Fashioning Publics – the Socially responsive design practice of Vexed Generation.

Socially Responsive Design has been defined as *"Design that takes as its primary driver social issues, its main consideration social impact and its main objective social change*" (Gamman and Thorpe, 2006). It is also the term that clothing designers Vexed Generation used to describe the kind of clothing and product design we delivered in London in the 1990's that took as its inspiration the social and environmental concerns of the day.

Whilst the above definition of socially responsive design successfully articulates a shared agenda with 'socially useful design' (Whiteley, 1993), describing a design process applied in address to social needs and human wellbeing over and above stimulating human desires so as to drive market economies, it fails to explain the intended distinction between socially *responsive* design and socially *responsible* design that is key to articulating a practice which understands responsibility as an "ability to respond" (Derrida, 1983).

The distinction is two fold, linked to i) the relationship of socially responsive design to the market; agreeing with Morelli (2007) that "the time has come to review Papanek…from a new perspective which reduces the distance between market-based and socially oriented initiatives", and ii) the agency of designers over design processes and designed products, both in their creation and use. On reflection of the existing debates in the field (Papanek, 1971, Rittel & Webber 1973; Buchannan,

1992; Morelli, 2007), socially *responsive* design does not acknowledge the primacy of designers as *responsible* for the societal outcomes related to the processes and products of design. Instead, socially *responsive* design understands design for society as a socially 'situated practice' akin to Suchman's concept of 'situated action, (Suchman, 1987) in that it is contingent on the situated context of the design process, particularly the agency of the people in and around it. Also, that the ability of design to have social impact in use is similarly contingent on users and contexts and, ultimately, beyond the control of the designer in that designs "are constituted through and inseparable from the specifically situated practices of their use" (Suchman, 1999).

This is not to say that socially responsive design rejects the notion of designers seeking to make responsible decisions as regards the impacts of their practices and products on social systems. Rather to suggest that when design is delivered via commission or collaboration the designers agency over the process and its outcomes is not entire. This is not a shortcoming of design, in the context of socially useful design and/or design led social innovation, but a condition of it. Socially responsive design is socially situated in process and in product – throughout the designs lifecycle – and that as designers we are only able to be *responsive* rather than ultimately *responsible* in our engagement with social, political and ethical agendas and objectives through design.

In this way socially responsive design seeks to offer a pragmatic reading of social design practice that does not require designers to eschew consumerism and the market to deliver socially motivated and mindful design.

The following case studies describe two initiatives delivered by Vexed Generation/Vexed Design between 1993 and 2003. They are hoped to illustrate a fashion design practice that is socially responsive in both its means (the process of design) and its ends (the products of design). They seek to demonstrate how designers of clothing and accessories can attempt to deliver socially responsive practice by application of different methodologies offering different intensities of social and market oriented activity and different intensities of collaboration with the users and stakeholders of their designs.

"YOU PUT UP A CAMERA AND I'LL PUT UP A COLLAR" – VEXED GENERATION CLOTHING (BETWEEN 1993-1995)

When Joe Hunter and I started designing clothes together in 1993 as Vexed Generation we knew we could not compete in the fashion industry and we did not want to.

We knew that our meagre resources (we were both on the dole for the most part when we started Vexed) and limited training and industry experience (neither of us had a formal fashion training) meant we could not compete on; price (other brands would always benefit from economies of scale and cheaper overseas manufacture we could not and did not wish to achieve); quality (we had limited experience of designing and manufacturing clothing and so did not assume that we could do so 'better' than those that had been at it for years); or marketing (we had no resources to pay for PR or advertising to gain awareness or generate desire for our creations).

Nor were we preoccupied with making clothes that we thought were ‘on trend’ or ‘in fashion’ and therefore would be desirable to consumers. Constantly trawling the markets and charity shops of Camden, Portobello and Brick Lane we were painfully aware and disparaging of the manner in which the styles adopted and adapted by the patrons of these stalls were aped in subsequent seasons by fashion brands in what we saw as an ever-decreasing spiral of creativity and quality. The ‘new’ versions of these garments being of such inferior quality of material and manufacture that they would never make it back to the market stall for re-sale and re-use, but rather contribute to landfill, resource use and climate change.

Consequently we sought to make clothing that was unlike any other. Clothing that met the contemporary personal and social needs of people like us living in London at the time. To do this we asked different questions of our clothing in an attempt to find different sartorial answers and we embraced the aesthetics that these answers suggested, even when they appeared odd and incongruous.

We wanted to make our clothes in the UK, for the UK and about the UK.

In the UK

Our desire to manufacture in the UK was not a consequence of nationalism but because we wished to contribute to jobs and prosperity locally if we were able. We also held, perhaps romantic and misplaced, ideals linked to the sustenance, even prosperity, of skilled labour, craftsmanship, even artisanship, within UK clothing and accessory manufacture. By manufacturing clothing that was ‘beautiful and useful’ (Morris, 1880) in the UK we hoped to assure a future for workers seeking to

experience the inherent expression, satisfaction and reward of a job well done. A perspective more clearly articulated by Sennet (2008) in his exploration of craftsmanship. Certainly, as newcomers to the skills and competencies required to make clothing that would endure, we were respectful of, even enamoured with, those that could realise our design prototypes as desirable and marketable products of a quality that would last. Anticipating that this durability, physical and emotional (Chapman, 2005) would avoid contributing to the un-merry-go-round of resource depletion and landfill that constituted the disposable fashion of which we were critical.

We were also keen to play a role in maintaining a regional diversity in fashion, such as that defined by Evans et al (2004) as a ‘London Look’. We consciously sought to offer an alternative to the homogenised aesthetics of globalisation that were losing their appeal to a generation of taste makers that were part of a 90’s DIY creative culture. A culture fostered in part by digital democratisation (of music and film) and part by a recessionary economic climate. The same climate that created redundant capacity in space and labour that meant that we could find (and just about afford) studio space, factory space and retail space to get our small dockets into production and distribution.

For and about the UK

In London, in 1993, the Conservative Government tabled the Criminal Justice bill. Amongst a raft of wide ranging proposals, the bill sought to introduce new legislation granting additional powers to the police that specifically targeted the removal of certain practices and lifestyles from UK culture, including; raves (free outdoor

parties), squatting (living for free and without permission in unoccupied property) ‘unauthorised camping’ on public land, and much outdoor peaceful protest (particularly environmental protest which often depended on occupation of land to prevent socially and environmentally harmful activities being carried out by the authorities, for example road expansion schemes and inhumane animal testing and transportation). The bill also championed surveillance (the use of CCTV by local authorities). In effect the Criminal Justice bill sought to criminalise, and in so doing eradicate, many social and collaborative cultural practices that supported and in some cases constituted alternative lifestyles. Many, including the Vexed Generation, perceived the bill as an attack on civil liberties and the ability of citizens to self-help in the face of social injustice and inequality. Furthermore, the partial and subjective nature of the legislation was perceived as indicative of an insidious and intolerant hegemony that would result in further marginalisation of certain groups within society. Despite fierce resistance, the bill was passed as an act in 1995.

The word *vexed* means ‘to be annoyed, frustrated or worried’. It also describes ‘a problem or issue that is difficult, much debated and problematic’. The word *generation* describes ‘all of the people born and living at about the same time, regarded collectively’. It also refers to ‘the production or creation of something’. We considered the words Vexed Generation as a noun and a verb. Simultaneously describing our state of mind in relation to social issues in London at the time, and the broader cohort of likeminded people that shared them. Also, the nature of our concerns, and our intended action, our ‘mission’; to use these concerns to generate designs that would communicate and address them.

Consequently, Vexed Generation designed clothing that was observed to "simultaneously communicate these issues and protect their wearers from their worst effects" (Evans, 2003).

Design research methodology (though not understood as such at the time)

In the first instance we applied what could be regarded as an auto-ethnographic design research approach. As avid scooterists and cyclists we reflected on the shortcomings of the garments and accessories available to us to facilitate less polluting, and more accessible, approaches to urban mobility. Living in Tower Hamlets at the time, we were exposed to the early use of CCTV as it spread from its early application within the City of London's counter terrorist 'ring of steel' into the neighbourhoods that bordered it. We conducted a literature review, grateful for the assistance of friendly journalists with access to Reuters news text (we had little or no access to the internet), who provided access to facts and figures on air quality and CCTV use as well as news of the on going activities surrounding the new powers introduced by the CJA. We conducted user-centred research, observing interactions between police and protestors, including police arrest techniques, on video and in situ. We engaged in 'immersive' design research placing ourselves in situations that enabled us to further experience first hand these interactions, some willingly, some not so! We met with groups that were directly affected and engaged by the new legislation (Justice, Liberty, Advance Party Network, Legal Defence Monitoring Group, Privacy International) listening to their experiences and insights and discussing our proposals. We iteratively reviewed our findings and created a design framework (summarised in Figure 1.1) that informed our design development.

<INSERT FIGURE 1.1 NEAR HERE>

Figure 1.1 Table summarising the design framework

Design development and production

These design considerations informed iterative product development that included sketching and ‘paper’ prototyping (including an early bag design prototyped in plastic bags and Sellotape). Pattern development and toile development followed. These product developments were informed by text books (Aldrich, 1994), trial and error, capable friends with whom we shared studio space, and deconstruction and examination of our own collection of favourite garments, many of which were military clothing. Later iterations were sampled in low cost fabrics of comparable weight and handle to preferred fabrics and wear tested by Joe and I. Final prototypes in comparable fabrics were further user tested by trusted friends (of similar but slightly different lifestyles and body shapes), and early customers, for several months and pattern changes and product iterations made as necessary. Design decisions were informed by user feedback and our competency and knowledge of materials and construction techniques. One example of how these limitations shaped our design process was our penchant for Velcro, a fastening we favoured due to its versatility and ease of use, in production (straight stitch into place) and wear (good with gloves on), easy to restore (clean with a pin) and replace (remove the panel and straight stitch on a new one). Our familiarity with Velcro significantly contributed to the originality of the design of the Vexed bag, which featured a Velcro strap closure. In

parallel, and in response to the user centred research described above we also engaged in materials research. Materials were selected and developed for their performance characteristics, also their language and meaning and finally their environmental impact. Sometimes there were conflicts between the required performance and language and the environmental impact of a material. In these instances Vexed prioritised social concerns (people) over environmental concerns (planet). The garments performance and language in use would take precedence. Our consideration of environment was implicit in the durability of the garments and the impact of the garments in use i.e. advocating and enabling urban mobility outside of cars and raising awareness for civil liberties that impacted upon those that fought for environmental preservation. This contradiction was apparent to us at the time and informed the definition of our practice as socially *responsive* and not socially responsible.

Finally, specified materials and prototypes were passed to manufacturers who consulted on most appropriate production techniques (sometimes involving minor construction and pattern amendment) and produced production prototypes, which were wear tested prior to batch production of products.

Design outcomes

The Vexed Parka (1994) (Figure 1.2) from the first Vexed Generation collection clearly illustrate the way in which the ‘brief’, developed from the ‘research’, informed the ‘design’.

<INSERT FIGURE 1.2 NEAR HERE>

Figure 1.2. Vexed Parka (1994)

The Parka was the collections' 'flagship' piece. The design directly responded to all the issues highlighted in the 'brief'; civil liberties (CJA), air pollution and CCTV. The Parka parodies police riot gear in aesthetic, material performance and material language. We were happy if the appearance was challenging and hopeful that this challenge would receive a response in the form of discussion and debate in the media and on the street – 'why was this garment relevant?' We were conscious that the concerns we were seeking to communicate were not overt; noxious gases that contribute to respiratory illness, particularly amongst the old and young are invisible outside of their effects, CCTV was often squirreled away from those it surveyed and civil liberties are most apparent in practice rather than policy. In addressing these concerns the design of the Vexed Parka sought to make them visible.

The Parka was made from MOD grade, high tenacity ballistic nylon that is slash proof. This fabric had never previously been deployed within civilian street-wear, previously used primarily in bulletproof vests and 'blast curtains' (curtains that contain flying fragments during controlled explosions). We applied a fire resistant neoprene coating to the fabric (in later versions of the parka we changed this for a waterproof breathable polyurethane coating as the neoprene proved to make the wearer hot and sweaty). The Parka includes strategically placed protective padding throughout the crown, spine, kidney and groin areas (areas one might get struck with a baton if in the wrong place at the wrong time). The hood and collar are designed to hide the wearers face and accommodate a respiratory mask that is stored in a covered pocket on the sleeve of the garment (the pocket leaves part of the mask

open to the air to enable condensation that builds up when used to evaporate away). The distinctive ‘tail’, front and back, joins between the legs to negate the effects of the ‘groin grab’ which was often deployed by Police to bring an individual into the ‘stack’ position (where a person is brought to their knees and their hands brought behind their back to incapacitate them and allow for handcuffs to be applied) when making a street arrest, such as those made at parties and protests. The chest pockets conceal a ‘Velcro’ lattice that enables items to be easily stowed and accessed.

Vexed Retail

We started to seek retailers for our designs in 1995. Early direct sales to ‘friends of friends’ made us aware of the relevance and popularity of our designs to a wider public. Despite this we were unable to gain retail stockists, nor distribution. Feedback from retailers praised the ‘intelligence’ and ‘originality’ of the designs but feared their lack of precedent and felt they were “not right for our customers”. Vexed pieces where often referred to as ‘futuristic’, a description that we found particularly frustrating given they were designed in response to a brief derived from the current social context. In this way Vexed products were viewed as *proleptic*, existing before their proper or historical time and anticipating and answering social concerns before they had been raised or understood by the majority. In short, they were perceived to be as alternative as the concerns they sought to champion. Whilst we conceded that our products were antagonistic to market hegemony we were convinced of their social relevance and value and felt that if more people could engage with the products they would share this view.

To achieve this we had to open a ‘shop’.

Collaborating with likeminded designers, artists and musicians, and with the assistance of an international aid charity, supportive neighbours and landlords seeking to enliven their estate during recession we negotiated reduced rent and rates to occupy a vacant central London property on a short term lease (a ‘pop-up’ shop). Vexed’s “retail installation” (Figure 1.3), opened in December 1995. The space communicated the concerns the collection responded to through the design of the retail environment. The design aimed to challenge and inform; the upstairs a sterile surveyed dystopia in which the clothing was displayed; the downstairs a creative and communal space with public access record decks and an ‘alternative TV service‘ made up of video works contributed by members of the public and ‘news’ broadcasts from ‘Undercurrents’ an alternative news service reporting on the ongoing struggle against the implementation of the CJA.

<INSERT FIGURE 1.3 NEAR HERE>

Figure 1.3. Vexed ‘retail installation’ - The White Shop (1995)

“THEY’RE NOT TAKING THE PISS, WE’RE GIVING IT AWAY” – KARRYSAFE COLLECTION (2002)

Research and practice on Design Against Crime (DAC) started at Central Saint Martins (CSM) in 1999, led by Dr. Lorraine Gamman. The DAC initiative, now a world leading research centre, explores new ways that design can contribute to the prevention of crime incidents and their wider harmful consequences. A large portion of crime is opportunistic. Building on theories of situational crime prevention (Clarke,

2008) and crime prevention through environmental design (Crowe, 2000; Armitage, 2013) DAC posits that design that reduces opportunities for crime will reduce incidence of crime. Also, that crime prevention through design delivers communal benefits linked to reduced costs to the tax-payer (through reduced load on the criminal justice system - 'cops, courts and corrections') and personal benefits linked to reductions in victimization and criminalization. Consequently, DAC at CSM originated an extended model of user centred design that includes considerations linked to the misuse and abuse of products, within the design process. In this way DAC sought to facilitate designers to design against illegitimate users of products, such as thieves, whilst simultaneously designing for the desires and uses of legitimate users.

In 2000, official records for both the London region and the UK indicated that street crime, particularly the theft of bags, for their contents, and other mobile accessories such as mobile phones, had increased [1]. In 2002, the UK Home Office and Design Council, keen to explore new ways to address the issue, commissioned the DAC initiative at CSM to deliver practice-led research into ways that design might respond. Dr. Gamman and her team had already undertaken significant research into bag theft, consulting a broad range of stakeholders with expert knowledge of the issue, including criminologists from the Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science at University College London, the Metropolitan Police and networks of victims and ex-offenders, to understand and visualize exactly what was stolen and how. This research was made available to designers via a CD ROM entitled 'In the Bag'[2] of particular value to designers are the 'frameworks' that help designers understand the principles of crime prevention and think through design responses likely to succeed in preventing crime. Also, the visualisations of 'theft perpetrator techniques' that

clearly show designers how crimes are committed, including; *dipping* (pick pocketing), *lifting* (theft of property from a static location), *grabbing* (robbery of property from a person), and slashing (cutting through the body of the bag to remove its contents).

The DAC team applied their research to the design of anti-theft bags working with staff and students at CSM. The resulting work was exhibited in the UK and Milan [3] in the hope of drawing attention to the issue of bag theft and the potential for design to contribute to its prevention. Also, to explore the possibility of licensing the CSM anti-theft bag designs to accessory and luggage brands. Despite enthusiastic media coverage, the industry did not adopt the new designs, with one leading brand representative arguing that; “crime is not the job of design it is the job of the police”. Consequently, Gamman approached Vexed Generation as designers with a track record in accessory innovation, protective materials and an awareness and concern for social issues, to respond to DAC’s bag theft research in the design of a range of theft preventing bags and accessories.

Vexed reviewed the existing research information gaining a clear understanding of the *what, why, where* and *how* of bag theft. Also, the strengths and weaknesses of existing staff and student anti-theft bag design responses, considering the balance between ease of use and resistance to theft. Consultation workshops with an advisory group of experts on bag theft, including police, criminologists, people who had experienced bag theft and a self defense instructor, provided further insight into bag theft prevention and personal security. Workshops included the role-play of theft scenarios in which we alternated between the role of victim and offender in order to get a clearer idea of the physical realities of bag theft and the object and human interactions that surround it. From these detailed explorations of both user and

abuser perspectives emerged significant understandings that informed the design of a range of bags and accessories that defended against the most common theft MO's (Modus Operandi). Materials were researched and selected for their slash resistance, durability, weather proofing, flexibility, weight, aesthetic and suitability to 'needle construction' methods. The resulting products combined accommodation of user requirements with defence against bag theft MO's.

Design outcomes

The *Karrysafe Screamer Laptop Bag* (Figure 1.4)*,* demonstrates the way in which the original research into bag theft informed original product development.

<INSERT FIGURE 1.4 NEAR HERE>

Figure 1.4. Karrysafe Screamer Laptop Bag

Featuring a 'carry front strap' (a strap construction that positions the bag to the wearers front when carried, unless the wearer choses to adapt the strap for side or back carriage in which case the strap obscures the bag entry), the 'safety breakaway' (an adjustable strap fastening that 'breaks' apart under extreme tear strength and in doing so releases the bag from the wearer [stopping them being dragged to the floor] and triggering a 138 decibel attack alarm within the bag), a 'securing lanyard' (a retractable, lockable lanyard that allow a bag to be secured to an immovable object). and a 'combination zip lock' the bag was constructed from

high tenacity nylon with a slash resistant polypropylene interlining. The bag can carry a laptop and accessories, papers and other equipment. It is resistant to *lifting*, *dipping*, *grabbing*, and *slashing*. The bag takes its name from the inclusion of an anti attack alarm that is triggered if the bag is snatched from the wearers possession. When the bag is violently tugged away from the wearer the strap will break and the alarm will sound. The concealed alarm is inaccessible to the thief and will continue to sound for up to 2 hours at 138 decibels meaning the thief is likely to discard the bag (with its contents secured within by the combination zip lock) until the owner returns to the screaming bag after it has been discarded and reconnects the breakaway strap.

Karrysafe branding and marketing

The name *Karrysafe*, chosen for the collection of theft resistant bags and accessories, was consciously overt in its security focus and lent itself to 'sub branding' that communicated the specific theft MO's that the design features protected against. *Dipsafe*, *Liftsafe*, *Grabsafe* and *Slashsafe* icons and labeling were featured on swing tags and point of sale. In this way, the branding itself aimed to raise awareness amongst consumers about the theft techniques they should be aware of and guard against. Selfridges' supported the introduction of the *Karrysafe* product range launching the collection with a carousel and point of sale featuring a combination of fashion photography and awareness raising brand communication. The products were also promoted and sold via a website [4], that offered support and advice to the public concerning the issues surrounding street crime and personal security, providing links to partner organisations.

The *Karrysafe* project was intended to raise awareness of personal property theft, and the complicity of design in granting opportunities for crime to happen, amongst consumers and industry. It was hoped that awareness for crime issues, and designs ability to address them, may lead to demand for such functionality amongst consumers that in turn might be met by market supply. The desired ultimate outcome of this ‘market interventionist’ approach was to increase the anti-crime functionality of bags and accessories, reduce opportunities for crime to happen, and reduce the number of people victimised or criminalised. So, the *Karrysafe* product range’s primary purpose was not to establish a commercially successful brand, although we were happy for the brand to be a commercial success, but rather to use commercial design intervention to establish a benchmark for crime resistant functionality that other designers and brands might incorporate into their own products in less overt ways.

FROM PRODUCTS AND MARKETS TO THINGS AND PUBLICS

The above examples extend a user centred approach to design to include consideration of other actors that impact upon, or are impacted upon by, the products and processes of design. For example, *Vexed* garments facilitated those that sought to enjoy activities and lifestyles legislated against by the CJA and threatened by the new powers it granted the police. *Karrysafe* designs aimed to deter thieves as well as meet the requirements of legitimate users of the bags Consideration of ‘actors’ other than 'users' of the products has informed the development and application of design methodologies that go beyond design *for* users, toward more participatory and collaborative design activities that involve

designers in designing *with* users and other stakeholders.

This extended role and function of design and design process seeks to both serve the ‘users’ of products (in the ways described above) whilst simultaneously highlighting the topics of concern that inspire the design response. In this way the products and processes of design provoke and focus conversation and debate, forming or extending a ‘community of interest’ (Fischer, 2001) for the issues that the design responds to. The pragmatist philosopher John Dewey described such communities of concern as ‘publics.’ Rejecting the notion of the amorphous public Dewey (1927) argued that a public comes into being around and through an issue of shared concern in order to address it. His thinking has informed many design researchers exploring the role of design in responding to social issues and shaping collaborative social action (Björgvinsson et al 2008; DiSalvo 2009, 2011; Thorpe and Gamman 2012; Malpass 2013, Binder et al 2014). DiSalvo (2009) explores the “designerly means for the identification and articulation of issues; such that they might be known enough to enable a public to form around them” and draws on the field of Critical Design as defined by Dunne and Raby (1998) to explain some of the design ‘tactics’ applied to do so. Namely, ‘projection’ which he describes “as the representation of a possible set of future consequences associated with an issue” with the intention to “make apparent the possible consequences of an issue”, and ‘tracing’ which he defines as “the use of designerly forms to detail and communicate, and to make known, the network(s) of materials, actions, concepts, and values that shape and frame an issue over time.” Whilst the cases provided above apply such ‘designerly means’ to the articulation of social issues they also offer utility to users so as to address them. In doing so these designs explicitly seek to be both ‘public forming *and public serving’*; public forming in that the product and/or process of

design may facilitate or catalyse the formation of a community of interest “on, around and through” the product and/or process, public serving in that the product and/or process of design facilitates a community of interest to *take action* in response to their concerns, to become a community of practice.

For example the anonymising hood and military aesthetics of the *Vexed Parka* provoked conversation around the need for such a garment, catalyzing debate and concern around civil liberties, surveillance and air quality whilst simultaneously concealing the wearers identify and protecting them such as may be necessary if they were demonstrating against perceived injustice or travelling around a polluted city. Similarly, the *Karrysafe* collection triggered debate around issues of personal theft and victimization through the design and marketing of bags that protected their users from the perpetrator techniques of thieves..

It is these designs’ implicit ability to facilitate socially responsive agency in use, their response-ability, facilitating ‘an ability to respond’ (Derrida, 1983), that sets socially responsive design apart from critical design. Whilst critical designs may be speculative, challenging hegemony, articulating possible and alternative futures and facilitating the formation of publics ‘on and around’ (Malpass, 2013) them, they do not implicitly serve those publics in taking action to address the issues that concern them.

The cases discussed describe a socially responsive approach that “informs, reforms and gives form” (Papanek,1995) *to* design and *through* design. Response to social issues informs, changes and shapes the process of design research, development and delivery as well as the aesthetic and function of the clothing designed. Ensuing

response to the designs in ‘use’ is anticipated to inform, reform and give form to the society in which it is situated.

In this way the approach addresses what Binder et al (2011) describe as “a major challenge for design today [which] has to do with what is being designed – not just a ‘thing’ (an object, an “entity of matter”) but also a *thing* (a socio-material assembly that deals with matters of concern)”. The approach posits the ‘fashion’ product, its design process, supply-chain, lifecycle and eco-system as a human centred, socio-material construction of relational actions, meanings and values. A fashion ‘*thing*’ that a socially responsive designer can influence, though not dictate, by joining in, in a mindful way.

Consequently, the socially responsive design approach embodies dual purpose in the formation and service of publics through the co creation of '*things*'. This is not to describe a social design practice that is adversarial to the market but rather one that seeks to commandeer the making and marketing of products in an attempt to ‘fashion’ publics and *things*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Much of the content of this chapter draws on collaborative practice and thinking realised with friends and colleagues in Vexed Design Ltd and the Design Against Crime Research Centre of the University of the Arts London, located at Central Saint Martins (CSM), particularly Joe Hunter and Professor Lorraine Gamman, whom I thank for their generous collaboration. Some of these ideas have been developed through presentation and discussion within the Socially Responsive Design

Research Group at CSM, the social innovation track of the AHRC funded FIRE Up project and the V&A Culture Salon.

NOTES

1. Police recorded crime data for London region for 2000 compared to 1998. British Crime Survey for the period 2001/02 compared to 2000/01.
2. A revised edition of the design resource In The Bag is available at http://www.inthebag.org.uk/whats-in-the-bag/)
3. Don't Tempt Me' exhibition, Milan 2001
4. www.karrysafe.com,

REFERENCES

Aldrich, W. (1994) *Metric Pattern Cutting*. London: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Armitage, R. (2013). *Crime Prevention through Housing Design: Policy and Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Binder, T., De Michelis, G., Ehn, P., Jacucci, G., Linde, P., Wagner, I. (2011) *Design Things (Design Thinking, Design Theory)* MIT Press

Björgvinsson, E., Ehn, P., Hillgren, P-A. (2010) Participatory design and "democratizing innovation". PDC Proceedings 2010.

Breward, C., Ehrman, E., Caroline E. (2004) *The London Look: Fashion from Street to Catwalk*. London: Yale University Press p.156-8

Buchanan, R., 1992. Wicked Problems in Design Thinking. *Design Issues*, 8, 5–21.

Chapman, J., 2005. *Emotionally Durable Design*. Earthscan, UK.

Clarke, R. (2008). Situational crime prevention. In Wortley, R. and Mazerolle, L. (Eds), *Environmental Criminology and Crime Analysis*. Cullompton: Willan

Crowe, T. (2000) *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design: Applications of Architectural Design and Space Management Concepts*, 2nd edition. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Derrida, J. (1983) “The Principle of Reason: the University in the Eyes of its Pupils.“ in: *Diacritics* (Fall), S: 3-21.

Dewey, J. (1927) *The Public and Its Problems*, 1st edn,. Athens, OH: Swallow Press (Henry Holt & Company).

DiSalvo, C., (2009) Design and the Construction of Publics, *Design Issues*. 25, (1)

DiSalvo, C., Lodato, T., Fries, L., Schechter, B., & Barnwell, T. (eds) (2011). The collective articulation of issues as design practice. *CoDesign International Journal of CoCreation in Design and the Arts*, 7 (3-4), 185-199.

Dunne, A. (1998). *Hertzian Tales: Electronic Products, Aesthetic Experience and Critical Design*. London: Royal College of Art Computer Related Design Research Publications.

Evans, C. (2003) *Fashion at the Edge: Spectacle, Modernity and Deathliness*. London: Yale University Press. p. 285, 302

Fischer, G. (2001). ‘Communities of Interest: Learning through the Interaction of Multiple Knowledge Systems’. 24th Annual Information Systems Research Seminar In Scandinavia (IRIS'24). Norway.

Gamman, L., & Thorpe, A. (2006). ‘What is Socially Responsive Design? – A Theory and Practice Review’. Proceedings of Wonderground, Design Research Society International Conference 2006, Lisbon, 1–4 November 2006.

Malpass, M., (2013) Between Wit and Reason: Defining Associative, Speculative, and Critical Design in *Practice, Design and Culture*, 5 (3), 333-356..

Morelli, N., (2007). Social Innovation and New Industrial Contexts: Can Designers "Industrialize" Socially Responsible Solutions?. *Design Issues*. 23 (4), 3-21.

Morris, W., (1880) The Beauty of Life (Lecture), referenced in; Kirkham, P. and Waggoner, D. (2003) *The Beauty of Life: William Morris & the Art of Design: William Morris and the Art of Design*, London:Thames & Hudson. p21

Papanek, V. (1971; 2nd edn 1984). *Design for the Real World*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Papanek, V. 1995. *The Green Imperative – Ecology and Ethic in Design and Architecture*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Rittel, H., & Webber, M. (1973). Dilemmas in a General Theory Of Planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155-169.

Sennett, R. (2008) *The Craftsman* London: Allen Lane.

Suchman, L. A. (1987) *Plans and Situated Actions: The Problem of Human-Machine Communication*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge and New York.

Suchman, L.A., Blomberg, J., Orr, J. E., Trigg. R. (1999). Reconstructing Technologies as Social Practice. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 43 (3), 392-408.

Thorpe, A and Gamman, L. 'Design For Agnostic Space – Reviewing Design Strategies For Conflict Accommodation In 'Wicked' Design Scenarios'. Cumulus Helsinki 2012: Northern World Mandate – Towards Open and Participative Cities, Aalto University School of Art and Design, Helsinki, Finland, 24-26 May 2012.

Whiteley, N. (1993). Design For Society. London: Reaktion Books. p.110