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Introduction

Edugraphology—the myths of design and the design of myths
Victor Papanek

The author makes a critical analysis of the design profession in general and the graphic design field in particular. He contends that most design activity is manipulative in character, wasteful of resources, and unconcerned with real human needs. He also believes that most forms of design education succeed only in turning out competent, competitive consumers, and not creative, autonomous individuals. He suggests that if designers really want to do something for people, they should invite them to participate in the design and production process, stop wasting scarce resources, and try to minimise environmental damage.

The myth of the 26 letter Roman alphabet
Patrick Wallis Burke

The author illustrates and discusses some of the many difficulties presented by English orthography. He believes that learning to read and write English is considerably more difficult than most skilled readers recognise. And it is this failure of the skilled English reader or writer to appreciate this fact, that hampers all attempts at sensible reform.

The Sound-Spell, an alphabet and a policy
Kingsley Read

Kingsley Read, a pioneer worker in the field of English alphabetic reform, introduces his newly developed system of Sound-Spell. This is an augmented Roman alphabet of 42 letters in which no phoneme is rendered digraphically. The rule is one sound, one letter. It is his hope that the system will succeed in reconciling the demands of the learner with those of the skilled, orthodox reader, ultimately becoming normal practice, rather than merely an initial teaching medium.

Soundspel—an American approach to an English phonetic alphabet
The Typographic Committee for Spelling Simplification

In essence, the Soundspel system attempts to make a more rational use of the existing letters of the Roman alphabet. Digraphs and, in some cases, trigraphs are used to identify various consonant, vowel, and vowel plus consonant sounds. By this method some 50 sound-sorts are systematically rendered. An experimental feasibility programme for tape-to-tape computer transliteration of Soundspel is also being carried out.
World language without words
Rudolf Modley

The author examines in detail the present state of chaos in our varied systems of symbolic communication. He seeks to identify the reasons for the failure of many symbols and symbol-systems intended for public use. He suggests that an inter-disciplinary international group of experts should be created to determine the maximum number of graphic symbols which could be accepted by the public, to develop a list of the most urgently needed symbols which might be adaptable to graphic treatment, and to specify the graphic characteristics which these symbols might have.

A group of this nature should include psychologists, linguists, anthropologists, educators, designers, and administrators. Any resulting proposals should be tested internationally, revised, and finally evaluated.

Two approaches to book cover design
Helmut Schmid

The author discusses and compares the work of two German graphic designers and their respective solutions to the design of a range of paperback books.

The book in a TV-age
Erik Ellegaard Frederiksen

The author contends that the book, far from being outmoded, still has enormous untapped potential. He believes that there must be far greater coordination between text and pictures, but that this means that the author must become part of a group of specialists who together create a new tool from his initial text. He further suggests that even literature might go further than monotonous pages of grey type. His own article attempts to demonstrate some of his ideas by adopting a rather more dynamic appearance and varying the weight of type used.

"They want production to be limited to "useful things," but forget that the production of too many "useful" things results in too many "useless" people." (Karl Marx)

Design philosophy and the designer's self-image have been victim to a series of shocks. Some twenty years ago designers saw themselves primarily as artists, able to close the gap between technology and market-ing through their concern with form, function, colour, texture, harmony and proportion. For an industrial designer or architect, a further concern was with cost, convenience and "taste." Within ten years the designer's role had broadened into a systems approach, showing greater interest in production, distribution, market-testing and sales. This opened the door to team-design, although with the team largely made up of the technocrats, sales specialists and modish "persuaders."

More recently a very few designers have attempted to create a new design coalition in which users of tools and makers of tools (read: consumers and workers) participate in the shaping of the design process together with social anthropologists, ecologists and others.

Elitist circles in design have even more recently given rise to such gimmicks as the "Nostalgia wave," "Kitsch Nouveau," "New Brutalism," and other fashions carefully manipulated to increase hedonistic ethnocentricity. In the Western world the concept of "designing things" and "Making things" is different is only about 250 years old. From then on the idea of design was increasingly connected to the appreciation of things deemed "beautiful" by an upper-class culture that created a moral and ethical basis for the concept of beauty.

Louis Sullivan's "Form-follows= Function," Frank Lloyd Wright's "Form-and-Function-are-one" and "Truth-to-Material," I like the Bauhaus "Fitness-for-Purpose" and "Unity-in-Diversity" were all basically ethical and moral imperatives. Often the moral imperatives ousted the practical reality, as anyone who ever sat on a Frank Lloyd Wright chair or read by a Bauhaus Kugellicht can testify.

Our future job in design education is made easier, not harder, by these changes design has experienced. For now the nexus between auto-nomous man and the benign environment has emerged as our new moral imperative.

Now the whole formal concept of design is under attack: increasing numbers of people feel that design no longer serves them, that modern planning and architecture are alienating (they are): industrial designer class-oriented (it is): and graphic design trivial and boring (it is). Design is further and further removed from people and the real world and it seems that "they up there" are out of touch with "us down here" (And all that is all too true).

Design education and the design establishment have responded to this in two ways:


2. "Business-as-usual" on one level, with increasing preoccupation by small design sectors with artificially invented "Third World" design, playground planning, aids for the handicapped or other minority groups.

About concentrating on an invented Third World and other "needs," one can say that this has to do with what Freud called Verdinglichung and which I translate as "Objectification." It involves the change from knowing one's real needs into a demand for consumer goods. It makes survival of marginal or oppressed groups or countries dependent on the knowledge monopoly of a professional elite and on the production monopoly of specialists.

"Basic needs" thus are re-defined as those that can be solved only by internationalised professions. (Since local production of internationalised products is highly profitable to native, highly trained elites, such groups will defend this as a "legitimate struggle against foreign domination."")

Edugraphology—the myths of design and the design of myths
Victor Papanek
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Finally, by flipping out into only designing for real or invented minorities, the mainstream of design is left to the mercy of establishments and their valuation.

Graphic design and graphic design education seem generally dedicated to six discernible directions:

1. To persuade people to buy things they don't need with money they don't have to impress others who don't care.
2. To persuasively inform about the class-merits of an artifact, service or experience.
3. To package in a wasteful and ecologically indefensible way, artifacts, services or experiences. (Look at any undertaker's coffin!)
4. To provide visual delight or visual catharsis to those classes taught to don't care.
5. To persuasively inform about the class-merits of an artifact, service or resources as if they were renewable (income resources).
6. The myth that design is for people. Design is mainly for designers. All designers know how hard it is to persuade marketing people to accept their designs. Marketing people in turn know how hard it is to get people to buy the goods. Right now millions carry expensive fountain pens that must be softly sand-papered from time to time to be kept "good-looking," just so that its designer might win a prize in Milano or a magazine page in Britain or a few notes of Modern Art award in New York. If Design were really for people it would be expensive, simple, small in scale and aware of the ever-increasing pace, subject to the same market-maniipulations that govern other commodities.

The myth that design is for production. Compared to the ideal of the how of design there is no future world of design that we could call the world of the perfect designer. A product is a thing, whereas a designer is a person. How of design must place the responsibilities of the designer and the values of the consumer in a right relationship. How of design must place the values of the consumer and the responsibilities of the designer in a right relationship.

8. The myth that design is for people. Design is mainly for designers. All designers know how hard it is to persuade marketing people to accept their designs. Marketing people in turn know how hard it is to get people to buy the goods. Right now millions carry expensive fountain pens that must be softly sand-papered from time to time to be kept "good-looking," just so that its designer might win a prize in Milano or a magazine page in Britain or a few notes of Modern Art award in New York. If Design were really for people it would be expensive, simple, small in scale and aware of the ever-increasing pace, subject to the same market-maniipulations that govern other commodities.

9. The myth that design satisfies needs. It does, but at great social cost. Furthermore the needs satisfied are invented ones. An airbrush, for instance, is an expensive, specialised and hierarchical tool. It takes months to really master it (or to be mastered by it). It makes its user into a professional specialist whereas a plain sable brush is cheap, easy to use, open to all and has infinitely more creative scope for the user.

10. The myth that design is time-related. Much design is concerned with creating artificial obsolescence. But obsolescence always creates devaluation leading to alienation and finally existential Angst. When design is for permanence, permanence is interpreted as five to ten years, whereas in reality a good tool (say: a bicycle, a motorised push-cart, a community freezer or an axe) should minimally last a life-time.

Design is a basic human ability to help autonomous self-realization. Designers and design educators are engaged in withdrawing this ability from all but a carefully screened group of people, through mythologizing who we are and what we do. We must de-mythologize and de-professionalize our work and our training.

I would like to list ten ways of bringing design back into the mainstream of life:

1. Some designers will be able to connect themselves differently in the future: why do thousands of us work for industry, but almost none of us for trade unions? Why do we work directly for cigarette companies or car makers, but almost never for cancer clinics or autonomous groups of pedestrians or bicyclists?
2. Designers will have to concern themselves consistently with the important differences between non-renewable and renewable resources, as mentioned earlier.
3. Design must enable people to participate directly both in the design development and the production stages of objects. Cross disciplinary teams must contain makers and users.
4. Designers will form new coalitions with makers and users; new coalitions between users and re-users.
5. A well designed technology must be one of self-reliance. That is a technology that is capital saving (the word "capital" is used here to denote non-renewable resources). It will further be a technology that is simple, small in scale and aware of ecological, social and political consequences of the design act.
6. Design must cure people of product addiction. This can only be done by de-mythologizing not only design but also the object itself.
7. Some of us can through schools bring our students into direct and continuous contact with real people's real needs in a real world, instead of manufacturing needs for them.
8. Design will still be concerned with tools. But they will be as unlike most of today's products as feasible: products and tools that only create the very demands they are specialised to satisfy and thus eliminate or diminish human labor, participation and ability.
9. As I have said somewhere else: all men are designers. All that healthy men do is design. We must take note of that and through our own work enable more and more people to design their own experiences, services, tools and artifacts. The poor countries need to do this to find work for their people, the rich countries in order to survive.
10. Technology as such need not be feared; the alphabet, Arabic numbers, moveable type, typewriter, photocopier, tape-recorder and camera have given us the "open-ended" tools to move design from myth to participation, from a joyous, autonomous way of personal fulfillment.

Let me close by quoting a proverb from China that sums up why design and design education must be directly tied to meaningful work and participatory life:

"I hear and I forget, I see and I remember, I do and I understand."
Another Cause (and perhaps borrowed from the former) which hath contributed not a little to the maiming of our Language, is a foolish Opinion, advanced of late Years, that we ought to spell exactly as we speak; which befile the obvious Inconvenience of utterly destroying our Etymology, would be a thing we should never see an End of. Not only the several Towns and Countries of England, have a different way of Pronouncing, but even here in London, they clip their Words after one Manner about the Court, another in the City, and a third in the Suburbs; and in a few Years, it is probable, will all differ from themselves, as Fancy or Fashion shall direct: All which reduced to Writing would entirely confound Orthography. Yet many People are so fond of this Conceit, that it is sometimes a difficult matter to read modern Books and Pamphlets; where the Words are so curtailed, and varied from their original Spelling, that whoever hath been used to plain English, will hardly know them by sight.

The myth of the 26 letter Roman alphabet
Patrick Wallis Burke

The alphabet is the last, the most highly developed, the most convenient and the most easily adaptable system of writing. Alphabetic writing is now universally employed by civilized peoples: its use is acquired in childhood with ease. There is an enormous advantage, obviously, in the use of letters which represent single sounds rather than ideas or syllables. No sinologist knows all the 80,000 or so Chinese symbols, but it is also far from easy to master the 9,000 or so symbols actually employed by Chinese scholars. How far easier it is to use the 22 or 24 or 26 signs only!

But the accidental concurrence of her need to learn to read and write English with my wish to learn to read and write Chinese, has given me the chance to make some useful comparisons. Comparing the two languages in terms of their capacity to render human experience is pointless—a bit like comparing football with chess. They are two totally different solutions to the same human problem.

Chinese is unquestionably difficult to learn. But I believe that laymen exaggerate its difficulties. More importantly, they seem blind to the considerable difficulties of our own alphabetic system. They have also forgotten what it felt like to be a child learning to read, and they mistakenly contrast the task of learning thousands of Chinese characters with that of learning "a mere 26 letters of the alphabet."

My daughter, Kirsten, is now almost five years old and has just begun her primary school education. For well over a year now she has steadily acquired a working knowledge of the Roman alphabet, and her progress has given me lots of reminders of something I had long forgotten—the business of learning to read.

Here, then, are the 26 letters of the alphabet.

Or, rather, here are the 26 Capital or Majuscule letters of the Roman alphabet.

I have chosen an elegant modern version, Helvetica, which still owes a good deal to the classic Roman original.
And here are a further 26 letters—the matching lower-case or minuscules of the previous alphabet. For Kirsten, these represented an additional learning problem. Most of them are completely different from the capitals. Only Cc, Oo, Ss, Vv, Ww, Xx, and Zz are identical in form. These additional letters give no extra sound-rendering possibilities. They do exactly the same job as the capital letters. So Kirsten had to learn 19 redundant characters. But she also had to be able to recognise non-letters, such as punctuation marks and numerals.

There are a great many styles of Roman alphabet, of course. Here are six variants—some old, some new. To a skilled adult reader such a set of minor variations gives no problems in recognition. My daughter, however, found it extremely difficult to see each of these examples as being the same letter. The lower-case a's, g's, and q's she refused to accept as being the same character. The Italic capitals were only accepted grudgingly.

The fact that we combine both upper and lower-case letters causes further recognition problems for children. In these examples, one can see that the word “the” can be made to look quite different, depending upon one’s choice of letters. Similarly, discrepancies in the forms of individual letters, as in the word “big,” can also throw a child.

Fortunately, children hang on to their innate common-sense for quite a long time. It usually takes secondary schooling or the university to knock it out of them. Kirsten soon saw that capital and lower-case letters served much the same purpose. So, in her early writings she used whichever form came to mind first.
A new breakfast food appeared on our kitchen table one morning—an American manufacturer's response to current anxieties about chemically treated foods. Claiming to be "100% natural cereal," it carried the name "California Revival."

Presumably, in inventing the name, the advertising agency had sought to unite the twin attractions of the health-giving properties of Californian sunshine and the spirit-boosting properties of "that old-time religion." Cereal manufacturers are all heart. Obviously a commercial artist had been commissioned to decorate the half-full cardboard box, and he came up with the lettering that I've drawn here.

Kirsten didn't do very well in identifying the letters of this particular alphabet, either. She also said that she didn't like it. Which I thought showed powers of discernment well beyond her years. Just how many beautiful or ill-formed variants of the Roman alphabet will a child encounter in the early stages of reading?

And, as reading develops, think of the multiplicity of handwriting styles that will need to be deciphered. How large, then does the alphabet become? How large a repertoire of forms does the average good reader need to have? Hundreds, certainly, perhaps even thousands of character variations would not seem impossible.

But up to this point, I have only been considering the problems of visual recognition of individual letters of the alphabet. The alphabetic system, however, is primarily a way of coding phonemes, or particles of sound. In English there are 40 or more typical sounds that English people use when speaking their own language. Since there are only 26 letters available as coding units, the writing system has to resort to digraphs, or various combinations of letters to stand for those sounds that cannot be rendered by a single letter of the alphabet. This, in itself, would not put too much strain on the memory of a learner, if the code were systematic. Unfortunately, the English coding system is highly redundant.

If the written code has lots of alternative written and printed characters for the same sound-unit, then it becomes difficult for the learner to deduce the underlying system. In the sentence, "we see the sea," three of the words have the same vowel sound (we, see, sea). Yet three different letter combinations are used (e, ee, ea). To add to the confusion, the fourth word "the" also makes use of the letter "e" but only to represent a quite different sound—the neutral or schwa vowel, which phoneticians usually indicate by an "ë" printed upside down.
Vowel sounds, in particular, are poorly served by the Roman alphabet. It only offers 5 characters, whereas the least one needs to represent English phonetically is seventeen.

Take a look at this extraordinary set of English words. All of them are generally pronounced with the same vowel sound—the "i" as in the word "ice."

In the face of these examples I would contend that Chinese is slightly easier to learn. In no sense could they be termed examples of phonetic writing. To read and spell them correctly one has to rely on visual memory, rather than on one's ears.

Richard Scarry's 'word-books' have been a constant source of pleasure to my daughter. A few months ago she staggered into my work-room with an armful of them. She dropped them beside my typewriter and suggested that I stop what I was doing and read them with her. She opened a colourful double-spread showing drawings of all the animals who would figure in subsequent stories. I was asked to read the names of some of them.

Running my finger along the words I read aloud... "Ali Cat... Squeaky... Pa and Ma Pig..." She called a halt to our litany and said that she would read some herself. Her finger selected an 8 letter name. The hissing sound indicated that she had successfully identified the initial letter 's.'

And here's another thing, whilst I think of it. About a year ago, when I began learning to read and write Chinese, Kirsten was interested in the many characters I copied out as a means of memorising them. A few weeks ago she was proudly showing me some of her writing.

She then correctly drew the symbol for "field.

She's not exactly into classic Chinese calligraphy, but as Lao-tse said; "... A thousand mile journey begins with one step."

Analysis of all the alternative ways of writing and printing the forty or more English phonemes, shows that there are more than two thousand alternative graphemes of the kind shown here.

With a sinking heart I heard the sound she was making for the second letter. I should explain that the letter 'u' had consistently refused to fix itself in her memory bank. For days past she had always needed to ask what it was whenever we met it in print. I had repeatedly told her that people called it 'Yew' and they usually pronounced it 'ugh' as in the word 'ugh.'

Today it was obvious that this drilling had paid off. "hiss... ugh... per..." a pause—then a triumphant "Superbee!"

What does one say at such times? English orthography is unfair to fathers, Dr Diringer. Sooner or later, my daughter will learn to recognize my limitations. The Roman alphabet ensures that it will be sooner, and I am fed up with apologizing for it.
Burke: The myth of the 26 letter
Roman alphabet

Top, fragment of Gutenberg's type.
Below, part of a Cyrillic alphabet
designed by Todor Vardijev,
two lines in Berthold's Arabic bold
face 49, and two lines in a Hebrew
typeface based on the design of
Rabbi Frank for the Ruhl type
foundry.
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There was a time, Dr Diringer, when
I would have argued just as
pompously as Jonathan Swift in
his letter of 1712:
I love the English language and
enjoy its intricacies.
Its absurd spelling conventions
always seemed to me no more than
the harmless eccentricities of
a well-loved friend.
But English, like all other languages,
is primarily spoken sound.
If our culture truly wishes to
extend communication by making
these sounds visible, then why
should there not be a closer match
between the spoken and written
language?
If your belief in the supremacy of
the alphabetic system rested upon
its ability to render the spoken
sounds of language, then I might
agree with you.
But which present-day alphabet is a
perfect phonetic system?
Neither the Latin, Cyrillic, Arabic,
Semitic, nor indeed any other
alphabet has sufficient characters
to unambiguously render all the sounds
made by native speakers.

Culture is always remarkably
conservative, Dr Diringer.
Old practices tend to linger on long
after better methods have been
discovered.
Chinese characters reached their
familiar form because they were
shaped by someone using a brush and
ink. Yet most modern Chinese
printing still reproduces them in all
their ancient complexity.
The first books printed in English
faithfully copied fourteenth century
handwriting, rather than exploit the
new freedoms offered by the
printing process.
No one will claim even 'cultural inertia' more
clearly demonstrated than in some of
the words we still use to describe the
arts of writing and printing.
The word 'write' once meant 'to
scratch, to cut', and relates, presum­
ably to the days when the early
Germanic tribes slashed runes on
lumps of wood.
'Book' is a variant of 'beech', since
this was a favoured rune-cutting
material.
The word 'read' in its earlier days
meant 'to decipher, to guess' and is
a remarkably accurate description
of my daughter's first efforts.
The French still write with a 'plume'
(feather), even though quill pens
died out some time ago.

It is never hard to know how to
improve something.
The hardest task is to persuade people
to want the improvement.
Perhaps George Bernard Shaw was
right in suggesting that it might take
a civil war to bring about the intro­
duction of a sensible English alphabet.

Certainly, the Russian Revolution
brought about some minor
improvements in their alphabet.
And so to the Tse Tung's gooner, a gooner has
increased literacy by drastic simplifi­
cation of their writing system.
On the other hand, the French
Revolution failed to modernise
mediaeval French spelling, and only
left us with the decimal system.

Unskilled readers do not need to be
told that English orthography is
difficult.
Even in the universities one meets
students who experience difficulties
in reading and writing.
It has been estimated that there are
at least two million functionally
illiterate adults in England and Wales.
They are either quite unable to read
or write, or they have a reading age
of less than one would expect from
a nine-year old child.

More still have a reading age of
between nine and thirteen years.
Thirteen years is the functional
literacy level as defined by Unesco.
This means that a surprisingly high
proportion of our population is
unable to read a newspaper, a legal
document, or the label on a
potentially dangerous household
product.
Nor is it true to say that all people
with chronic reading problems are
either educationally sub-normal
or mentally deficient.
Many intelligent people fail to master
the arts of reading and writing.

Is it then possible to assert that our
present alphabetic system of
writing is "acquired easily in
childhood?"
LAVINIA [composedly] Yes, Captain: they love even their enemies.

THE CAPTAIN. Is that easy?

LAVINIA. Very easy, Captain, when their enemies are as handsome as you.

THE CAPTAIN. At you, Captain! Impossible.

THE CAPTAIN. Then you are flirting with me, which is worse. Dont be foolish.

LAVINIA. But such a very handsome captain.

THE CAPTAIN. Incorrigible! [Urgently] Listen to me. The men in that audience tomorrow will be the vilest of voluptuaries: men in whom the only passion excited by a beautiful woman is a lust to see her tortured and torn shrieking limb from limb. It is a crime to gratify that passion. It is offering yourself for violation by the whole rabble of the streets and the riff-raff of the court at the same time. Why will you not choose rather a kindly love and an honorable alliance?

LAVINIA. They cannot violate my soul. I alone can do that by sacrificing to false gods.

THE CAPTAIN. Sacrifice then to the true God. What does his name matter? We call him Jupiter. The Greeks call him Zeus. Call him what you will as you drop the incense on the altar flame; kindly love and an honorable alliance?

LAVINIA. No. I couldnt. That is the strange thing, Captain, that a little pinch of incense should...
think what toll-free pleasant children will take in learning to read when printed letters and other sounds are always consistently related. With that assurance, those slow sound-redop soon become fast sound-redop, helped not by context, the child gets sens from our grown-up spellip, az yoo hav red the sens ov stranj-lukip wurd.

the ool and tha pusí-kat went tó se in a biyautiful pe-gren bot, tha tuk sum huni and plenti ov muni rapt up in a fiv pound not, the ool lukt up tó tha starz abuv, and sap tó a smol gitar, o luvli pusí o pusí mj luv, what a biyautiful pusí yoo ar, yoo ar, yoo ar! what a biyautiful pusí yoo ar!

pusí sed tó the ool, yoo elignat full how charmíngli swet yoo sip! o let us be marid! too lop we hav tarid, but what shal we doo for a rip? thá sad awa for a yer and a da, too tha land whi thà bop-tre gro, and thà in a wud a pigi-wig stud with a rip at the end ov hiz noz, hiz noz, hiz noz, with a rip at the end ov hiz noz.

Educationists uninterested in reforming English spelling are showing interest in the use of 'initial teaching media' which enable children sooner to read fluently, not only in spelling more often true to speech, but sooner and better in normal orthodox spelling. The first and best attested of such media is i.t.a., the Initial Teaching Alphabet.

Though no teacher, I have admired its successes over the last decade and have seen its procedures and results in school practice.

The following pages explore the possibility, the belief, that permanent reform could be advanced— as gradually as necessary— by a yet easier, more thorough, initial medium: by tolerating a rather wider gap than i.t.a.'s between novel and normal reading matter. If that wider gap can be jumped by children half as easily as they jump at present from i.t.a. to orthodox texts, then a thorough sound-spelling stands ready for permanent adoption as soon as a whole generation learns and wants it. This reforming strategy, with a Sound-spell only novel enough to serve it, is presented in this article.

English spelling is not only distracting to foreigners: it confuses, delays and inhibits children learning to read the language they speak. What can be done about it?

The whole language can be spoken intelligibly with 42 distinguishable sorts of sounds or 'phonemes' listed below. It needs as many single characters in its alphabet if spelling is to become simple and consistently related to pronunciation.

The Sound-Spell is an alphabet of 42 letters, spelling 42 phonemes with perfect constancy and economy of lettering. No phoneme is spelled diphthongally, though some are diphthongal in sound. No capital letters are used. A name-dot before proper names replaces capital initials. Thus a total of 43 characters can be substituted on typewriting and setting keyboards for their 52 Roman majuscules and minuscules.

The Sound-Spell is designed with these transitional and ultimate aims:

1. To introduce an exact spelling of known pronunciations as the most encouraging initial medium in learning to read. (Early confidence in sound-reading never delays and normally advances sight-reading of orthodox texts. That confidence should not be disturbed by frequent compromises with orthodox spelling such as two letters used diagnostically for yet a third sound, or by spelling words as they cannot be spoken.

2. To perpetuate this exact sound-spelling in the written work of education at all levels. (New generations with 10-15 years’ habituation to it will wish sound-spelling universally adopted and orthodox spelling superceded even in print.)

3. To minimize opposition and bridge the generation gap. (Orthodox sight-readers should need no tuition and little patience to understand at sight what is spelled by sound in an acceptable alphabet.)

Hopefully, these opening two examples embracing all 42 phonemes may be read without referring to the alphabetic key.

Publishers will always adopt (and writers will follow) one invariable spelling of each word: it helps readers. It is enough to standardize words as they somewhere, sometimes are heard provided that, so heard, they are recognizable everywhere.

For instance, words are better understood in print if all r’s are sound-spelled, following most American and Scottish pronunciation of them in preference to muting them, whenever another consonant follows, as a Southern dialect does.

Unambiguous single lettering of sounds saves on average one-seventh of orthodox lettering; or one-sixth if the is always written without its variable vowel. Far less frequently used contractions will include Mr, Mrs, Dr, etc. (Mr, Mrs, Dr, etc.)

Here is a Spell to transform the English reading of our children and foreigners' English pronunciation from chaos to order, from frustration to relish. Why should English remain the worst spelled language in the world?
The sound-spelling here proposed is evolutionary rather than revolutionary. It seeks to advance from one line of least resistance.

The first problem is how to rid young readers of their early instructions and bring about their turning spellings into sounds. By what consistent reasoning is the beginner to pronounce the letter 'O' differently in each of the simple words "to go" or to recognize the same vowel sound differently spelled in "to go own"? How come the eight sounds spelled alike with an A: the unuttered B in "lamb climb," the C with either a K or an S sound: the T sound and silent E in "messed asked;" the spelling of "if of (o) enough (inu)? ... Imagine the mental confusion engendered by 'simple' words in orthographic spelling. What a start for education!

But advanced teachers in recent years have made a better beginning. Many of the hundreds of infant reading methods now begin by learning an alphabet enlarged to some 42 letters from their spelling. This is not supposition. It is what has happened wherever an "initial teaching medium" is used till reading is attempted prematurely.

Whole contexts are helping his grasp speed, his now orthodox reading is as fast as ever. How cope with the eight sounds sometimes heard. The number of affixes only debatable in so far as they are repeatedly met in reading. The most recurrent words we read consist of repetitions of some 70 brief words. Of these, about half are unaffected by contextual emphasis or lack of it, or by dialect changes. Words of less frequent occurrence are less liable to alternative pronunciation of their root syllables, leaving a limited number of affixes only debatable in sound-spelling. The number of different syllables to be standardized, all told, is manageable in so far as they are repeatedly met in reading. The most frequent words and affixes and suggested spellings are set out in an Appendix to be published later.

How, for example, is the definite article, "the," to be written? Is it to become one of the two different words, like "a an," as context changes its vowel sound? Is it more consonant—just as some wise authorities suggest, and as it can be heard colloquially in context intelligibly—as a consonantal sound without any (variable) vowel? A new single letter?

Many hundreds of letters in sound-writing have been exchanged with America, the Antipodes, Africa, and parts of Britain with differing dialects. Correspondence circles have tested for years the perfect intelligibility and advantages of any sound-spelling done with 40 or more letters. That is more evident from experience than from theory. To children, one is told, the simple craft of sound-spelling is an exciting experience.

The sound-spelling here proposed is evolutionary rather than revolutionary. It seeks to advance from one line of least resistance.

The first problem is how to rid young readers of their early instructions and bring about their turning spellings into sounds. By what consistent reasoning is the beginner to pronounce the letter 'O' differently in each of the simple words "to go" or to recognize the same vowel sound differently spelled in "to go own"? How come the eight sounds spelled alike with an A: the unuttered B in "lamb climb," the C with either a K or an S sound: the T sound and silent E in "messed asked;" the spelling of "if of (o) enough (inu)? ... Imagine the mental confusion engendered by 'simple' words in orthographic spelling. What a start for education!

But advanced teachers in recent years have made a better beginning. Many of the hundreds of infant reading methods now begin by learning an alphabet enlarged to some 42 letters from their spelling. This is not supposition. It is what has happened wherever an "initial teaching medium" is used till reading is attempted prematurely.

Whole contexts are helping his grasp speed, his now orthodox reading is as fast as ever. How cope with the eight sounds sometimes heard. The number of affixes only debatable in so far as they are repeatedly met in reading. The most recurrent words we read consist of repetitions of some 70 brief words. Of these, about half are unaffected by contextual emphasis or lack of it, or by dialect changes. Words of less frequent occurrence are less liable to alternative pronunciation of their root syllables, leaving a limited number of affixes only debatable in sound-spelling. The number of different syllables to be standardized, all told, is manageable in so far as they are repeatedly met in reading. The most frequent words and affixes and suggested spellings are set out in an Appendix to be published later.

How, for example, is the definite article, "the," to be written? Is it to become one of the two different words, like "a an," as context changes its vowel sound? Is it more consonant—just as some wise authorities suggest, and as it can be heard colloquially in context intelligibly—as a consonantal sound without any (variable) vowel? A new single letter?

Many hundreds of letters in sound-writing have been exchanged with America, the Antipodes, Africa, and parts of Britain with differing dialects. Correspondence circles have tested for years the perfect intelligibility and advantages of any sound-spelling done with 40 or more letters. That is more evident from experience than from theory. To children, one is told, the simple craft of sound-spelling is an exciting experience.
A prototype typewriter alphabet for Sound-Spell being developed by Patrick Wallis Burke for Kingsley Read. It is an adaptation of an existing typewriter face augmented to include the system's additional characters.

Read: Sound-Spell, an alphabet and a policy.
Shown here are two possible layouts for 44 black keys, 88 characters. Either Sound-spelling or Orthodox spelling (without capital letters) can be accomplished. The first layout has been determined by the estimated frequency of each letter's occurrence in sound-spelling, and rearranges roman characters accordingly.

Of the unshifted letters d, g, k, and l are slightly modified presumably. In conventional form they could occupy some of the shifted blanks, along with the restored q, x and c.

The fingering assumed is that the left hand covers 5 keys in every row; right hand for the others.

Giving preference to orthodox spelling (without capitals), the second layout-Version 2—retains the 26 roman minuscules in their familiar (but ill-considered) positions, with all new letters except $ (measure) unshifted. This relegated letter has an average occurrence of once in two thousand letters only.

But without active encouragement from educational authorities and training colleges, how can teachers in general welcome sound-spelling as a new way of writing and reading English? How can they expect to compete with the quicker teaching of sound-spelled Finnish, of reformed Russian, Turkish, Dutch spelling, and of Spanish and Italian so little needing reform? Where is the lead to come from? What is the authorized scheme? Who is working towards decision and action?

Suppose one university or authority each in USA, Britain, Canada, Australia, were to agree decisively on a wholly adequate alphabet and its sound-spelling: would it not carry weight—and momentum? The year 2000 might then see a generation of English-speaking children reading and writing with no problems and more delight.
In view of the fact that we are publishing the first announcement of the late Kingsley Read’s "Soundspel," it was thought that readers might take the chance to compare it with an American approach to the same problem.

In spite of their similar names, the two systems represent radically different solutions.

Dr Godfrey Dewey's thorough research indicates that the "oo"-sound in "moon" occurs more frequently than the "oo"-sound in "wood" or "would." So Soundspel picks the digraph "oo" for the vowel sound in "moon" and uses a new digraph—uu—for the "wood"-sound.

At first the combination "uu" may seem a bit awkward to English readers because today it is found only in the word "vacuum." Fortunately, it will occur but once in every 135 words—only two or three times on an average page.

The other Soundspel digraphs and trigrams fall naturally into place and their pronunciation is largely self-evident. That is why anyone who can read English will soon see that he can read Soundspel too.

This article is an edited version of the material supplied by the Typographic Committee for Spelling Simplification, which is sponsored jointly by the International Typeface Corporation and the Photo Lettering Inc, and the Typographic Education Corporation.
The complete Soundspel alphabet system is shown here. The Soundspel concept is not novel: it is an adaptation—for English—of the phonetic spelling used daily by millions who write in Spanish, Italian, German, Russian, Swedish, Dutch, Finnish, Hungarian, Turkish and most other western languages. Some day, perhaps, such a system could free us from the ordeal of memorizing the spelling irregularities that are found in more than 100,000 English words.

Pairs of vowels ending in 'e' (ae ee ie oe uo) are pronounced like the first letter of the pair when you say 'a, e i, o, u' in reciting the alphabet—abedefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz.

Oldspell date, wait
Soundspell daet, wäet (ae)

Oldspell heat, feet
Soundspell heet, feet (ee)

Oldspell bite, right
Soundspell biet, riet (ie)

Oldspell boat, note
Soundspell boet, noet (oe)

Oldspell cute, few
Soundspell cuet, fue (ue)

The vowel-sound in 'good, should' etc., is written 'uu'-guud, shuud. (No change in 'oo' for the sound in 'moon, food, boot, loom, groom,' etc)

The Soundspell is close enough to our present day English so that you are not likely to misread it.

*The short vowels (a e i o) in unstressed syllables are often pronounced almost like a short u. (Linguists call this diluted pronunciation 'schwa'.)

**To keep certain words looking more familiar, medial and final au and ou may be replaced by aw and ow (as in 'law', 'tower').

1 To keep words looking more familiar, the final e may be dropped from words ending in ee (wee, hee), ie (ailiée), oe (goë, noë).

2 er and ur sound alike. Use er in unstressed syllables; use ur in stressed syllables.

3 After the short vowel-sounds a e o u use double rr rather than single r (to prevent confusion with the digraphs ar, er, or, ur).

4 th and x have two pronunciations—unvoiced th (thin), and voiced th (this); unvoiced x (axe, ks) and voiced x (exam, gz).

5 y is used not only as a consonant (yet), but also as a vowel (holy) often replacing unstressed ee or i.

Five self-evident abbreviations are used—u (you); i (I); th (the); to (to); do (do).
The visitor to a medieval European city, frequently illiterate, was often guided to the shops he was looking for by the "public symbols" of the tradesmen—the barber’s pole, the baker’s pretzel, the pawnshop’s three balls, the apothecary’s mortar and pestle. Limited in number and often related to the image of the craftsman’s products or tools, these symbols became guides to those looking for guidance.

Universally recognized, too, were the symbols of religious, political, and other institutions—the cross on the church steeple, the flags of friend and enemy, and the insignias and standards of the guilds of craftsmen and traders.

The pretzel did not stand for Baker Jones alone, the flag with the eagle for King Henry alone, or the cross for Bishop Harold alone. The pretzel represented all bakers, the flag King Henry and all his men and possibly his whole dynasty, and the cross stood for the church itself. It is this characteristic of a comparatively simple geometric shape representing a concept—broad or narrow—which makes the graphic symbol and which differentiates it from a portrait or a phus of Baker Jones or a painting of Henry V and from any other effort to portray the Church.

The most widely used graphic symbols are simple geometric shapes.

While a few generally recognized symbols—such as religious, political, astrological—played an important role in the past, it is no exaggeration to state that modern Western civilization has rest, and still largely rests, on a few graphic symbols: the letters of our alphabet and the Indo-Arabic numerals.

It is important to note, too, that we have not expanded the number of these commonly used basic graphic symbols significantly in recent history. The cild who learns to read and write and do arithmetic works with just about the same 50 basic symbols that were taught to his parents, grandparents, and earlier generations.

Enlarging our repertoire of graphic symbols could help us overcome some communication problems.

In spite of the enormous contribution which the 50 graphic symbols—and especially the 20 or so sound symbols—make to communication, we are beginning to realize serious shortcomings in written communication. Open any dictionary to the thesaurus and you’ll find that a single word can mean many different things. This often leads to misunderstandings when the dictionary meanings are imputed to identical words by the "sender" and the "recipient(s)" of a message.

It is time we started using symbols with a firm and unique meaning.

We may be able to create graphic symbols which have such unique meanings.

There are several thousand different languages and dialects in the world. Even if these languages were all written with the same alphabets (and they are not), people could not communicate freely. A few graphic symbols, universally understood, could overcome some of the language barriers.

"Word thinking" is complex. The words "turn right" have to be read and understood and acted upon. "Direction thinking" is even more complex when the eye gazes the arrow pointing right.

Uniqueness and clarity of meaning, independence from language and cultural differences, and visual directness are the ideal objectives which should underlie the creation of a new symbol system.

Symbolsists (if we may use the term) disagree on how to make the first basic breakdown in trying to classify graphic symbols. Some think that graphic symbols should be divided primarily by their form into "pictographic" and "ideographic." Others state that a breakdown should be used by as "public" and "professional" symbols.

We shall follow the latter breakdown for several reasons which will become clear in the course of the discussion.

We may define public symbols as those intended for the public at large—all those who use highways, schools, or hospitals: work factories and offices; travel in cars, planes, ships, or trains, and so on.

Industrial designer Henry Dreyfuss has published a "Symbol Sourcebook," which contains several thousand graphic symbols, many intended for "public" use, many for limited "professional" use. This collection, amassed over a period of many years from many diverse sources, is of great value to students. It is also a convincing demonstration of how drastically most of the "public" symbols fail to conform to the objectives we have established.

We may define one almost any of the "public" symbols in Dreyfuss’s book and we’ll find that it is not "unique," that it is not "independent of language and culture," and that it does not "convey its message directly by its visual form." This, of course, is not an indictment of Dreyfuss’s work but an indictment of the symbols which have been flooding the world without proper planning, proper coordination, and proper education.

There are a few graphic symbols which the public generally recognizes, accepts and follows.

Several of these are symbols used in traffic; they have been accepted because they are either almost self-evident (it is arrow indicating right or left turn) or have been learned by training, experience, or a combination with verbal instruction ("No Entry"). There are also a number of pictographic (image-related) symbols which, if placed in the proper environment, are generally recognized.

But the largest number of "public" symbols, including traffic symbols, are badly designed, insufficiently taught, and frequently misunderstood.

Recent tests at the Psychological Laboratories of the Universities of Utrecht and Vienna tend to confirm not only the fact that "standard" public symbols (such as Europe’s "universal" railroad symbols on Dutch railways) have a high percentage of failure rates in recognition but also that the symbols in use fail often to correspond with the imaginations of the persons tested.

The most common failures of symbols intended for the public are these: Conceptual failure: the symbol does not express the object or idea. Poor draftsmanship: the symbol is poorly designed. Confusing meanings: several different symbols are conveyed by one symbol conveying different meanings.

Poor use of colour: selection of colour with disregard of colour blindness, disregard of widely accepted meanings.

Failure to fully exploit available background shapes: inconsistent use of background, failure to assign constant meaning to background.

Excessive symbol use: use of symbols even when symbols cannot explain the intended meaning.

Criticism, of course, is easy. It is much more difficult to point the way to a solution. Before we do this, let me try to point out what I think, graphic symbols cannot do.

First of all, it makes no sense to try to develop new universal picture language-complete languages which are based entirely on graphic symbols. Historically, with a few exceptions among the Asian languages, pictographic languages have always evolved into alphabetic or phonetic scripts.

Most scripts in use today originally developed from pictorial signs into alphabetic scripts because those are the most efficient. They require the fewest different symbols. Any new ideographic writing system would, if it were ever produced, revert to a simplified phonetic system in the course of time.

Yet, much effort is being spent on the invention of all-picture languages have been made, many of them by authors who show considerable genius and skill.

The fact that most of us communicate today primarily with about 50 graphic symbols should teach us the next most important lesson: any effort to add more than a sharply limited number of graphic symbols (even pictographic ones) to our public communication system is doomed to failure.

The exact signs or symbols for numerals, the punctuation system, and the mathematical operators must be taught and learned. It takes several years of schooling and practice to do this. It would be very difficult indeed to expand the universally accepted number of non-pictographic graphic symbols from 50 to say, 100 or even 80.

Although the Chinese and Japanese do succeed in learning and using several thousand originally pictographic characters, people in most other cultures find this extremely difficult and too time-consuming. Except for the highly literate Buddhist countries more than half of all rail travellers don’t understand most of the "standard" pictographic symbols dealing with baggage (locks, check-in, etc.), and a full one-third failed to correctly identify 29 different pictographic symbols in one survey. Thus, our aim should be realistic: maybe a dozen or two new alphanumeric symbols (or for such concepts as "You Must," "You Must Not," "Caution," "Instruction," "Poo-Poo") and a small number of image-related symbols whose meanings is easily learned.

This leads to a third warning. Don’t believe that most pictographic (image-related, iconic) symbols are "self-explanatory" in the sense in which the symbol-creating agency intends them to be. There are several severe limitations even to pictographic symbols.

Many pictographic symbols are understood only by highly literate people in the environment in which they occur. A symbol of a cow may be understood as "cattle-crowding" only because we subconsciously assume that an official highway symbol wouldn’t just want to show us what a cow looked like.

Many pictographic symbols of man-made objects are subject to the technological change which the objects themselves undergo. One European railroad crossing symbol shows a railroad engine which looks more as if it were advertising a historic railway museum than a crossing. And how many people still recognize an automobile horn—a symbol still used, now even in the US to indicate "no horn blowing"?
Then there is the abuse of pictographic symbols to represent something which they do not show. The worst example of this is the use of the symbol of a man or a woman to indicate the location of a toilet. In the Austrian experiment, only 19% of the respondents drew a man or a woman to indicate a toilet. More than half drew what they considered a toilet to look like.

Equally misleading is the abuse of pictographic symbols which require complex interpretation before the meaning becomes clear—if it ever does. Using a symbol of a broken egg or a broken wineglass to try to indicate "fragile" is futile. It may be possible to portray the proper handling techniques pictographically in some cases, or we may, some day, have an arbitrary symbol for "fragile." But let's not expect others to follow complex mental processes to guess what is meant by a pictographic symbol.

In sum, there are limitations on the use of pictographic symbols. The best proof of this is that our successful permanent and universal symbols are almost exclusively "arbitrary" symbols whose meaning is accepted by convention. This shouldn't keep us from using pictographic symbols where they have clear advantages. It should teach us to be careful in their use.

This leads to the question of how we should go about developing additional symbols for public use.

The problem of changing today's chaos into order is almost overwhelmingly difficult from a practical point of view. Theoretically, however, we can break it into simple steps: (a) organization; (b) research; (c) development, testing, evaluation; (d) education; and (e) application.

Organization. Only a single world-wide organization can cope with the symbol problem. Today, we have a large number of limited-purpose groups which "do their own thing," often with complete disregard for what others have done. A European traveller who goes to an airport by train finds one set of symbols in the train, developed by the International Railway Union; those in the plane are another set, adopted by the International Civil Aviation Organization. Debarking in New York, the visitor who drives will have to cope with highway symbols which differ from the "international" symbols used in Europe.

The confusion is not limited to transportation; it continues in many different facilities. And to a great extent, the confusion encountered by the visitor is similar to that encountered by the American public in different parts of the United States itself. What is needed is a pooling of the monetary and talent resources of national and international organizations and a willingness to make compromises.

The problem has been recognized. A "working group" on public symbols of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) has been set up. Representatives of different national standards organizations are working within their own nations. The secretariat of the group is the Austrian standards organization. This first step in the right direction is probably the result of pioneering work done by the International Council of Graphic Design Associations (ICograda) and its most active exponent, Peter Kneebone of England. However, the working group still lacks the financial resources and authority to take all of the essential steps required.

Research. Any organization dealing with public symbols will have to face the issue of making the best compromise among what is already widely used, what is needed, and what would be best from a scientific point of view. This requires several lines of activity:

First, all the symbols currently in use should be collected with descriptions of their meanings, the areas where they are used, and the degree of acceptance they have found. This means the creation of symbol collections.

Next, these symbols should be classified by a system which makes it possible to locate symbols quickly and easily by their field of use as well as by their geometric (or pictographic) shape.

(2)

An interdisciplinary international group of experts should be created to determine the maximum number of graphic symbols which could be accepted by the public, to develop a list of the most urgently needed symbols which might be adaptable to graphic treatment, and to specify the graphic characteristics which these symbols might have.

A group of this nature should include psychologists, linguists, anthropologists, educators, designers, and administrators.

Development, Testing, Evaluation. The task of developing symbol systems and symbols on the basis of the specifications laid out by the interdisciplinary group should be assigned to one or more leading designers. The resulting proposals should be tested on an international basis, revised, and finally evaluated. If the outlook appears promising, final symbols should be designed.
Education. One of the elements most frequently ignored is the fact that all symbols must be taught. We do of course recognize this when we think of letters and numerals, but fail to recognize that "public" symbols will require a comparable educational process. They will have to be taught in schools, in adult education courses, in driver training, in vocational training, in guidebooks, and through other avenues of education. This will be especially important when new symbols are to be placed in public circulation.

Application. Only after the steps enumerated above have been fully accomplished can symbols be successfully incorporated into the body of our basic communications. It is obvious from this that governments must become closely involved in the symbol-developing process. Only government cooperation with private institutions on a national and international basis can assure that universal graphic symbols can become a reality.

Because of the scope and the enormous complexity of this process, "public" symbols must be differentiated from the "professional" symbols to which we now turn. The standardization and international acceptance of "professional" symbols is much simpler and much further advanced than that of "public" symbols.

Early searchers into the secrets of the universe found out quickly that graphic symbols offered them valuable shortcuts in their work. The symbols of the astronomer, alchemist, and astrologer are testimony to that.

Many of the professional groups of today have developed their own graphic symbol vocabulary with which they construct diagrammatic designs which express clearly and unequivocally what they want to "say." The architect’s blueprint, the cartographer’s map, and the chemical engineer’s process flow diagrams are written in graphic "language."

Because the number of professionals in each group is relatively small and their training already includes the learning of the trade’s symbols, many professional symbols have become standards for their profession. The process of standardization, which has developed since the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), established as the American Standards Association in 1918, is comparatively simple. One or more technical societies request that a committee be set up to develop standards. Some 270 committees develop and revise standards. Some of these deal with graphic symbols: one is exclusively concerned with "Graphic Symbols and Designations."

This committee, in turn, reports to the Graphic Technical Advisory Board, one of the 20 advisory boards set up by ANSI.

From the national level, standardization moves to the international scene through representation by ANSI at the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) in Geneva and other international standardization bodies. ISO, in turn, has a Technical Committee on Graphic Symbols.

Thus, "professionals" have more or less successfully developed limited languages of their own and organizational structures to make necessary changes and additions. However, "public" symbols are still in a state of chaos. The first steps towards a solution have been taken—highly tentative ones in the United States, more sophisticated ones by ISO. But the task is enormous. It is a challenge to the scientific community, to the design profession, and to the governments of the world.

Footnotes
1 Among the proposed graphic writing systems are the rather primitive SATO by André Eckardt (1955), developed from 1943 to 1951, and PICTO by Charles J. A. Janson (1958). More sophisticated systems have been developed by C. K. Bliss in his Semantography (1946), on which work was probably started in the late 1930’s or early 1940’s, and the most recent LoCoS by Yukio Ote. The major value of these efforts is that some of the symbols suggested may become part of a limited set of universal symbols.
2 Another working group of ISO is at work on this project.
These graphic symbols have been recently developed for the United States Department of Transportation by the American Institute of Graphic Arts. They have been designed by Cook and Shanosky. The symbols will be tested in the United States and have been submitted to the subcommittee of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO).
Two approaches to book cover design
Helmut Schmid

Reihe Hanser
Miladin Zivočić
Proletarischer Humanismus
Studien über Macht, Wert und Freiheit
"Das grundlegende Spezifikum des Menschen wird von Marx in seiner Universalität erkannt, und die Basis dieser Universalität ist seine praktische Aktivität, mit der er die Natur vermenschlicht und sich selbst humanisiert."

Eugene Ionesco
Welch gigantischer Schwindel!

Robert Leicht
GRUNDGESETZ UND POLITISCHE PRAXIS
Parlamentarismus in der Bundesrepublik
"Der Konflikt ist das Material, aus dem die Politik gemacht wird."

Peter von Oertzen
Die soziale Funktion des staatsrechtlichen Positivismus

Neues Hörspiel O-Ton
Der Konsument als Produzent
Versuche. Arbeitsberichte
Herausgegeben von Klaus Schöning

Materialien zu Bertolt Brechts Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg
Herausgegeben von Herbert Knust

Bertolt Brecht
Der gute Mensch von Sezuan

The 'paperback' symbolizes the Instant accessibility of our traditional Western literary culture. It is cheap, compact, standardized and expendable, not an exhibition piece for the bookshelf.

It has been said that when there is no barrier between the reader and the design, then the printed matter has succeeded. Emil Ruder has compared the book page to film music. Film music is successful only when we do not notice it. Book design has succeeded when the reader enjoys the writing but is unaware of the layout.

"Type, the voice of the printed page, can be legible and dull, or legible and fascinating, according to its design and treatment. In other words, what the booklover calls readability is not a synonym for what the optician calls legibility."

Standard book faces are still serif types, like Garamond or Times. At present, sans-serif faces are seldom used in pocket books. Of the two series illustrated here, one uses Garamond, the other Times, both in 9 point with 1 point leading. It is widely believed that 9 point type with a line length of around 60 letters makes for pleasant reading. There has been little change in the positioning of copy since Gutenberg. Books are set with justified text, very seldom flush left. Indenting is a matter of taste, and there may be slight variations in the layout of the title page, the imprint, or the contents page. The main differences between publishers usually starts and finishes with the cover.

"The book jacket has become a necessity and offers a rich field for decoration," wrote Oliver Simon. I believe that such an attitude should be resisted. The cover is not a playground for the decoration of the designer, it signals the title and the publisher, and is wrapping and seller at the same time.

"Should a jacket bear the stamp of a publisher's or a designer's style?" asked Kurt Weidemann in a recent article. Willy Fleckhaus gives a good answer to this question in his cover designs for Suhrkamp Verlag. This is no designer's style, but a straightforward typographical approach which has influenced the German book market considerably. Personally, I dislike giving each book title an individual image through an attempt to evoke the contents of the
book. The search usually becomes unsuccessful—at least after the twentieth title. The Suhrkamp Verlag series began some fifteen years ago, at a time when illustration dominated the forest of German pocket-book publishing. The solution to the Suhrkamp series is masterly. The lower half of the jacket has 8 lines. The top, and subsequent lines designate the author and title, whilst the bottom two lines indicate the publisher. If the title is exceptionally long, extra lines are added. 24 point Garamond stands on full colour. On dark colours the type appears in white, whilst the rules remain black. A very wide spectrum of colours have been used as backgrounds. At this moment there are about 700 books in this modern, yet classical typographic series.

Of a quite different nature is the series of the Hanser Verlag. Typography and illustration are bold, seemingly uncontrolled, the sole unifying feature being the yellow background colour used throughout the series. Type, within this series seems to mean, not one preferred style, but any existing typeface. Many variations, particularly in type styles, gives this series a fascinating and topical look. Nothing on the covers appears to be programmed. The title can be placed at the top, in the centre, or at the bottom. Arrangements can be symmetrical or asymmetrical. Type flows around the illustrations or stands in contrast to them. There are variations in the copy included on the cover, for on the jacket appear not only the author, title and publisher, but quotations and other copy. The series is designed and illustrated by Heinz Edelmann.

The restrained series of Willy Fleckhaus and the bold series of Heinz Edelmann are both solutions of a high order, but whilst the former has reached its limits, the second suggests possibilities for further experiment.
The book in a TV-age

Erik Ellellagd Frederiksen

The book is no longer what it used to be. This is not the grumble of some Jeremiah dolefully finding new proof of degeneration, but an admission that the book will change more and more because man's conditions and situation have altered. Originally, books were intended for the educated few prepared for slow, careful reading.

And the book had practically no rival.

Books are emerging more and more, as the movers of our society— as the information source of most integrity, as the only idea moving slowly enough and solidly enough so you can get hold of them.

The book, therefore, is still a very useful tool. In our minds it is first and foremost something to be read, line after line, and practically all the factors that promote reading are well known. We know that the paperbacks of our age are ideal to handle, and allow the use of suitable line-lengths if the intervals between them are large enough. We also have typefaces that promote the reading process. When certain rules for layout are respected an optimal form is achieved that will survive even in a television age. But not to the extent common in the past.

It is obvious even now that the increase in production will fall in the text-book section. Not in spite of, but due to the audio-visual media. To some extent the book will exist by itself, but it will also be closely coordinated with other teaching methods. It is this latter aspect that must now be aimed at. The challenge will first be felt by authors.

But does that end the role of the book? Not at all. The book offers so many advantages that it cannot be dropped. It can be taken everywhere. It is accessible, economical, effective. It can be skimmed or read slowly, and the reader can at any time return to the point where his understanding started to falter. And you can underline it in it.

As a leading American publisher, Robert Bernstein, put it:

Books are emerging more and more, as the movers of our society— as the information source of most integrity, as the only idea moving slowly enough and solidly enough so you can get hold of them.

In some way or other we must all spend more time at the school desk. Our basic education must be made more effective. Computer-assisted instruction is a reality. We also know that most of us must expect some form of post education.

At first it was believed that the new audio-visual aids, particularly the cassette, would dominate the field, and although the estimates are less promising, we can be sure that the new media are here to stay. The problem is not which one should dominate the classroom, culture centre or home, but to find the most effective combinations. The picture has become just as important to our learning process as the letter was in the past.

The challenge will first be felt by authors. The dynamic text-book cannot be produced only by one person. In the past, the overall text contained the ideas and illustrations were merely added as an afterthought. But to imagine is also to visualize. To see can be the means to understand. After three days, the average remembrance is

10 per cent of a read text
20 per cent of a picture's contents
65 per cent of text + picture.

Obviously, greater coordination between text and picture is needed. But this means the author should become a member of a group of specialists who together create a new tool from his initial text.

Possibly the author can be trained to think more directly in the media, but this demands instruction similar to that needed for film or television.

In brief, the process begins with separation of everything that can be presented in illustrated form. The text that remains is then re-edited, not to melt into an even grey mass, but for division into italics and semi-bold emphasis, colour coding, simple systems of headlines. But apart from the main text, the editorial group would have a whole arsenal of visual aids, including photographs, to use.

Some photographs can speak volumes without need for comment. But many say amazingly little without some explanation. This can, of course, be given in caption form as is most common.

The Swedish publishing consultant, Sven Lidman, pointed out the obvious fact that in a photograph, we see and believe in the reality, and through a drawing we understand the photographic.

The arsenal available is considerable:

- Author
- Pictorial Editor
- Graphic Designer
- Illustrator
- Photographer

Possibly the author can be trained to think more directly in the media, but this demands instruction similar to that needed for film or television. In brief, the process begins with separation of everything that can be presented in illustrated form. The text that remains is then re-edited, not to melt into an even grey mass, but for division into italics and semi-bold emphasis, colour coding, simple systems of headlines. But apart from the main text, the editorial group would have a whole arsenal of visual aids, including photographs, to use.

Some photographs can speak volumes without need for comment. But many say amazingly little without some explanation. This can, of course, be given in caption form as is most common. But more recently it has been more widely realized that a supplementary drawing can replace many words.

All these ingredients can be used alone, but even better in combination. The effect of each is then reinforced. Drawings can be copied into photographs, drawings can explain photographs, and photographs can explain drawings. Cassette, slide, transparency, and picture captions can all be superimposed into the illustratio
We are familiar with this form in the comic strip where text and picture fuse into a whole system that almost makes the text audible.

We know exactly when a figure whispers, or thinks, for the bubbles show each clearly.

In recent years valuable series have appeared that give better promise for the future than Walt Disney’s entertainment industry.

They are not just exciting tales that hold the reader captive.

Time after time it is starting to see how accurately even very unusual details from the past or present are shown, whether the object be an Aztec temple or a certain car.

This is entertainment combined with information of high quality.

There are as many styles of presentation as there are media using living illustrations.

Yet the realization of this has hardly begun. Only slowly is it being realized by a few publishing houses that a book can explain more effectively. Not just for children, but all the way up to the doctorate.

The media are not being used to their full extent.

In a situation where education makes greater and greater demands for motivation, the pages of a book must be made dramatic, must force the reader through information, compel comparison and participation, and then independent activity.

We must create a book form that does not merely present a solution, it must explain it, effectively, by means of the most suitable aids in the best combination.

Some time will pass before we reach this point. On the way, many people will wrinkle their noses and condemn it as superficial because of the economic consequences of this trend. And it is true that such complicated teaching methods are not accepted. But the question remains whether effective processing of the contents of a book cannot shorten the time needed to learn so drastically that the result is a profit. Furthermore, from other media pupils will become accustomed to the effect of illustrations so that the book will look like a silent grey bird by comparison if effective use is not made of the available facilities.

These are the problems that must be faced in the coming years.

So far we have been concerned with the educational book.

But why should literature not go further than monotonous pages of type?

It is true that experiments are being made with word combinations that resemble puzzles more than anything else and can be solved by a chosen few. There is little here the Many can understand.

But some years ago, Benjamin Britten composed his War Requiem, based on three levels with quite different musical combinations that made excellent use of the gramophone’s stereo effect.

Perhaps the idea could be transferred to the verbal level.

Authors might be given normal type, italic and semi-bold as a key to three persons, settings or levels.

Three codes, or even more, that give each their individual image.

Like the bubbles of the comic strip.

The pages of literature could also gain a dynamic appearance.

It only needs the author to learn his tools better, and realize that the way stands open to new and constructive ways of working.

These problems also concern the other media.

A greater graphic contribution can be used on television.

And, to date, the newspaper has not felt inclined to instruct with anything beyond words and an illustration.

In the case of the book, all that remains behind will be a few bibliophiles who turn in disgust, and search unsuccessfully for impressions of the text as it appeared when Gutenberg pressed it on his moistened, hand-made paper: “Books are no longer, what they used to be!”

We can only agree, but add: fortunately! The book still has untapped possibilities.

icographic would like to include a considerably larger selection of material from our Member Associations in future issues of the magazine.

Accordingly the Executive Editor would like to receive articles from members, or suggested experts in member countries. Wherever possible, we would like to group submitted articles into an issue that bears upon a particular theme.

It would be helpful if such contributions were thought of as attempts to add to the collective knowledge of our organization and to the raising of design standards via cognitive, rather than intuitive judgements.

Graphic design has been slower to accumulate ‘ergonomic’ data than science or other design professions, so that we would welcome reports of any investigations that could add to an understanding of the processes of visual communication.

Articles can be from 2000 to 6000 words (depending up on the extent of illustrative material).

They may be submitted in either French, German or English.

It would be particularly helpful if summaries in the remaining two languages could be submitted with the main text.

Listed below is a selection of suggested headings. The list is in no way definitive, it is intended merely to trigger off responses from possible contributors.

Advertising (persuasive or informative), Aesthetics (ethical or descriptive), Art movements in relation to visual communication, Animation, Book Design, Creativity, Cartography, Cartoons, Computer typesetting, Computer graphics, Corporate image, Children’s books, Concrete poetry, Colour theory, Colour printing, Design philosophy, Design practise, Education, Education of graphic designers, Educational use of visual communication, Ergonomics of visual communication, Film, Film setting, Graphic design schools, Graphics in architecture, coinage, entertainment, heraldry, music, magic or the occult, popular culture, religions, sport, science, space-travel, stamps, seals, transport, etc.

Human communication, Information theory, International languages, Legibility research, Methodology, Magazine and newspaper design, Psychology of perception, Printing processes, Photography, Semiotics, Traffic signs, Television and videotape as media for visual communication, ‘Underground’ publishing.

Please address all contributions or enquiries to the Executive Editor, icographic, 7 Templeton Court, Radnor Walk, Shirley, Croydon CR0 7NZ England.
What are the papers saying about your company?

There are some things that can’t simply be blamed on a bad press. Like flabby letterheads. Lifeless company reports. Or listless circulars.

The blame there rests firmly and squarely on the paper you use.

Take a letter. How does it fall out of the envelope – with a sickly thump or a crisp crackle? First impressions do count.

How about your company report. Does the paper suggest it’s been a bad year before anyone gets to the figures?

And circulars: a limp, spineless representative hardly inspires confidence in the company.

We would like to suggest you do two things. First, check your recent print jobs. And judge them according to this one test: do they speak well of your company, or does the paper belie your true image?

Second, call up your paper merchant or printer. Arrange to see our wide range of papers, papers as firm as a handshake, as crisp as a new banknote.

Eden Grove Bond or Classic for your letterheads. Culter Blade Extra for your circulars. And Hi-Fidelity Art, Silver City or Spectrum for those annual reports.

Get the right papers behind your company name.

Culter Guard Bridge
Papemakers

Culter Guard Bridge Holdings Limited, Guardbridge, Fife, KY16 0UU. Telephone: Leuchars (033 483) 551
The International Council of Graphic Design Associations was founded in London in April 1963. Its headquarters are in Amsterdam. ICOGRADA is an association of independent Member Associations. Membership is open to societies of professional graphic designers and organisations concerned with the training of designers and/or the raising of graphic design standards. Member associations are elected at the biennial General Assembly, which elects also the Executive Board, determines policy and overall activities and agrees financial arrangements.

The aims of ICOGRADA are:

1. to raise internationally the standards of graphic design and professional practice by all practicable means.
2. to collect and exchange information on professional, educational and technical matters.
3. to improve graphic design training and to assist the interchange between countries of graphic designers, teachers and students.
4. to organise exhibitions, international assemblies, congresses and symposia and publish documentation on graphic design and visual communications technology, including a News Bulletin.
5. to act as an international forum for co-operation and exchange of views between designers, organisations representing professionals from allied and other fields and those of commerce and industry.
6. to encourage the better use of graphic design and visual communication as a means to improve understanding between people everywhere.