‘Democrazy’, designing for democracy in Eastern Europe
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For design to attend to democratic endeavours it is not enough to rest on the claim that design is implicitly political, but to understand how democratisation — often in the name of political modernisation — has designed different social realities. Focusing on the ‘how to’ of infrastructuring for democracy has advanced a designerly politics-in-practice, and exploring political concepts in design experiments have made design more aware of the democratic conflict. Theoretical work-in-progress, this paper asks whether the concepts internalised within design literature are valid enough to think about infrastructuring for democracy in the context of Eastern Europe. We depart from the theoretical and practical difference between design for politics and political design to 1) understand how each of these concepts enable a democracy to come in Eastern Europe’s Romania, and 2) what are the entry points for design research to understand the democratic experience. We explore this through a participatory intervention in Bucharest.
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Introduction

Within the past decades, design has gained a rich repertoire of methods and techniques to argue for its capabilities in shaping democratic processes and democratic systems. By now there is a general shared consensus that design is both about technical capabilities and ways of thinking. It has explored democratisation by intervening, amplifying and building various movements with distinct democratic endeavours and priorities that came to be labelled under diverse design approaches such as participatory design, cooperative design, design activism or community infrastructuring to just name a few. The literature that has grown around calls to explore relations between design and democracy merges inspirations, readings and adaptations from scholarship on critical reflection in and for a democratic society, on publics coming together to address the democratic conflict, on how object-oriented politics can challenge social orders and representation, but where infrastructuring (by design) is an always-relational politically committed task. At the same time, there are nascent discussions on how democracies (by design) have played out in the political and politics of different socio-cultural settings. Theoretical work-in-progress, we are less concerned about the ‘how to’ of the infrastructuring for democracy, and more focused on what it entails to understand the democratic experience from the lens of design research.

To attend to questions of democracy, design has been building on concepts from democratic theories and political philosophies to inform the design object (the material/immaterial result of designing), the design process (activity, organisation, system and conduct of designing), and the design agency (mode of expression and the designed object as it acts on the world) (Willis, drawing on Fry, 2006). While these categories made use of the political concepts to inform the dialogue on design and democracy, they have not been studied.
specifically in relation to democracy and not contextualised within different democratic experiences. The recent ‘Democracy Design Platform’ by Manzini and Margolin (2017) provides an opportunity for that, but it also begs for more rigorous investigation whether the conceptual arrangements borrowed work in democracies other than Western.

The call departs from the assumption that democracy is ‘the condition that citizens wish to live with in a political system’ but leaves it open to interpretation: “We do not have to share exactly the same idea of what democracy is: to defend it as a core value, it is enough to recognize the strong convergence between democracy and design” — a huge ‘design project’ that could be approached as follows:

\[
\text{design of democracy} \rightarrow \text{improving democratic processes and the institutions on which democracy is built; design for democracy} \rightarrow \text{enabling more people to participate in the democratic process, especially through the use of technology; design in democracy} \rightarrow \text{building access, openness and transparency into institutions in ways that assure equality and justice; design as democracy} \rightarrow \text{the practise of participatory design so that diverse actors can shape our present and future worlds in fair and inclusive ways.} \quad (\text{Manzini & Margolin, 2017})
\]

The first three pillars seem to attend to the sociotechnical dimensions of modern democracies, while the last one suggests the free practice of participatory design within a liberal social order. Critics point out the open-endedness of this mission as a ‘vague commitment’ that positions design in support of liberal forms of democracy over alternatives (Tonkinwise, 2017). For design to respond to this challenge means to deal not only with the political principle and the structure of modern democracy but also with its sociomaterial histories and practices and their political and cultural dependences, as well as with its ‘undemocratic designs’ (ibid.).

For us the call means, first, a provocation to think about the design-democracy relation as linked with the design-politics nexus (Keshavarz, 2015) to challenge existing democratic frames, and consider ways to infrastructure for democracy that are responsive to already produced democratic experiences. In this, we approach design as a philosophical/practical quest about democracy that allows us to think about this relationship in terms of possibilities of theories and praxis for politics and the political. We ask whether the concepts internalised within design literature are valid enough to think about infrastructuring for democracy in the context of Eastern Europe. To respond to this, we first discuss the key conceptual developments within design literature in relation to the democratic theories design draws on. We then correlate this with democratisation in Eastern Europe, and sketch out an illustrative example of a design intervention in Bucharest in Romania.

**Infrastructuring for Democracy by Means of Politics and the Political**

Learning-by-doing has made design more aware of the democratic conflict that is a shared concern as well as a polarising debate in democratic theories. Participatory Design (PD) has been exploring a mutual learning between participatory democracy and radical democracy by combining concepts from both theories in ‘democratic experiments (in the small)’. These explorations have found conceptual guidance from various strands of the socio-technical, systems development, action research tradition and sociomateriality, as well as pragmatist philosophy. They supported PD to theorise designing (for) politics-in-practice from the perspective of participation and representational collaborative practices.

As PD increasingly engaged with the public sector, scholars made use of Chantal Mouffe’s agonistic democracy to frame the sociomaterial struggle for hegemony of the publics that come together to articulate and address issues, and their consequences (Björgvinsson, Ehn & Hillgren, 2012ab; CAL Dantec & DiSalvo, 2013). Here, the Deweyan public and Mouffean agonism are combined to enable infrastructuring for democracy through participation in design Things and strategies of infrastructuring. In this, design must consider the rights and world of nonhumans too, if it is to restore a liveable human-nature relation and address ecological democracy (White, 2018). By doing the work of agonism PD practices such as thinging, infrastructuring and commoning
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1 Mainstream thinking about the democratic conflict focuses on reaching consensus in conflicts that entail decisions about ways of ordering and organising human existence in a society. While pragmatist approaches tend to rely on human capabilities generating aims and methods to solve problems for public interests (e.g. Dewey, 2012), radical theorists stress to recognise the conflicts and division inherent in politics, their irreconcilability and the antagonistic nature of social relations that emerges from the practice of political, symbolic regimes of the social (Mouffe, 2015; Rancière, 2014).
have tried to address the key questions that radical democracy, according to critics, has struggled to address: that of institutionalisation and institutional change (Lotado & DiSalvo, 2018). But as acknowledged by design scholars too, it is becoming increasingly insufficient to only design processes for participation (Tonkinwise, 2017; Bardzell, 2018; Bannon et al, 2018) that diversify adversaries through agonism to eventually challenge the status quo, or to examine the political potential of nonhumans in politics in order to democratise sociotechnical practices (Marres, 2013; Bardzell, 2018).

Infrastructuring, conceived as a strategy, practice and analytical lens, has enabled PD to think beyond the temporal and spatial event of a designed project in relation to democracy (Bannon & Ehn, 2012). However, scaling up from the ‘democratic experiments in the small’ continues to be a struggle. Furthermore, within PD’s rich practice-based explorations there continues to be a productive tension between infrastructuring as perceived within design literature and political concepts rooted within deconstruction. This becomes even more relevant when considering infrastructuring for a ‘pluralist democracy to come’ and address questions of inequality beyond the liberal democratic context. While radical democrats, such as Mouffe and Laclau, Rancière and Wolin, draw attention to the weakened preconditions for participatory democracy and deconstruct institutional critique, participatory democracy of Carole Pateman has been concerned with empowerment, citizen participation, and has developed tools for institutional change and institutionalising participatory forms to sustain democracy (Vick, 2015). While radical democratic thought sees disagreement inherent within democratic politics via the concept of agonism, participatory democracy is focused on decision-making and designing the conditions where participation can happen. Both theories have much to teach design, just as design can contribute to articulate forms, shift action and make concepts work in practice. Thinking about infrastructuring for democracy, design might benefit not only from understanding how different democratic theories have treated participation but also how democratisation projects have carried out infrastructure(ing), and how, within those infrastructures, social movements mobilised participation for democratic ideals (Della Porta, 2011).

Focusing on ‘how to’ infrastructure for democracy has equipped design with a variety of tools and repertoires. But in order for these to work in and for distinct social realities, it is important to understand the democratic experience. In this, the conceptual and practical difference between design for politics and political design, as differentiated by DiSalvo (2010) based on the Mouffean distinction between politics and the political (2005), is highly relevant. Drawing on Derrida’s approach of the democracy ‘to come’ and a Wittgensteinian practice-based approach to political rationality, Chantal Mouffe develops her view of agonistic pluralist democracy as a response to the universal-rationalist view and the deliberative approach to democracy. ‘To come’ seems to keep a necessary distance to grasp the tensions occurring between politics and the political, specifically to reflect on how different conceptions of democratic logics get inscribed within a given social order. For Mouffe, the political is the dimension of antagonism that can emerge from any social relation, while politics thrives to set an order and organise social conditions that are inherently political.

Accordingly, design for politics supports and improves the mechanisms and procedures of governance (by e.g. increasing the efficacy of voting, mobilising voters, making the government more transparent and efficient), whereas political design is concerned with questioning and challenging issues and conditions of existing structures (DiSalvo, 2010). By doing the work of agonism, political design’s purpose is to ‘create spaces of contest’ through objects and processes of design that equal ‘sites and means of agonistic pluralism’. These might enable investigations into different democratic experiences to formulate alternative conceptions of democracy. One objective, according to DiSalvo, is to ‘identify new terms, themes and trajectories for action that sit opposite the known practices and discourses of design for politics’ (2010). In terms of infrastructuring this suggests, that both design for politics and political design constitute a set of practices of infrastructuring. While design for politics by improving existing structures and mechanisms ‘infrastructures (already) hegemonic relations’, political design works to reveal and deconstruct those to then reconfigure them. Design’s strength, accordingly, lies in ‘giving form to a political condition’ (or some aspect of it) and in ‘shifting towards action’. In

---

2 Infrastructure has been the focus of sustained inquiry of STS, history of technology, media studies, anthropology, literary and cultural studies too. Infrastructuring within PD, as borrowed from information infrastructure and developed by PD scholars, refers to an ‘ongoing designing’ that defers some aspects of design until after the completion of a design project as a way to support the potential for redesign for unanticipated use or other unanticipated change (A.Telier 2011). It ‘entangles and intertwines with the potentially controversial composition of priori infrastructures, previous design activities, along with everyday design activities in actual use such as mediation, interpretation and articulation, as well as actual design-in-use such as adaptation, appropriation, tailoring, redesign and maintenance’ (Bannon & Ehn, 2012, p.57).
the case of Eastern Europe, the political condition is marked by the frustrations of post-communism and failures of previous democratisation processes. To infrastructure for democracy in Romania, for example, one must deconstruct the democratic experience, make sense of what went wrong with previous democratisation projects and the blind alleys of the existing infrastructures. In order to be able to contest the hegemonic relations ingrained in civil society practices and revitalise democracy as a political system, political design must identify the terms and conditions of citizens’ hopes. We next draft a brief overview of the democratic experience in Eastern Europe and reflect on a pilot for citizen’s manifesto in Romania.

Democratic Experience in Eastern Europe (EEU)

Democratisation projects have been complicit in geopolitical games that made use of conceptual divisions and structural boundaries to promote their ideological self-interest, which in turn created imagined communities, such as Eastern Europeanness, and defined their democratic experience (Wolf, 1994). Visions for democracy in (Central) Eastern Europe have focused on testing and implementing conceptual schemes, typologies and patterns that were based on Western democracies but have failed to actually support the transitions in new democracies (Ágh, 1999; Roberts, 2006; Gagyi, 2015). Here, transition meant a linear change from the socialist realism of the 1980’s to a market economy and democratic capitalism associated with wellbeing, competition and freedom projected by the Western ‘open society’ that would bring along all kinds of modernisation of established liberal democracies. Instead, what emerged was a ‘multiform development’ or ‘hybrid’ regime with ‘new patterns of governance’ (Roberts, 2006) that copied and stitched together elements that would apparently meet expectations of established democracies but missed to respond to local hopes: to identify the knowledge, experience, resources and design necessary to reach for a transition to democracy.

While international media reports have been focusing on issues of global structures and the shared crisis, such as the anti-democratic measures introduced in Hungary and ongoing anti-corruption movements in Romania — both concerns of the European Union project —, there continues to be nascent talk on how citizens have organised to improve their living conditions since the regime change. Understanding the socio-political context of the region from how movements mobilise for change sheds light on ‘existing power-relations, political and economic blocs, symbolic fields and historically constructed political vocabularies’ (Gagyi, 2015) which could inform, for instance, infrastructuring for democracy by means of political design.

In the case of Romania, recreative activism is put forward as a concept to explain the particularities of collective action in the region (Gubernat & Rammelt, 2017). It is also used by the scholars as a way to bridge concepts such as space, participation, leisure and classic approaches to movement studies enabling ‘relational and cognitive social capital during protest participation, possibilities of online mobilization, and various forms of cultural consumption through scenes’ (2017, p.145). Here, ‘scenes’ refer to sites that have become part of a ‘lifestyle where part-time communities gather and mobilise through various engagement forms.’ These part-time communities or publics emerged as result of recent movements in Romania that stood up for social (Colectiv, in 2015), political (#rezist, #totipentrujustitie, OUG13 in 2017, #farape in 2018) and environmental justice (#rosiamontana in 2013). Along with street mobilisations, cultural producers have organised festivals that lined up debates, civic ateliers and exhibitions to contest the dysfunctions of the current system. Gubernat and Rammelt see the expansion of this protest culture as a ‘recreative activism’ that “has its roots in the concomitance of cultural consumption and non-institutionalized political participation, as well as in a certain disenchantment of protest participants with post-communist politics” (2017, p.158). Another study assigns the anger behind such mobilisations to how conditions of modern democracies — the rule of law and to suffrage — have been disabled by transnational kleptocratic networks (Chayes, 2018). Here, returning demands are not personal liberties or the act of voting but submitting the power elite to the rule of law, equal justice, and most importantly to pressure those in public office to exercise in the interest of the people. But while protesters demand adjustments in constitutional structure and its mechanisms, the government is deliberatively playing on the cultural divide and political polarization by distorting the claims and demands saying they are ‘engineered by the opposition for partisan purposes’ (Chayes, 2018).

Despite the growing body of documentation on creative activism part of such movements in Romania, there is no coverage of where and how design exists or intervenes in their changemaking activities. Departing from our research question which seeks to understand the democratic experience from the lens of design research, we set up a pilot event that invited citizens to reflect on what democracy means to them. This would inform the basis for a citizen’s design manifesto that could work together with ongoing initiatives and movements.
‘Democrazy’ in Romania

The pilot event organised was hosted at the Balassi Cultural Institute in Bucharest (a diplomatic cultural institution of Hungary) as part of the 2018 Late-Night Galleries, a yearly one-night event with multiple exhibitions and talks running simultaneously across various cities. Given the recent anti-pluralist and anti-democratic waves both in Romania and in Hungary, this cultural event was an ideal platform to host a workshop that would open a discussion on the relevance of the Democracy-Design initiative in the region.

Participants were invited to create banners out of tablecloths that record messages about citizens’ imaginings, demands and actions for democracy. These would be compiled and displayed in store fronts, (e.g. abandoned window displays) creating a communication channel to mobilise citizens within and across cities in Romania before the elections in 2020. Window displays used to have a particular aesthetic emblematic of the communist era, and even today they carry a sense of nostalgia. Following the regime change they have been taken over by brands, products and trends of Western democracies. We chose to replace the static setups of commercial design products with the banners that would depict visions for democracy. For the purpose of this event, the venue acted as a site for discussing a ‘citizen’s design manifesto for democracy’ (Figure 2 & 3). Making use of the particularities of the space and the activity of the institute, the setup mocked old-time coffee houses where intellectuals and revolutionists used to gather to debate and plan for change. The Romanian Renaissance Brâncovenesc styled basement — a venue now hosting events organised by the Hungarian Balassi Institute — was converted into a quirky installation where citizens reflected on what is to be done about today’s democracy. Five conversation tables were covered with linen and each equipped with a ‘resource basket’ and a series of postcards that pictured old and contemporary window displays. Participants were invited to replace goods and brands from the cards with messages about democracy. These conversation starters would then guide them into making a banner out of the tablecloth.

Figure 1 Speaker’s and media corner
Figure 2 Democrazy Welcome Map (front)

Figure 3 Democrazy Welcome Map (back)
A ‘speaker’s & media corner’ (Figure 1) had a mike for anyone wanting to share a call for action and a photo camera for e.g. shy participants to document the event. As visitors walked in, they picked up the welcome pack next to the ‘weighting scale of democracy’ and could join the conversation in whichever way they wanted (Figure 4). The weighing scale had messages depicting promises and values made by political parties mocking the current fragmentation of political infrastructure and confusion around ideological structures.

Visitors varied from diplomats to groups of students and designerly or artistically engaged activists. Tendency was to drop in from one event to the other happening simultaneously, so participation was relaxed. Responses from participants have been positive, but most seemed either to expect a tangible outcome from the conversation or preferred to just discuss rather than contribute to the tablecloths, or if contributing they stressed to remain anonymous. As intended, the event generated curiosity from the public based on its somewhat quirky installation (the democrazy window displays). While people seemed eager to discuss ‘doing something about democracy’, there was an underlying scepticism whether anything can be done and perhaps not specifically ‘for democracy’. Among the visitors, a diplomat couple representing the Hungarian government in Romania spent around three hours reflecting and debating the topic. Another group of four people have spent time discussing about the ongoing local movements and creating a banner that pictures four pair of hands showing conflicting emotions about democracy (Figure 5). Two of the participants have been actively documenting the protests happening over the past years.
Discussion

Our pilot event confirmed a sense of urgency towards ‘doing something about democracy’, even though participant’ responses were tinted with black humour that questioned democracy as a political system. Reflections converged on that ‘democracy is not good but for now no better system has been invented’. Words such as ‘demos’ and ‘rezist’ (resistance) seemed to be key, even for the diplomat couple who showed an uneasiness about the political establishment in Hungary and Romania but also questioned the efficiency of the ongoing socio-political movements. The banner created by the four participants shows how divisive it is even to come to terms with the concept of democracy (Figure 5). It depicts four pairs of hands with conflicting messages as they join forces. One pair of hands voices ‘togetherness’ but with a human figure trapped between shouting an unclear demand. The other pair notices democracy’s invisible hand backfiring the people while pointing direction Westwards. The third participant trusts in that ‘we are the world’ while her other hand hashtags ‘boikott’. Meanwhile, the forth participant appeals to God for help as her hands are tied. Together, the banner with the four pair of hands mirrors the paradox of reconciling with democracy: the cry for a demos-friendly democracy and the frustrations with a hybrid regime where the political system is guided by those who distorted the very substance of democracy.

Surely the messages conveyed on the banner are symbolic and relaxed but this echoes what Gubernat and Rammelt call recreational activism (2017). They may provide little evidence of the democratic experience in Romania, but are illustrative of the existing scepticism towards democracy as a (universal) political system which is grounded on a systemic distrust towards decision-making practices of implementing change at a policy level. This attitude towards democracy and the welfare associated with it, also varies from generation to generation. We are tempted to say that coming to terms with the democratic experience must be addressed from an intergenerational perspective. What this means for design research, is that in order to be able to talk about a ‘democracy to come’ (or any future vision of democracy), political design must confront the distrust dividing the youth and the older generation. Furthermore, it must rebuild confidence in citizens’ power in contributing to change through participation beyond the streets, and uniting around perspectives that can drive more collaborative strategic actions.
While the notion of recreative activism may be perceived as depoliticising by some, it has grown as part of the anti-corruption, pro-democracy and environmental movements. Despite converging on similar issues, sharing slogans and mobilisation repertoires with other global movements, these movements diverge in structural differences: when and where in time and space they are launched, and whom they directly concern (Gagyi, 2015). For the struggle for democracy, this implies that capacities, resources and conditions to organise will depend on how a given social order performs, what is set in motion that will reproduce a variant of democracy. In the case of Romania, the messages depicted on the banner illustrate the struggle to overcome the ills of democratic transitions that have marked the political condition. What this means for design is that in order to address democracy here, it must first deconstruct what has gone wrong with democratisation projects in the region, and make sense of structural problems vis-à-vis mainstream democratisation agendas and mechanisms. In doing this, the organisational life of local movements can provide social and participatory resources and entry points for political design to amplify citizens’ demands that ask for a more honest governance.

Furthermore, recreative activism has designed workarounds within the same system that have become part of the infrastructure that mediates and organises the lives of its community, or as Lauren Berlant would call it, the ‘lifeworld of their structures’ (2016). These workarounds remain opportunistic about the principles of a capitalist welfare system. Scholars see this as a form of ‘social therapy’ or a way of coping with the frustrations of post-communism (Gubernet & Rammelt, 2017) and the pitfalls of infrastructures promised by democratic transition agendas. Transition approaches to democratisation have been seen as reductive, deterministic, and caught up in dichotomies not only by social movements scholars (Gagyi, 2015; Della Porta, 2011; Agh, 1991) but also multicultural citizenship scholars (Kymlicka & Opalski, 2001) and foreign policy experts (Carothers, 2002; Carothers & Young, 2017). By focusing on a linear path of regime change and speaking the terms of international politics, it has dismissed the dimension of the political and by this, eradicated symbolic alternatives (Valantiejus, 2014). For instance, the liberal democratic category of pluralism could not make sense of the ethnocultural diversity, relations and the conflicts arising in the region after the regime change (Kymlicka & Opalski, 2001) and the political representation of minorities and politics of ethnic parties. In the case of Romania, a further complexity constitutes the representation of the Hungarian minority by the ethnic party called Democratic Alliance of Hungarians in Romania, which is also closely supported by the Hungarian government. This exists within a political landscape that has been continuously shifting between the ruling Socialist Democratic Party’s oligarchs, the liberal bloc and the technocratic movements supported by international actors and the anti-corruption agency. Continuously adjusting to meet the western standards, while developing strategies to cope with austerity measures implemented by the government, has not made it easy for the ordinary citizen to open up to the pluralist holistic worldview expected of them. Nor did the interests, strategies and discourses of minority politics in the region. With tensions around globalisation and the politics of migration, soon the ‘open society’ came to carry not the meaning of freedom but danger and fear from the ‘other’ (Krastev & Holmes, 2018). In their account for the nationalistic rhetoric and the so-called ‘illiberal’ turn in the region, Krastev and Holmes trace this back to an ongoing, and now reversed, ‘imitation game’ since post-1989. This now sweeps across and beyond Europe, turning narratives and issues into ‘branding opportunities’ that would keep established parties and their networks on power (e.g. the anti-Soros campaign).

Looking through the lens of design, the rhetoric and materiality of the ‘imitation game’ is dismantling democracies by infrastructuring (by design) for nondemocratic structures and paving the way towards autocratic policies. In the case of Romania, for now, this looks more like patchworking mechanisms and bargaining processes that favour the political elite, e.g. removing judiciary systems, passing laws by night to decriminalise corrupt politicians, and releasing inmates pretending to solve the overcrowding problem of local prisons, while these threaten the safety of the public. Such thinking and practices serve (by design) the established system and keep the existing leadership on power, thus assisting what DiSalvo identifies as design for politics. In turn, political design is then concerned with mobilising to resist these forces. This consists not only of staging conversations that challenge the status quo but speculate about processes and make use of resources to provide alternatives. The pool of resources and participants within the scenes of recreative activism are already infrastructuring pathways back to democracy by deconstructing existing conditions and contesting hegemonic relations. For political design to formulate alternative conceptions of democracy in Romania it must first make sense of the lived frustrations with previous democratisation processes, and the workarounds implemented by citizens to overcome a failed democratic vision and make incomplete infrastructures work. It must also find the political vocabulary and cooperative enquiry that relates to the part-time communities already engaged within these scenes. For now, only by keeping these scenes active...
scrutinisers of the established structure and dismantling mechanisms that enable corruption, could the system be reversed in favour of the citizen, and trust rebuilt in a democratic political system.

Conclusion

Attending to wicked problems has revolutionised what came to be seen design and expanded possible infrastructuring practices. But to infrastructure for democracy and make sense of democratic visions that are historically and culturally contingent, designing for democracy will mean to engage with the democratic experience of a civil society. If it is to contribute to democracies beyond Western democratic socialism, it has to understand the failures of democratic visions exported, the material, discursive and organisational practices of civil society actors, their interrelations and collective actions within the given political and economic system, and how, in a sense, design for politics has depoliticised the power of the people.

By drawing on concepts internalised within design literature that sustain a democratic horizon in the nexus of design-politics and by discussing them in relation to democratic theories, we asked what are the terms and conditions necessary to think about infrastructuring for democracy in Eastern Europe. Within our Democrazy pilot in Romania we have tried to identify through citizens’ imaginings, demands and actions for democracy what could be the conceptual entry points for design to infrastructure for democracy in Romania by first understanding the democratic experience through the lens of design research. In a context, where the general understanding of design is still rooted within the consumer society that came along with democratic modernisation, and where recreative activism contests the dysfunctionality of an incomplete democracy, we staged the conversation as an invitation for a citizen’s design manifesto. For political design to identify terms and shift action, to articulate the collective will and amplify political frontiers necessary to respond to local hopes of democracy, it must build on what movements have already set in motion. In the case of Romania, make use of the pool of resources and participation of the recreative scenes as well as the opportunistic mechanisms and workarounds that the community has carved out in the lifeworld structure of the civil society.
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