

BRANDADDIES

A SMALL, BIG BRANDING COMPANY COMPENDIUM.

ARNELL

Arnell group (OMNICOM 2003)

EST. 1979 BY PETER ARNELL

51-200 EMPLOYEES

1 OFFICE HQ: NEW YORK

GREAT Simple and solid, we've always liked this logo, perhaps its power is drawn from the © and ® symbols, but it seems to work. Plus the shape of the lowercase "r" is elegant.

NOT SO GREAT 100% orange juice & more! We're always in favor of pushing the boundaries. The public, however, is not. In the case of Tropicana, a complete departure from the past caused an uproar and the design was dumped shortly thereafter.

THE BRAND UNION

The Brand Union (WPP GROUP 1986)

EST. 1976 TERRY TYRRELL & SAM SAMPSON WITH MANY MERGERS ALONG THE WAY

500 EMPLOYEES

20 OFFICES WORLD WIDE HQ: LONDON

GREAT Nice type and simple, snappy shapes make these two companion marks attractive and fun. Also, we really like the Brand Union's own mark above.

NOT SO GREAT We don't love the type, nor the symbol, which is supposed to represent a hummingbird. It may suffer from being created in 1995, but mostly we think there is a better possible solution somewhere.

CHERMAYEFF & GEISMAR

Chermayeff & Geismar* (IND)

EST. 1957 BY IVAN CHERMAYEFF & TOM GEISMAR

AT LEAST 2 EMPLOYEES

1 OFFICE HQ: NEW YORK

GREAT What makes C&G's work great in our minds is that they keep it simple, and as a result there logos often have a timeless, unfussy quality that's beautiful and long-lasting, such as this mark for Rockefeller Center.

NOT SO GREAT The flip side is, of course, being so simple that there's no personality. This non-risk taking mark falls into the latter category.

*Stef Giesabuhler, a once full partner at C&G, left and started CG Partners with a lot of other C&G staff. C&G became C&G studio, a much smaller company where Ivan and Tom still work together. Just who really did what work when is hard to know, so it's safe to say you should also check out www.cgpartnersllc.com.



Futurebrand (IPG)

EST. 1999 BY JOHN DIEFENBACH & JOHN ELKINS

500 EMPLOYEES

24 OFFICES WORLD WIDE HQ: LONDON

GREAT This redesign does exactly what most redesigns try to do. It updates a refreshes an old look while still retaining strong echoes of the past. It's not a Frankenstein; it's lovely.

NOT SO GREAT You never know, sometimes work like this is the result of a demanding client. But we're not here to point the finger. This logo, however, is pointing to just about everything under the sun.

Key:

YEARS IN BUSINESS; MAXIMUM WIDTH = 70 YEARS

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES; MAXIMUM WIDTH = 1,000

NUMBER OF OFFICES; MAXIMUM WIDTH = 50

OMNICOM = Advertising holding company, '08 net income: \$1 bil

WPP GROUP = Same deal, '08 net income: \$818 mil

IPG = Another AHC, seeing a pattern? '08 net income: \$295 mil

MARSH = Another big company, '06 net income: \$0.99 bil

(IND) = Independent.

Notes:

We're sure we left someone out. We're not branding experts; we're far too young and wet behind the ears to call ourselves such a thing. We are enthusiasts, but hey, that also starts with an "e" so that's something. In choosing branding companies for this piece, we focused on the big boys, gravitated to US-based companies, and tried hard to produce a good selection. That said, defining what constitutes a branding company is a difficult task in and of itself. While **Pentagram** consistently produces great identities, they were omitted for being a multi-disciplinary design firm rather than a branding-specific agency. **Ogilvy and Mather** does the occasional rebranding as well, and they are certainly big, but ultimately we consider them an advertising firm more than anything else. The data comes from a variety of sources including firm websites, Wikipedia, and LinkedIn. Please note that fluctuating staff and office locations lead to conflicting numbers in some cases. So it should be noted these numbers are imperfect. And finally, we again want to stress there are many smaller design firms that produce great identities, often as good or better than the big boys.

Interbrand

Interbrand (OMNICOM 1993)

EST. 1974 BY JOHN MURPHY

1,250 EMPLOYEES

x.25

37 OFFICES WORLD WIDE HQ: NEW YORK

GREAT Hey, it's a lot more interesting than just a word mark. It's relaxed and strong, and we like the fact that the "W" is imperfectly proportioned, helping us read the "T" more easily.

NOT SO GREAT Do we need to explain this one? The most puzzling aspects: the ever-so slight translucency and the white "I" of investment overlapping on the light tan "b" letterform?

Landor

Landor (WPP GROUP 1989)

EST. 1941 BY WALTER LANDOR & WIFE JOSEPHINE

755 EMPLOYEES

24 OFFICES WORLD WIDE HQ: SAN FRAN

GREAT Flexibility. They say it's good for you. In our opinion it's good for identities too. Landor's City of Melbourne identity system is cool and fun, and we're envious. Wolff Olins' NYC logo strangely feels similar.

NOT SO GREAT It's hard to find a weak identity for Landor, so they're certainly doing something right. However, we're not feeling this one, it feels expected, and looks like a hundreds of other generic products.

LIPPINCOTT

Lippincott (MARSH 1986)

EST. 1943 BY J. GORDON LIPPINCOTT & WALTER P. MARGULIES

100+ EMPLOYEES

6 OFFICES WORLD WIDE HQ: NEW YORK

GREAT This mark is from 1978 but you wouldn't know it; and the rose illustration holds up beautifully.

NOT SO GREAT This, however, does reek of the 70's, not nearly as timeless.



Minale Tattersfield (IND)

EST. 1964 BY MARCELLO MINALE & BRIAN TATTERSFIELD

120 EMPLOYEES

8 OFFICES WORLD WIDE HQ: LONDON

GREAT This logo is for a manly spa, hence the name and typographic choice, which we think conveys oil. But MT refers to it as "molten pewter."

NOT SO GREAT We believe that this mark is a "B" and also a column. It took us a few looks to realize it though, and instead of one of those wonderful "AH-HA!" moments, it was more like "oh, okay."



Sterling Brands (OMNICOM AT SOME POINT)

EST. 1992 BY SIMON WILLIAMS

90 EMPLOYEES

3 OFFICES WORLD WIDE HQ: NEW YORK

GREAT Yummy! We loved the original, but this is a fun update, via a slight angle and subtle curve. Plus, the position and varying thickness of the orbiting blue stroke gives it nice motion. Also the buns became strangely shiny.

NOT SO GREAT This logo is okay, though we're not crazy about the shadow, save the drops, and the boxiness gave us an unpleasant flashback to the days of using Quark.

Saffron

Saffron Consultants (IND)

EST. 2001 BY WALLY OLINS*

65 EMPLOYEES

5 OFFICES WORLD WIDE HQ: NEW YORK

GREAT To appreciate this logo for dynamobol and how Saffron built a system around it, you really have to go to there site. So do so—it's worth it!

NOT SO GREAT Have you ever had one of those moments where you're trying to act cooler than you are, and suddenly realize your not fooling anybody?

*Wally started Saffron after leaving Wolff Olins, which he cofounded, see below.



Siegel+Gale (OMNICOM 2003)

EST. 1969 BY ALAN SIEGEL & ROBERT GALE

200 EMPLOYEES

7 OFFICES WORLD WIDE HQ: NEW YORK

GREAT It may seem tempting to pass off an older company like S+G as being past their prime, but this identity from a few years ago reminds us they're still relevant and hip.

NOT SO GREAT For this one, it's very possible we're missing something, but the triangle people scare us.



VSA Partners (IND)

EST. 1982 BY ROBERT VOGEL.

120 EMPLOYEES

3 USA OFFICES HQ: CHI-TOWN

GREAT There's something so pleasing about this old Singular logo. Many times abstract representations of people are not the best way to go (see the triangle people above), but in this case, they knocked it outta the park.

NOT SO GREAT Another case where finding a weak example required a little twisting of our collective arm; Its straightforward approach works, but what else can be said about it?



AND VARIOUS OTHERS)

Wolff Olins (OMNICOM 2001)

EST. 1965 BY MICHAEL WOLFF & WALLY OLINS

140 EMPLOYEES

3 OFFICES WORLD WIDE HQ: ??????

GREAT An example of the flexible, system-as-logo approach. What's really ballsy about Olins' AOL design is the white type always bleeding into a white background. A really confident example of risk taking.

NOT SO GREAT We're fine with the typography, but those weird, scientific, gradient cones cause it to shoot itself in the foot.

Brought to you by:



{ EST 2009, 2 PEOPLE, 2 HOME OFFICES, HQ: NEW YORK }