

[illegible]

Edited by Anne Massey



WILEY Blackwell

A Companion to
Contemporary Design since 1945

WILEY BLACKWELL COMPANIONS TO ART HISTORY

These invigorating reference volumes chart the influence of key ideas, discourses, and theories on art, and the way that it is taught, thought of, and talked about throughout the English-speaking world. Each volume brings together a team of respected international scholars to debate the state of research within traditional subfields of art history as well as in more innovative, thematic configurations. Representing the best of the scholarship governing the field and pointing toward future trends and across disciplines, the *Blackwell Companions to Art History* series provides a magisterial, state-of-the-art synthesis of art history.

- 1 *A Companion to Contemporary Art since 1945*
edited by Amelia Jones
- 2 *A Companion to Medieval Art*
edited by Conrad Rudolph
- 3 *A Companion to Asian Art and Architecture*
edited by Rebecca M. Brown and Deborah S. Hutton
- 4 *A Companion to Renaissance and Baroque Art*
edited by Babette Bohn and James M. Saslow
- 5 *A Companion to British Art: 1600 to the Present*
edited by Dana Arnold and David Peters Corbett
- 6 *A Companion to Modern African Art*
edited by Gitti Salami and Monica Blackmun Visonà
- 7 *A Companion to Chinese Art*
edited by Martin J. Powers and Katherine R. Tsang
- 8 *A Companion to American Art*
edited by John Davis, Jennifer A. Greenhill and Jason D. LaFountain
- 9 *A Companion to Digital Art*
edited by Christiane Paul
- 10 *A Companion to Dada and Surrealism*
edited by David Hopkins
- 11 *A Companion to Public Art*
edited by Cher Krause Knight and Harriet F. Senie
- 12 *A Companion to Islamic Art and Architecture, Volumes 1 and 2*
edited by Finbarr Flood and Gulru Necipoglu
- 13 *A Companion to Modern Art*
edited by Pam Meecham
- 14 *A Companion to Medieval Art*, second edition
edited by Conrad Rudolph
- 15 *A Companion to Contemporary Design since 1945*
edited by Anne Massey

Forthcoming

- 1 *A Companion to Modern and Contemporary Latin American and Latino Art*
edited by Alejandro Anreus, Robin Greeley and Megan Sullivan

A Companion to Contemporary Design since 1945

Edited by

Anne Massey

WILEY Blackwell

This edition first published 2019
© 2019 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by law. Advice on how to obtain permission to reuse material from this title is available at <http://www.wiley.com/go/permissions>.

The right of Anne Massey to be identified as the author of the editorial material in this work has been asserted in accordance with law.

Registered Office

John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA

Editorial Office

9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, customer services, and more information about Wiley products visit us at www.wiley.com.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats and by print-on-demand. Some content that appears in standard print versions of this book may not be available in other formats.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty

While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this work, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this work and specifically disclaim all warranties, including without limitation any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives, written sales materials or promotional statements for this work. The fact that an organization, website, or product is referred to in this work as a citation and/or potential source of further information does not mean that the publisher and authors endorse the information or services the organization, website, or product may provide or recommendations it may make. This work is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a specialist where appropriate. Further, readers should be aware that websites listed in this work may have changed or disappeared between when this work was written and when it is read. Neither the publisher nor authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data applied for

9781119111184 (hardback)

Cover Design: Wiley

Cover Image: © Paper Boat Creative/Getty Images

Set in 10.5/13pt Galliard Std by SPi Global, Pondicherry, India

Printed in United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

List of Illustrations	viii
About the Editor	xii
Notes on Contributors	xiii
Acknowledgments	xviii
Series Editor's Preface	xix
Introduction	1
<i>Anne Massey</i>	
Part I Time	7
1 Contemporary Design History	9
<i>Sarah Teasley</i>	
2 Nostalgia	32
<i>Elizabeth Guffey</i>	
3 Design Futures	51
<i>Damon Taylor</i>	
Part II Place	73
4 Transnationalism for Design History: Knowledge Production and Decolonization Through East Asian Design History	75
<i>Yuko Kikuchi</i>	

5	African Fashion Design and the Mobilization of Tradition <i>Victoria L. Rovine</i>	91
6	Urban Sights: From Outdoor Streets to Interior Urbanism <i>Gregory Marinic</i>	111
Part III Space		137
7	Virtual Space <i>Rina Arya</i>	139
8	Interior Atmosphere <i>Lois Weinthal</i>	157
9	Home Truths: Identity and Materiality in the Postwar Interior <i>Ben Highmore</i>	173
10	Design of Contemporary Mega-Events <i>Graeme Evans</i>	189
Part IV Object		215
11	The Vibrant Object <i>Alexa Griffith Winton</i>	217
12	The Consumed Object <i>Jonathan Bean</i>	240
13	The Object of Design History: Lessons for the Environment <i>Kjetil Fallan</i>	260
14	The Fashionable Object <i>Christopher Breward</i>	284
15	The Written Object: Design Journalism, Consumption, and Literature Since 1945 <i>Grace Lees-Maffei</i>	299
16	Destabilizing the <i>Scenario of Design</i> : Queer/Trans/ Gender-Neutral <i>John Potvin</i>	326
Part V Audiences		351
17	Luxury and Design: Another Time, Another Place <i>Jonathan Faiers</i>	353

18	Amateur Design <i>Paul Atkinson</i>	373
19	The Professionalization of Interior Design <i>Mark Taylor and Natalie Haskell</i>	393
20	Design Education <i>in</i> Higher Education <i>Vicky Gunn</i>	412
21	Design Against Consumerism <i>Paul Micklethwaite</i>	436
22	Guilty Pleasures: Taste, Design, and Democracy <i>Malcolm Quinn</i>	457
	Index	479

List of Illustrations

2.1	Interior of vintage clothing store, Truro, Cornwall, UK. Source: © Nik Taylor/Alamy Stock Photo.	37
2.2	Sales display of vintage television sets. Source: © Bill Burke/Stockimo/Alamy Stock Photo.	38
2.3	Old Volkswagen Beetle display at the Autostadt or Car City in Wolfsburg, Germany. Source: © Iain Masterton/Alamy Stock Photo.	47
2.4	Classic Volkswagen Beetle with its redesigned namesake. Source: © Konstantinos Moraitis/Alamy Stock Photo.	48
4.1	Cover of the proceedings of the 10th ICDHS conference. Source: Wong et al. (2016). Reproduced with permission from Blucher.	86
5.1	Wax prints for sale in Djenné, Mali, 2009. Photo: V. Rovine.	97
5.2	MaXhosa by Laduma sweater on display, BHV (Bazar de l'Hôtel de Ville) department store, Paris, France, 2017. Photo: V. Rovine.	100
5.3	Mimi Plange leather dress adorned with trapunto embroidery. Photo: Mimi Plange. Reproduced with permission from Mimi Plange.	106
6.1	The Galleria ice rink, Houston, Texas. Source: Photographs in the Carol M. Highsmith Archive, Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division. Public Domain.	120
6.2	Eaton Centre. Photo: Gregory Marinic.	122
6.3	Persia Court at the Ibn Battuta Mall. Photo: Gregory Marinic.	128
8.1	Blur Building illuminated at night. Photo by Beat Widmer. Image courtesy of Diller Scofidio + Renfro.	160

8.2	The kitchen island at the Tom Kundig-designed Studio House in Seattle, WA, USA, is a collaboration between Tom Kundig and Gulassa Metalworks along with another subcontractor who produced the cast-concrete top and rolling doors. The larger metal surfaces and cast-in-floor rolling tracks are patinated steel, while the hardware and wheels are cast bronze. Photo: © Paul Warchol. Image courtesy of Olson Kundig. Reproduced with permission.	168
8.3	Responsive interior curtain for Soft House, 2008. Source: Soft House, Kennedy and Violich Architecture. Image courtesy of Kennedy and Violich Architecture.	170
9.1	Mary's Minneapolis apartment: open plan and eclectic. Source: <i>Mary Tyler Moore Show: Season 1</i> (1970). Produced by MTM Enterprises, original network CBS, and distributed by 20th Television. Frame grab by Ben Highmore.	178
10.1	(a) Italy's pavilion at Milan EXPO (2015). (b) China's temporary pavilion at Milan EXPO. (c) China's permanent pavilion at Shanghai EXPO (2010). Photos: Graeme Evans.	198
10.2	The Hive, UK Pavilion, Milan EXPO 2015. Photo: Graeme Evans.	199
10.3	CGI of Olympic Park as envisioned for 2030. Source: Evans (2015). Photo: Graeme Evans. Reproduced with permission.	201
10.4	(a) Shanghai EXPO mascot and (b) logo. (c) Milan EXPO mascot. Photos: Graeme Evans.	205
10.5	Olympic rings at (a) St Pancras station and (b) Serpentine Bridge, and (c) Agitos at Tower Bridge, London. Photos: Graeme Evans. Source: Evans, Dong and Edizel (2013). Reproduced with permission.	210
11.1	Wendy Jacob, Squeeze Chair (Grouped), 2007. Source: © Wendy Jacob. Image courtesy of Wendy Jacob.	228
11.2	Jasleen Kaur, Fathers Shoes, 2009. Source: Image courtesy of the artist.	232
11.3	How to Guides – Bike Bloc. Illustration by Marwan Kaabour, Barnbrook, 2014. Source: Image courtesy of Victoria and Albert Museum.	233
12.1	Desk and objects, or looking down the rabbit hole of ontology. Photo: Jonathan Bean.	242
13.1	Kelmscott Manor depicted in the frontispiece to the 1893 Kelmscott Press edition of William Morris's <i>News from Nowhere</i> (1893). Source: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Kelmscott_Manor_News_from_Nowhere.jpg . Public Domain.	266

- 13.2 Landfill operation is conducted by the city of New York on the marshlands of Jamaica Bay. Pollution hazards and ecological damage have called out strong opposition. Photograph by Arthur Tress (1940–) as part of DOCUMERICA: The Environmental Protection Agency’s Program to Photographically Document Subjects of Environmental Concern. U.S. National Archives and Records Administration (NARA record: 1100153). Public domain. 268
- 13.3 American designer and activist Victor Papanek (front, left) and Swedish chemist and environmentalist Hans Palmstierna (center, seated) in a group discussion with Scandinavian design students during The Industrial, Environment and Product Design Seminar on the island of Suomenlinna outside Helsinki in July 1968. Lecturing at the seminar were also fellow notaries of US countercultural design, Richard Buckminster Fuller and Christopher Alexander. Photo: Kristian Runeberg. Reproduced with the permission of The Finnish Museum of Photography. 275
- 14.1 Design by Victor Stiebel (1907–1976) for a belted, velvet evening dress worn off the shoulder with gloves and heels. Source: Mary Evans Picture Library/Adrian Woodhouse (Picture No. 10196998/ADW). Reproduced with permission. 286
- 14.2 Two Punk Rocker teenagers in leather jackets, with spiky hair, drinking cans of beer in Cornmarket Street, Oxford. Source: Mary Evans Picture Library/David Kirby (Picture no. 10149596/KI4). Reproduced with permission. 292
- 15.1 “Dignity in the entrance hall,” Plate XIX in Derek Patmore, *Modern Furnishing and Decoration*, London: The Studio, 1934. 301
- 15.2 Gillian E. Naylor, “Decade of Development,” *Design* magazine, no. 120 (December 1958), p. 40. Design Council Archive, University of Brighton Design Archives. Reproduced with permission. 311
- 15.3 – Evelyn Waugh, Plate III Professor Otto Silenus [man with charts and books under arm, standing among ruins in front of ditch digging machine] illustration for *Decline and Fall*, p. 155. 1928. 1 drawing (ink), 38.3×27.9 cm. Captioned “I do not think it is possible for domestic architecture to be beautiful, but I am doing my best.” Evelyn Waugh Art Collection, Box. 1.25, Accession Number: 67.76.3.32. Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas at Austin. Reproduced with permission. 317

16.1	Jay Bossé, nipple pin. Embroidery thread and beads on cotton with pin, 2017. Photo: John Potvin.	329
16.2	John Philip Sage. “What is a queer object for you?” orientation card, 2016. Image courtesy of John Philip Sage.	332
16.3	Bathroom signs, Moderna Museet, Stockholm, Sweden. Photo: John Potvin.	339
16.4	Tork, conventional toilet paper roll. Photo: John Potvin.	345
17.1	The “haunted mirror” sequence from the film <i>Dead of Night</i> (1945). Directed by Robert Hamer. Produced by Ealing Studios. Frame grab by Jonathan Faiers.	358
17.2	Interior of Blofeld’s lair designed by Ken Adam for the film <i>Diamonds Are Forever</i> (1971). Source: Danjaq/EON/UA/Kobal/REX/Shutterstock.	361
17.3	Studio Job. “Bavaria” mirror 2008. Photo: Robert Knot. Reproduced with permission from Studio Job.	369
18.1	Maker Faire attendance infographic, 2016. Image courtesy of Maker Faire.	382
18.2	A series of “Tuber” lamps created by the FutureFactories software. © Lionel T. Dean. Reproduced with permission from the artist.	385
18.3	The Automake interface in use and resulting bracelet. © Justin Marshall. Reproduced with permission from the artist.	386
19.1	Florence Knoll with Alexander Girard coffee table (c. 1945). © Knoll, Inc. Image courtesy of Knoll, Inc.	397
19.2	Zaha Hadid Architects. View of interior layers. Photo: © View Pictures/UIG via Getty Images. Reproduced with permission.	407
21.1	10 signs of greenwash. Source: Futerra (2008) <i>The Greenwash Guide</i> , p. 5. © Futerra Sustainability Communications. Reproduced with permission.	442
22.1	Ulm School of Design (1953–1968), architect Max Bill. Source: Hans G. Conrad/René Spitz (Rechteinhaber), https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:1955_Foto-HansGConrad_HfGUlm_Architekt-MaxBill.jpg . Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Unported.	461
22.2	1955 Citroën car. Source: https://pxhere.com/en/photo/632055 . Public Domain (CC0-1.0).	465

About the Editor

Anne Massey is a Visiting Professor at Richmond, the American International University in London and specializes in design research, particularly the design of the interior. She worked in her father's architectural practice, *Harry Massey Associates*, during the 1970s and 1980s and subsequently worked at a range of universities as Professor of Design and Culture, including the University of the Arts London. She studied for a BA (Hons) History of Modern Art and Design at Newcastle Polytechnic (now the University of Northumbria) and then a PhD on "The Independent Group: Towards a Definition." She was the founding editor of the academic journal *Interiors: Design/Architecture/Culture*, now published by Taylor and Francis. Her books include *Designing Liners: Interior Design Afloat* (Routledge 2006); *Interior Design Since 1900* (Thames and Hudson 2008), and *Chair* (Reaktion 2011). She co-edited *Hotel Lobbies and Lounges* (Routledge 2013); *Biography, Identity and the Modern Interior* (Ashgate 2013); *Pop Art and Design* (Bloomsbury 2017); and *Design, History and Time* (Bloomsbury 2019). Massey has also contributed to a range of academic journals, most recently the journal *Architecture and Culture*. The Independent Group and the history of the Institute of Contemporary Arts remains a major research interest and she regularly broadcasts, curates, and publishes on the subject. This includes *The Independent Group: Modernism and Mass Culture in Britain, 1945–1959* (Manchester University Press 1996) and *Out of the Ivory Tower: The Independent Group and Popular Culture* (Manchester University Press 2013). She is currently writing the biography of Dorothy Morland, the first and only female Director of the ICA from 1952 to 1968 for Liverpool University Press.

Notes on Contributors

Rina Arya is Professor of Visual Culture and Theory at the University of Huddersfield. She is interested in the visual and material culture of religion. Author of *Francis Bacon: Painting in a Godless World* (2012) and *Abjection and Representation* (2014), she is currently working on a study of cultural appropriation in a Hindu context.

Paul Atkinson is Professor of Design and Design History at Sheffield Hallam University, UK. He has published widely on the design history of the do-it-yourself movement, the changing nature of the relationship between amateur and professional design, and the future impact of emerging technologies on the nature of design through practice-based research into postindustrial manufacturing. He has authored two books on the design history of computers (*Computer*, Reaktion 2010, and *Delete: A Design History of Computer Vapourware*, Bloomsbury 2013), and is working on a design history of the electric guitar for Reaktion.

Jonathan Bean is Assistant Professor of Architecture, Sustainable Built Environments, and Marketing at the University of Arizona. His research on taste and consumption spans the fields of consumer research, human-computer interaction, architecture, and design. He is the author of the Consuming Tech column for *ACM Interactions* magazine and is completing a multi-year immersive study of market transformation in the US building market. He has received grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the National Institute for Transportation and Communities, and others. His work on IKEA hacking was featured on an episode of the *99% Invisible* podcast.

Christopher Breward is Director of Collection and Research at the National Galleries of Scotland. He was previously Head of Research at the Victoria &

Albert Museum London and Principal of Edinburgh College of Art at the University of Edinburgh, where he retains a Visiting Professorship in Cultural History. He has published and curated widely on the histories of fashion, masculinity, and urban cultures.

Graeme Evans is Professor of Culture and Creative Economy at the University of the Arts London and has held professorships in Design Cultures at Middlesex and Brunel Universities and the Chair in Culture & Urban Development at Maastricht University. He convenes the Regional Studies Association Mega Events Research Network (<https://megaevents.org>) and his forthcoming book *Mega Events: Placemaking, Regeneration and City-Region Development* will be published by Routledge in 2019. He has published widely on the design, planning, and impacts from Olympics, EXPOs, and cultural festivals, and advises cities and governments on event and culture-led regeneration.

Jonathan Faiers is Professor of Fashion Thinking, Winchester School of Art, University of Southampton, UK. In 2014 he launched *Luxury: History, Culture, Consumption* (Taylor & Francis) the first peer-reviewed, academic journal to investigate this globally contested term and is a founding member of the Winchester Luxury Research Group. His current research includes a monograph on the socio-cultural history of *Fur* (Yale University Press 2020).

Kjetil Fallan is Professor of Design History at the University of Oslo, and currently Principal Investigator for the research project Back to the Sustainable Future: Visions of Sustainability in the History of Design. He is the author of *Designing Modern Norway: A History of Design Discourse* (Routledge 2017) and *Design History: Understanding Theory and Method* (Berg Publishers 2010), editor of *Scandinavian Design: Alternative Histories* (Berg Publishers 2012), and co-editor, with Grace Lees-Maffei, of *Designing Worlds: National Design Histories in an Age of Globalization* (Berghahn Books 2016) and *Made in Italy: Rethinking a Century of Italian Design* (Bloomsbury Academic 2014).

Alexa Griffith Winton is a design historian and Assistant Professor at Ryerson School of Interior Design in Toronto. Her work engages the visual and material culture of the last century, with a focus on the history and theory of interiors. Her research also addresses craft in the industrial and computer ages, and the role of technology in modern domestic design.

Elizabeth Guffey heads the MA course in Art History at Purchase College, State University of New York, and specializes in art and design history. She is author of several books, including *Designing Disability: Symbols, Spaces and Society* (Bloomsbury 2017), *Posters: A Global History* (Reaktion 2014), and *Retro: The Culture of Revival* (Reaktion 2006). She has authored numerous articles and is also the founding editor of the journal *Design and Culture*.

Vicky Gunn is Head of Learning and Teaching and Professor of Arts and Humanities in Higher Education at Glasgow School of Art (GSA). As well as leading learning and teaching development at GSA, she has a research profile in humanities, art, and design disciplinary higher education with two specialist areas of focus: uncommon design in higher education policy and historical visual practices as methods of social production for contemporary social justice.

Natalie Haskell is a PhD candidate and sessional lecturer at Griffith University, Australia. Her research focuses on the opportunities provided by digital fabrication technologies integrated across design disciplines, and the impact on design practice in the creation of customized and localized products and solutions. Recent publications that Natalie has authored/co-authored include *3D Printing Sociocultural Sustainability* (Springer 2016), “Digital utopia: the role of materiality and digital competency” (2016), and “Pattern and the digital narrative: the impact of digital innovation on pattern and placemaking” (2017).

Ben Highmore is Professor of Cultural Studies at the University of Sussex. He is currently working on the relationships among taste, retailing, urbanism, art and design, and domestic life as part of a major research fellowship for the Leverhulme Trust. His most recent books are *Culture: Key Ideas in Media and Cultural Studies* (Routledge 2016) and *The Great Indoors: At Home in the Modern British House* (Profile Books 2014).

Yuko Kikuchi is a Reader at TrAIN (Research Center for Transnational Art Identity and Nation) and CCW College at University of the Arts London. Her key works include *Mingei Theory and Japanese Modernisation: Cultural Nationalism and “Oriental Orientalism”* (2004), *Refracted Modernity: Visual Culture and Identity in Colonial Taiwan* (2007), and two special issues: “Transnational modern design histories in East Asia,” *The Journal of Design History* 27 (4) (2014), and “Negotiating histories: traditions in modern and contemporary Asia-Pacific art,” *World Art* 5 (1) (2015). Currently, she is editing a *Critical Reader of East Asian Design*, and writing a monograph on Russel Wright and the Cold War design in Asia, for which she was awarded the Terra Foundation Senior Fellowship at the Smithsonian American Art Museum

Grace Lees-Maffeï is Professor of Design History in the School of Creative Arts at the University of Hertfordshire, where she leads the TVAD Research Group in its work on relationships between text, narrative, and image and directs the Professional Doctorate in Heritage. Grace’s publications include *Reading Graphic Design in Cultural Context* (Bloomsbury Academic 2018), *Designing Worlds: National Design Histories in an Age of Globalization* (Berghahn Books 2016), *Design at Home: Domestic Advice Books in Britain and the USA since 1945* (Routledge 2013), *Iconic Designs: 50 Stories about 50 Things* (Bloomsbury Academic 2013), *Made in Italy: Rethinking a Century of Italian Design* (Bloomsbury Academic 2013), *Writing Design: Words and Objects* (Berg 2012), and *The Design History Reader* (Berg 2010).

Gregory Marinic, PhD, is an architectural theorist, scholar, educator, and practitioner whose research and practice are focused on the intersection of architecture, interiority, obsolescence, adaptive reuse, and geography. His New York-based multidisciplinary design practice, Arquipelago, has received awards from the Seoul Metropolitan Government, American Institute of Architects, and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture; Arquipelago has also exhibited in the AIA Center for Architecture in New York, the Estonian Architecture Museum in Tallinn, the Seoul Dongdaemun Design Plaza, the TSMD Architecture Center in Ankara, and the National Building Museum in Washington, DC. His critical essays have been published in *AD Journal*, the *Journal of Architectural Education*, *Design Issues*, the *Journal of Interior Design*, *AIA Forward Journal*, the *International Journal of Architectural Research*, and the *Int|AR Journal of Interventions and Adaptive Reuse*. Dr. Marinic is an Associate Professor at the University of Kentucky College of Design and Director of Graduate Studies in the School of Interiors. He previously served as founding director of the Interior Architecture program at the University of Houston College of Architecture and Design.

Paul Micklethwaite is course leader of MA Sustainable Design at Kingston School of Art, London. He is interested in the impact of the sustainability agenda on our theories and practices of design, and modes of design practice which are social in their ends and means. He is co-author of the influential course reader *Design for Sustainable Change: How Design and Designers Can Drive the Sustainability Agenda* (AVA Academia 2011).

John Potvin is Professor of Art History at Concordia University, Montreal. He is the author of *Material and Visual Cultures Beyond Male Bonding* (2008), *Giorgio Armani: Empire of the Senses* (2013), and, more recently, *Bachelors of a Different Sort: Queer Aesthetics, Material Culture and the Modern Interior in Britain* (2014), winner of the Historians of British Art Book Prize. In spring 2016 he was awarded a four-year Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada grant to explore “Sexuality, Masculinity and Shame in Interior Design: From Professionalization to Queer Theory, 1869–2015.”

Malcolm Quinn is Professor of Cultural and Political History, UAL, and Honorary Senior Research Associate, UCL Faculty of Laws, Bentham Project. Since the publication of *The Swastika, Constructing the Symbol* (Routledge 1994) his research has engaged with questions of design, aesthetics, and state power. He has written about public taste and state-funded art and design education for the journals *History of European Ideas*, *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, *Journal of Visual Arts Practice*, and *Revue d'études Benthamiennes*. He is the General Editor of *The Persistence of Taste: Art, Museums and Everyday Life After Bourdieu* (Routledge 2018).

Victoria L. Rovine is Professor of Art History at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her first book, *Bogolan: Shaping Culture through Cloth in Contemporary Mali* (Indiana University Press 2008), examined the recent transformations of a richly symbolic West African textile. Her second book, *African Fashion, Global Style: Histories, Innovations, and Ideas You Can Wear* (Indiana University Press 2015), explores the innovations of African fashion designers in an array of styles and markets, and on the imagined Africa constructed by Western fashion designers. Her current research examines the cultural politics of textiles at the nexus of France and French West Africa in the late colonial period.

Damon Taylor is a design theorist and practitioner who writes on the relationship between the made environment and the politics of action. He is currently Senior Lecturer in Design at the University of Brighton, where he teaches product design, design and craft history and theory, (un)sustainable design, socially useful design, and design systemics.

Mark Taylor is Professor of Architecture at Swinburne University, Australia. His primary research focus is the history and theory of the modern architectural interior with an emphasis on cultural and social issues. Mark has authored and edited several books including *Interior Design and Architecture: Critical and Primary Sources* (Bloomsbury 2013) and co-edited *Designs on Home: The Modern French Interior and Mass Media* (Bloomsbury 2015) and *Flow: Interiors, Landscapes and Architecture in the Era of Liquid Modernity* (Bloomsbury 2018).

Sarah Teasley is Reader in Design History and Theory and Head of Programme for History of Design at the Royal College of Art. She specializes in the history of design, technology, and society in modern and contemporary Japan, with particular expertise in furniture and industrial design, design education, manufacturing communities, industrial policy, and knowledge networks. An attention to materials and artifacts and human interactions with them underlies her research, as does a commitment to interdisciplinary work between history, STS, and design research. Publications include *Global Design History* (Routledge, 2011) and “Design and society in modern Japan,” a special issue of the *Review of Japanese Culture and Society* (2017).

Lois Weinthal is Chair of the School of Interior Design at Ryerson University, Toronto. Her research and practice investigates the relationships among architecture, interiors, clothing, and objects, resulting in works that take on an experimental nature. She is the editor of *Toward a New Interior: An Anthology of Interior Design Theory* (2011) and co-editor of *After Taste: Expanded Practice in Interior Design* (2012), with Kent Kleinman and Joanna Merwood-Salisbury, both published by Princeton Architectural Press. She is a recipient of grants from the Graham Foundation, Fulbright, and DAAD. She studied architecture at Cranbrook Academy of Art and Rhode Island School of Design.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Jayne Fagnoli, the commissioning editor at Wiley, who worked closely with me on the original proposal for this edited collection. Gratitude also to Dana Arnold, the series editor, for all her help and support throughout the process. Clare Barry was the editorial assistant in the early stages of the book, and my thanks to her for detailed and accurate work. Special thanks are due to the contributing authors, who produced innovative and inciteful essays to bring the field of contemporary design history to life. This has been a major undertaking, spanning more than three years. I trust it will give a flavor of the excitement and variance that characterizes thinking and writing about design.

Anne Massey
London, July 2018

Series Editor's Preface

Wiley Blackwell Companions to Art History is a series of edited collections designed to cover the discipline of art history in all its complexities. Each volume is edited by specialists who lead a team of essayists, representing the best of leading scholarship, in mapping the state of research within the subfield under review, as well as pointing toward future trends in research.

This *Companion to Contemporary Design since 1945* aims to consider the history and theory of design in relation to contemporary practice. In this way we comprehend design as both something a professional designer produces and how it is recognized by its users and consumers. The essays present a challenging account of the boundaries that have come into being between design history and its cognate disciplines, especially art history.

Each of the five sections of the volume provides a multilayered, interdisciplinary re-evaluation of design. The opening three sections address the concepts of “Time,” “Place,” and “Space,” while the final two on “Object” and “Audiences” offer a more nuanced examination of the various ways that we encounter design in terms of the objects themselves and as viewers, users, and consumers.

Together, these essays combine to provide a new and thought-provoking revision of our conception and understanding of contemporary design that will be essential reading for students, researchers, and teachers working in design history, theory, and practice, and in related fields.

A Companion to Contemporary Design since 1945 signals an important rapprochement between art history and design history and is a very welcome addition to the series.

Dana Arnold,
2018

Introduction

Anne Massey

As you read this text, either in book form or by means of a computer screen or hand-held device, you are interacting with design. The font and layout of these words is designed; the physicality of the book or the screen has been designed for ease of interaction; the chair you sit on or the bed you lie on or the means of transport you are sitting on have all been designed by someone for someone – in this case, for you. Design is a big subject and comprises spaces, objects, and technologies from a recent urban development to the microchip, with interiors, fashion, craft, graphics, and the digital lying in between.

The purpose of this volume is to provide a critical overview of a broad range of design disciplines, to stimulate interdisciplinary debate and consider undiscovered convergences and synergies. *A Companion to Contemporary Design since 1945* is part of the Wiley Blackwell Companions to Art History series, and was initially inspired by Amelia Jones's edited collection *A Companion to Contemporary Art since 1945* (Jones 2006) and mirrors its approach. Like Jones, I studied the history of modern art and design within an art school context at Newcastle Polytechnic (now the University of Northumbria) and we even participated in practice as part of the degree course, one of the first in the world to have “design history” in its title. I then went on to study for a PhD on the Independent Group at the same place, and this breadth of approach, which covers architecture, art, design, film, and popular culture in tandem with contemporary practice, has stayed with me over the past 30 plus years (Massey 2013). As Jones explains: “This book accepts the challenge of exploring the

complexities both of contemporary art as a now ‘historical’ phenomenon (as the years between ‘now’ and 1945 expand in number) and of contemporary art as potentially the cutting edge of what people calling themselves artists (or understood by others as such) are making and doing in this increasingly complex and globalized economy of cultural practices” (Jones 2006, p. 3). This collection aims to consider the history of design since 1945 in relation to the design of now across and between design’s disciplinary boundaries. The added dimension for this book is the multifarious nature of design, which can be defined as something a professional designer produces but, in addition, what society at large may understand to be design, that is, an amateur practice or a co-design for example. The punk rocker garb discussed and illustrated in Chapter 14 is an example of street style, of design by and for the wearer.

Critical thinking about the complex area of design has emerged since 1945 under a series of banners, most predominantly design history, design methods, design studies, and, more recently, design thinking. These latter approaches try to pin down and logically explain this complex subject, even producing hermetically sealed models for the professional practice of the design process. This particular tendency of design theory emerged under the grouping of design methods. As Penny Sparke explained: “One of the earliest manifestations of design scholarship – which was loosely described as ‘design methods’ – emerged in the 1960s as part of a general desire to systematize hitherto un-systematized processes. Growing out of the anthropomorphic and ergonomic work of the wartime and immediate post-war years, and linked to the growing interest in cybernetics, attempts were made to minimize both the artistic and commercial definitions of design that had hitherto been emphasized by many design professionals, influenced by earlier developments in the USA, and to see it, rather, as a discipline rooted in a rigorous and rational ‘scientific’ process” (Sparke and Fisher 2016, p. 3). As an Independent Group stalwart, Reyner Banham argued at the time, when discussing the development of software and invisible technology and the redundancy of scientific approaches to design, that “The significant and memorable products of the present time nearly all contain elements of surprise, of variability, of exploitable imperfection” (Banham 1969, p. 11). And it is these surprises, variabilities, and imperfections which the book focuses on rather than assuming a more didactic and absolutist approach. Banham and his Independent Group colleagues understood the importance of ephemerality in the design process and for design criticism. He described the role of the design critic as:

He [sic] must project the future dreams and desires of people as one who speaks from within their ranks. It is only thus that he can participate in the extraordinary adventure of mass-production, which counters the old aristocratic defeatist 19th-century slogan, “Few but roses,” and its implied corollary, “Multitude are weeds,” with a new slogan that cuts across all academic categories: “Many, because orchids.” (Banham 1981, p. 93)

Although we now would seriously question ephemerality from the point of view of sustainability, one of contemporary design's biggest challenges, the need to understand design beyond didactic theory, is vital.

An important crucible for understanding design in the 1980s was the journal *BLOCK*. Writing in the Introduction to the "Design History" section of *The Block Reader in Visual Culture* the editors echoed Banham's horticultural analogy when discussing the early days of this significant cultural journal: "There was a thrill in refocusing the 'art historical' eye to take in that undergrowth of visual culture. Design history was an opportunity to explore the productive *frisson* of botanising the apparently mundane object – to investigate the minutiae which, from the lofty vantages of art history, appeared as an unauthored blur" (Bird et al. 1996, p. 132). This approach has reverberated through a critical understanding of design right into the twenty-first century. The *frisson* of studying popular taste in an academic environment pervades, with researchers unproblematically exploring "kitsch" and denigrating and disrespecting mass taste (Massey 2000, pp. 1–19). The chapters in this volume take a generous and empathetic view of design and of popular taste, offering a thoughtful and sensitive approach to the panoply of design.

Design theory has been enriched over recent years by new work in the fields of fashion, graphics, and interiors. While Penny Sparke has provided an excellent overview of general design journals (Sparke and Fisher 2016, pp. 3–4), it is also important to take new journals in the subdisciplines of design into account, notably *Fashion Theory: the Journal of Dress, Body & Culture* launched in 1997; *Communication Design: Interdisciplinary and Graphic Design Research* in 2009; and *Interiors: Design/Architecture/Culture* in 2010. This development has enhanced the richness of reflecting and writing about design. An amalgamation of these different approaches, which gives an overview of the excitement and energy surrounding the discussion of writing and thinking about design at present, constitutes this volume. Grouped around five key themes, the collection brings together leading authors in the field, and provides an overview of current, critical writing on the subject. The five themes are "Time"; "Place"; "Space"; "Object"; and "Audiences." The book therefore progresses from the general to the particular, charting the different dimensions within which contemporary design can be understood.

The first theme of "Time" is crucial to any understanding of design now. In the digital age our perceptions of time have transcended the rigid formulations of analog time, and entered an era when time is layered, the past extends into the present, and the future into the past. The section begins by thinking about how we historicize the present, with the chapter by Sarah Teasley which details the contribution that contemporary design history can make. She takes as a case study her own experience of working in the field of graphic design in Japan in the 1990s. This is followed by a chapter by Elizabeth Guffey, which examines current views of the past in terms of "nostalgia." This chapter examines the concept of "new nostalgia" in the contemporary world, and explores the

relationship between contemporary design history and the past. We then turn our attention to thinking about the future, a key area of work for contemporary designers and theorists. Can we predict the future? In a subtle and complex chapter, Damon Taylor maps out the different approaches to future gazing and establishes the seeming impossibility of such a task.

The next section, “Place,” pinpoints an important navigational point for design, that is, where it is produced and consumed in the postcolonial present. Yuko Kikuchi argues for the importance of East Asian design history in her chapter “Transnationalism for Design History: Knowledge Production and Decolonization through East Asian Design History.” She argues for a de-centering of design history and the production of knowledge. Victoria Rovine then examines the contemporary significance and meaning of African fashion design for African fashion designers, and explores the ways in which they work with traditional emblems and traditions. The section finishes with Gregory Marinic’s consideration of “Urban Sights: From Outdoor Streets to Interior Spaces,” which takes us from the USA to Dubai and considers the shopping mall in relation to Fredric Jameson’s notion of interior hyperspaces.

The following section, “Space,” considers design within the context of spatial cultures. The section begins with Rina Arya’s investigation of “Virtual Space,” which considers the ubiquity of digital culture and contemporary perceptions of space and place. The perceived dichotomy between the real and the virtual is problematized. The focus then shifts to “Interior Atmosphere” in the chapter by Lois Weinthal, who explores the poetic dimensions of the ephemeral and transitory in the design process. Ben Highmore turns our attention to the creation of the postwar domestic interior, using the twin forces of modernity and tradition. He focuses on technology in the home and how this can be marshaled to link back to the past and forward to the future. The section concludes with Graeme Evans’s consideration of the design of contemporary mega-events. Looking at the design and planning of the huge sites for hosting international events, particularly the Olympic games, he considers the local and the global in the creation of these branded spaces.

The next section moves to a more finely grained examination of the “Object” of contemporary design in their various formats. Alexa Winton provides a useful overview of the field of object-oriented ontology using key examples and invites us to reconsider the significance of stuff in the study of contemporary design. Jonathan Bean explores the Consumed Object from the perspective of Consumer Culture Theory (CCT). He argues that there is scope for collaboration between the fields of CCT and design history to further develop our understanding of the consumption of design. A different facet of the consumer and contemporary design is explored by Kjetil Fallan. He sees contemporary design history as an important discipline for the education of designers but reaching out further in terms of society and culture in general. Fashion is often overlooked in the theorization of design practice and its history, often operating within its own realm. Christopher Breward takes “The Fashionable Object” as his subject and examines shifting meanings of fashion in relation to style and

taste. Grace Lees-Maffei then investigates “The Written Object: Design Journalism, Consumption, and Literature since 1945.” Although design is conventionally thought of as a visual or haptic activity, the written word has always been, and continues to be, important throughout the design process. Lees-Maffei argues that words are present from the client brief through to the design blog. The section concludes with a chapter that examines the neglected area of design and sexuality. John Potvin argues that the area of sexuality offers new and exciting avenues of enquiry, and turns our attention to the politics of gender neutrality in contemporary design.

The last section, “Audiences for Design,” takes us from objects to people. Jonathan Faiers takes “Luxury and Design: Another Time, Another Place” as his subject, detailing how luxury is consumed as an ahistorical entity through the device of film and television. Paul Atkinson turns his attention to the world of amateur design and the ways in which non-professional design interacts with design production in the digital age. This challenges the prevailing norm, where contemporary design history is regarded as the province of the professional designer only. Still on the subject of professional design, Mark Taylor and Natalie Haskell trace the trajectory of the history of the interior design profession in relation to the development of interior design education and research. This is followed by Vicky Gunn’s chapter on “Design Education *in* Higher Education,” which situates the training of designers within the art and design context, highlighting the dominance of an unsuitable fine art model. Paul Micklethwaite then takes the radical stance of considering “Design Against Consumerism” and the ways in which the contemporary practice of design can mitigate against the destruction of the planet. Arguing against a consumer-led model of design, he questions the viability of a sustainable consumption approach. The final chapter provides a rare overview of design in relation to social class. Malcolm Quinn argues that bourgeois discernment and taste created a cultural idealism that reinforced a liberal democracy, an idealism that can unravel when this shared taste is challenged.

References

- Banham, R. (1969). Softer hardware. *Ark* 44 (Summer): 2–12.
- Banham, R. (1981[1960]). A throw-away aesthetic. In: *Design by Choice* (ed. P. Sparke), 90–93. London: Academy Editions.
- Bird, J., Curtis, B., Mash, M. et al. (eds.) (1996). *The Block Reader in Visual Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, A. (2006). *A Companion to Contemporary Art since 1945*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Massey, A. (2000). *Hollywood Beyond the Screen: Design and Material Culture*. Oxford: Berg.
- Massey, A. (2013). *Out of the Ivory Tower: The Independent Group and Popular Culture*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Sparke, P. and Fisher, F. (eds.) (2016). *The Routledge Companion to Design Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Part I



Time

Contemporary Design History

Sarah Teasley

In 1995, I spent the summer designing and building web pages in Kanazawa, a regional city in Japan. Writing and dreaming in Hypertext Markup Language (HTML), I worked alongside engineers at the region's first Internet service provider, a mid-size conglomerate, to produce promotional webpages for hotels and tourist attractions. I was not a trained designer: I had taught myself basic photography and graphic design out of interest, and thanks to a childhood spent with computers could train myself to code in HTML and to use software such as Adobe Photoshop and Illustrator.

My efforts to render Kanazawa's famously succulent prawns even more enticing on tourist websites tell a story about social change: I had begun a summer internship in the conglomerate's central administrative division. As a woman, I was assigned a turquoise and white uniform and directed to stuff envelopes alongside the other young women in the administrative track, which ran alongside the career track for male university graduates. But my line manager swiftly moved me to the IT division, in a more specialized role, once my amateur computing and design skills became known, and I was offered a full-time role in the company following university graduation. It is unclear whether a Japanese woman would have been offered the same opportunity, so difficult to say whether my reassignment represented a re-evaluation of women's roles within the company, but at the very least indicates that the firm was open to foreign hires. My male colleagues' employment itself demonstrated change as well: some had postgraduate degrees, which complicated their position and

salary in an age-based system predicated on joining companies immediately after university graduation. These attributes made us misfits. But they also represented a corporate strategy that valued internationalization and specialist technical knowledge, within a national corporate culture of preferring malleable – and Japanese – male generalists (Matanle 2003; Ogasawara 1998).

My web design role also tells a story of economic and technological change: by the summer of 1995, Japan was several years into the post-economic bubble economy that would soon become known as “the lost decade” (Fletcher and von Staden 2014). Around me, acquaintances’ firms were suffering, even closing, and the term *risutora* (restructuring, or corporate layoffs) had entered quotidian use. But from my superficial vantage point, the firm that provided the internship seemed less affected, perhaps because it had diversified its portfolio from energy and chemicals, the firm’s earliest divisions, to include building systems and computer hardware and software back in the 1960s. The firm’s location in Kanazawa also buffered it from the Great Hanshin Earthquake, which heavily damaged the Kobe–Osaka area in January 1995, and from the Aum Shinryo-kyo sarin gas attack on the Tokyo subway system in March that same year.

As a respected and well-connected firm already offering comprehensive systems installation and maintenance, my employer was well positioned to profit from the World Wide Web’s arrival in Japan. My role as graphic designer, web developer, and copywriter had nothing to do with a corporate interest in branching into online advertising or graphic design; rather, the Web’s arrival represented an opportunity to provide a new level of regional infrastructure. The availability of software such as Adobe Photoshop and Illustrator and the ease with which one could learn to use them, given time, a manual, and increasingly user-friendly interfaces, meant that an amateur with a computer, a color scanner – essential for translating analog photographs into digital images – and access to examples of similar designs could create and publish her own graphic products, outside the existing industry.

As this account of desk-top publishing (DTP) in Kanazawa indicates, the Web’s arrival in Japan in the 1990s was one of a number of historical developments that positioned design in new arenas. These changes brought new actors into areas previously occupied and shaped by self-consciously professional designers. Websites, web design, and the Internet behaved as an open space – technology that had not yet “stabilized,” to use the science and technology studies (STS) phrasing – that could be occupied by a conglomerate with a burgeoning IT division and performed by a non-professional designer. In twentieth century Japan, as in many other Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries, graphic and industrial designers had organized for social and professional recognition of the designer as a skilled, irreplaceable member of the production team (Fischer and Hiesinger 1995; Insatsu Hakubutsukan 2008). Now, new technologies, uses, and users were destabilizing the industry, and designers who had fought for recognition of

their professional status feared replacement by amateurs with DTP skills and a general degrading of graphic aesthetic sensibility and technique as a result. New practices existed alongside older and older new ones, creating a hybrid environment in which a foreign intern could use Photoshop, analog photography, and fax machines together, working alongside a team of suited men in a turquoise and white “office lady” uniform, despite her reassignment to a skilled role.

My work that summer had only marginal if any historical impact, but illustrates important shifts and conditions in contemporary Japanese history and the contemporary global history of design. (Or at least it would if anything remained of it; the websites evanesced years ago.) But I had forgotten about the experience, even after beginning to research the history of 1990s Japan through its industrial and graphic design industries. In that project, design journalist and educator Watabe Chiharu and I focused research efforts on professional designers in Tokyo, as visible in products and photographs from the period, published in industry journals, and interviewed in oral histories (*Design History of Now* 2014). I had not recalled my experiences as a web designer in regional Japan let alone thought them relevant. I overlooked them because they were at once too intimate and too distant, both in time and – with their amateurishness and location in a regional conglomerate, far from Tokyo’s storied design offices – from canonical or mainstream histories of Japanese design. I also overlooked them simply because the historian usually narrates someone else’s story, not one’s own. Why would I have thought to connect my own experiences either with design history or with Japan’s contemporary history more generally?

I begin with this anecdote as it illustrates the difficulties of compiling contemporary history. Not least that contemporary history, what we might call history of the recent past, intersects with the realm of personal experience. It suffers from proximity, or from what we might more aptly call an “in-betweenness of distance” that makes it neither history nor the present. Writing in 1975, historian John Dower noted, “For Western scholars, occupied Japan remains something of an anomaly: too remote (1945–1952) for most economists and political scientists, still uncomfortably close for historians” (Dower 1975, p. 485). Writing in 2018, the 23 years to 1995 provide a similar gap. Writing or even seeing “history that has just happened” presents a challenge because it is no longer fresh in the mind, yet not so long ago for public opinion to regard it as worth chronicling or archiving. The events of 20 or 30 years ago are close enough to make us believe we remember them, but far enough that events are anything but fresh in the mind, making it easy to misremember them.

As the anecdote suggests, design historians can suffer from a blind spot when it comes to spotting the “significant quotidian” in recent history. This chapter raises and considers the particular challenges presented by the task of compiling design histories of the recent past – or, equally, history of the recent past through design, or history of recent design pasts. While acknowledging design history’s occlusions, the chapter also posits that design history, as a set of

approaches, perspectives, and techniques, offers a potentially strong mode for undertaking histories of the contemporary, by design historians and others alike. It suggests that the approaches and perspectives possible in the history of design – attention to lived experience, materiality, and the everyday; an understanding of experience as interface with artifactual environment; and a concern with the making and experience of the artifacts, environments, and experiences that shape our physical and emotional interaction in the world – might provide an effective net for catching and seeing that history.

Combined with methods for communicating histories that activate such an understanding of affect as a designer would – or in collaboration with artist and designers – the chapter suggests that design history offers a powerful script for compiling and communicating histories of the recent past, and for placing those histories in relation to decision-making now. To make its points, the chapter revisits ground familiar to design historians and contemporary historians alike. I claim neither originality nor novelty in the treatment of either topic or set of methods. Rather, the intention is to invite historians working with contemporary questions and material to engage with design historical approaches, and to articulate avenues, tools, and challenges for researchers and students in contemporary design history, studies, research, and practice. To this end, the chapter draws primarily on evidence and literature in design history, with reference to some methodological reflections on contemporary history.

The chapter is organized in three sections. The first explores the temporality, scope, and subjects of contemporary design history. The second discusses methods, perspectives, and challenges for undertaking contemporary design history effectively; and the third makes an argument for the potential of contemporary design history, as an aggregation of approaches and perspectives, to make a larger contribution to history practice and public knowledge alike. Assertions and arguments derive in part from findings from the research project, mentioned above, that sought to identify, test, and develop tools and perspectives for contemporary design history (*Design History of Now* 2014). That project identified methodologies, tools, and challenges through methods including a literature review within and beyond design history, dialogues with historians, curators, designers, and others working in the field, and student and public workshops. To test our emergent methods, we conducted scoping research into graphic and industrial design industry change in 1990s Japan, employing archival sources, oral history, and visual and material analysis.

This chapter builds on findings from that project towards a more general theory of contemporary design history practice. Keeping in mind historians' aversion to general theories, it nevertheless argues that our specific relationship with the present and recent past requires particular ways of working which design history might offer. At the same time, it emphasizes that even design history, with its attention to experience and the everyday, easily falls into the contemporary's traps. With attention, however, design history can offer something useful for making sense of the present and recent past, and for productively

questioning how we work with it and within it. Ultimately, the chapter aims to provoke critical, constructive reflection and action towards *doing* contemporary design history, and towards what *contemporary design history* can do.

The Time and Subjects of Contemporary Design History

Writing in 2011, political historians Jan Palmowski and Kristina Spohr Readman characterized “contemporary history” as possessing the capacity to:

engage on two levels with the past ... On one level, contemporary historians can explore the cultural, political, social, intellectual and economic history of the most recent past and present – a time which historians are living through and can actively remember. On another, contemporary history can also encompass events and periods that are central to the formation of collective memory in the contemporary period. (Palmowski and Spohr Readman 2011, p. 504)

One obvious definition of contemporary design history, too, is histories of recent and current design practices, products, and cultures.¹ Our study of design in 1990s Japan followed graphic and industrial designers’ experiences of the period, as a lens into historical shifts and conditions. We intended the project to counter two aporia: first, a lack of attention to design’s agency within histories of the period, and second, a lack of attention on the 1990s within design history, Japanese or otherwise. Whether as information graphics, hospital interiors, or packaged sweets, design products shaped everyday experience of economic, political, social, and technological change and crisis in the decade, at both the community and individual level. Given such impact, attending to design’s 1990s seemed a significant, potentially useful addition to current historical work on the period.

Compiling contemporary design history can also involve recording design practice in the present, and offering critical, connected commentary on present events through practices of collecting, curating, and writing. Referring to historian Geoffrey Barraclough’s influential thoughts on contemporary history (Barraclough 1964), Spohr Readman writes:

Leaning on Barraclough, I want to postulate, firstly, that the principal distinguishing feature of “contemporary history” (in the truest sense of the term) is surely that its practitioners will write *in medias res* about events and developments that are perceived as actual and central to present day life, as perceived by publics and political elites, and the outcome of which might still be uncertain. It is this definition of “instantaneity” that forms the “chronological core of recentness.” (Spohr Readman 2011, p. 526)

In discussions around methodologies for contemporary design history conducted as part of the 2013 research, design historians shared this view, with

design historian Jane Pavitt describing contemporary design history as “retrieval of the present as well as the past” (Teasley 2014a). Here historical perspective becomes key: not only documenting the artifacts, experiences, and outcomes that constitute events but offering critical contextualization and analysis that fully employs the historian’s toolkit. We might look at Fiona Hackney’s examinations of agency and activism in British amateur craft since 2000 (Hackney 2013), or Jilly Traganou’s articulation of spatial politics in Manhattan’s Wall Street during the Occupy Movement in 2011 (Traganou 2016). Crucially, such work articulates the agency of design and designers – amateur or professional – in shaping contemporary conditions, agendas, and ideological stances. Economic, political, and social analyses of current affairs have acclimatized us to understanding contemporary conditions as the result of policy decisions, global financial market fluctuations, ingrained cultural biases, and the weather; contemporary design history not only writes the recent into design history, but indicates design’s role in shaping history as well.

Such design history in-the-moment recalls the historian and journalist Timothy Garton Ash’s understanding of contemporary history as “history of the present” (Garton Ash 2000).² In Garton Ash’s words:

You record what people did not know at the time – for instance, that the Wall was about to come down. You dwell on developments that seemed terribly important then but would otherwise be quite forgotten now because they led nowhere. (Garton Ash 2000)

In Garton Ash’s formulation, immediacy means that some historically significant details may be missed and others, later seen as less important, emphasized. But he suggests that writing from “within” the present might help avoid the “optical illusion” of retrospective determinism, or selecting content based on later interpretations of a moment. Will Hackney and Traganou’s interpretations of early twenty-first century amateur craft and anti-capitalist protest seem prescient and significant in 20, 50, 100 years’ time? It is likely that they will, but what we can say with certainty, now, is that they provoke readers to think, to see differently, and perhaps to act in the present. Additionally, they provide a record by which future generations can understand our concerns and – importantly – the physical environment and material practices through which we express them.

How far back does contemporary design history need to look? Spohr Readman suggests:

contemporary historians need not only work from a certain starting point forward, exploring temporal causalities, contingency and agency of their object of research. They must also look backwards for explanatory depth – to said historical hinterland of events and the roots of developments – indeed, as far back as necessary. (Spohr Readman 2011, p. 526)

Spohr Readman's advice seems obvious yet, as design historian Linda Sandino has noted, "There's not enough history in contemporary design history" (Teasley 2014b).³ Whether by editorial decision or for lack of attention, representations of recent and current design practice – including user or consumer behavior around new products – often focus on novelty and innovation, and downplay or omit connections to longer trajectories. Here we should remember historian David Edgerton's reminder that new technologies become historically significant not when they are patented or first announced but when they are adopted on a mass scale and fundamentally shift common social practices, environmental conditions, or economic systems (Edgerton 2007). A new aesthetic tendency, technology, or eye-catching product might represent a future potential direction, but we must attend equally if not more to the everyday uses and experience of that product if we are to represent its history accurately. Such an approach has been central to design history since the 1980s; when shifting attention to contemporary topics design historians can remember and apply these concerns.

As part of this, we must remember that, as in our own lives, new practices or technologies do not immediately replace others, and to look for the agendas that shape our sources. Studying 1990s graphic design practice in Japan, Watabe and I saw that, while industry journals emphasized digital tools' potential to radically transform design products and designers' work experiences, many graphic designers and art directors preferred to continue working as they had previously and had the industry clout to dictate office practice, even if their own designs adopted a "digital" aesthetic (Watabe 2014a). Had we prioritized novelty and change, we would have missed this fundamental aspect of the period. Awareness of key arguments around sociotechnical change as complex and contingent on technology and human desires and capacities alike (Bijker 1995; Parr 1999), alongside attention to Edgerton's adage, allowed us to counter the contemporary's push towards the new.

What are the timescales for communicating contemporary design history? One answer is "immediately." The Victoria and Albert Museum's "Rapid Response Collecting" initiative not only collects designed artifacts that speak to contemporary issues but displays them in a devoted gallery space (Victoria and Albert Museum 2018). The Design Museum's Beazley Designs of the Year, an annual exhibition and competition, presents significant designed artifacts from the previous year with an emphasis on objects, systems, or spaces that convey conditions or concerns core to that year, or that have contributed to shaping them (The Design Museum 2018). Both museums disseminate these initiatives widely, raising the possibility that artifacts' identification and analysis as historically significant or representative might impact existing experience, use, and memory of them, in real time.

This raises questions about awareness, responsibility, and ethics on the part of the contemporary design historian. Like any act of live documentation, contemporary design history cannot operate outside the conditions it analyzes

(Teasley 2014c). All data collection and presentation disturbs conditions in some way: evoking memories in oral history subjects or by adding to user statistics for public archives. Publicizing an artifact or designer in writing or by collection or exhibition within a museum context can affect market value. And presenting historical arguments can shape public opinion and produce contention, even violence. Contemporary design history brings even further potential for systems disturbance. In 2014, the Victoria and Albert Museum's exhibition "Disobedient Objects" presented historic and contemporary objects created by grassroots social movements internationally for use in political protest. The exhibition offered free "how-to guides" for fabricating some of the objects in the exhibition, presented as PDFs online and as tearaway sheets in the physical exhibition (Victoria and Albert Museum 2016). By November 2014, four months after the exhibition's opening, protesters in the USA had used the exhibition's how-to guides to fabricate their own tear-gas masks (Duarte 2014; Flood 2014). Direct intervention into protests was not an explicit aim of the exhibition, but curators Catherine Flood and Gavin Grindon recognized the live nature of presenting activist artifacts in a highly public, highly publicized media space (Flood and Grindon 2014, p. 19). Whether addressing a subject as explicitly political as "Disobedient Objects" or not, contemporary design history's chroniclers must recognize and embrace this role, which means addressing questions around ethical practice, agency, and social responsibility (Jones et al. 2013).

A second definition of contemporary design history, already suggested in previous paragraphs, is simply contemporary history through a design lens, or histories of the contemporary through design artifacts, practices, industries, and cultures, in which artifacts might be objects, policies, or interactions, material or immaterial (Fry et al. 2015; Walker 1989, p. 33). The 1990s Japan project indicates precisely how. Owing to their inseparability from technological change, economic systems, everyday experience, and the material environment, the graphic and product design industries and their products provide rich insight into the period's larger structural issues and conditions. Japan in the 1990s was marked by particular crises – social, economic, political, and environmental – that have shaped collective memory and scholarship on the period subsequently (Gerteis and George 2013; Yoda and Harootunian 2006). Our research confirmed many of these narratives, for example around the impact of the economic crash of 1992 on corporate and consumer spending, prices, and the experience of work in the period. It also nuanced and complicated these narratives by attending to how designers at different stages in their careers experienced the period (Watabe 2014a), and explored the extent to which decisions and conditions in design practice and products, as mediating elements of everyday life, affected others' experiences and trajectories through the period.

Contemporary design history's subjects also require discussion. The 1990s project followed established design industries, but design history can range far

beyond those boundaries, into money, international law, economic policy, computer code, and emerging scientific methods and mechanisms as artifacts and processes, to name only a few areas. The expansion of design history's subjects corresponds to the broadening conceptualization of "design" within design history, studies, and research, from a set of professional industries and their products, often with culturally agreed high aesthetic value, to a more open-ended stance that emphasizes design as an active set of processes, practices, or a mindset around improving environments and experiences (Julier 2014; Manzini 2015; Margolin 2002; Simon 1996). Contemporary design history can follow practices and products within this expanded definition, as the Victoria and Albert Museum's Rapid Response Collecting initiative does through acquisitions like a "Pussy Hat" worn to the 2017 Women's March in Washington, DC, collected as artifact testimony and record (Jones 2017). By highlighting the designed, constructed nature of artifacts and environments, contemporary design history also enables us to raise questions about the constructed nature of collective memory, and to nuance, enrich, and occasionally challenge grand narratives.

Not all contemporary design history – like not all design history – does these things, but the combination of attention to the contemporary, of a perspective that foregrounds design, and of history's apparatus enables it. The next section explores what a perspective that foregrounds design and employs history's apparatus can be. The point is that methods are important too: not only studying design industries, products, and cultures, but the way that a contemporary design history approach allows us to study them.

Methods, Perspectives, and Challenges for Contemporary Design History

Methods for contemporary design history expand on those of design history: both histories of design – in the expanded sense outlined above – and a particular disposition for conducting historical inquiry (Fallan 2010; Walker 1989). Design researcher Lucy Kimbell has described designers as "of the culture which really profoundly attends to human experiences at human scale and pays attention to the artefacts" (Design Commission 2013, p. 21). Design history can bring similar attention to the process of "doing" history. If "doing" history means in part to articulate and understand change over time, design history can accomplish this by attending to human and non-human interactions within our environment, at both the immediate and larger scales. Put very simply, if a classic historical question is "who does what to whom?," design history can ask "who *and what* does what to whom *and what*?" This mode of design history draws on approaches in actor-network theory, archaeology, and anthropology (Ingold 2007; Kimbell 2012; Latour 1992; Tilley 2004), particularly the emphasis on material agency and on sensory lived

experience of our interactions with material and immaterial worlds. It shares perspectives with the social history of technology, the approach that sought to nuance grand, often technologically determinist, narratives around historical change by recording how users actually engaged with then-new technologies such as the motor car and washing machine (Kline and Pinch 1996; Parr 1999). It also parallels more recent academic developments like “envirotech,” whose proponents bring together environmental history and STS perspectives (Jørgensen et al. 2013; Pritchard 2011), and the recent convergence of design history with environmental history (Fallan and Jørgensen 2017).

Artifact analysis lies at the core of this approach, as it does for design history across periods. “Contemporary design history has objects. If it’s just history, it loses the object,” stated historian and curator Glenn Adamson in the 2013 discussions (Teasley 2014b). In design history, artifacts – including spaces and immaterial artifacts – become evidence alongside more conventional textual sources, quantitative data, visual sources and oral history, providing insight, routes, and provocations towards understanding economic, social, technological, cultural, environmental, and political conditions (Fallan 2010; Harvey 2009). As Spohr Readman notes, historians’ privileging of textual archival sources has traditionally made writing contemporary history difficult: if documents have not yet been archived or the archive is embargoed, then document-based history cannot be written (Spohr Readman 2011, p. 510).⁴ Like oral history, visual sources, and cultural representations, artifacts surmount this problem (if only to present different ones). Palmowski and Spohr Readman suggest:

Contemporary historians can provide a multilayered evaluation of how ideas, contexts, artefacts and structures affected the decisions of the powerful – and of the social practice of the nameless “many” on whose actions the exercise of power depended. (Palmowski and Spohr Readman 2011, p. 497)

Artifact analysis allows us to articulate the nature and impact of the environmental, economic, political, social, cultural, or technological forces that shaped artifacts and our experience of interactions with them. It also allows us to articulate how artifacts themselves – including raw materials – shape those forces. Together, these mean that actors must be identified, which – even in simple grammatical terms – necessitates assigning agency and seeing history as comprising networks and power flows. If everything is made, then who or what made it?

Paying attention to our interactions with artifacts and our environment – for example how the early tourist websites I designed in Kanazawa impacted users’ interactions with the shops and services they advertised – allows us to pinpoint the impact of larger historical decisions and conditions as they play out, rather than when they are made. Garton Ash, arguing for the importance of recording live historical events, commented:

During some of the dramatic debates between the leaders of Czechoslovakia's "velvet revolution," in the Magic Lantern theater in Prague in November 1989, I was the only person present taking notes. I remember thinking, "If I don't write this down, nobody will. It will be gone for ever, like bathwater down the drain." So much recent history has disappeared like that, never to be recovered, for want of a recorder. (Garton Ash 2000)

For political history, specific arguments made, directions considered, and turning points reached in debates can disappear if not recorded. But the political history of experience – a social history of the present – can be accessed through artifacts, either direct analysis or their use as prompts in oral history. Here, contemporary design history's practitioners can draw productively on precedents set in anthropology and material culture studies for studying social identity and environment through in-time interaction with artifacts (Miller 2015), and from the use of "design probes" in design research (Designing with People n.d.). As the format of what we can consider as an artifact proliferates and dematerializes, we need to acquire tools for identifying, interpreting, and communicating the different sensory and emotional experiences that come from interaction with a website, a policy, or a service. We can draw on digital anthropology and user experience design research methods, but again should not forget the deep historical perspective and attention to nuance and complexity developed already for histories of people and artifacts in earlier periods. Alongside ethnographic or other forms of research into user experience of interactions of contemporary artifacts and environments, we can and should continue to mine archives for qualitative and quantitative data that can illuminate those interactions. What is the contemporary design history equivalent of the court records, immigration logs, and inventories that allow colleagues in Early Modern history to trace interactions with other people and things?

Attention to materiality prompts researchers to consider the sensory experience of human–artifact or human–environment relationships and to reflect on the impact of that experience for how we understand larger historical narratives, and indeed how they have unfolded (Ingold 2007; LeCain 2017; Mitchell 2013). Contemporary design history is no different: in addition to thinking outside historical categories of artifactual evidence, we can attend to the material properties and consequent impact of those artifacts and environments, how the materiality of something like a dead web link shapes the experience and memory of an interaction (Teasley 2014a). In the 2013 workshops, design curator Jana Scholze articulated this position by saying, "With something like open source design, what is the object? What is the object with games, with software? Is the inquiry not about the 'object' per se? What is the object?" (Teasley 2014c). Similarly, design researcher Guy Julier wondered how contemporary design histories of social systems would proceed, given the immaterial nature of something like a social service, algorithm, or public policy (Teasley 2014c). We need to learn to perceive different forms of

artifacts and to acquire skills and language to understand, analyze, and communicate them.

Viewing design as process as well as product might also prevent myopia. For the 1990s Japan research, understanding magazine layouts as a palimpsest or set of traces of actions, performed by multiple actors over time, allowed us to disaggregate “digital” appearance from actual hybrid production. Understanding all conditions as made, whether by natural, human, or hybrid forces, necessarily brings temporality to any study of contemporary design, in effect historicizing it. Furthermore, contemporary design history has the unusual opportunity to document decision-making as it happens rather than inferring it from records or artifacts. Taking a cue from colleagues in social sciences and design research (Kimbell 2012; Law and Callon 1992), contemporary design history can articulate how decisions are made. This includes decisions that do not obviously appear in final products, a point stressed by writer and curator Monika Parrinder and designer-maker Maiko Tsutsumi (Teasley 2014b). Doing so as part of attending to production, mediation, and consumption, as the temporal elements of design’s “social life” (Appadurai 1986; Lees-Maffei 2009), might also enhance history-telling’s ability to indicate the produced, mediated nature of history itself.

Artifact analysis for contemporary history poses challenges. The number of artifacts available for study mushrooms for current and recent history, and abundance complicates the selection of evidence and time and labor resources required to filter and work with that evidence (Garton Ash 2000; Palmowski and Spohr Readman 2011, p. 495). However, abundance also provides the useful prompt that all histories are only ever partial and fragmentary. In the 1990s Japan project, the profusion of sources and direct access to multiple individual voices made it difficult to escape the conclusion that research results represented an aggregate of individual experiences within specific industry communities, rather than a definitive singular narrative of “design in 1990s Japan.” Focusing even on professional designers, rather than on users of design more widely, and looking only within graphic design, we found clear specificity of experience depending on designers’ age, industry, gender, location, and role at the time (Watabe 2014a).⁵ Established designers found the 1990s difficult and discouraging due to the economic crash and subsequent stagnation of demand. But many designers who were students or more junior at the time recalled the 1990s as exciting and full of potential, as new, more casual graphic design styles and ways of working emerged. As Watabe phrased it:

One thing that really struck me from the interviews and public sessions is how much generational differences and other differences in stance change the way we saw the 1990s, the way we remember the decade and the design events that we mark as important in it. Obviously, the design history of any period will differ according to who’s looking. But whereas there’s some sort of consensus about important events in design history up to the 1980s, it’s a free-for-all once you hit the 1990s. (Watabe 2014a)

Social history emphasizes the rich variance in individual experience of shared conditions, yet some histories of design elide difference in favor of grand macro-narratives of change, and takes narratives from political or economic history as accepted fact. An aggregate approach towards events such as the end of Japan's economic bubble c. 1992, on the other hand, asks about specific experience. For some established design consultancies, for example, the bubble experience did not truly end, in terms of types of briefs and clients and the rate and scale of commissions and income, until 1995. An aggregate approach offers the chance to nuance narratives about the pace, drivers, and rate of change.

A fragmentary picture insists on the contingency of things and poses the possibility that much of the data escapes assumptions governing the measurement of variables. It highlights disparities and challenges narrative hegemony, in particular inaccurate assumptions that globalization has erased differences in experience in an industry or practice like design. It recalls design historian Yuko Kikuchi's critique, in the 2013 discussions, that "Local specificity is hidden by the idea of a 'common language' – and we forget that histories are different, when we're speaking of now" (Teasley 2014b). Kikuchi's point, like that of the movement to decolonize design (Schultz et al. 2018), was that power imbalances operate within contemporary design history, as anywhere else, and that its practitioners should consider their own power and its potential effects when engaging with others or defining the field (something acutely relevant for this chapter, which makes a subjective if evidenced proposal for what contemporary design history might be).

Artifacts' evanescence offers a further challenge for contemporary design history. In the 2013 discussions, craft and design historian Christine Guth called for attention to ephemeral objects that have an impact but are overlooked, whether for being too "popular" for academic scrutiny, aimed at audiences unfamiliar to historians, or simply too evanescent to catch (Teasley 2014a). For our research on design in 1990s Japan, publishers' archives and design university libraries afforded access to industry publications and other book and periodical designs of the period, but some ephemeral sources such as billboards were available only in visual records like film and photographs, and others such as websites and flyers only in memory. Industrial design products resided in an inconvenient valley between collectible and useful: often still in everyday use but unnoticed as historically significant, whether for presenting to researchers or for preserving rather than discarding, once scruffy or superseded. Charity shops and online auctions become a key source, raising questions about the arbitrary nature of accessible pools of objects that become useful for questioning artifact analysis-based histories of earlier periods as well. Artifact histories of earlier periods share the challenge of evanescent, overlooked objects (Adamson 2009), but evanescence in the face of abundance for contemporary material feels particularly acute.

Museum collection policies for contemporary material, including acquisitions related to topical temporary exhibitions, catch some of this ephemera, as do personal collections. An exhibition at the British Museum in 2001 on

souvenirs from contemporary Japan, for example, added telephone cards, a now-obsolete technology and graphic product, to the Museum's collection. And for the 1990s Japan project, personal archives of ephemera such as lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer (LGBTQ) club flyers and supermarket advertising inserts into daily newspapers provided invaluable narratives of aesthetics, actors, technologies, and economies outside those presented by industry journals. Contemporary design history's practitioners can also develop lenses and filters working with the multiple material natures of contemporary artifacts, for example web use metadata and open access records of users' experiences with designed artifacts like Amazon product reviews (Teasley 2014a). A further challenge lies in convincing audiences that the familiar and immediate are significant. Here too we can draw on design history's developed expertise in presenting mundane objects as historically significant.

Artifacts' multivalency presents a third challenge and opportunity for contemporary design history. Historian Giorgio Riello, among others, has pointed out the difficulty of assuring definitive historical conclusions from artifacts, noting "Artefacts are multifarious entities whose nature and heuristic value is often determined by the diverse range of narratives that historians bring with them" (Riello 2009, p. 30). The potential to mislead may differ for contemporary and earlier artifacts; we are more likely to be able to identify an artifact and its context, but may miss salient facets precisely because of familiarity. In our research into design in 1990s Japan, employing oral history and archival sources, including quantitative data, allowed us to cross-check findings from overly familiar objects, and to recognize key problems posed by them for conventional historical narratives of the period. For contemporary design history as for history of earlier periods (Harvey 2009), artifacts pose useful problems for familiar narratives; at the same time, unfamiliar data allows us to work more critically and objectively with artifacts we think we know.

Temporal immediacy and the possibility of oral histories allow stories compiled and told to reflect the multiplicity of subjective experience of a period, but our own subjective memory of a period matters, very clearly, as well. Personal experience offers both particular help and particular hindrance: the help is that we can identify and access plural heterogeneous actors. The hindrance is that we believe we know a story, and must move past our own assumptions and familiarity, as my own inability to recall my web design experience in relation to graphic design in 1990s Japan demonstrates. Both design historians and contemporary historians have considered the advantages and disadvantages of subjectivity and its relation, proximity, for the activities of doing history (Fallan and Lees-Maffei 2015; McBride 2011). Within or nearby contemporary history we cannot see it clearly; we lack the distance prized by historians in the twentieth century as requisite to assess factors in change and continuity. But at the same time, embeddedness within, or at the very least some proximity, can afford access to archives and sources, and perhaps the ability to recognize and understand nuance once apprised to it.

Checks and balances through cross-disciplinary work might be a way to do this. They bring other advantages, as well. Palmowski and Spohr Readman argued that contemporary history, to retain effectiveness and salience beyond its late twentieth-century incarnation, needed to cross-fertilize:

Entering into a dialogue with other scholarly approaches and new methods of analysis will not only provide a fuller account of contemporary history, it will also generate a more complex analysis of power construction and decision-making ... In the twenty-first century, contemporary history must be as mindful of diverse historical approaches, as it must engage with other disciplines including cultural studies, anthropology, the political sciences, and the physical and health sciences. (Palmowski and Spohr Readman 2011, p. 497)

Design history, as a discipline, has actively engaged in cross-fertilization with fields as varied as history of art and architecture, cultural studies, social and political history, economic history, feminist history and gender studies, LGBTQ history and queer theory, postcolonial studies, anthropology, business history, and postcolonial studies (Fallan 2010; Margolin 2002; Walker 1989). Design history might fruitfully engage further with these areas and with materially minded disciplines like environmental history, as these other disciplines themselves shift and develop. Design history would benefit from increased engagement with quantitative analysis, including “big data” at the scale that requires machine learning techniques, and with methods developing within the digital humanities. Critical race studies’ presence within design history is sorely lacking, and geopolitical shifts in the twenty-first century afford the welcome opportunity to fundamentally reconsider the conceptual maps that underpin design historical practice: by adopting postcolonial perspectives on topics in contemporary European design, for example, rather than consigning awareness of postcolonial power structures to studies of former colonies alone. More extensive and more overt collaboration with researchers of all stripes might also produce robust findings. The 1990s Japan project would have benefited from work with an environmental historian, for example, as mapping power and resource flows such as electricity demand and design industry waste volumes would have allowed a more rounded picture of the social lives of design practitioners, products, and tools.

Contemporary design history – as method and topic alike – can cross-fertilize further with design research, not least, as 2013 discussion participants noted, by embracing participatory design and co-design methods for generating data and its interpretation, analysis, and use (Teasley 2014b). As part of the 1990s Japan research, Watabe and I led public workshops in Tokyo around the question, “What should a history of 1990s design include?” We worked with visual and physical probes to stimulate recollection, critical assessment, and discussion around this open-ended question. We aimed to encourage and capture multiple perspectives, and to empower participants to feel themselves actors in the history, regardless of age or professional status at the time.

These workshops ended with data collection and the participants' own personal takeaways, but one strand of the research could easily have run as co-creation with participants, transforming social design proponent Ezio Manzini's concept of "design-ing" – as an active, inclusive activity performed by all – into "design history-ing" (Manzini 2015).

In addition to adapting methods from other fields, contemporary design history can draw on difficulties for interdisciplinary collaboration, for instance between journalism and contemporary history as fields that document, analyze, and communicate current events. Garton Ash describes the similarities:

the virtues of good journalism and good history are very similar: exhaustive, scrupulous research; a sophisticated, critical approach to the sources; a strong sense of time and place; imaginative sympathy with all sides; logical argument; clear and vivid prose. (Garton Ash 2000)

At the same time, he notes that journalists write to short deadlines so can tend towards superficiality, while academics take time but sit outside the conditions they describe, and descriptions of events can seem unreal to actual participants (Garton Ash 2000).

Garton Ash's characterization correlates with our experience in the 1990s Japan project. Watabe wrote of our collaboration:

It's hard to say that journalists and academic historians make ideal working companions. One example: this morning I conducted an interview in London, and I had to write up the article for a deadline tonight. According to a historian I'd need to check all the sources before writing anything up, but that would make me miss my deadline. And besides, one page of the magazine can only fit so many words.

If the wall of academia opposes things I've always taken for granted, how much can a media approach contribute to history? A better question is: where can we find halfway points and correspondences/agreements? ... the project itself will run for the next year, so this is a major issue we need to clear. (Watabe 2014b)

It may be that we never cleared this issue. While we found it easy to comply with both fields' standards when compiling evidence, when analyzing material and disseminating findings this was often difficult. How, for example, to offer both journalism's emphasis on clarity and history's preference for acknowledging nuance and complexity? Rather than one unified voice, we often opted for multiple voices co-existing on the material, a tactic that allowed it to reside in multiple cultures and languages of practice. The inability to reconcile standard practices proved a benefit: together, our various presentations of research findings further demonstrate the subjective, aggregate nature of historical experience and its representation, and made a point about the open ownership of contemporary design's histories and of contemporary history more broadly.

At the same time, contemporary design history's practitioners can share its methods with colleagues in other fields, as a contribution towards effective, ethical history. In sum, these include (but are certainly not limited to) artifact analysis alongside other types of historical source, curating alongside writing as practice, sound empirical argumentation combined with theoretical agility and critique, self-reflexivity, an attention to narrative, and the question "who and what does what to whom and what?"

The Potential of Contemporary Design History

In order not to be crowded out by competing voices as they speak to power, contemporary historians must become more mindful of how they engage in public debate – in "high" and "low" politics. In short, the need for contemporary historians to interact with political power and with different publics has never been greater, but the conditions and the presuppositions for doing so have changed completely over the last half-century, if not the last ten years. (Palmowski and Spohr Readman 2011, p. 500)

In the public sphere, contemporary history has provided preservation of sources – documentation – as well as critical engagement with public memory: bringing historians' critical perspectives to create public narratives and trying to compile more accurate ones, for populations living with memories of those events. Contemporary design history might provide another perspective or method for participating in public decisions around shared futures, both as a form of history (Guldi and Armitage 2015) and as part of the project to employ "design thinking" or "design" within government, business, and communities (Bason 2016).

Contextualization and comparison offer two ways for doing this. Parallels drawn between Japan's "lost decade" and economic and demographic shifts in the UK and other economies render a study of Japan's 1990s through design relevant beyond Japan as well (Pilling 2014). While remembered as a painful time for many designers working at the time, understanding how individual designers and the industries more broadly reacted to change and crisis provides some explanation for conditions within Japan's design industries now. Additionally, it might provide useful comparisons for designers operating within conditions that – given climate change, an aging population, economic inequality, regional geopolitical tensions, and unresolved environmental, social, and economic issues resulting from the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake – remain equally, if not more, challenging today.

Contemporary design history can make a powerful contribution to public memory through record-making, in a practice that not only records historical conditions and their evidence but frames them within salient critique. The Victoria and Albert Museum's Rapid Response Collecting initiative performs this function in part by framing historical objects within "design." This act

endows often mass-produced, cheap, or anonymous objects with cultural capital while at the same time drawing on their approachability, a double act that intensifies attention and appeal. Similarly, Clive Dilnot has evocatively argued that visually engaging, intentional, but almost ephemeral slices of historical pasts inserted into contemporary urban fabric within memory sites such as Berlin might provoke critical engagement with troubled pasts and their legacy at a moment when they disappear from living memory (Dilnot 2015).

As both of the above examples indicate, contemporary design history's power derives in part from the media at its command. Palmowski and Spohr Readman characterize a key strand in postwar European contemporary history as "the construction of public memory and national self-understanding" (Palmowski and Spohr Readman 2011, p. 490). They cite historian Hans Rothfel's conviction that immediacy allowed historians to create empathy, and to use this empathy to educate audiences and impact decision-making. Most readily but not exclusively through exhibitions, contemporary design history can communicate in ways that do this, telling stories through the nature of what we research that activate empathy and in doing so indicate how design plays a role in construction of public memory, including narratives of past and present.

Such an understanding of contemporary design history's agency – whether positive, neutral, or negative – combines the historian's sense of moral responsibility with the designer's belief in design's potential to create change, within a more general critical activist stance provoked by a sense of urgency around social, economic, and political inequality and instability and the pace of environmental change. Palmowski and Spohr Readman write:

Arguably, the growth in popular demand for representations and evaluations of recent historical events makes it all the more necessary for contemporary historians to be heard. Precisely because governments and politicians can derive (and on occasion actively seek) historical legitimacy for their actions from other, non-professional sources much more easily, there is a continuing need for historians, with their ability to conceptualize and contextualize the present against the historical background, to engage with political power. (Palmowski and Spohr Readman 2011, p. 499)

At the same time, we must attend to the limits and contingency of such a critical stance. All history-making is political, and Christine Guth noted in 2013 that inequality extends to what can and cannot be said, depending on the context in which we practice: "We take for granted the freedom to be critical, even political, in our analyses. But our students may not" (Teasley 2014b). Criticality embodies a certain hubris and may not have the impact we hope, quantitatively or qualitatively.

Even within these limits, however, contemporary design history offers something if we agree with the charge of moral responsibility, whether as historians or as individuals. What design history brings, differently, is the compelling

nature of artifacts, an emphasis on everyday lived experience, and the reimagining of events, environments, and conditions that occurs when we see history as the accumulation of interactions between people and people, people and things, and things and things. Whether addressing the history of graphic design in 1990s Japan through interviews with prominent designers, co-design workshops, or personal recollections of writing HTML in a turquoise uniform with a floppy pussy bow, at its best contemporary design history could combine seeing as a designer – history as the experience of interfaces – with seeing as a historian – narratives of why and how, inquisitiveness, and fundamental dissatisfaction with received narratives, and a scientific concern to work from sources, whatever form they may take. Attending to the materiality of those encounters in relation to large historical factors, communicating the narratives that emerge from them through compelling, problem-posing means, and provoking awareness of interactions with the environment as constituting experience and building memory: these are only some of the ways in which design history might contribute, both as history and as design, to contemporary designs.

Acknowledgments

Research for this chapter was generously supported by an International Partnership and Mobility Scheme grant from the British Academy, and by the Royal College of Art and Tokyo Zokei University. Thanks are also due to Watabe Chiharu, Justine Boussard, Lauren Fried, Zara Arshad, all interviewees and discussion group participants in London and Tokyo, and colleagues, students, and external guests at workshops on contemporary design history in the V&A/RCA postgraduate program in History of Design, 2013–2017 and to Anne Massey for the encouragement to contribute this chapter.

Notes

- 1 “Contemporary history” as practiced in Europe developed largely after 1945, with particular care towards understanding the impact of World War II on subsequent nation-building and populations (Palmowski and Spohr Readman 2011, p. 487). This focus on postwar European political and social history, rather than a more expanded “history of the recent past,” made much published contemporary history less immediately relevant to work in contemporary design history than the common wording might suggest. The genre’s methodological concerns, types of evidence, and attentiveness to the formation of public memory and to history as subjective are, however, extremely relevant for contemporary design history in and of any geography.
- 2 Garton Ash draws the phrase “history of the present” from American diplomat George Kennan’s review of a previous book of Garton Ash’s (Garton Ash 2000).

- 3 All quotations from research project workshop participants are cited in the workshop reports, published as part of the project website. Citations here refer to that text; speakers are noted in in-text references but the chapter references provide the workshop reports, rather than listing the contribution of each panelist separately.
- 4 Employing only archival documents also avoided the danger of overly subjective interpretation due to proximity to historical events; somewhat tautologically, concerns around the contemporary contributed to privileging the archive, and working only with archives disallows most contemporary history.
- 5 Spohr Readman offers a related critique of “generational” contemporary history, noting that what is “within the lifetime of” one author will not be for another, indeed for many readers (Spohr Readman 2011, p. 523).

References

- Adamson, G. (2009). The case of the missing footstool: reading the absent object. In: *History and Material Culture* (ed. K. Harvey), 192–207. London: Routledge.
- Appadurai, A. (ed.) (1986). *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Barracough, G. (1964). *An Introduction to Contemporary History*. London: C.A. Watts.
- Bason, C. (2016). *Design for Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Bijker, W.E. (1995). *Of Bicycles, Bakelite and Bulbs: Toward a Theory of Sociotechnical Change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Design Commission (2013). *Restarting Britain 2: Design and Public Services*. London: Design Commission https://www.policyconnect.org.uk/sites/site_pc/files/report/492/fieldreportdownload/designcommission-restarting-britain2.pdf (accessed 27 August 2018).
- Design History of Now (2014). Design practice in Japan, 1990–2000. <http://historyofnow.rca.ac.uk/research/case-studies-japan/?sub=Design+Practice+in+Japan%2C+1990-2000%C2%A0> (accessed 3 March 2018).
- Designing with People (n.d.). Methods – design probe. <http://designingwithpeople.rca.ac.uk/methods/design-probe> (accessed 25 April 2018).
- Dilnot, C. (2015). History, design, futures: contending with what we have made. In: *Design and the Question of History* (eds. T. Fry, C. Dilnot, and S.C. Stewart), 131–272. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Dower, J.W. (1975). Occupied Japan as history and occupation Japan as history. *Journal of Asian Studies* XXXIV (2): 485–504.
- Duarte, S. (2014). Ferguson & the design dimension: exploring makeshift tear-gas masks on BBC Radio 4. *V&A Blog*, 26 November 2014. <https://www.vam.ac.uk/blog/disobedient-objects/ferguson-the-design-dimension-exploring-makeshift-tear-gas-masks-on-bbc-4> (accessed 7 April 2018).

- Edgerton, D. (2007). *The Shock of the Old: Technology and Global History since 1900*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fallan, K. (2010). *Design History: Understanding Theory and Method*. London: Berg Publishers.
- Fallan, K. and Jørgensen, F.A. (2017). Environmental histories of design: towards a new research agenda. *Journal of Design History* 30 (2): 103–121.
- Fallan, K. and Lees-Maffei, G. (2015). It's personal: subjectivity in design history. *Design and Culture* 7 (1): 5–27.
- Fischer, F. and Hiesinger, K.B. (eds.) (1995). *Japanese Design: A Survey Since 1950*. New York: Abrams.
- Fletcher, W.M. and von Staden, P. (eds.) (2014). *Japan's "Lost Decade": Causes, Legacies and Issues of Transformative Change*. London: Routledge.
- Flood, C. (2014). How to guide: a makeshift tear-gas mask. *The Design Dimension*, BBC Radio 4, 20 November 2014. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b04ps6py> (accessed 7 April 2018).
- Flood, C. and Grindon, G. (2014). Introduction. In: *Disobedient Objects* (eds. G. Grindon and C. Flood), 6–25. London: V&A Publishing.
- Fry, T., Dilnot, C., and Stewart, S.C. (2015). *Design and the Question of History*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Garton Ash, T. (2000). Introduction. *History of the Present: Essays, Sketches, and Dispatches from Europe in the 1990s*. <http://www.nytimes.com/books/first/a/ash-present.html> (accessed 3 March 2018).
- Gerteis, C. and George, T.S. (eds.) (2013). *Japan Since 1945: From Postwar to Post-Bubble*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Guldi, J. and Armitage, D. (2015). *The History Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hackney, F. (2013). Quiet activism and the new amateur: the power of home and hobby crafts. *Design and Culture* 5 (2): 169–193.
- Harvey, K. (ed.) (2009). *History and Material Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2007). Materials against materiality. *Archaeological Dialogues* 14 (1): 1–16.
- Insatsu Hakubutsukan (ed.) (2008). *1950-nendai Nihon no gurafikku dezain: dezainā tanjō*. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankokai.
- Jones, H., Ostberg, K., and Randeraad, N. (eds.) (2013). *Contemporary History on Trial: Europe Since 1989 and the Role of the Expert Historian*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Jones, J. (2017). "Pussyhat" acquired for rapid response collection. *V&A Blog*, 8 March 2017. <https://www.vam.ac.uk/blog/network/pussyhat-acquired-for-rapid-response-collection> (accessed 7 April 2018).
- Jørgensen, D., Jørgensen, F.A., and Pritchard, S. (2013). *New Natures: Joining Environmental History with Science and Technology Studies*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Julier, G. (2014). *The Culture of Design*, 3e. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.