

Making Futures V Edition Crafting a Sustainable Modernity (towards a maker aesthetics of production and consumption)

by Malcolm Ferris, curator of the international Making Futures research platform

Plymouth College of Art, UK

Introduction

It gives me enormous pleasure to introduce this, the fifth volume of the proceedings of the biennial international *Making Futures* conference, which took place in September 2017 at the magnificently located Mount Edgcombe country house, in what was our fourth visit to this site since the series began in 2009.ⁱ

2009 to 2017 represents five biennial conferences, making this a first decade anniversary edition, and thus amounting to a little over ten years of operations. This is indeed a long time in the hyper-fast changing academic environment of today. Therefore, I'd like to thank the Plymouth College of Art senior leadership, for their vision and perception in standing behind and supporting this long-standing series through these uncertain times. Their far-sightedness has been confirmed as with each edition the series appears ever more relevant to the contemporary moment. Indeed, the creative impulses driving *Making Futures* show no signs of losing their significance. In fact, quite the opposite. The times we now move in reveal the *Making Futures* agenda - to explore the potential of emerging maker ecologies as 'change agents' built around contemporary artists-craftspeople, makers and designers and neo-artisanal micro-entrepreneurs - to be more relevant with each event in our series.

What I want to do with this introduction to the 5th Journal edition is, first, say something about the 2017 *Crafting a Sustainable Modernity* theme. I will then briefly move on to say something on the related subject of crafting community and social making. This topic, while present in all of the *Making Futures* series, particularly came to the fore in many discussions surrounding the 2017 event. As such it is likely to form the principle theme of our 2019 international conference edition. Finally, I will return to, and end on the structure and logistics of the 2017 programme and this journal edition.

The 2017 Crafting a Sustainable Modernity theme ⁱⁱ

In making these introductions I always refer to the current edition as being in some ways more ambitious than the last. This is not hyperbole (nor, indeed, mere habit). For in marking this as an anniversary edition, I sincerely feel we have again taken a step forward. The '*Crafting a Sustainable Modernity, towards a maker aesthetics of production and consumption*' theme was indeed ambitious. The proposition underpinning it was that of reclaiming a renewed position for contemporary artists-craftspeople, makers and associated artisanal micro-entrepreneurs. One that doesn't turn away from our complex late-Modern condition, but see's these creative maker cultures as able to actively participate in the construction of a more progressive and sustainable future. A future which challenges the marginalization that these small-scale creative practices have seemingly suffered since the onset of the industrial factory system and the development of global systems of mass production and consumption.

In saying this, I am, of course, only too well aware of Modernity's dark side: the view of our current times as a sort of hiatus, a moment in which the actually existing socio-economic structures are seen by many to be failing. I refer here, of course, to the exploitative dimensions of industrial capitalism with its all too familiar litany of unfulfilling low wage work and the 'gig' economy, rising inequality, the erosion of community, and the longstanding environmental trashing of the planet, linked since the late 80's, to a particularly rapacious form of finance capitalism based upon, as Jason Moore puts it, the four Cheap Natures: cheap food; cheap energy; cheap raw materials; and cheap labour (including unpaid female reproductive labour) most of which Moore (and other commentators) view as now coming to an end.ⁱⁱⁱ

But through the *Crafting a Sustainable Modernity* theme, we wanted to take-up and reaffirm Modernity's more positive and responsible dimensions: the progressive aspects of the Enlightenment project of respect for individual rights, and the social principles that spring from these, of egalitarianism in terms of social, racial and gender identity, of universal access to shelter, education, healthcare, and not least, to productive work and life. To a Modernity that can be environmentally responsible and which deploys its technological knowledge and human capitals to work for a sustainable and resilient change which is embedded in, empowers, and contributes to community well-being and place-making. Clearly, this thought corresponds with a widespread and growing disenchantment with global mass consumption regimes and their environmentally destructive procedures, and a developing consumer desire to support the principles of a circular economy, and to buy ethically produced and/or locally sourced food and goods that support local resilience. In this respect *Making Futures* might be seen as a material culture analogue of local food and land rights movements, from the various southern Campesino associations, to networks like Terra Madre, to local farmers markets and shops that feature and celebrate locally grown produce.

And so, through *Crafting a Sustainable Modernity*, we seek to investigate the present conditions alluded to above, through the optic of contemporary craft and neo-artisanal maker movements in ways that aim to situate these movements as part of a forward-looking effort to re-imagine a viable late Modernity through a new emerging 'aesthetics' of production and consumption, rather than seeing them as constitutive of some idealised space 'outside' modernity that all too easily lapses into nostalgia or simply passes over the unethical. In saying this, we do not seek to deny the exploitative dimensions of much modern craft-based labour (one need only think of the serried rows of textile machinists locked into industrial scale sweat-shop production, or the precarious nature of much self-employed creative work), nor the phenomena of contemporary 'craft-wash' marketing with its ubiquitous 'craft' ales, foods and clothing. However, for reasons explored in previous essays^{iv}, large-scale factories based on mass production processes are becoming a liability in many fields. The emphasis is shifting to smaller-scale, flexible, customisable, and often batch-produced runs, or even one-off forms of making. These

thoughts oblige us, in turn, to recognise that we are not looking at a reading that posits craft on one side and industry on the other, but a spectrum of activities, including those in which post-Fordist regimes of small-scale artist-craftspeople, makers and micro-manufacturers are attempting to innovate around technology, form, function, aesthetic meaning *and* social relevance; exploring the potential for engaging in responsible (often place-based) social and economic activities which frequently strive to step outside the exploitative forms of human and non-human commodification associated with the 'disembedded' global markets resonant of neo-liberalism.

These points are illuminating on several counts. First, not least because there's that much-underplayed story of how high-level maker skills, the basis of much pre-industrial production, actually led and supported the development of industrial manufacturing, and is now, we argue, returning to play an ever-increasing important role in areas of social and industrial activity today. Secondly, this shift is mirrored in one characteristically defining (but still contested) vector of contemporary creative practice, that is the progressive detachment from medium specificity. This tendency of course varies from practitioner to practitioner within art, craft and maker circles. Nonetheless, the ideas that flow from these liminal zones where boundaries blur inform even those craft *métiers* rooted in disciplinary adherence to a narrow set of materials. Certainly, for example, many craft-based teaching programmes in the Western world have long since aligned themselves with fine art, and/or morphed into designer-maker courses. Some have adopted all three (fine art, craft-based medium specificity, and design-to-make) as flexible nodes within the triangular figure of a more open pedagogy. Again, *Making Futures* echoes these hybrid influences in the ways it presents and explores its agenda through the various and overlapping perspectives of artists, crafts-people, fab-style work-shoppers, designer-makers, industrial modellers, etc., viewing all as parts of a relational field rather than totally distinct points of endeavour.

It is this 'spectrum of activities' that the papers in this volume both exemplify and explore, engaging with what it means 'to make' and its future significations - personally, socially, politically... its impact on sustainable agendas, its potential to subvert mass consumption, its relation to new technologies, its contribution to community and 'place-making', and to the possible emergence of new political economies. In short, the idea of a sustainable late Modernity that can embrace small-scale producers as an urgent and progressive project in its own right.

Clearly, there is a craft utopian strand at work here that underpins the imaginative impulse behind *Making Futures*. But this is certainly no backward glance to some imagined pre-modern idyll. Rather, as the title '*Crafting a Sustainable Modernity*' implies, it is a forward-looking utopianism in the best inspirational and aspirational senses of the word. One that looks to a future replete with real possibilities rather than to an idealised past which must necessarily give way to false disappointment. Moreover, we understand that progressive change will not occur as one big solitary leap forward, and neither, of course, can small-scale maker enterprises solve all our problems. Speaking for myself, social improvement will always be connected with the mobilization of large-scale governmental (and, *inter-governmental*) resources as the necessary building blocks of a progressive society - in clean energy, healthcare, education and welfare, as well as security and the rule of law.

But as someone once put it, if Governments do top-down, we, the artists, makers, and designers, do bottom-up... and this then, is what '*Making Futures, Crafting a Sustainable Modernity*' exemplifies, a manifesto for innovating artists, craftspeople, makers and designers who are responding to the challenges we face. A platform to draw attention to, to document, to share and explore the thinking and doing that our contributors represent, with their practice-based projects and research; a multitude of co-existing experiments and creative solutions, that seed the future and collectively contribute to a vision of what a viable late-Modernity might look like.

Looking forward: on Community (or Crafting Social Worlds & Social Making)

Community, in its many varied senses, it at the heart of the *Crafting a Sustainable Modernity* theme, and indeed the wider *Making Futures* enterprise. Indeed, one of the main issues to emerge from the *Crafting a Sustainable Modernity* conference, was a concern to look beyond the circumstances of makers as singular creative agents, and to explore the movement, and pooling, of individual maker practices into socially embedded creative enterprises capable of establishing more constructive community-based circuits of engagement, production and consumption.

Community is typically understood, particularly in its political connotations, as a group bounded by common interests, or a common fate, with both real and imagined characteristics, sometimes freely entered into, sometimes imposed. A subject participates in and contributes to, perhaps even makes sacrifices for, the community in order to be bestowed with its sense of identity and belonging, purpose and even protection. However, this notion of community necessarily draws a boundary inside of which there is a 'we' or 'us' who belong, and beyond which there resides a 'you' or 'other' which is outside.^v Indeed, the current global wave of populist politics, with its turn to a militant nationalist sentiment, can be seen as an outcome of the widespread sense of social destruction wrought by economic globalization, especially since the crash of 2008. It generally tends, of course, to an understanding of community that is, fundamentally, rooted in an 'us' and 'them'.

Against this more common understanding, Roberto Esposito famously seeks to develop a broader, more radically open, conception of community.^{vi} In his (to me, secular theological) interpretation, developed through a close etymological reading of 'co' (as with, alongside, in support of) and 'munitas' (as common, service, obligation, gift) community is understood as nothing more or less than our common fellowship in finitude, with the idea that this finitude can only be endured, and perhaps to that extent at least, overcome, through an acceptance of (or form of love) that simultaneously recognizes the impossibility of overcoming this finitude with the unavoidable necessity to live a shared life within its shadow. In this reading community is a mutuality or reciprocity of necessary giving, a gift that in fact *must* be given, in the face of a common understanding of our non-belonging.

"Neither is community to be interpreted as a mutual, intersubjective "recognition" in which individuals are reflected in each other so as to confirm their initial identity; as a collective bond that comes at a certain point to connect individuals that before were separate." Community is found in the subject's "...exposure to what interrupts the closing..." "...the breach, the trauma, the lacuna out of which we originate". (Esposito, pages 7-8).

These philosophical renderings of community might seem far removed from the practicalities that artists, craftspeople and designer-makers might engage in when initiating, or participating in, community-based initiatives. But is that really the case? Of course, recent practices in art, making and design, have sought to engage in the making of social relations through encounters, gatherings and events. These are often staged as localized therapeutic interventions that seek to remake communities that have been marginalised, undermined or shattered even, (for example) by the policies of neo-liberal market economics. Certainly, while we can probably think of many examples that tend to better fit with the first model of a bounded 'inside' and 'outside', it seems to me that some artist's projects are much closer in spirit to Esposito's notion of community.

In truth, probably each project must be judged according to its own merits. What we can perhaps agree, however, is that at the heart of crafts claim to support community is the event of making, an experience I have previously explored under the title of *'Crafts Theatre of Becoming'* as an immersive encounter with material that is fundamentally embodied, performative and time based.^{vii} Often constituting a liminal space that has the potential to generate processes of alterity, identity formation and becoming. These processes (of subjectivity formation) emerge in moments of intense concentration, the "being in the zone" often characterized by

rhythmically structured procedures that orchestrate movement forwards and backwards between self and matter, between subject and object, the two occasionally blurring to the point where momentarily, polarities fuse and material becomes maker and maker becomes material, where object determines subject. This *'Theatre of Becoming'* is sometimes charged with the energy of the idea (as much as the actual experience) of this transformative encounter and its potential as a "freedom to" that binds it to concepts of affirmative agency and intentionality, integrity, identity of self and identification with 'the community' of makers, to particular configurations of space and place, and to notions of localism and the wider communal good. In doing so, these significations bring the non-instrumental "freedom to" into the social-political dimension of a "freedom from". And it is at this point that subjective experience (imagined or real) crosses into from the subjective 'I' into the objective 'we', or the world of systemic social experience and the contested terrain of crafts political, social and ethical claims. This *'Theatre of Becoming'* then, becomes at least one significant way to understand crafts broader purchase on the idea of community.

Nor should we forget here the ways in which *Making Futures* itself is constituted through a plurality of different cultures of making, or what might be thought of as various tribal sub-groupings, (the bounded communities typified by a within and without?) Yet in *Making Futures* they come together as a broader fellowship, and with the resources of this broad collective behind it, *Making Futures* is empowered to explore its topics from the perspectives of various overlapping creative alignments: arts based, crafts-based, design-led making, making as aesthetic enquiry or making as social intervention. Projects geared around the private spaces of domestic DIY, or the public spaces of the commodity form. All exist, within *Making Futures*, as parts of a relational field. And in the way *Making Futures* traverses back and forth across this field and its many unseen boundaries, we perhaps not only change (or 'broaden' might be a better term) our understandings of contemporary maker cultures, but also, as noticed, reconfigure our sense of what contemporary industry might be too. Because when all's said and done concerning the various tribal groupings brought together through *Making Futures*, we not only respect difference and what separates, but as a broader community we also share in the idea of a 'critical making' that can serve a progressive future. Critical making being used in this context to reflexively frame contemporary practice within a wider socially progressive horizon of what our ways life, collectively and individually, might become. In this sense, we appreciate what is common and what we can learn through our overlapping interests, and how together we might help forge a shared vision of what a viable progressive practice might mean.

Making Futures VI (2019) will develop and explore these issues of community further, investigating the social dimensions and impacts of creative maker practices and how these can positively contribute to the construction and regeneration of communities. Or, put another way, as well as exploring how making produces value through the production of material objects, we will use 2019 to also investigate the social dimensions of making as practices capable of producing value by enhancing the development of progressive social groups that can, and often do, traverse age, gender, ethnicity, and health barriers, be they producers or consumers

Remarks on the Structure and Logistics of the 2017 Event

Finally, I will now return to, and end on, matters around the planning and execution of the 2017 programme in relation to this current journal edition.

In response to the unprecedented interest in the *Crafting a Sustainable Modernity: towards a maker aesthetics of production and consumption* theme, we structured delegate contributions to the edition through an expanded conference programme built around eight parallel sessions (three Workshops and five Thematic Sessions) interposed with five plenary Keynote interventions. In addition, we ran one major performance-based exhibition, alongside two smaller events (see entries below). The papers collated in this volume are organized and presented under whichever of these elements they originally appeared in. Note however, that Workshop and Thematic

Session delegate papers are lodged in alphabetical order and not in the original conference running orders in which they were originally presented.

Keynotes:

The five plenary Keynote interventions dividing the Workshops and Thematic Sessions were, in order of appearance: the craft historian and curator, Glenn Adamson, Senior Scholar, Yale Center for British Art, USA and author of, amongst many other significant titles, the impressively important *"The Invention of Craft"* which provided the historical context for our *'Crafting a Sustainable Modernity'* theme. Anthony Tovey, an industrial sculptor who has spent his career as a highly skilled and in-demand clay model-maker working in automotive design studios from Longbridge to Torquay to Turin to Tehran, and on projects from an onion dome for a mosque to a Porsche Boxster. (Anthony appeared in discussion with Peter Oakley from the Royal College of Art). Katie Schwab, an artist whose practice interweaves personal, social, and craft-based histories, often drawing from traditions of living, making and working collectively. Sarah Mann, Director of Architecture Design Fashion at the British Council, who explored the critical position of women in the many modernities being forged outside the blueprint of the 'typical' Western model, and roles they might assume as leaders of progressive change through craft. Bastian Lange, Founder of Multiplicities-Berlin, an urban and economic geographer specialising in the creative industries, who explored collaborative maker communities as an expression of creative micro-entrepreneurs and small-scale designer-makers.

The Three Workshops:

The *'Crafting in Industry'* Workshop was convened by Peter Oakley, Senior Tutor (Research) at the Royal College of Art, alongside Rod Bamford, who at the time was Head of Programme for Ceramics and Glass, at the Royal College of Art. *'The Well Maker Space'* Workshop was convened by Nick Gant, co-founder of Community21.org, alongside Fiona Hackney from the University of Wolverhampton and Katie Jane-Hill. The *'Making Leaders: Curating Maker Cultures'* Workshop was convened by Paul Harper, South West representative for CraftNet, an independent network that promotes leadership and strategic development for contemporary craft, and Alice Kettle, Professor of Textile Arts at Manchester Metropolitan University. Each Workshop is introduced in this journal according to its original thematic outline, followed by the participants who have submitted to this journal.

The Five Thematic Sessions:

'Translations Across Local-Global Divides', was chaired by Guy Julier, The Victoria & Albert Museum Principal Research Fellow in Contemporary Design and Professor of Design Culture, University of Brighton, UK. *'Making Thinking: Crafting Education'*, was chaired by Emma Smetham from Plymouth College of Art. *'Lifecycles of Material Worlds'*, was chaired by Paul Singleton from Plymouth College of Art. *'Craft in an Expanded Field'*, was chaired by Tim Bolton from Plymouth College of Art. *'Procedures of Making: Materials & Processes in Transformation'*, was chaired by Jason Marks from Plymouth College of Art. Again, each Thematic Session is introduced according to its original thematic outline, followed by the participants who have submitted to this journal.

The 2017 Conference Exhibitions & Installations:

The main conference exhibition featured the master Korean ceramicist, Kanghyo Lee, who during the days leading up to the conference, constructed one of his signature large-scale coiled *Onggi* vessels at the front of Mount Edgcumbe house. In Korean culture *Onggi* is one of the oldest forms of ceramic ware, but still in use as a popular storage vessel by all classes for holding fermented food. During the vessels construction, Kanghyo Lee worked with children from several local schools, including children from the Plymouth School of Creative Arts

that we, Plymouth College of Art, established in one of the poorest wards of the city operating under a “*learning through making*” philosophy that is already producing transformative results. His building continued through the first day of the conference and ended on Thursday evening with a live *Buncheon* (literally meaning to ‘cover the surface’) slip decorating performance for *Making Futures* delegates and members of the general public alike. See the video of this performance on the Kanghyo Lee page in this journal, along with an essay on Kanghyo Lee’s work by the respected Korean curator, Jungwon Park.

Plymouth City Museum and Art Gallery also deserves a special mention here for its continuing partnership support in working with us to bring Kanghyo Lee to *Making Futures*. I would also like to acknowledge the support of Arts Council England in helping to make this event happen.

Two other events deserve mentioning, but are not, unfortunately, represented in this journal. First, our colleagues from the Royal College of Art set up a pop-up working show in the main hall of Mount Edgcumbe House relating to the ‘*Crafting in Industry*’ workshop. This featured ceramic printing using digital laser print technology, the result being much more complex images than could be achieved using traditional transfer or screen print methods. Second, Jenn Reid, who researches 19th century English industrial weaver ballads and compares them with contemporary East Asian weaver songs, and who presented her work in the ‘*Translations Across Local-Global Divides*’ session, kindly agreed to additionally stage a short performance for all *Making Futures* delegates that included singing the ballads (with clog dancing!) during an interval at the conference meal. It was an effort that not only demonstrated her practice-based approach to this research, but was sincerely appreciated by the *Making Futures* delegates.

Clearly, the three Workshops and five Thematic Sessions that made up the *Crafting a Sustainable Modernity* theme deeply resonated with the wider art, craft and designer community. All were heavily oversubscribed following the three calls, with abstracts received from across the UK, Europe, the Americas, and the Asia-Pacific regions. This growing international awareness is also confirmed through the enquiries we receive to this, the on-line journal. It represents an important turn for *Making Futures* because through it a much-needed transnational community of practice-based researchers is emerging that can share and critically interrogate the themes from cross-cultural perspectives.

Given the restrictions placed on conference delegate numbers it was inevitable that, as in previous years, many good proposals could not, finally, be accommodated within the programme. But as I have said before, this meant that the delegate speakers who were able to attend and present, and who have contributed to this journal, can be justifiably proud of their efforts. In this respect, I would also like to acknowledge the support of the Devon Guild of Craftsmen, Plymouth Culture Board, and Plymouth College of Art, for the *Making Futures* bursary scheme that supported over 13 independent makers to attend and present who otherwise would have been able to attend. Indeed, of the 153 plus delegates in attendance, the majority, at least 101 (and this does not include the contributions made by the main conference chairpersons or Thematic Session chairs) were directly involved as presenters in one form or another. Of these, 60 have contributed papers to the present volume - an outstanding number of submissions by any account. This range of contributions is significant to the identity and character of *Making Futures* in the way it reinforces both the critical scope and depth of the field we cover, a position further explored below.

The Analogue/Digital Craft Relationship

Seasoned *Making Futures* delegates might notice that for the first time the 2017 edition did not include a session dedicated to exploration of the analogue/digital craft relationship. This is not due to a lack of interest in the issue. Indeed, a strong feature of the call response was the large number of proposals touching upon this area.

However, having noted in the previous 2015 edition how many authors interested in this theme did not, in fact, opt for our workshop dedicated to the topic, but preferred to disperse themselves amongst other sessions, we decided against such a singular interpretation of the digital-maker issue, recognizing that digital design and fabrication systems have become embedded into (many) work-practices to the point at which they are no longer especially unique. Furthermore, that many participants appeared to have moved on from discussing the issue as a stand-alone topic, but preferred to approach it through a particular thematic perspective. As such, the use of digital technologies surfaces in the majority of our thematic sessions.

Yet, by the same token, the large number of submissions broaching the topic indicates that the analogue/digital craft relationship still remains a site of critical discussion and exploration. Moreover, the field itself is still rapidly changing. Multiple distributed design and manufacturing systems have developed as digital technologies such as online file sharing, cloud computing, standardised geometric data modelling and open source programming languages have emerged and matured. These are scalable, both in terms of geographical nodes, technological and social practice and material production. The inherent flexibility of these nodes and modes of design and production separate them from larger industrial systems that tend to operate at bigger scales and (arguably) with less dexterity. Therefore, in the next 2019 edition of *Making Futures*, we will most likely return with a thematic session dedicated to the analogue/digital craft relationship, but with a particular focus on digital platforms and how they are being used to aggregate and support communities dedicated to collaborative design and problem-solving, as well as distributed micro-manufacturing techniques that often blend with analogue making processes.

A note on the technical and economic future of the Journal

With many academic journals increasingly appearing behind pay walls, I am proud also to reaffirm the commitment to free Open Access that *Making Futures* has pledged to maintain since its first edition. The five-volume archive now holds over 274 entries on craft and maker enterprises investigating the themes the *Making Futures* community is exploring, establishing it as a unique and valuable research resource for anyone interested in these topics. However, to ensure its future technical and economic resilience and viability, we are currently migrating the Journal and the archive to a new and more technologically secure environment. *Making Futures* is, of course, an initiative of Plymouth College of Art, and this move consists of transferring contents from an externally managed service provider to an internal system based on the Plymouth College of Art website itself. This means the current Journal edition will appear as part of this website for the present time. However, we view this as a temporary measure which will be replaced with a more stand-alone journal interface, albeit one that still reflects the Plymouth College of Art identity.

Conclusion

To conclude, with 10 years behind us, and this, our fifth journal edition, *Making Futures* is making an ever-stronger contribution to our understanding and promotion of contemporary maker cultures. Needless to say, preparations are well under way for the sixth edition of *Making Futures* which will take place in September, 2019. We look forward to continuing the good work of exploring with colleagues and community our common future in, and through, making.

Malcolm Ferris
Curator of the International *Making Futures* Research Platform

Endnotes

ⁱ I should make it clear that the ideas and positions explored in this paper represent my opinions only, and any errors or omissions are mine alone.

ⁱⁱ Elements of this recounting of the 2017 ‘*Crafting a Sustainable Modernity*’ theme first appeared in previous writings and verbal presentations. See, for example, the editor’s introduction to, Malcolm Ferris, (ed), *Making Futures 2015: Craft and the return of the maker in a post-global sustainably aware society*. Vol 4. ISSN 2042-1664. Available at: <http://makingfutures.plymouthart.ac.uk/2015/journal-home/>
Also, in extracts from my printed introduction to the abstracts booklet of the 2017 international conference ‘*Making Futures V: Crafting a Sustainable Modernity, towards a maker aesthetics of production and consumption*’, and in my notes to my introduction to that event.

ⁱⁱⁱ See, for example, Moore Jason W. ‘*Capitalism in the Web of Life, Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*’. Verso, 2015. Note especially, ‘Part IV, *The Rise and Demise of Cheap Nature*’. (pp 221-241).

^{iv} See ii above, and the editor’s introduction to, Malcolm Ferris, (ed), *Making Futures 2013: Interfaces Between Craft Knowledge and Design: New Opportunities for Social Innovation and Sustainable Practice*. Vol 3. ISSN 2042-1664. Available at: <http://makingfutures.plymouthart.ac.uk/2013/journal-home/>

^v Tanesini Alessandra. ‘*In Search of Community: Mouffe, Wittgenstein and Cavell*.’ *Radical Philosophy* 110, November/December 2001.

^{vi} Esposito, Roberto. ‘*Communitas: The Origin and Destiny of Community*’. Stanford University Press, 2010.

^{vii} See the editor’s introduction to, Malcolm Ferris, (ed), *Making Futures 2011: The Crafts as Change-maker in Sustainably Aware Cultures*. Vol 2. ISSN 2042-1664. Available at: <http://makingfutures.plymouthart.ac.uk/2011/journal-home/>