

Design Talks

Design Miami/ Basel 2007

The Process Behind Limited Edition Design

Moderator: Julie Lasky

Panel: Rolf Fehlbaum, Didier Krzentowski, Greg Lynn, Hella Jongerius, Konstantin Grcic and Ronan Bouroullec

JULIE LASKY: Good afternoon. I'm actually nervous and I'm usually not nervous on a stage, but I'm looking at this sea of faces and what should really make me nervous are the panelists that I have sitting here because we're welcoming a very distinguished group of designers and manufacturers, and a gallerist, to talk about limited edition design.

Now, you probably haven't been living in a cave lately, so you're probably aware that limited-edition design is a really hot topic today. For instance, the Friedman-Benda Gallery in New York: Mark Benda and Barry Friedman are opening in Chelsea a whole gallery devoted primarily to design, with an inaugural exhibition of Ettore Sottsass. Meanwhile, Galerie Thaddaeus Ropac in Paris just announced expansion into the field of design with a joint exhibition by the artist Peter Halley and the designer Matali Crasset. And I don't know if you're familiar with Artnet.com. It's a website that tracks what's going on in the art market by the performance of 4,000 artists and they have just started tracking 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century design as an index for investment. And you may have been, if you were in New York this last spring, you might have seen Marc Newson exhibited at the Gagosian Gallery, where his very highly refined marble bookcases and chairs and tables were selling for hundreds of thousands of dollars each. And finally and not least, thanks to Ambra Medda we are sitting here once again in Basel, in the heart of an art fair, presenting and talking about limited-edition design.

So to discuss this, I have a panel of people that I could spend all day long introducing, but luckily they are so famous I can actually do it in just a second, as well.

Nearest to me, Greg Lynn, an architect, who may be best known for having designed a Presbyterian church in Queens, primarily digitally with two other architects at long distance. He's also been working in limited editions with work for Alessi – tea and coffee services; he did a chair for Vitra a couple of years ago. And next to him, Ronan Bouroullec, who is half of the power duo known as the Bouroullec brothers. His clients include...well, just about everybody you can imagine, but if you just even look around you'll see work that he's been doing in limited edition for Galerie Kreo – more about them later – and of course for Vitra itself. Next to him, Konstantin Grcic, who is based in Munich, and is a designer of chairs for Magis, of coffeemakers, of...I believe you are the only person on our panel who has designed a garbage can. Extremely functional, extremely beautiful materials and products. Next to him, Didier Krzentowski, the founder of Galerie Kreo in Paris. He is well acquainted with these people, because two of them have produced designs for him in limited editions. We are missing right now, Hella Jongerius, who should be showing up, but she is being represented by her sofa, on which everybody is sitting, the 'Polder' sofa. And finally, Rolf Fehlbaum, chairman of Vitra, and the real reason why we're here, the glue that's holding us together, because tomorrow Vitra will be introducing to the world, today they are introducing here, a collection of Vitra 'Editions,' limited-edition design produced by all the designers who are represented on this panel. Now this is not a new area of activity for Vitra. Rolf started working in limited editions 20 years ago with designers like Shiro Kuramata and Frank Gehry, but he is returning to it and we'd like to talk more about what he has in store for the designs that he has and just for the whole world of limited edition.

(4:23)

Without further ado, let me ask the panel: production and limited editions has obviously been going on long and longer than 20 years ago, Rolf, when you started your first feature edition. Why is it enjoying newfound popularity today, and how have the production methods and markets for this work changed from past to present?

ROLF FEHLBAUM: The big question to start with. I think whatever we do is not done because we decide to do it. There's certain social, economical conditions which create the situation where these kinds of things can be done. Obviously, it's the product of a time of affluence. These things don't happen in dire times. I think it's a combination of an exploding art market, which spills over to the neighboring areas, a lot of money around. Maybe on the other side, in industrial design, sometimes too many constraints, too many norms, too many issues of logistics, etc. limit the possibilities in the industrial design area. So, this is a moment where again other types of more experimental designs are possible because there is also a market for them. Somebody wants that. And for designers or people like ourselves, it's rather wonderful, because you can do research that you probably wouldn't do otherwise. You can do products which are not in the logic of the everyday product, but in another logic. It is a fantastic opportunity to do this. So I think, in that sense, it's a very interesting time for design again.

(6:30)

JL: Let me go to Didier. Do you have anything to add to Rolf's explanation, which covers a lot, about the revival right now of interest in limited editions? Are you seeing more people rushing into Galerie Kreo, for instance?

DIDIER KRZENTOWSKI: We've been in this business for about ten years. In fact, we limit the pieces just because it's like a dream for the designers to work with us. In our gallery the designer works without any constraints, so they can do the research they want without constraints of money, of sizing, of anything. Because it's research, it's very difficult to make it, to find the manufacturer to do it. So when we began ten years ago, to limit these pieces, it was just because that was very difficult to do and of course it was impossible to make it industrially because we don't want to make any tricky things. So

when it can be industrial, it *is* industrial. So what we want to show, exactly, is researched pieces.

(7:48)

JL: Does anybody else have anything else they want to add about means or opportunities regarding the revival of limited editions?

KONSTANTIN GRCIC: I think for me, if we talk about research and at the same time no constraints in the context of galleries, I don't think it's quite true because research, if it's really free, I do it without any commercial context. I do it just for myself, not even for the public, and the gallery is the opposite of that. There is money involved, expectation, a public. I would not agree that it is exactly research without constraints, but I still think it is a very interesting kind of free space for design to be happening at the moment.

Especially at this time of design of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, because maybe industry, which has been extremely fast to progress and open new possibilities, has also grown. And the bigger industry puts a lot of pressure and constraints on the design and I think working in the kind of small scale of an edition, the small scale of the platform of a gallery is, in fact, then liberating and quite free. But I don't think it is just research.

(9:31)

JL: I'd like to hear more from Konstantin, from you and the other designers here, about how your methods and expectations shift from working in limited editions versus mass market. For instance, you've worked for Krups. Giant corporations. At the same time, you have produced work for Didier, out of wood, I believe. Didn't you do a carved piece of wood in a fairly small edition? Something extremely craftlike. Can you give me some specifics about projects that you've worked on, something for the other designers to

consider? Hella, for instance, your work has included work for Ikea, as well as for Nymphenburg and porcelain.

HELLA JONGERIUS: Yeah, for me I always work experimentally. I start as an experiment, so it's not the end result that changes the way I work. It's a way of working, and sometimes I choose to make it so functional that it's good for an industrial market. But each project starts the same, as an experiment. And sometimes I have the opportunity to show it in a gallery and it stays limited because of several reasons and sometimes I choose to take a particular one a step further and go for industrial clients.

JL: If you had a chance, and you could just do work for a gallery and enjoy all the experimentation, the technological experimentation, the lack of constraints that go with that, would you do that or would you maintain a practice that also includes mass production?

HJ: What's the last question?

JL: If Ikea said, "produce a vase for us". Start with your idea, sky is the limit in terms of materials, resources. Make it however you want. How would you do that vase? Would it still look like a project that you would do for a company like Royal Tichelaar Makkum?  
(12:02)

HJ: Yes, it's the same. It's one method. I have one method. It's starting with research and experimenting on the question and re-asking a question and searching materials and methods and trying to find boundaries or to find something interesting. If I know Ikea is the end client, then at a certain point in the work I start working towards that client, and

if I know the client is a gallery, I stop at a certain moment. Or I go even further, you can also say it that way. I go further, I go over other borders.

JL: Ronan, you produced 'Roc' as part of the limited-edition collection. You have a partition that is a highly crafted screen in an irregular form that's computer controlled. I saw it in Milan two years ago, it was beautiful. Now it looks like it's stopping because of technological limitations. First of all, could you comment on your process of producing it, what those limitations might be. And now, could you tell us something about how you envision rock in the future? How do you expect it's going to be used in its new form as part of Rolf's special edition?

RB: I think this project is a good example to explain why this field of design in a limited edition could be interesting in this world. I think especially this project that we did with Vitra is something we link with computer technology, which is something more or less realistic, but not realistic in mass production since the prices are totally incredible to do some very simple cardboard pieces. The only way to make it exist in this world is just to number the piece and consider that maybe some people will be crazy enough to invest some money in some sheet of cardboard. But without this field, this sort of research would never appear. Basically when we work for Vitra, we can consider that the time that we need to do a project is more or less three or four years. When the project is completed, it has to spend a year in the test room to be sure that when an elephant will sit on it, it won't break. So for us, the gallery is a sort of sketchbook in which more intuitive ideas can appear. I'm not afraid at all to make some errors, and I know that I make a lot when I do pieces for gallery, but I think the work needs sometimes to be light, to be strong. We have to be in front of different types of questions in any sort of maybe hygienic situation sometimes to work in this field.

(16:45)

JL: Didier, did you want to comment?

DK: I think in the gallery we can serve the experimental pieces that the designers do because, in fact, the people who buy the pieces, they can buy dreams. They don't think of the function, but they are happy to buy the dream of the experimentation of the designer.

JL: So your gallery clients are financing, effectively, the technology – or underwriting the technology – that can later be used for further development in the mass market?

GREG LYNN: I do think that today there are more possibilities to make things without having to make a tool. I know the fundamental question when I started to work with Rolf... Rolf said, "Why don't we use some of the computer technology to make a kind of 'art chair'"... I think was the term Rolf used. And I said, "Well I'd like to make a chair chair." And Rolf said, "Yeah but chair chairs have to not fall over. The three legs is a problem..." We went through all the engineering issues, but more than that, it was that we had to make tools, and once you make a tool, you have to sell thousands to pay for the tool. And I think there is a little bit of a bubble right now with the art market and with technology, where people are doing things without having to make tools that they couldn't do otherwise. That's a way into testing things, but I also think 20 years from now, the art market may not be necessary to do things without tools. A lot of these things are getting more and more affordable. Like the rock system or these bricks we did with Panelite. I mean it's not *so* astronomically expensive to avoid a tool.

(18:47)

JL: Could you talk a bit, Greg, about what you did with your tea and coffee service for Alessi. You managed to do away with your tools effectively because you were working with computer technology, but truly space-age stuff. Could you describe briefly what you did in order to produce that?

GL: I found a company that made titanium parts for private airplanes and military airplanes where basically every single part they made was always unique. We just adapted that technology to the tea and coffee service where we designed I think it was something like 50,000 coffee pots that all had the same volume and the same ergonomics but were all a little bit different. And every tool we would make in graphite we would use as the packaging for the set. Basically, you could have a one-of-a-kind thing that was industrially produced, but also it was designed in that industrial manner so I designed a series of target surfaces and then made 50,000. I never even saw all 50,000, but I know they are all equally beautiful and functional and all those things. I think that world of mass-produced tool-less elements is much cheaper than it was before. I mean, you could never do a set like that without a computer.

(20:57)

JL: Greg, you talked about a world in the future. You know, right now galleries like Kreo can sell limited editions, that can help finance... This is going to give an incentive for manufacturers to produce small quantities. Established & Sons, a company in England, is using this as a business model, creating small editions of say, a table by Zaha Hadid, selling that table for enormous amounts of money and then using that to plug it back into the company in order to do larger edition design. But what about this future, Didier, if Greg is correct, when that client for the gallerist may not be necessary, when we can jump past that small edition into highly technological design? Will there always be a market for this kind of design?

DK: Perhaps not. I don't know, we'll see! What can I say? I think so, yes, because it will be possible to sell something else, to sell the research of that in paper, I don't know. But for the moment we are really far from that.

RF: This technological issue is only one of many. That is not the only one that could lead to something new. Typological research, social research, there is all this research that is possible, and technology is one. And the edition business, it will just change issues and themes. There will be new themes all the time to be studied. So we shouldn't worry that his business will disappear because someone can do it technologically. And I think we have to look at this edition possibly really as testing new things, the new frontier. All these people are also working in industrial design. It's not that you have to decide the good and the bad, or the elitist or the democratic. Of course the design movement started with a social idea and this idea goes on. Think of Jasper, who is not here. He works in edition design and he works also for Muji, which is a very, very low-cost product. So it is no longer either/or. Design is a very young discipline, and it shouldn't be told where its limits are. It can define its limits all the time in a new way.

(24:27)

DK: We had an exhibition one year ago. The subject was the missing object. So that's right, technology is just a small part of design. It will always be a part of design but there are other things in design.

JL: Building on that, in the statement Rolf, that you wrote, about the Vitra 'Editions', you said "experimental objects often do not want to solve practical problems," your point exactly, "they are manifestations of the designers and architects' creative intelligence, an expression of a critical position, a utopian wish or a form of fantasy."

Konstantin, 'Landen,' which is your project that looks like a lunar module, is described as being wider than a Hummer and can only be moved by a crane. What were you expressing with that?

KG: First of all, I think it illustrates a very personal interest. The fact that I'm given a chance to pursue such a very personal interest in making an object. I think in discussing with Rolf, and in the context of this project, the edition and a potential market for it was really secondary or even *further* away. It was an opportunity to do something that clearly I could not do for anyone else. The context was totally self-initiated. It's a piece of furniture for an outdoor environment. It's bigger than a piece of furniture. It is maybe more uncomfortable than a piece of furniture. It is slightly brutal or ugly. All these things were the kind of freedom that I felt were in this project, and I did it just as a kind of first trial. Where would that lead? And in this trial there was almost no responsibility. If it had failed, then it would have failed. I think the first result is interesting and probably a steppingstone into actually pursuing that more deeply. Ideally, I would think that pursuing it would lead then again more into an industrial production or a reality context. So not at all free and just for myself, but actually addressing real problems and real requirements. But having come from a totally open project and free interpretation of it. (27:38)

JL: I want to ask actually the same question of Hella. With your 'Household Pets' that you did for Rolf, which if you haven't seen already, the one that's displayed looks like a white leather insect on a base of a task chair, a rolling base. So what were you thinking of when you designed that? What was the concept behind it?

HJ: Rolf sometimes asks me if I can do something in the office or try to think about pieces for the office, and I'm always a little bit afraid to step into this world because of

its instrumental functionality, which is totally efficient, and everything is solved, and everybody has thought about everything. It's in a way a kind of dead environment. So this was an opportunity to work in 'officeland' but to go further, to try to have some imagination or disturbing the world of the office in a sweet way, not in an aggressive way. So that was the idea about the office pet.

JL: I want to make an observation and then ask a question. And my observation of Hella is that, when I saw 'Office Pet' it reminded me a bit of your plates where you have wonderful animals coming out of the center – hippopotamuses, fawns – because to me, it challenges the definition of a plate. You're taking the surface area, and you have a porcelain extension coming from it and you're playing with the role of function. Same thing when I saw your 'Office Pet' on its task-chair base rolling around, a very kind of almost Dadaist expression, of taking the chair and not making it a chair anymore, effectively. And it raises that old question: how design differs from art. And I feel it's important to raise it even though designers often roll their eyes. Let's talk about the differences, and if this is not an important question, please tell me why it isn't. Konstantin, did you want to address that?

KG: It's a difficult question. I don't think I can fully answer that. I think it starts with your own attitude. The artist has his attitude of being an artist and producing art, and I think we are all designers and we consider ourselves designers, and what we produce is design no matter if it is made once, like a one-off, or ten thousand times. I think it's about a process or an attitude of mind, and therefore I would claim that all of my work is always design and not art. I'm sure that the same applies to an artist. He would approach a project from his consciousness of being an artist producing art. I think the qualification is never the quantity, the technology, whether it's useful or not, the price, the gallery or the supermarket. None of that is a qualification. I think that really gives a kind of solid

explanation. I think it's much more the question where does it actually come from, the person that produces it, what was his or her attitude?

(32:24)

DK: I think if you take the piece of Hella's with the 'Office pet,' for me, it's also design. Why is it design? Because it speaks about design. Okay, you cannot choose it, but it's a reflection about design so it's design.

JL: Ronan, do you buy that? A critique of design is design?

RB: It's becoming more and more difficult. [JL moves to sit by RB.] I know that Julie wanted to sit next to me. It's why they organized all that.

JL: You saw through my clever ploy.

RB: I'm supposed to say something very intelligent about the difference between art and design.

JL: Only if you agree with Didier, and you can say no.

RB: I always agree with him. I work for him, so I have to. It's the basis of our relationship. It's the same thing with Rolf. I have to agree with him... I'm a bit lost here. What was the question?

JL: The question was, Didier said that Hella's 'Office Pet' actually is design because it's a critique of design. Hella wanted to comment about the office space, and she did it very

effectively. So Didier has very cleverly said that that's design because it *talks* about design. I just wondered if you agreed.

RB: Didier's very clever. I agree with what he said.

JL: Greg, do you buy that?

GL: There's something that I find troubling about the edition design, which is that luxury is a part of the equation whether you want to admit it or not. And I think in better and worse cases you see things being done in materials that justify the cost of the object. I do think that that's why it's not art. You don't really factor in labor and materials, things like that, into the evaluation of art, but you do in edition design. It's not always the case, but I think more and more you see things being done in materials that don't make sense except to justify the fact that you have to sell it as edition design and to me that's a big problem.

(35:04)

DK: But I think this problem is also in art. For me, that's bad design what you are speaking about.

PANELIST: Or bad art.

DK: Or bad art. Exactly.

RB: For me, I think I feel the way the others feel. I think the number of interesting projects is very small in design, or in architecture. It's the same thing. We can speak about art, but I think that the quantity of efficient answers is very, very small. I totally agree

with you that it's a very good trick to use a very shiny material or to use a big piece of marble. I think it's really like literature or art, the number of very bad projects is enormous. I think we all participate with an actual sketchbook and what will stay after ten years will be a very small quantity.

(36:31)

JL: Didier, why did you become a gallerist of design rather than art? How did you get Kreo started and what was the inspiration?

DK: In fact, I was an art and a design collector, and when I opened the gallery I just opened it when the designers wanted to. We told them to make limited editions, and to come to me and to make experimental pieces. I just opened the gallery and with second market design and I began to work with two Austrian designers and they wanted to do some experimenting with me. And because I was a neighbor to art galleries, collectors arrived and looked at it and I began like that.

JL: When was this?

DK: It was ten years ago.

JL: And how do you feel about the competition that's growing around you? Do you see this as competition that there are more people who are venturing into your world?

DK: In fact, we are really only one of a few producing pieces. But I think it's good if more people are coming in.

JL: Rolf, we haven't heard from you for a long time. What do you look for in the designers you select for your editions? Is it a different set of criteria from 20 years ago?

RF: Some, I guess, is the same and some is different. What is the same is that it is a form of liberation, an escape from too many constraints that you have in your everyday design work. Now, the themes may change. If I look back at what we did 20 years ago with the first 'Edition,' that was trying to find new forms and shapes and characters for chairs. Now, I guess we are much more interested in many other aspects, and not just the chair and its manifestations. This has been done so many times. But other themes like, in our 'Edition,' for instance, we have a very small car which explores the possibility of a sort of campus life and how you could have a car which is also your office and is also a way to move very slowly to very nearby places and do things that are different from what you would do in a car normally. So that kind of issue interests us as much as, say, a chair, and the chair continues to interest us. Or a table. So I think the themes are wider than 20 years ago. More things to think about.

JL: You obviously know Tibor Kalman wrote a book about Rolf called *Chairman*. Rolf Fehlbau, your passion for chairs is legendary. Why do you think that problem hasn't been solved by now? What do you still find interesting about the chair? What are you looking to solve still in seating?

RF: Of course all these themes are eternal themes to do again and again and again. The 'Edition' is like a method, and a different exploration method, so that's the great thing about it. And that's what makes me believe that we've entered another great period of design, because designers can look and do things that they couldn't before. Because we are. We know now what is a practical, well-designed, well-costed, ergonomic, ecological product. This is something we do every day, and it's very serious and very good. But

there are so many other issues that are interesting to deal with, and designers can have voices and can say things to other themes than they are usually asked for. Eames is the perfect example of somebody who covered many, many themes as a designer that hadn't been covered by designers before. Before Eames, designers were here to do a nice product. And Eames thought, "We are here to deal with issues of knowledge, of dwelling, of communication," and it widened the field. And I think now we are in a period where again the field of design will enormously widen. The figure of the designer will have a much more important role as a consequence.

(41:14)

JL: We've also been in the age, for the last ten years, of the new form of the museum: the museum as the design object. And as the museum has grown to be a design object, there's been a more problematic question of how design is shown *within* the museum, and I'm thinking specifically about the Museum of Modern Art's new building. The design galleries were harshly criticized in the press for looking so much like design shops. Rolf, you as a person who has started museums, what do you think is the role of the museum in showing design, and how can design be shown to make it really special and effective in that context?

RF: As you know, there are different types of design museums these days with different ideas. In the early phase, like 20 years ago, the idea was to make more people aware of design and show the great things of the past, and this continues, of course, to be a big issue. But on the other hand, to give a museum to experiment and open it to designers to change it, to create environments and to raise the issues we discussed. I think that's a very interesting task for today. And for instance, we are doing that just now with the show that opens tomorrow. A number of designers who are present here are doing installations and I think this again is not a new task. It has been done before but that is

more interesting now than showing for the 20<sup>th</sup> time the wonderful 20<sup>th</sup> century achievements.

(43:14)

JL: I'm going to do something a little crazy. I'm going to open the floor up for questions. It's only crazy because we're having some sound issues here. So if you have questions, shout them out. I will repeat them and I think we can have a conversation. Questions from the floor? You're never going to have this chance again. Or questions from the panelists to each other is also allowed....Yeah, Susan!

SUSAN: [Unintelligible]

JL: So Susan, you are saying that constraints have traditionally been an inspiration. This is something Eames said. He said he would never compromise. Compromise is bad, constraints are good. Susan, do you want to know if that still holds for our panel?

KG: I think there are still so many constraints in whatever you do. It's a different set of constraints or your own set of constraints. I totally agree with what the Eames say and that we need constraints and within the constraints, that's where creativity happens. But sometimes the constraints are really boring, or they are always the same. I think this is what we were referring to. And then it's nice to put them aside and focus on a totally different set of constraints. And I think more importantly, your own set of constraints. Because formulating your own set of constraints is part of the experiment and the research and part of the debate about design. What are our constraints?

JL: I just want to be a little challenging here, Konstantin. You've designed something that looks like a lunar module, its so heavy you need heavy equipment to move it around, it

doesn't look like it would pass any code, because you said one of the attractions of this piece is that its kind of dangerous. If you crawl in it, you might fall off of it. So where are your constraints?

KG: [laughs] Where are my constraints? Lots of technical constraints, still, which I think are not worth even mentioning now. The constraints are, how does this object, which on the one hand, I'm trying to leave or escape a common typology, how can that still be legible for people because its meant for public space? I'm putting this object in front of people who don't know what it is and I'm not there to explain. How can this strange thing still be legible and make people feel good to use it? I think those are constraints. In a different way. Of course there are all the other constraints. The constraint was the project itself. We had four months to do it. There was maybe a budget or a technology. And the constraints are also my own work. I think that whatever we do or produce, there's always a kind of meta-project, a whole body of work that we do over the years. And that's also a set of constraints for myself. Why am I doing this now? So it may sound very loose, but I think it's not about defining it in a conclusive way.

JL: Greg, there's no architect who seems more allergic to constraints than you.

GL: [laughs]

JL: This is a good statement. I mean, just that you have incredibly beautiful, organic forms that seem impossible to achieve. You do it through literal rocket technology, molten titanium, space-age style vacuums. Where do you see your constraints primarily lying?

GL: This is a personal take on it, and its coming from architecture, not design. I think for an 'Edition' project the biggest constraint is that it has to be provocative. I mean not

necessarily to the client, but to my work. I think that that's an assumption across the board, that these things have to be original in some way. Like with the 'Ravioli' chair, I just tried to attack the typology and do something with the legs. You know, treat the top like a bucket and turn the bucket strategy to the legs. And I wanted to do something new and something provocative and that's why it started off as an edition. I think that's a very hard constraint. I mean when you get up in the morning and you have to make the *perfect* chair, that's a very different problem than getting up in the morning and having to do a *new* chair. And I think honestly it's harder to do a new one than it is to perfect and refine, which is a different kind of problem.

(49:23)

RF: I think today's design is divided into the kind of design that happens everyday and which doesn't enter the archives of design. And it's the patient work of small steps and a little invention here and something there, and that's how the general progress of product happens. But the archives of design, the gateholders, the gatekeepers, the art historians, the curators, are not interested in that design. That disappears. The competitor, if we do a product of that, the competitor knows exactly that we did something interesting, but the curator is not interested in that because that is not the visible newness. So what enters the archives of design is not the timeless, it's not the well-resolved problem. It is the fashionable, it is the extraordinary, it is the things of *this* time. It's just not the timeless. Of *this* time. Because later, looking at the archives, we will see that something is typical of that time, while the timeless has very little trace of today. So, the design that, at certain periods, works with constraints, like the Eames one, was also the new. Sometimes that comes together, that's a great moment in design. But generally the work is between the patient practitioner who works on the small issues and people with very exciting ideas. And in some designers, now you have both sides. That is very interesting. That again

leads to the edition design on the one side, the sort of normal everyday product on the other side. Some of the people here do that.

JL: I'm going to bring this conversation full circle, as you're concluding, to science again. I appreciate that technology isn't the only activity that's going on with 'Editions.' So we know the role of experimentation. There's an entire pursuit of emotion and poetics in these products. But as I was going over all of your biographies...Jongerius Lab, Hella, your studio originated with the word "lab" in the title. Greg, you're based in a part of southern California where you say you're deliberately there because that's where the aeronautic industry, the automobile industry and the entertainment industry come together and you make use of those technologies. Konstantin, you're nothing if not a rationalist, a good rationalist. But very functional minded, though certainly not dismissive of the poetic and more human emotions of design. I would think the Bouroullec brothers also fall in that category. So my question is maybe instead of sitting on this stage talking about design and art, an obvious topic, we should reconvene at some point and talk about design and science more, or talk about what's really happening in the world of design. Because it is a confluence of many different disciplines, and I think that's always what design is. It's set on the borderline between art and science and commerce, in a position that I always think has made it very hard to pin down. Thank you so much for your time and attention and thank you to my panel: Hella, Greg, Konstain, Ronan, Didier, and of course, Rolf. And thanks, Design Miami!

(53:07)

WAVA CARPENTER: We had great legends on stage today and I'm really appreciative of the large crowd, so thanks again!