



Track 2.a Introduction: Decolonising Knowledge to Transform Societies

BENIWAL Sucharita^a; NOEL Lesley-Ann^b; MATHUR Sahil^a; PEMBERTON Cilla^c; BALASUBRAHMANYAN Suchitra^d and SAKTHIVEL V^a

^a National Institute of Design, India

^b Stanford University, USA

^c The University of the West Indies

^d Ambedkar University, Delhi, India

doi: 10.33114/adim.2019.2a

The aim of this track was to question the divide between the nature of knowledge understood as experiential in indigenous contexts and science as an objective transferable knowledge. However, these can co-exist and inform design practices within transforming social contexts. The track aimed to challenge the hegemony of dominant knowledge systems, and demonstrate co-existence. The track also hoped to make a case for other systems of knowledges and ways of knowing through examples from native communities.

The track was particularly interested in, first, how innovators use indigenous and cultural systems and frameworks to manage or promote innovation and second, the role of local knowledge and culture in transforming innovation as well as the form of local practices inspired innovation. The contributions also aspired to challenge through examples, case studies, theoretical frameworks and methodologies the hegemony of dominant knowledge systems, the divides of 'academic' vs 'non-academic' and 'traditional' vs 'non-traditional'.

The 4 paper from 9 authors approach the theme of this track from various perspectives, highlighting different aspects of approaches to other ways of knowing, leading to change and transformation in design. The responding papers came from rich and diverse cultures of India, Namibia, South Korea, United states, United kingdom, Australia, Sweden and showcased examples from many more contexts. The accepted papers covered various forms of decolonisation.

In the first paper, In Colonizing Innovation: The Case of Jugaad, Abhinav Chaturvedi and Alf Rehn question the currently popular concept of frugal innovation that has been appropriated in western management literature as an innovation. This popular phenomena has its roots in the culturally colonial appropriation of indigenous knowledge systems. They sequentially explore various journals for use of postcolonial theory or thinking to inquire into the knowledge systems of innovation studies and innovative thinking, and also break down the concept and phenomenon of Jugaad to understand its linkages. Thereafter, they examine the colonisation of Jugaad through exortisim and narratives of want, and the commodification of the terms as well as the knowledge system; calling for an understanding of the phenomena of non-western paradigms to be reviewed and understood for their own worth and through their own lens.

Boeun Bethany Hong and Sharon Prendeville, in their paper Understanding Development Discourse through Ontological Design: The case of South Korea examine the case study of South Korea's manufacturing industry and its replication as a form of coloniality. While the authors begin their paper with understanding discourse and its relationship to ontological design. Through empirical analysis they demonstrated how the current manufacturing industry in South Korea has been evolved through development assistance strategies from the west. However, in replicating their hegemony of manufacturing know-how in the South-Asian region they are replicating the "West-centred" discourse of developmentalism.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

Melanie Sarantou, Caoimhe Isha Beaulé and Satu Miettinen explore Namibian art and design proliferation through the frameworks of decolonising design and participatory service design with scope of improvisation therein, that allows the participants agency to shape the service. They analyse the role of Art South-South Trust (ASST), a start-up Namibian not for profit (NFP) organisation, as service providers, in increasing visibility and enabling global exposure of the artists, designers and artisans. The paper draws on reflective practice to analyse the data of interviews of various Namibian and Australian partner art organisations. It also uses reflective practice to analyse the focus group discussions between Namibian artists, designers, artisans and arts organisations. The authors use critical thinking to evaluate the findings of the focus groups need for awareness and open dialogue and the plural identities and the complex social, economic and cultural environments in which the participants live and function. Expectations of focus groups were to promote Namibian artists and designers globally through sustainable links with art and design organisations, providing feedback to participants and the broadening of knowledge and experiences. The authors suggested sustained engagement with international markets, efficient, yet flexible and agile management protocols. The authors finally build a practical framework for decolonising practices in Namibian art and design through a mindful and enacted shift from stifling institutions to a willingness to erode and fight power structures associated with institutionalisation. The challenged institutional politics and gatekeeping in the arts by suggesting an alternative participatory framework. They elaborate that this could be achieved through adopting bottom-up approaches as well as fostering capacity building in areas of service design, digital business management and marketing and digital storytelling.

The final paper in the track was by Nicholas Baroncelli Torretta and Lizette Reitsma, through enquiring three Design for Sustainability (DfS) projects through design approach strategies, made a case for challenging colonial and modern development structures. The authors problematises the dynamic between situated place, situated community and design work. They also problematise the term sustainability is deeply local and tied to specific nature/culture contexts and as a collective global action for life on planet. They use Paulo Freire's decolonial perspective to analyse the approaches of the case study. They first take on the approach of design activism in an example of Design for Sustainability (DfS), projects on urban farming in Finland. The second approach is of humbling designing shown through a DfS project of energy conservation project in Sweden. Lastly, Radical Listening as design approach in the case of preserving tropical forests through offering healthcare in the context of Borneo. The authors also caution against the use of Design for Sustainability (DfS), projects themselves becoming as a colonial tool. They conclude that steering DfS to become decolonial or colonizing is a relational issue based on the interplay between the designers' position in the modern/colonial structure, the design approach chosen, the place and the people involved in DfS.

All the papers examine the role of local knowledge and culture in transforming innovations. Situatedness, local-global community interplay, indigeneity and identity become a feature in every case study that has been discoursed. All papers locate the innovations inspired by local practices, and diverse design approaches as means of decolonising and challenging the hegemony of western paradigms. They showcase experimentations and scales in this knowledge domain, through their own categories. The diversities of the case-studies and the many locations of the examples show the many ways in which designers, communities, organisations and innovators challenge the expertise position, while acknowledging the models of experiential, subjective and tacit knowledge that making/doing/problem-solving inherently hold. The track also paves way to view these knowledge beyond binaries, create new dialogues and evolve a common language through diverse action examples. The papers examine diverse design approaches and contexts, however the commonality is the caution about any of these case studies or approaches becoming an colonial tool.