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Weaving People and Places: Art and Design for Resilient Communities

Background: Cultures of Resilience—a Cultural Experiment

Contemporary societies are fragile. This fragility has different causes, but a major contributor is the lack of social cohesion within them; or more precisely, their low degree of social resilience.

The problem is particularly evident when a catastrophic event happens; but it can also be recognized in everyday life events, such as those associated with the economic crisis or the migrant flows across Europe and worldwide. In all these cases, a lack of social cohesion is apparent in breakdowns at every level from the micro scale of human encounters, to the macro level of society as a whole. On the other hand, both theory and empirical evidence indicate that “significant benefits can arise from collaborative forms of governance that foster self-organization and flexibility.”

Robert Sampson’s account of the “enduring neighborhood effect” evidences that at the neighborhood scale, prosocial activity reduces antisocial activity and fosters greater community resilience. Sampson observes that those communities that have greater social and civic connectivity and activity respond better to catastrophic events. Tennis clubs become rescue centers and their members a connected network of support services. The barbecue equipment becomes a kitchen, the indoor courts a dormitory, the towels from the shower rooms bedding and bandages – the day to day is repurposed in response to the extreme. Adam Greenfield makes a similar observation about what he calls the “spontaneous infrastructure” that emerged during the Occupy networks’ relief response to Hurricane Sandy in 2012.

What these authors observe is that, after a catastrophic event – when there are no longer normal ways of doing things, and when standard top-down communication collapses – people who know each other and know the place where they live are able to find a way of organizing themselves and making the best use of existing assets. Something similar can happen when facing acute economic and social crisis: networks of people living nearby and organized in open and flexible social networks can give each other not only fundamental practical and economic support, but also the psychological support needed to face difficult and unforeseen events with a sense of togetherness (this is exactly what is not happening today in Europe – the migrant issue is revealing a wider dimension of European social fragility).

We can summarize these observations by saying that social resilience requires the existence of groups of people who interact and collaborate in a physical context. Proximity and relationship with a place are what enable these people to self-organize and solve problems in a crisis.
Accepting the importance of these social forms we ask, “What is the nature of these place-related communities? What can be done to support them?” And, in particular, “What can art and design do for them?”

This theme issue of *She Ji* brings together a collection of papers that reflect on art and design action research that has been delivered in response to a common theme: *Cultures of Resilience*. Initially, the purpose of *Cultures of Resilience* (CoR) was to discuss the cultural dimension of resilience and produce a set of narratives, values, ideas, and projects on this topic. But as it evolved, CoR narrowed its focus to one of “place related communities,” identified as a pre-condition for every possible scenario of social resilience.

The CoR project was made viable by the observation that there were already several initiatives underway at the University of the Arts London (UAL) that were dealing directly or indirectly with the issue of social resilience and community building. In view of this, the aim of CoR was to offer these ongoing projects a common platform from which to exchange experiences and discuss and build some original art and design knowledge. In doing so, CoR carried out a *de facto* action research project, where the action thread consisted of several art and design initiatives, and the research thread was the program of discussions and seminars exploring the social effects of the projects. Beyond this main goal, CoR also aimed at including normal didactic activities in the research process, challenging an art and design school to act also as an action research agent.

CoR had two phases. The first one, from February 2014 to October 2014, was dedicated to building a group of committed CoR members, and discussing the CoR theme. This first phase had a mainly divergent character, cultivating differences while raising the level of the conversation and, at the same time, deepening and enriching it.

In the second phase, from November 2014 to July 2016, thirteen parallel CoR project teams agreed to enter a converging process. They were to present and discuss their activities, which the participants had very different motivations and goals, from the same point of view: the projects’ impact on social forms. Each explored the same question: how to describe the social forms the projects’ were helping to generate. In other words, during the second phase, the on-going projects were used as references and practical experiences on which to base a discussion about the nature of contemporary communities, the encounters on which they are built, and the role of art and design in staging or supporting these encounters.

**Social Desertification, New Tribalism, and Emerging Contra-Trends**

To withstand and recover from present crises, and to prepare for foreseeable future ones, our societies should improve their cohesion through strengthening different kinds of social forms. Unfortunately, predominant cultural trajectories appear to be heading in the opposite direction. As Richard Sennett writes, “modern society is de-skilling people in practicing cooperation.” The result is that pre-modern communities—families, neighborhoods, villages—are progressively disappearing.

At the same time, the intentional communities of the twentieth century—communities driven by strong ideologies, shared interests, and sense of belonging, like political parties and trade unions—are becoming weaker.

Loose, flexible, temporary social networks are increasingly replacing such communities. The effects of this transformation are contradictory, but, for sure, the main and most visible effect is a tendency toward an increasing individualization and displacement of people, which in turn weakens further the traditional and intentional communities described above and contributes to increasingly fragile social systems.
But the weakening of traditional communities is not the only risk presented by this vicious circle of social erosion to which present societies are exposed. Returning to Richard Sennett, we can see that a second, equally dangerous consequence may be that of turning the human demand for community and collaboration toward what he calls *tribalism*, a form of “cooperative exchange [that] can produce results destructive to others.” A risk that today appears very high and we can recognize in several contexts. The most obvious is when cooperation is explicitly oriented toward furthering the interests of the group by damaging others (see criminal gangs, mafias, or terrorist groups). However, we can also recognize it clearly in all cases in which people cooperate against someone else in the name of their specific identity, as happens among some ethnic and religious groups. Finally, seeds of tribalism can be found every time cooperation produces *closed* organizations: groups of people who separate themselves from, and potentially set themselves against, those who are not members of the same group. Examples of this are evident in urban tribes, gangs of hooligans, and even residents of gated neighborhoods. No need to say how dangerous these closed communities are: they are carcinogenic social forms, the growth of which has lethal effects on the hosting societies, increasing the crisis in social resilience. Against this backdrop is silhouetted the picture of increasing numbers of people on the move across the planet, not as privileged actors in the marketized activities of globalization – those that might propagate, manipulate and maintain the networks of the information age that support a global free flow of capital – but rather those displaced by the twin perils of globalization and the tribalism described above.

Importantly, while apparently dominant, these are not the only social trends that can be observed. Looking attentively at the complexity and contradictions of contemporary societies, we can also see something else: against the mainstream trend towards both social desertification and carcinogenic tribalism, we see a growing number of people that are creating new salutary social forms, based on the rediscovery of collaboration and the quality of places.

Once we start to observe society in search of initiatives like these, a variety of interesting cases appear: groups of families who decide to share some services to reduce economic and environmental costs, but also to create new forms of neighborhoods (cohousing and a variety of forms of sharing and mutual help within a residential building or neighborhood); new forms of exchange (from simple barter initiatives to time banks and local currencies); services where the young and the elderly help each other, promoting a new idea of welfare (collaborative social services); neighborhood gardens set up and managed by citizens who, by doing so, improve the quality of the city and of the social fabric (guerrilla gardens, community gardens, green roofs); systems of mobility in alternative to individual cars (car sharing, carpooling, the rediscovery of the possibilities offered by bicycles); new models of production based on local resources and engaging local communities (social enterprises and cooperatives); and fair and direct trade between producers and consumers (fair trade initiatives).

These are radical social innovations. They appear as *creative communities* and, when successful, evolve into *collaborative organizations*: groups of people who choose to collaborate with the aim of achieving specific results and creating social and environmental benefits.

In recent decades, a growing number of collaborative organizations have merged with digital social networks creating unprecedented networks of people who are digitally and physically connected with each other and the place where they live, apparently straddling the “space of flows” and the “space of places.” In leveraging globally networked information and local face-to-face exchanges, these conditions and characteristics are producing a new generation of place-related communities.
Lessons Learned/1: Characteristics of Contemporary Communities

All the Communities of Resilience projects purported to be community-related initiatives, but if we look carefully at the social forms they contributed to generate, we realize that they were brand new, quite unlike communities of the past. They lacked a clear definition of what they really were—and therefore of what, in the new context, the term community really meant.17

Moving from here, the CoR project discussions are modest but meaningful contribution to a better understanding of contemporary communities, particularly so because it is a contribution based on art and design experiences that seek to build specific art and design knowledge in this field.

Lessons Learned/2: Meaningful Encounters and Communities-in-Place

Communities can be observed from different points of view, using different conceptual tools. CoR research focused on the micro-scale of the interactions that participatory art and design practices can contribute to creating these place-related communities, the weaving of people and places, and reflect on the lessons learned about how to do so.
constitute the communities’ building blocks: meaningful encounters, when people meet and start conversations oriented towards doing something together. And, in doing so, establish different forms of relationships between them and between them and their surroundings.

Special attention has been given to the ways in which these encounters relate to the place where they happened. Meaningful encounters contribute to creating the place-related communities that, as we have seen, are so important in creating a resilient society. From here on, we will refer to them as communities-in-place: communities built on conversations that (also) deal with, and are influenced by, the place in which they are embedded.

The objectives of the projects explored through CoR, and reflected upon in these pages, were diverse, ranging from explicit attempts to leverage the capacity of “the design school, as a bastion of the diversity and redundancy of thinking and doing essential to experimentation, reflective learning and innovation” to support social and service innovation, working with local government and the communities they serve, to understanding how art and design can deal with interpersonal relations in its practices by providing guidelines to deal with interpersonal vulnerability to nurture and strengthen communities. The first of these seeks to afford communities a redundancy of ways and means of addressing local needs and goals, while the latter understands that to connect people-in-place requires address to the fact that “an encounter with someone who appears to be very diverse requires taking a risk: the risk of opening yourself to an unknown person and, doing so, becoming more vulnerable.”

On the basis of this diversity, CoR used the results of these projects to get a better insight into the nature of the encounters they created, their relationships with the contexts where they took place, and the social forms they contributed to building. In doing so, some common patterns have been recognized and emerging themes proposed. These results offer some insight into how to trigger and support meaningful encounters between different and transient interlocutors. That is, how to foster meaningful encounters in fluid society.

Lessons Learned/3: CoR Projects as Places Where Strangers Meet

Across their diversity, the results show that – in different ways and with different motivations – all of the CoR projects created opportunities for connecting people in places, by which we mean opportunities for encounters that might become the building blocks of communities-in-place.

All the project findings explicitly or implicitly refer to three key recognitions. The first and more basic one is that the encounter must be considered the unitary action from which society is built. This is the understanding that, to reweave people and place, we must consider encounters, and their quantity and quality – with the assumption that if their number is low, and if they do not pro-duce enough social values, society is eroded, its democratic life weakened, and its resilience reduced.

The second recognition regards a possible role for arts and design in creating opportunities for meaningful encounters in a fluid world. Anne Eggebert sees the arts “as a tool for connecting with others through socially engaged and participatory practices,” adding that “momentary, fluid, short-lived connections in place can be as powerful as long term relationships.” Her statements suggest that the potential of light and temporary encounters and transient membership of communities-in-place are both significant and revelatory of a new kind of


community-in-place, in the contemporary, highly fluid world, in which light and temporary encounters are becoming the norm. Working with the hypothesis that these kinds of encounters may be in their own way powerful, and deeply relational, all the proposed projects—with all their differences—can be seen as experiments on how to make these light and temporary encounters happen, and how to improve their quality.

From this perspective, the fact that several of the projects shared here generated encounters between people living in a place and students, often only present in a place for the duration of their study, or even their project, becomes particularly meaningful; these projects present extreme examples of what in the contemporary fluid society is becoming normal: the need to weave together highly different, transient people with resident populations.

In this way, the CoR projects themselves can be understood as “a place where strangers meet.” As Christine Barwick points out, while Jane Jacobs predominantly focused on sidewalks, Ray Oldenburg addressed the importance of “third spaces” in a city, described as “the core settings of public life.” The crucial characteristic of third spaces is their harboring of the chance encounter. Oldenburg, Jacobs, and Sennett all share concern for the loss of such spaces within our cities as our public sphere is ever eroded by private interest. As the bounteous sociability of Sennett’s public sphere is depleted, so the social resilience afforded by access to the diversity of opportunities that strangers present, the connectivity of chance encounters, and the redundancy of myriad relational configurations is also curtailed.

Given all that, we arrive at the third main recognition: encounters are relational and cannot be directly designed. Therefore what can and must be designed are the conditions that make encounters more probable and their quality higher.

Looking at the ways that CoR projects created these conditions, we can recognize that most of them provided some enabling artifacts, events and activities—in other words, dedicated product-service systems, or communication initiatives, or dedicated frameworks for practices, thanks to which a well defined kind of encounter is favored and fostered. These kinds of actions are totally in line with what we have learned in several years of experience in design for social innovation. But in this framework of coherence with previous experiences, these projects give an original contribution, focused on the importance of two particular devices: relational things, capable of triggering relational/empathic encounters; and safe places, where meaningful and relational encounters can happen in a de-risked environment.

**Lessons Learned/4: Special Artifacts Capable of Triggering Relational/Empathic Encounters**

All of these projects draw upon some kind of special artifacts and interactions that can be understood as boundary objects and processes. Described as being “both adaptable to different viewpoints and robust enough to maintain identity across them,” these socio-material interactions accommodate the exchange, dialogue, and even contestation of diverse actors’ perspectives necessary for relational understandings to be built. Such devices are as diverse as the contexts of their application, ranging from the t-shirt that invites exchange within the I Stood Up at Chrisp Street project, described as a “familiar, relatable object,” that acts to “offer participants the opportunity to be heard,” to the learning games deployed within the MakeRight project, aimed at developing, trust, cooperation, communication skills, and mutual respect and empathy between inmates and facilitators. These artifacts and their engagement are observed to afford “elastic connection between assertion of individuality, connectivity within community, and wider contribution to societal infrastructures.”

---

24 Christine Barbick, Social Mobility and Neighbourhood Choice: Turkish-Germans in Berlin (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), 86.
27 Ibid., abstract, 387.
of socially engaged art practice” and foregrounds the shared experience of making and the role of material in prompting processes of engagement and the provocation towards dialogue, an understanding that resonates with the description of processes within the **Early Lab**.\(^{32}\)

Empathy is crucial to fostering meaningful encounters between people. It is built between participants in the participatory and collaborative creative processes described here explicitly, through development and application of empathetic design research methods and tools, including design probes, journeys, personas, and stories that surface people’s experiences, needs, and values. Empathy is also built implicitly, though proximity and process, whereby the tenets of participatory design – as democratic and emancipatory, and committed to ensuring everyone’s voice is heard in the decision-making processes that will affect them – prevail, allowing the perspectives and values of the other to become more known to each involved participant. Fine arts practice applies different and diverse approaches toward similar goals. For example, in addition to the act of making together, participatory and collaborative activities within the **Superannuates and Tenderfeet** project included “going for walks, visiting exhibitions, exchanging techniques, writing each other letters, and drinking tea.”\(^{33}\)

**Lesson Learnt/5: Safe Places, Where Encounters Can Happen**

As Carla Cipolla\(^{34}\) observes, the formation of relationships across diversities implies vulnerability. “An encounter with someone who appears to be very diverse requires taking a risk: the risk of opening yourself to an unknown person and, in doing so, becoming more vulnerable.”\(^{35}\)

Thus, the meaningful encounters that give rise to the possibility of relationships, even fleeting ones, require consideration and mediation of the risk of vulnerability for the people involved. This is something that is common to these projects, which all – in their different ways and contexts – create a safe space for meaningful encounters to happen. Strategies for creating such de-risked spaces include consideration of the nature of the place in which they are situated. From the conscious choice of **I Stood Up** to host their engagement in a disused shop rather than a gallery or museum so as to avoid the “rules and regulations, risk and liability” that create “social boundaries through which encounters must operate;”\(^{36}\) to the choice to stage the **MakeRight** design academy in the prison workshop, rather than the educational areas of the prison, to avoid the negative associations with traditional educational environments that many inmates experience. The latter choice also created an alibi of “paid work” for the deeply relational and transformative activities that the inmates were engaging in. In both scenarios, the site of encounter between participants was consciously and carefully curated or created to deconstruct hegemonies, instill openness, and invite engagement. Additionally, strategies for de-risking the “space” of encounter go beyond the situational to address behavioral considerations. Perhaps the most extreme example shared here is again that of the **MakeRight** design academy, which deployed the principles and approaches of restorative justice combined with those of participatory design to remove the prison mask\(^{37}\) from participating inmates. This metaphorical mask describes a demeanor that at once protects the wearer, “hiding their feelings in order to avoid upset or conflict”\(^{38}\) and isolates them from meaningful connections with others. Another strategy is that of favoring conditions for playful and loose encounters that make the very high level of collaborative intensity easier to handle for all participants, reducing risk.\(^{39}\) Cipolla explores the diverse strategies applied across the CoR projects in greater detail, framing them as “enablers of vulnerability.”\(^{40}\)

Fundamentally, the de-risked nature of these encounters comes from the fact...
that they appear to some extent superfluous — offering a positive redundancy — and hence capable of enabling participants to prototype and practice, to rehearse new ways of being together that may be drawn upon in future, more crucial contexts.

Lessons Learned/6: Enabling Systems and Infrastructuring Activities

The scenarios in these papers combine to portray communities-in-place as spaces of possibilities where a rich, complex, fluid constellation of actors, assets, encounters, and conversations enable several different place-related projects. In turn, the plurality of these projects affords resilience through redundancy — multiple configurations of relationships and resources affording alternative ways and means of achieving present and future goals.

Looking at the ways that Communities of Resilience projects contribute to these conditions, two approaches are visible. The first one, that we can define as a project-based approach, consists in conceiving, assembling, and enhancing dedicated sets of actors, assets, and artifacts as enabling systems, thanks to which specific projects may be delivered, and through which more desired encounters and conversations become possible and probable.

The second approach aims at enriching and improving the existing sociotechnical ecosystem to create the conditions for different encounters and conversations — unforeseeable at the outset — to exist and thrive. This approach can be effectively described as infrastructuring: connecting actors and resources such that multiple alternative projects may emerge more readily in future.

According to Erling Bjorgvinsson, Pelle Ehn, and Per-Anders Hillgren, this strategy requires “long-term commitment, but it also provides an open-ended design structure without predefined goals or fixed timelines.” It is “characterized by a continuous process of building relations with diverse actors and by a flexible allotment of time and resources. This more organic approach facilitates the emergence of possibilities along the way and new design opportunities can evolve through a continuous matchmaking process.”

At a first glance, all the CoR projects — except one, the Public Collaboration Lab — are examples of the first strategy. The Public Collaboration Lab clearly exemplifies the second. But, looking more attentively, we can recognize that, beyond the diverse specific goals, all of them also contribute to improving the entire sociotechnical ecosystem. That is, they can be seen as initiatives supporting the infrastructuring approach.

In fact, it happens that their enabling systems — or some of their components, at least — have lasted in time beyond the end of the projects for which they were assembled, and become part of local infrastructures. Additionally, it is foreseeable that the trust, shared values, and empathy the relational encounters may produce endure within the existing sociotechnical ecosystem, become part of it, and reinforce relational infrastructures.

It follows that, between the two approaches, a virtuous cycle can be established: improving the local infrastructures makes more projects possible and probable; and, in turn, the multiplicity of projects, the resources they locate and connect, and the relational goods they produce, improve the infrastructures of communities-in-place.

Conclusion

The CoR projects presented in this She Ji theme issue give us a better insight into the nature of contemporary communities-in-place and their building processes. In
particular, they demonstrate the importance of light but highly relational encounters, and the role played by the relational interactions, and artifacts in triggering and supporting them. The projects also highlight the significance of the de-risked spaces where these encounters become acceptable to participants, through a balance of vulnerability and a sense of being supported and protected. Finally, they help to understand the two main approaches for making these encounters possible and probable: the enabling system approach and the open-ended infrastructuring approach. In doing so, this research contributes to our understanding of how collaborative and participatory art and design practice might configure a virtuous cycle by which to create and re-create communities-in-place in a fluid society; resisting and reversing the effects of the vicious cycle of social erosion to which contemporary communities are exposed.

But doing all that, these projects also tell us something else concerning the role of art and design in everyday life politics.

The CoR projects can be seen as political acts – peculiar kinds of political acts – that are not made apparent by putting art and design at the service of politics, but rather by producing events, services, and products capable of generating meaningful encounters and resilient, sustainable ways of being and doing. In other words, they do not do politics, they are politics. They do not promote a resilient and sustainable society, and more generally, a new civilization, by making propaganda (much less by supporting political parties or movements that wave the banner of this new civilization). On the contrary, they are themselves aspects of this new civilization. They are previews – rehearsals of possible, desirable futures.

These activities could all be seen as a kind of activism. However, maybe it is rather reductive to refer to them in this way: it makes one think that there are other, non-activist, ways of being an artist or designer, whereas it may be that this is simply the way that art and design should want and be able to operate to be truly worthy of their names.
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