The media is a battlefield where moral systems collide. Ownership tilts it. TV channels and newspapers in the U.S. promote their business interests by supporting a pro-big business government and its war. Even THE NEW YORK TIMES, which opposed invading Iraq without UN consent, did so in a way unlikely to rock the boat—and clearly in direct contrast to the intention of Britain’s DAILY MIRROR.

The MIRROR’s front page, designed to generate newsbox sales by aggressively engaging the man in the street, is as pointed and artistically crafted as an editorial cartoon. On March 14th, Tony Blair leered at the world from the MIRROR’s cover, the sticker “PRIME MONSTER” plastered across his forehead. No doubt the photo is “real”, but the top light gives him a dusting of eye shadow, and the saturation slider has been pushed a little too far, powdering his cheeks with blush and pinking up the lips—the makeup of a pantomime villain, the flush of a routé. Removing the highlight in one eye becomes the final act of character assassination.

On March 24th, the MIRROR’s front page (“Still anti-war?”) showed two victims of the war. In North America, such photos of “collateral damage” are confined to inside pages. This culture, which glorifies splatter in movies and video games, shies away from carnage in news media, presenting the war as a grand game of leaders, generals, military equipment, and explosions.

The suppression of horror is complete in the ads that invited the “silent majority” to an April 4th Rally for America in Toronto (“Now it’s time for the Silent Majority of Canadians to speak up!”). No mention of a war—the important thing is we don’t want to piss off our biggest trading partner. The Friends of America (started by a small group of successful businessmen) who organized this rally described themselves as “a wide, non-profit coalition of concerned individuals”. The April 5th Toronto anti-war march was publicized by Coalition to Stop the War, “supported by over 40 labour, faith, community and cultural organizations”. continued on page 46
The tombstone layout of the pro-war ad combines with its attractive stock imagery, name branding, and institutionally bossy Extra Bold Sans Serif typeface, creating a solid, conservative tone that speaks with authority, motivating by style rather than content. By contrast, the anti-war poster (“Stop Bush’s Mad War”) is a disturbing design: asymmetric and cramped—from the dramatic press photos to the captions to the big slogans to the carefully squared-off main text box, it throws the reader’s eyes around, driving home its argument. With a nod to contemporary styles, the designer puts all-lowercase white bold sans serif names in round-cornered black bars, but keeps the overall typography un-designy by choosing Microsoft’s Arial and Trebuchet as the fonts. Despite the aggressive layout, Trebuchet is a friendly face—its caps have quaint Gill-like proportions, and its lowercase is soft and round.

Online, big business loses some of its political clout. Friends and acquaintances exchange amusements via email attachments, and this is how I’ve come to receive various anti-war “graphics”, mostly satirical in nature (perhaps there are pro-war attachments going the rounds, but no one sends them to me). The satirical retro poster is the killer genre. The best are painfully on point: “I’m fighting for Whitey” (from www.whitehouse.org) puts U.S. National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice in uniform, highlighting the disproportionate number of blacks in US frontline troops. “We’ll take care of the axis of evil...” blithely lists the rules of a fascist state—“A message from the Ministry of Homeland Security”. The genre is heavily ironic, its loving parody of retro-Americana pop culture not far removed from the graphic look of Old Navy, or a Munsinger ad.

Tony Sutton takes the opposite approach. At ColdType.net he collects and re-sets the newspaper columns of journalists such as Robert Fisk, Norman Solomon and Antonia Zerbisias, creating books-in-progress that can be downloaded as PDF files. His unaffected typography is strong, precise and articulate, a pleasure to read on screen or printed out.

There’s a huge range of graphic techniques on view in the signs carried by protest marchers. What could be more hardcore than some wiseacre slogan (“Bombing for peace...” and “Die bluts spur der USA...”) that took five seconds to scrawl—the speed
of reading matches the speed of execution, the reader reliving the
gestural conviction of the writer. Stencils and adhesive lettering
(“The war is not about oil…” and “A village in Texas has lost its
idiot!”) have an earnest, laboriously physical quality; the amateur
spacing gives a grassroots authenticity.

Most of the signs at pro-war protests are production runs,
supplied by the organizers; at anti-war protests, one-off home-
made signs predominate. Many are computer-generated, few by
professional graphic artists. They are none the worse for it,
however, with a simplicity and directness (“Land of the Free?”
and “How did OUR oil…” that frequently eludes the pro.

Within any protest march there is a mixture of philosophies
and agendas. The distinction between being against Bush’s War
and being for peace is significant. The quality of peace is shown
in signs that are delicately drawn, brightly colored, picturing a
dove or the peace symbol (“I vote for politicians…”).

The peace symbol was designed in England in 1958 as the
logo for the newly formed Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.
Its designer, Gerald Holtom, had been a conscientious objector
during World War II and was a professional graphic designer
and artist. Intentionally, the symbol has never been copyrighted; in

the U.K. its meaning is still associated with the CND, but it has
spread elsewhere as a generic sign of peace.

Prior to the invasion, the U.S. “bombed” Iraqi soldiers with
clouds of propaganda leaflets. The mediocrity of their design
(“Do not risk your life” and “The Medina RGFC has been
targeted for destruction.”) has puzzled Western pundits.

The problem is that we know nothing of Iraqi visual culture. Is
the quality of Italian graphics bad or good—or do we just think it’s
bad because it’s Arabic? Are the U.S. leaflets intended to adopt
the vernacular style of Iraqi graphics, and if so, are they a good
imitation or bad? Are they poorly designed because the military’s
graphic designers think Iraqis have no taste or because this is the
best that military hacks could do? Or is it because the designers
had an impossible client? Then again, perhaps these designs are
brilliantly Post-modern—they’d look pretty chill in a Diesel ad.

It’s unclear whether the flyer drops have had the desired effect,
but it’s unlikely. The military was a little out of its depth on this;
“Quit or die” has a woeful track record as an advertising strategy.
One has to wonder why didn’t they bring in the really big guns—
from Madison Avenue. After all, hasn’t U.S. marketing done a far
better job of conquering the world than the U.S. military?