



In the present scenario, designers are not confined to work in isolates for clients that require their services. They continue to develop as key players in artistic research, partner with academic research whenever possible. And collaborate with 3rd sector organisations. They need to manage this triangle.

Keeping a log is likely to be central—to keep things together and achieve this triangulated knowledge that is unique to designers—as a policy of *life-long learning* for the designer. It is a format in which drawing, colour and drawing join with some writing and categorisation to triangulate ongoing projects.

A way to describe this *design* is 'environmental humanities gone live'. It develops in *association* with knowledges that are strictly *beyond* its bounds, and will succeed inasmuch as it will *trade back* the advantages of an ecosystem. That is, a real alternative to what might be called [environmental narcissism](#).



Credits ensia.com

Among the large-scale processes that are running across the globe there are 3 salient ones that we will have to relate to as designers, in our future work-life: 1) security [cf, the pandemic]; 2) the environment [cf, electricity crisis]; 3) opportunity [cf, boat refugees]. It is something that we know for sure.

We also know for sure that each of them can backfire: security and backfire on democracy and can lead to *gated* communities; environmentalism can backfire on equal opportunity by cleaning up the *privileged* part of the world; while equality opportunity can lead to the *depletion* of planetary resources.

What are our options? Can we transmute this vicious circle into a virtuous one? Well, if the horizons of damage listed in the previous paragraph, result from the three processes considered as *separate*, the least we can do is to try to combine them—as three different dimensions—in all the projects we do.

We can look for ways to work them as three deliverables we have to work with in all projects, and see how they *rub*, bleed *into* each other, and bring checks *and* balances in to the project as it progresses. The point being that we cannot predict these, but they can/should be cultivated and harvested.

As long as we keep them isolated, we will not be doing this work. It is only by keeping to deliveries that do *not* fit—at the outset—that we can work in this way: having 3 as a minimum. Asking about what occurs in the between-space: what have we here? where is it going? is something already achieved?

This way of working runs *deep* into the way that that designers are working anyhow. That is, the good ones. And more/less implicitly. It has to do with the attitude of gardening—as an ongoing care and watchfulness—rather than the problem-solution approach to e.g. security, environment and opportunity...

Moreover, this way of working provides a reorientation *from* the global to the terrestrial, in Bruno Latour's terms. That is, the final states that we can realistically hope moving towards by when proceeding by 1) isolates [global attractor]; 2) ecosystems [terrestrial attractor]. We will have ups and downs.

In the end *persistence* and *quality* may make the difference. At least at the level that designers—as reflective practitioners—can hope to operate.

Because not all can be addressed at this level. Politics is another aspect: e.g. the work of 3rd sector organisations who work at changing legislation etc.

What will happen if we use criteria as these to address greenwashing: safety/security, environmental care, equality of opportunity. This is actually close to what our former Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland intended when she coined the term '[sustainable](#)' future. But she was a politician, not a designer.