what do the different types of inserts, graphic tools, calaus types of printing mean?

RELATIONSHIPS OF UNEQUAL POWER: SOME RESISTANCE

Entanglement is less hierarchical than embeddment. In a condition of entanglement, one text does not have to be smaller One example of entanglement is interlinear discussion than the other, and when it is, then the sense of its secondariness is and commentary. This might take the form of dialogue, immediately established. This text might suggest that the role of refutation, objection, agreement, expansion, extension, entanglement is mere commentary, exposition without any relation or any of an infinite number of other positions. to the text into which it is inserted. However, the opposite is true. Entanglement complicates a text.

This text makes it difficult to read the first text on its own.

Other approaches to entanglement might involve the in-

troduction of alternative texts (tasks) or forms of contra-Puns and bomonyms entangle the text on the axis of substitution. But their parenthetical placement moots/mm diction into the field of textual production (promotion).

At first glance, the pull quote seems unable to

As the multiple levels of text begin to work into and out

of each other, the concept of entanglement becomes The terms of entanglement are closely related to more and more evident. The relation of one text to anthose of associational and permutational operations. other and each text to many and all others inside a work The variants proliferate internally, by virtue of sug-and outside creates a fully entangled field. If the full efgestion, as surely as they connect any extant text fect of embeddment is to produce tensions from within a with the possibilities of other lineages. The interlinfield of textual play, then the full effect of entanglment is to connect any single text to the matrix of all others.

If a text attempts to stand alone, announcing itself merely by appearing on the page, then what are the chances that it will be left without interference? Almost nil. The force of attraction of one text to another practically generates commentary, as if the need to intervene, contravene, make a statement on any other statement were contained within the text. + A seed of controversy, or at the least, dialogue, is contained in any statement, merely by virtue of having been made.6 Its assertions, however mild, are as evident as the shape of the block on the page, which says, I begin here and end there, which has to be a fiction, of sorts, because no boundedness can sustain itself.

The act of indentation, of beginning again with the whole, makes an initial nod towards the indebtedness of

engage with entangling propositions.5

any element to another. The dependencies of forms upon each other is a principle of the relational nature of the system within which the elements appear on the page.

This is another section, and refers itself to the preexisting sections by conforming to the habits established. The shape of the text respects the need for gutters and margins, but the simple march of lines across the sheet claims space according to regulations disciplined to show their decorum. The single interruption on this page shows that another discourse exists elsewhere with continuities

4. Once again the lower depths, pushing upward, crouching down, doing both simultanteously, register their presence as a counterforce. Easily ignored, in their small scale and lowly place, they are also a site that attracts the eye, as if their diminished scale performed (and it does) an act of relative conceitment. The beneathness of the space in which notes operate makes them appear insignificant but fraught, full of a pent energy that is compressed into this tight articulation. These lines become too long, too difficult to read, and yet, command a scale change in attention.
5. Introducing a note at a larger scale threatens the consistency of discourse. Where is that number? In what rets stream does it belong? Does it rupture the continuity of the text block, again reinforcing the force of the call-out?

---- diagrammatic writing, johanna drucker

180mm

other to fight for attention - 10 not strict competition agnostic struggle text header inflects text navigational purpose subordacte tex + connot claims authority the passage above " it's all wrong ", role of helpful voice nothing produces anxiety What could have been? Singular line defines text inside another neutro, decorative porprotive not aggressive, supporting voice? bold line each of the subsequent lines step down to suggest on embedded relation to that above changing size of text slowly supports relative Supports relation text smaller but with significant speak suggests autorany oronos sits confortably not featnote, not madinal bat of myole changing the point size couses to dominate enfrome add clarify? commerting my vice? footnotes, take up as much space as they wont they confor the text ca be agoversive elements of dialogue not dolo to dreaty interese offer clority

sit next to each

single line defines the space repetition fulfil expectations of continuit ent ong lement dialoque, refutiation, agreement, expossion difficult to read one on it & our imposing, imperious force beceverything else to become backgrand marginalica ore like pebbles on the road foces questioning of the text your read

significantly smaller == magnala # : X

citation supports first text no dispute

organisation and order expands, mixes, changes suggest opening of the mind

push to gutter drain from attention

changing the grid to 1 = turned morgania questioning of the text more assuptively foces record to think? not discost

_o D blak space

new voices disrapts everything point changes perception of Sliciogue

refuting other side, takes up more space

changing agle slices up thangs becomes the new organisation suggest unembedded/relation to disagreeng the others

complete illegibility pressege offes na legibility must be a continuing factor only the commentary Hodricke

completel

toles co