The Journal of Modern Craft

Volume 6—Issue 2
July 2013
pp. 135–146
DOI:
10.2752/174967813X13703633980731

Collaborative Craft Capabilities: The Bodyhood of Shared Skills[1]

Otto von Busch

Dr. Otto von Busch is an assistant professor and researcher at Parsons the New School for Design. In his research and practice he explores how design and craft can be reverse-engineered, hacked, and shared among many participants as a form of civic engagement, building community capabilities through collaborative craft and social activism.

Abstract

With the rise of the Internet, skills, patterns, and ideas are being shared more widely among people engaged in the crafts, which seems to break with some of the underlying assumptions about the lone genius craftsman. Much discourse about craft has been focused on the hands of the artisan, or the "tacit" knowledge used by the maker, but as crafters collaborate in a larger extent some other perspectives could be of use, especially since the surrounding environment seems to take a more active involvement in the production than the mere maker. Increasing Internet prevalence has made this even more obvious, as do-it-yourself instruction and the sharing of skills are abundant in craft forums online, blurring the borders between influences, makers, and situated modes of production. This article examines some concepts and metaphors by which some of the potentials of craft collaborations could be understood. Combining theories of cognition from super-organisms like ant colonies and their "bodyhood" with the "capabilities approach" of Amartya Sen and the concept of educational sloyd, the text builds an associative framework for a perspective on how collaborations actualize new craft capabilities. In conclusion, the article proposes a wider understanding of do-it-yourself activities as a shared endeavor toward

expanded collaborative capabilities; do-it-together rather than yourself.

Keywords: craft, capabilities, bodyhood, collaboration, do-it-together (DIT)

From childhood, most of us have encountered some form of handiwork or craft, whether gardening, basic repairs, sewing, or cooking. We all do something with our hands and employ practical skills to a certain end. Very often, such endeavors are framed as some form of do-it-yourself (DIY) practice, and how-to books on gardening, repair, sewing, and cooking seem to be endlessly popular. Do-it-yourself enables a form of self-reliance and our encounters with professional craftspeople tend to reinforce our understanding of craft as solitary. Craftspeople may be very social and share a workspace, but in their practice they often work alone. It is the hands that do the work, and those hands belong to one person: the craftsman.

Of course we know craftspeople work in teams, in shared workshops, in historic traditions: all are inscribed in a social framework. But how can we come to understand craft as a collaborative practice, and what conceptual models would render the capabilities of craft collaboration more visible? One way to understand craft as a collaborative endeavor could be to draw parallels to the emergence of external relations or interoperative "protocols." This perspective has become popular through the rise of the Internet, as new intelligent behaviors seem to emerge on the level of a cooperative human "super-organism" through cultures of collaboration and sharing, facilitated by telecommunication (Castells 1996). Over the last decade several authors have drawn parallels between the super-organisms of insect societies and the organization of new media (Johnson 2001; Parikka 2010). The practice of craft and the life of insects are different, but if we look at our skills as actual parts of our cognition, we may see how craft affects the capabilities of "what we can do and be" in the world. As I will draw out in this text, a craft perspective on the "capabilities approach" of Nobel laureate Amartya Sen may help us reconceive craft's role in the world. It may also offer a fresh understanding of the work of Otto Salomon and Gustaf Larsson, founder and early promoter of the sloyd system of educational crafts.

Collaboration and Living Systems

A famous instance of organized cooperation is the way that ants are networked into colonies. This is often called "self-organization," in that coordination occurs from the bottom up, not top down. Like many other eusocial or "social insects" (for example honey bees and termites), ants use a system of trophallaxis for communication, where they secrete and exchange a common stomach acid, which functions as a "social medium" (Wheeler 1928). The whole colony is coordinated through this abstract medium, which is chemical rather than visual or oral. Similarly, the whole colony shares one "social stomach" to create a super-organism (Hölldobler and Wilson 1990, 2009), coordinating their endeavors through liquid food exchange and transferring stomach fluids.

A memorable episode from a BBC wildlife documentary captures the life of

a fire ant colony in the Amazonas (BBC Wildlife 2007). When a flood overflows the jungle and the anthill, the colony leaves the submerged anthill and the members hook up to form a living raft. Floating on the surface tension of the water they drift away through the jungle, carrying the queen and eggs on top, protected from the water. What is perhaps most fascinating is that this complex survival strategy is not controlled by the queen or another control-ant. No single Noah is saving the colony from drowning; neither is the queen giving some life-saving commands. Instead, it is the joint leaderless efforts, with the help of their interconnected communication protocols, that make them hook up into their body-vehicle and drift off to dry land. The joint capabilities of the ants form a collaborative craft, saving the colony from the flood.

Biologists and philosophers of consciousness Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela would say the ant colony forms a super-organism through the whole colony's shared cognitive system, joined by the "chemical coupling" between every ant in a "continuous chemical flow" (Maturana and Varela 1992: 186). To Maturana and Varela every living system is a cognitive system, and life itself is a process of cognition, reflexive feedback control, and interoperation with the surrounding world.

> There is no "transmitted information" in communication. Communication takes place each time there is behaviorial coordination in a realm of structural coupling. (Maturana and Varela 1992: 196)

In the super-organism of the ant colony, the cognitive system itself, it is the interconnectedness between individual ants that creates a responsive dynamic, which far outreaches that of the individual ant. To Maturana and Varela, the ants do not communicate "something." Rather, their coordination is an integral part of the cognitive act itself. The raft only exists as an emergent phenomenon, sprung up "in between" the ants and through the very art of their collaboration. The very act of *knowing*, which for Maturana and Varela is the same as *doing*, "brings forth a world" (Maturana and Varela 1992: 234). In the case of the raft, the collaborative knowing produces a floating world.

Like Maturana and Varela, philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari focused on the *doings* of bodies. They argued that interconnecting practices between bodies form the assemblages that act in the world:

> We know nothing about a body until we know what it can do, in other words, what its affects are, how they can or cannot enter into composition with other affects, with the affects of another body, either to destroy that body or to be destroyed by it, either to exchange actions and passions with it or to join with it in composing a more powerful body. (Deleuze and Guattari 2004: 284)

Here, Deleuze and Guattari took on Baruch Spinoza's assertion that things are never separable from their relations with the surrounding environment. It is the interaction between multiple bodies that produces the world, not a singular action inside the individual mind. The "mind" of the ant super-organism is not a literal brain, but is instead located in actions such as the sharing of stomach acid. The "social" of the colony is a liquid substance—a matter in itself. The

collaboration between the ants itself has a materiality, just like the world the colony inhabits.

From the ant colony's collective act of salvation, we learn that if members learn to coordinate and synergize their efforts in resonance with their surrounding world, their connected doings or practices can be symbiotic and symbiogenetic. From this perspective, skill—how we use tools to approach the world and become cognitive of it—is *part of our body*. It is what Maturana calls our "bodyhood," our physiological state of existence. Our bodyhood is not a container of ourselves, but the extended sensory vehicle with which we operate in the world. It is an organ tuned to our surroundings and it also affects our surroundings. We modulate the world through our bodyhood, our interactions, and our skills—what our body can do. According to Maturana:

> Bodyhood and manner of operating as a totality are intrinsically dynamically interlaced; so that none is possible without the other, and both modulate each other in the flow of living. The body becomes according to the manner the living system (organism) operates as a whole, and the manner the organism operates as a whole depends on the way the bodyhood operates. (Maturana 1997)

For Maturana, language is a set of "coordinations of actions in which the observer distinguishes his or her bodyhood as a node in a network of recursive distinctions" (Maturana 1988). We must thus step beyond an inherent form of meaning, or the mental activity of deciphering meaning, to look at how bodies interact, connect, and network to form societies of their own. This theory of bodyhood has clear affinities with the distribution of agency in Bruno Latour's Actor-Network-Theory (Latour 2005), and Maurice Halbwachs's ideas on collective memory and group consciousness (Halbwachs 1992).

In applying these theories to craft, we need to turn our focus away from the *mind* or the individualistic properties of craft, such as the hands, the genius cult of the maker, or the personal intentions that lie behind an object. Neither should we look only to the embodied knowledge of a single maker. Rather, we should seek the external relationships that form the bodyhood of craft. How might craft, shared by many, "bring forth worlds"?

Abilities and What Bodies Can Do

Usually, when we try to understand possibilities of action, we tend to look inward for answers. What can we invent? What can we imagine? What can the mind do? Many assume a trained mind must be better than an untrained one, but we may also invert the argument. As the famous Zen teacher Shunryo Suzuki is quoted as saying: "In the beginner's mind there are many possibilities, in the expert's there are few" (Suzuki 1970: 1). For Suzuki, the expert mind already has a preconception of its abilities and inabilities that may hamper the exploration of what new action can be made. However, if we focus on the body, and what a body can do, another perspective may emerge based on how skills interconnect to form larger wholes, rather than being confined within the mind. Like the raft, the collaborative skills of bodies assemble into something beyond the most imaginative individual mind.

Craft practitioners know that a mental possibility, however impressive, is not enough. The world of practice, or "bodyhood," does not emerge solely from our mind, but in synchronization with our hands and body. As neurologist Frank Wilson elaborates in his work, our mental world emerges in close interaction with our hands as we touch the components of our world, pick it apart, and reassemble it into something new (Wilson 1998). With the example of the ant raft in mind, we could reinterpret Suzuki's quote with that of Spinoza to read something like this: "In the beginner's body there are few possibilities, but in the expert's there are many." The expertise of the ant lies in the collaborative protocols, the skills to form the living raft with the other ants. In the single body there are few possibilities, but in the super-organism's there are many. An interconnected expert body may produce more unexpected outcomes than the mind may think; we do not know what a body can do—and even less what many bodies can do together.

The message for craft practitioners would be to look more thoroughly at "action spaces," or how our crafts affect our *abilities* (von Busch 2008). Action spaces are the rooms for maneuver, the operational possibilities realized by skill, the choices available to execute practice. For example, for a beginner, learning to swim facilitates new experiences—a new way of transportation and thus new prospects. For every skill acquired and for every shared method, new choices and fields of practice are possible. The collective body of skills actualizes unknown capacities.

In a similar vein, tools can empower skill and amplify modest practices. If practitioners help develop tools and teach others how to use them, we can operate a new social practice similar to the ants' raft. In this way, craft addresses the everyday politics beyond the field of representation or the analytical pursuit of meaning. The question is not what is the meaning of the craft itself, but how the craft affects my *bodyhood*—and how it connects to other crafts. Remember, we are primarily looking for what a *body can do*; what goes on in the mind is a part of the cognitive act of the body. The craft is an extension of my mind.

The previous discussion on bodyhood and action spaces resonates well with the "capabilities approach" put forward by Nobel laureate and economist Amartya Sen, later developed further in collaboration with philosopher Martha Nussbaum. One of Sen's fundamental critiques of our everyday perspective on societal development is that we are too focused on economic growth and the measuring of this development through our access to commodities (Sen 1985). To Sen, the gross domestic product (GDP) is a blunt tool for measuring development, especially if we acknowledge "softer" measurements of the standard of living such as life expectancy health, well-being, and justice. As Sen argues, possessing a commodity does not mean one is able to use it:

> Commodities are seen in terms of their characteristics. The characteristics are various desirable properties of the commodities in question. Securing amounts of these commodities gives the person command over the corresponding characteristics. … However, the characteristics of the goods do not tell

> us what the person will be able to do with those properties … In judging the well-being of the person, it would be premature to limit the analysis to the characteristics of goods possessed. (Sen 1985: 9)

Sen argues that we need to shift focus from the commodities, or the inherent characteristics of these objects, to instead look at "what the person succeeds in *doing* with the commodities and characteristics at his or her command" (Sen 1985: 10).

To Sen, capabilities should be understood as *what a person is able to do and be*. Here Sen differentiates between internal and external capabilities, our inner abilities and our opportunities to enact them in the world. As Nussbaum puts it, capabilities "are not just abilities residing inside a person but also freedoms and opportunities created by a combination of personal abilities and the political, social, and economic environment" (Nussbaum 2011: 20). These combined capabilities are thus abilities living in a state of symbiosis with the surrounding and lived environment. But our internal capabilities do not grow in a vacuum either. Instead, they are:

> trained or developed traits and abilities, developed, in most cases, in interaction with the social, economic, familial, and political environment … A society might be quite well as producing internal capabilities but might cut off the avenues through which people actually have the opportunity to function in accordance with those capabilities. (Nussbaum 2011: 21)

As mentioned earlier, the *ability* to engage in craft allows us, for example, to choose whether we take on a repair job ourselves, or leave it to the mechanic. As Nussbaum put it: "The notion of *freedom to choose* is thus built into the notion of capability … To promote capabilities is to promote areas of freedom" (Nussbaum 2011: 25). The "capabilities approach" of Sen and Nussbaum—the freedom and capability *to do and be something*—thus reverberates with Maturana's ideas about bodyhood—the capacity to "bring forth a world" through cognitive acts, through actions that happen in close connection to the surrounding world. As we will see, craft activities often happen in close collaboration with other practitioners, shaping collaborative capabilities.

Collaborative Capabilities

In *The Craftsman* (2008), sociologist Richard Sennett has elaborated on the importance of craftsmanship and the special attention and skill in which the craftsman can take pride. But while Sennett specifically focused this book on the skills of the individual and the motivations of good work, he later explored the particular craft of cooperation in *Together: The Rituals, Pleasures and Politics of Cooperation* (2012). In the latter, Sennett investigates how collaboration evolves, why it has eroded in contemporary society, and how it can be strengthened. Collective craftsmanship, which requires finding points of agreement and managing disagreement, is a "dialogic" activity and shapes a specific socio-*ability*. The craftsman's workshop is thus not only a site for introverted handicraft that pursues the development of an individual's technique, but it can be a locus to build skills in a community and to exchange mutual respect for shared manual labor. It can make "technical competence into sociable

experience" (Sennett 2012: 63). Shared crafting can build skills among a community and engage civic life, as Sennett exemplifies in his discussion on crafts in ancient Greece. Within this tradition, he sees the workshop as a site for social liberation:

> The workshop spawned an idea of justice, that the things people made cannot be seized from them arbitrarily, and it enjoyed a kind of political autonomy, at least in Greece, since artisans were allowed to make their own decisions about how best to practice their craft. (Sennett 2012: 57)

Sennett's link between crafts and autonomy points towards a *freedom to do*. However, this is not primarily an autonomy focused on rights originating from the individual, but instead the advancement of collaborative crafts and shared gestures as capabilities *to do*.

Sennett addresses the gestures of work in collaboration—how "bodily gestures take the place of words in establishing authority, trust and cooperation" (Sennett 2012: 205), that is, *bodies in collaborative action*. In a striking passage Sennett expounds on how the craftsmen used the space in their collaborative work in a stringed instrument shop in London. He describes how, in the crammed workshop, the five luthiers move like "dancers around the cutting saw" at the center of the workshop, which has evolved in accordance with their "complicated bodily gestures at work" (Sennett 2012: 205). They carefully move around each other, often collaborating without any words spoken. When the five luthiers get help from an architect to remake their workshop, very soon the new space slowly transforms into something like the old, as the work pattern of the luthiers has not been taken into account in the design. The workshop is not merely a layout of workbenches and tools, but a collaborative space of shared gestures. Sennett notices how the luthier was "making working-space with these gestures as his tools" (Sennett 2012: 206). The gestures of the luthiers resonate well with Maturana's ideas on bodyhood: the gestures of the craftsman actually produced the workshop space and determined the activities. The workshop became an interface between internal and external capabilities on both a personal as well as social scale, between hands and tools, and the collaborative gestures of *shared* hands and tools, as a co-inhabited world. One could easily think that the workshop Sennett described was occupied by all-knowledgeable master craftsmen, but he emphasizes the mixture of apprentices, journeymen, and masters, as well as interested customers (he is himself at the luthier to get his cello serviced). The collaborative work of a craftsman is thus not only between craftspeople, but with others as well.

A discussion between Christopher Frayling and the late David Pye about the gray zones between craft and design raised the question as to whether a good designer needs to know craft practices (Frayling 2011: 104). In his earlier writing, *The Nature and Art of Workmanship* (1968), Pye draws a clear distinction between the two separate skills of design, making a mental model of a product and the workmanship itself—the hands-on engagement required to execute the design into a physical manifestation. However, in a later discussion with Frayling, Pye takes another perspective and gives the example of the acclaimed Danish furniture designer

Kaare Klint, who had no practical knowledge in cabinet-making, yet still produced fantastic designs based on a deep knowledge of workmanship:

> I don't think he ever made anything, but all the Danish designers and cabinet-makers used to say about him, "Klint has never made anything, but we all go and ask him how to do it!" Because he knew: he knew it absolutely backwards. (Pye, quoted in Frayling 2011: 104f)

This may seem counter to his earlier writing, where Pye separates the craftsman and designer (Pye 1968), but as Pye points out, Klint worked with the same master maker, Rudolf Rasmussen, throughout his life. Such a close collaboration affects the outcomes and connects designer and craftsman capabilities.

The craft of collaboration develops through enacting the "mechanic's" perspective that produces a special bodyhood of gestures. Indeed, as a cohabited capability, cultivating craft as a civic ability has a long history in the story of sloyd, the nineteenth-century Scandinavian education model for schools, which aimed at fostering dexterity, industriousness, and self-reliance through the manual arts.

Cultivating Capabilities

The culture of making has been a constitutive part of every human society of *homo faber*, "man the maker." More than a century ago, as the public school systems emerged, the Nordic countries saw the birth of educational craft, or sloyd, integrated into the general school curriculum. As a school subject, sloyd was first instigated in Finland by the clergyman and public educator Uno Cygnaeus in the mid-1860s, but it was later formalized and made a global export by Swedish educator Otto Salomon from the sloyd seminar at Nääs in western Sweden. Etymologically, "sloyd" stems from the Germanic adjective *slög*, meaning "handy," but also "dexterity, manual skill, or artistic skill" (Salomon 1898: 8).

Starting out as a movement for home industries, the "chief aim in sloyd teaching was to teach 'the children of working men to love bodily labor,' and also to give them the capacity to use the hands on which their living would depend" (Salomon 1898: ix). It was thus the body that was the focus of the pedagogy. Posture and technique by the workbench was as important as the final outcome. Over time, practice-based sloyd education was introduced in general education, including physical education and sports (Salomon 1898; Larsson 1902; Larsson 1907). Craft education was meant to cultivate "manual dexterity, self-reliance, accuracy, carefulness, patience, perseverance" and specifically to "train the faculty of attention and develop the powers of concentration" (Salomon 1898: 1). The trained body, through rigid exercise and correct posture, was key to this development. But another key component was an anti-alienation ethos, as Larsson quotes from Frederik Fröbel, the founder of the kindergarten educational model: "Man only understands thoroughly that which he is able to produce" (Larsson 1902: 11), a standpoint which resonates well with the idea of craft as a sensory skill.

The idea of sloyd education in the new common schooling systems cultivated logical and abstract thinking, as well as dexterity and resourcefulness for future job training. Developing and disseminating craft skills

among the population at a time when the larger social body experienced industrial alienation was seen as a social good. To mobilize skills among the population and empower the poor was a key component for a living civil society and also a way to curb social unrest.

Yet, despite the strict political intentions of sloyd education, it also set in motion a set of unpredictable consequences. As anyone who has been in a shop class knows, youngsters not only build birdhouses and boxes, but also happily produce objects of dubious use: metal throwing stars, baseball bats, or lock-picks. Already from the start, the centrality of sharp tools in sloyd education created a risk of youngsters "armed" with tools (Stowe 2005: 80). While these capabilities may not necessarily be put into action, craft knowledge nonetheless allows for questionable operations. Indeed, the Germanic root for *slög* could also be translated as "crafty," the devious and tricky. Sloyd educators were concerned not to create an early twentieth-century version of the television character McGyver, a resourceful agent who improvises complex devices with everyday objects. Put in more theoretical terms, their approach was antithetical to Michel de Certeau's call for intentional misreadings, or "poaching," grass-root tactics that can be directed against strategic imperatives of the "right way" to be in the world (de Certeau 1984).

Yet craft capabilities always leave room for dissident design. We do not know "what a body can do." Take the case of the potato, introduced in Europe as a food crop from South America. It can of course be cooked and eaten, but it can also be used in other ways—crafty ways—such as printing with potato stamps; and also in ways which provoke the boundaries of the legal (and even more popular)—to make alcohol. Craft in the hands of people produces unexpected results; hacking and file-sharing challenge the legal system of copyright and authorship. As it opens abilities and makes new actions possible, craft capabilities influence how we shape the affordances of everyday objects. But as they are uncontrolled, they also shape "mis-affordances," or potential transgressions and misuses. Making alcohol from potatoes actualizes a less well-known capacity of the material, and still there might be room for future productive possibilities.

A perspective on hacking and dissident design that highlights their capabilities could reclaim bodyhood, or find a practical way to "speak back to the system." As the slogan from a popular forum for DIY culture and technology, *Make* magazine, says, "If you can't open it, you don't own it." In today's consumer society, the everyday consumer lacks the tools and techniques to explore his or her everyday technology. As exemplified in many of *Make* magazine's articles and manuals, there is a desire to reclaim and expand the room for personal engagement with our everyday objects and culture and not be left "interpassive." The activist's embrace of open source software "creative commons" and similar examples (Lessig 1999, 2004), can be seen as a community effort to produce a new bodyhood: to collectively "bring forth a world" that can be shared, which is not fragmented, owned, or under power of someone else. It is a world where open engagement and the possibility to tinker with the everyday is encouraged, in direct opposition to the design of most of today's gadgets, which are sealed shut

to avoid user intrusion. It would thus be a mistake to see craft skills as a "do-it-yourself" practice, it is rather a "do-it-together," emergent, and uncontrollable phenomenon, beyond the command of one single author or maker. DIT, not DIY.

Supporting collective tinkering, or DIT, may produce an uncontrollable super-organism, a "wild thing," to use Judy Attfield's terminology (2000). In her account of "things with attitude," objects become invested with cultural meaning not just at the moment of original production, but on an ongoing basis (Attfield 2000: 11ff). As they become objects with their own history, or a history created by the user, they are disconnected from their original status as symbolic objects, their references interrupted and even corrupted by a new attitude, a new mindset, or skill of appropriation.

In this way, the tactics of DIT align with network theoretician Andreas Boeckmann's observation about the politics of the Internet, which he sees as moving "from collective to connective" (Broeckmann 1999). The social organization, or togetherness in networks, is not so much about making collective actions in unison, but of producing molecular and interconnected discourse and practice. The "togetherness" of DIT is both a kind of "social making" (Carpenter 2011) and an interconnected mobilization of skills, spreading tools, patterns, and methods to enhance internal as well as external capabilities among users.

Conclusion

DIY culture is a field of contested practices, actualizing various capabilities, from agency, industriousness, and liberal entrepreneurship to subversive skills such as copying, bootlegging, and bomb making, not the least noted in disputed books such as the *Anarchist Cookbook* or *Al Qaeda Manual*. But DIY culture is also big business, and over the last decade chains of supply stores have thrived on our eager willingness to rebuild kitchens, expand the verandah, and make bead necklaces. As artist Lisa Anne Auerbach has noted, there is a risk that the frugal and sometimes countercultural DIY ethos may be corrupted by consumerism under the disguise of empowerment:

> D.I.Y. has become just another tactic to rip away our humanity, turning us into operators of cash machines and credit cards … We have become hungry monsters, drooling to take back production for ourselves, whatever the cost. Our ethos has been giftwrapped and sold back to us. Our revolution has been pilfered. (Auerbach 2008)

In objection to the commercialization of DIY, Auerbach proposes a Don't-Do-It-Yourself movement, opposing the idea of DIY as total self-reliance. To Auerbach, DIY has become an expression of individualized identity politics, where the maker strives to be an independent "army of one," rather than an interdependent collaborator; "Don't-Do-It-Yourself finds us standing side by side, leaving behind the 'army of one' while moving forward into a world of our own design" (Auerbach 2008).

On the other hand, the craft community has perhaps asked itself the wrong questions when looking at emerging practices that have taken place outside of the studio crafts movement over the last decades. In observing new DIY practices, the question is often asked: "Is this really craft?" This

line of inquiry fails to take into account the potential and manifested capacities in the popular crafts, the untamed promise of empowerment of the skill dissemination throughout the social. We may too easily focus on the quality of the objects produced or the individual technique of the amateur, while turning a blind eye to the capacities released by the interest in reclaiming skills of the body, of bodyhood.

Instead of drawing new distinctions between amateur and professional or between art and craft we should ask: "How does craft mobilize community capabilities?" That is, how can and does craft become a tool to liberate and release new potentials of capability and even freedom? This would require taking a more strategic perspective on craft, to look at how it forms a bigger social strength, shared by many as a collaborative endeavor of "what one can do and be." Perhaps most importantly, we should ask: "How can craft interconnect to actualize new action spaces, open new vistas, and turn skill dissemination into a sociopolitical force of empowerment?" If we want to be inspired by the ant colony we could test new ways to interconnect craft practices and build new diagrams where crafts amplify each other to bring forth new bodyhoods through interconnected DIT practices, beyond the survivalist skills of self-reliance.

So, to take the perspective of an ant, the question is not: "How will my craft make me the new Noah?" But rather: "How does my craft hook up with other practitioners to form new and unexpected alliances? What type of co-craft can help us form a floating raft?" You might be an amateur Etsy crafter or a veteran professional studio artist; you might have an expert's mind or an expert's body—but the issues are still the same. Which protocols shall we use to liberate and cultivate more capabilities within the crafter community and beyond? How do we interconnect our practices? Finding new alliances would allow us to release the full potential of craft, a craft of crafters, and take craft forward.

Note

The article is based on a lecture originally delivered at the symposium "Craft Forward," organized by Deborah Valoma at the California College of the Arts in April 2011.

References

Attfield, Judy. 2000. *Wild Things: The Material Culture of Everyday Life*. Oxford: Berg.

Auerbach, Lisa Anne. 2008. "D.D.I.Y.—Don't-Do-It-Yourself." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Protest*, Issue #6 (November 2008). Available at: http://www.journalofaestheticsandprotest.org/6/lovetowe/lisa.html (accessed April 5, 2012).

BBC Wildlife. 2007. "Ants Create a Lifeboat in the Amazon Jungle—BBC Wildlife." Available at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A042J0IDQK4 (accessed April 5, 2012).

Broeckmann, Andreas. 1999. "Subject: Urban Agencies." In: *Read Me! ASCII Culture and the Revenge of Knowledge*. New York: Autonomedia.

Busch, Otto von. 2008. *Fashion-able: Hacktivism and Engaged Fashion Design*. Gothenburg: ArtMonitor.

Carpenter, Ele. 2011. "Social Making." In: *The Power of Making*, exhibition catalog, ed. Daniel Charny, pp.49–51. London: Victoria and Albert Museum.

Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Vol. 1, The Rise of the Network Society*. Malden: Blackwell.

Certeau, Michel de. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. 2004. *A Thousand Plateaus*. New York: Continuum.

Frayling, Christopher. 2011. *On Craftsmanship*. London: Oberon Books.

Halbwachs, Maurice. 1992. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hölldobler, Bert, and Edward Wilson. 1990. *The Ants*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hölldobler, Bert, and Edward Wilson. 2009. *The Super-Organism: The Beauty, Elegance, and Strangeness of Insect Societies*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Johnson, Steven. 2001. *Emergence: The Connected Lives of Ants, Brains, Cities and Software*. London: Allen Lane.

Larsson, Gustaf. 1902. *Sloyd*. Boston: Sloyd Training School.

Larsson, Gustaf. 1907. *Elementary Sloyd and Whittling: With Drawings and Working Directions*. New York: Silver, Burdett & Co.

Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: University Press.

Lessig, Lawrence. 1999. *Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace*. New York: Basic Books.

Lessig, Lawrence. 2004. *Free Culture: How Big Media Uses Technology and the Law to Lock Down Culture and Control Creativity*. New York: Penguin Press.

Maturana, Humberto. 1988. "Reality: The Search for Objectivity or the Quest for a Compelling Argument." *Irish Journal of Psychology*. Available at: http://www.univie.ac.at/constructivism/papers/maturana/88-reality.html (acccessed April 5, 2012).

Maturana, Humberto. 1997. "Metadesign." In Joke Brouwer and Carla Hoekendijk (eds.), *TechnoMorphica*. Rotterdam: V2. Also available at: http://www.inteco.cl/articulos/006/texto_ing.htm (accessed April 5, 2012).

Maturana, Humberto, and Francisco Varela. 1992. *The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of Human Understanding*. Boston: Shambhala.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2011. *Creating Capabilities*. Cambridge: Belknapp.

Parikka, Jussi. 2010. *Insect Media: An Archaeology of Animals and Technology*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Pye, David. 1968. *The Nature and Art of Workmanship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salomon, Otto. 1898. *The Theory of Educational Sloyd*. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co.

Sen, Amartya. 1985. *Commodities and Capabilities*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Sennett, Richard. 2008. *The Craftsman*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sennett, Richard. 2012. *Together: The Rituals, Pleasures and Politics of Cooperation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Stowe, Doug. 2005. "The Sloyd Knife." *Woodwork* 80 (August 2005).

Suzuki, Shunryu. 1970. *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind*. New York: Walker/Weatherhill.

Wheeler, William. 1928. *The Social Insects, Their Origin and Evolution*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co.

Wilson, Frank. 1998. *The Hand: How Its Use Shapes the Brain, Language, and Human Culture*. New York: Pantheon Books.