# Who designs the designer? An anticolonial response to the world that design us back

Eduardo A. B. M. Souza[a], Carmem Saito[b], Frederick M. C. van Amstel[c], Rodrigo Freese Gonzatto[d]

[a]Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia de Pernambuco

[b]Loughborough University London

[c]Federal University of Technology – Paraná

[d]Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná

*Corresponding author e-mail: eduardosouza@recife.ifpe.edu.br

https://doi.org/10.21606/drs.2026.2410

**Abstract**: The ontological aspect of designing is commonly defined as a feedforward loop between the world and the designer, as if the world designed us as much as we design it. In this definition, derived from the "everyone is a designer" motto, "everyone" means "we," but also "no one". Thus, design philosophy avoids scrutinizing worldly agents interested in designing the designer, understanding the world as a homogeneous force reacting to the designer. A world where many worlds fit isn't a homogeneous one; therefore, answering "who designs the designer?" from an anticolonial stance requires considering the social production of design(ed) bodies and their historical inequalities in world-making. This paper builds upon Vieira Pinto's question "who produces the producer", and recent research on userism that asks "who gets to design/to be designed". Thus, this research unveils the worldly dispute for sustaining and dismantling the coloniality of making, including the production of design philosophy.

**Keywords:** ontological designing; design philosophy; pluriversal design; design education.

## 1. Introduction

In 2023, Brazilian Minister of Environment and Climate Change Marina Silva met with US Secretary of State John Kerry. The US representative said: "we expect to see a renewal of the commitment to this extraordinary treasure [the Amazon] that belongs to everybody." Marina Silva corrected him, saying that while John Kerry might think that way, she defends that Brazil has national sovereignty and the right to determine how to care for its part of the Amazon (Prates, 2023). Her ministry was willing to accept help from the United States, provided that no self-determination was lost in that partnership.

In this short vignette, Marina Silva provides a clear example of what Álvaro Vieira Pinto's (2020; 2005) had argued in his philosophy of *técnica*[1] (from here on translated as technique). That the centers of capitalist development, those now referred to as the Global North, hinder other nations' techniques to impose their own and maintain the metropolis-colonies relations by economic means. In other words, the above US Secretary of State declaration reproduces the view of the Amazon forest that reenacts histories of international development aid, technical cooperation, and colonialism. As if the obvious path for oppressed nations would be to import the technologies as "gifts from gods", in Vieira Pinto's words. As he defended, the long-term effects of this functioning were the domestication of the former colonies' future. By making these nations, now recognized as Global South, wait passively for "innovations" coming from the centers of capitalism, they would not see themselves as participating in the same existential time, but in the past of another's past (Van Amstel & Gonzatto, 2021; Saito et al., 2023; Vieira Pinto 2005).

For Vieira Pinto and Marina Silva, the Amazon forest is not a "natural" space, as in devoid of human inhabitants and practices, but a politicized and technical human space like any other. Indeed, evidence from ethnographic and ethnohistoric studies has found that many species found in the Amazon Basin were selected by human techniques throughout, at least, 13,000 years (Roosevelt, 2013). This means that underdeveloped[2] countries like Brazil need to be respected internationally for their technical sovereignty, if we are to sustain a democratic world order. Declarations such as those made by the US Secretary of State explicit that those colonial relations have not vanished, but have found other ways of being maintained, which demonstrates that categories employed by philosophers such as Vieira Pinto are obsolete, that nations still compete for markets and that resistance should be thought of in the sphere of countries.

Building on Vieira Pinto's philosophy of technique, and proposing a critical response in dialogue with the Latin American Modernity/Coloniality Group, we have developed the concept of the coloniality of making to account for this phenomenon and look at its implications for design research (Van Amstel, 2023) and design philosophy (Van Amstel et al.,

---

[1] In Portuguese, *técnica* could refer both to skill or technology. Following Jerónimo (2023), we shall employ technique as its translation, as we will refer to technology in its broadest sense: not just as state-of-the-art devices or findings, but as any interface humans deploy to interact with their surroundings.
[2] While contested in favour of more commonly used "Global North/Global South" we employ the terminology Developed/Undeveloped as it is conceptually a better fit when engaging with Vieira Pinto's work. We believe it to be more precise in politicising the relational and historical positions produced through the process of colonial metropolitan development.

2026). The coloniality of making affects production, circulation, consumption, and use of artifacts and techniques because the making of developed worlds depends on the (un)making of the underdeveloped world. Yet, this dependence is denied and inverted as an advantage for the developed (Vieira Pinto, 2020). In the dominant development paradigm, former metropolises constantly update their technological standards to maintain an unassailable competitive edge, so that the underdeveloped always appear "outdated". Simultaneously, underdeveloped nations are condemned by the unmaking of sacred mountains, rivers, or reserves of any material needed to pursue this production and development model in the so-called underdeveloped world. This also obscures a historical irony that these resources were extensively exploited by Global North for their imperial, colonial, and industrial ascent. Developed nations are unable to develop otherwise from this model because they are stuck in the structural dependency formed by this oppressive relationship that ravages the underdeveloped. One contemporary example is the investigation led by the U.S. government on Brazil's state-led instant payment system pix which bypasses U.S. networks Visa and Mastercard (Marques & Mendoça, 2026).

The coloniality of making highlights the unequal process of unmaking the new worlds to make old worlds. For everything made in the metropolitan world, something else was unmade in the colonial world. The colonizers depended on the colonized to make their colonizer worlds, but they did not recognize the making of the colonized as legitimate. Global South worldmaking was not considered ontological design (Fry, 2014); hence, in need of an extra intellectual loop to reach the world, a loop that would necessarily pass through the Global North. That means ontological designers operating in the Global South were not being designed by one world that designed them back, as described in ontological design philosophy; instead, they were being simultaneously and contradictorily designed by the colonial world and left undesigned by the metropolitan world.

The design and undesign of designers in the coloniality of making have not been sufficiently scrutinized yet in design philosophy. Therefore, in this paper, we address this issue inspired by Vieira Pinto's (2020) question "who produces the producer", and recent research on userism that asks "who gets to design/to be designed" (Gonzatto & Van Amstel, 2022). We will look at the international division of labor in design as well as the dimension of the body along with the political, social, cultural, and collective embodied practices of those who make and occupy the spaces of production. In other words, we will examine the making of the privileged making subject, the designer. We want to convey that there is potential wealth in Vieira Pinto's ideas for design philosophy. Thus, this research unveils the worldly dispute over shaping design education and colonizing design spaces, controlling design tools, which turns marginalized designers into users.

## 2. Decolonial and anticolonial design philosophies

Design scholars have, over the last decades, drawn heavily from philosophical work to make sense of design's role in worldmaking and the social production of reality. Famously, the works of Adorno, Latour, Flusser, Heidegger, Foucault, among others (Bonsiepe, 2006; Findeli, 1995; Fry, 2014; Tonkinwise, 2004; Ehn, 1988; Winograd & Flores, 1986) have been particularly influential to design scholars who sought to better articulate subject-object relations in everyday encounters. One of the concepts developed in this interdisciplinary

space between design and philosophy is ontological designing, a two-way determination process between design and designers, as framed by Anne-Marie Willis (2006, p.70): "we design our world, while our world acts back on us and designs us."

Through this formulation, the philosophy of design is centered on a view that largely leaves out the worldly agents interested in designing the designer, along with the social structures in which an object is made within. The coloniality of making aims at addressing this gap, parsing the growing philosophical criticism of feminist, postcolonial, and critical theorists (Fanon, 2002; Spivak, 2003) to support design philosophy. In this approach, the question of who says what, with what interests, in which existential situation, at what human costs, in sum, how philosophy is concretely made is central (Van Amstel et al., 2021). Such criticisms have been canonised in the Design research field by the Decolonising Design Group (Schultz et al., 2018), which introduced a growing body of decolonial criticism is taking stock in design research more broadly (Abdulla et al., 2019; Akkach, 2003; Prado de O. Martins, 2014). This has played an important role in raising awareness about the Modernity/Coloniality decolonial scholarship in the design discipline and education. Their contributions carried the works of Franz Fanon, Gayatri Spivak, Paulo Freire, Arturo Escobar, and the M/C group to demand radical shifts of power structures in design, in both industry and academia (Abdulla et al., 2019). As a consequence, the discipline undertook what has been called a 'decolonial turn'. Maria Rogal (2015) referred to this as the emergence of "decoloniality" in design research, characterized by the process of denaturalizing the historical colonial others—particularly indigenous peoples—with whom designers wished to collaborate.

One of the most canonical terms associated with decolonizing design is Arturo Escobar's notion of the 'pluriverse,' which is often associated with the Zapatista call for 'a world that can fit many worlds' (Escobar, 2018). Undoubtedly, this turn has demonstrated that design does not encompass the same kind of thinking globally (Saito et al., 2024). Thus, a decolonial philosophy of design draws attention to how the discipline is intricately intertwined with processes of colonization, extractivism, and capitalism from education (Fleuri & Fleuri, 2018) to design (Cruz, 2021; Ansari, 2019). Since then, a growing body of scholarship has developed around decolonial frameworks as an existential project that counters the internationalization of the European modernity project, along with important critiques on the power relations of those positioned at the center of the canon and those at its margins (Bispo dos Santos, 2023; Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012). In the Design field, Ansari assesses its developments in design academia, but limits its contributions as critical tools for pedagogical reform and novelty in practices and modes of inquiry, rather than engaging in ideological stances (2025). We instead counter this argument. The project of European modernity, as the dominant ideology (Gonzatto et al, 2013), is irreconcilable with decolonizing design, so decolonial design must aim at an ideology of liberation. There is a case to be made that over a decade after the decolonial turn in design, its contributions have not promoted a paradigm shift in design practice, and, as argued by Danah Abdulla and Pedro Oliveira (2023), the term has been widely co-opted, instead of engaging in radical liberation projects that address the geopolitical structures of design thought and practice.

Moreover, in the process of advancing the field of decolonial design, the rejection of modernity has been accompanied by the rejection of technology, as if technology, understood as a flattened category, was inherently colonial (Tunstall, 2023). This lack of framing around technology, technique and of designers themselves renders the field vague and ripe for appropriation. Thus, the political and ideological design philosophy of Álvaro Vieira Pinto and the framework of the coloniality of making that we propose offer the necessary approaches that can support other decolonial approaches in examining those specificities.

For example, Vieira Pinto's philosophy of technique challenges this understanding of technology. Indeed, there is a well crafted narrative that the oppressed might perceive oppression as external forces whose visible face is technology, leading to a conflation of technology with oppressive structures (Gonzatto & Van Amstel, 2017) which can fuel destruction or rejection of 'technological' goods as acts of resistance. The Luddites are until today the most misunderstood historical example of such anti-technology stands, being commonly used as an insult to those who are technophobic. They were a movement composed of textile workers in Britain who rioted during the industrial revolution and used the destruction of private property (machinery) as one of their main tactics. The large misconception here is that the luddites were not against the machines or technological development itself, a notion that has been thoroughly debunked by recent research (Merchant, 2023). In fact, they were expert technologists in their practice and machinery, and were active contributors to the improvement of their tools. What they opposed was the use of technology as a tool of oppression, the undemocratic ways in which the oppressors designed them and decided on the paths and implementation of technological development to accelerate the accumulation of capital. Similarly, science fiction author Ursula Le Guin (2005) reminds us that technology should be understood as an active interface through which humans engage with the material world, and not only the recent technical prowess attained through extensive exploitation of natural and human resources. Thus, for Vieira Pinto, modern technology indeed carries colonial biases, but these could be transformed into anticolonial perspectives, provided they are redesigned by the oppressed, for the benefit of the oppressed.

The role of technology in worldmaking cannot be relegated to a form of self-oppression, as some decolonial design philosophies suggest. A pluriversal understanding of technologies rejects universals and strives to build on alternative making traditions, the making of many alternative worlds, as if they could exist or develop in parallel and were not enmeshed with global making traditions. To build liberation without confronting its centres is to leave its structures intact and unexamined. While the concept is appealing and rhetorically powerful, the attention drawn to the many 'verses' of the pluriverse might divert the entanglements that sustain the colonial project. Against this, Vieira Pinto argues that this framing rests on a problematic interpretation of universality as inherently oppressive, for it erroneously entails homogeneity. However, the concept of universals does not imply homogeneity. On the contrary, this theoretical tool can be used for articulating commonalities among particulars, which means that any given universal must be richly diverse and increasingly so. For example, what has to be fought against is the falsehood of universal humanity as white male

European bourgeois individual that has indeed legitimized colonialism and patriarchy—and the technology it has produced.

In tune with Vieira Pinto, we argue that universals can be a tool not only for articulating commonalities among particulars but also for drawing the relation between the making of the developed world and the unmaking of the underdeveloped world. In other words, by rejecting the universal, the pluriversal risks obscuring systemic articulations of power and dependence theories, which are vital to understanding structural oppression. For these fundamental differences, we prefer to characterize Álvaro Vieira Pinto's philosophy as anticolonial, rather than decolonial or pluriversal, despite sharing many concerns united under these labels. In the next section, we examine Vieira Pinto's philosophy of technique in greater depth and extract insights from it into a potential anticolonial design philosophy.

## 3. The role of technique in collective existential projects

During the 1950s and 1960s, Álvaro Vieira Pinto served as director of philosophy at ISEB (Higher Institute of Brazilian Studies), a Brazilian government-funded think tank that aimed to analyze and create national development ideologies. Vieira Pinto (2020, 2005) believed that philosophy could help transform the world he lived in. Influenced by CEPAL (United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean), the philosopher conceptualized underdevelopment as an oppression that afflicted nations that had been or were being subjected to colonialism, those we now call the Global South. He emphasized that Brazilians should neither adopt European philosophy nor model their country after the United States but ought to advocate for a philosophy tailored to underdevelopment that could also be useful to other nations beyond Brazil. Because of this, he framed it as an opportunity for devising different projectories than following the same trajectories taken by developed nations.

Influenced by the Modern Art Week in 1922 and its subsequent developments, his interest in the anthropophagy literary movement is evident in his preferred word for characterizing cultural assimilation: "manducar", an archaic Portuguese word meaning "to eat". Following this principle, he understood that the condition of underdevelopment bore an advantage: a restrained development potential that could be redirected to experiment with new forms of coexistence. The colony's existence for the metropolis (the other, the colonizer) was a major hindrance to developing an oppressed existence and, as such, should be overcome. In other words, technique from underdeveloped countries should be aimed at creating better conditions of existence. By this, Vieira Pinto (2020) meant an existence that is authentically produced by the people for themselves; in other words, they can exist for themselves, not just for others. This means that Vieira Pinto's philosophy of technology didn't just seek to explain or theorize an essence of technique but to stimulate it to become a conscious practice that can existentially transform the underdeveloped, formerly colonial reality. For that, it was necessary to connect the study of technology with the study of being and making. Every time humanity develops a new technique, it becomes more humanized because it can now handle and manipulate reality more effectively. Technique follows the ontological vocation of human beings described by Paulo Freire: to become more (Gonzatto,

2018, Freire, 1970). Humans are trying to become more through technique, and, at least from Vieira Pinto's view, one cannot separate who is human from what is technique.

Hence the concept of the existential project, proposed by Vieira Pinto (2020), entails a collective of people seeking ways to sustain their lives. Even if it involves figuring out a way to bend wooden planks or organizing the village or the collective in a new way to build a hut, all of that is also science and technology (Gonzatto & Merkle, 2017). Accumulated work spreads new techniques, allowing for the perception of new needs and possibilities, which, in turn, stimulates the search for new ways of working (Vieira Pinto, 1969). Thinking and making, science and technology, even between divisions of labor, can be dimensions of the same existential project. The alternative to oppression, as reproduced by technology, lies in humanizing the world as a space for human coexistence (Gonzatto, 2018). This entails that there is no way for human beings to "get rid of technique". For Vieira Pinto's (2005), technique is historical. Technique is one of the existential ways human beings relate to the world. The essence of technique is the way in which, historically, human beings work and develop their capacity to produce themselves. This is not just a matter for "modern technology", but for each social group at different points in its development in history. Thus, for Vieira Pinto, there is no technique without a human being, so criticism of technique should always be the criticism of how technique is produced, for what purposes it is produced, and to whom. Vieira Pinto's critique thus shifts not to the "essence" of technique, but to how it comes into existence in human relations, oppressing or liberating human beings for new modes of existence.

Alienating "technical reason" is, in reality, the thinking that prevents many of the world's peoples from developing beyond a relationship of dependence and domination. The problem lies not in an abstract "modern technique" but in the continued imposition of techniques, by techniques, and of conceptions of techniques that prevent the underdeveloped world from announcing its other forms. Eliminating alienation involves precisely the question of technique, because the production of new forms of existence requires transforming reality, and the only way to do so is through the use of technique and the development of new techniques, in other words, their refinement. If technique refers to any human action with a specific purpose, crafted in culture to become more effective and closer to understanding reality to which humans are bound, Vieira Pinto is compelled to disagree with some technology critics, such as Martin Heidegger (1977). The German philosopher suggests that technology has an intrinsic bias against humanity, as if it were essentially bad and modern, and was only now invading our lives. Therefore, the alternative is to deny and reject technology in search of a pre-modern nostalgia. On the other hand, Vieira Pinto (2005) noted that this is an ideology of technique. For instance, reducing life only to resources is an essence of a social form in capitalist societies, not an essence of technology in general. In fact, for Álvaro Vieira Pinto, too, a forest is not just wood. Nor is a river just a force for producing electricity. Additionally, human beings are products of nature, which distinguishes them from other beings by the need to reconcile themselves with this contradiction with nature.

It is, thus, a specific, ideological use of technology that reduces all nature to mere resources. But this includes all of those people who are dehumanized: the colonized. By postulating

those groups as being "closer to nature"—therefore, "less human"—they invisibilize, marginalize, deny, and prevent their own technological development. A technique that would be truly interested in producing its own existence, and would inevitably seek ways to confront and contest coloniality. For Vieira Pinto (1969; 2020), then, our relationship with our world is never direct; it is always mediated. We understand the world, locate ourselves within it, and transform this world through mediations such as language, tools, and design. Any mediation carries our knowledge, theories, judgements, and prejudices about others. The design of these mediations is also mediation in itself, yet more abstract (Vieira Pinto, 2005). Hence, the need to scrutinize the making of world-making. The concept of technology, for example, could be one of them. If underdeveloped people could reclaim their transformative power, tackling the contradictions they experience in their own territory and developing their own technology, they could create other worlds, which seems increasingly urgent—especially due to the climate crisis that endangers most forms of life today. However, what actually follows is the repeated arrival of new foreign technologies in the Global South as if they were finished and neutral.

The alternative is to highlight that such development serves a particular ideology that suggests that knowledge produced in territories other than the so-called Global North is not "technical enough" (Vieira Pinto, 2005). The ideology of technique promotes the reinforcement of a narrow view of technology, which is of interest to the former metropolises at a certain point in history, and imposes it on other nations as if it were timeless. Vieira Pinto counters this idea by stating that technology is a human existential, which is linked to every human being. The question is what purposes technique serves: for the transformation of the world towards better conditions of sociability (production and reproduction of existence) or to reinforce the alienation of oppressive realities. This, as argued by many authors ascribed to the decolonial turn, characterizes the underlying assumptions of the colonial modernity project. For example, the assumption is that there is only one existential project that humanity can implement. By arguing that technique plays a vital role because it corresponds to the effort of all human beings striving to achieve a higher degree of development, Álvaro Vieira Pinto helps us to challenge that. There are other ways of being human in the world that do not rely on the exploitation of labour, do not produce and reproduce patriarchal relations and gender-based violence, do not perpetuate racial, ethnic, or religious hierarchies, and do not see nature as a resource to be extracted for profit.

## 4.  Collective existential projects in anticolonial design education

Design education approaches, such as the positionality wheel (Noel, 2021), help design students become aware and self-conscious about the implications of designing across unequal worlds. Other approaches suggest that halting normalized hierarchies in the pedagogic space engage students in constructing autonomy and critical thinking (Souza & Cunha, 2022). Similarly, the design privilege walk (Souza et al., 2022) prompts participants to reflect on the kind of design each had access to throughout their life and how that has limited the kind of person they could have become. For instance, designers are more valued than makers or crafters, yet some designers are more designers than others. A graphic designer with excellent digital drawing skills, who creates social media cards, is sometimes paid the same or even less than a manual worker in another occupation. Whereas a design

researcher who masters scientific methodology and has solid academic training might be paid as an intellectual worker. Yet, a design researcher operating in an underdeveloped world is often considered less intellectual than one operating in the developed world, unless that researcher is conducting a temporary field study there.

Inspired by the anticolonial philosophy of Vieira Pinto, the third author has developed in recent years a pedagogic design experiment called "I am my trash" where he invites design students to collect a week-long bunch of personal trash and reflect: "Do I want to continue to make myself like I am doing now? The answer is a self-portrait with the garbage that this consumption implies, a photo of ourselves with the garbage accumulated over the course of a week. Brazilian students were very clever in using this opportunity to reflect on their own privilege, as well as the absence of privilege, as different members of social groups. For example, many students associated their overconsumption of processed food as a survival habit of their class. Some of them noticed that the food manufacturers were mostly multinational companies who send profits to their headquarters abroad, typically in former colonial metropolises. Even if the food was produced in Brazil, the packaging design came from abroad or, at least, had to follow a visual identity system designed abroad. Design students noticed that they could not make themselves without being made by these designs.



*Figure 1   Examining the coloniality of making in the way design students make their bodies.*

All of these reflections made by design students leads them to question "who designs the designer", following Álvaro Vieira Pinto's call for questioning "who educates the educator" (Vieira Pinto, 1982) and "who produces the producer" (Vieira Pinto, 2005). In Vieira Pinto's philosophy of technique, the answer is always "society", because both human beings and

technologies are socially produced, emerging from all the conditions society created for their existence. Ergo, liberation from the coloniality of making means design by and for any given existential project, which entails a collective of people.

In this underdeveloped context, a design philosophy must provide foundations for the key historical task of remaking foreign technologies to design for liberation (Van Amstel & Gonzatto, 2016). In Brazil, for example, the word design is translated as *projeto*, however this translation carries with it the coloniality of making. Rarely people use the word *projeto* for something that is already made, a product, for example. A product is design, an idea is *projeto*. If the product does not seem well-made, this is seen as a lack of *projeto*, thus, not-design. The everyday concept for that is *gambiarra*, a technical improvisation made with what is immediately available (Chiesa and Foletto, 2022). If a person tries to make herself out of many *gambiarra* and few designs, can they really become a designer? In this existential situation, this person will think like and be treated as a maker instead of a designer.

When this happens in the underdeveloped world, it often appears monstrous in the light of colonial aesthetics. When colonizers tried to invade Abya Yala and Pindorama, they faced Indigenous resistance and due to their misunderstood strength and skills, these people were depicted as monsters in the colonizers' narratives and imaginaries. Henceforth, reaffirming a kind of monstrosity became a common approach to counter the coloniality of making in decolonial arts and design. The author had the experience of making a monstrous manifesto on the politicization of design with design students that broke all the rules of colonialist graphic design (Angelon & Van Amstel, 2021).

These experiences stem from a longstanding investigation of decolonizing design by admiring, devouring, digesting, and assimilating foreign ideas (Van Amstel & Gonzatto, 2020). In the Brazilian cultural landscape, anthropophagy is an Indigenous now artistic tradition of eating the colonizers, taking what is good and expelling what is bad. This practice stems from the Tupinambá tradition of eating the first Portuguese colonizers in an honorable way once they arrived at their coast. It became an artistic practice after its celebration in the aftermath of the Modern Art Week in 1922. Brazilian Modernism, the artistic movement in which anthropophagy came to the fore, had a completely different understanding of modern; it was a counter-project to the European avant-garde, particularly, against Futurism. Building on this tradition, anthropophagic design aims at envisioning future existences from past existences (Van Amstel & Gonzatto, 2020).

## 5. Conclusion

In a Global setting, there is a world (developed countries) where things are designed and used, and another world (underdeveloped countries), where these projects are going to be only used. Userism reinforces the idea of only-users as "natural" setting of technology and technology-making, ignoring that new creations, adaptations, and developments are being produced—and denied in the Global South (Gonzatto & Van Amstel, 2022, Corrêa & Maass, 2021; Corrêa & Cardoso, 2022). Thus, this represents a division of labour based on the alienation and the hierarchisation of knowledge and making, as a "justification for the denial of the possibilities of historically oppressed social groups to use and produce technologies to

design their means of existence and to develop new conditions for being humans." (Gonzatto & Van Amstel, 2022, p. 768)

By appreciating Vieira Pinto's philosophy of technology, we can conclude that designers are not just designing things; they are also making themselves and rendering others less human while designing. Vieira Pinto's ontological perspective on technology teaches us to consider that all individuals, people, and cultures, at any time, already possess some form of technique and design, and this can serve as the starting point for creating the new. The struggle against the coloniality of making begins with recognizing the world made by one's own hands and heads as a result of projects carried out by many people. The key movement in overcoming the coloniality of making entails recognizing oneself as immersed in the world as an estranged other (the alienated self of Hegel, 2018) and emerging from that world as a conscious self. Thus, the first existential project to be liberated is the project of the collective self. Instead of being a project for the other (the national and international workforce markets), the existential project becomes a project for the self (the nation or community).

Returning to our guiding question "who designs the designer?", along with Vieira Pinto's given answer "society", the threads presented attempt to articulate that the coloniality of making shapes not only the modes of production but society structured through the metropolitan interference over the colonial society, as societies are always surrounded by other societies that interfere with one another. Thus, it is through these relational structures that universality and homogeneous forces must be articulated.

**References:**

Abdulla, D., & J. S. Vieira de Oliveira, P. (2023). The Case for Minor Gestures. Diseña, (22), 6–6. https://doi.org/10.7764/disena.22.Article.6

Abdulla, D., Ansari, A., Canlı, E., Keshavarz, M., Kiem, M., Oliveira, P., Prado, L., & Schultz, T. (2019). A manifesto for decolonising Design. Journal of Futures Studies, 23(3). https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.201903_23(3).0012

Akkach, S. (2003). Design and the question of eurocentricity. Design Philosophy Papers, 1(6), 321–326. https://doi.org/10.2752/144871303X13965299302910

Angelon, R., & Van Amstel, F. (2021). Monster aesthetics as an expression of decolonizing the design body. Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education, 20(1), 83-102. https://doi.org/10.1386/adch_00031_1

Ansari, A. (2019). Global methods, local designs. The Social Design Reader.

Ansari, A. (2025). Calling for a more critical design studies: Appraising decoloniality and post-development in design discourse and practice. Third World Quarterly, 0(0), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2025.2549358

Bispo dos Santos, A. (2023). A terra dá, a terra quer. Piseagrama/UBU.

Bonsiepe, G. (2006). Design and democracy. Design Issues, 22(2), 27–34. https://doi.org/10.1162/desi.2006.22.2.27

Chiesa, C. D., & Foletto, L. (2022). On gambiarras: Technical improvisations à la Brazil. In Ricaurte, P., Chaudhuri, S., & Fiormonte, D. (eds.) Global Debates in the Digital Humanities. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 271-282. https://muse.jhu.edu/book/100081

Corrêa, P. C. M, & Maass, M. C. (2021). The peripheral spontaneous design of Brazil and Cuba in Latin America. Translated from Portuguese by Isabela Castro Machado da Costa. V!RUS, 23. http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/virus23/?sec=4&item=11&lang=en

Corrêa, P. C. M., & Cardoso, A. L. C. (2022). The Production of Life in Latin America and the Caribbean and its Relation to Design and other Related Fields: About Delinking, Disobeying, and Decolonizing. Diseña, (21), 3-3.

Cruz, C. C. (2021). Decolonizing philosophy of technology: Learning from bottom-up and top-down approaches to decolonial technical design. Philosophy & Technology, 34(4), 1847–1881. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-021-00489-w

Ehn, P. (1988). Work-oriented design of computer artifacts (Doctoral dissertation, Arbetslivscentrum, Umeå University). https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-62913.

Escobar, A. 2018. Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds. New ecologies for the twenty-first century. Duke University press.

Fanon, F. 2002. Black skin, White masks. Repr. Pluto Classics. Pluto Press.

Findeli, A. (1995). Design history and design studies: Methodological, epistemological and pedagogical inquiry. Design Issues, 11(1), 43–65. https://doi.org/10.2307/1511615

Fleuri, Reinaldo Matias, and Fleuri, Luciana Justo. Learning from Brazilian indigenous peoples: Towards a decolonial education. The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education 47(1), 8–18. https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2017.28

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Continuum.

Fry, T. (2014). The Origin of the Work of Design: Thoughts based on a Reading of Martin Heidegger's "The Origin of the Work of Art". Design Philosophy Papers, 12(1), 11–22. https://doi.org/10.2752/144871314X14012672861973

Gonzatto, R. F. (2018). Usuários e produção da existência: contribuições de Álvaro Vieira Pinto e Paulo Freire à interação humano-computador [Users and the production of existence:

Álvaro Vieira Pinto and Paulo Freire's contributions to human-computer interaction]. Doctoral thesis. Federal Technological University of Paraná. Postgraduate Program in Technology and Society. http://repositorio.utfpr.edu.br/jspui/handle/1/3794

Gonzatto, R. F., Van Amstel, F. M. C., Merkle, L. E., & Hartmann, T. (2013). The ideology of the future in design fictions. Digital Creativity, 24(1), 36–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/14626268.2013.772524

Gonzatto, R. F., & Merkle, L. E. (2017) Vida e Obra de Álvaro Vieira Pinto: Um Levantamento Biobibliográfico. Revista HISTEDBR On-line, 16(69), 286–310. https://doi.org/10.20396/rho.v16i69.8644246

Gonzatto, R. F., & Van Amstel, F. M. (2022). User oppression in human-computer interaction: a dialectical-existential perspective. Aslib Journal of Information Management, 74(5), 758-781. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-08-2021-0233

Gonzatto, R. F., & Van Amstel, F. M. C. (2017). Designing oppressive and libertarian interactions with the conscious body. In Proceedings of the XVI Brazilian Symposium on Human Factors in Computing Systems (IHC 2017). Joinville, SC. Available at https://doi.org/10.1145/3160504.3160542

Hegel, G. W. F. (2018). The phenomenology of spirit. Oxford University Press.

Heidegger, M. (1977), The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays, Garland Publishing.

Jerónimo, H. M. (Ed.). (2023). Portuguese philosophy of technology: Legacies and contemporary work from the Portuguese-Speaking Community (v. 43). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-14630-5

Le Guin, U. K. (2005). A rant about technology. *Ursula K. Le Guin Archive*. https://www.ursulakleguin.com/a-rant-about-technology

Marques, T. C. d. A., & Mendoça, F. (2026). Autonomy and its limits: Brazil's response to Trump's threats. (GIGA Focus Lateinamerika, 2). Hamburg: German Institute for Global and Area Studies (GIGA) - Leibniz-Institut für Globale und Regionale Studien, Institut für Lateinamerika-Studien. https://doi.org/10.57671/gfla-26022

Merchant, B. (2023). Blood in the machine: The origins of the rebellion against big tech (First edition). Little, Brown and Company.

Noel, L. (2021). Encountering development in social design education. In Bohemia, E., Nielsen, L.M., Pan, L., Börekçi, N.A.G.Z., Zhang, Y. (eds.), Learn X Design 2021: Engaging with challenges in design education, 24-26 September, Shandong University of Art & Design, Jinan, China. https://doi.org/10.21606/drs_lxd2021.04.275

Prado de O. Martins, L. (2014). Privilege and oppression: Towards a feminist speculative Design. In Lim, Y., Niedderer, K., Redström, J., Stolterman, E. & Valtonen, A. (eds.), Design's Big Debates - DRS International Conference 2014, 16-19 June, Umeå, Sweden. https://dl.designresearchsociety.org/drs-conference-papers/drs2014/researchpapers/75

Prates, V. (2023, 02 Mar). Kerry diz que 'Amazônia é de todos' e Marina destaca soberania brasileira. Estado de Minas. 02/03/2023. https://www.em.com.br/app/noticia/politica/2023/03/02/interna_politica,1463761/kerry-diz-que-amazonia-e-de-todos-e-marina-destaca-soberania-brasileira.shtml

Rivera Cusicanqui, S. (2012). Ch'ixinakax utxiwa: A reflection on the practices and discourses of decolonization. South Atlantic Quarterly, 111(1), 95–109. https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-1472612

Rogal, M. (2015). Decolonizing graphic design. In Proceedings of 11th EAD Conference: The value of design research. European Academy of Design Conference Proceedings 2015.

Roosevelt, A. C. (2013). The Amazon and the anthropocene: 13,000 years of human influence in a tropical rainforest. Anthropocene, 4, 69-87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ancene.2014.05.001

Saito, C., Gonzatto, R. F., & Van Amstel, F. M. C. (2023). Colonialidade do fazer no design: Corpo e dicotomia entre trabalho manual e intelectual. In Proceedings of Colóquio de Pesquisa em Design e Arte: Arte, Design, (Re)invenção Política e Transformação Social, https://doi.org/10.29327/1397816.4-4

Saito, C., Gonzatto, R. F., & Van Amstel, F. M. C. (2024). Anticolonial prospects for overcoming the coloniality of making in design. In Proceedings of DRS2024: Boston, 23–28 June, Boston, USA, https://doi.org/10.21606/drs.2024.255

Schultz, T., Abdulla, D., Ansari, A., Canlı, E., Keshavarz, M., Kiem, M., ... & JS Vieira de Oliveira, P. (2018). What is at stake with decolonizing design? A roundtable. Design and Culture, 10(1), 81-101.

Souza, E., Van Amstel, F. M. C., Serpa, B. O., Silva, S. B., & Mazzarotto Filho, M. (2022). Design e opressão: cumplicidades históricas e solidariedades entre lutas. In Proceedings of 14º Congresso Brasileiro de Pesquisa e Desenvolvimento em Design. São Paulo: Blucher. pp. 8418-8428. https://doi.org/10.5151/ped2022-c10

Souza, E. A. B. M., & Cunha Filho, P. C. (2022). La huelga de estudiantes como práctica pedagógica crítica en la enseñanza del diseño gráfico. Revista Diseña, (21). https://doi.org/10.7764/disena.21.Article.5

Spivak, G. C. (2003). 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' Die Philosophin 14(27), 42–58. https://doi.org/10.5840/philosophin200314275

Tonkinwise, C. (2004). Ethics by design, or the ethos of things. Design Philosophy Papers, 2(2), 129–144. https://doi.org/10.2752/144871304X13966215067994

Tunstall, D. (2023). Decolonizing design: A cultural justice guidebook. The MIT Press.

Van Amstel, F. M. (2023). Decolonizing design research. In Rodgers, P. A., and Yee, Joyce (eds.) The Routledge companion to design research (pp. 64-74). Routledge.

Van Amstel, F. M. C., & Gonzatto, R. F. (2020). The anthropophagic studio: towards a critical pedagogy for interaction design. Digital Creativity, 31(4), 259–283. https://doi.org/10.1080/14626268.2020.1802295

Van Amstel, F. M. C., & R. F. Gonzatto (2021). Existential time and historicity in interaction design. Human–Computer Interaction, 37(1), 29–68, https://doi.org/10.1080/07370024.2021.1912607

Van Amstel, F. M., & Gonzatto, R. F. (2016). Design livre: Designing locally, cannibalizing globally. XRDS: Crossroads, The ACM Magazine for Students, 22(4), 46-50. https://doi.org/10.1145/2930871

Van Amstel, F. M., Gonzatto, R. F., & Saito, C. (2026). Coloniality of making in design philosophy. In Secomandi, F. & Verbeek, P. (eds.), Design Philosophy after the Technology Turn (pp. 39–58). Bloomsbury. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350494480.ch-3

Vieira Pinto, Á. (1969). Ciência e existência. Paz e Terra.

Vieira Pinto, Á. (1982). Sete lições sobre educação de adultos. Autores Associados.

Vieira Pinto, Á. (2005). O conceito de tecnologia. 2 vol., Contraponto.

Vieira Pinto, Á. (2020). Consciência e realidade nacional. 2 vol., Contraponto.

Willis, A.-M. (2006). Ontological Designing. Design Philosophy Papers, 4(2), 69–92. https://doi.org/10.2752/144871306X13966268131514

Winograd, T., & Flores, F. (1986). Understanding computers and cognition: A new foundation for design. Ablex publishing corporation.

About the Authors:

**Eduardo A B M Souza** works as a Graphic Design Instructor and researcher at IFPE. His research concerns critical design education and design as labor, especially related to movable type and experimental printing in the laboratory Gráfica-Escola, which he co-advises.

**Carmem Saito** is a designer and researcher working across fashion and interaction design. As a Technē grantee by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) Carmem is a doctoral researcher at the Institute for Creative Futures at Loughborough University London. Her research examines fashion consumption in digital contexts, critically analysing how technologies of consumption are imagined, designed, and used.

**Frederick M. C. van Amstel** is the Head of the Graduate Program in Prospective Design at UTFPR and an editor of Design Issues. His research and education address contradictions in design, including the recent rise of oppressive and liberating designs.

**Rodrigo Freese Gonzatto** is an interaction design professor at the Polytechnic School (PUCPR) and researcher in the Graduate Program in Prospective Design (UTFPR). His research focuses on users' and designers' production of existence through technology, grounded in the work of Vieira Pinto and Paulo Freire.