

ers that this was UFOs. The others laughed and said: No this is the future. It's a future festival in Stockholm. The town was very different, there were no big corporate things anylonger, no McDonalds, no H&M, no Gucci, it seemed quite poor. There were small kiosks where you could buy homemade sandwiches with peanut butter or some kind of marshmallow fluff. You could also buy alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages in these kiosks, which is forbidden in reality. I went to a nightclub called Riche where they had put flyers on the walls. They had used a copy of Jonas typeface Biff on the flyers. I said: This is nothing like the future, this font is old and the design looks like regular boring contemporary graphic design. The guy responsible for the future remake of Riche, who was Tobias Barentin Lindblad, answered: But Riche will not be so trendy in the future and it will have changed name to Rache. Back at the apartment I went into the new room, I noticed that it was quite messy and a bit scary, but I could at the same time see a potential to use it for the future festival. Later in the dream I was in my hometown driving my uncles old pedal car, a yellow Mercedes. The pedals were broken so it just worked down hills. Just when I arrived to an uphill part and had to use the hands to slowly paddle the car forward, a SUV stopped and a guy with two black dogs stepped out. The dogs had no problems catching up with me and started to bite my hands, quite softly, but to display their power. I told the guy that he should take better care of his dogs. I said I wanted his telephone number so I could file a report to the police about his negligence. He said ok and gave me number, didn't seem to be very upset about this. I also noticed I was not very scared of his dogs, although determined to file the report. Then I think I woke up.

Finally, can I ask you for an advice? Shall I send M an

sms and ask for her address? In that case I think i will draw a very complex initial letter, built up on different things that starts with »H«.

Thank you and good night Will, where ever you are!
/ Samuel

(I read the poem again. I still like it, but why can't he just enjoy looking at them when they are sleeping and do the grotesque dance when they are awake. It would probably create a lot of joy.)

Dear Samuel,

Thanks for your long response. I'm glad to see that we both seem to feel that it's fine to be open about certain things (crying, banalities, dreams), though more because I assume by now we know these letters are going to be published and we don't mind either way. This seems to be key to what we are talking about in relation to design: understanding the situation (of possible public exposure) does not alter your view, it just alters what you wish to point out. And it would be more efficient if we edit ourselves as we go along.

I'm on my way back from a wonderful weekend in Spain, where I was asked to attend a conference. That sounds really fancy, because the word 'conference' has connotations which exhalt those present above the public domain, yet in this case, those present didn't seem to be adopting a different design-of-self, we were just happy to meet each other in the flesh. Obviously much more is said than the papers that were delivered. I may relate more to this (physical) experience later on. But for now I think (editing as we go along) that its important that you tell me (us) your jeremiad for teaching, because I think you think I must already know what it is, but I must ask you to re-

peat it not only for my sake, but for the sake of our readers. AND I'm sure its course has changed since our drinks under the palm trees, and after a conversation or two with Mr.Rappo. (I'm glad you call him that, so many people refer to him simply as Rappo. It's nice to make a habit of greeting people nicely.)

This aside, what I wanted to point out about the weekend was a question that struck me. Someone, who seemed to express the most interest in F.R.DAVID, and was over-excited when I gave him the donkey, asked (paraphrased): »Do you understand that F.R.DAVID could get you into a lot of trouble with writers' estates? Do you know that a hip-hop records cost more to produce than what they are worth?« This question came before I gave my talk, in which I also spoke of how the world is conditioned to not trust a stranger than be generous to them (referring to the first reaction people have to my bookshelf in bristol: »but people will steal your books«). Do you see what I'm getting at? That if adherence to these rules of professional conduct and diplomacy go before pointing out that which is good about the world, then we live in a pretty dark, ungenerous place. You know how you sometimes only know the answer to a question a few days after the fact. I think my answer to both of his would have been »I ain't no perfect man, I'm trying to do the best that I can, with whatever I have.« (Umi says) (his second question, AFTER the talk, was »What is the difference between 'information' and 'knowledge'?«). And he wore a t-shirt which said »78 Helvetica Neue Bold« in Helvetica Neue Bold. Makes me sick.

When you ask me »Why is there so little energy«», it's because (people who ask) questions like this can suck you into inertia. They point at the reasons and rules that make people so inert, attempting to try to solve a symptomat-

ic problem instead of simply pointing at something lively. This harks back to Stein: »I said in the beginning of saying this thing that if it were possible that a movement were lively enough it would exist so completely that it would not be necessary to see it moving against anything to know that it is moving. This is what we mean by life and in my way I have tried to make portraits of this thing always have tried always may try to make portraits of this thing.« Design as »Problem solving« is a bad choice of words, putting the emphasis on all the problems there are. Armand Mevis even says »if there isn't a problem, I will create one.«

Or... are such questions (rules) the new technological constraints we are given to deal with? Much like Mr. Albers and Mr. Crouwel thought it was better to design typefaces that adhered to the constraints of reproduction, even if they made no distinction between image and text-recognition.

SO. It looks as though, since we propose to edit these letters for publishing, I will attempt to write one that deals with Banjo harmonies (you're Burt Reynolds, I'm the inbred gimp) or chapters that I think we could edit into:

[image: point (large please!)]

Pointing (is design pointing?)

As I said, I was glad you brought the subconscious in, even if it is only to acknowledge something that we all have in common, and that is regulated by forces beyond our control. Your dream seems to point to parts of a world you would like to live in. I could edit your letters and point to a world that sounds like a wonderful place to live in. I could also edit them and point at a dystopian nightmare, dom-

inated by people like Tobias Barentin Lindblad. Let's not do the sliding doors trick, not focus explicitly on relativity, and how choice is what everyone wants. I'll choose:

Future festival, even in Stockholm, sounds lovely (even if Kim West [also at the conference. I'm sure you know him] tells me that the welfare state has also succumbed there, and us free-lancers have little hope of pensions... aargh, see there I go...).

Restart: At the conference Melanie Gilligan remarked that she was pleasantly surprised at my activities, as no-one seemed to be concerned with the future as much as in, say, the 60's. (after repeating the line »Will Holder is currently rewriting William Morris' »News from Nowhere (An epoch of rest)« (1876) into a guide for design education and practise set in 2135.« I spoke of Popper's ideas of »piecemeal engineering«, that you get to the future step by step – not by making elaborate blueprints and maps of how things will look – and I suppose it all depends on which way you point, what you highlight, whether you are careful enough to ensure that every step you take points in the same direction. Left or right? Utopia or dystopia? I suppose that IS design, after all, signage is something we do, no? (»Don't worry, all those problems aren't going to spill over, they'll be contained, and in fact maybe they don't even exist.«)

In my notes for this letter I'd written »pointing is NOT design«, which someone we know would say is juxtaposed to my previous paragraph, in which I seem to think it is. Sliding doors, anybody? Or is it just the outcome of thinking and conversing about these things all weekend, with people who are all pointing the same way, but in very different ways? Did they make me change course, or did they remind me of what I really meant to say?

However, I wrote (in the notes, before the weekend), next to »pointing is NOT design«... »a logo on a build-

ing does not point at what happens inside that building«. During the weekend I flippantly remarked that F.R.DAVID is a logo, but is not a reflection of the exhibition programme of de Appel. It is a programme in itself, an adaptive logo that adjusts itself to conversations between myself and Ann, the director of de Appel.

Pointing IS design, even if its only because we design big arrows. However, as you say, since the 90s, when new technologies made it possible for everyone to print out their own arrows, some people found it necessary to resort to theory in order to make our profession seem more grand, more priestly. Since then, it has been proven that there is not much to talk about, and that quite soon discussions around good bad and ugly are taking place. Some designers feel that if they make an arrow that stops people in their tracks, they have done a good job. I thought arrows were made to ensure that we all kept moving, but anyway. Falke and I had a discussion recently about what we would propose if we were asked to make a »roundabout sculpture«. I said I would put this sign in the middle of it:

[image]

Am I repeating myself, like Gertrude? I wanted to move on to observation and description. Can you send me the portrait you made of Sarah Palin? I would like to see how you »observe« someone you don't know, and what, for example, your drawing of her nose points at. Anyone for Gestalt psychology?

You see, I am still interested in your dream. »Tell me about your mother.« No seriously, I wanted to introduce the fact that I am over sensitive to the textual and spoken kind of language, and I hope that you understand that

it could easily be a visual pointer. De Certeau writes that »metaphorai« is the Greek word for taxis and taxi buses. Isn't that brilliant? Doesn't that explain things, again, in terms of transportation and where you would like to go today? A metaphor gives us the chance to go somewhere beyond the physical, a transcendent realm like your dream. It can offer us so much more, if we relate something banal, like a rose, to a dawn. Liam Gillick also writes »So maybe their mission could be expressed as a beach-towel. They could take a phrase and use it. Maybe 'My step was light and I could feel the ball of each foot pushing the earth down from me as I walked'. [...] It's maybe the only line of thinking produced by this commune. It's the only moment of functional poetry. A pause and description of stoppage before non-action. A moment when shifted attitudes take on a fresh structure; it's the flickering, stalling, micro-conclusion where our group somehow express some real belief in the world of the commune and dodge round the formation of a compound«, which is saying the same. Gomringer also wrote (of) »Poetry and the Structuring of the Social Environment«.

I speak of more, and in my notes I wrote »more knowledge, more money, more friendship« just to remind myself of people's (subconscious) motives for restructuring society. The constructivists believed, and Kandinsky believed, that human urges can be better represented by less complicated structures (don't forget that his circle-square-triangle experiment with the students was called a »Psychological one«).

This weekend I also said »form has become overrated, and form has become underrated.« In this I meant to say that the 20th century has conditioned us to read forms in a certain way: forms can be employed as an efficient, re-

ductive aid. Reverse-engineer a possible answer to his test, and we can say that if Hans (Kandiinsky's favourite student) answered 1. yellow circle, and 2. »I feel that it represents a pre-conditioned human need for a community gathered around warmth and light«. Blame Kandinsky for replacing a perfectly good means of expression, a technology that we have been using perfectly well since just after we discovered how to make fire, ALL are able to use to construct a world around ourselves, to express and determine how we want to live: speech.

All this form (cf. »vormgeving«) is a grand cover-up for what we really have to say. We, as designers, allowed it to develop into this ugly monster we aren't able to control any more, and we are now living in a »culture of complaint« as Stuart rightly says (in an interview in Rosa B. magazine).

I said this once: »I remember a commissioner telling me of how Karel Martens believed that every word (chosen well or not) generates its own form. All you do is set it in Grotesk, and if your company is called Jan you have a different form than when you call yourself Iwan.

I know Karel is right, it IS that simple. Try convincing me that there's no formal difference between an i and an a.

The trouble with design today, from the commissioner's point of view, is that it is easier to change your typeface after 2 years than to admit you have a bad name.«

And a girl who wanted to be my intern got in my good books by writing: »To be honest, I didn't expect that kind of generous words from

someone like you, who might receive many emails like mine everyday.

I am not sure if it is fine to say that I am somehow related to you. Not necessarily in a sense of aesthetic, but in

a sense of your perspective of written words in your work. Whether you consider them as »content« in the role of editor or as »work« you generate yourself, I feel you are really look after them. I strangely feel you would choose Chekhov over Martens if someone ask you. But maybe I'm wrong. In fact, I don't even know myself which one I'll choose. Probably Chekhov. But I like Karel Martens too.« (part of the reason I wrote to her was she wrote »I don't mind just making tea, or sitting in the library seven days a week«. Brilliant.)

Do you see where I'm taking this?

Before you answer, tell me what came first here, the name or the design? Or is the name the design, is choosing each letter design?

When our bandwidth is so high, then why the hell not use a William Carlos Williams poem as a title? Why the condensation? (no-one reads, says Steve Jobs), (no-one reads my long e-mails, thinks Will).

In all my teaching, all I try to do is ensure that designers start to read, or create the conditions within which they can, because they must. Obviously the word »read« is a metaphor, a model, for observation, taste, listening, care, friendship, time... etc. Kim West told me an account of how a designer completely destroyed the nature of his writing because he hadn't read a word of it.

I would like to end this letter by proposing that speaking & writing, and listening & reading is the new constructivism.* »I mean that Sincerely.«

yours

W

*you may ask me how your cartoons fall into this, besides the easy answer that writing and drawing are both mark-

making. I think it's easier to say that not everyone can draw, and many are put off drawing or scared of it by the time they are 14. So there's the possibility that drawing will be admired as a craft, or an exclusive skill.–'Everyone' can write.

ps. I wrote this letter in a first-class compartment, does it show?

pps. A good sign of how to deal with the credit crunch: First class is full of pensioners.

ppps. Let's make plans for getting this to Sweden, this week.

Subject: Pointing (by not Pointing)

Hello Will,

Your last mail, or epos, opened a few doors for the Crescendo of this »conversation«. I realized that knowledge does not necessarily come from learning, but from recognition.

I appreciate the inconsistency of the pointing discussion. It's good to change opinions, even if it happens two or three times in the same letter. Is graphic design pointing or not pointing. Or perhaps both? Like you said I hope that the definition keeps moving, that it is changing while we write. I do agree with you that the word is very central. When I think about it's all about our ability to relate to words. Yes you are right, I love them. I'm quite into narrative aesthetics, at the moment. I can't really explain what I mean with that.

Perhaps the world is the dark and ungenerous place you describe. I'm afraid this place is produced by this »democracy«. Mathematics tell us that the average opinion is the truth. Since I don't believe in mathematics I can happi-

ly discard this paradigm. Truth is always changing, much faster than our minds, fortunately.

It's a new day in the office. Jonas is listening to graphic design lectures on Youtube. It's not so often these days we are here, even less often at the same time. But it's very nice.

I go back to your letter, I read it again on the subway this morning.

You ask me what came first, the name or the design. I would say they arrived at exactly the same time. Like if I would start to call you »Moln«, you would from that moment be »Moln« for me. I could say that the person I call »Moln« existed before he got the name, but then he was, no doubt, called Will.

In the same way, like I said before, the name contains all possible ways of the practise. To keep the subject moving we push it further in different directions. In order to know what directions we analyse the present state, not necessarily by reading design books, but by being observant.

A few words about the teaching.

It's hard for me to pronounce a philosophy of teaching, I also think it would be rather stupid to do it. I can say that I see the teaching as some form of therapeutical work. I learn a lot from it, perhaps more than most of my students. But I know this is not enough.

Somone said: If the teacher is better than the student, it's a bad teacher (or something like that). That's a stupid aforism. Who is better than who is irrelevant.

I found this instead:

»No man can be a good teacher unless he has feelings of warm affection toward his pupils and a genuine desire to impart to them what he himself believes to be of value.« (Bertrand Russell)

I think the first thing is the most important, to like your students. To see them as individuals and not working material. But liking your students or even to be interested in other people is of course nothing you can decide.

What I'm doing this year for my 2nd year students is to concentrate on the other teachers classes, helping them to save time for working on personal projects. I'm currently trying to find a good form for doing this, last week was a bit too much when they had to talk about all the things at the same time. It's easier to have a discussion in the class if it's focused on a few things at the time. I think that is what I will do next week.

For both years I want them to find the aspects of work they are most interested in developing, to find their skills and to be more confident. Confidence, I think, is the key to everything. If you have confidence in something you will be more able to learn other things.

My teacher in painting school told me at one point: You know enough of the technical. You should now do what you like, the cartoons, and you will learn the rest automatically.

This was for me, at the time, a big relief.

(Added later: When we had one of our first workshop we started with quite rigid theories what we wanted the students to learn. By the end of the workshop it was obvious we have had to specific expectations of what they shouldn't have learnt and could not accept that they were unable to comprehend our good intentions. After that we always started with more open assignments that could be adjusted later after the students interests.

I still think it's good as a teacher to have a philosophy around what you are doing, but it's a mistake to force other people in to it.)

I look fwd to the next already. Hope all is very fine with you, where ever you are.

/ Samuel

btw. M contacted me the day after your sms. Did you practise some kind of witchcraft?

Subject: one more thing

Burt was a spectator in the duel scene. Ronny Cox was the inbred kids partner (or opponent). But maybe you are right, I am Burt.

Dear Samuel,

Thanks for your wisdom, or at least your attempts to condense some of the issues we've been speaking of into something graspable (for others). I think you too have become aware of the efficiency of having the understanding that this you actually writing to our readers, while writing to me at the same time. It could be perceived as a narcissistic exercise, but I feel we are not out to say something shocking or grand, we're just using this as a way of getting to know each other better by way of recounting what we already know and experience. Perhaps this is closer to your idea of teaching, though I feel you missed the point when jumping on the 'someone' who said »If the teacher is better than the student...«. Doesn't he or she simply mean what you conclude? No-one is better, some people are just more interested than others. For many people, school is not interesting at all, other experiences can be much more productive: It's your first day on the job. You are met by the foreman, who lays it out like this: »OK, this is a photo of an antique German car we want to build. Here is the original design. Over there are all the different parts that will make

up the finished car. Here is a set of detailed instructions, showing you the order you need to follow to construct it. These are your teammates, they are going to be working with you and they have done this before so they are going to show you how it all works. And we have to be done by the day after tomorrow. You punch in and out on the time clock over there, and I'm in charge, so please do as I say. Any questions?»

Or: It's your first day on the job, and there's somebody whose role is unclear at the door of the factory. She ushers you in and you find yourself in a huge empty space. She doesn't show you anything, because there's nothing there. And she says »So, hey, what shall we make?»

No prizes for guessing which situation applies to graphic design education, and moreover the world after school. As you probably know, I am more impressed by how advanced and self-liberating music theory seems to be, and as far as I read it, you could find/replace music with design, and things would seem a lot less uptight. (The two stories above are from an interview with Fred Firth, a musician, and paraphrase conventional music education and improvisation).

A while ago, I gave a workshop at RCA London, based on the music of Christian Wolff, and in particular »Changing the System« (1972). We watched a documentary of a recent recording of this piece, which, as with most of Wolff's work entails a system of shared responsibility and non-hierarchical productions. One of the students remarked »All I can see are a bunch of old men in blue shirts,« and this remark has returned to haunt me ever since. I am not sure why, because I know this student is intelligent, and I think he wanted to say something about how this male, conceptualised approach to production doesn't seem

to fit with our times. Something I may agree with, yet cannot seem to find better examples of co-operation and exchange in the present, even if they are based on reading condensed versions of someone's thoughts and methods.

As I write this, I am becoming aware of the fact that I want to talk about the text I proposed to you for us to re-publish, and I think I want to close this last letter in a small discussion of it: it was distributed as an insert in an English magazine called »Spanner« (most probably named after 'spanner in the works'), which in itself was an obscure piece of distribution, and this insert doubly so. The issue of »Spanner« (no.17) is edited by Christopher Jones, and contains essays with titles such as »HOW MY THOUGHTS ABOUT DESIGN METHODS HAVE CHANGED DURING THE YEARS«, or »IS DESIGNING A RESPONSE TO THE WHOLE OF LIFE«. If we chose to re-publish those then we would have to start our letters again, or throw them away, I fear.

The insert is also written by J. Christopher Jones, aka Chris Jones aka John Chris Jones (which brings me to asking if you are sure about your brilliant Moln/ Will theory, surely re-naming something is not re-designing it [intrinsically]? or do I misunderstand?). Jones, as you will see in his writings from 1950 to 1979, has written extensively on design, and I think the most interesting body of writings were from the 70s and early 80s, then followed by a wonderful insight of an old man into the potential of Html. I say »old man« because I don't expect Jones to wear »75 Helvetica Neue Bold« (I stand self-corrected) t-shirts but blue shirts.

I think it goes without saying that his notions of publishing and correspondence reflect our letter-writing, but what I like most about this text is that it simultaneously hi-tech and luddite-optimistic. Jones' knowledge of tech-

nology is aimed at returning us to a more human state of communication, ie. one that surpasses being encumbered, encoded and objectified through technology, and contains the optimism to point beyond these constraints. »Why not make a start at using them in more personal and human ways? To do this one has to begin by ignoring the responses and assumptions we have inherited from centuries of mechanisation.« And yet he goes on to explain that his ideas cannot yet be supported by technology of the time (»My 7XL has yet to be invented« Kool Keith), whereby they must remain in the sketch-phase, which perhaps in turn makes them more useful for others to understand and apply. Again, this is a basic constructivist thought, also adopted by the Noigandres concrete poets of Brazil, and called function-relations.

These basic human principles of participation seem to be reflected in your observations at the bus-stop, and are things that have been going on for centuries, despite the bus, or the stop. This is what Jones seems to be hearkening back to, without becoming nostalgic and placing it in a period, as William Morris may have done with his ideas of Mediaeval societies and guilds.

Returning to my comments on Muriel Gray's »poetry« and here the sketchy, yet-to-be-completed nature of Jones' writing is brought up again when he speaks of his »Unfinished Books«: »I had not meant to mention these but now the impulse to list everything is upon me I might as well. Who knows what it may lead to? its one's perhaps impulsive acts which sometimes lead, I'm finding, to the best accidents.« Dieter Roelstraete wrote of Gödel in F.R.DAVID »The Book of Intentions«, who I believe attempted to silence your boys Wittgenstein and Russell, by proving that for any mathematical system to be complete/

true, »there must be at least one axiom that is unprovable, making that system undecidable«. All this seems to tie in with accepting this to be current 'staircase moment', that I 'could' have said this or that, but I have to make do with what I have said until now, AND Jones' notion of publishing ALL of his writings, ie. the attempt to be complete containing the acknowledgement that 'unfinished' writings are also writings. So all this, and my attempt to wrap things up, yet still wanting to say so much, is my conclusion, and I hope that the deadline and word count of this »Forms of Enquiry« book does not mean that this discussion can be continued.

Yours,
Will

Subject: Re: JCJ – A few thoughts on Microfiche and xerox etc.

I'm thinking a bit about Jones, theres something »Seducing« (RCA lingo?) about his half-obsessive relation to the methods of duplication. Lets keep in mind, though, that we read this through sweet clouds of sentimentality, 30 years after.

It's hard for me to imagine how hi-tech his suggested methods really were at the time, wikipedia for example tells me the microfilm was invented 1839 and the xerox 1959, in the 60s it took over after the stencil duplicators (in developed countries, in less developed the mimeo is still more common). The mechanical duplicating process, »Autographic printing«, was invented by Thomas Edison already in the 1880s.

So I would rather call Jones methods romantic than rational or »top of the line«. Romantic in a political way, since they claim to imply a faster and, to some extent,

cheaper way of producing publications on demand. In small editions. The idea is still interesting, i agree, from a designers perspective. Also in sense of what is the meaning of a publication. Is it an object that is chosen by a publisher, designed, printed, assembled and distributed or is it already the invented text, theoretically put together in a bundle? Does the design mean the most rational way of duplicating the publication or does it mean the most relevant way of presenting it, or could it even be creating the content?

I would like to think of the publication in the more philosophical meaning, as the theoretical bundle, produced in the most democratic and rational way. But still there are other factors to discuss, like in what shape is the content most accesible? I would not say this is an obligatory question of the design process, but nevertheless relevant.

I think at this point we could return to the Spanner/Will/cloud example; couldn't the design point at a certain use, the most comprehensible, from a specific point of view/time? The purpose of the object is discovered (\approx designed) and the design points to how you use (or produce) the object most efficiently.

I could fx assert that for a small edition magazine the fastest or cheapest way of producing the cover is not 5 colour linoleum, but perhaps in combination with the paper, the kind of images, the ambience of the texts, all put together, it makes sense and completes the object.

For me this is hard to discuss though, to make a mathematic science out of it would be rather nonsensical. The mathematics of Jones example is applicable in the economical and logistic sense, even if they are not exceptional. For us now they have a new meaning. Fx When Jonas (in a

mail) says he ordered one of his books on demand, I would almost call it an ironic act, or at least romantic. I would also claim that our profession is of a romantic kind. We can't rationally explain our part in the production process, more than that we point at a specific use of an object or content. We try to rationalize, force our activities in to the mathematical paradigm, both blue shirts and Helvetica bold 75 pt, but from this point of view we will inevitably become superfluous. I would in fact say that everything becomes unnecessary, but that's another discussion.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I2AWcFlqlaE>

Me and Nazareno are doing some experimentation with this kind of thing, mixing impersonal and cost efficient ways of production with analogue printing methods and their relation to the content. Our last project was a catalogue for the artist Annika Larsson. In discussions with her we agreed her projects are without a pronounced meaning, they are projection spaces of possible interpretations, you could say »pointing« without saying anything. The book contains of Skype dialogues, as a design element as well as content, where we discuss how the book should be made and what it should contain. The last part is an argument with Annika about a poster that we wanted to attach to the book, depicting a sign we found in a harbour one of the days we were working with the book. The poster was offset printed in dark blue, the book was the cheapest and fastest kind of digital print. The cover of the book was left blank, four stamps with symbols taken from Annika's film was produced and each poster and cover of the book was stamped with four different colours, dark blue, red, purple and black. The title was written by hand on the back of the book, in red or blue. Each book was also numbered (the edition was 200).

The design process of this example included the following elements: relation to a content, relation to a budget, relation to the context it will be presented and distributed, the general ideas and discussions between us at the time, knowing Annika and know how to convince her about our ideas, finding the cheapest and fastest printer, finding a pms colour for the poster, optimize the images for digital xerox, finding paper for book and poster, deciding an analogue duplication method for customizing the cover and the poster, producing stamps, deciding for a method to present the title, finding people to help us stamping, deciding whos handwriting should be on the back, me writing on the back, a relation to our own philosophies called »The New Thing«, the people who use and own the book.

Back to the teaching, and the saying »If the student does not become better than the teacher, the teacher has failed« (or something similar). Perhaps you are right, you can interpret this positively, but i still think »better« is a strange measurement. I would like to change to »If the student becomes like the teacher, no one has learned anything«. I think your example of the old german car, or even horse carriage, is how lots of graphic designers look upon their duties. In the empty room we of course have a woman in the example. This situation would be very uncomfortable for the designer.

I would of course position myself in none of these situations.

The german car might not offer the most rational way to transport yourself, but the ride could be enjoyable. You would be quickly overtaken on the highway, but if you are not in a rush that is not so important.

The room can't contain nothing and she must show me something.

The important thing what perspective I have to myself in these situations how the state of facts relates to other possibilities. The sum of this relation is the point, the design.

I will end this with a quote from Esias Tegnér, Swedish 19th century poet:

»What you can't say clearly you don't know, by the the thought the word is born on the lip of man: what is is duskily said is duskily thought«

(translated from swedish by yrs truly)

Yrs Truly/ Samuel

Confronted to the non-existence of afterlife, what did the priest say to the other priest?