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Mobility is an arena in which design has exerted a strong but often overlooked influence; affording particular forms of mobility whilst limiting others. As designers seek to ensure the efficient movement of people and goods, so too they are implicated in the facilitation of social and civic goals (Knox, 2011:101), whether consciously or otherwise. As gatekeepers, designers both afford and limit alternative visions of and possibilities for movement. In *Mobilising design*, we have sought to tease out the intersections and connections between different registers, scales, and categories of mobility in order to understand how particular places, identities and artefacts are made up. In this conclusion, we identify a range of themes that signpost both the collective contribution of chapters and avenues for further enquiry and exploration. We consider the effects of movement on design as unfinished accomplishments; the role of design techniques and practice in the process of conceiving the mobile subject; and the disciplining effects of design on the mobile subject. The final section highlights the importance of understanding designed objects and designers as moral and political actors.

**Unfinished accomplishments**

The first theme we wish to highlight is the idea of both mobility and design as unfinished accomplishments. It is all too easy to see ways of moving and design processes as fixed and unchanging. Chapters in this collection speak to a post-structuralist understanding of these practices as uncertain and becoming. Design is shown to be a process shaped by the boundary crossing and connective movements of practitioners and materials. In contributions from Thomas Birtchnell, John Urry and Justin Westgate; Kim Kullman; and Philip Pinch and Suzanne Reimer, design emerges as a practice that is ‘unmoored,’ heterogeneous and much less emplaced than perhaps it once was. As indicated in chapters by Margo Annemans, Chantal Van Audenhove, Hilde Vermolen and Ann Heylighen; and Jayne Jeffries and Peter Wright, design practice can be resistant to change. Yet design practice is also transformed through movement, as we see in contributions from Kim Kullman and Craig Martin. Peter Cox’s chapter demonstrates how meanings of design are changed as they are inserted into different worlds of sense-making and varying social and political contexts.

Similarly, the practices and subjects of mobility are seen to be shaped through more or less relational encounters between designers and users. As chapters by Anna Nikolaeva and Simon Cook demonstrate, spaces are conceived to discipline bodies to particular modes of comportment, yet the resulting spaces may semiotically define appropriate movement in ways that conflict with material design affordances in unintended ways. As Ole B. Jensen, Ditte Bendix Lanng and Simon Wind’s chapter reveals, the relation between the lived and conceived becomes less the product of a linear and bounded process and more the product of constant flows.

**Techniques and practices of design**

Secondly, contributors to *Mobilising design* demonstrate a variety of design techniques and practices that are more or less open to embodying multiplicity, flexibility and “vagueness” (Miller 2006), in turn demonstrating different political orientations. Margo Annemans and colleagues; Emily Falconer; Lesley Murray and Susan Robertson; and Jayne Jeffries and Peter Wright all foreground the methodological and analytical underpinnings of design in capturing, analysing and representing mobility. What these authors emphasise is the varying distance created between lived and conceived through the use of particular techniques such as mobile ethnographies, drawing or video-recording. By asking how different design professionals understand others and become more or less porous to other ways of knowing and doing, these authors raise interesting questions regarding the politics of design in knowing ‘the other’. By exploring the relationship between bodies and techniques, these authors collectively excavate the political implications of uncertain relationships where differing intensities of power accrue in some places and not others.

**Calculation, discipline and embodiment**

Foregrounding the moral and political dimensions of design invites us to engage with broader debates around how bodies are disciplined through design. Contemporary governmentality relies on the regulation of everyday conduct, and in particular modes of self-regulation that increasingly produce the individual as a calculating, self-interested actor (Ganti 2014: 95). Guy Julier engages with this debate in relation to design, arguing that designed objects such as the games console construct a micro-practice and calculative mode of being where progress is ‘measured out’. Similarly, in their discussion of designing London’s pedestrian sign system, Spencer Clark, Philip Pinch and Suzanne Reimer highlight the fact that the pedestrian is produced as a calculating and rational actor whether conceived of as a commuter or tourist; while Martin Emanuel’s chapter considers the disciplining effect of traffic lights on both drivers and pedestrians in interwar Stockholm. In relation to car design, Lino Vital García-Verdugo discusses the closure of other ways of moving and relating due to the self-regarding focus of commercial vehicle designers. For Vital, the body and vehicle are positioned in relation to other bodies and spaces rather than in a unilinear relation to themselves. All of these accounts hint at the production of the calculating mobile subject by affording some things and proscribing others. Building upon this work, we argue that it would be helpful to connect themes of calculation, discipline and embodiment more explicitly in future work.

**Morality and politics**

*Mobilising design* has built upon understandings of designed objects and designers as moral and political actors (Latour 2002; Spinney et al 2015; Verbeek 2011). As many chapters have attested, design is fundamentally a process of distilling and reducing: it is an inherently political process concerned with shaping what is and what is not important. Design filters and fixes a precise ideology out of a ‘vague’ set of everyday practices:

representations by their nature are precise, and it is this act of precision that works against the vagueness and ambiguity of the world and, therefore, the openness of social life. It is in that movement from vagueness to precision where power relations are enacted (Miller 2006, 464).

Within moments of transformation, power is enacted because it fixes identities and movements through defining what is appropriate. Which groups are allowed to define those aspects of the lived that are included in the conceived, therefore, can be highly problematic.

Accordingly, chapters in this book have built upon the ways in which mobility informs morality by design. Verbeek amongst others (2011, 21) has argued for the inclusion of artefacts and technologies in the shaping of everyday moral agency. Moral acts, he goes on to argue, depend on the ways in which human and nonhuman mediators are “integrally connected” (Verbeek 2011, 38). The contributors to *Mobilising design* have invited us to see moral agency as shaped by and distributed across socio-technical systems that encompass users, designers, mediums and objects. In so doing, the book argues that opening up design in relation to the production of mobile practices and subjects enables a more complete understanding of morality as the product of connections and disconnections. Seeing morality as an ongoing process of connection opens up a ‘‘research programme […] focused on all the mechanisms and material mediations that make these [moral] affections, and the entanglements they reveal, visible and perceptible by the actors themselves’’ (Callon and Rabeharisoa 2004, 17). Here a designed object or project becomes more a ‘complex ecology’ than a ‘static object’ (Yaneva 2012, 93). Politics and morality are shaped by bringing mobility and design together.
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