About 25 minutes

Get into groups of four (we will divide you into breakout rooms)

1) Introduce yourselves briefly to each other.

2) In silence, read the passages of text provided. Be aware that they are missing citations. Look up unfamiliar words.

3) When you have all finished reading, work together to decide where you think citations should or could be added.

4) Within your breakout room, share your thoughts about the writing. Bear in mind that they are snippets of texts with which you are otherwise not familiar. At least 5 minutes.

5) Nominate one person to briefly share your reactions, about where citations should go and about the writing generally.

Text one

As an established concept and part of the professional idiom, ecological design has a relatively brief history. Much of its basic principles were developed in the above-mentioned seminal period of the 1960s and 1970s, but only at the turn of the twenty-first century was it explicated and popularized as a distinct professional approach. However, as Lydia Kallipoliti has argued, it has a much longer pre-history – tracing a genealogy from naturalists like Carl Linneus and and Ernst Haeckel (who coined the term ecology in 1866), via the evolutionist ideas of designers like Patrick Geddes and Frank Lloyd Wright and the biocentrism flourishing at the Bauhaus, to the comprehensive systems thinking of design theorists like Richard Buckminster Fuller, John McHale, and Ian McHarg on the one hand and the more pragmatic, activist approach promoted through counter cultural outlets like the *Whole Earth Catalog* on the other. Thus, as many of the contributions to this volume exemplify, there is a long and rich history of design's conversations with ecology. This book seeks to push at the nature of that relationship, proposing also that designing itself can be understood *as* ecology – *as* ecological systems, ideas, thinking, and practice. Such an extended understanding of design as ecology may also overcome the misconception common to much environmentalist discourse that ecological principles presuppose a 'static', unchanging nature as the ideal condition, recognizing instead that natural systems are open, dynamic, evolving. A notion of ecological design as 'an ideational and philosophical system of viewing the world of ideas, information and matter as flow, rather than as the accumulation of discrete objects' is in line also with a shift in focus from conservation and restoration to resilience, requiring a conceptualization which 'signals the migration of life through the conversion of one thing to another.'

Second text, first part.

ABSTRACT

This paper takes as its starting point the fact that we live in the aftermath of previous making and design. For participatory design to adequately answer to this aftermath, we suggest building on a combination of participatory and speculative design approaches in everyday life settings and exploring the practice of un/making matters. The paper draws on two cases where participants have been invited to engage with recent scientific findings and practices - one where they explore the practice of un/making plastic waste through composting, and one on un/making polluted soil through plants that can accumulate metals. By not primarily aiming at feeding into new iterations of a design process, there is an openness for speculating beyond the given systems, and to bring into question imaginaries of constant progress, which have been part of generating these lingering matters.

Second text, second part.

The practice of un/making will be explored through two projects, that are situated within an emerging body of work that combines participatory design with speculative design. While these two projects have slightly different set ups, they both invite to engage with new and still speculative proposals for how to engage with the aftermath of previous designs. More specifically, the projects engage with the possibility of un/making plastic waste through composting and un/making polluted soil through phytoremediation.[1] Rather than situating speculations in galleries, which often is the case with speculative design, the two projects invite actors to bring these still speculative practices of un/making into their own everyday lives. Through, for example, prototypes and guidelines the un/making of the aftermath is made doable, or at least almost doable. The aim here is not to gather knowledge and insight that can be fed into the next iteration of a design process. Rather than being an inquiry for design, these explorations of un/making can, in line with other attempts to combine speculative and participatory design processes, be seen as an inquiry through design, that might teach us something about the condition of design. Or, more specifically, that can teach us something about the condition of the aftermath of design.