# Zombie Modernism

## it Lives!

# Mr. Keedy

This is a very scary essay. It's about death and denial. But you don't have to be afraid to read it, because it's just language, and meaning is arbitrary. At least that is what those nasty postmodernists, and deconstructivists, want you to believe. But we know better. There is a right way and a wrong way to do everything. A good way and a bad way, a rational way and a crazy way, a clear way and a chaotic way, the modern way and the modern way. In graphic design, there is no alternative to modernism. To predate modernism, is to be a commercial artist, printer or scribe, not a designer, because the designer was born out of modernism. To postdate modernism is equally incomprehensible for most designers, because it exists outside their realm of comprehension.

In most areas of cultural production like art, architecture, music, and literature, modernism was just one more event in a continuing life cycle. Graphic design, on the other hand, did not have sufficient time to develop a mature sense of self—the umbilical cord had not been severed yet. So when modernism died, many designers' ideology died with it. However, they did not go peacefully into that dark night. They refused to acknowledge their own ideological demise, and they continue to haunt the living, moaning and groaning because they no longer belong to this world. That is the fate of the Zombie Modernist, the living dead who design among us.

In the beginning, when modernism was young, it was a radical idea that positioned itself in opposition to a more conservative traditionalism. As time went on, the modernist ideology spread into all areas of cultural production, eventually becoming the dominant aesthetic ideology. Design was an extremely effective tool in converting the masses to modernity; it spread modernism from a few liberal thinkers, to a conservative majority. Consequently, designers defined design as a modernist practice, and design's history and theory exist almost exclusively within the modernist paradigm.

Unfortunately, design's modernism is an ill-considered version of art modernism, one that is based on an Enlightenment faith in progress and singular answers, reinforced by a rationalist, universalism. Modernist design theory has developed little beyond the reiteration of modernist platitudes that are endlessly repeated but that are not expanded, questioned, or adjusted to meet the needs of design theory and practice.

Only in the past few years, has there emerged a sufficient amount of work and writing to challenge the hegemony of design modernism. This has prompted some modernist designers to re-evaluate and re-define modernism. They want to appear relevant, without giving up the privileged position that a universalist dogma constructs. These last ditch efforts, superficially pay lip service to, and subsequently disavow, the importance, complexity, and diversity of contemporary culture.

Design modernism's hegemony reveals itself in its countless annual shows and publications that primarily function to establish a universal standard of "excellence" by a constant canonizing of "modernist masters" in design[1], the absolutist, rationalist, obsession with, "problem-solving," "clarity," and "legibility," and the paranoid attacks against anything that is pluralistic, de-centered, or new.

The core philosophy of modernist design is in instrumentalist, or pragmatic thought. "Pragmatism is America's only native philosophy,"[2] it is goal oriented, practical, and distrustful of all things metaphysical. Paul Rand frequently quotes, John Dewey: "in Deweyan pragmatism there is no ecstasy, no Dionysian muse, no charismatic illumination."[3] It is this pragmatism that is at the root of America's "down to earth," but decidedly "cranky" tone in criticism (this essay not excluded).

1. Books on design can be divided into two types: "serious" monographs on famous modernist masters (the canon), and "fun" collections of vernacular ephemera (the "other").

2. John Patrick Diggins, *The Promise of Pragmatism: Modernism and the Crisis of Knowledge and Authority*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

3. Ibid.

In Europe we find, not surprisingly, that design critic Robin Kinross's philosophical hero
is the neo-pragmatist, Jürgen Habermas. The German hyper-rationalist who's faith is that
"language, however distorted and manipulative, always has consensus or understanding as
it's inner *telos*,"[4] and that "the truth of statements is linked in the last analysis to the interpretation of the good and the true life."[5]

**4.** Terry Eagleton, *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*, Basil Blackwell, 1990.

Habermas's and Dewey's pragmatism is not an unlikely source of interest for designers,
particularly die-hard modernist. I wonder how our pragmatist critics overlooked
Richard Rorty, America's best-known (neo-pragmatist) philosopher, who makes use of the ideas of
Dewey and Derrida. Many designers are disturbed by the Marxist and leftist politics of
postmodern theorists, but absolutely nothing has been said of the right-wing conservatism
of the modernist theorist. Is that simply because design consists of a silent conservative
majority? Following the historical model of early, classical, and late periods, I would
categorize modernist ideology in graphic design as; starting with the (early) pragmatic, art historical dogma of
Paul Rand, ossifying into the (classical) traditionalist, hyper-rationalism of Robin Kinross,
only to dissipate into the (late or rococo) decorative, modernism of Dan Friedman[6].

**5.** Quoted in Thomas McCarthy, *The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas*, London, 1978, p. 273.

**6.** Dan Friedman is not a designer. "I have chosen to define my position as that of an artist whose subject—design and culture—affects all aspects of life." However, his new book, *Dan Friedman: Radical Modernism*, has been reviewed, and received as a design book, (I found it in the design section of my local bookstore), and he continues to be a design educator, so I am treating him here as a designer. His impact in design was substantial; his impact on the art world is yet to be seen.

Although the work of these modernists differs greatly, the message is the same; "I am
the voice of clarity and reason," "I am the voice of authority and progress," and
"I am in charge of this family's values." From the Bauhaus to our house, this "father-
knows-best" baloney has always passed for design theory. Graphic design's alleged birth place, the Bauhaus, has, from the start, been idealized
and mythologized by designers.
"The pathos of such idealism has been revealed by subsequent events. The fact that the
school was destroyed by Fascism may have enhanced its credibility in post-war Europe
and the United States, but it's ideal of universality was a myth and mirage, shattered by
the war, politics and the demands of a consumer society."[7]

**7.** Gillian Naylor, *The Bauhaus Reassessed*, E. P. Dutton, 1985. p. 180.

Creation myths die hard, if at all. The Zombie Modernist refuses to let go of modernism at all cost.
For the Zombie Modernist everything outside of modernism is chaos, superficial, trendy, of poor quality, and just an empty formal style.
It became increasingly difficult for designers to keep the myth alive. Gropius himself in
an effort to recuperate modernism in design said in 1968 "The complexity and psychological
implications, as we developed them at the Bauhaus, were forgotten and it (modernism) was
described as a simple-minded, purely utilitarian approach to design."[8] The fact is, for
the most part, it was a simple-minded, purely utilitarian approach that continues to be taught the same way today.
Likewise, the Granddaddy of all Zombie Modernists, Paul Rand, complains in his latest book
that, "The Bauhaus, into whose history is woven the very fabric of modernism, is seen as
a *style* rather than as an idea."[9]

**8.** Ibid.

**9.** Paul Rand, *Design Form and Chaos*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1993. p. 212.

Echoing that sentiment, the radical Zombie Mod Dan Friedman says in his latest book, "Many
in design think of modernism as a style that began in the Bauhaus in the 1920s and fell into
disrepute in the 1960s. But modernism means different things and is traced to different origins
by different people. Philosophers, for example, trace it to the seventeenth century
and the dual influences of rationalism and humanism."[10] I am not sure exactly what the
point is, but I'm sure there is one. The important thing is that modernism is not a *style*.

**10.** Dan Friedman, *Dan Friedman: Radical Modernism*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1994. p. 114.

That's right, modernism is *no longer* a style, it's an ideology, and that ideology is conservatism.
Modernism, unarguably designs' greatest asset, has become its greatest liability because it is inextricably bound to conservative dogma.
As such, design has become primarily an ideologically conservative practice.

In *Design, Form, and Chaos*, Paul Rand quotes A. N. Whitehead: "*Mere change without conservation
is a passage from nothing to nothing*. Mere conservation without change cannot conserve."
(the emphasis on the first sentence is Mr. Rand's). This quote is instructive not only as an
illustration of Mr. Rand's usual harping against change, but also for its assumed goal to
"conserve."

Modernist designers believe the function of design is to "conserve" universal values in
designed objects. I suspect most designers are comfortable with that idea, even though
few of them will admit it publicly. Most designers claim to be very liberal, or even
radical, like their early modern art heroes. But this is 1995, not 1925, and we are formulating design practice, not art history.

Recently I interviewed design critic Rick Poynor, and I asked him if he was a modernist or
a postmodernist. He said, "The problem I have with postmodernism is the relativism and
nihilism that follows it."[11] Understandably, many design critics are reluctant to give up the
absolute values of modernism because that is what makes design criticism an easier, right or wrong proposition.

**11.** Rick Poynor, AN INTERVIEW WITH RICK POYNOR, BY MR. KEEDY, *Emigre*, #33, Winter 1995. p. 35.

By contrast, the contextual postmodern approach is "relative," because the discourse is
relative to the subject at hand. This greater demand for specificity and complexity is often
dismissed as "nihilism" or "chaos." Mr. Poynor went on to say, "So I recognize what you
say; that there is, at times, in the way I write and in the areas that interest me, a split between
those two areas of thinking (modernism and postmodernism)—an acknowledgment of one,
and maybe a hankering after the other."[12] It is precisely this fearful, and nostalgic
"hankering" for modernism that has retarded the intellectual growth of design theory, and criticism, and hidden a deep seated conservatism.

**12.** Ibid.

My aim in this essay is to examine modernism in design, not make a case for postmodernism.
If you would have told me ten years ago that I would still be making a case for postmodernism
in design in 1995, I probably wouldn't have believed it because the political imperative that
drives modernism-at-all-cost in design was not as evident to me then, and I assumed design would move along with other cultural practices.

How, then, should post modernism in general be evaluated? My preliminary assessment
would be this: That in its concern for difference, for the difficulties of communication,
for the complexity and nuances of interests, cultures, places, and the like, it exercises a
positive influence. The metalanguages and metatheories, and metanarratives of modernism
(particularly in its later manifestations) did tend to gloss over important differences, and
failed to pay attention to important disjunctions and details. Postmodernism has been
particularly important in acknowledging "the multiple forms of otherness as they emerge
from differences in subjectivity, gender and sexuality, race and class, temporal (configurations
of sensibility) and spatial geographic locations and dislocations."[13]

**13.** David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Blackwell, 1990. p.113.

## Zombie Modernists survive
## by eating the living flesh of postmodernism

The Zombie Modernist's biggest enemies are postmodernism and deconstruction, because
they reveal that the simplistic, rationalist/universalist modernism of design is long dead and starting to stink.

"We know the world only through the medium of language. Meaning is arbitrary. Meaning
is unstable and has to be made by the reader. Each reader will read differently. To
impose a single text on the readers is authoritarian and oppressive. Designers should make
text visually ambiguous and difficult to fathom, as a way to respect the rights of the readers."[14]
This is the "straw man" of postmodernism that Robin Kinross props up so he can knock
it down with his universalist, rationalist, truth-seeking, neo-con rant titled *Fellow readers*.

**14.** Robin Kinross, *Fellow readers: notes on multiplied language*, London, Hyphen Press, 1994. p 5.

That we understand the world through language, that meaning is unstable, and that people
tend to interpret things differently are hardly radical or wacky ideas. What *is* wacky, is
Kinross's hilarious interpretation of how postmodernist designers react to this condition.
It does strike me as a bit "authoritarian" and "oppressive" to "impose" a single *anything* on any one. I like choices.
People who believe in democracy are nutty that way. However, *assuming* a single reading
from a text is just plain stupid (even Mr. Habermas has failed to make a convincing argument).
Given that multiple readings are inherent in most texts (too relativist an idea for Kinross because "truth" loses its absolutism),
it doesn't make any sense to make the text even more "difficult to fathom" unless you absolutely hate the reader.

But Mr. Kinross already knows that the whole point of his ridiculous characterization of poststructuralist theory is to insist that without modernism all is chaos, obscurantism, lies, and nonsense meant to draw attention to megalomaniac designers **(like me, me, me)**.

Robin Kinross is an Enlightenment Era throwback, who has taken it on himself to be the quality control officer of our "common society." He goes about this task with a decidedly "un-common" set of ideological and formal values that never seem to make their way beyond the posh and precious world of limited-edition, fine, collectable books. As one of societies' "common folk," let me be the first to say, "Gee, thanks Robin!"

I have included Mr. Kinross as the European representative of fundamentalist, modernist thinking. There are others, but he presents the most compelling argument, such as it is. As with most cultural concerns, the "European version" is "classier" than the "American version," but the political strategy is the same. The usual party line of the far right is: we are being led astray by "bad people" (academics, pinkos, perverts), and they are steering us away from the "truth" (family values, Jesus, order, clarity) for their own "selfish gain" (wealth, fame, power). We must get back on the "right track" (throw the bums out, vote for me, buy my crap).

Modernism in design went from a radical idea to a liberal ideal only to stagnate as conservative **dogma**. Because the Zombie Modernist doesn't want to come to terms with the fact that their ideology is dead, they are always trying to *rationalize* away (they think they own exclusive rights to everything that is rational) the postmodern condition the rest of us know as reality. That is why postmodernism must be discredited and exposed as empty formalism (a style), and one should never "attempt to go beyond Modernism." Typically it goes something like this: "It (postmodern design) concentrates on visual techniques and individual solutions rather than on cultural context. Much of this 'Postmodern' design uses a visual vocabulary pioneered by the 1920's avant-garde, yet without the critique of cultural institutions that informed the found-object collages of Kurt Schwitters, the typographic havoc of the Futurists, or the socially engaged design of the Constructivists. Our attempts to go beyond Modernism are often realized by referring to visual techniques that we have been taught represent radicality: avant-garde design of the 1910s and 1920s." [15]

15. Mike Mills, The (Layered) Vision Thing, *Eye* magazine, no. 8, vol. 2, 1992. The title is a reference to George Bush. Ironic, Huh?

Like the smooth "double talk" of Ronald Reagan, this makes sense if you don't think about it in any detail or any actual context. But the idea only makes sense in a contextless void where there is no distinction between art and design or past and present—in the "meta-context" of design modernism. Even if we accept the dubious claim that art movements like dada and constructivism were effective as critical social discourse, (as if Lissitzky's prouns and Schwitters' collages really enlightened the mostly illiterate masses who somehow had the luxury of visiting art galleries and museums from 1910 through the 1920s), who ever said it was design's ambition to "critique its cultural institutions, or its clients"? The strategy of subversion is an art world pretension that has little relevance to design practice. To criticize design for its lack of "cultural critique" makes about as much sense as criticizing art for its inability to "solve problems."

Art exists outside (above) society and is expected to be critical of it. Design exists inside (below) society and is expected to serve it. Many young designers today refuse to accept that simple distinction, or any distinction between art and design, because they think art is somehow "better" than design (I think it has something to do with the fact that design is taught in ART schools). Actually, most postmodern design was and is engaged in a critique of a cultural institution. Obviously, postmodern design is very critical of *modern design*—design's cultural institution. **The effectiveness of its criticism is evident in how afraid the modernist designers today are of postmodernism.**

The other half-baked idea, expressed in the quote above, is how those postmodern designers stole their forms from early modernist artist and are therefore less original (Never mind that the modernist designers also stole their forms from modern art). The modern art paradigm of originality—or Who Did it First?—*assumes* to be the most important factor in evaluating design (even though the art world itself has discredited that as a primary criteria years ago).

Obviously the art world did it first because, at the time, graphic design as a discipline didn't even exist. So if we judge design by modern art standards, (as most of our so-called *design* critics do) then design can't possibly "go beyond" (art) modernism. It can only catch up, at best. Using art world paradigms for graphic design criticism not only renders postmodern design useless, but the validity of design practice itself is always in question.

If the Zombie Modernist can't discredit postmodernism, then they try to co-opt it. Whatever threatens to be new, or different, must immediately be subjugated to modernism. In an essay about Neville Brody's new project, *Fuse*, Michael Rock writes: "While the forms assume the variegated surface of post-modernism, the underlying issues indicate that projects such as *Fuse* are deeply rooted in Modernist goals of avant-garde experimentation and artistic originality." [16] Sounds familiar? Michael Rock points out that *Fuse* is just continuing in the **modernist tradition**, (art tradition, that is. Never mind that *Fuse* exists in the design context). He then goes on and uses (Art critic) Rosalind Krauss's postmodern critique (of modern art) to lambaste the whole project. Is he advocating postmodernism? Art criticism? Of course not. The main point he feels compelled to make is that *Fuse*, like everything else in design, is still just "good ol' Modernism."

16. Michael Rock, Beyond typography, *Eye*, No. 15, vol 4, Winter 1994. p. 31.

Mr. Rock continues, "The stranglehold of a single, homogeneous Modernist theory is a designer's fantasy." As proof of the fact, he offers that, "Even a cursory glance through a type house manual or popular magazine from the last 30 years should dash the idea that the world ever tottered on the brink of global Helvetican domination." [17] But is that proof of an alternative *theory* to modernism?

17. Ibid. p.27

I know I will be accused of portraying modernism in design too narrowly and simplistically, particularly now that we have entered the revisionist-modernist era, when issues raised by postmodernism are routinely claimed as modernist by dredging up obscure precedents in modern art practice. It is no fantasy that there have been very few voices reaching the entire design community. The ones that have, however, are modernist ones ("Oh, but the times, they are a changin'!").

If the hegemony of modernist design theory is a fantasy, where are all the essays and books on postmodern design theory? Where should we look for them? Certainly not in *I.D.* magazine, where Ralph Caplan has been dispensing his, "good-old-boy," "common-sense," modernist pap for years, only to be replaced by Mr. Rock's own, "pedantically-correct," "middle-of-the-road," modernism. Sounding a lot like *previous* Yale professor Paul Rand, Michael Rock writes in the *AIGA Journal*: "Perhaps the most socially *irresponsible* work is the over-designed, over-produced, typographic stunts that serve no real function, speak only to other designers and the cultural elite, and through opulence and uselessness revel in a level of consumption that glorifies financial excess." [18]

18. Michael Rock, Responsibility: Buzzword of the Nineties, *AIGA Journal*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1992.

I doubt if Mr. Rock would complain about Architects, Doctors, Engineers and Scientist speaking only to themselves. Of course they talk to themselves, they are experts, specialist, and professionals. Because design is not a profession, [19] designers do not understand that professionals have a responsibility to each other to keep practicing at the highest level. That is how they protect the credibility and the value of their profession.

19. A professional is someone who has a specialized knowledge, skill and training, that is regulated by their peers. Professionals establish standards of employment and advancement, practice, research, development and education, to further that practice. Although most practicing designers today receive degrees from accredited universities, there is absolutely no necessity to have a degree to practice, and there are no regulated standards for practice or teaching. Design educators are, however, the only professionals in design, because they are professional educators.

Designers, however, have the trade mentality that the more accessible their work is, and the greater number they can service, (over one billion served daily!) the more secure their jobs will be. This trade mentality is ironic coming from someone like Michael Rock who is not a professional as a designer, but is as an educator, a degreed, accredited, professional. One can only guess who this "champion of the people," and current Yale professor, considers the "cultural elite," [20] but the fact that design critics pick up the rhetoric of the far right should come as no surprise. Whether it is politics, economics, aesthetics, or design, **conservatism is still conservatism.**

20. "Newt Gingrich, the new Speaker of the House, promises to furnish many ingenious demonstrations of ways to dress authority in the rhetoric of anti-elitism. So far, his handling of his status as a former professor has proved the most instructive. When he first made his ill-fated appointment of new House historian, Gingrich explained in a public appearance that he was, in fact, a pro. As 'a Ph.D. in history,' he said, 'I think I have the right to select an academic who has legitimate credentials…I think I may be peculiarly, of all the people who have been Speaker, in a legitimate

Most of the current debate in graphic design, is characterized as a generational split between the older modernist and the younger postmodernist. As I have pointed out in this essay, there are more than a few vocal young modernists, as well as a few older

postmodernist (Ed Fella, for example). It would be more accurate to characterize our current situation as the backlash of an entrenched conservatism against a real, or perhaps only imagined threat, of a relativist/liberal agenda. Design is certainly big enough to hold designers with conservative and liberal agendas, but I guess it's just a bad time for liberals everywhere now.

Ask yourself this question, if Newt Gingrich, and Rush Limbaugh, were graphic designers, would they be:
(A) Complaining about the "visual Pollution," "typographic stunts," and the many short-comings of deconstruction and postmodernist design in centrist publications like *I.D.*, *Print*, *CA*, and the *AIGA Journal*?
Or would they be:
(B) Writing about new ideas and work in smaller circulation publications like, *Emigre*, and academic publications like *Visible Language*, *Design Issues*, or *ACD's Statements*.

## Hmmm?

As it became embarrassingly obvious that there were fundamental flaws in modernism, as it traditionally functioned in design, some designers started to redefine modernism as a one-ideology-fits-all, meta-philosophy.
"I view modernism in design as a broad, potentially open-minded, and inexhaustible way of thinking that began in the mid-nineteenth century and continues today among the majority of us who believe that we should use all existing means to understand, improve, change, and refresh our condition in the world." [21] Sounding suspiciously similar to the ingratiating speeches made by beauty pageant contestants, as in "...and I wish for world peace!," modernist designers try to prove that their ideology is still universally relevant through a new (trendy?) commitment to good citizenship.

"Modernism ran out of steam over a decade ago. But at it's core is an ethic—the responsibility that a designer has to actively contribute to, indeed enhance, the social, political, and cultural framework—that continues to inform even the most diehard Post-modernist." [22] Wow, I had no idea that the whole concept of being a productive, responsible, citizen was **invented** by **modernism!** I thought it was just something modernist used to justify their aesthetic self-indulgence (I guess that's just the nihilistic, postmodern, cynic, in me).

"Although the rhetoric proclaimed better goods or living conditions, the intended consumers, the public, had little chance to influence or shape Bauhaus ideology. The public became a misunderstood and mostly unwilling participant, blamed for its lack of worldly perspective and aesthetic-value discrimination." [23] Maybe the Bauhaus doesn't represent the "ethical core" of modernism. But then, what does? That's the great thing about modernism, you can pretty much take **your pick from the past six decades.**

In an effort to avoid change, contemporary modernist designers indulge themselves in a pathetic, kinder, gentler, morphing ideology, that is virtually meaningless. The only connection that the current modernism has to what was once understood as modernism is that it is now *rationally* and *universally* useless. This "new" or "late" modernism is an exhausted modernism that designers prefer to a vibrant but uncertain postmodern future.

The myth of universal modernist values is so pervasive in design, it swallows up even the possibility of an alternate ideology. "The fact is, it's foolish to deny that anyone who seriously explores the outer limits and inner soul of visual communication is not in some way a Modernist. Or as *Pogo*'s Walt Kelley said: 'We have met the enemy and it is us.'" [24] I believe, it would be more accurate to say "We have *re-invented* the enemy and it is us." By co-opting all change and difference into a simplistic modernist paradigm, we prohibit **design from ever growing up** and leaving it's conservative modernist home. Imprisoned in a dilapidated old house, built by modern art, design is unable to strike out on it's own and make a place for itself in the world. Thus design's "outer limits and inner soul" is immobile, caught between heaven and earth, in a no-place, we call purgatory—**the zombies' fate.**

position to make a selection that I think will be helpful in re-establishing the legitimacy of history."
But when at the same appearance he was asked about his qualifications for teaching his course on American history at Reinhardt College, he was quick to put his anti-professionalism on display. "I teach a course which is an outline of my thoughts at 51 years of age, based on everything I've experienced, which is, frankly, rather more than most tenured faculty," he noted. "I haven't written 22 books that are meaningless." He's not a professional academic after all. He's a citizen professor. We're going to see more of them."
Louis Menand, The Trashing of Professionalism, *The New York Times Magazine*, March 5, 1995. p. 43.

21. Dan Friedman, *Dan Friedman: Radical Modernism*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1994. p. 114.
I consider the consistently favorable reviews of *Radical Modernism*, as emblematic of the myopic, New York biased, design press, and the general "dumbing down" of America.

22. Steven Heller, Design (or is it war?) is Hell, *Emigre*, #33, Winter 1995. p. 48.

23. Dietmar R. Winkler, Morality and Myth: the Bauhaus Reassessed, *AIGA Journal*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1990.

24. Steven Heller, Design (or is it war?) is Hell, *Emigre*, #33, Winter 1995. p. 48.

"Today no designer or design organization could or would contemplate universal solutions to the problems of design for the real world. We are still in search of a theory, social commitment is still elusive, so we indulge in our fantasies, ironies and pastiche, which are more comforting (and more profitable) than that respect for 'stern realities' that Gropius demanded from architecture and design." [25]

25. Gillian Naylor, *The Bauhaus Reassessed*, E. P. Dutton, 1985. p. 180.

Designers should stop "hankering" after a mythical modernist ideal, or pretending that art theory is a viable theoretical model for design. We don't need to "conserve" our past and resist change. We need to construct our future theoretical discourse, carefully, around the particular and exciting context of design. We must allow ourselves to look at design in new and challenging ways, we must look for—ourselves.

## The End?