

The West Wing Weekly
0.13: "Graphic Design for President!"
Guests: Michael Bierut and Leslie Wah

[Intro Music]

HRISHI: You're listening to *The West Wing Weekly*. I'm Hrishikesh Hirway.

JOSH: And I'm Joshua Malina.

HRISHI: And this week we've got a bonus episode about something that I find endlessly fascinating: presidential campaign logo design. Every election cycle, this specific genre of graphic design enters our lives in a really prominent way. It's a strange and specific cultural phenomenon that I'm a little obsessed with. And throughout season 6, we've seen signs and logos for the Santos, Russell and Vinick campaigns and they all feel different and distinct from one another and, just like with real presidential campaign logos, they're supposed to represent this person, or this character, and their ideas. They're meant to affect the way you think of that person even if it's subliminal. So in this episode, we're digging into what the process of creating those logos is really like, both in the West Wing and in the real world. We have two guests: coming up later we'll speak to Leslie Wah, the graphic designer on *The West Wing*, who's responsible for all those seasons 6 designs; but before that let me introduce you to our first guest, Michael Bierut. Michael Bierut is a partner at the prestigious New York design firm Pentagram. His past clients includes the *New York Times*, Saks Fifth Avenue, MasterCard and the New York Jets, among many others. He also teaches at the Yale School of Art, and the Yale School of Management. He's a co-founder of the design journal *Design Observer*. But the credit that's of particular importance to this episode is this: as a volunteer to Hillary Clinton's communications team, Michael Bierut designed the H logo that was at the core of the visuals for Secretary Clinton's 2016 presidential campaign. Michael, thank you so much for joining me.

MICHAEL: Oh my pleasure, Hrishi. It's an honor to be on *The West Wing Weekly*.

HRISHI: When you watch *The West Wing* now, what do you notice when you see those campaign logos? I feel like campaign design has gotten pretty sophisticated. At least in some cases. But these feel pretty different from what we see today. Do you think that the season 6 logos were a good reflection of how this stuff was approached in the mid 2000s?

MICHAEL: I think to a certain degree, the graphics are fairly accurate in terms of what political graphic design would have looked like at that moment, you know, in terms of political graphics. It's Obama's campaign that actually is kind of a big dividing line; it's like, the O and A before Obama and after Obama, in terms of how candidates have approached graphics.

HRISHI: Before President Obama's logo, the idea really was just, "Here is this person's name, choose a typeface, put the name either in blue or red, add some stripes or some stars, and you're done".

MICHAEL: Yeah, exactly. You know this is true with design in general, with life in general, people are sort of governed by these two kind of competing impulses. One is to fit in, and the other one is to stand out. If you look at the way that the candidates are arrayed on the stage at the end of "Freedonia," everyone is sort of like dressed in this kind of like normal, sober way, because people really don't want to stand out too much. It's also interesting because there's a

whole other level that's of course happening in terms of what's going on on a television show, which is that what we're really critiquing is the decisions that production designers and their teams have made, as they try to figure out what will make a convincing, non-distracting kind of background noise on the show to make it look like, "Oh this is a campaign event."

HRISHI: The thing that is noteworthy about it is that these characters, at least in terms of Santos and Vinick, these are new characters. And we don't have a lot of data to go on as we're watching. And so, the production designers' choices for how they present them in these signs, does even in this kind of non-design way, it still has an effect on how we think of the character.

MICHAEL: You know particularly the Santos one, which I have spent some time kind of looking at, it really looks as though the people on the show gave an instruction to the production designers, and they said, "We want Santos' graphics to look different from everyone else's." And what's interesting is they do, everyone else is using kind of these innocuous variations on either Helvetica or Times Roman, just to name two very, very common typefaces. You know and Santos is using a typeface that I actually did a little bit of crowd sourcing on my team back at Pentagram, and I sent around a screenshot, "Hey guys, what the dickens is this typeface?"

HRISHI: [laughs]

MICHAEL: And as happens, in the miracle of crowd sourcing these days, one of our interns, Anastasia on my team, came back and said, "That is called Serpentine Pro." And I looked it up, and it turns out that Serpentine Pro is from 1972. This is the typeface that literally the word Santos is written in.

HRISHI: Mmhm.

MICHAEL: And Matthew as well. It's called Serpentine Pro, it's from 1972, it was designed by a guy from Minnesota, not known as a big type designer, his name is Dick Jenson. Jenson was designing what I imagine he thought was kind of a cool, futuristic typeface back in '72. And it does have that very, you know, kind of Philip K. Dick, Samuel Delany sort of, you know, science/sci-fi kind of look to it, I think. Everyone else is using conventional typefaces. Santos would have come out with something that looked different just because he is arriving at the scene as a guy that's impatient to disrupt 'politics as usual', and let that kind of seep into his graphics as well. Hats off to the production team, who, I think, got something right about it which is they just sort of figured if a Santos figure came along, that person would have to somehow operate in territory that was not associated with any of the campaigns up to that point.

HRISHI: This is the person who represents progress and the future more so than anyone else.

MICHAEL: Yeah exactly right, exactly right.

HRISHI: So with that, let me pause my conversation with Michael Bierut right now, and turn to Leslie Wah, the person who actually created the Santos logo. Leslie, you were the graphic designer on *The West Wing* for a long time. How did the assignment come to you, that you were going to have to make these campaign logos for all the different presidential campaigns?

LESLIE: Well, we knew it was coming, I think with the build-up and the script pretty much, and we talked about how the campaigns had to look completely different from each other pretty much, so that we could distinguish between all the signage and people. So, when we look

through the scripts we do breakdowns, and I have to do like a graphic breakdown, and then all of a sudden I'm seeing, "Oh gosh... ok, I have four different campaigns to design!" [laughs] as they came up. So we kinda tried to create a look or brand for reflecting the personality or tone of each candidate, but keeping that look consistent across the board for each one. But then each campaign, of course, had to be so different from the other, and that's tough when, you know, a lot of back in the day everything was, you know red, white and blue.

HRISHI: Right.

LESLIE: [laughs] You know how many versions of the flag can you do? or...

HRISHI: [cross talk] Right.

LESLIE: [cross talk] How many versions can you do of that? So yeah, it just, I had to differentiate 'em a little bit.

HRISHI: So what was it that you were thinking of when differentiating them in terms of your sense of who the characters were? You said that you wanted them to be informed by who they were, and so what were the things that you were thinking of? Say for Matthew Santos, what were the qualities of that character that you were thinking about when you made what turned out to be his logo?

LESLIE: He had new ideas and visions to express, and to me you he was very intelligent, but humble and progressive and modern, and so we wanted a little bit of a classic look, but I wanted to use maybe at the time it was a more contemporary font, not the typical Serif/Times Serif font or something like that. So I wanted to do something a little bit more modern and have just a touch of the stripes going behind it, just to show the all American colors and everything.

HRISHI: With the turnaround being so fast on this show, did you have time to revise the idea, did it go through a revision process, or do you just go with sort of your first instincts?

LESLIE: No, we have time to revise a little bit. I usually do a run of like maybe three or four looks, and then I'll run it by Ken, my boss, the production designer, and he'll pick a couple and he'll present them to the directors and the producers, and see what they think, and it has to be approved by everybody. And they do get revised along the way as well.

HRISHI: What blows my mind is that you worked on the show for this long, and just imagining this approval process, you know, when that production designer, Ken Hardy is going through and taking these designs; the two of you, Josh and Leslie, you never met that whole time.

LESLIE: [laughs]

JOSH: That's right, we were just introducing ourselves before we started speaking. Which is kind of sad. Did you have interaction with the cast at all, ever?

LESLIE: Not a lot. Every once in a while I would go to stage, and measure something that had to be... [laughs] You know, had to have a sign or something like that,. Every once in a while I'd go to stage and I'd run into somebody and one of the cast members, and I'd say hello or introduce myself sometimes, but I didn't hang out at the set, or at stage at all, because I was

always prepping for the next episode and in my office behind my computer you know, designing. It's kind of funny, I hardly ever get to really meet the cast.

HRISHI: To get back to the logos... What can you tell us about your sense of Bob Russell and what informed that logo?

LESLIE: Well since he was the current VP, Vice President, and he was a running candidate, I wanted to show that he was really well supported already, that he already had money behind his campaign. Everyone already knew his face, so we used it in the campaign posters, and the popular standees.

[West Wing Episode 6.11 excerpt]

CAMPAIGN STAFFER: Folks love taking pictures with those, almost like the real thing.

JOSH: Almost.

CAMPAIGN STAFFER: They talk a little less.

JOSH: Don't say that too loud, his wife is gonna want one.

[end excerpt]

LESLIE: Yeah, and he had the expensive flashy campaign bus, that you couldn't miss coming down the road. We wanted the designs to be confident, red, bold. I used the classic kind of all-American Serif font, but then I wanted to modernize it a bit with some dimension. And, you know, he had a website already established, so we put that on there. I can't remember if it was a request or we kinda just put it on there, but he took on the 'For America' tagline, which is Bartlet's tagline when he ran. It was 'Bartlet for America'. I mean I think a lot of presidential candidates probably use it, but we put that on his.

HRISHI: Yeah, so in addition to sort of just creative decisions about the font, and the colors, you were also making text decisions.

LESLIE: Well, Ken and I would sometimes come up with slogans or taglines, and we'd run it by the writers, or they already had something. So it was either scripted, or they had something in mind. We always would ask them first, if they had something in mind usually.

HRISHI: Yeah. And then lastly, how about the Vinick campaign logo, the Sans Serif...

LESLIE: The bold type.

HRISHI: Yeah?

LESLIE: Yeah! That was fun cause it was much more conservative and old-school. Yet we still kind of tried to make it a little contemporary with his full color campaign buttons, and a website address on some of the posters. I was trying to make it kind of a classic, simple look...

HRISHI: Yeah!

LESLIE: Kind of, 'Vote Vinick', 'Victory with Vinick', kind of similar to the 'I like Ike', 'I'm for Nixon' buttons, you know, that we saw. Cause we would do a lot of research before we even designed anything. So some of those we were looking at Goldwater and Reagan and Nixon and Eisenhower buttons and campaign graphics, just to get a more classic traditional look on his campaign. And with Santos, we were kind of thinking along the lines of John Kerry and his campaign look. It was primarily dark backgrounds, some blue and white, and the flying red stripes.

HRISHI: But you picked a much more interesting typeface.

LESLIE: Well what's funny is, at the time, I would use that typeface a lot kind of for like sporty type of things.

HRISHI: Mhm.

LESLIE: And I was thinking "Oh! Well, you know, he's kind of new, and contemporary." I wanted to do something a little different. Oh, and then Hoynes, the Hoynes campaign. That one I think we were basing it off of the Gore and Lieberman look. It had this arch, with the star, and then we just kind of did a more modern or sexy version of it for him.

HRISHI: Wow. I love the Vinick logo because it really does feel apropos to his character. There's something kind of no frills and austere about it. And that character presents himself in that way, where he's just like, "I am what I am, what you see is what you get, and I'm not dressing it up for you."

LESLIE: [laughs] Yeah, it's funny because we do actually think about those things, with their personalities also, cause I really wanted to figure out what's the best way to differentiate them too. And just look-wise I could only think of their personalities and to try to convey it with the design.

JOSH: It's kind of cool, because it parallels an actor's approach to character. It's interesting to hear you talk about.

LESLIE: Oh? Yeah! I never thought of that. Pretty much, that's the only way I could really come up with different looks for them, you know, just always to think about their personalities and their characters.

[transition music]

HRISHI: Josh and I have more questions for Leslie about her other work on *The West Wing*, but we're going to save that for later in this episode, but first more with Michael Bierut because I wanted to find out what it was like to create a campaign logo for a presidential candidate in the real world.

MICHAEL: We have to displace ourselves back to the moment in time when they were actually making this series of decisions. So when were they doing season 6, what year was that?

HRISHI: So this was 2005.

MICHAEL: Yes, so 2005, so they were sort of coming off of the graphics for the 2000 presidential candidates, that was Gore and Lieberman as I recall, they had Gore Lieberman went with something like Times Roman, so then I think George W. Bush had a Sans Serif typeface.

HRISHI: Yeah, the Bush Cheney logo in 2004 had their names in this sort of italic Sans Serif typeface.

MICHAEL: Yeah, rushing forward, really kind of like, you know, "Get the hell out of the way we're coming through" sort of...

HRISHI: Yes.

MICHAEL: ... aggressive, "You're either with us or against us," kinda typeface in 2004 definitely.

HRISHI: But it also had a really offensive apostrophe that [laughs, cross talk] it's like a...

MICHAEL: [laughs] Yeah yeah! [cross talk] No, No it's like...

HRISHI: ...a prime symbol instead of an actual apostrophe.

MICHAEL: Can you believe it, it's like sad isn't it? That I kind of can view the grand sweep of American politics, not though policy decisions or the titanic clash of visions of what the country can be, but instead just by the names or the typefaces of the different candidates and their logos! [laughs]

HRISHI: I don't think it's sad at all, it's what's earned you [cross talk] a place as our honored guest.

MICHAEL: [laughs, cross talk] Oy vey, oy vey.

HRISHI: Looking at *The West Wing*, on our podcast, we often note things that do feel dated, whether it is the clothing or just the issue that's at the center of an episode, or the attitudes around an issue that we're still dealing with. I was wondering if you think that there was something unique about Barack Obama's campaign design that caused this tectonic shift, as a component of this sort of historic moment in history; or if you think that our attitudes towards design in general have changed? There's a part of me that thinks the general public is just more sophisticated and more tapped into issues of design now than ever before.

MICHAEL: Yeah, and there's been a real kind of intelligible timeline of that, that you can track basically from the campaigns through the 21st century. And when Obama came on the scene, it's interesting, his design program is actually pretty well documented, it was one of the first ones that actually was authored in a way.

HRISHI: Can you explain what that means, his design program?

MICHAEL: For years, I mean for ages and ages and ages going all the way back to the 19th century, political candidates, ever since campaigns became a thing, and you know as a student of history that originally campaigning way back when, was considered kind of crass and gentlemen wouldn't do it. You simply would let the people decide. But then, when campaigning

became a thing, kind of, prehistoric primitive 19th century marketing, with signs and banners and all these things that are now a collectible that you can see at the Smithsonian, became a thing, slogans and songs for candidates etc etc, all through the 20th century, and then, sort of, it was really, it was only kind of with Nixon in '68 where, if we trust the journalists, that somehow, someone sort of had the realization that you basically in a post-Marshall McLuhan age had to market a political candidate just like a consumer product basically. You literally had, you know, ad agency executives on the staff, you know? I think there were that whole series called the, *The Making of the President*, I remember in '68, I think Joe McGinniss came out with a counter history of the campaign called *The Selling of the President*, and the original first edition cover of it just superimposed Nixon's face on a pack of cigarettes and sort of like said, you know, "We sold you this guy just the same way we would sell you Lucky Strikes or Marlboros," basically. And so the idea that there was this kind of professionalization that would happen in terms of marketing started happening in the '60s and '70s. It was very like retail, sort of. It was based on mailings lists and direct mail things, how many people would respond to what sort of message, focus groups, all this other stuff. That's how you design a package of spaghetti sauce to go on a grocery store shelf. What happened with Obama, which I thought was really interesting and distinctive, that campaign really felt like a corporate identity, not kind of like, "We're going to market this guy like a consumer product," but like, "We're going to create a brand like Coke, or Nike, or Apple."

HRISHI: Mmm.

MICHAEL: Except it's going to be called Obama. Obama literally had a logo, a symbol, that was 2008, that wasn't that long ago. And so this idea of a candidate having kind of a corporate logo like that was considered weird. And the way he got that was curious because it wasn't... he didn't wake up and say, "I need a logo." It was his campaign team had hired a firm to do, I think, a website for them; a guy named Saul Sander who worked with two younger designers of his team, Amanda Gentry and Andy Keen, and they were brought in just to do, you know, cause, "Hey we're designing a website, we need a logo, we need something to put in the upper left hand corner that becomes the thing you click on that takes you home," etc etc. And so Sander and Gentry and Keen together came up with a whole bunch of different alternatives, which are all kind of documented somewhere, and the one that the campaign team picked ultimately was the one we now recognize as Barack Obama's logo. The *New York Times* was doing a story back in June '08 about how Obama made decisions and worked with his team, and the quote is, "He, Obama, did not initially like the campaign's blue and white logo intended to appear like a horizon, symbolizing hope and opportunity, saying he found it too polished and corporate."

HRISHI: Hmm.

MICHAEL: And it's interesting cause it is sort of like polished and corporate; people have said it looks like it could be a logo for some, you know, high fiber breakfast cereal in a way...

HRISHI: [laughs]

MICHAEL: It's very, you know, it is kind of like very button down, and you can see if your background like Santos is in kind of disruptive community organization, a kind of impatience with 'politics as usual', you could sort of say, "Hey I want to have something that feels like a rude scrawl done by hand," that [cross talk] felt like kind of...

HRISHI: [cross talk] Right. Something humanistic.

MICHAEL: Something humanistic, yeah. And I think or I'm guessing that Axelrod and Plouffe would have advised him at the time they would have said, "You're already, you know, your name and your appearance and your resumé are already sending that message, we need to kind of buttress the other side of the equation, which is that you are hyper-competent, on top of things, the no drama person we know you to be, and what we want is for all of this stuff to be so buttoned down that it just seems like you've got it completely under control." I think the consistency and the thoughtfulness and the kind of overall integration that then we saw with the Obama campaign, which was remarkably pervasive, I mean stunningly pervasive. I remember just kind of turning on the tv and watching campaign events and seeing that the signs were always, whether it was Toledo, Ohio or New Hampshire or San Diego or Austin, Texas, the signs were always in the same typeface, a typeface called Gotham, and that it just was completely consistent. I remember saying to someone, "If this guy can get, you know, I can't get my clients to use the same typeface," and you know ...

HRISHI: [laughs]

MICHAEL: In these situations this guy can do that then certainly he can kind of bring peace to the Middle East and...

HRISHI: [laughs]

MICHAEL: ...do these most difficult things with the same ease you know? And so, you know, I think he sort of set that standard, you know. And certainly in the moment, you know, his leading primary competitor, Hillary Clinton, had like a bunch of old-school, kind of just slogans done every which way at every one of her campaigns. His ultimate opponent, John McCain, had a more conventional logo interestingly enough, set in the typeface Optima, that if you were trying to look for patterns, Optima is the same typeface that's used in the Vietnam Veterans' Memorial? And I believe when that surfaced, his campaign was confronted about that and they denied, pretty credibly, knowing that and or kind of calculating that that would mean something [cross talk]...

HRISHI: [cross talk] Mmhm.

MICHAEL: ... but it could have been that they just intuited that that typeface had a kind of quiet, measured dignity, that they were trying to associate with McCain. And that's sort of how typefaces work and that's how graphics work. They're not very overt, they actually do their work and in this very subtle, kind of subliminal sort of way.

HRISHI: The O in Obama opens up all of these possibilities but it really did give that campaign a mark, without having to rely on his name and it was ubiquitous and they were able to unify things just with this one symbol. And then in 2012, Mitt Romney had an "R", a red white and blue "R"..

MICHAEL: Yeah, yeah.

HRISHI: And then in 2016, on both the Democratic and Republican side there were campaigns that used initials: Bobby Jindal had a "J", and Rick Perry had a "P", and O'Malley had a "O'M", and then of course there's the most famous example, which is the "H" that you designed.

MICHAEL: It's funny to watch communications and the response of professionals who purport to kind of style messages for communications channels. We really are reacting to changes of technology to a large degree, so just as in 2008 the initial call to Saul Sander and his team was really driven, it wasn't right from the campaign it was, you know, the people doing the website needed something to stick on the website...

HRISHI: Right.

MICHAEL: ...but I think what happened was, you know, after 2008 you sort of had the rise of social media, the rise of platforms other than websites you would look at on monitors or on laptop computers, but mobiles and other things, and suddenly then, if for no other practical reason, all of a sudden real estate on screens became a real factor, you needed a little thing that could sit in your Twitter feed or on your Facebook page...

HRISHI: Yeah.

MICHAEL: ...or on your Instagram, and suddenly then everyone, and this is not just political candidates but every brand out there, sort of has this pressure to come up with some really concise way that will work at a very small scale that people can see and click on and think, "Oh, that's a thing that represents that product or service that I want," right?

HRISHI: Mmhm.

MICHAEL: And so, you know, when we undertook the work for Secretary Clinton back in 2015, you know, that was sort of a starting point. The genius of the work that was done for Obama back in '08 was that in a way it anticipated that, and then set a template for it, that may be that template is actually... there's an interesting conversation to be had about whether or not everyone kind of just ends up using the last campaign as the template for the next one?

HRISHI: Right. But it is interesting to think about, like if the legacy of this design identity for Obama would have had the same kind of lasting effect if he hadn't won.

MICHAEL: Yeah, after my association with the Clinton campaign in 2016, in the aftermath of that, I remember talking to one of my, Teddy Goff who was my main contact inside the campaign, he said, "80,000 votes and 3 mid-western states and people would be in every interview, you know, ask us, 'When did we realize we were geniuses and how unbelievably smart we all were', and instead you lose and suddenly people are just saying, 'At what point did you go wrong?' "

HRISHI: [cross talk] Right.

MICHAEL: [cross talk] "And how many mistakes did you make and how did you contribute to this calamity?"

HRISHI: Yeah.

MICHAEL: But I do think that, to the extent that a lot of the design for campaigns that emerge post 2008 is driven not just by 'follow the leader' but also by just the requirements of communications technology. I think you know someone is going to say, "Mr. or Ms. Candidate, we're going to have an Instagram page for you and we need to have something that goes in the

circle right over here.” And if you’re Amy Klobuchar you got a nice short three letter name and that works just fine, right? If you’re John Hickenlooper you have a different [cross talk] problem to solve, right?

HRISHI: [cross talk] Right!

MICHAEL: Right? And Obama had a weird name altogether. His first name was weird, his middle name was actually...

HRISHI: Toxic.

MICHAEL: Toxic. And then his last name sort of like sounded like strange to a lot of ears, but it did have that great initial letter that just happened to correspond to a lot of the channels into which it would have to flow, right?

HRISHI: Mmhm.

MICHAEL: So I think that when we were working with Hillary’s...Clinton’s campaign, the idea that the candidate referred to as Hillary as opposed to Clinton [cross talk] ...

HRISHI: [cross talk] Right.

MICHAEL: ...or HRC.

HRISHI: Yeah.

MICHAEL: That was a decision made on really early on so the “H” kind of gave you a little boost into the name as the O for Obama did.

HRISHI: Ok, let’s take a quick break and when we come back more with Michael Bierut and Leslie Wah.

[ad break]

HRISHI: How did you actually get involved with the Hillary Clinton campaign, to begin with?

MICHAEL: Oh, right at the beginning of 2015, well in advance of the election, a good 23 months before the election was going to happen...

HRISHI: Mmhm.

MICHAEL: ...I got a call from a lady named Wendy Clark, who had taken a leave of absence from her job in corporate advertising, to be a volunteer to the campaign and to help set up a team of volunteer professionals who would contribute creative ideas to the campaign. So we got our brief, and the brief is interesting when you think about, sort of in a way the diametric opposite of Obama, where Obama was like a start-up, it was a new product launch, an unfamiliar thing, unfamiliar flavor that people didn’t even have any idea they wanted, with a strange name, and kind of burdened with some deficits that would have to all be surmounted. There were things to surmount in the Clinton campaign, but one of them was not unfamiliarity.

And in fact I think the very first word in the brief that we got was, "The candidate has 100% name recognition."

HRISHI: Right, yeah. [laughs]

MICHAEL: So it's not about, you know, meet this unfamiliar character who has announced that she wants to become president. It's someone who, in a way, it was about somehow creating something that could defamiliarize her a little bit?

HRISHI: You have to sharpen the point of one particular part or some subsection of what people thought of when they thought of her, because there was too much information maybe?

MICHAEL: Right, right, right. And again, I don't think anyone, I don't think people sat in a room and said, "And you know we have this problem, we're going to have a logo fix that problem for us," right?

HRISHI: Right.

MICHAEL: And in fact, I said that all the time, I said "I'm not even sure how important what I'm doing is. I'm happy to be doing it, but I don't think at the end of the day it is the, you know, people don't vote for logos they vote for candidates" and the...

HRISHI: Right.

MICHAEL: ... to the degree that these things have any utility at all it's that they become just like a flag, just like symbols kind of function as things to rally around and things to carry into battle, but they aren't the cause, they just represent the cause, right?

HRISHI: Right.

MICHAEL: And so I think what you try to do, is do something that can aptly represent that cause. But I think I also really wanted to do something that could exploit something that I think was a little bit inadvertent about the Obama campaign, which was that people started making their own versions of that logo, back in '08.

HRISHI: Right, yeah, you'd see people make handmade signs, on posters where they would sort of draw their own version of the "O".

MICHAEL: Yeah, yeah, yeah, and that thing was hard to draw. Those curves aren't all concentric...

HRISHI: Oh, yeah.

MICHAEL: ...they're different kind of diameters, and they're kind of masked in this sort of subtle way, so it's actually a fairly difficult, complex thing to draw. And I remember saying really early on, "I want our thing to be so easy to draw that like a 4 year old can do it, that anyone can do it."

HRISHI: Yeah.

MICHAEL: I just want it to be like a peace sign, or a smiley face, or a heart. You know?

HRISHI: Mmhm.

MICHAEL: I want it to be like the simplest thing in the world. The “H” luckily is a really simple symbol, the problem with an “H” is that it’s sort of has a kind of static quality. It’s a square and it’s symmetrical, it isn’t going anywhere. Then the idea of putting an arrow in it, was kind of adding some dynamism to the stable square form. Secretary Clinton, from the very beginning, wanted to make it really clear that she wasn’t doing this because it was her destiny, she wasn’t doing this because it was owed to her, because she’d been waiting patiently and biding her time, and earning her position and now she was owed this thing. She was doing it for the American people, she was doing it for America, she was doing it for you. I mean she felt that way and she still feels that way I believe. And so I think the idea was that, that when we finally hit on the “H” with the arrow in it, one of the things that made it potent was that the arrow could point to veterans, or Ohio, or you know whatever cause, whatever constituency, whatever person it was all about. And then it also had this very simple character where you could make it out of cheese, you could make it out of pumpkin pie, you can make it out of all sorts of things, right? So it was both very participatory and kind of outwardly directed, that was how we conceived it at least.

HRISHI: It reminds me of a conversation that Josh and Santos have in “Opposition Research”.

[West Wing Episode 6.11 excerpt]

SANTOS: You know, I almost wish that we could have a campaign slogan, without my name.

JOSH: Yeah, ‘For President’. It’s catchy.

[end except]

MICHAEL: [laughs] Yeah I know I think it’s, I mean thoughtful candidates, and ones that are really passionate about what they’re doing, you know, I think so often they actually... You get the sense that they feel just sort of handcuffed by the necessary conventions of just what it takes to compete out there in the world. And I think in the case of, you know, Secretary Clinton she really, everything was trying to not have it be about her or the inevitability of her candidacy. That was sort of like my tactic. Which is sort of like the way to victory is to accept something that feels, you know, not a fully baked cake, that you can kind of like see is ready to, you know, be put in the center of the table; but something that feels more like ingredients that people are going to be able to participate in.

HRISHI: If there were lessons that were learned from 2008, and there were echoes from that, I feel like the lessons from 2016 hasn’t actually rippled through 2020 primary candidates yet. And there’s a lot of irony in this, as we’re talking about the focus on the candidate versus their mission, and sort of the altruism of trying to lead a country. Because I think Donald Trump clearly has a very healthy sense of his own ego, very strong sense of self, and makes so many things about him. Every tragedy, every success, everything just turns back to him, but I think one of the most successful pieces of design recently, and tell me if you agree with this, is the ‘Make America Great Again’ red hat.

MICHAEL: Oh yeah! Absolutely! Yeah.

HRISHI: And it doesn't have his name on it.

MICHAEL: No absolutely no, no. It was funny, when we- way back in '15, you know, they did some focus groups where they wanted to kind of do some blind test with some potential voters, and we mocked up not just things showing our proposed logo for Secretary Clinton, but also a logo that could represent what we thought might be a likely, you know, opposing candidate, and that was Jeb Bush's logo.

HRISHI: Right.

MICHAEL: Which was goofy, remember Jeb with the exclamation mark. [cross talk]

HRISHI: [cross talk] Yeah the Jeb with the exclamation point.

MICHAEL: I love exclamation marks by the way so, I, you know, there for the grace of God, but...

HRISHI: [laughs]

MICHAEL: So I remember we did that, and like if someone, you know, I remember there was some talk about who the potential opposing candidate would be and, you know, two names never, you know, there are two names that I don't remember ever coming up in our process. One was Bernie Sanders and one was Donald Trump.

HRISHI: Right.

MICHAEL: If you're a student of politics and you were following along at the time, you'll remember that it all just, you know, it was really just a reminder that things can come out of nowhere, candidates can come out of nowhere, ideas can come out of nowhere, and they end up overturning everyone's expectations and kind of completely derailing whatever the operant paradigm is, right?

HRISHI: Mmhm.

MICHAEL: And so with Trump, again there's a sort of thing where even the debate continues to this day on so many different levels, whether or not he represents an aberration or some sort of permanent sea change. One thing I think is, he's a marketing genius. He's an intuitive marketing genius, in the classic American mold. Going all the way back to P. T. Barnum. He had devoted decades already at the moment he announced his candidacy, to building up a huge idea about what the Trump brand was. It sort of transcended all categories including the presidency. It was about a certain kind of savviness, a kind of blunt, 'say what you think, regardless of the consequences', be willing to make the tough decisions. You know, I mean still to this day, you know, I have friends back in Ohio who sort of say, 'Well, you know, at any rate the guy may be crazy in some other ways but you can't deny he's a fantastic business man.' I've lived in New York for, you know, and witnessed his career in action. He's not a good businessman! What he is, he plays one on TV and does it really, really well. But that red hat was a genius move and sort of ended up being a way that just took an object and merged it with the idea of a campaign in a way that was bigger than just kind of like classical professional branding technique, and had this kind of intuitive quality to it that I think people really responded to.

HRISHI: Yeah I think the thing that's so interesting about that hat is that it is a great piece of design, even though it does have this undesigned quality to it. It's just all caps, there's nothing to it but it is a brilliant piece of design because the fact that it's on a baseball cap, the monolithic quality of that red color, and the all caps part of it... I mean just because it has an undesigned quality to it doesn't mean it isn't great design.

MICHAEL: Yup.

HRISHI: And because of that I'm kind of surprised we haven't actually already seen in 2020 a bunch of versions of some kind of analogous equivalent of the red hat with a logo that doesn't have the candidate's name. I mean maybe because, outside of Joe Biden and Bernie Sanders, most of the candidates don't have that kind of 100% name recognition, it's too early for them. Because Donald Trump *is* someone who, like Hillary Clinton, did have just incredible media saturation over decades of being a public figure. He didn't need it. But I was surprised that we haven't seen that yet, because the fact that it was manifested that this slogan and this idea of an identity, I mean 'Make America Great Again' is really, it's a limited message but the fact that it's something you can wear, not just to put outside your house was, I thought, again it's so smart.

MICHAEL: Wear, and kind of you know it's like getting in uniform when you wear something, right? You know...

HRISHI: Yes!

MICHAEL: It's a personal commitment beyond merely just kind of like putting a bumper sticker on your car...

HRISHI: Right.

MICHAEL: It really is, it's right up there by your face. It's so powerful that if you see a video of two people and one of them is wearing that hat and the other person isn't, the narrative kind of arrives in your mind predetermined in a way...

HRISHI: Yeah.

MICHAEL: This is a confrontation between you know, some Trump supporter and some Trump opponent.

HRISHI: Right, two different teams.

MICHAEL: Yeah, two different teams and it's like, the reason you put on a uniform is so your teammates can distinguish you and so the opposition can know who they're against.

HRISHI: And so you can feel like you're part of something larger too.

MICHAEL: Yeah. To the degree that everything has an equal and opposite reaction, I mean the rhyming reaction from the other side to the MAGA hat, you could say was the pink pussy hats.

HRISHI: Mhm.

MICHAEL: There was actually a beautiful moment, and I remember having been at the women's march in DC, and going down there on Amtrak, and getting into a car I was one of the few guys and one of the few people not wearing one of those pink hats. And the fact that they were made by hand, the fact that it was like, "women's work" in a way to knit...

HRISHI: Yeah.

MICHAEL: It sort of had the metaphoric power that I think the red hat has in a way, and I think those kind of metaphors happen, they happen by accident. You know, I don't think there was a bunch of professionals in a room, sort of like you know, that had one last slide in the presentation, and they said, "Ok Mr. Trump, we now have the coup de gras, it's gonna be, the next thing we show you is going to be absolutely ubiquitous." Just like so many things in this campaign, someone started chanting, "Build the wall" and it kind of caught on, and someone started chanting, "Lock her up" and that caught on, and someone started making some hats and people liked them, "Let's make some more of those hats." In a way he kind of like does... He test markets and then when someone picks up he just kind of does a big nationwide rollout of it and then just puts everything he's got behind it. It really is kind of classic. It may be that, whatever, if there's a response that we come to admire because it prevails when we're, you know, after 2020, it may be something that, in fact, is not based on the template of what happened in 2016. What we would talk about after the fact is the genius of something that has nothing to do with a square or round logo or the color of a hat or anything else, but just someone who figures out a way to embody the moment that we can't anticipate.

HRISHI: Just based on a purely design perspective, which presidential campaign logo would you vote for right now, among the 2020 contenders?

MICHAEL: Who's made the biggest commitment to my narrow constituency [cross talk] of graphic designers...

HRISHI: Exactly! [cross talk]

MICHAEL:... Oh I mean I don't think that's even close, it's Pete Buttigieg has. I mean he really... When he made his announcement in South Bend I was on his Twitter homepage and I saw that at the top of the page there was a rendering of his logo, which is his four letter name, Pete, in a rectangular shape that has a curve at the bottom.

HRISHI: Yeah.

MICHAEL: And in that curve at the bottom is the arc of a historic bridge in South Bend, and that's all made very explicit... There was this little animation showing the relationship between that curve and the bridge. And I remember looking at that and thinking, "Oh shoot, this is like real graphic design here. This isn't, this thing doesn't happen by accident." And sure enough behind that was kind of a fully articulated, systematic way of looking at his logo, about all the state logos, all the constituent logos, a full view of a color system, a typographic system; it's like really up one side and down the other, done by a really good firm out of Brooklyn called Hyperakt, who at the same time that Mayor Pete was announcing there was an article going up on a fast company that sort of unveiled the design system, announced that it would be participatory, that people who supported him would be able to download the elements of it and make their own stuff. So the whole thing was like, you know, it was really one of those things

where they had looked very carefully at what had happened in 2016 and were trying to kind of like just take it all the way and kind of just perfect that thinking for 2020 in a way.

HRISHI: Hmm.

MICHAEL: And so then what's interesting of course is that in the aftermath of that came critiques from the progressive wing of the democratic party saying this is all too technocratic, and it's exactly the kind of thing you'd expect from a guy who had spent time at McKinsey, where he's supposedly from the heartland but doesn't hesitate to go to a flashy, you know, Brooklyn based design firm etcetera, etcetera.

HRISHI: Right.

MICHAEL: The whole thing is like too deliberate and too controlled and....

HRISHI: Like too successful in the thing that it's supposed to be doing.

MICHAEL: Yeah, inherently inauthentic, 'cause it's too kind of deliberated.

HRISHI: Hmm.

MICHAEL: You know.

HRISHI: Yeah.

MICHAEL: You know looking at that as a designer, I actually think that you can tell that either he or someone on his campaign just loves that kind of thing, you know, is just like all in on it. There's a color system where every color is named after something, you know, two colors named after his two dogs. Everything is sort of completely, charmingly worked out.

HRISHI: Yeah.

MICHAEL: Almost like it's a parody of a comprehensive corporate design system, except done around a bright, charming guy from a medium-sized town in Indiana, right? And so I think he sort of has it completely thought out in that regard, you know?

HRISHI: Yeah.

MICHAEL: To me, I think the critique you make of it is, is he perfecting 2016 rules for a 2020 campaign that'll be played by entirely different rules? Who knows?

HRISHI: Right. What I love about his design system, and I mean my admiration for it is both aesthetic but also the calculation of it, the cynical calculation of it potentially too. There is something about it that smacks of like a very trendy, retro approach to logos.

MICHAEL: Mmhm, yeah.

HRISHI: You know, if you've ever looked at hipsterlogogenerator.com?

MICHAEL: Mmhm. Yeah, yeah. [laughs]

HRISHI: Where you can just... You take these sort of things and you go anywhere in any city in America and you see all these examples of this: kind of a shield, a circle, crossed lines and simple Sans Serif type that's become...it has its own meaning, you know, of this heritage type thing. There's something both very youthful about it but it's also vintage in a way that I think helps both play into his youth of being the youngest candidate, but also connect with this idea of some heritage that he might be bringing. Some kind of older part that contrasts with his youth as well; while also having this kind of sports team feeling to it. I mean it even says 'Team Pete', and it goes with throwback jerseys for sports teams, and all that stuff is built into it and I think it's really smart.

MICHAEL: Yeah, yeah, I know, it's funny when we did Hillary back in '15, '16, we set up kind of the ingredients for all the different combinations but it was really down to a team in Brooklyn led by Jennifer Kinon, who was their design director, to kind of like work out how it all got played through...

HRISHI: Mmhm.

MICHAEL: ...along the course of the campaign. We did a lot of like prototypes saying, "Look it can be these different colors," or, "Look the "H" arrow thing can hold different forms," or, "We can customize it to work for different constituencies," but we just sort of thought "Oh, you would do this, you know, months and months into the campaign when it got to be well known." That's when you would get around to doing this stuff, and what's interesting about Mayor Pete is that it's all there all at once from the very beginning. And then also the thing that I've learned since 2015, is the day that Secretary Clinton announced her candidacy and she put out a video and at the very end of the video was, for the first time, the world saw the logo that we'd been working on for months at that point.

HRISHI: Mmhm.

MICHAEL: I have to admit like it wasn't that long ago, but I'm sort of still stunned at how naive I was. I was just like, "Oh man, they used my logo, I'm so excited." I was like really happy. And then literally within a minute, you know, on Twitter someone says, "What 4 year old designed this logo, it looks like a hospital to the right sign?"

[Conan excerpt]

Conan: People have been criticizing Hillary Clinton's campaign logo for being too plain, have you seen it? That's her logo. That is her real logo, people say it's too plain.

[end excerpt]

[Unknown News report excerpt]

Interviewer: David Axelrod, you're a visual guy?

David: Yeah

Interviewer: The logo, look, you certainly now recognize it. I think some people like it, some don't.

David: Yeah, but logos should have a message to them, our sunrise logo for Obama had a message to it, I'm not sure what the message of that logo is.

Interviewer: You're not a big fan?

[end excerpt]

[Unknown Interview excerpt]

Interviewer: I'm gonna show you a picture.

Man: Alright

Interviewer: I want you to tell me what you think it is.

Man: Mmm, Hospital that way?

Interviewer: Hospital that way!

[end excerpt]

MICHAEL: The pile on was so immediate and [cross talk] intense.

HRISHI: [cross talk] Of course.

MICHAEL: Now I know better. Every time we do a logo now one of the things we do if it's got any visibility whatsoever, we'll advise the client, "Brace yourself." The way social media culture works now is that you're gonna get push back on this immediately, and you just have to be prepared to weather it, be prepared to respond to it if you want, but it's gonna happen. And in fact now I think I have a lot of clients, who, their real dread is that no one will notice at all.

HRISHI: Huh! They want the debate.

MICHAEL: Yeah I mean ideally they'd like it if everyone says, "Oh, I love the new logo," but that isn't what Twitter is for [cross talk] for one thing...

HRISHI: Right [cross talk].

MICHAEL: ... and social media in general is not for, "I love things." It's more for, "Did you see this latest horrible thing, I hate it, and here's a clever turn of phrase that I hope will go viral, explaining how bad it is."

HRISHI: [laughs] Right. Did you have a hand also in picking outside of the "H" mark, did you also choose the typeface, was it I think it's Sharp?

MICHAEL: Yeah yeah yeah yeah, a guy named Lucas Sharp had done a typeface called Sharp Sans that he modified for us, and he licensed it to the campaign under the name Unity Sans. Yeah, we looked at a lot of different typefaces. That sort of thing is fun, because really you're doing this very specific exercise where, in the case of Secretary Clinton, she's got her first

name, her last name, each are seven letters and they're very specific letters, and you can't negotiate those letters, right?

HRISHI: Mmhm.

MICHAEL: And so you start to look at a lot of typefaces and try to judge in which font does... In which typeface do these seven letters look their best, upper and lower case, all uppercase, etc etc. And I think that people tend to underestimate that you've candidates who have the option of four letter names, whether it's Cory or Beto or Pete, then you have people who have the option of longer name, like Klobuchar, but they're blessed with short first names like Amy...

HRISHI: Mmhm

MICHAEL: ...you got the first and last name, then someone goes through the process of saying, "Ok it could be Serif, it could be Sans Serif, it could be all upper case, it could be upper and lower case." You don't get to go to John Hickenlooper and say you know, "Can we talk about a new name, 'cause this name just is so long and so cumbersome, it's not gonna fit neatly in any of the containers that we know we have to put it in," and he's not going to say, "Yeah, let's go with John," you know?

HRISHI: Those are the constraints you have to work with.

MICHAEL: Those are the constraints, yeah, and so in fact you can sort of like see it on *The West Wing*. The production designers were trying to make the different candidates sort of like... Just style them so they are different so if you're at Vinick headquarters you sort of see those six letters in the background and they look different than they would at Santos headquarters, etc etc.

HRISHI: Right. So, if you could walk our listeners through this process, the choosing of the specific typeface, it does have a lot of ramifications. And so my viewpoint from the outside was I saw it and I thought of course it makes sense that you choose a Sans Serif typeface, and this one in particular has a kind of friendliness, because I thought if you had gone with a sort of more classic Serif typeface it might have played into people's feelings about something dynastic or something you know like... [cross talk]

MICHAEL: Yeah yeah yeah [cross talk].

HRISHI: ...something too historical or something, and that approachability was something that was probably a mandate that you were responding to. Is that true, was there an explicit discussion of these kinds of personality traits that you wanted to evoke by choosing one typeface versus another?

MICHAEL: Yeah, we had one moment where we were looking at... I think what we just kind of like set Hillary, Hillary Clinton, Clinton, HRC in all sorts of different typefaces, and of course, it's interesting is you sort of have the two "L's" in a row and if you do them capital, apologizing formally to all listeners about how nerdy this is gonna get but this is what we do, you get the two "L's" in a row, if they're capital letters they're kind of like square, horizontally, you know they have a horizontal dimension because of that bottom part that's horizontal. If they're lower case, you can just represent them with just two vertical lines so [cross talk]...

HRISHI: Mmhm [cross talk].

MICHAEL: ...that means you can kind of save space, horizontally and make the name bigger and the logo bigger ultimately. And so, that's one of the things I think we noticed. I think another thing, obviously, is that upper and lower case just feels a little bit more conversational, than all caps, and...

HRISHI: Yeah.

MICHAEL: ...and when she was running you know, in the primaries against Obama in '08, she had a lot of all caps stuff. They were very George W. Bush-y looking, all caps, italic, 'HILLARY FOR AMERICA', in just like really big and kind of like loud, and we thought, "No, we want to make this feel more personal and more conversational," which fit, to a degree, my own experience of the candidate.

HRISHI: Mmhm.

MICHAEL: And so upper and lower case felt a little bit more like the way people talk, we just wanted it to feel kind of very simple and clear.

HRISHI: Having gone through it now once, would you do it again if another candidate were to ask you to design for them?

MICHAEL: I think I would love to help. I think I would... pass the baton of actually doing the actual work part of it. I'd love to help kind of like give them advice about people out there I thought could do the work well, and I think one of the things I would do is try to figure out, "How do you anticipate how these campaigns will be defined going forward?" That has nothing to do with logos, typefaces etc, as you pointed out Hrish. I think it has to do with some other sense of personal identification that voters have with their candidate, and it's a design challenge, and it's a design opportunity to figure out what are those new ways of doing it. How do you just think in a more capacious and open-minded way about how people actually live these campaigns, and how can you do it in a way that just feels more human and participatory, and energizing for the people who ultimately will be called upon to bring their passion to the fight?

HRISHI: Michael, thank you so much for coming on the podcast. I've been a fan of yours for years so it feels really special to get a chance to talk to you. Thank you.

MICHAEL: No, likewise, this has really been fun for me too, and like I say, it's not the most important part of all this stuff but it's sometimes fun to look under the hood and understand that the world we live in is actually the outcome of a million mysterious little decisions that are made by people for whatever reason, both *The West Wing* and the real world is fun.

HRISHI: Ok, so before we wrap things up, Josh and I had another couple other *West Wing* questions that we wanted to pose to the show's graphic designer, Leslie Wah.

JOSH: I wanted to ask you, do you remember the classic incident when we were shooting out of town [cross talk] ...

HRISHI: [laughs, cross talk].

JOSH: ...I think in Baltimore? We had a scene with Marine One, President Bartlet's helicopter [laughs] and we arrived and on the side it said 'United States of America'?

LESLIE: Oh my God... You've been talking to Ellen [laughs]!

JOSH: [laughs] I just remember that fondly myself, because I was in that scene and I was like, "Hey wait a minute guys! Look at that!"

LESLIE: Yeah, the Marine One helicopter...

JOSH: [laughs].

LESLIE: Yeah, that was shooting on location, I think we either had the graphics sent over there or there were vinyls that they had put on the helicopter. And we either the vinyls sent over there or we had the vinyl lettering made there. And I had sent them files. Now, as soon as my boss came back and told me about it and showed me a photo [laughs]...

JOSH: [laughs].

LESLIE: ...I went running to my computer, and looking at my file, just to verify, I was like "I know I did not spell that wrong!" [laughs]

JOSH: [laughs].

LESLIE: So, it was not my fault. I showed him, "Look at my file!" So I don't know what happened to the "I".

JOSH: I just wanted to give you the opportunity to clear your name. I'm glad you have now done so.

HRISHI: [laughs].

LESLIE: That is like a painter mistake or I don't want to blame the painter, but it either got lost in the shipment or it...Yeah, they're very large letters and it either got lost in the shipment or the painter missed it, or I don't know what happened but it was in my digital file, I had proof [laughs].

JOSH: And do you remember what happened, it was just I guess a mad scramble at that point to produce another?

LESLIE: Yeah, they had to have the local place just whip one up really quickly, and yeah, every time I work with Ken Hardy again he'll put that photo up in his office.

JOSH: [laughs].

HRISHI: Leslie, are there any other stories that you have from the show that are particularly favorite memories? Anything that we should be asking you about for posterity? We're almost done with our podcast and so we want to collect any juicy anecdotes that we can while we have the opportunity.

LESLIE: There were a couple of times where we had some period pieces that were really cool. There was a 1950s Brooklyn set that we did.

HRISHI: Right! In the opening of "*Holy Night*"

JOSH: Oh, God, you're good Hrish!i!

HRISHI: [laughs]

LESLIE: That, yeah, I can't even remember.

HRISHI: Yeah, the season four Christmas episode.

LESLIE: That was so much work, for that one little opening scene. But it was so awesome! It was so fun to do because I was doing all this period work and signage, and designing these hand painted windows, and 1950's ads on a huge brick wall. I mean, we had so much fun with that, all the way down to the period street signs. I took so many photos of that location. It was on the lot, and I took so many photos and everything and I don't even know how much of it even showed up in the scene, 'cause it was night-time but we had so much detail put on that street you know, between set dec and all the construction and the paintwork and everything, and the signage and the cars, too. The cars, you know, I was designing vinyls for the taxi, and things like that and we had so much detail and you only get this little tiny glimpse, you know?

JOSH: Yeah.

LESLIE: And sometimes... but it's worth it, you wanna make it perfect.

JOSH: Do you ever get to keep anything? Do you have an office or a home littered with memorabilia, or no?

LESLIE: I keep like little things, yeah. Period vintage looking signs are kind of my thing that I love, so I [cross talk] keep a few of those here and there.

JOSH: [cross talk] Ah.

LESLIE: You know, I ask first if they're just gonna get rid of them, of course.

JOSH: I have a 'Seaborn for Congress' bumper sticker somewhere, but my wife will never let me put it on my car.

LESLIE: Oh my gosh.

JOSH: [laughs].

LESLIE: Yeah I think that was mine too. [laughs]

JOSH: Oh awesome! I own your work, I'm a collector.

LESLIE: [laughs] Yeah, I know, I wish I would have kept all those bumper stickers. I think I only maybe have a couple [laughs]. It was a great show, such a great experience.

JOSH: Well, you did tremendous work on it.

LESLIE: Thank you, so much.

HRISHI: And thanks for joining us and talking to us about it.

LESLIE: Thank you for asking me. I really am flattered and appreciate the opportunity.

[transition music]

HRISHI: And that does it for this episode of *The West Wing Weekly*. Thanks so much to our guests, Michael Bierut and Leslie Wah.

JOSH: Thank you to Zach McNees, Margaret Miller and Nick Song, for their indispensable expertise in putting together this episode.

HRISHI: If you have any comments about this episode, you can leave a comment for us on our website or on our Facebook page, or you can tweet at us. You could follow Michael Bierut on Twitter @michaelbierut or on Instagram @mbierut. He also has two podcasts of his own, both about design. One is called *The Observatory*, and the other is *The Design of Business, The Business of Design*. And both are great. I listen to both of them and you should too. You can find those on whatever podcast app you might use to listen to *The West Wing Weekly*.

JOSH: We remain in 2019, a proud member of Radiotopia. Radiotopia is a collection of fine, fine podcasts that you can listen to for free. To find out more about them go to radiotopia.fm.

HRISHI: I would also recommend everyone check out the work that Michael did, along with the rest of the design team, for the Hillary Clinton campaign in 2016. You can go to Hillaryforamericadesign.com. It's a great, fascinating resource and you can see all the different applications and it's a great website to nerd out on. Also if you want to follow up on the Pete Buttigieg stuff that we were talking about, you can go to design.peteforamerica.com and you can see this whole systematic breakdown of colors, and ideas, and typefaces that they're using for that campaign. And I'll put links to both of these up in the show notes.

JOSH: Ok.

HRISHI: Ok.

MICHAEL & LESLIE: What's next?

[Outro Music]