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Is it all just fair game when possible?
Dear Reader,

The intent behind this publication is for each volume to address a theoretical concept from multiple perspectives, hopefully in a way that has some sort of personal connection to the lived experience of the authors who write them. The beauty in theories is there is no finite, specific answer. They are ideas to debate and reflect upon. Volume 16.1, “Fair Game,” is dedicated to appropriation. In opening up the dialog on appropriation, we get a richer sense of what it is and how it affects us, because there really isn’t just one answer. Each designer has their own value system and approach that defines how they feel and the choices they make regarding appropriation, copying, and plagiarism.

Contributor Julianna Johnson opens with an essay outlining her experience as a designer and illustrator who has had her work stolen and re-sold. Bonnie Blake writes on typography and “oriental exoticism,” rampant in United States via pop culture. Nic Meier plays with appropriation as a generative practice for creating work, borrowing from Sol Lewitt and Eva Hesse. Aaron Secrist writes a pro-appropriation essay on what it means to be a design student just about to graduate—and how appropriation can best serve us. Andrew DeRosa, inspired by Learning from Las Vegas, takes us along a drive from New England to New York, noticing buildings and signs that are direct appropriations of the environment immediately surrounding them. There are also interstitials throughout. It is important for designers to know that even though illustrations and photographs are copyrightable (even photographs of art and design), graphics are not. I know this because I’ve had email conversations with our national copyright office about it. I wholeheartedly disagree with their position—as if one method is somehow more valid artistically than the other, or as if creating illustrations or drawings doesn’t use the exact same methods sculpted from basic shapes and forms that graphics and fonts use—but I do understand it is not their decision to make. To change this requires a change in the law, which would require a concerted effort by our profession to lobby for the change.

The aesthetic for the overall publication is composed of imagery I am initially pulling from elsewhere. Doing so is controversial, but it gets to the heart of what it is to be creative and participate in our collective culture. This is not common practice for me; I diligently pursued developing my own aesthetic, an undertaking that took years to solidify.

To redraw Mickey Mouse or reprint Richard Prince without permission is putting my work on the line. Richard Prince doesn’t bother to get permission, which is exactly my point. Whether loosely referencing appropriation artists like Shepard Fairey or directly redrawing free fonts, I’m pushing on my own boundaries of authentic making, in the name of exploration, education, and cultural critique.

It also bears mentioning that Julianna created such a compelling layout for her article that I am borrowing from her in subsequent layouts. This is also feeding into another larger point that as designers, a lot of what we do is collaborative and dynamic.

I look forward to your thoughts, feel free to reach out. ~ Meredith
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JULIANNA’S WORK WAS LIFTED FROM SOCIAL MEDIA AND PICKED UP BY AMAZON RESELLERS. A YEAR LATER SHE’S STILL FILING CLAIMS TO GET IT REMOVED.

JULIANNA JOHNSON

A STORY ABOUT EMOTIONS AND PROBLEM SOLVING
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"I found this while shopping for pillows online. Isn’t it your illustration?"
—My sister.

"Yes."
—Me.

Discovering that my illustration had been stolen was, as one would expect, an emotional experience. There were moments when I felt ambivalent: Should I be flattered? Apathetic? Angry? Ultimately, the overwhelming feeling was anxiety surrounding the scale of the problem and my inability to solve it, as well as my perspective on the work itself. Pause for real talk: Around the time that I made this illustration (along with the others in the series pictured below), I had just finished a year of therapy and was thinking about the disturbing similarities between my professional life and my personal life. As a designer and illustrator, I created work that told stories and attempted to control the perception of messaging. As a human, I presented a narrative of my life and marriage that was pleasant, content, and stable. The images in this series are a manifestation of my psyche, at least in part.

To most viewers, this series would be perceived as calm, safe, friendly, and on trend in the world of "Home and Baby" Pinterest boards. As intended, the circumstance that led to the creation of the series is, I believe, completely masked.

Three years, a divorce, a new house, and new boyfriend later, I had pretty much put it behind me. But then, all the feelings of lack of control and isolation that spawned the work came back to me in the form of a pillow.

My sister discovered my illustration for sale within a collection of fox-themed pillow covers on Amazon.com. As I dug deeper, I found it on multiple sites, including Walmart.com and a variety of small and large online shops. I shared my findings with the world and a small army of kind (yet angry) designers and illustrators came to my defense. Thanks to their support, some of the negative feelings began to transform into excitement. Maybe this angry mob could take down the man!

But who is the man? Maybe it’s Amazon, maybe China, maybe it’s a weird barn-themed kid-friendly shop in Canada that told me that I had “lost control of [the work]” because I failed to watermark it.

While what this Canadian shop told me was annoying and ridiculous, it started to feel accurate. The more I looked, the more I found. I read the reviews, the product descriptions, and reached out to dozens of companies. I began to see that no matter how many companies I emailed, I likely could not prevent new shops from carrying the pillow, nor could I stop manufacturers from exploiting me or other illustrators.

"THE COPYRIGHT YOU PROVIDED DOES NOT MATCH THE CONTENT YOU REPORTED."

—Amazon.com

A story about emotions and problem solving by Julianna Johnson

Since I put my own work on Pinterest, and because of how the site functions, it would be easy to track the source. Unfortunately, despite the fact that I could easily be found, someone snapped a screen shot of my work, slapped it on a pillow cover, and began mass producing it without ever reaching out to me for permission.

I ordered a pillow cover (pictured above), just to confirm that this was in fact a scaled-up, low-resolution carbon copy of my work. It was. All the tiny errors only I could recognize were present. They didn’t bother to change one thing.

On the following pages, I share my personal experience: How the work came to be, how these circumstances have affected me, my approach to the problem, and my hopes to someday fully put this behind me.
I eventually concluded that not much would be gained by hunting down the fox pillow. Instead of rallying my friends and family, I would reach out to companies that carried the pillow and simply ask them to remove it from their shops. And someday, I’d fully move on.

If I allowed myself to move past this event, would I be disappointing the small army that came to my defense? Would I miss an opportunity to educate a company, and in turn, protect a fellow illustrator from this same fate? What is my responsibility in this conversation?

The reality is, issues of fair compensation and authorship will likely become more prevalent as new online companies make images readily available to an ever-expanding audience. Additionally, as it becomes easier to open online shops and maintain relative anonymity, there will continue to be few (or no) consequences for businesses that casually source their shop inventory from disreputable wholesalers.

Beyond that, it’s troubling that when work is stolen, there’s no way for the creator of that work to ensure that ethical manufacturing practices are followed. The breadth of the problems is insurmountable for a single person.

The time it took to create the piece, how much I could have realistically earned for that work under a variety of other traditional agreements, how much I could hypothetically charge in royalties, and how many pillow covers would need to be sold with the hypothetical royalty in order to equal what I could’ve made under the other possible agreements.

To grasp the lost potential of this work, I focused on the following: (1) the time it took to create the piece, (2) how much I could have realistically earned for that work under a variety of other traditional agreements, (3) how much I could hypothetically charge in royalties, and (4) how many pillow covers would need to be sold with the hypothetical royalty in order to equal what I could’ve made under the other possible agreements.

Wholesale prices ranged from $1.36 to $3.99 USD per unit, while typical retail prices (at named shops, not individuals on eBay) in the U.S., U.K., and Canada ranged from $9.99 to $32.99 USD per unit. Reasonable price was based on the retail price range, as well as what I believe a typical company could charge for a product of this quality.
Many of the companies I reached out to claimed that they were unaware that they were selling items that featured stolen images. While they willingly took down my work, I’m hesitant to give them too much credit. The same companies that were apologetic and responsive to my situation continue to sell other clearly stolen items. For example, the pillow featuring my illustration came in a set of four fox-themed pillows. Most companies that carried all four pillows did not stop carrying the other three that came in the set.

Hoping to bring another voice into the battle, I reached out to an illustrator whose work was being sold alongside mine. As of the date that this was written, I have not heard back from them.

Given the magnitude of the problem (the internet? Capitalism?) and the need to present one’s work online, maintaining complete control over how an image is reproduced feels a bit like a hopeless fight. So, what can we do? Here are a few simple, proactive steps that I either took or contemplated:

- **REPORT A RIGHTS INFRINGEMENT ON AMAZON**
  I have had limited success with reporting images on Amazon’s site, but I’ll admit my follow through here has been weak.

- **CONTACT A LAWYER**
  I ultimately did not hire a lawyer (and I am not a lawyer), but in my experience, lawyers are not needed when communicating with most retailers if the goal is simply to get work removed when it is encountered. A lawyer would likely be more essential when communicating with international manufacturers and wholesalers, though there’s no guarantee that threat of legal action will stop production of stolen work. Additionally, even if the initial manufacturer ceases production, other manufacturers may pop up and begin selling the work immediately thereafter.

- **HELP EDUCATE RETAILERS**
  Every U.S. based retailer that I contacted took the work down immediately. Thanks to Reverse Google Image Search, I occasionally discover new shops that are selling the work and reach out to them when I have time.

- **SAY THANKS**
  I appreciate that Andrea R. credited me as the inspiration when she “tried” my Pin.

- **PROPOSE AN INDEPENDENT AGREEMENT**
  If the primary concern is lack of compensation, propose to shops that they pay a royalty on all items sold that contain the stolen images.

- **LET IT GO**
  I acknowledge that many people will think that I should fight harder and longer. But when I look at how I make a living (working by the hour or project), I can’t justify anything more than an email or report here and there. So as much as it pains me to relinquish control, I’m ready to heed the wise words of Queen Elsa of Arendelle, “No right, no wrong, no rules for me, I’m free! Let it go, let it go!”

What are the expectations for crediting sources when the “inspiration” is something as universally recognizable as an Apple emoji?
LEGAL PROTECTIONS FOR DESIGNERS

Copyright laws are as old as the founding of our country. In Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, it states that Congress shall have the power “to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.”

Protecting creative work is important. Yet there remain discrepancies. Unlike photography, illustrations, and even architectural drawings, graphics are not legally protected by copyright laws, and neither are fonts. To directly quote the Copyright Office, “Unfortunately, concept, design, lettering, graphics, and layout are, by law, not copyrightable.”

Yet, copyright laws change over time; there were 70 different amendments and clarifications between 1976 and 2016. Copyright law began to cover computer programs only as recently as 1980. Architectural works have only enjoyed copyright protections since 1990. Protecting the work of graphic designers is more than possible. The only reason graphic designers do not have copyright protection is that we, as an industry, have not yet lobbied for this change.

GRAPHICS ARE NOT PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT
BONNIE’S ESSAY FOCUSES ON APPROPRIATION AS IT IS FOUND COMMONLY AMONG TYPEFACES AND THEIR USE IN POPULAR CULTURE.
Type is what language looks like,” psychologists instructed to read two or more text-only writings, linespacing. Published findings from these studies set with markedly different type properties, such as typeface, case, style, color, and paragraph appearance might influence human viewpoints, attitudes, perceptions, judgments, and decision-making. In most studies, participants are typically instructed to read two or more text-only writings, set with markedly different type properties, such as typeface, case, style, color, and paragraph linespacing. Published findings from these studies have generally pointed to a definitive change in cognitive perception among study participants concerning the different typefaces used in these tests. By deconstructing Ellen Lupton’s statement, “Type is what language looks like,” psychologists and others can gain perspective concerning how the visual form of typography can inform peoples’ thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors.

Of the studies conducted on the visual properties of typography to date, none have explored the publics’ cognitive perceptions of Latin typefaces designed to resemble non-Latin alphabets such as Chinese, Arabic, Hebrew, Cyrillic, and other Asian cultures. As Biľak points out, there appears to be a Eurocentric bias toward Latin typefaces because history credits Europeans for the creation of movable type and advances in printing, when in fact China created and was using movable type for five centuries before Gutenberg. There also appears to be a scarcity of writings, historical or otherwise, on non-Latin typefaces written in a Latin characters (Biľak, 67). Yet, in the present day, there is an abundance of Latin typefaces designed to resemble non-Latin fonts that are readily available for commercial use on free sites such as Da Font, 1001 Fonts, Font Space, and Font Squirrel, among others. Anyone, therefore, can create their own or download and use another designer’s faux typeface they are appropriating.

As Paul Shaw (2009, para. 4) pointed out when referring to faux ethnic typefaces, “These types’ ethnic flair relies on a viewer’s inchoate expectations of what a given culture’s type should look like.” With Shaw’s comment in mind, if the visual manifestation of type can influence one’s cognitive perceptions of the message itself, what happens when English language words are commonly typeset in a style that appropriates a non-Western language? Take, for example, a faux Chinese typeface set in Latin characters and consider whether the written word’s message would take on a different meaning other than what was intended for native English language readers.

The use of these faux typefaces becomes more complex when one considers the following scenario: For decades, faux Chinese typefaces have been commonly associated with “Chinese” cuisine and have manifest themselves in the form of Chinese restaurant identity, as well as on frozen and canned foods in the United States and parts of Western Europe. If an East Asian type designer creates non-Latin faux Chinese typefaces, and if commercial business owners of Chinese origin use these faux Chinese typefaces on their products and promotional materials, are they perpetuating stereotypes of their own culture? Or, in their typeface design or aesthetic choice of typeface nothing more than a signifier for the experience of their product as seen through the Western eye? And if so, is there an ethical issue with the non-Asian designer who uses faux Chinese typefaces for promotional purposes or, even more complex, actually designs a faux Chinese typeface? Is the non-Chinese designer then co-opting a minority culture? These questions and more will be explored in this article.

**TYPOGRAPHICAL STUDIES: PERCEPTUAL INFLUENCE AND VISUAL PROPERTIES**

In studies conducted to date concerning how and if the visual properties of typography can influence cognitive perception, researchers have not included the use of Latin typefaces that appropriate the look of non-Latin typefaces and characters. However, there are several noteworthy studies whose findings can be applied to questions posed in this article involving as they examine subjects’ reactions to a particular typeface. For example, in an older study, psychologists Albert Poffenberger and R.B. Franken considered whether or not typefaces used in specific advertising campaigns influenced peoples’ perceptions of the product or topic at hand. Five descriptive impressions (Cheapness, Dignity, Economy, Luxury, and Strength) and five product classifications (Automobile, Building Material,
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Coffee, Jewelry, and Perfume were typeset in 29 different typefaces. Test subjects used a numerical scale to vote on the degree of appropriateness of the typeface and its properties in relation to the descriptors and product classifications as listed above. The above figure shows the following phrase set in a Bodoni Bold font along with the tallied results on the degree of appropriateness in that typeface: ‘WHEN, IN THE COURSE OF HUMAN EVENTS, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve $\text{12345}$.”

Out of the 29 typefaces measured (which included New Caslon Italic, Century Oblique, Old English, Cheltenham Bold Outline, and Tiffany Text, among others), Bodoni Bold was found to be the most adaptable typeface (Poffenberger & Franken, 1923).

In another study on typefaces and their impact on readers’ cognitive perceptions, Eve Brumberger (2003) argued that, while visual rhetoric is very much a part of document design, typography is also an important element that is sometimes ignored. Her study was a two-part exploration of 15 different typefaces. The first part explored whether test subjects commonly attributed the same personas to a typeface. The second study used the same rating system and typefaces as in part one. However, its primary focus was on short writings set in different typefaces rather than on the typeface itself. The typefaces used were varied and included Comic Sans, Bauhaus, Lucida Sans, Old English Italic, Black Chancery, Arial, and Courier.

The qualitative results of this study revealed that test subjects consistently assigned the same attributes to typefaces and styles. Therefore, Brumberger’s (2003) study strongly suggested that typefaces not only possessed individual personalities but might also contribute to the reader’s cognitive perception of the writing itself. Both the Poffenberger and Franken (1923) and the Brumberger (2003) studies suggest and perhaps confirm what most designers already know: Visual language has meaning beyond the words themselves. Like humans, typefaces possess personalities that give additional meaning to the written word. As Robert Bringhurst said (1992, p. 11), "Typography is the craft of endowing human language with a durable visual form, and thus with an independent existence.”

### Typeface attributes and corresponding scale for Brumberger’s study of personas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typeface Attributes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretentious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloppy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfume</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfume</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
examined a nonsensical word, set in a style that vaguely appropriates an East Asian calligraphic font. Some respondents referred to, only 17 responded. Comments were varied, and interesting. In summary, respondents appeared to have a favorable impression of this typeface and its persona. In contrast, the typeface tested in the second part of this informal survey was the Bodoni Italic. A classic typeface, Bodoni was designed by Giambattista Bodoni in the latter part of the 18th century. Renowned Italian designer, Massimo Vignelli, called Bodoni “one of the most elegant typefaces ever designed” (Millman, 2010). The highest descriptive ratings for the Bodoni Italic words, “Insensitive,” were given to the following: Somewhat Costly, Dignified, and Elegant. For the Not at all rating, the descriptives, Cheap, Sneaky, and Loud scored high.

When asked what the word “Ipsumtel” referred to, two respondents thought it sounded like an expensive beauty product or prescription medication. Another thought it was an upscale restaurant. Two others thought it was the name of an adventure film, and two others thought “Ipsumtel” was some sort of tech company. Other respondents had no idea what the word referred to and instead seemed drawn to the visual elements of the characters. They were struck by the visual formality of the word and in general, assumed it referred to something important but could not give an example of what that might be. What’s interesting to note is that respondents did not perceive any kind of cultural associations related to this typeface as they did with Chinese Takeaway. The Bodoni Italic typeface elicited no connection or curiosity to want to engage with whatever “Ipsumtel” was. As such, it appears that the test subjects were more drawn to “Taldectin.”

ETHNIC FONTS AND APPROPRIATION: CHINESE DESIGNERS OF FAUX CHINESE TYPEFACES

On the free font site dafont.com, under the category of “Foreign Look, Japan and Asian,” there are 168 typefaces, all of which use Latin characters. Of the type designers in this category, there are three who identify as Chinese: Pi Luo Chiu, who designed “Asian Guy”; Archer Lai, who designed “Hsi Chinese”; and Fei Tian, who designed “Line Phone.” There are also two Japanese type designers: Fumemiji, who designed the “Yozakura” font, and Kazuyoshi Ishikawa, who designed the “Blade Runner” font—both styles similar to the faux Chinese typefaces. The remaining designers originate from a broad range of nations around the globe, which may reflect the scope of cultural appropriation in type design.

At the beginning of this article, I posed the following question: If an East Asian type designer creates a new Latin faux Chinese typeface, and if commercial business owners of Chinese origin use faux Chinese typefaces on their products and promotional materials, are they perpetuating stereotypes of their own culture? Or is their typeface design or aesthetic choice of typeface nothing more than a signifier of the cultural origin of their product, as seen through the Western eye? Crystal Wang (2018) posed a similar question in the article “Designing the Chinese American Brand,” where she discussed her perception of typographic representation of Chinese culture. Specifically, she examined a faux Chinese typeface “Chop Suey” (although designer and design historian Paul Shaw, 2009, argued that “Chop Suey” was a catch-all name for a style of typeface, as opposed to a singular one), and briefly discussed its name make, the once-popular dish created by Chinese natives specifically for the American palate. Wang posed the following question about what she refers to as the Chop Suey typeface: “Is it misappropriation and offensive design if the creator is of Chinese descent? Does their heritage give them more legitimacy? The Chop Suey typeface was originally perpetuated by Chinese restauranteurs though not accurate, was there more legitimacy because they were used and promoted by Chinese people themselves?” (Wang, 2018, n.p.). Wang’s question is, of course, rhetorical; there is no ethical standard that exists on the topic of typefaces, only the issue of appropriateness. However, Wang does seem to suggest in her quote that it is more appropriate for a person of Chinese descent to design with a faux Chinese typeface. Paul Shaw goes a step further by suggesting that these stereotypical typefaces can be beneficial to business owners and entrepreneurs of Chinese origin and that in this context, they are useful: “They
are shortcuts, visual mnemonic devices. There is no room for cultural nuance or academic accuracy in a shop’s façade. Restaurant owners want passersby ... to know immediately that they serve Chinese ... “food, and a lettering style that achieves this is welcome” (n.p.).

FAUX FOOD AND FAUX TYPEFACES: VISUALS USED ON AMERICAN-OWNED PRODUCTS

The following is the second question posed at the beginning of this article: “Is there an ethical issue with a non-Asian designer who uses faux Chinese typeface is Luigino Francesco Paulucci, the creator of the Chun King brand of canned “Chinese” food. Paulucci, also the inventor of Juno’s frozen pizza rolls, called out his American, first-of-its-kind, mass-produced faux Chinese food in 1947.

A good example of the Chun King typeface can be seen on vintage “Chun King” brand packaging and advertisements. Note the happy Chun King “coolie,” the mascot of the Chun King brand as represented in both advertisements. This offensive stereotype is further compounded by the “cute” use of broken English in the advertisement to the right as well as the canned food sitting on the face/brain of yet another happy Chinese man.

Chun King food products were even more far removed from the original Chinese cuisine of China than the Chinese cuisine served in Chinese-owned restaurants in the United States. Paulucci went so far as to create his own chop suey recipe for the Chun King brand, where the chop suey recipes used in North American Chinese restaurants had already been greatly modified to appeal to the American palate. For his signature Chun King recipe, Paulucci combined celery, pimentos, Italian herbs, and spices with noodles, chicken, and bean sprouts (Shapiro, 2011). In addition to the Chun King brand’s stereotypical logo and product identity, Paulucci’s Italian-influenced Chinese recipes are also one of many misrepresentations of Chinese culture in the United States during this postwar period.

The Kari-Out brand, an American-owned manufacturer of Chinese restaurant condiments, offers a contemporary view of visual appropriation as displayed in typographic choices and images on their product packaging. Howard Epstein from the Bronx, New York, is the creator of the disposable, one-serving Chinese condiment whose rise to fame paralleled the popularity of Chinese takeout in the mid 1960s and beyond. Epstein’s products were at first shunned by the Chinese restaurant community until he began to market his condiments to commercial airlines (Basu, 2015). Today the fast food condiment line of products dominates over half the Chinese condiment market share instead of similar products. Note that most packets are adorned with the stereotypical “Chop Suey” style typeface as well as a cute cartoon panda illustration (another Chinese signifier). Others display what appears to be a degraded clip art illustration of a Chinese woman playing a flute and dressed in a Qing Dynasty robe. The packet’s designs attempt to create what Americans perceive as the “Chinese dining experience.” Ironically, even Epstein’s soy sauce is faux in that it contains little to no soy. And, what little it does contain—hydrolyzed soy protein—is antithetical to the fermented soybean process and preparation used in real soy sauce manufactured in China.

VISUAL APPROPRIATION IN AMERICAN ADVERTISING

Another more contemporary example of an American-owned food company who used a Chop Suey style typeface for one of its products and in advertisements is Fresh Direct. Fresh Direct is a popular food service that offers an alternative to fast food for busy Americans. It delivers nutritious, easy-to-assemble meal kits along with instructions on how to prepare the dishes. Fresh Direct’s curated menus reflect current food trends, and they are delivered right to the customer’s doorstep. Jeff Yang (2012), columnist for the Wall Street Journal, tells the story of his friend, filmaker and author, Jennifer Lee, who in 2012 received an advertisement from Fresh Direct for their new, East-Asian-inspired stir-fry kits. Lee was incensed at Fresh Direct’s lack of cultural sensitivity in the design of this advertisement. As in so many other products, the ad appropriates the look of Chinese typography by its use of a Chop Suey style typeface for its main headings, along with a set of chopsticks resting on the letter “D” of the word “Dumplings.” This word is set in a typestyle meant to resemble chopsticks. Yang calls the typestyle, “that cliché
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There are a number of terms used to describe working with existing material or ideas. In art and music, specifically, these terms can be quite discrete, although understanding the nuances of different types of musical appropriation, for instance, often clarifies concepts in other artistic genres. The following definitions can be found in the Oxford English Dictionary Online.

**APPROPRIATION, TECHNICALLY**

There are a number of terms used to describe working with existing material or ideas. In art and music, specifically, these terms can be quite discrete, although understanding the nuances of different types of musical appropriation, for instance, often clarifies concepts in other artistic genres. The following definitions can be found in the Oxford English Dictionary Online.
NIC IS
APPROPRIATING
GRID SYSTEMS
ORIGINALLY
CREATED BY
SOL LEWITT
AND EVA HESSE.
This project is an ongoing exploration of the work and ideas of Sol LeWitt and Eva Hesse and an appropriation of their mark making systems. After seeing their work in person, I became fascinated by their process and thinking, which at first glance even seemed to be antithetical. LeWitt’s work included wall-scale drawings and serial variation, simple methods, and emphasis on the concept as the artwork; the applications of the drawings felt rational, cerebral, and rarely random. Eva fully embraced the random, repetitive, and absurd, and she brought drawing off the flat surface into sculptural space. Fundamentally, they were both exploring line, but with completely different approaches. Hesse’s drawings initially grabbed my attention because of their many different access points—it was hardly just a gray, minimalist cube in a room at MoMA. Upon approach, the variations come into focus. Looking inside the work revealed incredible texture, form, sensuality, randomness, and even chaos. Sol’s wall drawings that I was able to see at Dia:Beacon were monumental and were flat on the surface, yet taken as a whole, voluminous and sculptural. The drawings could be overwhelming or subtle and austere, depending on the application of line. I would back up to take in the entirety of the work and also get really close to see the individual marks. Although I enjoyed the scale of the works, I also wanted to see these drawings in a book. LeWitt’s drawings were greatly influenced by the music of Bach (namely the Goldberg Variations) and showed all the variations within a simple system. The compositions would give you all the notes that would be used and they were the compositions in and of themselves—all the possibilities revealed. I also wanted to see larger expressions of these combinations, out of order, random, pure noise made by lines in four directions.

After reading Kathryn A. Tuma’s article, “Eva Hesse’s turn: Rotations around the circle drawings,” and also looking at LeWitt’s Four Basic Kinds of Straight Lines…, I found a convergence between the two artists that centered around the grid. Through the documentary Rims Sol LeWitt: Wall Drawings and Eva Hesse, I learned about their close friendship that shared ideas, correspondence, and encouragement. After Eva’s early death, Sol appropriated her marks—wavy lines and a little more randomness—and carried these elements in his visual vocabulary throughout the rest of his life.

Tuma’s article begins by discussing a drawing by Hesse on grid paper. This drawing featured mostly circles, diagonal lines, and handwritten notes. The text, “On Sidestart Tip Over Not/Upstart Sideways” suggests that she might have been rotating the page in between each mark. Only one circle occupies a square, and at most, two lines fill a square in an X. While the marks look relatively uniform, there is another layer in the process of the work’s creation. The center is always disrupted—the mark requires a complete uproot from the grid rotations. Each rotational position makes each line set different when made by hand. This project is an ongoing exploration of the work and ideas of Sol LeWitt and Eva Hesse and an appropriation of their mark making systems. After seeing their work in person, I became fascinated by their process and thinking, which at first glance even seemed to be antithetical. LeWitt’s work included wall-scale drawings and serial variation, simple methods, and emphasis on the concept as the artwork; the applications of the drawings felt rational, cerebral, and rarely random. Eva fully embraced the random, repetitive, and absurd, and she brought drawing off the flat surface into sculptural space. Fundamentally, they were both exploring line, but with completely different approaches. Hesse’s drawings initially grabbed my attention because of their many different access points—it was hardly just a gray, minimalist cube in a room at MoMA. Upon approach, the variations come into focus. Looking inside the work revealed incredible texture, form, sensuality, randomness, and even chaos. Sol’s wall drawings that I was able to see at Dia:Beacon were monumental and were flat on the surface, yet taken as a whole, voluminous and sculptural. The drawings could be overwhelming or subtle and austere, depending on the application of line. I would back up to take in the entirety of the work and also get really close to see the individual marks. Although I enjoyed the scale of the works, I also wanted to see these drawings in a book. LeWitt’s drawings were greatly influenced by the music of Bach (namely the Goldberg Variations) and showed all the variations within a simple system. The compositions would give you all the notes that would be used and they were the compositions in and of themselves—all the possibilities revealed. I also wanted to see larger expressions of these combinations, out of order, random, pure noise made by lines in four directions.

After reading Kathryn A. Tuma’s article, “Eva Hesse’s turn: Rotations around the circle drawings,” and also looking at LeWitt’s Four Basic Kinds of Straight Lines…, I found a convergence between the two artists that centered around the grid. Through the documentary Rims Sol LeWitt: Wall Drawings and Eva Hesse, I learned about their close friendship that shared ideas, correspondence, and encouragement. After Eva’s early death, Sol appropriated her marks—wavy lines and a little more randomness—and carried these elements in his visual vocabulary throughout the rest of his life.

Tuma’s article begins by discussing a drawing by Hesse on grid paper. This drawing featured mostly circles, diagonal lines, and handwritten notes. The text, “On Sidestart Tip Over Not/Upstart Sideways” suggests that she might have been rotating the page in between each mark. Only one circle occupies a square, and at most, two lines fill a square in an X. While the marks look relatively uniform, there is another layer in the process of the work’s creation. The center is always disrupted—the mark requires a complete uproot from the grid rotations. Each rotational position makes each line set different when made by hand.
GRID DRAWING 1

Random sequence: Fill five lines

Process:
1. With the page in any direction, draw five vertical lines in a square, evenly spaced.
2. Repeat eight times, moving to a new random unoccupied square of your choosing.
3. Rotate the page 45 degrees counter-clockwise.
4. Draw five vertical lines in a square, every spaced.
5. Repeat eight times, moving to a new random unoccupied square of your choosing.
6. Continue rotation-draw cycles until all squares are occupied with one set of lines.

GRID DRAWING 2

Line drawing

Process:
1. Drop a pencil or pen point side down onto a piece of grid paper. This is your starting point.
2. Draw five vertical lines evenly spaced.
3. Rotate the page 90 degrees counter-clockwise.
4. Move one square in any direction that does not already have lines in that orientation.
5. Draw five vertical lines evenly spaced.
6. Repeat until you run out of available spaces to draw, or you decide to stop.
7. Each square can only have lines in four directions.

GRID DRAWING 3

Composite gradients (after Scribble Drawings by Sol Lewitt)

Process:
1. Draw a curved line in pencil within a frame on grid paper.
2. Fill each square that the line went through with solid black ink.
3. On the left side of the filled squares make a composite descending gradient to the left.
4. On the right side of the filled squares, make a composite descending gradient to the right.
5. Draw ascending and descending gradients until the frame is met.

GRID DRAWING 4

Five lines in eight directions; all combinations

Process:
Each number refers to the rotational page position. 1 = 0 degrees (standard portrait orientation). 2 = 45 degrees counter-clockwise page rotation from position 1. 3 = 90 degrees from position 1, 45 degrees from position 2. The arrow and numbers near the border of this drawing point to the "top" of the page for that rotation position. Position 5 would turn this entire journal upside down.

1. Draw each set of five vertical lines in a separate grid square (eight total).
2. Draw all two-direction combinations. Leave out 180 degree pairs. 1+4, 2+5, 3+7, 4+8.
3. Draw all three-direction pairs.
4. Draw all four-direction pairs. Leave out 180 degree pairs.
I created the most simple structure that I could for these drawings. I kept the drawing frame constant. I would only rotate the page 45 degrees at a time in a counterclockwise direction and always draw vertical lines from top to bottom. This created eight orientations of the page—positions 1 through 8. Positions 1 and 4 would produce lines in the vertical direction (as would 2 to 5, 3 to 7, and 4 to 8), but they would have been drawn in opposing ways because of the page. I also explored the number of lines drawn within a square (but kept to three and five lines for this series). I would start most of the drawings by dropping a pencil onto the page.

Grid Drawing 1 used "random," selection of the square. It was not truly random and I probably made unconscious decisions that were aesthetic and distribution-related. I rotated the page after eight squares were filled in this orientation and repeated until all empty squares were occupied by one set of lines. I often lost count of how many squares I had filled.

Grid Drawing 2 allows for combinations of lines in different directions. Each square can only hold lines in four directions. The drawing is created by rotating the page after a single square is filled and advances one square in any direction that is not occupied by lines in that direction—the redundant line-sets are treated as the same orientation. This drawing is essentially a line of filled squares, meandering around the grid-space until completely filled with lines in four directions or the drawing gets blocked by the occupant rule, or I made the choice to stop. The combinations of lines generated a set of values that reminded me of Sol's *Scribble Drawings* that generated gradients defined by scribble density. Grid Drawing 3 was made in response to these drawings—a LeWitt within a LeWitt within a Hesse. The drawing started with a simple gestural line made in the grid-space. Every square that was touched by the pencil was filled in with black ink. I then used the combinations of lines to generate the transition from black to white. These drawings illustrate the basis of the rotation-and-combine concept.

With page rotation as my basis for drawing generation, I learned very quickly that this created a very complex system in comparison to the elegance and economy of LeWitt's four line drawings. Grid Drawing 4 shows this increase in complexity when compared to *Four Basic Kinds of Straight Lines and All Their Combinations in 15 Parts*. The number of combinations increases from 15 to 74 possibilities but would essentially collapse to the minimum LeWittian value of possibilities when generated digitally.

Creating these drawings required a lot of concentration, especially when counting the number of squares before rotating. I would easily lose count and feel the need to start over. The process was obviously repetitive—each drawing would rotate the page hundreds, sometimes thousands of times—but was not unbearable or boring. I barely reached some of the levels of repetition that a LeWittian wall drawing requires. The drawing process was fascinating to me. Each line in a line-set was different; I became aware of each movement I was making and the contextual micro-adjustments I would make to connect neighboring squares. It would take much more practice to train my hand to capture more uniformity, but the process was under constant disruption. Resetting the hand and making consistent marks after rotating the media creates a tough challenge. It might even require tools if I wanted more uniformity.

The original drawings were created by hand on quadrille notebook paper in felt-tip pen or pencil. They were translated into vector drawings through Illustrator—the drawings were built in a standard orientation. Future explorations will include scale changes in grid and media size and number of repetitions. I will also explore using random number generators to choose orientations instead of following the counter-clockwise rotation progression. This project can further develop to use algorithms to generate these drawings automatically, though this will come at the loss of the human mark.
AARON REFLECTS UPON WHAT APPROPRIATION MEANS TO A DESIGNER ABOUT TO ENTER THE FIELD.
I would technically agree that it’s true, but not necessarily in the way it’s most often interpreted. People generally say it means the concept of “original” is a fallacy and that every object in our universe is a combination of things that came before it. It’s true, that’s the point I’ve been trying to make this whole time, but to say that originality doesn’t exist is to ignore one important thing: the personal touch of the artist. To make original work is to appropriate all the knowledge and skills of those that came before you and remix it with a little piece of yourself. If you can apply your own unique perspective to your creative process, it’s possible to make things that nobody else on the planet could have even dreamed of.

A good real-world example of this concept in practice is the art of collage. In recent years I’ve experimented with analog cut and paste techniques to form compositions ranging from abstract to literal, and the thing that fascinates me most about collage is its ability to form a cohesive whole from many parts. Each piece of the collage originated in a different context, but now exists in an entirely new space with really say you found it all on your own? Did you learn to navigate the perils of the ocean by yourself? Did you build and sail the ship with no help at all? Who was it that taught you to be curious in the first place? Did you already know there were islands past the horizon yet undiscovered? The point of all this is that we learn and support one another and come up with newer and better ideas to improve our collective species. Without appropriation of knowledge we would certainly still be in the stone age. It wasn’t until the development of culture that appropriation gained its modern meaning (through the lens of capitalist concepts like copyright law, monetary value, and intellectual property), but the process by which it occurs is still the same. Ideas get picked up, repurposed, and then picked up again in an infinite cycle of learning.

Stepping back and looking at our problem in this way helps to change our method of thinking a bit. Instead of having a panic attack while trying to come up with a big idea, we can sit back and breathe easy knowing that original ideas are practically a myth. You’ve probably heard the (exhaustingly overused) phrase “everything ideas exist in a vacuum. Every idea everyone has ever had, down to the second human ever born (made?), was in some way appropriated from another human. Even if the influence was incredibly minute, everything we experience and everything we learn meshes together to form our perceptions of the world, which in turn produces our thoughts, actions, and ideas. The ability to transfer information to the next generation has allowed us to grow, adapt, and become the dominant species on the planet (which we are now so graciously destroying). Even since the birth of communication and then language, people have been accumulating knowledge and appropriating it to expand the breadth of human understanding. Appropriation in the traditional sense is usually used in reference to a piece of culture (art, sound, music, fashion, images, video, symbols, etc.) being repurposed (sometimes unethically) and thrust into a different context. But what we often forget is that ideas and knowledge can be appropriated too.

Let’s say you have discovered an uninhabited island. The history books will record your name, and the bust in the city square will be of your face, but can you
An entirely new role. Whatever meaning that fragment once held is now fused with the meanings of its adjacent pieces, and in turn, the collage as a whole. Even if each piece only has a vague suggestion of meaning, if enough of these scraps are used intentionally, the final effect can be quite powerful. Appropriating from books, magazines, and newspapers to make a new work can be incredibly rewarding. My favorite collage projects are the ones where I really didn’t have an idea in mind when I started working, but the meaning emerged as more and more pieces fell into place. With a little imagination it’s easy to see how this relates to the bigger picture. The individual pieces are your skills, knowledge, interests, and experiences, while the process represents your individuality shaping the final product into something new and unique.

But of course putting this into practice is easier said than done. I believe every creative person at some point struggles with originality and finding their own voice. No matter how hard we try or how much we try to change our ways, I really should have seen this as a compliment, considering what I know now about style and appropriation. These days, I take a slightly different approach. Since everything we produce is a product of our knowledge and experiences, I now embrace appropriation rather than rejecting it. If I see something that really catches my eye, I try to notice what I like about it. What is the line quality like? How does the artist use color? Shape? Texture? What questions does the piece bring to mind? How does it fit into the context of our world? These observations inspire and influence me in a way that I am no longer ashamed of. Using other artist’s techniques is how we learn and adapt. After all, nobody can produce a masterpiece in complete isolation, because complete isolation doesn’t exist. Appropriation is a perfectly natural part of being human, and that’s why making and doing what you love. The only reason making authentic work is put on such a pedestal is because it goes hand in hand with passion. When artists truly put their heart and soul into their work, it shows. The only way to achieve this is to be unapologetic about your interests and make what you want to make; the money will come later. This is something I often struggle with, usually when I produce something that is either extremely personal or outside the norm. What will people think? Will they understand it? Will they pay me for it? Even though I try not to care that much about the value assigned to my work by capitalism, I still need to eat and sleep. There’s this magical idea that if you do what you love for long enough, someone will pay you for it. All we can really do is forge ahead believing that this statement is true, or someday face the choice between money and happiness. The ultimate hope is that what makes us happy will carry us through our whole lives, because hey, life is too short to waste time making shit you hate. We’re all so very fragile and temporary, and so is the world we inhabit. Even the days of our planet are numbered, so create what you want while you still can. Someday it all will return to the dust from which it came, so live unapologetically, create with wild passion, and go out there and make your thing happen!
THE FOUR CRITERIA OF FAIR USE

LEGAL RAMIFICATIONS

Work created by graphic designers is not protected by copyright law, which means that design work can be legally appropriated or plagiarized without consequence.

If our work isn’t valued and protected, if it is regularly used by others, it stands to argue that designers should also be well informed of their right to use, borrow and appropriate the work of others. Fair’s fair.

The Fair Use Clause (Section 107 of the Copyright Code) is a list of limitations on copyright law. Even artists and inventors who enjoy protections have to accept the limits of those protections.

Fair use establishes four basic criteria that allow for the reuse of the work of others:

1. **The purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes**
2. **The nature of the copyrighted work**
3. **The amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole**
4. **The effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work.**

For purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research, is not an infringement of copyright. In determining whether the use made of a work in any particular case is a fair use, the factors to be considered shall include—
ANDREW WRITES ABOUT APPROPRIATED ICONS, BUILDINGS, AND SIGNAGE AS HE TRAVELS FROM BOSTON TO NEW YORK.
Highway Robbery
By Andrew DeRosa

In the spirit of *Learning from Las Vegas*, the 1972 book by Venturi, Brown, and Izenour, this essay uses the vernacular landscape of the American highway as a learning tool for design. It examines a gas station, roadside hotel, and cell tower found along the road between Boston and New York City. The objects’ design devices are analyzed as a means to both critically judge the work and to better understand the context and characteristics that make these everyday objects compelling.

**GULF SUNRISE META-SIGNAGE**

Gas stations are a necessary utility and a ubiquitous part of the American highway. As I drive through Massachusetts and Connecticut to New York City, Gulf gas stations are very common. They are recognizable from a distance by the distinct branding expressed on their signage. It is an update of the iconic Gulf logo that had been in use since the 1960s. The biggest departure from the original mark is the use of digital-age lighting and drop shadow effects that give Shell’s formerly flat orange circular badge the pictorial depth to imply a three-dimensional circle. All this new digital bling is contained within a thick flat blue outline retained from the original design. Behind these conjoined elements is imagery of blue sky and clouds rendered with photographic precision that stretches to edges of the sign. Given its height and the vantage point of oncoming motorists, the sign frequently appears above the horizon line. To the viewer, this means the sky and clouds rendered on the sign are set in relief by the actual sky above the landscape. This creates a dialectical relationship: The sign has appropriated the sky’s likeness.

When Gulf launched the updated brand in 2008 they called it the “Gulf Sunrise.” The rhetoric is optimistic in nature and carefully crafted to appeal to a broad range of new and existing customers. When commenting on the success of the project, then CEO Joe Petrowski gave insight into the design process:

I think it’s because when we set out to do the new design, we had meeting after meeting of “What shade of orange?” and “How many clouds should there be?” and ultimately, the greatest solution was to go out to the customers and ask them. It’s not surprising that we based it simply on the customer feedback, but we’ll take credit for being design geniuses.

While the results may be considered either successful or bad design depending on the criteria, they are also delightfully strange. The simple addition of clouds and sky, as well as lighting effects on the orange circle, shifts the imagery from flat two-dimensional space to a three-dimensional space. In the context of the highway, this shifts the signage from being a purely sculptural industrial design form to a sculptural form holding a pictorial, illusionary space. What is captured within this new space is a fantastical world in which the Gulf logo signage is no longer confined to gravity and is hovering in the sky. Given the sky imagery’s proximity to the actual sky, this causes a strange symbolic dissonance in which the signified (the image of the sky) is too close to its referent (the actual sky). This creates a slippage of meaning in which the physical world and fiction blend together and reference one another.

**LA QUINTA BRUTALISM**

The Armstrong Rubber building is located at the busy intersection of Interstates 91 and 95 in New Haven, Connecticut. The building was designed by Marcel Breuer in 1966 and is a classic example of the architect’s modernist principles at work. The separate functions of the building are clearly articulated by floating a narrow four-story administrative office building two stories above an adjacent long, two-story research lab. It is clad with modular precast panels of concrete that provided protection from the sun and give the façade a unique sense of depth, texture, and play of light. The concrete panels vary in scale and design depending on their underlying function. The building also has a peculiar recent history. It has been vacant since the early 1990s and is currently owned by Ikea, which razed most of the first two
international and attention to detail one would expect from master architect Breuer. Rather than the dynamism of the asymmetrical balance of the Armstrong Rubber building, the La Quinta building is torpid in its symmetry. Where as Breuer’s design elegantly floats the administrative offices two stories above the research facilities on pilotis, the La Quinta building is a single heavy monolith. However, the hotel’s design does delineate some programmatic elements through by stylistic applique of brand elements. For example, the bottom floor entryway is clad in the yellow stucco that is a trademark of the hotel chain; the attached diner, The Greek Olive Restaurant, still has the distinct shingled pitched roof emblematic of the Howard Johnson’s that used to occupy the location. The La Quinta Inn building clearly resembles and refers to its neighbor, but it lacks the

floors to use the area for a parking lot for it’s neighboring big box store.

Next door to Breuer’s modernist masterpiece is a motor inn and restaurant constructed in 1971 by architects Slingerland, Bossa & Fakas. It was originally a Howard Johnson’s and is now a La Quinta Inn. It has rooms advertised as starting at $99 per night plus tax and seems like a perfectly suitable place to stay for the business and leisure travelers it seeks to accommodate. What sets this building apart from the chain’s other limited service hotels is its architecture, which appropriates unique visual elements from the neighboring Armstrong Rubber building.

The La Quinta Inn building clearly resembles and refers to its neighbor, but it lacks the

intentionality and attention to detail one would expect from master architect Breuer. Rather than the dynamism of the asymmetrical balance of the Armstrong Rubber building, the La Quinta building is torpid in its symmetry. Where as Breuer’s design elegantly floats the administrative offices two stories above the research facilities on pilotis, the La Quinta building is a single heavy monolith. However, the hotel’s design does delineate some programmatic elements through by stylistic applique of brand elements. For example, the bottom floor entryway is clad in the yellow stucco that is a trademark of the hotel chain; the attached diner, The Greek Olive Restaurant, still has the distinct shingled pitched roof emblematic of the Howard Johnson’s that used to occupy the location. The La Quinta Inn reduces visual aspects of its Brutalist neighbor to a style and applies the precast concrete panels with little regard to their function.

By contrast, the Armstrong Rubber building is the result of an economic use of materials and forms that are specifically tied to a series of programmatic needs and design principles the architect explored throughout his career.

The La Quinta Inn building is banal design in a pastiche of styles. However, its proximity to the Armstrong Rubber building creates a delightful, even humorous visual counterpart for passing motorists. On its own it is simply another piece of unremarkable architecture that litters our countryside. Next to the Armstrong Rubber building, the hotel is elevated to roadside folly.

FRANKENPINE KITSCH

Soon after I enter New York from Connecticut on the Hutchinson Parkway, looming high above the tree-lined horizon is what the locals call the “Frankenpine.” It is a large cellular tower that is decorated to look like an extra-large conifer tree. Its thick metal column is painted brown to resemble a tree trunk, and the various transmitters, processors, and other electronics the column supports are obscured by a system of protruding artificial evergreen branches.

As I drive down the road, my eye is immediately drawn to this hybrid visual form. While appropriating the look of the trees it towers above, it is also out of scale with its surroundings and lacks the verisimilitude to blend in. Instead, this camouflage-outfitted giant begs the viewer to take notice. I’m reminded of a photograph by Diane Arbus from 1962, Rocks on Wheels, Disneyland, Cal. As the title implies, the image shows a group of clearly artificial rocks being carted on wheels along a dirt road in a natural and majestic California landscape scene.

The cell tower, likely deemed unsightly, has been stripped of its original character through a process of disguise and repackaged in a more sanitized format. The resulting obfuscation feels both garish and sentimental. There is implicit irony to the form. It denotes a tree, which carries the assumption of being natural, yet it is clearly artificial and man-made. This creates a visual pun.

Breuer’s building was partially demolished to build the IKEA.
CONCLUSION

The five-hour drive from Boston to New York is a chance to be alone with my thoughts, remove myself from my day-to-day activity, and see things in a different light. I am able to see the strangeness in the everyday design of a gas station sign, a roadside hotel, and a cell tower. While the delightful effects of these objects seem unintentional, designers have an opportunity to leverage the underlying logic inherent in the work. An analysis of the three designs yielded the following principles:

Visual Appropriation
All three design artifacts took visual form from their surroundings. While the La Quinta hotel reflects brazen appropriation of its neighbor’s design elements, the Gulf signage and Frankenpine take visual cues from the nearby natural environment.

Lack of Authenticity
Some things are not what they seem. The cell tower is rendered to look like a tree. The hotel resembles its neighbor, and the gas station sign looks like a picture of itself.

Insincerity
The hotel architecture takes cues from modernist architecture but does not reflect the principles that are the basis for such design. The results feel hypocritical and dishonest. The cell tower looks like a tree but is not convincing enough to feel sincere in its intent. The Gulf sign eschews a coherent visual logic in favor of feel-good bling.

Camp
All of these designs are theatrically dressed up to the point of being humorous.

Irony
These designs signify the opposite of (or at least something quite different from) their true nature. The clouds on the gas station signage are highlighted as extremely artificial next to real clouds in the sky. The hotel architecture quotes modernism and reduces it to a visual style. The artificiality of the cell tower is dressed up to be more natural in appearance.

Cliché
The signage created for the gas station implements drop shadows and 3D lighting effects that are stock tools for digital graphic designers. It is over-used to the point of losing its original meaning or visual intent in favor of something that “pops” or offers visual interest quickly.

Folly
The objects are visually extravagant beyond their practical purpose. The results mock the form they represent, whether a beloved neighboring building or surrounding trees.

Excessive Garishness
The varied and ostentatious graphics of the gas station signage, the vegetal ornament of the cell tower, and the pastiche of stylistic ornament on the hotel are applied with lurid effects.

Pun
These designs are open to two or more meanings, often at odds with each other. The tree is a cell tower. The sign is a picture. The sky is a sign. The hotel is a tire factory. It is humorous because it is absurd.
SHOULD DESIGNERS BE HELD TO A HIGHER STANDARD?

You are reading volume 16.1 of LIVD, “Fair Game.” This volume focuses on appropriation and how it exists in design. As culture producers, should designers be held to a higher standard than the general public? Most people are taught early on to respect the authorship of written text, but not with regards to images. If our society doesn’t teach everyone how to use imagery fairly, why should designers be held to a higher standard?

The body text is set in PT Mono. The subheads are typeset in Alternate Gothic No. 1 D. Helvetica Neue makes a few cameos.

The authors are responsible for their own content. Editor Meredith James is responsible for a majority of the graphics/layout, including all of the graphics that are redrawn from well-known cultural icons (like Mickey Mouse). Meredith also redrew custom fonts in Bonnie Blake’s article. Julianna Johnson designed her own essay. Eileen Ewing drew the map of the Vegas strip shown at the beginning of Andrew DeRosa’s article. LIVD’s website was recently redesigned by Kyle Charlson. Eileen and Kyle were interns for spring and summer, 2018.

Thank you to everyone who was involved in the creation and production of this publication. We could not do it without you.

If you are interested in contributing to a future volume of LIVD, please contact the editor.
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