

As a young designer living in the current digital era, new ways to visually communicate with a designated audience seems to border upon being limitless, with groundbreaking methods taking root instantly. Thus, in the pursuit of something new and exciting, we keep churning out contemporary formats and formulas to keep our viewers interested. What seems to be the most perplexing to me is that my fellow User Interface and Experience designers are not seeing how influential and important the art of typography is to the audience, whether or not said audience receives it consciously.

Typography, as visionary Marshall McLuhan puts it, is seen as the first mechanization of a handicraft and in itself is the perfect instance of not a new knowledge, but an applied knowledge. This again reiterates the fact that typography is the direct representation of what the writer wants the reader to understand, and it is defined in an explicit and intuitive manner, one that nor rebus, pictogram, or illustration can match up to in regards to its effectiveness in communication. So why are young designers not integrating the most trustworthy form of visual communication into their work? Some believe it to be an antiquated form of media, one that in the past was overused. Therefore, this accounts for the behaviours of many new designers, as they fear for their work to be misconstrued to be anything but their intent.

However, the form of typography used can create a different emotion contingent upon the subject matter and most obviously, the typeface used. If a swash or script based typeface like Lobster or Desdemona is used, it implies certain friendliness to the audience, one of approachability. If one were to use a book type like Baskerville or Caslon, it also brings about new feelings of authority, so it would be improper to use them in the same circumstance that you would use the aforementioned Lobster. However, a designer should not have to respect the so-called "design laws" just because there seem to be constraints as to when or where to use certain fonts, as using them in fun and new combinations create a new aesthetic and more visual interest.

According to the tenants of Bauhaus typography in Patrick Cramsie's The Story of Graphic Design, he discusses how Herbert Bayer created Universal and while in regards to intent, it was clear, it was not successful. This is mostly due to the fact that Bayer's personal opinion limited him in creating a typeface that was legible and user friendly. Of the same era, Paul Renner of Futura created a successful sans-serif typeface with contrasting thin strokes and high legibility. Renner and Bayer were under similar constraints, but Renner was successful due to his desire to remain audience centered, thus people responded to his typeface naturally, rather than it seeming to lose competence in communication.

So while there may be new and fascinating ways for new methods of design, maybe we as designers should bring out our inner Moholy-Nagy and respect how much typography has done for us, whether it is in the momentous ways in which information is democratized for the masses, or in how helvetica neue light made this an easy think piece to understand. Type is ubiquitous and a powerful weapon for the designers who choose to use it correctly, therefore, I implore you to find your inner type nerd and pave your identity- one letter at a time.

To my fellow designers, as typography is a long rooted love of mine that I'm now able to practice as I please, this is what I've learned.

- \*Contrast is key, but don't mix different moods of font, nor should one combine typefaces that are wildly similar to one another.

- \*Combine sans-serifs with serified typefaces for different visual feels, however, any work with more than one typeface will not appear unified, so proceed with caution.

- \*Please- don't use **comic sans**, papyrus, *curlz*, or **HERCULANUM**. For the love of all that is holy, don't use comic papyrus.