Part I

Time

1

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" a esthetic (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, archeology, 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

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.

Barraclough, 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://des(igning withpeople.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.

Kimbell, L. (2012). Rethinking design thinking: part II. *Design and Culture* 4 (2): 129–148.

Kline, R.R. and Pinch, T.J. (1996). Users as agents of technological change: the social construction of the automobile in the rural United States. *Technology and Culture* 37 (4): 763–795.

Latour, B. (1992). Where are the missing masses? The sociology of a few mundane artifacts. In: *Shaping Technology/Building Society: Studies in Sociotechnical Change* (eds. W.E. Bijker and J. Law), 225–258. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Law, J. and Callon, M. (1992). The life and death of an aircraft: a network analysis of technical change. In: *Shaping Technology/Building Society: Studies in Sociotechnical Change* (ed. W.J. Bijker and J. Law), 21–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

LeCain, T.J. (2017). *The Matter of History: How Things Create the Past*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lees-Maffei, G. (2009). The production-consumption-mediation paradigm. *Journal of Design History* 22 (4): 351–376.

Manzini, E. 2015. *Design, When Everyone Designs: An Introduction to Design for Social Innovation*, (trans. R. Coad). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Margolin, V. (2002). *The Politics of the Artificial: Essays on Design and Design Studies*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Matanle, P. (2003). *Restructuring Japanese Business in a Global Era*. New York: Routledge Curzon.

McBride, I. (2011). The Shadow of the gunman: Irish historians and the IRA. *Journal of Contemporary History* 46 (3): 686–710.

Miller, D. (2015). *The Comfort of Things*. Cambridge: Polity.

Mitchell, T. (2013). *Carbon Democracy: Political Power in the Age of Oil*. London: Verso.

Ogasawara, Y. (1998). *Office Ladies and Salaried Men: Power, Gender, and Work in Japanese Companies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Palmowski, J. and Readman, K.S. (2011). Speaking truth to power: contemporary history in the twenty-first century. *Journal of Contemporary History* 46 (3): 485–505.

Parr, J. (1999). *Domestic Goods: The Material, the Moral, and the Economic in the Postwar Years*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Pilling, D. (2014). *Bending Adversity: Japan and the Art of Survival*. London: Allen Lane.

Pritchard, S.B. (2011). *Confluence: The Nature of Technology and the Remaking of the Rhône*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Riello, G. (2009). Things that shape history: material culture and historical narratives. In: *History and Material Culture* (ed. K. Harvey), 24–47. London: Routledge.

Schultz, T., Abdulla, D., Ansari, A. et al. (eds.) (2018). Editors' introduction. *Design and Culture* 10 (6): 1.

Simon, H.A. (1996). *The Sciences of the Artificial*, 3e. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Spohr Readman, K. (2011). Contemporary history in Europe: from mastering national pasts to the future of writing the world. *Journal of Contemporary History* 46 (3): 506–530.

Teasley, S. (2014a). The dangers and delights of contemporary design history, part 1. *Design History of Now: Addressing the Contemporary in Research and Practice*, 15 December 2014. http://historyofnow.rca.ac.uk/london-professional-consultations-key-finds (accessed 7 March 2018).

Teasley, S. (2014b). The dangers and delights of contemporary design history, part 2. *Design History of Now: Addressing the Contemporary in Research and Practice*, 15 December 2014. http://historyofnow.rca.ac.uk/the-dangers-and-delights-of-contemporary-design-history-part-2 (accessed 7 March 2018).

Teasley, S. (2014c). The dangers and delights of contemporary design history, part 3. *Design History of Now: Addressing the Contemporary in Research and Practice*, 15 December 2014. http://historyofnow.rca.ac.uk/the-dangers-and-delights-of-contemporary-design-history-part-3 (accessed 7 March 2018).

The Design Museum (2018). Beazley designs of the year. https://designmuseum.org/exhibitions/beazley-designs-of-the-year (accessed 25 April 2018).

Tilley, C.Y. (2004). *The Materiality of Stone: Explorations in Landscape Phenomenology*. Oxford: Berg.

Traganou, J. (2016). Wall Street bounded and unbinding: the spatial as a multifocal lens in design studies. In: *The Routledge Companion to Design Studies* (eds. P. Sparke and F. Fisher), 29–39. Basingstoke: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Victoria and Albert Museum (2016). Disobedient objects: how-to guides. www.vam.ac.uk/content/exhibitions/disobedient-objects/how-to-guides (accessed 7 April 2018).

Victoria and Albert Museum (2018). Rapid response collecting. https://www.vam.ac.uk/collections/rapid-response-collecting (accessed 25 April 2018).

Walker, J.A. (1989). *Design History and the History of Design*. London: Pluto Press.

Watabe, C. (2014a). Nothing interesting happened in the 1990s? It depends who you were. *Design History of Now: Addressing the Contemporary in Research and Practice*, 10 December 2014. http://historyofnow.rca.ac.uk/nothing-interesting-happened-in-the-1990s-it-depends-who-you-were (accessed 7 March 2018).

Watabe, C. (2014b). Project seminar at the RCA, 1: How can journalists and academic historians work together? *Design History of Now: Addressing the Contemporary in Research and Practice*, 10 December 2014. http://historyofnow.rca.ac.uk/project-seminar-at-the-rca-1-how-can-journalists-and-academic-historians-work-together (accessed 7 March 2018).

Yoda, T. and Harootunian, H.D. (2006). *Japan after Japan: Social and Cultural Life from the Recessionary 1990s to the Present*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.