

NOTES

1. "in fashion" and "like (or as) fashion"
2. "world view" or philosophy of life

1984

Dieter Rams, "Omit the Unimportant"

The German architect and industrial designer Dieter Rams (1932-) began working for the German consumer appliance company Braun in 1955, shortly after Ott Aicher and Hans Gugelot of the Ulm Hochschule für Gestaltung (see introduction to "Program of the HfG, Ulm") had created a new, more modern corporate identity for the company. As head of product design at Braun for many decades, Rams established his "less, but better" design ethic as Braun's house style.

Reprinted in its entirety from Dieter Rams, "Omit the Unimportant," *Design Issues* 1:1 (Spring 1984): 24-26. ©1984 by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Reprinted by permission of MIT Press.

Every industrial product serves a specific purpose. People do not buy a specific product just to look at it, rather because it performs certain functions. Its design must conform in the best possible way to the expectations that result from the function the product fulfills. The more intensive and explicit the product's use, the clearer the demands on design. That all sounds very obvious, but anyone who looks at our environment will discover a host of products whose design is not substantiated by any functional necessities. Often you can count yourself lucky if the design is not disturbing during use. Rigid functionalism of the past has been somewhat discredited in recent years. Perhaps justly so because the functions a product had to fulfill were often seen too narrowly and with too much puritanism. The spectrum of people's needs is often greater than designers are willing, or sometimes able, to admit. Functionalism may well be a term with a multitude of definitions; however, there is no alternative.

One of the most significant design principles is to omit the unimportant in order to emphasize the important. The time has come for us to discover our environment anew and return to the simple basic aspects, for example, to items that have unrestricted obvious-seeming functionalism in both the physical and the psychological sense. Therefore, products should be well designed and as neutral and open as possible, leaving room for the self-expression of those using them.

Good design means as little design as possible. Not for reasons of economy or convenience. Arriving at a really convincing, harmonious form by employing simple means is surely a difficult task. The other way is easier and, as paradoxical as it may seem, often cheaper, but also more thoughtless with respect to production. Complicated, unnecessary forms are nothing more than designers' escapades that function as self-expression instead of expressing the product's functions. The reason is often that design is used to gain a superficial redundancy.

The economy of Braun design is a rejection of this type of approach. Braun products eliminate the superfluous to emphasize that which is more important. For example, the contours of the object become more placid, soothing, perceptible, and long-living. Much design today is modish sensation and the rapid change of fashion outdates products quickly. The choices are sensible: disciplined simplicity or forced, oppressive, stultifying expression. For me there is only one way: discipline.

Every manufactured item sends out signals to the mind or emotions. These signals—strong or weak, wanted or unwanted, clear or hidden—create feelings. But the most important factor is whether the item can communicate its use. Of course, a product's effect is also important. What sentiments does it evoke? People are very much directly influenced and emotionally moved by the design of items surrounding them, often without realizing this immediately.

My own experience can be summarized in two theses. First, items should be designed in such a way that their function and attributes are directly understood. For design, this is an opportunity and a challenge. Until recently, this task hasn't been taken very seriously and the opportunity hasn't been used enough. The self-explanatory quality of most products is low, especially in innovative fields where it is very important that a product's utility is understood without the frustrating continuous studies of user's instructions. Design riddles are impudent and products that are informative, understandable, and clear are pleasant and agreeable. Of course, getting products to "talk" by means of design is a demanding task. Creativity, experience, tenacity, ability, and diligence are necessary.

Second, the fewer the opportunities used to create informative design, the more design serves to evoke emotional responses. This is not always conscious but more or less instinctive, created by fireworks of signals that the products send out. Often these responses are so intense that they are confusing. I try to

fight against them. I don't want to be dominated, nor do I want to be excited, stup[e]fied, or amazed. I refuse to be surprised by the steadily increasing dynamic of taste. I refuse, as well, to submit to widespread demands or structures of the market without asking for the product's use.

The latest design trends are intended to evoke emotions by trivial, superficial means. It is not a question of information for use, nor a problem of insight and perception in a broader sense. The issue is stimuli: new, strong, exciting, and therefore aggressive signals. The primary aim is to be recognized as intensely as possible. The aggressiveness of design is expressed in the harshness of combat to attain first place in people's perception and awareness and to win the fight for a front place in store display windows.

I don't support dull or boring design but I do take a stand against the ruthless exploitation of people's weaknesses for visual and haptic signals, which many designers are engaged in. The festival of colors and forms and the entertainment of form sensations enlarges the world's chaos. To out-do each other with new design sensations leads nowhere. The alternative is to return to simplicity. And that requires working hard and seriously.

This task is not only for designers. Participation is required by all those involved in developing new products, and by the public as well. Aggressive individuality must be abandoned. We should not forego innovation, but reject novelty as the sole aim. Our culture is our home, especially the everyday culture expressed in items for whose forms I am responsible. It would be a great help if we could feel more at home in this everyday culture, if alienation, confusion and sensory overload would lessen.

Instead of trying to outdo our rivals, we designers should work together more seriously and thoughtfully. Designers are critics of civilization, technology, and society. But contrary to the many qualified and unqualified critical minds of our time, designers cannot stop there. They must continue to look for something new, something that ensues from the criticism and that can stand up against it. In addition, they cannot remain at the level of words, reflections, considerations, warnings, accusations, or slogans. They must transpose their insights into concrete, three-dimensional objects.

Of the many issues that confront designers, the increase of violence seems to be the most threatening. Destructive, aggressive tendencies are gaining momentum and counteract the idea on which design was founded. It is a frontal attack. I work in the hope of designing objects that are useful and convincing enough to be accepted and lived with for a long time in a very obvious, natural way. But such objects do not fit into a world of vandalism, aggression, and cynicism. In this kind of world, there is not room for design or culture of any type.

Design is the effort to make products in such a way that they are useful to people. It is more rational than irrational, optimistic and projected toward the future rather than resigned, cynical, and indifferent. Design means being steadfast and progressive rather than escaping and giving up. In a historical phase in

which the outer world has become less natural and increasingly artificial and commercial, the value of design increases. The work of designers can contribute more concretely and effectively toward a more humane existence in the future.

1985

The Japan Management Association, "Just-In-Time at Toyota"

The Japan Management Association (JMA) is a nonprofit organization that was established in 1942 under the auspices of Japan's Ministry of International Trade and Industry; its goal is to "pursue innovation in management that will result in improved quality and productivity" in Japanese business enterprises.¹ *Kanban: Just-In-Time at Toyota*, published by the JMA in Japanese in 1985 and in English in 1986, outlines a set of management strategies developed by executive vice president Taiichi Ohno (1912-1990) of Toyota Motor Co. that constituted perhaps the greatest revolution in management theory since Frederick Winslow Taylor's "scientific management" of the early 1900s.

The Japan Management Association, *Kanban: Just-In-Time at Toyota: Management Begins at the Workplace*, edited by the Japan Management Association and translated by David J. Lu (1985; English translation, Stamford, Conn. and Cambridge, Mass.: Productivity Press, 1986); 24, 66, 68-69, 72-73. Reprinted from *Kanban: Just-In-Time at Toyota*, edited by the Japan Management Institute. English translation copyright ©1986 Productivity Inc.; 800-394-6868; www.productivityinc.com.

An ideal condition for manufacturing is where there is no waste in machines, equipment and personnel, and where they can work together to raise the added value to produce profit. The most important concern for us is how closely we can approach this ideal.

To make the flow of things as close as possible to this ideal condition—whether they be between operations, between lines, between processes or between factories—we have devised a system in which the materials needed are