Community Matters

$30.00

W/A

Credits

Wayward Arts is an inspirational monthly magazine showcasing the pure unfiltered spirit of Canadian graphic design. Each month a prominent Canadian design studio will design a new issue filled with innovative design, featuring specialty printing and finishing techniques. Every issue will be an unpredictable expression of creativity!

Hagon Design is a brand communications agency strategically focused on the healthcare, community-based and public sector industries. Our agency has developed a national reputation for award-winning work in branding, digital, traditional marketing and advertising.
Contact: Ben Hagon ben@hagondesign.com

Flash Reproductions is widely considered to be Canada's most innovative and versatile print production facility, collaborating with brilliant designers to produce award-winning results since 1969.
Contact: Rich Pauptit rich@flashreproductions.com

Unisource is the leading national distributor of commercial printing and imaging papers, deeply committed to the Canadian graphic design community and corporate communication marketing departments.
Contact: Susan Corbeil scorbeil@unisource.ca

Specs Conventional Offset Spot Colours & Ultra Matte AQ, Letterpress
Paper Cougar Smooth 65lb Cover, Cougar Vellum 80lb Text

Red Thread Sewing by Anstey Book Binding

Wayward Arts Staff
Rich Pauptit — Biological Father
David Gallant — Guidance Councilor
Derek Emerson — Truant Officer

Contents

Introduction

In general, print shop presidents tend to wear shiny suits, part their hair to the side, and have a subtle but persistent distaste for the creative community. They also really like golf. So as far as printing company presidents go, Flash Reproductions' Rich Pauptit is a pretty unique guy. Rich has an imposing physical presence, a thick red beard, the deepest voice in the world, and a love for all things creative.

It was this love for the creative that led Rich to an idea. Rich was tired of hearing his beloved designer clients bitch and complain about the creative restrictions of professional practice: The client made me do this, there isn't enough budget for my vision, the supplied photography sucks, etc. So in August of 2007, almost six years ago, Rich contacted me about a concept he was working on.

The concept was very interesting. A crowd-sourced creative forum where designers could create anything they wanted, submit to Flash, and then in collaboration with my firm, we would produce a publication that showcased all of this "art".

How could I say no?

We set ourselves a deadline of the RGD's annual conference DesignThinkers in November and got to work creating a magazine, a brand, and a website to bring *Wayward Arts* to life.

Issue One was a huge success by our measure. Bursting with colour, creativity and originality. We were thrilled.

Unfortunately subsequent issues proved more difficult. Submissions dwindled, and the project team became

disillusioned that in spite of significant effort on our part, and the concept of providing the freedom designers supposedly craved, the design community did not provide the content we fundamentally required to keep going.

Issues became more sporadic, and while the final issue in the old format may have been the best, *Wayward Arts* needed defibrillation.

Once again, Pauptit stepped up to the plate. His new concept was to challenge some of the finest studios in the country to produce *Wayward Arts* on a monthly basis. The only direction given was a theme: Community.

Faced with this challenge for Hagon Design's issue, it became evident why the original concept was such a struggle. Without direction, without a brief, objectives or goals; design is unbelievably difficult. It becomes Art, not design, this challenged me to my core. Can I turn away from 13 years of professional practice and just "art"? The answer, was a resounding no.

I have respect for artists, and the utmost respect for the role Art plays in our society, (more so in a public than a highbrow way) without art I would never have become a designer.

I also have too much respect for art and artists to just pick up a brush (metaphorically speaking, of course) and start to pretend I still know what I am doing. I felt this way about the challenge of both the original and current formats of *Wayward Arts*. Without a brief, a client, or any kind of parameters; my personal design process was rendered null and void.

So, approaching this like a designer, I challenged

myself to think what value we could provide this issue of *Wayward Arts*, and moreover, what value we could provide to our industry. I debated whether to produce a magazine of cool looking stuff, or something that I personally would find interesting.

Then the idea hit. I challenged the Hagon designers to write two pieces on how they feel about the design community. It could be anything, as long as it related to the world of design, and came from their hearts.

And so, you hold in your hands, Hagon Design's issue of the new *Wayward Arts*.

Please keep in mind, that none of us are professional writers. We just wrote what we felt, and we hope that you find that interesting in some way. The essays may not be on a level with Tolstoy, Beckett or Joyce; but they are honest, sincere and worth ten minutes to read.

We hope you enjoy this issue of *Wayward Arts* and we look forward to the creativity of the subsequent issues from some of Canada's very best design studios.

Ben Hagon RGD
Kitchener, Ontario
June 17, 2013

www.hagondesign.com

In the winter of 2003 *Emigre* released *RANT*, the first in a series of critical writing books that ran for five issues and two years before *Emigre's* final issue of all time *The End* issue #69.

RANT was a shock to the design system for *Emigre* fans. After years of publishing creative and visually-focused design magazines, this small red book literally knocked us all off our Herman-Miller task chairs.

In 2003 I was two years or so into my Canadian design career having graduated in 2001 from one of the UKs most renowned and creative design schools, LCP (now the London College of Communication). I was working at a boutique, award winning design studio, Pylon Design, (now defunct) and quite satisfied with how things were going. I was winning awards, working on creative projects (logos, books, some corporate design stuff), and generally happy to be working.

Then I read *RANT*.

RANT was like lighter fluid to a still rather angry young man. It ignited feelings in me that I hadn't felt since I was an angsty teenager, and it made me question what I was doing with my creative abilities. *RANT's* essays included *6.26.02: Cranky* by Rick Valicenti, *Towards Critical Autonomy or Can Graphic Design Save Itself* by Andrew Baluvelt, *What's My Motivation* by Shawn Wolfe and more. It was the most scathing industry criticism I had read yet, and I was inspired.

Actions speak louder than words, so I did something, I poured all of my 24 year-old feelings into a passionate, exciting, incendiary opinion-piece called *MUTE*. I spent a good deal of time on the essay, writing, rewriting and writing some more. I also had a talented editor friend (Josh Thorpe) help me polish it to what I thought was a respectable piece.

I then sent the essay off (after wasting too much time type-setting, designing and mocking it up) to Rudy VanderLans at *Emigre* and sort of forgot all about it.

MUTE was full of vitriol and controversy including nuggets such as:

"Critical design writing circa 2003 is in crisis. 'Visual Communications Specialists' continue to reproduce faster than horny rats, yet new ideas and new voices are scarce."

"Are young bucks happy to accept the general level of bullshit that a professional has to tolerate on a daily basis from clients, co-workers and bosses."

"By using outside sources to influence our work — Mac-monkeys, get away from your desks — our field may have some effect besides selling chocolate bars, lawyers, and easy chairs."

You get the idea.

Much to my surprise some months later, VanderLans sent me a message saying he'd love to publish *MUTE* in a subsequent issue of *Emigre*. I was delighted, finding it far more thrilling than winning at creative award shows and a testament to my staunch opinion that design should be a cerebral activity not a craft to be learned by imitation and repetition.

Sure enough, in issue 66 of *Emigre, MUTE* was published. I was thrilled, my peers seemed genuinely impressed, I wrote a couple more pieces for other on- and off-line publications, and then life and my work continued and I forgot all about *MUTE*.

Fast forward ten years and so much has changed. In 2004 there was no iPhone, barely any BlackBerry, we still had dial-up, used Quark, we burned things to CD, we still bought music in physical form, "in-house" was relatively rare, we thought Flash was a good thing, there was no Brand New, no Behance.net,

shit there wasn't even Facebook! (Let alone Twitter, Pinterest, Linkedin, Google+, et al). Our jobs barely resemble today what we did in 2004.

My life is also radically different, in 2006 we decided to leave Toronto because of economic constraints (how do designers afford mortgages there anyhow?), We moved to Kitchener-Waterloo, a smallish but booming city smack-dab in the middle of Southwestern Ontario. In 2009, I left the tumultuous twenties behind. In 2009, I launched my own design agency and we decided to have more kids (we now have four wonderful children).

So, in light of the changes to work, life, and society at large, I was wondering recently how *MUTE* held up, so I reread it.

I was actually surprised at how much I still enjoy the essay. Sure it is deliberately inflammatory often for the sake of it. Sure it is the raging of an angry young man, but many of the core themes in the essay still hold true today and some of them are even more valid now than then.

I thought it might be interesting to examine some of the core ideas from *MUTE*, and relate them to today's context utilizing an extra ten years of "maturity".

Idea 1: there are no voices, only producers

In 2003, we had far more critical design writing than we do today. The concept of voices over producers almost seems quaint in our current context. The voices we now hear simply report on industry phenomena, mainly reviews of completed projects (see www.underconsideration.com/brandnew), and even more so, the nefarious comment sections of design blogs. I cannot remember the last time I read how design relates to

society, how designers' influence public opinion via our work's messages, design's relationship to art, or anything else that doesn't relate to the metaphysical practice of working.

There is no mainstream coverage of our work. The best we can hope for is a cynical bit of journalism, often sneering at the "wasted" public money spent on branding, advertising, et cetera, et cetera. Our work is as prevalent, though not as permanent as architecture, civic design, or any other more highbrow creative vocations, yet it is ignored and/or accepted as a necessary societal evil.

This is a shame, but it is also a waste. Our abilities as designers to craft and efficiently deliver information could be tremendously useful to the public at large but interest is low. Communications design has been lumped in with marketing, which of course is viewed with extreme cynicism by critical writers. Accordingly, designers have responded by burying our heads, working hard, and trying to make a living doing this thing we love.

It is no wonder; the voices are even quieter in 2013.

Idea 2: designers are discouraged from thinking

Here we see a paradox. Over the last ten years we have seen the proliferation of in-house design departments. Gone are the days of simple design work — because quite simply and in some regards correctly — it is more efficient for clients to create in-house production lines, where staff designers create powerpoints, posters, simple pamphlets and such on command. I don't like this as an agency owner, but I accept and understand it. Schools continue to pump out too many design graduates, and these folks all need to make a living.

Clients now need us to think more than ever before. They are hiring agencies and studios to help them solve complex problems through visual communications, to do the work that their junior in-house designers cannot execute. Clients come to our company to help them with one (or more) of these three problems:

1. The project is too challenging for their in-house team
2. The project timelines are too demanding
3. They need a standard of design quality that their designers/coordinators cannot reach

Clients are looking for creative people who think. The paradox comes when considering the context of the original statement in *MUTE*. This thinking was deeper critical analysis of what we do, how we do it, and why we do it. Of course, the vast majority of clients do not care much about these philosophical industry musings, let alone are they interested in subsidizing it. The continued economic challenges and never-ending budget crunching of 2013 especially make this concept seem more outlandish.

Critical thought is all but extinct in our industry, our thinking is being utilized to creatively solve client problems, as it should be. However, it rests upon creative director/ownership's shoulders to encourage deeper critical thinking from designers, which in turn over the long-term will be of benefit to all of our clients.

Idea 3: Design that is inspired only by design

Of all the ideas in *MUTE*, this one is probably the most dated. The world has become ever smaller due to the internet and the proliferation of digital information. As a result, the world of graphic design is no longer one-style-driven in the way it used to be. Visual inspiration is everywhere, and good designers morph and mold based upon the context of their assignments. Ten or twenty years ago, a leaf through an awards annual revealed distinct visual languages related to era, a similar leaf (or more likely, a click) today does not yield the same impression.

The one area where this does not appear to hold true is in the world of design education. Students of today seem to be searching for styles to mimic, from grunge to minimalism to folksy Americana; repeatedly we see 'school-styles' that give the impression of student immaturity that may or may not be true.

We also are witness to the development of new visual trends that designers pick up and put down at will. Infographics, flat design, hand made. The variance between this current practice and the "styles" of the past is that designers utilize these visual languages with awareness — at will — rather than by subscription. Some assignments are deemed appropriate, others not. This self-awareness was less prominent in the style years.

Digital resources play a large role in this awareness and variety. Now designers can be influenced and inspired with the tap of a finger, or a glance at a Smartphone; no longer do they need to be immersed in books, events, conferences and their ilk, styles can be adopted and then discharged with ruthless efficiency. This leads to a much richer landscape of graphic

design than we saw as little as ten years ago.

Idea 4: Solving client problems in the same way

This idea is still incredibly relevant, though again my context has shifted. Whereas in *MUTE* I was talking about innovation for the sake of the designer, now, being an employer, a creative director, and beyond everything else, responsible for client projects; I see an innovative approach as essential to provide value to our clients.

If we utilize the same old same old, we will no longer continue to be seen as innovative, and this is very dangerous for our survival. We need as creative thinkers to be bringing fresh ideas, new processes, and radical questions in our work, and especially with the development of our work and the manner in which we collaborate with our clients.

Clients are looking to us for innovation, and this relates to the two biggest threats I see to our profession:

1. Cheap, fast, crappy work. Everyone knows somebody who calls himself or herself a designer. These people have questionable training, no real experience, and a vast lack of commitment to the craft. What they do offer is cheap work done quickly with no protesting. To some clients this is a dream come true, but as a profession, we must be very wary of the impact these hacks are having.

2. In-house. As stated above, in-house has its place. In the vast majority of cases however, in-house design departments do not innovate, they do not push our profession forwards, they do not ask the hard questions of our clients that result in the most meaningful work.

In order to combat these threats, we need to innovate, speak up, push (where appropriate) for change, and be the creative professionals we all want to be. This includes our clients. We have one client in particular that states that while we are the most expensive agency they have worked with, they always come to us first, because we push them, we challenge them on their choices, and they are always proud to show off our projects. We don't quit quality half way through the project due to adversity, and because of this we have a very loyal client.

Idea 5: A true cultural representation

Again another paradox. On one hand we have Dove's real beauty campaign, social media, Me-to-We, and many other "real" representations of life. On the extreme other end of the scale, we have grossly retouched magazine covers, models who look like adult film stars, and the never-ending stream of aspirational ads with narcissistic spokespeople revealing their midriffs or worse.

In 2004, we could not have imagined today's visual landscape and the magnitude of choices we would have at our disposal. Cable TV, unlimited internet, iTunes store, Netflix, endless magazines, Kindles, Amazon; we have more methods to consume information than ever before and as a result, design is just as varied. Good graphic design should be representative of the context that surrounds it, and our age of duplicity and access cannot help but give us an appropriately varied scale of truth in designed works.

Idea 6: Change or die

We have changed and we have not died. We have not necessarily become more sophisticated, more educated, or more cultural. What we have done is become more malleable, more varied, more integrated with the world around us. Designers no longer wear black exclusively. They are no longer introverted as the rule. They can no longer be categorized so easily. This is a good thing for our profession. There are more opportunities, more selection, and more avenues to pursue than ever before; indeed it is an exciting time to be a designer.

The area most at risk is design education. Portfolios lack this contextual vibrancy and variety. They feature the same magazine assignments, the same logo projects, and the same edgy posters. These projects are more or less identical to the student projects of 2004. This is very disturbing. What justice are we serving our next generation of practitioners if we train them the same way as ten years ago, but working reality is starkly different? Academia is a large ship that is slow to turn, but we as the employers and peers of the future graduates must demand a swift turn of the wheel, and they must do it now. Boards of education be damned.

If design schools cannot change quickly enough, their programs will be usurped by other, more field-agnostic programs whose students can code, write, think and contribute adeptly and naturally. Students must learn the essential qualities for today's designer: collaboration, innovation, debate. These qualities are as important today as the traditional skills of composition, problem-solving, idea generation, and colour theory.

Design students and design studios must demand better of our academies. If we don't, and if we don't demand it soon, then we may eventually face the prospect of death.

I, for one, do not intend on dying anytime soon.

Remaking what it means to be original

Picture the scene: A newly formed company needs a simple but unique name that supports its primary objectives, and helps differentiate it from the would-be competition. You and your team have been charged with devising the name, one that will elicit a chorus of grins, nodding heads, and universal appreciation of its remarkable originality.

If you've found yourself in this situation, you understand the immense challenge that lies ahead. After a satisfactory amount of research and head scratching, a strong idea emerges … the perfect name! Almost immediately, a hasty Google search reveals that someone, somewhere has beaten you to it and the name is gone. Back to the drawing board. Soon enough, everyone around the table starts thinking that "if it's any good, it's been done before". Bummer.

The name game, with all the legal implications that come with it, might be one of the most challenging scenarios facing creative communicators today. Then, combine that with other challenges that play themselves out in all kinds of other creative endeavours — logo and brand identity development, ad campaigns, tagline copywriting and on and on.

For instance, even if you've created a logo that you swear is unlike anything you might have seen before, there's a very real chance that, in some far-flung part of the word, someone has done something eerily similar. If the doppelganger in question is discovered post-launch, an awkward client conversation is a foregone conclusion. "Uhm … I swear, I've never seen or heard of that company, or that logo ever before." If you're lucky, your client will believe you.

These are certainly dark days for originality, in the

purest sense of the word. For so long, originality has defined creativity — quite literally in fact. Even the very definition of the word includes "characterized by originality of thought." (No wonder so many of us are feeling a little down.)

Decades ago, one of history's most celebrated graphic designers, Paul Rand, poignantly said, "Don't try to be original, just try to be good." Certainly, this is a tidy little idiom, but what exactly was he getting at? Was he referring to our feeble attempts to bathe in the shrinking pool of original thought resulting from hundreds of years of history? Or was he simply expressing a belief that the ego-driven quest for originality threatens the strength and efficacy of communication?

Everyone can debate the varying degrees to which originality can be defined. Simply put however, we all know what originality "feels" like. It's something unprecedented that succeeds either in thought or execution, to transcend its real-world application.

Rand declared his words of wisdom prior to our age of hyper-connectivity among the world's billions of people. So if the slowing occurrence of pure global originality was a concern then, the situation has assuredly metastasized to Stage IV. We must be left not only scraping the barrel, but salvaging it for parts.

Imagine two inversely related parabolic arches on one of those Cartesian planes from high school math. As human population grows and becomes more interconnected, the curve swings sharply upward. At the same time, the frequency and occurrence of what is deemed original creative work swoops downward — approaching but never quite reaching zero. So, are we there yet? Is originality now the elusive Holy Grail?

What if Rand was instead referring to communication efficacy? The origin of the word communication is "to make common". Is this the primary reason to be laissez-faire about trying to achieve originality? Which is to say that as attempts at originality become the driving force of a project, perhaps the commonality of the message is weakened. Instead, by readily combining conventional, cultural or connotative symbols, colours and typefaces that inherently impart meaning, originality is achieved. So, could this redefine what it means to be original?

Every new technological innovation welcomes a renaissance of recycled ideas to uninitiated new generations, few of which could be categorized as original in the classic sense. Still, no one seems to mind. Consider the visual irony of Instagram: digital images passed through filters to give the illusion of 1970's era analog photo-processing limitations. It is undeniably intoxicating. One hundred million users (and counting) agree.

Even language is influenced by these sorts of mash-ups. Last year, Webster's dictionary officially added the words "sexting" and "gastropub" to its list of new words. No formal definition required. Message clearly received!

With each new attribute, functionality or plug-in that the web offers, the wall between web and print comes down brick by brick. A growing range of web fonts and CSS attributes mean centuries old typographic styles and theories are reintroduced to the online experience. Search engines love it. Designers love it. Users love it. It's an exciting time to be a web designer with all of these old ideas now at our disposal.

If we embrace the notion that pure originality doesn't

necessarily define our creative virtuosity, what becomes apparent is that "trying to be good" still leaves a wealth of possibilities to explore. There's no point in getting bummed out, or declaring that, collectively, the design industry is in some sort of slump. Forget it. We're extremely fortunate to be living in a time and place that affords the luxury of standing on the shoulders of all the giants that came before us.

Sure, it may be the end of 'originality' as we once knew it. But I feel fine.

James Bisch

A life in Graphic Design
With Hagon Design's Lesley Drago

What do you love about graphic design? What do you hate about it? What is it about working as a designer that keeps you heading into the office every morning? More than many other professions, working as a designer is the kind of job that informs who you are in all aspects of your life. Hagon Design's Lesley Drago explains how she got into the business, and what keeps her inspired when she dives into her latest brief.

How did you get into design?
I'm pretty sure it was grade 10 that I took my first media arts class. The classroom had rows of colourful iMacs and it felt like a whole new world to me. My next step was a co-op stint at a local design agency. Once that wrapped up I was fairly sure that when I grew up I wanted to be a graphic designer. Three years of college and a short internship later and I was ready.

My first real job as a designer was in the graphics department of a university. From there I was fortunate enough to move on and hone my skills at some great local agencies. And here we are in the present, and I'm still honing my skills.

Why do you love graphic design?
I love it because I get to be creative! I feel like it's something that comes naturally to me. I'd be lost without it. Every day that I come into work I revel in the opportunity to help hardworking businesses raise their profile through my work.

Basically, I like coming up with ideas and thinking visually.

I love working with people that appreciate what we do and why we do it. I also love seeing results from the effort that we put in.

What do you hate about it?

Hate is a strong word. I can't say I've ever used it in the same sentence as graphic design. There are definitely certain scenarios in this line of work that can bring on frustration. We experience it, our clients experience it, and everyone deals with it in one way or another. From my perspective, the challenges we face are just creative obstacles and aren't worth dwelling on. You have to find the best solution and make the most of the project. Then, move forward and learn from your mistakes.

What is about design that gets you out of bed every morning?

Well, It's a combo of things. I love where I work and my colleagues, which makes doing my job easy. I get the chance to do great work for our clients in an environment that makes me feel supported and happy. I'm pretty lucky, I think.

The highs and the lows

The highs ... that would be getting briefed on a project that gets me really excited, coming up with a fun idea, inspiring brainstorms with the team, getting positive feedback from the client, winning awards and much, much more.

The lows would be creative block, lack of creative connection with a client, a poorly flowing project, wanting to be more active, feeling distracted, and of course, missing my dog!

How do you feel about your career so far?

Overall I'd say I feel pretty good about my career. I mean, I've been told I should be more confident, but I've also been told that I was too confident. Surprise, surprise, design school inflated my ego. Oops! But I do my best to keep it in check. Honestly though, I feel like I've been very lucky to receive some great career opportunities, but I know I've worked hard to get them.

Realistically, I'm pleased with where I am. I look forward to growing into the best visual communicator I can be. There's a lot to learn every day.

So, why do you keep doing it?

I keep doing it because I love it, and haven't burnt out yet!

What makes you smile?

Uhm ... working on projects that make a difference in the world. Having clients tell me how much our work has helped their business. When the team shares success together and we're all on design cloud nine.

Where do you see your future in graphic design?

There's no doubt that graphic design will always be a part of my life. I'm proud to say that I'm a graphic designer. As for the future, I really hope my career continues to let me to do work that has a positive impact on the world.

Lesley Drago

Sketch, sketch, sketch. Stand on the shoulders of giants.
Five Things I wish I had been told in design school

When I graduated from Conestoga College's design program two years ago, my friend, mentor and boss, Ben Hagon, gave me two very important pieces of advice. One, hard work is more important than talent. Two, the first two years as a junior designer will set the tone for your future.

Now at the conclusion of my first two years as a designer, I would like to share with you a few conclusions of my own. Behold, five things I wish I'd learned in Design School:

4. **Don't be afraid to make mistakes**

Some of the projects I've been most proud of since starting my career have been born from re-evaluating work that was absolute crap. Constant re-jigging or re-planning concepts until they barely resemble your initial idea is almost always for the best. These projects have taught me the value in making mistakes. That I shouldn't be afraid to try something that doesn't appear to work, because it might work, if it gets reworked. (Know what I mean?) Reworking a mistake can make way for an even better solution to the problem at hand. Overall, designers need to be adventurous and seek discomfort in new techniques. Start anywhere.

5. **No one cares about grades**

I can't even begin to count the hours I spent locked away during my years at design school. Days upon days I could be found in the design wing of Conestoga College,

preparing for evaluations, killing myself for good grades. Not to say that this was a complete waste of time, as I'm proud of the skills I picked up, but I get now that efficiency is a better game. Go to class, do great work, but take the time to read, go to a museum or local events, bask in the world outside of design. Your work will thank you for it. Maybe you won't get perfect grades, but your creative output will be deeper and richer. Which will result in a better portfolio, which is worth way more to future employers than your grade transcript.

6. **When it comes to your career, no one owes you a thing.**

   Finding that first job is one of the toughest tasks for any up-and-coming graphic designer. The job market is crammed with hundreds of graduates every year, schlepping portfolios from interview to interview, all competing for the same jobs. It can be the most exciting and frustrating time of your life. But if I know one thing to be true, it's that the people who get the jobs are the ones who work their asses off for it. The people who went to events, networked, and developed the relationships that help propel them into the working world. I can't stress it enough, at some point students need to shut off the computer and network. Then they need to get an internship at a studio that does great work, and work like mad to produce the best work possible. Basically, put yourself out there. Nobody is going to hand you a golden opportunity on a platter.

7. **Real learning begins after graduation.**

Coming out of school I naively thought I knew it all. I thought I'd learned everything I needed, I had some awards to back my claims and figured I'd waltz into a job. Was I wrong. Now, this isn't to say that I didn't learn anything at school, but I can see now how completely unaware I was of how much I still had to learn. Once you graduate, you're still going to feel like a student for a couple of years. You'll learn how a business runs, how to work with vendors and clients, there's a whole world to be discovered. This is when you start to feel like a real graphic designer. So, don't be afraid to ask questions. Lots of them.

8. **Hard work beats talent.**

We can't all be Michelangelo. Rather, you have to work your butt off to make it in this industry. I guarantee you it will pay off in the end, however. Being a good designer isn't enough anymore. You've also got to hustle in order to improve and impress your boss, coworkers and clients. Learn from the past, but keep yourself fresh and relevant. As an older designer once told me: "Sketch, sketch, sketch and stand on the shoulders of giants." So you've got to work hard, then work harder. As Snoop Dogg said, you have to "pay da cost, to be the boss." It all comes down to hard work. It's as true in design as anything else.

Bill Watterson

Why Graphic Design?

As cliché as it might sound, I love what I do. Realistically, how couldn't I?

The ability to communicate visually and by way of the written word lies at the very core of what it means to be human. Visual communication has been a lasting hallmark of every great civilization throughout history. Whether we're cognizant of it or not, we're all helping contribute to the visual communication by which our own civilization will be judged in the future

As designers, the challenge of finding order among the chaos is deeply ingrained in our collective psyche. Graphic design has a history nearly as deep as that of humanity. Its future is bound only by our capacity to grow, learn and develop within our world, and beyond. The more we learn and understand, the more we depend on design to convey and preserve these important messages.

Most of the time, we aren't aware of the power we wield every time we sketch, collaborate, ideate, iterate, refine and produce. The work just seems to slip by unnoticed. However, being able to inform, influence, incite, instill confidence and pride, even change the thoughts and behaviour of people we'll never even meet, puts us in a very powerful position. A position most of us take for granted when grinding through our day-to-day projects.

My grandfather was a carpenter. One afternoon I came across one of his dusty old carpentry handbooks. It began with a credo that stated something to the affect of, "When we build, we build not only for ourselves today, but for the generations that follow tomorrow." The passage left a

lasting impression on me. Why? I believe this same altruistic sense of purpose is present in the best of graphic design. As an example, think of Massimo Vignelli when he implores us to create design "that is timeless."

I'd like to believe that it's also for these reasons that designers freak out when CERN scientists inexplicably present such significant findings as the Higgs Boson in Comic Sans. Or, cry out in disapproval when someone even considers meddling with the prized, iconic identities created by our heroes. (Such as Massimo's American Airlines eagle, or Paul Rand's UPS parcel).

Conversely, when something amazing happens design-wise, like Barack Obama's iconic 2008 visual campaign, we look on with intense pride at the power of great design. To me, it's events like this that solidify our community and reinforce why I feel so strongly that what we do matters. As opposed to the trappings and inflated egos of industry award shows.

Still, as with any proclamation of love, one must accept some faults. For example, our industry associations release survey data based solely on income distribution, implying that this is somehow the sole success metric. Why can't we have a survey that asks how we feel about our profession? Where it is going? Whether or not we're doing fulfilling work? Or how satisfied we are with the level of public awareness about our industry? In other words, do we matter to anyone besides other designers?

Increasingly, I believe we do matter. Designers today delve into an ever-growing skillset. Just skim through any issue of *Fast Company* and you'll find that the expressed

need for designers and creativity is overwhelming at all levels. The days when we could shield ourselves from the outside world behind our increasingly larger Mac monitors are numbered. Today, we have to roll up our sleeves and try to solve real problems in ways that only we can.

And, realistically, I wouldn't have it any other way.

James Bisch

The rise of the armchair critic

I couldn't even begin to guess the exact moment the general public became consciously aware of graphic design, or even if they are really aware of it on the same level that designers are. It's such a part of our world that everyone – even non-designers – want to get involved in the creative process. In daily life, we interact with design constantly. People see brochures and posters, directional systems and restaurant menus, and rightly ask: could this be better?

My journey in design began in late 2007, a hefty year for the design world. Barack Obama's presidential election marked the first time I was exposed to a holistic design solution being used during a political race to rally supporters. Although I don't believe the actual design of the Obama campaign was consciously recognized by the general public, I do believe the branding was so well done that people actually saw past the aesthetic in order to concentrate on his message of hope. It was also the year American propaganda artist, Sheppard Fairey, (Obey Giant) designed one of the most iconic images of the decade: an AP photo of the president elect, stenciled and created using good ol' American red, white and blue. It was an image the entire world knew and, for better or worse, sparked an appropriation frenzy, feeling like an image the public owned to customize as they saw fit. I had never seen that sort of re-action before. In fact, the only previous example I can think of was when Milton Glaser's designed the now iconic I ♥ NY logo. A design that had been appropriated a billion times before I was even born, a graphic completely owned by its users both American and global.

While the Obama example above undeniably took the world by proverbial storm, it would be another 2007 campaign that would ultimately give rise to what I like to call, the armchair critic: the London 2012 Olympic logo.

When the London Olympic Committee released its infamous logo, designed by Wolff Ollins, the world spun into an unprecedented level of backlash. Writers, critics, bloggers, designers, and world leaders, alike threw it to the wolves. A petition was signed by over 50,000 people worldwide demanding it be removed as the official logo of the games. While the logo would ultimately survive the manhunt and represent the London 2012 Olympic games, it appeared to me as a designer, that a new internet-wide, full-contact, no-holds-barred sport had been created: design bashing.

Visit any comment section on any design blog these days and it is likely you will be inundated with haters, bashing whichever rebrand or marketing campaign happens to be popular at that moment. Some comments will express incredible aesthetic hatred, while others will feel so unnecessary, you wonder if they are just there to bulldoze over anyone whose opinions differ.

A perfect example of the armchair critic run amok is the case of the University of California's launch of a new brand system last year, designed by the university's in-house design team. As soon as it was launched, the haters went wild. Everyone from U of C Alumni to the general public had something to say.

The brand rollout had initially been showcased on Armin's Vit's wildly popular Brand New, a blog where designers and non-designers can critique newly released branding programs. The U of C rollout garnered such comments as:

"The "redesigned" one looks like something somebody made in PowerPoint in 5 minutes."

And, one of my personal favourites:

"This heavily devalues my university as well as my bachelor & master's degrees."

Both comments, in my view, are the types of general statements that don't actually help solve any problems, and evidently, Armin Vit agreed. The furor over the U of C design led Vit to make a comment of his own to the haters themselves: "Shut up. Just shut up."

While Vit's comment seemed borne out of the same frustration as the commenters themselves, you can understand the reasoning behind such a statement. His post outlined why he believed this logo was being grossly mistreated and encouraged future viewers to use logical thinking, and formulate opinions based on what best suits the university's needs, not just to offer purely aesthetic guttural reactions like, "I refuse to identify myself and my affiliation with such a great institution as the U of C system through a badly-designed overlaying of more-or-less random shapes." To add insult to injury, another petition was started that saw 54,000 people sign up on Change.org to "Stop the new U of C logo". Unlike the London Olympic Committee, the University of California ultimately caved and the logo met the chopping block. The result of a "design by committee", armchair critics had killed a brand system that had been professionally designed and well thought out. Something we as, designers, are normally afraid of and do not encourage.

U of C's logo wasn't the first logo to meet such a grizzly end, (think of the Gap rebrand that didn't even last 24 hours before being killed) and it won't be the last. For better or for worse, the armchair critic is here to stay. Which leads to the question:

Why do we care so much?
Today's largest and most recognized brands have become such an important part of daily life that people feel partial ownership over them. Brands become a piece of who they are. Something they will stand behind and support. There is always some underlying value

that a customer will hold onto. In some instances, for dear life. So it's understandable that when a brand changes, it can spark an outcry. Consumers need to know that when changes are being made to their beloved brands, they are being made for the right reasons, not just for the hell of it. Of course, designers will always be engaged in the discussion, and want stay up-to-date in the ever-changing design landscape – it's how we make our living after all, but as professionals can we realign our thoughts to get things moving in the best direction possible and ensure consumers that we are making the right moves, for the right reasons?

So where do we go from here?
First, we need to look more closely at the issue of design criticism.

The title for Michael Beirut's essay posted on *Design Observer* says it all: "Graphic Design Criticism as a Spectator Sport". The essay's theory is that there are more causalities in this sport than not. Ironically, it is happening at a time where the public has looked to designers like never before, during an era where end-users interact with our design output like never before. For the first time, the general public is engaged in design, and we owe it to them as professionals to guide them through thoughtful, well executed solutions, rather than just spouting out aesthetic-based, petty comments from the sidelines.

It can be argued that the haters, the know-it-alls and armchair critics, are pushing design backwards. That what they are really doing is pushing the stereotype that designers are nothing more than creators of 'pretty pictures'. It is time to put away the personal attacks and replace them with logical and thoughtful design criticism, to encourage healthy debate and make educated decisions on the underlying value we bring to every project.

As designers, we have the ability to create great work and we owe it to our industry to produce the work that will be around long after the haters have moved on to the next big thing.

Bill Watterson

Looking for a creative boost? Lay off the snooze button.
I know a lot of designers are night-owls, but starting tomorrow morning, why not force yourself to stop hitting the snooze button? I realize this can be a huge struggle, especially if you aren't typically a morning-person, but give it a shot. Tomorrow, try hopping out of bed and starting your day with intention. As daunting as that might sound, the days that start with an early rise are often the most productive. They can result in a huge bout of inspiration too. (Usually after a strong coffee). If you're a graphic designer in a rut or just looking to boost your creativity, challenge yourself to waking up a bit earlier and see how it affects your day.

For me, being up early is a way to avoid stress. I take that extra time to plan and prep for the jobs I have going on that day. I can take my time without the scramble of production schedules, meetings with my creative director, client calls, brainstorming sessions, and everything else that takes up so much of the day at a design studio. The extra time in the morning means that by the time the day has even really started, I can have everything under control and a plan of attack mapped out. Ideally, I'll even cross a few small items off my to-do list before our morning production meeting has even started. The whole process creates a sense of achievement and frees me up to focus on the major design challenges of the day.

On top of the benefit to my working life, I've also found that my early morning routine makes more room for me-time once the day is done. Because I've crossed everything off my list, I can meet friends for dinner, sign up for a pottery class or just spend time exploring my neighbourhood. I can get away from my desk and take part in the daily interactions and activities that inspire my design work. I can unplug from the day-to-day of design, and feel re-energized for the next day of work. I love it.

For those of you who are intrigued by this whole waking-up-early thing, but find it next to impossible, here are a few simple ideas you can try. First, go to bed seven or eight hours before you plan on waking up. Then, when you do wake up, jump out of bed immediately – no snooze button. Open your blinds. Let in the sunlight. Feel the stillness of the early morning and make it part of you.

Getting up pre-snooze button might take some adjusting, but before you know it, an earlier rise will begin to feel natural. Who knows? You might even begin to prefer it. I know I do.

I'll admit, being an early riser might not be for everyone, but give it shot. In my experience, it's been completely advantageous in my career as a graphic designer. Best of luck, from an early riser.

TO CERTIFY OR NOT TO CERTIFY

Certification refers to the confirmation of defined and predictable characteristics of a person, place or object. In a professional setting, certification refers to the confirmation of competence to perform a certain job or task, usually involving some kind of examination or review procedure.

Accreditation is an extension of this concept. It refers to the process of ensuring certain certification practices are acceptable. Many professions in Canada offer certification: Architecture (you actually need a license), interior designers (ARIDO), industrial design, engineers and many more. When it comes to Graphic Design however, certification or accreditation has been a source of debate for as long as we have had the term "graphic designer". Today, the only countries that have recognized certification programs for graphic designers are Australia, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Switzerland and the UK.

Most noticeably absent from this list, is the USA. Of course, Americans have the AIGA (American Institute of Graphic Arts) but they do not currently offer certification programs.

Somewhat surprisingly, RGD Ontario (Registered Graphic Designers) offers the only recognized accreditation program for graphic designers in the world. It was created as an Act of Ontario Legislature in 2001. From the official RGD website: "*The RGD and Registered Graphic Designer designations are signals of quality and competence to the profession, public and government. Successful candidates have met a rigorous set of standards that includes documented levels of relevant, professional education and experience as well as competence in the areas of business, design principles, research, theory and ethics demonstrated through the successful completion of a written test and portfolio interview.*"

To become a Registered Graphic Designer, a candidate must pass both a written exam, and portfolio review, and meet certain criteria in regards to education and experience. The process is lengthy, but attainable for anyone with the minimum experience and education levels. (Disclosure alert: the author is an accredited RGD.)

Alternatively, the GDC (Graphic Designers of Canada) offers CGD designation. According to the GDC's website: *The GDC licenses the CGD certification mark to those designers whose services have met the rigorously defined standard."* (No more information on the process is immediately evident on the website.)

It's interesting to note that Canada offers two associations offering variations of the same qualification, especially when you consider how few countries offer any certification at all. The organizations suffer from a tenuous relationship where truth is stranger than fiction, but their relationship issues have little to do with the nature of this article.

Graphic design in Canada, and in most places in the world, suffers chronically from a lack of public engagement or awareness. The public, media and business world, do not recognize us as having much worth. This is a matter of frustration for intelligent professionals, and it has been hugely damaging to our industry over the last 15 years.

Design plays a huge role in modern society. Advertising on TV, the web and in urban environments, signage and wayfinding that help us navigate through our world, the digital interfaces we all use every day for many hours, and the marketing communications that help companies grow, hire, expand, provide benefits and keep society rolling. Graphic design, and graphic designers have a role to play in all of this. So, why is it that we have been reduced to the invisible man? People interact with our creations continuously, so

why is 'graphic designer' now a dirty term?

The issue lies, as always, at our own feet. Fellow designers: WE HAVE ALLOWED THIS TO HAPPEN! Architects would never let their profession be so debased, neither would Engineers. Both hold themselves and their professions to much higher standards. Graphic designers are content to look the other way, piss around with Photoshop, and let our industry fall into irrelevance around us. Why? Let's examine some of the reasons.

1. There are too many of us.
   Schools continue to pump out designers at extraordinary rates, far more than the industry can support. This volume leads to dilution. Too many in-house designers, too many freelancers in basements, too many "my nephew is a designer" designers. We've all been there. We've all been confronted by designers who have been schooled but not properly trained.

2. We focus too much on the metaphysical, and not enough on upholding professional standards.
   Because of the reasons outlined in point one, it has become harder and harder to make a living. So, in the process of trying to put bread on the table, we focus on being busy and working harder and harder each year, without devoting the time required to develop the reputation of our profession.

3. Our associations have a lot to answer for.
   Both the RGD and GDC, have lost their way. They've settled into looking inward and self-preservation rather than moving the profession forward. I recognize how hard our associations work for us, but they need to work smarter, not harder.

If you take a moment to scan the image banner on the RGD's new website, you'll see links to nothing but industry events like student awards, salary survey results, exam promotions, designer webinars, even an in-house networking event. Not a single link or article about reaching the world outside our profession. The GDC's home page is slightly better, but only marginally so.

So what gives? Besides the fact that most of this is paid programming that fosters self-preservation, as members, we need to scream and yell from the roof tops that this is not what we pay membership dues for. Not for one goddamn minute! If we don't make our voices heard, we have no right to complain, so speak up.

Mark Busse of Industrial Brand in Vancouver puts it this way: "You get out what you put in. The fiefdoms at our associations will continue if designers allow it to continue." Unsurprisingly, navel-gazing designers do allow it, and continue to allow it. Nothing will change if we don't expect better of the organizations we put our trust in to forward the needs of our industry.

Of course, we all recognize the need for industry dialogue, ongoing learning and support for students of graphic design. But ... and this is a big "but", this is not why the RGD was created. The RGD was created to offer something more. In 2001, their founding vision was to create a designation that actually meant something – a level to aspire to. Unfortunately, since then our industry has only continued to slide into obscurity. How far into obscurity? So far that many people don't even call themselves graphic designers anymore, lest they be laughed from the room. How did this happen one might ask? Especially considering the fact that our own provincial government passed legislation to regulate standards for graphic designers?

The answer is clear. Associations need to offer less inward

programming and turn the clock back to when our professional designations meant something.

I have a few ideas.

- Forging a relationship with a national media partner like the *Globe & Mail* or *National Post*, and publishing regular columns written by RGDs or CDGs on the relevance of design

- Insisting that our provincial and federal governments promote and support our industry through awareness programs and continued standardization – including guidelines on spec work

- Lobbying governments to rescind their heinous procurement policies glorifying the message that the lowest bid is the best bid. (A destructive and borderline malicious practice impeding Canadians who are trying to make a living)

- Stopping internal promotions. Promote with full effort to the purchasers of our services: Marketing Directors, C-level executives, Public Sector Managers, and more. We need our associations and our peers to promote the value of retaining proven, certified professionals

- Forging relationships with marketing associations for cross promotions. As an example, DesignThinkers should be as well-attended by clients as by designers

- Lastly, most importantly, how about including portfolio quality as a factor in RGD examination policy? If a designer's work isn't good enough, they should fail. Yes, this is difficult to police, but until it happens, the RGD designation won't garner the respect it should, and could have

Clearly, our industry regulators have a few kinks to iron out. Joshua Emberlin, a Senior freelance design director in Toronto sums it up nicely: "What do I get from joining RGD? They accept anyone that passes the minimum requirements. Just look at the portfolios they showcase on their site, many are terrible. Our industry is all about the portfolio, and more still, 99% of clients don't even know what the RGD designation means."

Tellingly, Josh is not alone in his views. If designers are going to part with their increasingly harder to earn cash and pay membership dues, they want bang for their buck. For most, this means seeing returns in the form of client awareness of their designations, not subsidizing networking breakfasts for in-house designers.

Claire Dawson, a partner at Toronto's well-respected studio, Underline has this to say: "In a time of the rampant overuse of the word 'designer', I understand the desire to bring in accreditation. But truthfully, in our day-to-day design practice, its usefulness is rather limited. For instance, it's helpful to be able to say that we cannot do spec work because of our accreditation. It gives us an industry guideline to hold up as a rationale, rather than just personal values or the company's standards. But we have never had a client ask if we are certified, or insist on it as a requirement. Clients come to us because of the work we do. They appreciate a high level of design, understand what it takes to produce it, and the value it brings to their business. They don't care if we are certified. Their biggest concern is what our portfolio looks like."

While Claire's statement is 100% true, it is also 100% disturbing. Consider: "No client has ever asked for certification, they only care about the portfolio." If we dig in deeper, this highlights the growing pains our industry is experiencing. Our value is placed solely upon how "good", "cool" or, god forbid, how "sexy" our work is. The

quality of our portfolio should be simply the starting point in how we are assessed by clients. Certainly, if they don't like our work, the relationship cannot continue. But, if we assume a universal baseline for quality, a slew of new, more in-depth factors add up to a symbiotic working relationship. Which factors? Oh, how about qualities like, experience, recognition, defined processes, references, service style, pricing, results of past projects, etc.

This is where our associations have let us down. Precisely where. As it stands, clients flip through our portfolios for 'cool' stuff they like. Even worse is when they look for spec concepts as proof of our abilities and/or commitment to a project. Please. Our associations would be infinitely more valuable if they focused on educating the business world, public sector, governments and the public at large of the value our work can bring. Instead we find them putting significant investment into running webinars, conferences, award shows, and networking events where designers can speak to other designers about design-y things. Again, as an industry, we need to stand up and demand better. Check out the job boards. No longer do we see job postings demanding RGD or CDG certification, or even membership. We used to, but not now. The blame lies plainly at our feet. If we ourselves don't strive for professional standardization, how can we expect paying clients to?

Lionel Gadoury, President of RGD Ontario had this to say: "Today RGD has a community of over 3,000 practising professionals, educators and students who have met the respective qualifications for membership. Becoming an accredited RGD is no cakewalk. Last year 17% of RGD applicants did not meet the RGD standard. We are however the largest graphic design organization in Canada and offer on-going advocacy, continuous learning and mentorship programs that benefit the entire industry. RGD's many initiatives

include the annual DesignThinkers conference in Toronto with over 1,500 attendees, a national industry survey of salaries and billing practices, a virtual professional development program, a new international awards program recognizing design for social good, the Business of Graphic Design handbook, weekly webinars and much more."

Sounds great right? It is great, really great. In theory, all of these things are fantastic. Our industry needs these types of programs. I participate in them. Just recently I hosted one of the very webinars I'm now bitching about. I hope that my presentation was interesting and useful to the people who watched it.

Phil Mondor RGD, states: "I am always confused when asked by other designers why I am a member of the RGD. As designers we are taught that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts and apply this (gestalt) theory everyday in our creative practices. To be a part of an association which represents all aspects of the Graphic Design discipline as a whole only makes sense. I ask back — Even though you already benefit from the RGD's work, how can one not be a member?"

In theory the concept of an accredited designation is tremendously attractive. The problem is that, in reality, it currently isn't. The mark has been missed, and missed by a mile. CAPIC (Canadian Association of Professional Image Creators) has the tagline: Dedicated to safeguarding and promoting rights and interests of photographers, illustrators and digital artists. How about that, design associations? Safeguarding and promoting our rights and interests, now that has some real value."

Now, before you go on thinking I'm an association hater, I'm not.

For instance, on the issue of spec work, associations have done great work. Spec work is a blight on the creative community. Crowdsourcing no better. Spec work is the creation of concept

designs with no compensation in the hope of securing work. It is common practice in the advertising world and often creeps into graphic design as well. Our associations have done a very good job at battling this scourge. Personally, I have seen RFPs changed, requests withdrawn and contracts won by Hagon Design because of lobbying and support from our associations.

I hope the point that comes across from this article is more of a reflection on our industry, rather than a condemnation of our associations, and where certification fits into the puzzle. (Really, I just want to do, and to see, progress in our industry.)

Certification or accreditation should be aspirational. It should set a level of excellence our industry should strive for and assign value to. Imagine, if you will, a measurable standard of quality that could impact billing rates. In that scenario, studios would be falling over themselves for certification! Alas, that isn't the current state of affairs.

Think back to design school. You're young and impressionable, you want to change the world. Industry associations look like they're going to help you fulfill your dreams. However, once you leave school, where the associations are usually promoted quite aggressively, they melt into the background. Why? Because Creative Directors don't see RGD of CGD as a measure of talent, the designations have been watered down. The result? Designers do not strive for certification, why go through the hassle?

So when reality bites, what certification or accreditation comes down to is personal values. Do you want letters after your name? Do you want to appear qualified by an association to practice? Do you care enough about your craft to invest in an industry association and take on the responsibility that brings?

Our associations are at a crossroad of sorts. If designers don't see value, because Creative Directors don't see value, if clients don't

ask for designation, or even know what it is, if the government that legislated it doesn't even require it in their own RFP system, there is only one question to ask: What the hell's the point?

First, we need to look at ourselves and ask a few questions:

- What direction can we give our associations about these issues?
- How can we give them creative suggestions to achieve some of the goal of assigning value to designation?
- How can we be clearer about our expectations for the industry, and how our associations can help us achieve these expectations?

Then, we need to make it happen.

We need to insist that changes are made, that the nation's attention is captured, and that it all really matters. Does hiring an RGD or a CGD make a difference? The answer needs to be: yes! What's in it for the client and why should they care? The onus is on us as an industry to tell them.

At the end of the day, only one point is clear, in-fighting and bickering will achieve nothing. When we receive a request for proposal or contact from a new client that **demands** designation for their project, we will know our associations finally have it right.

Mark Busse passionately states, "This issue should be a call to arms for designers everywhere. The only thing I expect when I pay my dues is that my association protect the honour, the value, the integrity, and the rights of our profession — all the rest — the webinars, the networking events, the white papers, is just gravy. I demand that my association be graphic design's brand guardian in the public realm."

Do you hear that associations? It's time to do something about it.

Colophon

Primary Typeface for this issue of *Wayward Arts* is **Miller**. Miller, designed by Matthew Carter, is a "Scotch Roman,"
a class of sturdy, general purpose types of Scottish origin.

Mute Nine Years Later is set in **Guardian Text Egyptian**,
designed by Christian Schwartz and Paul Barnes. Taking its basic form from the Egyptian, Guardian Egyptian Text works perfectly in smaller sizes and is robust enough to cope with adverse
printing for newsprint and the like.

Remaking what it means to be original is set in **ITC Slimbach**. Slimbach was designed in 1987 by world renowned calligrapher and type designer Robert Slimbach. Slimbach created a
"contemporary text font with a progressive look," combining clean serif shapes with the warmth of calligraphic forms.

A life in Graphic Design is set in **Whitney** by Hoefler & Frere-Jones. Whitney was originally developed for New York's Whitney Museum, Whitney contends with two different sets of demands: those of editorial typography, and those of public signage.

Sketch Sketch Sketch and Standing on the Shoulders of Giants is set in **Sentinel**. This face is a fresh take on slab serif typefaces, offering for the first time a complete family that's serviceable for both text and display.

Why Graphic Design is set in **Akzidenz Grotesk**, originally released by the Berthold Type Foundry in 1896. It was the first sans serif typeface to be widely used.

The Rise of the Armchair Critic is set in **Chronicle**, a vigorous
hybrid of time-honored forms with contemporary friendly features.

Lay off the snooze button is set in **Utopia**, designed by Robert Slimbach in 1989. It combines pronounced stroke contrast of eighteenth-century with contemporary innovations in character shapes and stroke details.

THAT'S IMPOSSIBLE. IT'LL NEVER WORK. THAT'S IMPOSSIBLE. IT'LL NEVER WORK.

LET'S DO IT.

F L A S H

Cougar® gives you the power to transform your best ideas into beautifully printed pieces that are as visually stunning as they are economically viable.

This issue of Wayward Arts is printed on 80lb. Cougar® vellum text and 65lb. Cougar® smooth cover. Cougar® is a member of the Domtar EarthChoice® family of products. Available from Unisource in a broad range of weights and finishes including white & natural, super smooth, smooth and vellum.

unisource®

www.UnisourceDesign.ca

Domtar