow sense).

Expanding the field of design can be helpful in improving our chances at working with design in a narrow/er sense. If the present something we ascend to—and not whatever is going on at the same time—it is because we in a heightened state can *transpose* from *concerns* to *knowledge*.