



We want our designs to be durable, repairable and recyclable. This is in demand by *progressive agents* in society. How do we respond? **Photo**, credits: CAHIDE NUR ÖZDEMİR (Doktora, 2020, p. 45)

Developing a culture of *environmental care* is challenged by our *limited* human attention: especially in areas where it appears that we have limited, or *no*, control. For instance, as people working with *design*, the expanded field of the profession includes *industrial* production and *media-advertisement*.

Yet, we are *on board* of both (Frode). So, the question is what we may need to think about if we want to be on board as [critical ferments](#) of change: here we cannot see global environment in isolation, we must see it in relation to the push and pull between *security capitalism*, and *poverty levels* in the world.

We have lived through *security* regimes the two last years we didn't dream of before the pandemic. They have *limited* mobility. We also have become more aware of the 3rd world as garbage dumps we do not want to acknowledge. Can designers help to *wire environment, security and poverty*? A challenge.

The poster against greenwashing: 10 commands

1. Be honest and accountable.
2. Sustainability efforts must go beyond communication's& marketing departments.
3. Avoid talking about the importance of sustainability, nature, the climate and ethical trade, if your company has not made serious efforts on these issues yourselves.
4. Do not under-communicate your company's negative impacts.
5. Be careful using a big share of the marketing budget on small measures.
6. Avoid buying a clean conscience through climate quotas.
7. Use established labelling (Svanemerket, eco-label, GOTS...)
8. Be careful using terms such as "better for the climate, nature, and the environment".
9. "Cherry Picking" from the UN sustainable development goals can lead you astray.
10. Donations and sponsorships are great, but not a proof that you are working on sustainability-issues.

How would we want the 10 commandments against *greenwashing* to be? Do we have a stronger voice in the commercial world through partnerships (e.g. the Consumer Council)

In the eyes of people who take design seriously, our field yields an output which 1) is the product of *care*, and which 2) is worth *caring* for. The latter is of course what is most important to people who want to link up with, and acquire what we have to offer. It represents their way of *being in the world*.

Here—relating to Bruno Latour last term—*modernism* clearly has always had a different agenda than industrial *modernisation*. Design, as a professional activity in its own right, has never *presented* itself as a front-runner for consumerism. Rather it invites its audience to slow down, stop and think.

From a philosophical angle, Martin Heidegger's idea of being in the world as the *care for being*, has had a similar impact among the educated, as advertisement generally. We have two problems: **a)** that design is for people whose affluence includes education; **b)** their culture is superficial and mundane.

a) People whose place in society is linked to their *cultural capital* (Pucen), whose concern is with *1st world problems* (J.P.), and whose sense of responsibility does not reach to things they do *not* see: as, for instance, the garbage dumps that keep growing (NaNa) notwithstanding our good design-attitudes.

Whether this form of [selective blindness](#) to the world is part of **b)** the *superficial* relation we entertain to philosophical ideas—like Martin Heidegger's on being in the world as *care* for being—is something we may want to discuss, along with philosophical ideas in general to grant us a *share* of depth.

Using philosophical references as *identity* markers, often put the scope and range of “care” for the world on display: people who are “deep” and not really that deep. Deep in a [mundane](#) sort of way, that suffices to to give us a sense that we are *advanced*—& ‘not bad’—people. We are challenged by this.

However, by impact of recent events and the focal area of media-attention this kind of cultural capital may become obsolete, in the wake of security regimes (e.g. the pandemic), climate damage and poverty: earning cultural credit-points may not be a key to come out as a good, aware and real person.

We will see. According to Pucen—as I read her BB—the categories that earn us credit (or, capital) is currently set adrift. In our context, it is clear that going green in *advertisement* gives such credit. But so is being a good citizen and keeping to pandemic *restriction*. We enter the era of security capitalism.

The question is, whether we—under the present conditions—will develop similar *credits* in being responsive to poverty: in being [terrestrial citizens](#).