Deleuze and Design

Deleuze Connections

'It is not the elements or the sets which define the multiplicity. What defines it is the AND, as something which has its place between the elements or between the sets. AND, AND, AND – stammering.'

Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*

Titles Available in the Series

Ian Buchanan and Claire Colebrook (eds), *Deleuze and Feminist Theory*
Ian Buchanan and John Marks (eds), *Deleuze and Literature*
Mark Bonta and John Protevi (eds), *Deleuze and Geophilosophy*
Ian Buchanan and Marcel Swiboda (eds), *Deleuze and Music*
Ian Buchanan and Gregg Lambert (eds), *Deleuze and Space*
Martin Fuglsang and Bent Meier Sørensen (eds), *Deleuze and the Social*
Ian Buchanan and Adrian Parr (eds), *Deleuze and the Contemporary World*
Constantin V. Boundas (ed.), *Deleuze and Philosophy*
Ian Buchanan and Nicholas Thoburn (eds), *Deleuze and Politics*
Chrysanthi Nigianni and Merl Storr (eds), *Deleuze and Queer Theory*
Jeffrey A. Bell and Claire Colebrook (eds), *Deleuze and History*
Laura Cull (ed.), *Deleuze and Performance*
Mark Poster and David Savat (eds), *Deleuze and New Technology*
Simone Bignall and Paul Patton (eds), *Deleuze and the Postcolonial*
Stephen Zepke and Simon O'Sullivan (eds), *Deleuze and Contemporary Art*
Laura Guillaume and Joe Hughes (eds), *Deleuze and the Body*
Daniel W. Smith and Nathan Jun (eds), *Deleuze and Ethics*
Frida Beckman (ed.), *Deleuze and Sex*
David Martin-Jones and William Brown (eds), *Deleuze and Film*
Laurent de Sutter and Kyle McGee (eds), *Deleuze and Law*
Arun Saldanha and Jason Michael Adams (eds), *Deleuze and Race*
Rebecca Coleman and Jessica Ringrose (eds), *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*
Inna Semetsky and Diana Masny (eds), *Deleuze and Education*
Hélène Frichot and Stephen Loo (eds), *Deleuze and Architecture*
Betti Marenko and Jamie Brassett (eds), *Deleuze and Design*

Visit the Deleuze Connections website at
www.euppublishing.com/series/delco

Deleuze and Design

Edited by Betti Marenko and Jamie Brassett

EDINBURGH
University Press

Edinburgh University Press Ltd
The Tun – Holyrood Road, 12(2f) Jackson's Entry, Edinburgh EH8 8PJ

www.euppublishing.com

Typeset in 10.5/13 Adobe Sabon by
Servis Filmsetting Ltd, Stockport, Cheshire,
and printed and bound in Great Britain by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon CR0 4YY

A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978 0 7486 9153 1 (hardback)
ISBN 978 0 7486 9155 5 (webready PDF)
ISBN 978 0 7486 9154 8 (paperback)
ISBN 978 0 7486 9156 2 (epub)

Contents

Chapter 9

Sustainable Design Activism: Affirmative Politics and Fruitful Futures

Petra Hroch

If, for Deleuze and Guattari, art makes percepts and affects, science deals in prospects or functions, and philosophy creates concepts (1994: 24), how then are we to think of an interdisciplinary activity like design – a creative endeavour at the interstices of artistic, scientific and conceptual thinking? Design draws upon and contributes to all three of Deleuze and Guattari's 'domains of thought': it shares with art its concern with percepts and affects, with science its interest in prospects and functions, and designers often think of themselves as creating 'design concepts'. We might assume, then, that design is exactly the kind of experimental exercise, the sort of hybrid multiplicity, the type of creative, critical and conceptual assemblage that Deleuze and Guattari would have found promising. And yet, while they refer extensively to art, literature, music, theatre, opera and film in their work, they pay remarkably little attention to design. Moreover, while they find promise in creativity expressed through these various artistic modes, they are overtly hostile when they do – albeit briefly – turn their attention to design. They write: 'Finally, the most shameful moment came when computer science, marketing, design and advertising, all the disciplines of communication, seized hold of the word "concept" itself and said: "This is our concern, we are the creative ones, we are the ideas men!"' (1994: 10).

This chapter focuses on design as a discipline in relation to Deleuze and Guattari's three domains of thought. I argue, first, that the *problem of design* – that is, Deleuze and Guattari's critique of the discipline and its complicity with capitalism as 'the great Major' (1994: 149) – is critical to understanding the context and driving force for Deleuze and Guattari's thought and, as such, should not be overlooked by designers wishing to engage with their work. However, I also argue that the *problem posed by design* as a discipline – particularly by what I call 'minor' (Deleuze and Guattari 1986: 16) modes of design such

as emerging forms of 'design activism' (Fuad-Luke 2009; White and Tonkinwise 2012; Julier 2013a, 2013b; Markussen 2013) that provide alternatives to mainstream neoliberal capitalist logics – challenges Deleuze and Guattari's overly narrow and negative conceptualisation of design as a discipline. In fact, emerging directions in design that challenge taken-for-granted assumptions, structures, systems and distributions of power resonate with concepts in Deleuze and Guattari's oeuvre by sharing a common interest in challenging *doxa*, experimenting with intensities, and creating heterogeneous connections in the interest of promoting more equitable forms of future flourishing.[1] Indeed, as Marcelo Svirsky observes in the *Deleuze Studies* supplement on 'Deleuze and Political Activism', 'Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophies have created some of the conceptual tools which may be put to use in activism that seeks to break with repressive traditions' (Svirsky 2010a: 4). Although a comprehensive analysis of Deleuzo-Guattarian politics is beyond the scope of this chapter, as is an extensive overview of the many definitions of design activism emerging in debates today, my interest here is simple and specific: to focus on how Deleuze and Guattari's work in *What is Philosophy?* can be mobilised as part of this conceptual toolbox for emerging design activisms, particularly in light of their critique of design and its complicity with the repressive regimes of neoliberal capitalism in this, their last, text. A focus on this issue – it is my hope – will contribute to emerging debates on art, design and politics in Deleuze and Guattari (Massumi 2013), as well as design, activism and neoliberalism (Julier 2013a).

To propel this twofold line of argument (or what I call, respectively, the *problem of design* and the *problem posed by design*), I propose an intensive method of reading *What is Philosophy?* that first seeks to deterritorialise the three domains of thought by seeking to understand the domains not in static terms of what they are, but rather along the more Spinozist lines of flight that ask what they can do (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 108). Extending this methodological approach, I suggest design be re-thought as an 'intra-domain' mode of thought and re-conceptualised *intensively* through a re-consideration of how design works and what it can do. This approach reminds us to remain critical of examples of design that territorialise creativity onto reductive, difference-diminishing, monopoly-oriented outcomes. As I argue in the second part of the chapter, this approach also opens up fields of design that may not be conventionally recognised *as* design in order to demonstrate the potential of design to have effects other than what Deleuze and Guattari characterise as 'shameful moments' (1994: 10). In sum, this

chapter invites us to read Deleuze and Guattari's domains of thought *intensively* and also to consider the potential capacities of design activism to effect *intensive resistances* to the present (Hroch 2013b: 22). I invite us to ask what kind of design expresses both critiques and creative alternatives to problems such as ecological destruction and waste, economic disparity and collapse, and social inequality. In other words, I consider *what design can do* as a set of practices intent on engaging with and re-making the material world in more ecologically, economically and socially sustainable ways.

To this end, I am particularly interested in design activism focused on environmental sustainability that uses the social realm as its medium. I focus especially on a close analysis of one example, Toronto's *Not Far From the Tree,* to highlight some of the ways their activities operate as an expression of design activism that, by re-conceptualising, re-organising and deterritorialising material flows of fruit, people, private property and profit, reconfigures a system of deeply enmeshed social, environmental, as well as economic 'problems' into a rich web of opportunities for the flourishing of different, more equitable, and perhaps surprising or unforeseen connections.

Deleuze and Guattari's Critique of Design (The Problem of Design)

In this section I start by delineating Deleuze and Guattari's three domains of thought in relation to what I call the *problem of design* in their work. I underscore Deleuze and Guattari's critique of the discipline and its complicity with contemporary capitalism as 'the great Major' (1994: 149) and argue that it is critical to understanding the context out of which Deleuze and Guattari's thought arises and the impetus that drives it. To begin, Deleuze and Guattari's overt criticism of the 'disciplines of communication' including computer science, marketing, design and advertising (1994: 10) is rooted in the wide-ranging critique of capitalism that grounds their collective work in *Anti-Oedipus* (1983) and *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987). Indeed, the subtitle that connects these two tomes, *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, offers what we might think of as their summary assessment of the state of things and identifies the problem with which the two volumes take issue.

In their last book, *What is Philosophy?* Deleuze and Guattari argue that the disciplines of communication including design are troublesome because no matter how 'creative' they purport to be the so-called 'creativity' of these disciplines produces little if anything 'new'. By 'new',

these thinkers who had a passion for inventing tools for thinking that work against the capture of life's forces and flows by capital refer to concepts, percepts and affects that do just this. That is, they argue against concepts, percepts and affects that create – or themselves become – the 'new' as in new commodities. The 'new' for Deleuze and Guattari is not the 'new' in neoliberal capitalism, but rather, its intensive resistance – or resistance through the ongoing creation of difference. Indeed, for designers drawn to Deleuze and Guattari's vocabulary of concepts, to ignore their indictment of advanced capitalism is to risk reproducing the very same problematic they critique: using design as simply another capital-creating enterprise and reducing concepts such as the 'rhizome', 'assemblage', 'deterritorialisation', 'concept', and, indeed, the term 'new' to mere slogans. As Deleuze scholar Adrian Parr argues in her recent work on Deleuze and Guattari and architectural design, if concepts such as 'the fold, force and becoming are not connected to the larger political impulse driving Deleuze and his collaborations with Guattari', then 'the concepts are no longer tools in the way that Deleuze insisted they need to be treated' and in their political disengagement become 'profoundly un-Deleuzian' (Parr 2013: 204).

Deleuze and Guattari's collective work takes aim at the way in which capitalism eliminates – rather than creates – difference and 'newness' (that is, the production of ongoing differentiation). They warn, for instance, that capitalism today has appropriated, instrumentalised and commodified the concept of the 'concept' for the purposes of sloganeering, seduction and sales. Deleuze and Guattari not only critique the way in which the 'concept' is used by the disciplines of communication such as design, but also foreshadow the rise of contemporary neoliberal capitalism's championing of concepts such as the 'knowledge economy', the 'creative class', the 'enterprising individual', and 'design thinking' when they write:

> Information and creativity, concept and enterprise: there is already an abundant bibliography. Marketing has preserved the idea of a certain relationship between the concept and the event. But here the concept has become the set of product displays (historical, scientific, artistic, sexual, pragmatic), and the event has become the exhibition that set up various displays and the 'exchange of ideas' it is supposed to promote. The only events are exhibitions, and the only concepts are products that can be sold . . . The simulacrum, the simulation of a packet of noodles, has become the true concept and the one who packages the product, commodity, or work of art has become the philosopher, conceptual persona, or artist. (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 10)

In an era in which ubiquitous capitalism is the new normal within which images of thought reside, Deleuze and Guattari have this to say about the role of philosophy in creating concepts:

> Certainly, it is painful to learn that Concept indicates a society of information services and engineering. But the more philosophy comes up against shameless and inane rivals and encounters them at its very core, the more it feels driven to fulfill the task of creating concepts that are aerolites rather than commercial products. It gets the giggles, which wipe away its tears. So, the question of philosophy is the singular point where concept and creation are related to each other. (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 11)

In the face of the concept's appropriation by the capitalist machine Deleuze and Guattari seek to defend the concept of the concept from the way it is used to commodify ideas – what they call an 'absolute disaster for thought' (1994: 12).[2] At the same time, the distinction they draw between the concept in philosophy and its instrumentalisation by 'rivals' is also an attempt to defend philosophy as a discipline from conservative forces within the discipline of philosophy itself. In other words, their defensive argument against 'rivals' is a twofold attempt to deflect forces that reduce what philosophy can do from within as well as from without. Like their critique of majoritarian modes of design, Deleuze and Guattari's critique of the conservative forces at work in philosophy champions experimental, presentational (not representational or recognition-based), and 'new' (as difference-producing) modes of concept-creation. Indeed, as Svirsky observes, although Deleuze and Guattari 'do not provide ready-made blueprints for revolution' they do certainly promote a 'minor' art of thinking/doing as a way to challenge oppressive structures including representational forms of thought (Svirsky 2010a: 5).

In order to argue that the problem posed by 'minor' modes of design (Deleuze and Guattari 1986: 16) such as emerging forms of 'design activism' challenge Deleuze and Guattari's reductive conceptualisation of design as a discipline, I begin by proposing in the next section an intensive method of reading *What is Philosophy?* that deterritorialises the three domains of thought by understanding them in terms not of what they are, but rather of what they can do (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 108).

Deterritorialising the Three Domains of Thought

Throughout their collaborative work, beginning with *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari are not as interested in setting up *extensive*

categories as they are in exploring, expressing and experimenting with *intensive* processes (DeLanda 2002; Hroch 2013a). These thinkers' emphases on processes of desiring-production reveals their interest not in what things are called, what they mean, or what they call 'extensities' (extensive measures of things), so much as in 'intensities' and intensive capacities – what things are capable of, what becomings they engender, what effects they can have, what they produce, *and what they can do*. As they underscore, 'the question posed by desire is not "What does it mean?" but rather "*How does it work*?"' (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 108; original emphasis). It strikes a reader as strange, then, given Deleuze and Guattari's insistence on intensities and intensive processes rather than extensities (such as categories and classifications) that in *What is Philosophy?* they shift from a style of thinking and writing focused on breaking down categories and building connections that they put to work in *Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus* to one that attempts rather rigidly to delineate disciplinary territories and erect conceptual boundaries around the 'three domains of thought': 'art', 'science' and 'philosophy' (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 24). Isabelle Stengers notes that, for her, as it was for many readers, Deleuze's last book, co-authored with Félix Guattari,[3] came as 'a surprise', even 'a disappointment' (Stengers 2005: 151). In her essay on *What is Philosophy?* entitled 'Deleuze and Guattari's Last Enigmatic Message', she observes that we suddenly 'face a strong differentiation between the creations which are proper to philosophy, to science, and to art' which has 'caused many to wonder or even to feel betrayed' (2005: 151). After all, these were the thinkers associated with 'the affirmation of productive [connections], the creation of deterritorialising processes escaping fixed identities, transgressing boundaries and static classifications, destroying the power of exclusive disjunction, that is the either/or alternatives' (2005: 151). Deleuze and Guattari's last work together thus left many readers – especially those who appreciated their previous critique of categories such as 'Royal science' (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 361) wondering why, as Stengers asks, they chose to create a trifecta – 'a seemingly "classical picture"' (2005: 151).

So, why this approach in *What is Philosophy*? Why this tripartite territorialisation? I suggest – and here I agree with Stengers's insightful reading of Deleuze and Guattari's writing on philosophy in relation to science[4] – that the shift in style and the concerted effort to clarify and simplify (and perhaps in a sense even *over-simplify*) concepts (such as their effort to clarify the role of philosophy suggested by the title itself) can be seen as a purposeful attempt at once to defend each domain from

the reductive tendencies encroaching upon them, as well as to launch an offensive strategy to remind readers of the potential of each domain to continue to be creative, to resist the present, and to refuse not only to be treated reductively in terms of disciplinary definitions, but also to resist being instrumentalised in the service of capital.

I support Stengers's argument that *despite* the 'classical' delineation of tripartite categories, the text may be the most 'political' of Deleuze's books in so far as the crucial problematic it tackles is their observation that 'we lack resistance to the present' (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 108). Stengers adds that by 'resisting the present', Deleuze and Guattari do not simply mean criticising or denouncing but rather creating and constructing (2005: 152). It is in this spirit that I invite us to revisit these categories of 'art', 'science' and 'philosophy', and suggest that rather than simplistically denouncing or uncritically fetishising them, we should heed Deleuze and Guattari's own advice to 'resist the present', to create and to construct – and not simply to repeat what they said, but rather, to 'do what they did'. I follow in Stengers's steps in my approach to this text – an approach that, in the following passage, she describes as an engagement that seeks to 'actualise' or 'effectuate' ideas. I will not stay within Deleuze and Guattari's text but rather follow Deleuze's own advice, as noted by Stengers: 'we should be interested in tools for thinking, not in an exegesis of ideas. An idea is always engaged in what he called a matter, always a specific one . . . in order [to ask] how and why [the idea] matters, the kind of difference it makes' (2005: 151).

The style of reading Stengers suggests is in keeping with Deleuze and Guattari's own style of engagement with other authors' ideas. Following Deleuze and Guattari's advice, we should read their own concepts by asking *what they do* (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 28) and continuing, as they did, to create concepts 'adequate' for and 'worthy' of the ever-changing present (Braidotti 2006: 272; 2013: 184). I thus suggest that we regard Deleuze and Guattari's seemingly territorialising gesture in *What is Philosophy?* as one that attempts to concentrate on the intensities – and indeed *to concentrate the intensities* – of each 'domain' in the face of what they may have regarded as their potential 'collapse' (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 161). As they point out, stratification, or staying 'organised, signified, subjected' as a strategy is 'not the worst that can happen', but experimenting with strata is the approach they champion (1987: 161). My intention, then, is not simply to repeat these categories by tracing the contours that delineate their territories, but rather, to ask *what these categories do*. In deterritorialising these domains, we can

draw connections that actualise and effectuate the intensities – the forces that resist the present – that inhere in them.

Following Deleuze and Guattari's advice to problematise existing concepts and postulate concepts – in other words, to do the work of philosophy – I suggest that not only their categories of 'art', 'science' and 'philosophy' but also their critique of 'design' require reconsideration. Moreover, I suggest that thinking about these categories in relation to the work of design and *vice versa* enable us to do this work – that is, to reconsider their own previous work in the ways they advised. This kind of re-reading is important not only as Deleuze and Guattari's work – and in particular their attention to the three domains of thought – is continually taken up by designers and architects, but also as the fields of design and architecture shift towards projects and activities that Deleuze and Guattari may not have identified as 'design', projects and activities that stand in a different – sometimes problematic and sometimes also *problematising* – relation to capitalism or what they call 'the great Major' (1994: 149).

From Extensive Models to Intensive Modes: Understanding the Three Domains of Thought as Images of Thought

In order to extend this deterritorialising movement as a methodological approach, in the following section I suggest that the three domains of thought be understood as images of thought; that is, I posit that we move from understanding Deleuze and Guattari's categories as extensive models to understanding them as intensive modes. Following this line of argument, I propose that design be re-thought as an 'intra-domain' mode of thought and be re-conceptualised *intensively* through a reconsideration of how design works and what it can do (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 108). This approach enables us to consider 'minor' modes of design as examples of design that Deleuze and Guattari overlooked in their analysis, at the same time that it reminds us to remain critical of examples of design that territorialise creativity onto reductive, difference-diminishing, monopoly-oriented outcomes.

In *What is Philosophy?* art, science and philosophy do not function as 'extensities'. Rather, given the overtly political thrust of their previous work, and in keeping with Stengers's observation that *What is Philosophy?* is implicitly political, these categories or 'domains of thought' attempt to re-intensify each domain, to wrest each free of its impotent state, and to re-focus, re-charge, re-new each domain of

thought so that they might work together again with their full critical and creative force. At the end of his life, Deleuze turned his focus from 'doing philosophy' to the question of 'what philosophy *is*' in order to ask 'what philosophy *does*'. That is, the question posed in terms of the 'identity' of philosophy here is a final attempt, approached perhaps with more clarity and certainly more urgency, to underscore philosophy's strengths and to emphasise its potencies and potentials. Deleuze and Guattari's parallel focus on the other domains of thought does not separate them from philosophy once and for all. Rather, it invites us to be critical of increasingly common, habitual and reductive approaches to each and to encourage us to find each domain's creative force and, in turn, to afford us each domain's full capacity to 'resist the present'. In this way, Deleuze and Guattari's seemingly conservative manoeuvre can be read, paradoxically, as a radical gesture.

In this section, then, I attend to the concept of the 'concept' in Deleuze and Guattari's oeuvre by suggesting that to understand the 'three domains of thought' in their work – art, science and philosophy – requires that we understand these 'domains' as *modes* through which thought-events happen rather than as *disciplines* to which a particular image of thought belongs. I propose that deterritorialising the territories that define these 'domains of thought' affords us the ability to engage more productively with Deleuze and Guattari's oeuvre and with interdisciplinary disciplines such as design – those 'perpetually interbreeding' (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 24) disciplines that are uniquely prepared to tackle some of today's most pressing conceptual, perceptive, affective and prospective problems, namely problems of sustainability or, more precisely, problems of what I elsewhere term 'sustaining intensities' (Hroch 2014). Indeed, I suggest that this deterritorialisation of the domains is an always-present and yet often-underemphasised dimension of *What is Philosophy?* and perhaps reveals less about the authors of the text and more about us as readers and what 'lines' of reading we have been prepared to 'effectuate' (Stengers 2005: 151). Indeed, Deleuze and Guattari recognise their own over-simplification and outline their methodology as follows:

> At present we are relying only on a very general hypothesis: from sentences or their equivalent, philosophy extracts concepts (which must not be confused with general or abstract ideas), whereas science extracts prospects (propositions that must not be confused with judgments), and art extracts percepts and affects (which must not be confused with perceptions or feelings). In each case language is tested and used in incomparable ways – but in ways that do not define the differences between disciplines without also constituting their perpetual interbreeding. (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 24)

Deleuze and Guattari begin their delineation of the 'three domains of thought' by pointing out that the 'sciences, arts, and philosophies are all equally creative' (1994: 5). Although all three are creative,[5] what distinguishes philosophy from science and from art is that it is 'the art of forming, inventing, and fabricating' or '*creating*' concepts (1994: 2, 5). Deleuze and Guattari address the work of science and art in order to distinguish it from the work of philosophy, and to defend a creative mode of philosophy from being encroached upon by reductive scientific and artistic paradigms.[6] At the same time, from their first definition of philosophy, despite distinguishing it from science and art, Deleuze and Guattari already forge connections between philosophy and art, by conceiving of philosophy as one kind of creative process the object of which, by definition, is to create 'new' concepts (1994: 5). This definition already compels us to ask: if philosophy creates concepts, *is it not the case that wherever there is the creation of concepts there is philosophy?* This may sound like an analytical gesture but I think it addresses the issue at the heart of how to read this text by placing the emphasis on what things *do* as opposed to what things are and are *called*. Philosophy creates concepts and so even when something isn't necessarily called 'philosophy', if a concept is being created, philosophy is being done, or one is working in a philosophical *mode*. Deleuze and Guattari concur when they write: 'So as long as there is a time and a place for creating concepts, the operation that undertakes this will always be called philosophy, or will be indistinguishable from philosophy even if it is called something else' (1994: 9).

It follows, then, that if we read Deleuze and Guattari's definition of philosophy not as a disciplinary model but rather as an image of thought, then we can say that aspects of artistic, scientific and even *design practice* can be philosophical if they create concepts in the philosophical *mode* and, concomitantly, engage in the posing of problems (1994: 27). For Deleuze and Guattari, when doing philosophy – or thinking philosophically – problems must be posed 'just as concepts must be created' and 'new concepts must relate to our problems, to our history, and, above all, to our becomings' (1994: 27). Deleuze poses philosophy as a problem-solving endeavour that involves the positing of questions, the putting forth of propositions, and the creation of always-provisional concepts that respond to an ever-shifting context. By posing problems and creating concepts that relate to our current and ever-changing context, we remain immanently rooted in – while using philosophy as a way to resist intensively– the present.

As the second part of this chapter unfolds, I turn to focus on activist

design as a set of philosophies that are critical of capitalist waste and accumulation and as a set of practices intent on making and re-making the material world in more ecologically, economically and socially sustainable ways. I am interested particularly in activist design practices that, rather than create objects, artefacts, or 'products' (or, 'services', which, David Noble argues in *Trading the Future*, commodify relations), re-conceptualise existing 'problems' and re-organise existing territories in order to contribute to the design of more equitable and yet difference-sustaining connections among humans and their more-than-human environments (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 81). What is at stake in this section is this: deterritorialising the domains of thought allows us to expand the concept of the concept from applying only to the work of philosophy proper to include activist aspects of 'design thinking' which, in turn, can open up ways of not only conceptualising but also of materialising more sustainable modes of collective becoming.

Lodging the Self on a Stratum: Design as Thinking/Doing Differently

At the same time as Deleuze and Guattari's work compels us to critically interrogate design's complicity with capitalism, their concepts – not to mention modes of 'minor' design themselves – also enable us to see the complexity of capitalism in its contemporary neoliberal modulations (Harvey 2005; Hroch 2013b). Design practices are products of, co-produce, and at times intensively resist in a myriad of complex ways, the ways capitalism is both conceptualised and materialised (Julier 2013a, 2013b; Svirsky 2010a, 2010b). Design, by engaging the material world through a practice that includes conceptualisation, also exceeds it by doing the work of conceptualisation through more-than-abstract media thereby complexifying what concepts are and what they can do. Design methods and 'ways of knowing' (Cross 2001) experiment with a variety of modes of thinking, doing, thinking and/as doing, and doing and/as thinking. By engaging the material world, and re-making it differently (through concept, practice, concept-as-practice, and practice-as-concept) design understands an ideological/material practice such as capitalism less abstractly than critical theoretical conceptualisations of capitalism alone. Design enables a less reductive understanding of capitalism – not only as a totalising abstraction, but as itself a design: a series of practices, habits, ideas, patterns, materialities, fabulations and fabrications (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 2) that are made, and thus, can also be un-made and re-made (Julier 2013b: 224).[7]

Design practices might be said, then, to enable what Deleuze and Guattari invited us to do: 'lodge [oneself] on a stratum, experiment with the opportunities it offers, find an advantageous place on it, potential lines of deterritorialisation, possible lines of flight, experience them, produce flow conjunctions here and there' (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 161). We might even say that engaging with 'minor' design practices is an experiment in 'lodging oneself' on the great Major stratum of capitalism in particular. As I discuss in the following section, 'minor' modes of design such as the social design activist practices I explore, produce two related flow conjunctions: 1) they conceptualise the world differently in order to re-make or re-materialise it in different ways; and 2) they materialise the world differently in order to re-make or re-conceptualise it in different ways. Through the design process, conceptualisation happens through materialisation, materialisation happens through conceptualisation, and both modes of engagement – the conceptual and/as the material, and the material and/as the conceptual – engage, lodge on, find an advantageous place in the made world in order to experiment, find potential lines of deterritorialisation, possible lines of flight, and re-make the world differently, producing different connections and different conjunctive flows.

Let us address, prior to proceeding further, what I mean by 1) design, 2) activism, and 3) the term design activism. Following the work of Deleuze and Guattari in *What Is Philosophy?* I am interested in positing intensive definitions of design, activism, and design activism – definitions that focus on how things work and what they do (rather than what Deleuze and Guattari call an 'extensive' one – namely, what things are called or what they mean) (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 108). Alastair Fuad-Luke provides an intensive working definition of design as 'the act of deliberately moving from an existing situation to a preferred one by professional designers or others applying design knowingly or unknowingly' (Fuad-Luke 2009: 5). Interestingly, Fuad-Luke's definition of activism is remarkably similar – and similarly intensive – to his definition of design. He defines activism as 'taking action to catalyse, encourage, or bring about change, in order to elicit social, cultural and/or political transformation' (2009: 6).

Of course, in spite of the similarities between design and activism as modes of change, transformation, movement and differentiation, not all design is activism, and not all activism is design. Likewise, not all those doing design (often called 'designers') are doing (or claim to be doing) activism, and not all those doing activism (often called 'activists') are doing (or claim to be doing) design. Still, it is interesting to note that

design and activism have much in common in their focus on imagining possible futures and working towards their actualisation. Indeed, design and activism as modes of engagement with the world share a number of similar characteristics that makes their intra-action particularly synergistic: both design and activism fit very much within a Deleuzo-Guattarian strategy of producing different connections, experimenting with intensities, actualising latent potential and engaging in processes of transformation of the status quo.

So what, then, is 'design activism'? In *Design Activism*, Fuad-Luke provides a combined definition of 'design activism' as 'design thinking, imagination and practice applied knowingly or unknowingly to create a counter-narrative aimed at generating and balancing possibilities of social, institutional, environmental and/or economic change' (2009: 27). I suggest this definition is 'intensive' because, like the definitions of design and activism above, it too focuses on what design activism does rather than by whom it is done, or what it is called (that is, whether the doing is explicitly defined as design, activism, or activist design). Indeed, as Fuad-Luke adds, speaking of 'design activism' is to imply 'that it already exists and has an established philosophy, pedagogy, and ontology' (2009: 1), although this is not necessarily the case. Rather, to speak of design activism is to gesture towards the existence of what Fuad-Luke describes as 'an emergent' phenomenon with the 'potential to help us deal with important contemporary societal issues' (2009: 1). Guy Julier's definition of design activism adds to this broad definition the idea that design activist practices, like Deleuze's 'minor' modes of art, are 'collective and constructive struggles' concerned with the 'public sphere rather than the individual' (Julier 2013a: 146). For Julier, design activism 'reallocates resources, reconfigures systems, and reprioritises interests' and is thus 'necessarily broad in its scope and aims' (2013a: 145), intersecting with other practices such as 'social design, co-creation, sustainable design, and critical design' (2013a: 146) as well as 'community design' and 'participatory design' (2013b: 226). In order to elaborate upon and ground these ideas about design activism I will focus predominantly on one example that fits within these broader trends, as well as an emerging trend that Ezio Manzini has called 'design for social innovation': Toronto's *Not Far From the Tree* urban fruit-picking project. *Not Far From the Tree* is an example of the kind of activity that 'analyzes and critiques systems of provision, looking for or proposing non-mainstream models to create alternative constellations of people and artifacts and rearrange channels between them' (Julier 2013a: 146), and, as such, can be seen as a form of 'minor' design that intensively resists neoliberal

systems of power that deregulate, individualise, privatise and 'free' up to market machinations what was once shared, collective or 'common' (Hardt and Negri 2009).

Design Activism: Difference as Intensive Resistance

In this second part of the chapter, I turn to fields of 'minor' design in order to demonstrate the potential of design to have effects other than what Deleuze and Guattari characterise as 'shameful moments' (1994: 10). In other words, I invite us to ask *what can design do* as a set of practices intent on engaging with the made world and re-making the world in less ecologically resource-intensive and less polluting, less economically unequal and monopolistic, and more socially just and equitable ways. I refer to Toronto's *Not Far From the Tree* to highlight some of the ways their activities operate as a model of design activism that, by re-conceptualising, re-organising and deterritorialising flows of fruit, people, private property and profit, experiment with the reconfiguration of a system of deeply enmeshed social, environmental as well as economic 'problems' into a rich web of opportunities for the flourishing of different, more equitable, and perhaps even surprisingly fun, connections.

Many designers today recognise that in a world in which non-renewable resources are quickly becoming depleted and where waste – whether landfill, water pollution, or greenhouse gas emissions – is exceeding critical limits, we cannot 'design' our way out of these issues merely by innovating technologically or by producing more 'stuff' within a design context that ignores ecological limits.[8] Manzini, echoing the work of designers such as Victor J. Papanek in *Design for the Real World* (1971) and *The Green Imperative* (1995), as well as the many critiques of environmentalists, sociologists, political theorists and critical economists, points to the tension between the results of our current consumptive patterns and the impossibility of the promise of unending capitalist growth and expansion when he underscores that today '20 percent of the world's population . . . consumes 80 percent of the available physical resources' (Manzini 2008b: 11). If this trend continues, the other '80 percent of the worlds' population, to whom we are trying to sell the same dream, will have to make do with the remaining 20 percent of these resources' (2008b: 11). He points to this inconsistency in order to drive home the point that the promise of ongoing consumption of 'stuff' is a promise 'we now recognise is impossible to keep' (2008b: 11). This very predicament – the tension between the economy's growth

imperative and the environmental, social and political limits with which this 'growth' and 'expansion' conflicts – leads the designer Nathan Shedroff to argue provocatively that 'design is the problem' and to go so far as to suggest that even 'sustainable' design too often results in the production of more stuff (2009: xxiii). Ann Thorpe reinforces this observation when, in *Architecture and Design versus Consumerism*, she remarks that although 'sustainability' is taught in design school:

> outside of the studio or class that investigates 'sustainability', students are often immersed in the business context for design. Students are groomed for conventional market expansion rules through standard portfolio development, final year shows and 'design management' modules. Individual practitioners and researchers may meet at conferences to examine inspiring activist case studies and assemble systemic and necessary transdisciplinary approaches, only to return to institutions . . . that reward siloed expertise, profitability and disciplinary purity. (Thorpe 2012: viii)

A potential issue with these critiques is that, in not being specific enough about *what kind of* 'sustainable design' and *which kinds* of sustainable design schools and institutions, they risk generalising and dismissing what is in fact a varied landscape of sustainable design pedagogies and practices. Although there is room for more specificity, what I think is valuable in their critique is similar to what I think is valuable in Deleuze and Guattari's, namely, that they pointedly address the missed opportunities of modes of design that simply perpetuate the individualist, consumerist, expansion-oriented, monopolistic, neoliberal capitalist status quo. Although these designers' critiques may be excessively broad – and indeed, this chapter is interested in adding nuance to Deleuze and Guattari's own generalisations on design – they are motivated by an interest in promoting sustainable design solutions that challenge dominant capitalist paradigms. In so doing, they echo Deleuze and Guattari's critical questions about activities that follow, reinforce and reproduce contemporary capitalist logics, assumptions and mechanisms, all the while promising 'the new'. Deleuze and Guattari ask, rhetorically, whether these promises of 'the new' or 'the innovative' do not often lead us right back 'to the simple opinion of the average capitalism, the great Major?' (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 149). Of course, many designers are themselves asking critical questions about what is specific, unique and, indeed, 'innovative' or *different* about what designers can bring to the world. Some designers, such as those participating in recent colloquia on design activism,[9] are interested in activities that, rather than creating new commodities or services, focus on the creation of systems or

the re-creation of existing systems that prioritise more equitable social, economic and ecological relations.

One example of an organisation that takes this approach is Toronto's *Not Far From the Tree*. *Not Far From the Tree* is a grassroots project that engages creatively with a series of existing, entrenched, 'wicked' problems. As Fuad-Luke notes, sustainability is one such 'wicked problem', first described by Horst Rittel in the 1960s, whose definition Fuad-Luke quotes as follows: 'a class of social system problems which are ill-formulated, where the information is confusing, where there are many clients and decision-makers with conflicting values, and where the ramifications of the whole system are thoroughly confusing' (Fuad-Luke 2009: 142). In the case of *Not Far From the Tree*, the complex or 'wicked' problem involves issues related to social cohesion among neighbours, food going to waste by people who don't have time to harvest it, and lack of access to produce by lower-income individuals and families. *Not Far From the Tree* confronts these problems not merely by 'problem solving', but by identifying a series of complex needs that may go unseen in the first place, by seeing these from a different perspective, and by re-conceptualising, re-configuring and creatively re-inventing a set of existing relations into potentially different, surprising and more equitable – and even more joyous – connections among trees, fruit, cargo bikes, neighbourhoods and people.

Although *Not Far From the Tree* does not define itself as a design project or as an activist project – indeed, the organisation prefers to focus on what they do rather than what they are called – I am describing it as an example of design activism following a definition of design activism that focuses not on what is called design or activism, but rather on what a given activity or design does. I am inspired here by not only Deleuze and Guattari but also Tony Fry, whose definition of design is a process-oriented one. He suggests that design need not be practised by a designer, nor does a person need to recognise that s/he is doing design for it to be design. For Fry, design is defined by what it does: 'design designs' (Fry 1999: 176; see also Fry 2009, 2011). Similarly, we can say that activism need not be done by activists, nor pre-defined as activism, for it to activate people and effectuate social, environmental or economic change. We might say, similarly, taking inspiration from the work of Rosi Braidotti, that activism activates affirmative affects and latent potentials in people, places and things (Braidotti 2010: 45). Although *Not Far From the Tree* may not self-define as a design, activist, or design activist project, organisations like *Not Far From the Tree* not only demonstrate a keen attention to matters of system design but

are also becoming increasingly interesting to designers, whose own discipline – where 'minor' design modes such as activist activities are concerned – continue to take inspiration from a range of community activities and actions that do not necessarily consider themselves 'design'. To name just one further example of this trend, the recent emergence of 'participatory design' similarly borrows from the kind of community organisation and action that has a long history in grassroots local political activity (such as neighbourhood associations) and practices of direct democracy (such as those perhaps most prominently on public display during the Occupy Movement). Thus, what I suggest here, following Manzini, Julier and others, is that design activism today is intermingling with, inspired by, and also inspiring – especially, as I go on to explain, where 'design for social innovation' is concerned – other kinds of interventions that may not consider themselves design or activist per se. In the section that follows I point to other emerging examples of such practices, while focusing on *Not Far From the Tree* in order to flesh out in greater detail its connections to what I have called 'minor' modes of design.

Not Far From the Tree: Intensive and Affirmative Modes of Design Activism

Inspired by Los Angeles's *Fallen Fruit* project and itself inspiring other fruit-sharing projects in numerous cities, Toronto's *Not Far From the Tree* is a not-for-profit organisation that mobilises volunteers to harvest produce that would otherwise go to waste from fruit-bearing trees in private yards across the city. Founded by Laura Reinsborough in 2008, this experiment in social, economic and environmental sustainability has grown into an organisation that since 2008 has mobilised 1,600 volunteers to pick 71,159 pounds of fruit from 1,500 downtown trees in fourteen neighbourhoods (notfarfromthetree.org). *Not Far From the Tree*'s harvest – as diverse as cherries, apricots, plums, grapes, elderberries, pears, apples, mulberries, service berries, gingko and walnuts – is picked by volunteers, distributed by cargo bikes and shared in equal thirds among fruit-pickers, fruit tree owners, and local food banks. Reinsborough describes the project as a 'logistics' operation that 'moves all the pieces' and 'mobilises' people, property lines and produce using a modular design (Reinsborough 2013). The organisation does not itself pick the fruit – rather, it works to facilitate a series of new connections and flows. Fruit tree owners who can't keep up with the amount of fruit their tree is bearing, don't have time to harvest the fruit, or can't make

use of all of the produce, register their trees with *Not Far From the Tree*. Volunteers who have the time and have registered their interest in picking fruit, sign up for the fruit-pick neighbourhood by neighbourhood. The fruit that is picked by volunteers is divided in thirds among fruit tree owners, tree-picking volunteers, and food banks and shelters for those who need food but may not be in a position to volunteer. The fruit-picking tools and ladders, as well as the produce that is picked, is distributed by cargo bicycles stored in central, accessible, and also volunteered, storage locations in each of the participating Toronto neighbourhoods. The organisation's simple mandate, to 'pick fruit and share it' responds to a series of complex needs – for environmental sustainability, social justice, food security and economic equity, and offers an alternative, creative and collective model of ecological, economic and social sustainability premised upon an affirmation and reconfiguration of existing abundance, an actualisation of latent potentials, and an orientation towards enabling the future flourishing of trees, neighbourhood connections, and access to fresh local fruit by those in need.

Not Far From the Tree's founder Laura Reinsborough describes how the shift in her perspective came while picking apples in a city orchard at a one-time event. This act of picking fruit in the city activated what she describes as her 'fruit goggles': all of a sudden, she became attuned to her milieu and began to see the city differently. Most notably, she began to see fruit trees – and their latent, unpicked potential – throughout the downtown core (an area often described by food activists as a 'food desert') (notfarfromthetree.org). This shift in perception – from seeing the given world in terms of scarcity (for example, downtown Toronto as a setting for wealth disparities, homelessness, poverty and hunger) to seeing it from the point of view of abundance – is the very kind of shift in perception and interpretation that Deleuze and Guattari advocated in their Spinozist focus on the capacities of things, their Nietzschean emphasis on joy, and their interest in affirming immanence (Thiele 2010). Although, for example, there can be little doubt that there are real shortcomings in the ways in which current food and social systems are organised, a Deleuzo-Guattarian response to such a situation would begin by advocating for an activation of desire in a productive mode, which begins with an ontological shift – an attempt to conceptualise the world differently in order to re-make it in a different way. Similarly, *Not Far From the Tree* engages with the world affirmatively – by creatively identifying what is possible in what is already immanently given, by experimenting with the virtual potential in every actual state of affairs, and by being oriented towards a future that does not merely attempt to

'solve problems' but, more importantly, enables environmentally and socially equitable flourishing.

Indeed, *Not Far From the Tree*, though it doesn't call itself a design or activist project, is nonetheless the type of project that designers interested in models of design for social innovation consider examples of the direction design can take in order to engage with emerging social, economic and environmental challenges. Ezio Manzini, leading theorist of design for social innovation, describes the challenging and yet promising transition that design as a discipline is currently undergoing:

> Design was born and has developed its conceptual and operational tools in a world that looked simple, solid, and limitless. This triad of concepts has been swept away by the force of new phenomena: by the discovery of system complexity, by the need to learn how to navigate in the fluidity of events, and, today, with reference to the transition towards sustainability, by the emergence of limits. It is in this new complex, fluid, limited world that design must operate today . . . design for sustainability has to find its way and to define its concepts and tools. (Manzini 2008a: x)

Not Far From the Tree is one among many examples of design for sustainable social innovation. Some of the projects Manzini and Tassarini described in a working paper for a panel on 'Sustainable Social Innovation' at the Parsons New School for Design in 2012 included 'cohousing, collaborative housing, couch surfing, circles of care, elderly mutual help, social incubators, micronurseries, time banks, local currencies, carpooling, car-sharing, food coops, farmers' markets, zero miles food, CSA, street festivals, [and] community gardens' (Manzini and Tassarini 2012: 4). Though an in-depth critical engagement with each of these examples – though very important – is beyond the scope of this chapter, these kinds of projects exist in communities around the world, including in Toronto. Although each of these activities responds to a different set of 'wicked problems', and each arise from a specific context, many of them can be thought of as eclectic modes of design activism, though they may not identify in such a way. What is clear, however, is that they are of interest to designers interested in activist modes of re-making the world. According to Manzini, these kinds of initiatives demonstrate that 'already today, it is possible to do things differently' (Manzini 2008b: 18) from conventional mainstream economic, ecological and social paradigms and expectations (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 85).

Of course, as one network in a much broader set of networks, *Not Far From the Tree* isn't single-handedly able to solve hunger, social

cohesion, economic equity, or food waste issues in Toronto; however, it models at a local level a conceptual and a material mode of thinking and/as doing our environmental, social and economic system differently. As Reinsborough explains, 'it takes that first experience of getting over the social barrier', of entering a neighbour's yard, having a neighbour enter your yard as well as eating the fruit that grows in it (Interview 2013). *Not Far From the Tree* challenges the ways in which property lines and increasingly individualistic social systems have created divisions among people. It also challenges the notion that the 'urban' isn't also an 'environment' or a 'nature' capable of providing food for inhabitants, and it promotes not only individual food growing but also food sharing in a metropolis. *Not Far From the Tree* creates – even if just for a short time – a blurring of the boundary between private and common space, challenging the idea that we must live in an era of scarcity, and that economic austerity and increased competition among individuals are the ways to promote positive change (Gardiner 2000). Indeed, when someone regards cities as zones of austerity and scarcity – as concrete jungles of anonymous, uncaring and disconnected neighbourhoods – it takes a shift in perception and action to reveal the latent and actualisable abundance – an abundance of trees bearing fruit and an abundance of people willing to give their time to connect and transform their ecological, social and economic environments.[10] In other words, in the case of *Not Far From the Tree*, it's not about what's missing, but about creatively conceptualising, affirming and activating what's immanent in the environment – what's already here. In this way, *Not Far From the Tree* synthesises what Julier terms 'materialist and postmaterialist interests' by 'grappling with' both the 'everyday stuff of life' as well as 'ideas and understandings' (2013a: 146), and functions as what Svirsky calls an 'activist-machine' by creating 'alternative connections' through both the 'actualised world' and 'new imaginations' (2010b: 177).

The Problem Posed by 'Minor' Design: Affirmative Politics and Fruitful Futures

In this chapter I have invited us to read Deleuze and Guattari's domains of thought *intensively* and to consider the capacities of design activism as an 'intra-domain' discipline capable of effecting *intensive resistances* to the present – resistances that present ways to think and do otherwise. I contend that Deleuze and Guattari's return to 'categories' in their classification of the three domains of thought (not to mention their reduction of 'design' to its most narrow definition) is a critical response designed

to defend the capacities of each domain and to target the way the creative force of the fields of art, science and, most importantly for them, philosophy (but also the 'disciplines of communication' such as design) have been captured by reductive thinking and practice. Although their critique remains pertinent to discussions about design today, especially as the ways in which we have been making and re-making the world are increasingly recognised for their problematic social, economic and ecological effects, contemporary expressions of activist design are also demonstrating potentialities that at once problematise the narrow way in which Deleuze and Guattari conceived of design, and, more importantly, respond critically and creatively to their prescient warnings.

Deleuze and Guattari's critical analysis of the way in which 'newness', 'creativity', 'concepts', and indeed 'design', often work as part of a difference-*diminishing* machine that leads to environmental degradation, economic monopolisation and social inequity, is instrumental in order to posit other modes of engaging the world, or worlding-otherwise. However, in their categorical dismissal of design, they failed to create a space for design as a potentially 'minor' mode. Given the understanding of activist design I've been describing in this chapter, I have sought to emphasise the ways that 'minor' or activist design poses a problem to Deleuze and Guattari's trifecta.

In this final section, I summarise some of the characteristics of design in a 'minor' mode. 'Minor' modes of design, like Deleuze and Guattari's modes of 'minor art' are 'collective enunciations' that challenge dominant paradigms and are thus always 'political' (Deleuze and Guattari 1986: 17). I emphasise the need to think the three domains of thought intensively – in terms of what they do, rather than what they are called – in order to do the kind of work Deleuze and Guattari advocate. Finally, I underscore the potential of design practices to effectuate difference in the way that Rosi Braidotti describes as 'putting the active back into activism' (Braidotti 2010: 45). That is, I highlight how design activism can enact an affirmative politics – a politics that engages the made world in order to re-make it in ways that promote the flourishing of future heterogeneous connections.

First, the primary 'problem' posed by design as practised today is that it is much more diverse, and also potentially much more like the kind of activity Deleuze and Guattari advocate than they recognised in *What is Philosophy?* Design in a 'minor' or activist mode enacts creative practices that are not simply part of a marketing machine churning out 'concepts', and instead challenge the underlying structures that territorialise creativity onto a plateau of profit at-all-costs. The design activist's role

is to question whether the field of possibility that exists and has become taken for granted – the current way in which capitalism is operating – is the context within which one should continue to define sustainability, or whether sustainability as a paradigm must instead ask more difficult-to-answer questions such as: What is it we want to sustain? Does the economic, environmental, social and political framework within which we are operating allow for the conditions of possibility of a sustainable world (Hroch 2013b)? As Manzini points out, although we have been told that consumption 'turns the wheels of the economy and produces wealth . . . for everybody' (Manzini 2008b: 10), ecological and economic evidence suggests the contrary; as he explains, 'beyond a certain threshold, our conventional way of conceiving well-being, and the economy that supports it, produces disaster' (2008b: 11). Indeed, Manzini advocates for 'enabling solutions' that enhance the capacities of people and things and argues that sustainability, and the conservation and regeneration of environmental and social capital, means breaking with the currently dominant models of living, production and consumption and experimenting with new ones. If this experimentation does not take place, if we are unable to learn from the new experiences thus generated, then the historical pattern of disabling solutions will continue (Manzini 2008b: 16).

Second, the need to think Deleuze and Guattari's three domains of thought intensively extends to the way we think about design as an intra-domain modality of thought and/as action. Because of the border-crossing characteristic of most problems, design is, in its modes of analysis and engagement, a necessarily complex and interdisciplinary endeavour (Coyne 2005; Farrell and Hooker 2013). Design thus has the potential to offer us a set of complexity-embracing approaches and tools for dealing with the vagaries of 'sustainable' solutions or 'wicked problems'. Indeed, it is especially in the search for sustainable design solutions that, as Stuart Walker notes, 'the boundaries between the distinct disciplines can become barriers to change' (Walker 2008: 26–7). By following the flows of fruit through the circuitry of a city's citizenry, *Not Far From the Tree* is one example of an emerging form of design activism that expresses a response to a more broadly felt struggle about how to effectuate collective agency in the context of neoliberal structures of governance and their inherent processes of individualisation, fragmentation, competition and inequality. This kind of project not only challenges the status quo but also posits – at a local scale – alternative economic, ecological and social models that affirm what is immanent in the environment and activate more equitably fruitful futures.

In conclusion, designers reading Deleuze and Guattari's work need not despair at the harshness of their characterisation of design. Indeed, many modes of activist design have already incorporated Deleuze and Guattari's critical and creative modes of conceptualising and materialising – fabulating and fabricating – the world. At the same time, if we are to learn from Deleuze and Guattari's oeuvre, we should take seriously the political impetus of their work, attend to their expressed enthusiasms as well as to their warnings, and continue to reflect critically throughout the creative design process on the question: 'what does this do?' Indeed, Deleuze and Guattari are thinkers who have themselves designed formidable tools with which to fabricate concepts for thinking and doing differently. Thus, although they did not address design activism directly, design that aims to generate such a counter-narrative is very much the kind of problem-posing, counter-effectuating, convention-resisting mode that resonates with Deleuze and Guattari's description of art, science and philosophy in their most creative actualisations. Design activist responses to some of today's most pressing problems are already materialising intensive resistances to the present in their experimentation with different ways of thinking that draw on philosophical, scientific and artistic modes. We should not only include such design activist practices in our toolbox of 'concepts' but also put them to use.

Notes

1. Previous work on Deleuze and Guattari and design activism includes the special issue of *Design Culture* (2013) as well as the special issue of *Deleuze Studies* on Deleuze and Guattari and political activism (2010), based on the conference that took place at Cardiff University the previous year. More recently, more specific work has been done on Deleuze and the Occupy Movement by Thomas Nail (2013), and Brian Massumi (2013) has done work on activism and philosophy.
2. Deleuze and Guattari witnessed the beginning of the phenomenon we continue to see today – the predominance of 'design' as a synonym for innovative thinking. Their remark that the 'concept' is 'everywhere' (Dosse 2010: 457) or, even more boldly, that 'marketing appears as the concept itself' (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 146) reveals their critical stance on the term 'concept' becoming a way of marketing a 'new' idea.
3. As François Dosse notes in his biography of Deleuze and Guattari, Deleuze attributed shared authorship of *What is Philosophy?* to Guattari despite their not penning the work together, out of a sense of gratitude and indebtedness to Guattari for friendship and previous collaborative work which made this text possible (Dosse 2010: 456). In this chapter, despite the book's noted 'ambiguous status', I follow this tribute by attributing the authorship of the text to both authors.
4. Stengers focuses in particular on the connections and disjunctions between philosophy and science. As she notes, she 'leave[s] art aside and concentrate[s] on

the differentiation between philosophy as a creation of concepts, and science as dealing with functions' (2005: 151).

5. Deleuze and Guattari describe all three domains of thought as creative in the following passage: 'If philosophy is this continuous creation of concepts, then obviously the question arises not only of what a concept is as philosophical Idea but also of the nature of other creative Ideas that are not concepts and that are due to the arts and sciences, which have their own history and becoming and which have their own variable relationships with one another and with philosophy. The exclusive right of concept creation secures a function for philosophy, but it does not give it any preeminence of privilege since there are other ways of thinking and creating, other modes of ideation that, like scientific thought, do not have to pass through concepts' (1994: 8).
6. This delineation presents a number of paradoxes. First, Deleuze and Guattari – thinkers of interdisciplinarity and the 'inter-breeding' of domains – in order to create a tripartite classification system, take a very reductive view of what 'science' is as well as what is considered 'art' (not to mention design) in their defence of a proper 'philosophy'. Commenting on what Deleuze and Guattari seem to have in mind when they refer to 'science', Stengers points out that these process philosophers paradoxically seem to privilege 'what is usually called "science made"' (2005: 153) – a definition of science focused on the 'achieve[ment of] result[s] as the direct consequence of a normal, rational method' (2005: 154) over 'the vivid, open, risky construction of "science in the making"' (2005: 153). Stengers remarks that this narrow characterisation of science as 'Royal science' is 'disappointing' at first, adding that 'this first disappointment . . . led [her] to a political reading of *What is Philosophy?*' (2005: 53). My argument that design is thought overly reductively in *What is Philosophy?* (design as 'discipline of communication' rather than a mode of conceptual-material fabulation and fabrication) resonates with Stengers's response of this text.
7. Although I include the work of ideology and conceptualisation in my understanding of design activism as also material, it is in material practice especially that in Julier's view the real work of design activism takes place (2013a, 2013b). Svirsky underscores the importance of both thinking and collective action for activism, stressing that the 'time activists spend on articulating ideologies will count for little if their practices are separated from a strategy that includes, at least partially, entering into joyous participation with others – meaning, pursuing compossible relations with them' (Svirsky 2010b: 176).
8. Examples of design activism that work within an economy of scarcity include projects such as Cynthia Hathaway's work in *Car Mekka* on the sustainability of skills and expertise as part of *Utrecht Biennale for Social Design No.4* and Darren O'Donnell's work in collaboration with the Catalyst Centre in *Beachballs41+All* in Toronto, Canada.
9. For example, the panel of 'Design Activism and the Production of Future Social Natures', organised by Damian White and Cameron Tonkinwise at the *Association of American Geographers Annual Meeting* in New York in 2012, as well as the *DESIS Philosophy Panel* on 'Emerging Aesthetics: Is Sustainable Social Innovation Generating a New Aesthetic Paradigm?' featuring panelists Clive Dilnot, Ezio Manzini, Victor Margolin, Cameron Tonkinwise, Virginia Tassinari, Tom Fisher and Marghertita Pillan at Parsons The New School for Design in New York in 2012.
10. Indeed, *Not Far From the Tree* has shown that what was once regarded as 'lack' (i.e. food deserts striated by private properties) can actually yield not only abundance but also over-abundance. There are more people interested in registering

trees than there is infrastructure to pick them, and there are more volunteers interested in picking fruit than are able to attend any single pick.

References

Braidotti, Rosi (2013), *The Posthuman*, London: Polity Press.

Braidotti, R. (2010), 'On Putting the "Active" Back into Activism', *New Formations*, 63:3, pp. 42–57.

Braidotti, Rosi (2006), *Transpositions: On Nomadic Ethics*, London: Polity Press.

Brown, Valerie A., J. Harris and J. Russell (2010), *Tackling Wicked Problems: Through the Transdisciplinary Imagination*, London: Earthscan.

Buchanan, R. (1992), 'Wicked Problems in Design Thinking', *Design Issues*, 8:2, pp. 5–21.

Coyne, R. (2005), 'Wicked Problems Revisited', *Design Studies*, 26:1, pp. 5–17.

Cross, N. (2001), 'Designerly Ways of Knowing: Design Discipline Versus Design Science', *Design Issues*, 17:3, pp. 49–55.

DeLanda, Manuel (2002), *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*, London: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles (1992), 'Postscript on the Societies of Control', *October*, 59, pp. 3–7.

Deleuze, Gilles and F. Guattari (1994), *What is Philosophy?* trans. H. Tomlinson and G. Burchell, New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles and F. Guattari (1987), *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia 2*, trans. B. Massumi, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, Gilles and F. Guattari (1986), *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, trans. D. Polan, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, Gilles and F. Guattari (1983), *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia 1*, trans. R. Hurley, M. Seem and H. R. Lane, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dilnot, C., E. Manzini, V. Margolin, C. Tonkinwise, V. Tassinari, T. Fisher and M. Pillan (2012), 'Emerging Aesthetics: Is Sustainable Social Innovation Generating a New Aesthetic Paradigm?', *Parsons Desis Lab.*, Desis Philosophy Talk no. 1, Parsons The New School for Design, New York.

Dosse, François (2010), *Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari: Intersecting Lives*, trans. D. Glassman, New York: Columbia University Press.

Farrell, R. and C. Hooker (2013), 'Design, Science and Wicked Problems', *Design Studies*, 34:6, pp. 681–705.

Fry, A. H. (2011), 'Getting over Architecture: Thinking, Surmounting and Redirecting', in I. Doucet and N. Janssens (eds), *Transdisciplinary Knowledge Production in Architecture and Urbanism*, Amsterdam: Springer, pp. 15–32.

Fry, A. H. (2009), *Design Futuring: Sustainability, Ethics and New Practice*, New York: Berg.

Fry, T. (1999), *A New Design Philosophy: An Introduction to Defuturing*, Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Fuad-Luke, Alastair (2009), *Design Activism: Beautiful Strangeness for a Sustainable World*, London: Earthscan.

Gardiner, Michael E. (2000), *Critiques of Everyday Life: An Introduction*, London and New York: Routledge.

Hardt, Michael and A. Negri (2009), *Commonwealth*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harvey, David (2005), *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Hroch, P. (2014), 'Deleuze, Guattari, and Environmental Politics: *Ritournelles* for a Planet-yet-to-come', in M. Carlin and J. Wallin (eds), *Deleuze and Guattari, Politics, and Education*: *For a people-yet-to-come*, London: Bloomsbury, pp. 49–76.
Hroch, P. (2013a), 'Intensity', in R. Shields and M. Vallee (eds), *Demystifying Deleuze: An Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts*, Ottawa: Red Quill Books, pp. 95–8.
Hroch, P. (2013b), 'Resilience versus Resistance: Affectively Modulating Contemporary Diagrams of Social Resilience, Social Sustainability, and Social Innovation', in G. Elmer and M. Tiessen (eds), *MediaTropes. Foucault/Deleuze: A Neo-liberal Diagram*, 4:1, pp. 17–46.
Julier, G. (2013a), 'Introduction: Material Preference and Design Activism', *Design and Culture*, 5:2, Special Issue on Design Activism, pp. 145–50
Julier, G. (2013b), 'From Design Culture to Design Activism', *Design and Culture*, 5:2, Special Issue on Design Activism, pp. 215–36.
Manzini, E. (2008a), 'Introduction: Designing for Sustainability and Strategic Design', in E. Manzini, S. Walker and B. Wylant, *Enabling Solutions for Sustainable Living: A Workshop*, Calgary: University of Calgary Press, pp. ix–xiv.
Manzini, E. (2008b), 'Design Context: Enabling Solutions for Sustainable Urban Everyday Life', in E. Manzini, S. Walker and B. Wylant, *Enabling Solutions for Sustainable Living: A Workshop*, Calgary: University of Calgary Press, pp. 1–24.
Manzini, E. and V. Tassinari (2012), 'Discussion Paper: Is Sustainable Social Innovation Generating a New Aesthetic Paradigm?' *Parsons Desis Lab*., DESIS Philosophy Talk no. 1 (2 March), Parsons The New School for Design, New York.
Markussen, T. (2013), 'The Disruptive Aesthetics of Design Activism: Enacting Design Between Art and Politics', *Design Issues*, 29:1, pp. 38–50.
Massumi, B. (2013), *Semblance and Event*: *Activist Philosophy and the Occurrent Arts*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Nail, T. (2013), 'Deleuze, Occupy, and the Actuality of Revolution', *Theory and Event*, 16:1.
Not Far From the Tree (no date), website; available at http://www.notfarfromthetree.org (accessed 1 October 2013).
Papanek, Victor (1995), *The Green Imperative: Natural Design for the Real World*, London and New York: Thames and Hudson.
Parr, A. (2013), 'Politics + Deleuze + Guattari + Architecture', in H. Frichot and S. Loo (eds), *Deleuze and Architecture*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 197–214.
Reinsborough, L. (2013), 'Interview', by P. Hroch (20 April).
Rittel, H. and M. Webber (1973), 'Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning', *Policy Sciences*, 4:2, pp. 155–69.
Shedroff, Nathan (2009), *Design is the Problem: The Future of Design Must Be Sustainable*, New York: Rosenfeld Media.
Stengers, I. (2005), 'Deleuze and Guattari's Last Enigmatic Message', *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 10:2, pp. 151–67.
Svirsky, M. (2010a), 'Introduction: Beyond the Royal Science of Politics', *Deleuze Studies*, 4, Deleuze and Political Activism (Supplement), pp. 1–6.
Svirsky, M. (2010b), 'Defining Activism', *Deleuze Studies*, 4, Deleuze and Political Activism (Supplement), pp. 163–82.
Teal, R. (2010), 'Developing a (Non-linear) Practice of Design Thinking', *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 29:3, pp. 294–302.
Thiele, K. (2010), '"To Believe In This World, As It Is": Immanence and the Quest for Political Activism', *Deleuze Studies*, 4, Deleuze and Political Activism (Supplement), pp. 28–45.

Thorpe, A. (2012), *Architecture and Design versus Consumerism: How Design Activism Confronts Growth*, New York: Earthscan.
Trading the Future (2008) videotape, dir. b. h. Yael, Canada.
Walker, S. (2008), 'Sustainable Design', in E. Manzini, S. Walker and B. Wylant (eds), *Enabling Solutions for Sustainable Living: A Workshop*, Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
White, D. and C. Tonkinwise (2012), 'Design, Design Activism and the Democratic Production of Future Natures', *American Association of Geographers Annual Meeting*, 24–28 February, New York.