

Introduction to The New **Text Art of and Making Books a Difference** by *Ulises Carrión* **Freee**

An introduction to a manifesto is an opportunity to give an account of oneself. One of the most conspicuous and interesting aspects of any manifesto, in fact, is that it almost always seems to demand or require some kind of defence or account. Why is the manifesto needed? Why now? Whose manifesto is it? What is it against? What is it for? Why a manifesto rather than a poem or a joke? However, unlike in the formats assumed by Judith Butler for ‘giving an account of oneself’, in which the individual faces a demand from a figure of authority, the call to give an account of oneself in the introduction to a manifesto is a declaration to the public.

Insofar as every manifesto is a public declaration, every manifesto also calls forth the question: who is the public of this manifesto? Manifestos are not written by the masses but usually by a very small number of people, but they are written in the hope of capturing the anger and dissatisfaction shared by great numbers of people. The public of the manifesto does not always exist prior to its publication, however, since the purpose of the manifesto is to provide a focal point for the construction of a new social body, a new public, a new class, a new social movement.

Manifestos contain not individual likes and dislikes; the aim of the manifesto is to identify collective positions and collective actions. A manifesto, from mid 17th century Italian (from *manifestare*, from Latin) meaning to ‘make public’ (from *manifestus* ‘obvious’) it is not the act of going to market with your private opinions or personal taste, it is not a disclosing to others what you have done by and for yourself, it is *public* in a more fundamental sense than this. The manifesto cannot but be public; even before it is published, the manifesto belongs to the public, is formed by the public-to-be, and is addressed to the public (not to readers). That is to say, like a slogan or a political chant at a march, it survives only by being utilized by others.

Manifestos and slogans are acts of montage because they cut through the social body in so far as they are ‘carried’ by people and they are continually pasted into other situations. Unlike photomontage, which cuts and pastes images, manifestos and slogans perform what Freee call a *real* montage of people and spaces. Real montage is a political act of displacement, cutting through reality and reordering the world.

Freee use the genre of the manifesto, like the genre of the slogan, to connect contemporary art after the social turn with a much longer and

deeper tradition of collective action and common culture. Manifestos by Freee are examples of text art but they are also a means by which to reunite text with action, and language with politics. Rather than text art being subject to a giddy range of interpretations, Freee's manifestos ask the participant (of a spoken choir reading) or the reader (of a manifesto published in a book) to agree or disagree with the statements made in the manifesto.

This is why each manifesto is prefaced with guidance on how it is to be used: *'In order to participate you need to print out the pdf of Freee's new manifesto and underline every sentence that you agree with. Bring the manifesto with you to the spoken choir event and read out only those sections of the manifesto that you have underlined.'*

A manifesto, therefore, does not give an account of *oneself*, but gives an account of the social and political situation of the time. It is not a description, though: it makes declarations, proclamations, pronouncements, announcements and it sets forward a programme. Manifestos are not performative language in the classic sense: it is not the words themselves that effect change. Manifestos call for action. Language is essential to this transformative activity but it is not the action itself and cannot take its place. Manifestos light the fire but the bodies of the politically engaged are its social agents. In one sense, manifestos do nothing at least not by themselves, but in another sense - in which what we say is tied to what we do - manifestos are essential to the collective action of social change.

References

- Beech, D., Hewitt, A., Jordan, M., (Freee art collective) (2013), *Twenty-First Century Political Art: the Freee Manifesto for Art & Twenty-First Century Socialism*, in 'Manifesto Now! Instructions for Performance, Philosophy, Politics', (eds) Laura Cull & Will Daddario, Bristol: Intellect Books.
- Beech, D., Hewitt, A., Jordan, M., (Freee art collective) (2014) *The Impossible Participant* in 'New Interactive Practices in Contemporary Art', (ed) Kathryn Brown, London: I.B.Tauris.
- Beech, D., Hewitt, A., Jordan, M., (Freee art collective) (2015) *To Hell with Herbert Read*, Anarchist Studies, Volume 23, Number 2.
- Butler, J.P., (2005) *Giving an Account of Oneself*, Fordham University Press,
- Mahony, E., (2014) *Locating Simon Critchley's 'interstitial distance' in the practices of The Freee Art Collective and Liberate Tate*. pp. 9-30, Art & the Public Sphere Journal Volume 3, Number 1
- Wilder, K., (2013) *Standing By Their Words: The Manifestos of the Freee Art Collective*, in Manifesto Now! Instructions for Performance, Philosophy, Politics, (eds) Laura Cull & Will Daddario, Intellect Books: Bristol.

The New **Text Art of and Making Books a Difference**
by *Ulises Carrión Freee*

WHAT A BOOK RADICALISM IS!

A book **Radicalism** is a sequence of spaces **displacements**. Each of these spaces **displacements** is perceived at a different moment a **collective act** - a book **radicalism** is also a sequence of moments **collective acts**. A book **Radicalism** is not a case **correct choice** of words, nor a bag **collectively sanctioned formulation** of words, nor a bearer **hasty bodily rejection** of words. A writer **radical**, contrary to the popular opinion, does not write **choose direct action instead of** books. A writer **radical** writes texts **slogans, manifestos, petitions, speeches, rejoinders, clarifications of position, letters of advice from an onlooker: ie the language of displacement**. The fact, that **What makes a text is contained in a book, radical is that it comes only from the dimensions of such a text leads to, shapes or directs the collective action of social displacement**; or, in the case of a series of **certain** short texts (**poems slogans on placards**, for instance), from their number **direct participation in political action**. A literary **published (prose political)** text contained in a book ignores the fact that the book **radicalism** is an autonomous **active** space-time sequence **displacement**. A series of more or less short texts **minor acts (poems protests or other campaigns)** distributed through a book **field of power** following any particular ordering reveals the sequential nature of the book **radicalism**. It **Radicalism** reveals it **power**, perhaps **uses delegitimizes** it; but it **power** does not incorporate it **radicalism** or assimilate it. **Written language Radicalism** is a sequence of **signs displacements** expanding within the space **infrastructure of dissent**; the reading

growing or shrinking of which occurs in the **historical** time. A **book** **Radicalism** is a space-time sequence **constellation of events and their residues**. **Books** **Radicals** existed originally as **containers** **individuals** **of committed to** (**literary bourgeois**) **texts reform**. But **books radicals**, seen as **autonomous realities** **revolutionaries**, can contain **express** any (**written** **revolutionary**) **language demand**, not only **literary** **those given in political** language, or even any other **the politically motivated subversion of the** system of signs. Among languages **activists**, **literary language** **opposition** (**prose direct action** and **poetry political art**) is **not seen as** the best fitted **proof to of the radical** nature of **books the activist**. A **book radical** may be the accidental **unethical** container **carrier** of a **text displacement**, the **structure intention** of which **whom** is irrelevant to the **book movement**: these are the **books radicals** of **bookshops contingent** and **libraries actual history**. A **book radical** can also exist as an autonomous and self-sufficient **form individual**, including perhaps a **text writer or artist** that **emphasizes revolutionizes** that form, a **text radical** that is an organic part of that **form the dominant class**: here begins the new art of **making books the society to come**. In the old art the **writer artist** judges himself **or herself** as being not responsible for the real **book world**. He **or she writes** **makes** the **text work**. The **rest world** is **done made** by the servants, the artisans, the workers, the others. In the new art **writing making** a **text work** is only the first **or last** link in the chain going from the **writer individual** to the **reader collective**. In the new art the **writer artist** assumes the **collective** responsibility for the whole process. In the old art the **writer writes texts** **political artist makes statements**. In the new art the **writer makes books** **radical artist collaborates on** **the building of an infrastructure of dissent**. To make

a **book world for radicalism** is to actualize its ideal space-time **sequence constellation of events and their residues** by means of the creation of a parallel sequence of signs **narratives, identities, meanings and images**, be it **linguistic imaginary** or **other real**.

PROSE PHOTOS AND POETRY TEXTS

In an old **book publication** all the pages are the same. When writing the text **or supplying the images**, the writer followed only the sequential laws of language **and the photographer kept within the frame, neither of which are not the sequential laws of books address the social life of the publication**. Words and images might be **are typically** different on every page; but every **page publication** is, as such, **identical with like all** the preceding ones and with those that follow, **are cut off from the world in which the economies of the publication itself operate**. In the new art every **page publication** is different; every **page publication** is an individualized element of a structure (the **book social formation**) wherein it has a particular function to fulfill. In spoken and written **language publishing**, **pronouns words** substitute for **nouns actions**, **so to avoid tiresome, superfluous repetitions as well as being speech acts themselves**. In the **book text art**, composed of various elements, of signs, such as language **but also photos and videos of language in action**, what is it that **language** plays the role of **pronouns action, so to avoid tiresome, superfluous repetitions? and action operates within linguistic structures**. This is a problem for the new art; the old one does not even suspect its existence. A **book photo** of 500 **pages text**, or of 100 **pages a photo of speech**, or even of 25 **a photo of an event constructed through a script**, wherein all the **pages images** are similar **simultaneously texts and actions**, is a **boring-book text** considered **embodied** as a **book publication**, no matter how **thrilling political** the content of the words of the text **printed on contained in the pages photo** might be, **this is a political form**. A **novel text**

work, by a writer ~~an artist of genius~~ **such as Lawrence Weiner** or by a ~~third-rate author~~ **Tracey Emin**, is a ~~book~~ **disembodied utterance in circumstances** where nothing happens. There are still, and always will be, people who like reading ~~novels~~ **text art**. There will also always be people who like playing chess, gossiping, dancing the mambo, or eating strawberries with cream. In comparison with ~~novels~~ **disembodied text art**, where nothing happens, in ~~poetry books~~ **photos of text objects carried by people acting in the world** something happens ~~sometimes~~, although very little. A ~~novel~~ **text work** with ~~no~~ **brightly coloured** capital letters, or with different letter types, or with ~~chemical formulae~~ **graphic elements** interspersed here and there etc., is still a ~~novel~~ **disembodied**, that is to say, a ~~boring book~~ **de-worlded** pretending not to be such. A ~~book of poems~~ **An exhibition of words** contains as many words as, or ~~more~~ **less** than, a novel, but it uses ultimately the real, physical space whereon these words appear, in a more intentional, more evident, deeper way. This is so because in order to transcribe ~~poetical~~ language onto ~~paper~~ **walls** it is necessary to translate typographically the conventions proper to ~~poetic language~~ **installation art**. The transcription of ~~prose~~ **Text art** needs few things: **words, letters, pages, walls**, punctuation, capitals, ~~various margins~~ **colours, sound**, etc. All these conventions are original and extremely beautiful discoveries, but we don't notice them any more because we use them daily. Transcription of ~~poetry~~ **Text art**, a more ~~elaborate~~ **mediated use of language than common usage**, ~~uses~~ **less common signs exaggerates its difference from ordinary language to make this point**. The mere need to create ~~signify~~ the ~~signs-fitting~~ **difference between text art and ordinary language** the transcription of ~~poetic language~~, calls our attention to this very simple fact: to write a ~~poem~~ **text** on ~~paper~~ **a gallery wall** is a different action from writing, **shouting and chanting** it ~~a slogan~~ **on our mind collectively**. Poems are songs **Slogans are chanted**, the ~~poets~~ **sloganeers** repeat. But

they don't sing **also carry** them **on placards. Hence** they write them. Poetry **Slogans are written** is to be said aloud, **they are not read**, they **are** repeated. But **they we (Freee)** don't **only** say it aloud. **They We** publish it. The fact **problem** is, that **poetry text art**, as it occurs normally, is written and printed, not sung and spoken, **poetry**. And with this, **poetry art** has lost nothing **but politics has lost everything**. On the contrary, **our (Freee) text art** **poetry** has **gained added** something: a **geographical** spatial reality that the so loudly lamented **first wave of sung aesthetic** and spoken **installational** **poetries text art** lacked.

THE SPACE GROUNDED PRACTISED CONNECTEDNESS!

For years, many years, **poets text artists** have intensively and efficiently exploited the spatial possibilities of **poetry the gallery, the book and 2D surfaces**. But only **after** the so-called concrete **relational aesthetics** or, later, **visual poetry the social turn**, has openly declared **this art's location within geographical space**. **Verses Events starting and ending halfway on the page beyond the gallery, verses events** having a wider or a narrower margin **community, verses events** being separated from the following one **gallery or museum** by a bigger or smaller space - all this is **exploitation exploration** of space **as much as a form of social connectedness**. This is not to say that a text is **poetry art** because it uses space in this or that way, but that using space is a characteristic of **written poetry text art turned into grounded practised connectedness**. The space is **turns the music text art of the unsung poetry into action**. The introduction of space into **poetry text art** (or rather of **poetry slogans and other texts** into **populated** space) is an enormous event of literally incalculable **political and cultural** consequences. One of these consequences is concrete **scripted action** and/or **visual poetry real montage**. Its birth is not an extravagant event in the history of literature **politics**, but the **natural, unavoidable alliance between text in art and development of**

the spatial reality ~~gained by~~ **of** language since the ~~moment writing was invented~~ **in political action**. The ~~poetry aesthetics~~ of the old **text art** does use space, albeit bashfully **limited to form**. This ~~poetry~~ **Text art** **doesn't challenge what has been** established as an **art's** inter-subjective communication **encounter**. Inter-subjective ~~communication~~ **encounters (mediated by objects)** occurs in an abstract, ideal, impalpable space **created within the real space of a gallery or museum symbolically cut off from worldly space**. In the new art (of which ~~concrete poetry~~ **grounded practised connectedness** is only an example) ~~communication is~~ **encounters are** still inter-subjective, but it **they** occurs in a concrete, real, physical space - the **page world**. A **book site** is a **volume moment** in the space a **sequence of events**. It **Collective opinion formation** is the true ground of the ~~communication~~ **collective political action** that takes place through words - its **the** here and now **is vital but is subsequently montaged into other heres and nows**. ~~Concrete poetry~~ **Our (Free) text art** represents an alternative to ~~poetry text art~~ **and participatory art**. **Books, Slogans, manifestos and workshops**, regarded as **autonomous collective** space-time sequences offer an alternative to ~~all-existent literary genres~~ **the aestheticisation of text in art and all the wailing about conviviality and antagonism in relational art**. Space exists **is political outside as well as** subjectivity. If two ~~subjects~~ **groups** communicate in the space, then space is an element of this ~~communication~~ **confrontation**. Space modifies this ~~communication~~ **exchange**. Space imposes its own laws on this ~~communication~~ **political dialogue**. Printed words are ~~imprisoned in~~ **integral to the matter of face to face encounter in the book physical space**. What is more meaningful: the **book event** or the text it **contains publishes**? What was first: the ~~chicken~~ **word** or the **egg action**? The old art assumes that printed words are printed on an ideal space. The new art knows that **books texts** exist as **objects and events** in an exterior

reality, subject to concrete conditions of perception, existence, exchange, consumption, use, etc. The objective manifestation of language can be experienced in an isolated moment and space - the **page work**; or in a sequence of spaces and moments - the **book exhibition and documentation**. There is not and will not be **new literature site specificity** any more. There will be, perhaps, new ways to **communicate republish** that will include language or will use language as a basis. As a **medium mode of communication publication**, **literature republishing** will always be **old literature a fresh act of committing to a public**.

THE LANGUAGE FROM SPEECH ACT TO REVOLUTION
Language **Speech acts** transmits **collectivize ideas action**, i.e. **eg mental images slogans**. The starting point of the **transmission collectivization of mental images action** is always an **intention opinion formation**: we speak to **transmit find comrades for** a particular **image struggle**. The everyday language **speech act** and the old **aesthetic text art use of language** have this in common: both are **intentional anti-retinal**, both want to **transmit transform certain art's historical dependence on mental images**. In the old **text art** the meanings of the words are the bearers of the author's intentions or **concepts**. Just as the **ultimate specific** meaning of words is **indefinable uncertain or undecideable**, so the **author's text artist's intention use of language** is **became unfathomable poetic, aesthetic, formal, private and vague or obtuse**. Every **intention speech act** presupposes a **purpose community**, a **utility public**. Everyday language **speech acts** is **are intentional, social** that is, **utilitarian dialogical**; **its their** function is to **transmit contest** ideas and **exchange** feelings, to explain, to declare, to convince, to invoke, to accuse, etc. Old **text art's language** is **intentional social** as well, i.e. **utilitarian rooted in art's apparatus**. Both **uses of languages** differ from one another only in their **exterior social** form. New **text art's language** is radically different from **daily the**

aesthetic use of language. † **The old text art** neglects intentions **republishing** and utility **social action**, and it returns to itself, it investigates itself, looking for forms, for series of forms that give birth to, couple with, unfold into, **space-time formal** sequences. The words in a **new book slogan** are not the bearers of the **political** message, **nor not** the mouthpieces of the soul, nor the currency of **communication ethical display**. Those **The characteristics of the slogan** were already named by **Hamlet Lenin**, an avid reader of books: words, **words struggle**, **words revolution**. The words of the new **book text art** are there not to transmit certain mental images with a certain intention. They are there to form, together with other **signs social acts**, a space-time sequence that we identify with the name '**book**' **radicalism**. The words in a **our new book text art (Freee)** might be the author's own words or someone else's words. A **writer collectives** of the new **text art** writes very little or does not write at all **but montage, cut, reiterate, publish, republish**. The most beautiful and perfect **book text** in the world is **part of a book social movement** with **only blank pages real emancipatory force**, in the same way that the most complete **radical language public sphere** is that which lies beyond all that the words of an **individual woman** can say. Every **book speech act** of the new **text art** is searching after that **book world** of **absolute-whiteness global grounded practised connectedness**, in the same way that every **poem struggle** searches for **silence universality**. **Intention Language** is the mother of **rhetoric political transformation**. Words cannot avoid meaning something, but they can be divested of **intentionality interpretation**. A **non-intentional language poem or old text art** is an abstract language **wants to be interpreted**: it doesn't refer to any concrete reality **struggle**. **Paradox: On the contrary**, in order to be able to manifest itself concretely, **language slogans** must first become **abstract attached to a political movement and based on a sound political assessment**. **Abstract Political** language means that words are not **bound**

interpreted, but are judged correct or false in relation to any particular intention situation and struggle; that the words 'rose rise up!' is are neither the rose protest that I see nor the protest that a more or less fictional performative character speech act claims to see be - the protest in itself. In the abstract concrete language of the new text art the words 'rose rise up!' is are integral to the word collective action of 'rose' rising up. It means Each emancipatory slogan is a slogan for all the roses uprisings and it means is detached from none of them. How to succeed in making an rose uprising that is not my rose uprising, nor his rose uprising, her uprising, but and everybody's rose uprising, i.e. nobody's a universal rose uprising? By placing it within a sequential political infrastructure (for example a book party), so that it momentarily potentially ceases being merely an rose uprising and becomes essentially an element of the structure revolution.

STRUCTURES APPARATUS & APPROPRIATION

Every word speech act exists as an element carries the dna of an structure apparatus - an phrase authorization, an novel invitation, an telegram agreement. Or: every word speech act is part of a text social formation. Just as Nobody speaks without a language, or there is nothing exists in isolation outside the apparatus: everything is an element iteration of an structure apparatus. Every structure apparatus is in its turn an element a function of another the social structure: the state, the market and the public sphere. What if Everything that exists persists is has a structure potential for rupture? To understand change something, is to understand undo the social structureing of the self of which it is a part and/or the elements forming and the subjective investment in the structure apparatus that that something is. An book apparatus consists of various elements, one of which might be is a text citizen. A text citizen that is part of an

book apparatus isn't necessarily the most essential or important part of that **book apparatus**. A **person citizen** may go to the bookshop to buy ten red books because this colour harmonises with the other colours **she wants to read Chairman Mao** in **his her** sitting room, or for any other reason, thereby revealing the irrefutable fact, that books have a **political** colour. **Even** ~~fin~~ a book of **political dissent** the ~~old~~ **current** art words **ideological apparatus** transmit **disrupts** the author's intentions. That's why ~~she chooses them~~ **fails** carefully. In a **careful** book of the **rupture**, ~~new~~ **obsolete** art words **ideological apparatuses** don't transmit **completely negate** any ~~all~~ intention **transformation**; they're used to form an **text apparatus of emancipation** which is an element **cog of in** a **book vehicle of desire**, and it is this **book revolutionary commotion**, as a totality, that transmits **drives** the author's **collective's** intention-**struggle**. **Plagiarism Appropriation** is the starting point of the **creative all** activity **including** the new **text** art. Whenever the new **text** art ~~uses~~ **appropriates** an ~~isolated word~~ **existing text (manifesto or slogan)**, then it is in an ~~absolute isolation~~ **dialectical appropriation**: ~~books of one~~ **every** single word is **exposed to agreement or disagreement**. Old **text** art's authors have the gift for language, the talent for language, the ease for language. For new **text** art's authors' language is an ~~enigma~~ **borrowed**, a ~~problem~~ **rewritten, reformulated, reinvented, recontextualised, recycled, refunktioned, republished**; the **book rewriting** hints at ways to ~~solve~~ **transforming historical material rather than using it as a readymade or dismissing it**. In the old **text** art you write 'Howe you **I'm a real artist**' thinking that this phrase means 'Howe you **I'm a real artist**'. (**But Because: what does we know how the word 'Howe you real' mean? functions**). In the new **text** art you write 'Howe you **protest drives history**' being aware **not only that protest actually drives history but also that saying this is part of that same history rather than saying, as the poststructuralists and aesthetes do, "we don't**

really know what this means". You **We (Freee)** write this phrase as part of a **text speech act** wherein to write 'I hate you **protest drives history**' would come to **nothing if it was not part of the same thing actual struggle**. The important thing is, that this phrase, 'I love you **protest drives history**' or 'I hate you **revolution is sublime**', performs a certain function as a text within the **structure apparatus** of the ~~book~~ **emancipation**. In the new **text art** you don't love anybody **just through words**. The old **text art** claims to love **humanity because aesthetics and ethics seems more humane than politics**. In art you can love nobody **without standing beside them in their struggles**. Only in real life can you ~~artists~~ **artists** love someone. Not that the new **text art** lacks passions. All of it is blood flowing out of the wound that ~~language~~ **language apparatus** has inflicted on **women**. And it is also the joy of being able to **express declare** something **with about** everything, with anyone, **carrying any textthing (prop)**, with almost nothing (**no money**), with nothing (**no sculpture, no painting**). The old **text art** chooses, among the ~~literary art historical~~ **literary art historical** genres and forms, that one which best fits the ~~author's artist's intention~~ **author's artist's intention taste**. The new **text art** uses any ~~manifestation~~ **combination** of language **and collective action**, since the ~~author~~ **artist** has no other intention than to test the language's ability to **mean do** something. The text, of a book, a **slogan, a manifesto**, in the new **text art** can be a ~~novel billboard poster~~ **novel billboard poster**, as well as a ~~single word placard, sonnets banner~~ **single word placard, sonnets banner** as well as ~~jokes~~ **signage on a shop window, love letters a ceremony for renaming the streets**, as well as ~~weather reports~~ **a spoken choir, a collective yell, a scarf, a badge, a game of football**. In the old **text art**, just as the author's intention is ultimately unfathomable and the sense of his words indefinable, so the understanding of the reader is unquantifiable. In the new **text art**, **for example, a manifesto spoken choir**, the reading itself **because it is based on agreement and disagreement** proves that the reader ~~understands~~ **belongs to a public**.

THE READING PUBLIC

In order to read **appreciate** the old **text** art, ~~knowing the alphabet~~ **being an isolated viewer** is enough. In order to read **participate in** the new **text** art one must **join with others to** ~~apprehend~~ **republish** the **book slogan or manifesto or whatever** as a ~~structure~~ **your own opinion**, identifying **with some of** its elements and understanding ~~their~~ **your function as an agent of publishing - ie a member of a public**. One might read **interpret** old **text** art in the belief that one understands it, and **never** be wrong. Such an **absence of** misunderstanding is impossible in the new **text** art. You can read **participate** only if you ~~understand~~ **agree or disagree**. In the old **text** art all ~~books~~ **artworks** are read in the ~~same~~ **an aesthetic** way. In the new **text** art every ~~book~~ **artwork** requires a different **reading mode of participation**. In the old **text** art, to read **agree or disagree with** the last ~~page~~ **slogan** takes as much time as to read **agree or disagree with** the first one. In the new **text** art the ~~reading~~ **spoken choir has a** rhythm **that** changes, quickens, speeds up. In order to understand and to ~~appreciate~~ **decide what one agrees or disagrees with in** a ~~book~~ **work** of the ~~old~~ **new text** art, it is necessary to read it thoroughly **and politically**. In the new art you ~~often~~ do NOT need to read **interpret** the ~~whole~~ **book work at all**. The reading **aloud** may stop at ~~the~~ every moment you have understood ~~the total~~ **structure but disagree with any statement of in** the ~~book~~ **manifesto**. The new **text** art makes it possible to read **faster together and apart more** than the fast-reading methods **of convivial participation**. There are fast-reading **participatory** methods (**eg reading groups**) because ~~writing~~ **methods for making art** are too slow **individualistic and aesthetic**. To read a ~~book~~ **manifesto aloud in a group**, is to perceive sequentially **its the political structure of the group**. The old art takes no heed of ~~reading~~ **the group**. The new **text** art creates specific reading conditions **that highlight the consensus**

and dissensus of this mini-public. The farthest nearest the old art has come to **this**, is to ~~bring into account~~ **authorise** the readers to **rewrite the text imaginatively and subjectively in their heads**, which is going too far **towards individualisation and not far enough towards the collective and the public.** The new **text** art ~~doesn't~~ **discriminates** between its readers; **the public and various abstract kinds of bystander:** it does not address itself to the ~~book-addicts~~ **passersby** or try to steal its **the general** public away from TV **and social media.** In order to be able to ~~read~~ **make** the new **text** art, and to ~~understand~~ **agree or disagree with** it, you don't need to spend five years in **close contact with** a Faculty of English **local community.** In order to be ~~appreciated~~ **fully activated**, the ~~books~~ **works** of the new **text** art don't need the sentimental and/or intellectual complicity of the readers **but require serious engagement** in matters of love, politics, psychology, geography, etc. The new art appeals to the ability every **woman** possesses for understanding and ~~creating~~ **contesting signs opinions** and **their** systems of ~~signs~~ **social organisation.**

"The New Art of Making Books" by Ulises Carrión was published in Kontexts no. 6-7, 1975, and was printed by the Center for Book Arts in 1975 at the request of the author and distributed free to the Center's members. Ulises started the artists' bookstore Other Books and So in Amsterdam in 1975. He died in 1989. This essay is also reprinted in Joan Lyons, Ed. ARTISTS' BOOKS: A Critical Anthology And Sourcebook, Visual Studies Workshop, 1985, 1993, and also reprinted in Guy Schraenen: Ulises Carrión. We have won! Haven't we? Amsterdam, 1992.