A major purpose of this paper is to focus attention on the way in which institutions of art (academies, art galleries, museums etc.) confer a creative role on some men, whilst denying it to other men. If societies distribute unequal life-chances through their mechanisms of political and economic control, then one important aspect of those life-chances is to do with the production and consumption of art. However, the values of art are so often projected as being fundamentally antagonistic to the core values of industrial living, that their function as agents of social and cultural differentiation is usually obscured. The values of art 'appear' as antagonistic to those of rational bourgeois culture: art is a 'superior reality' encountered in opposition to the experiences of our daily lives at home and in the industrial sphere. Such an opposition is sustained in the advice of one contemporary art historian on the matter of collecting works of art:

"One of the great mistakes new collectors can make is to try conscientiously to find a work of art that will match colors in a particular room... Works of art are meant to speak for themselves. They should function independently in their own surroundings, and because they are unique creations that will probably outlive man and man-produced wares, should take unquestioned precedence."1

And it is also sustained in the view that the artist is a special person, apart, whose province is beyond the mundane world and whose works are (sooner or later) sanctified in the inner recesses of museums, galleries and academies.

The hiatus between artist and public, culturally defined as a matter of the consumer's ignorance or philistinism is in itself a division of artistic labour that underscores the most fundamental values of industrial capitalism. As Fernand Léger put it: people "believe in art makers because they too have a trade."2 In holding this belief men unwittingly conspire in their own aesthetic impoverishment.

A proper understanding of this problem of aesthetic impoverishment is a matter, not of locating the intrinsic characteristics of the consumer (bad art education) but of grasping the way in which such characteristics are given in the relations of artistic production and consumption. Likewise the characteristics of the producer are to be understood in terms of his/her orientations as occupant of an artistic role. Thus, the role of the contemporary artist as an autonomous creative ego is the end product of a process of atomization amongst art producers that has been going on since the beginning of the last century. That atomization has been brought about by massive changes in the focus of power within the art world (structured by external social processes) and by the proliferation of agents and functionaries who live off the artist's 'alienation' and the public's 'ignorance'. Viewed in this way art institutions can be seen correctly in their function as mechanisms of control and legitimation in relation to the existing division of artistic labour.

At any given moment an existing division of artistic labour has emergent properties. These can only be grasped through a recognition of the systemic character of its relations, and the way they are articulated to the broader spheres of social power and culture. Pierre Bourdieu has drawn attention to the way in which one such emergent property can be the pattern of competition amongst artists for "intellectual consecration and legitimacy" in the eyes of the consumer; and also to the way in which the artist is defined not only by his position in the relations of artistic production, but also by the authority that he exercises or claims to exercise over the public.

"This authority represents both the prize and at the same time to some extent the empire of the competition for intel-
lectual consecration and legitimacy. It may be the upper classes who, by their social standing, sanction the rank of the works they consume in the hierarchy of legitimate works. Also, it may be specific institutions such as the educational system and academies which by their authority and their teaching consecrate a certain kind of work and a certain type of cultivated man. Equally it may be literary or artistic groups, coteries, critical circles, ‘salons’ or ‘cafés’ which have a recognised role as cultural guides or ‘taste-makers’.?

Now the relationship between that authority and patterns of creative activity is a matter of considerable interest. From the point of view of its social organisation an art world can be viewed as a system which confers different degrees of access to the creative principles of a particular epoch. Some men may have the right to interpret those principles, others only to learn and acknowledge their validity. Some men may have the power to change them, whilst others can do nothing but conform. Some men may have the autonomy enabling them to escape or remain uninfluenced, others may find themselves sucked in and crushed by them. And some men may believe in them, uphold them and celebrate them in their day-to-day activities as artists or critics, whilst others deny their validity and even execrate them.

If artistic relations are structured in this manner, then the way in which various kinds of artists possess differential access to power and authority is also a matter of considerable interest. As Bourdieu points out: not all art forms enjoy the same position of cultural legitimacy, and if some artists within “the entirely consecrated arts” of, say, painting or sculpture fail to gain the intellectual of the public, so too do all the producers of some art forms.

We must, therefore, distinguish between art forms where artistic elites have successfully arrogated authority in aesthetic matters, where the consumer tends to exercise only intellectual deference, and those art forms where an independent aesthetic with portals guarded by artists, critics and teachers has failed to emerge. It frequently happens that the failure of a particular art form to achieve intellectual autonomy is at least partly a consequence of the fact that its practitioners find access to major avenues of power and prestige blocked by an artistic elite.

In some cases this may well depend on the fact that an established elite simply wishes to insulate its artistic image from that of ‘inferior’ activities. The distinction between different kinds of artistic activities (arts and crafts) may well be inscribed in broader cultural distinctions (theoretical and practical knowledge) from which the artistic elite draws its identity and shibboleths. The elite may well fear the direct competition of the less ‘consecrated’ art, and seek to limit its power by denying it access to the institutions of patronage and the market. Or the elite may have extended its power and authority directly into the sphere of production of another art-form, exercising a kind of aesthetic domination in that region.

The history of an institution like the London Royal Academy is punctuated with incidents which are expressions of these kinds of relations — competition, domination, conflict and rebellion — between artistic groupings holding different amounts of power and authority in relation to the public. In this context art institutions like academies, colleges, galleries and journals can be seen in one of their key functions as distributors of artistic life-chances. It is necessary to focus attention on four aspects of this role.

a. The institutionalization of particular definitions of art which confer an aesthetic structure on the world. Thus art is found here and not there; it is, for example, opposed to and excluded by a machine culture, or popular culture.
b. The differential transmission of the knowledge of those definitions and of the principles that underly them.
c. The celebration of certain kinds of men as artists.
d. The hierarchical regulation of access to power and privilege so that some men are totally excluded from what is publicly recognized as the artistic community, whilst others are given only a qualified membership.

Artists and Artisans

From its foundation in 1768 the London Royal Academy was dominated by particular groups of artists — painters, sculptors and architects. Rather than viewing them primarily as artists, it is better to see them as men who successfully claimed that role and had access to certain creative principles. The Academy was an institution in which the so-called Fine Arts were enshrined, and amongst these painting had a particularly prominent position.

And yet these artists depended on craftsmen for much of their influence in what was a growing market. An important basis for the power and authority of painters was the widespread dissemination of their ideas and work through the medium of reproductive engraving. A major function of the engraver in this period (prior to the development of, and adequate technical advances in photography) was in fact the reproduction of paintings. However, this was no happy cooperation between artist and artisan. There were conflicts and tensions between them, flowing from their mutual interaction within the relations of artistic production.

The picture that emerges from an examination of the inter-actions between these two groups is one of artistic domination. The art of the engraver was subordinated to that of the painter. The function of the engraver was essentially to reproduce the aesthetic of the painter, and to transmit the properties of paint.

The idea that engraving was an art in its own right with special properties and a special aesthetic was a challenge to the artistic assumptions of the Academy, closely allied as they were to the pre-eminent status of painting. But the association between engraving and reproduction tended to encourage the intellectual subordination of the engraver, and to sustain a view that he was bereft of intellect. It is in the relationship between painting and engraving that we must locate many of the properties that were thought to be intrinsic characteristics of the latter activity, particularly its inferiority as an art.

Whatever we think of his indictment on Victorian art, whatever we think of his remedy, it remains true that the writings of William Morris provide us with crucial insights into the social context of creativity. For he recognized that the “flattering-craving flunkey” in the artist, and the “brutal tail-worn slave” in the artisan were both emanations of the division of labour in art and society. He sought to identify the artist and the artisan, not as isolated phenomena, but in terms of their mutual relations within artistic production. William Morris wrote:

“The artist came out from the handymen, and left them without hope of elevation, while he himself was left without the help of intelligent, industrious sympathy. Both have suffered; the artist no less than the workman.”

The humble handmaiden of painting

The earliest techniques of engraving — woodcutting, copper engraving and etching — were developed in the workshops of painters, sculptors, woodcarvers and goldsmiths in the fifteenth century. It is known that painters such as Pollaiuolo, Mantegna,
were all directly involved in the making of prints. The sixteenth-century treatise on goldsmithing and sculpture by the Italian Benvenuto Cellini contains a chapter on the manufacture of acids, "one for parting, the other engraving and etching". And of course our own William Hogarth was apprenticed to a silver-plate engraver.

But by the close of the eighteenth century, with certain important exceptions, the activities of painting and engraving had become largely insulated from each other. Early symptoms of this situation can be traced back as far as the time of Durer and Raphael. In England, in the second half of the seventeenth century, the diarist John Evelyn lamented the reluctance of painters to take up engraving. In the following century the engraver George Vertue noted that as soon as people with a training in engraving got a start in painting or sculpture, they ignored their first calling.

Throughout the nineteenth century, despite the fact that there were painters who practised engraving, the status of "artist" was something only begrudgingly conferred on men who made their living from engraving. In the minds of many nineteenth-century commentators the artist might be an engraver, but it did not follow that the engraver was an artist. And the claim that an engraver was an artist was likely to draw ridicule, irony, or at the very least a sideways glance.

Thus, in Mark Rutherford’s *Clara Hopgood*, the character Frederick Dennis is sarcastically introduced as a wood-engraver who “preferred to call himself, an artist”. A meeting at the Royal Academy was once reduced to laughter by the very suggestion that a monument be erected in Westminster Abbey to the memory of the engraver William Woollett.

If biographers ever have their readers yawning about their subject by the first page, first prize for this achievement must surely go to the author of *Charles Turner, Engraver*.

"To write the biography of an engraver, is as a rule, to tell the story of a stay-at-home... an engraver generally leads a humdrum existence. He learns his craft in his master's studio, and there after practises it from morning to night, almost year in year out, on his own. Few stirring incidents come his way, and his circle is limited to the artists whose work he interprets, his brother craftsmen whose society he enjoys, and the print sellers who profit by his labours."

Half a century earlier, in 1853; Ruskin had drawn less attention to the fact that the occupation was bereft of interest and excitement, than to its sheer squalor. If you buy an engraving, he informed his Edinburgh audience, you pay a man to work in dirty conditions whilst he breathes noxious fumes and laboriously copies another man's work.

Both descriptions were fundamentally true of the lives and working conditions of a large number of nineteenth-century craftsmen who worked in the name of Art. Theirs was the fate of the "brutal tail-worn slave" condemned to the most sycophantic of roles in their relations with painters and to a growing exploitation by the entrepreneurial interests of the market.

**Industrialization and Art**

One feature of industrialization was the development of new forms of occupational control and authority. This is most obvious in those occupations most directly linked to the industrial process, for example, in the development of the textile industry outside the authority of the guilds. But the creation of new wealth, both great and moderate, had an impact on a range of occupations. Law, medicine and art are examples of occupations which had been largely under the hegemony of aristocratic and ecclesiastical elites. With industrialization, however, the demand for these services was diffused to new sectors of society, particularly to the middle classes.
There were several symptoms of this development with respect to the visual arts. One was the emergence and growing popularity of public exhibitions from the middle decades of the eighteenth century. The growth of art journalism was another sign. The declared intention of policy by the editor of *The Art Journal* in December of 1849, clearly reflects a new force in the visual arts — the small purchaser. He wrote:

"We shall commence the year 1850 with renewed vigour and augmented resources. We shall endeavour, by rendering ‘good Art cheap’, to place its most meritorious examples in the hands of ‘the many’ so to become sources of pleasure and instruction . . . ."

And this was to be done through the publication of engravings after paintings located in famous collections. By 1855 *The Art Journal* had worked its way through the collection of Robert Vernon, and was making a start on pictures from the Royal Collection.

In the second half of the eighteenth century the world of engraving had become a world of big business and capital investment. The market for engravings of all sorts, illustrations, portraits, maps, landscapes and reproductions of paintings had grown. According to one authority, prior to 1725, there were only two print shops in London. By the 1840s there were about twenty print sellers in London with turnovers averaging £16,000 per annum. One business was said to have reached £22,000.7

It was through engraving that a growing middle class demand for information about paintings and the art world was satisfied. It was through engraving that painters could hope to reach new publics, and develop a broader interest in their art. This interdependence between painter and public mediated via the engraver, provided the basis for the emergence of new functions, roles and institutions. In particular it favoured the emergence of the engraver as a mechanical copyist, the growth of relatively large workshops, and the appearance of powerful entrepreneurs — middle men — who had the contacts with painters and a specialized knowledge of the market.

It is important to stress the nature of the growing demand for art. It was a demand structured in terms of certain received aesthetic categories. These categories were themselves an expression of the division of labour in art which had emerged in association with academies, and had made painters, sculptors and architects members of a liberal profession.

Thus, although the relationship between the Academy, its ideals and an increasingly differentiated purchasing power became one focus of change in English aesthetics, one thing tended to remain relatively stable. This was the central role played by the portable painting, either in the form of a direct demand for this kind of art, or for information about it. It was the relatively high consensus on the importance of painting in an expanding art world (expanding particularly with respect to the small purchaser) that favoured the reproduction of paintings through engraving.

From the point of view of the painter an engraved reproduction of his painting could be of paramount importance in spreading his fame and providing money. For example, in 1822 the engraving firm Robinson and Hurst agreed to pay Thomas Lawrence £3,000 per year for the exclusive right of engraving his paintings.8

So, one feature of the economic and social developments associated with industrialization was the growth in size and complexity of the institutions servicing the needs of ‘fine art’, exhibitions, journals, critics, dealers, publishers and the specialists in reproduction.

Anonymous artisans

It is true that everyone who turned his hand to engraving during the nineteenth
century was not an artisan reduced to mechanical servitude by painters and the machinery of the market. But one effect of the way in which the academic ideologies intersected with the changing patterns of consumption in art was the creation of a kind of engraver of whom this was true. Such men were to be found in the line engraving shops like that of James Heath (1757-1834), or the wood engraving shops of men like the Dalziel brothers in the second half of the last century. The engraving workshops were highly efficient, rationalized organizations, with production carried on in a kind of semifactory fashion. There was a division of labour (already apparent in the fact that the engraver was copying another man's design) such that pupils and assistants would specialize in engraving particular portions of a picture, and might never reach the stage where they could engrave a whole plate themselves. The subjection of engravers to this kind of work was made possible by the routinization of the engraving process itself. In extreme situations this went far enough for the necessary skills to be directly transferable from other kinds of production. For example, in 1839 one commentator reported a case where the labour for mezzotint engraving had been recruited from a pool of unemployed buckle workers. In the wood engraving shops of the 1860s the block might be broken up into several pieces, and each given to a different engraver.

Employment in an engraving workshop was associated with a drudgery that confined the artisan to narrow areas of engraving, and even denied him the public recognition of his own signature on his own work. On one occasion the engraver John Pye managed to carry through some work on his own, only to discover that his employer's name had been added to the plate. On another occasion he found that an agreement that he should do a piece of work had been revoked, and the job taken over by his boss. It seems that Heath intended using a team of assistants, one of whom was to be Pye. Pye refused to co-operate on these terms and even managed to whip up some support from his fellow assistants.

But more important than the length of the working day was the intellectual subordination of many engravers. At its most extreme the relationship was one of complete subordination. The personality of the engraver found no expression in the end product. Some of the worst excesses were reached with wood engraving where the picture (transferred to the block by hand or later by photographic means) had to be protected from the very sweat and breath of the engraver. As the artist Hubert Herkomer put it in 1882:

"... the lines are all drawn by the artist, and if the engraver renders them
well, the drawing should bear no trace of his hand."  

The developments which took place in the production of wood engravings during the second half of the last century are a very good illustration of the way in which the growth of commercial interests combined with academic interests to eliminate creativity.

Design, creativity and power

The point has already been made that all nineteenth century engravers did not conform to the stereotyped image of the humble craftsman. There were men who carried through original work in one or other of the engraving media. There were men who attempted to combine the functions of design and execution.

But even in the case of a man like Blake, trained as an engraver and anxious to execute his own designs, the production of his prints might be taken out of his hands and placed in those of a specialist engraver. This happened with his designs for Blair's Grave, when the publisher Cromek passed them on to the engraver Schiarvonetti. The difficulties that faced men who tried to draw a living from original work as engravers are amply illustrated in the life of Samuel Palmer. He would have liked to have been an oil painter, but found the medium difficult. His real aptitudes lay with water colour painting and etching, particularly with the latter. Isolated from high status art and the rewards associated with it, Palmer was left vulnerable to the vagaries of an impersonal market with its unscrupulous dealers and print sellers. The difficulties that faced a man who brought to engraving the same creative powers that other men reserved for painting are well illustrated in his observation that:

"It is my misfortune to work slowly, not from any wish to niggle, but because I cannot otherwise get certain shimerings of light, and the mysteries of shadow; so that only a pretty good price would yield journeyman's wages."  

If a market dominated by the Academy was unfavourable to the designer who worked the plate himself, there were corners of the art world, groups of artists and traditions, where signs of resistance are to be spotted. If we go back to the founder members of the Academy, Paul Sandby and Thomas Gainsborough are examples, we can find men who did their own etchings. And certain illustrators like George Cruickshank were publicly known through work they etched themselves. In the middle decades of the century a group of Academicians, including Thomas Creswick (1811-1869) and Charles West Cope (1811-1899) carried out original etching. However, in the case of the illustrators market forces favoured a division of labour in the long run. And in the case of the Academicians it was an interest that was pushed into the most private and intimate areas of their lives. The art for which Creswick, Cope, and others were known was oil painting, and it was as such that they obtained academic honours.

And, if we look at the Royal Academy more closely, it is difficult to see how things could have been otherwise. The single most prestigious and powerful institution of English art (its prestige confirmed by a King's charter, its power flowing from a particular configuration of aristocratic and bourgeois support) defined engravers as inferior artists.

The position of engravers as members of the Royal Academy was inferior to the one they had enjoyed in earlier art institutions. It was also less than they must have expected from the sorts of plans that had been put forward for the founding of an Academy in the 1750s and '60s. Yet, in 1768 engravers were totally excluded, and only admitted as inferior artists (associate members) in 1769. Over the years a recurrent feature of academic politics was to
do with the debate about the relative status of engraving and engravers.

In reply to an engravers' petition of 1812, seeking an improvement in their status, the leaders of the Royal Academy replied that:

"... the relative pre-eminence of the Arts has ever been estimated accordingly as they more or less abound in those intellectual qualities of Invention and Composition, which Painting, Sculpture and Architecture so eminently possess, but of which Engraving is wholly devoid."

But dissident engravers initiated a debate that could not be ignored. Their case was carried before successive monarchs, into Parliament and into the art press, and it was argued both privately and publicly by men such as John Landseer and John Pye.

On a much more external front, the Academy found itself (in the last quarter of the nineteenth century) in confrontation with another group of engravers - the etchers. It is important to recognize the distinctive features of this relationship, for the challenge presented by the etchers was of a more fundamental nature.

The demands of John Landseer and others in the first half of the last century had been for a limited autonomy within the hierarchy of academic values, for some recognition of their creative, but nonetheless subordinate role. But in the case of the etchers, led by Francis Seymour Haden, the demand was the uncompromising one of full recognition as an independent and original art. In 1890 Haden recalled how,

"For twenty years we sent in to the Royal Academy original etchings which have since acquired a European reputation ... In the Royal Academy they met with no encouragement whatever. When a vacancy occurred among its members, it was supplied by the election of the copyist engraver, and not by the original etcher; so that at last, worn out by the unequal struggle, we abandoned further effort, and formed the present society."15

In 1883 he had delivered a paper to the Royal Society of Arts in which he asserted that etching and engraving were fine arts, and that their practitioners ought to have an appropriate status within the Academy. He had, however, already formed a society in 1880 (eventually to become the Royal Society of Painter-Etchers) in order to extend public knowledge of original etching, particularly through the organization of exhibitions. Thus, a group of artists successfully fought for the public recognition as art of work where the functions of design and execution were not separated. Such a success was a fundamental denial of the legitimacy of the Academy's definitions of artistic worth. How was this success possible?

It is not possible to give a detailed answer here, but the major condition of the etchers' success lay in the fact that relations between them and the Academy were increasingly structured by factors which were outside the orbit of academic influence.

Hierarchical, elitist and powerful, the Royal Academy had originally managed to edge competing societies out of business and to absorb those elements that threatened its pre-eminence. However, the continued growth of a loosely organized purchasing power for fine art (originally one of the factors that had preserved the independence of academic artists from aristocratic control)16 increasingly accommodated artistic interests and institutions that threatened its dominance in matters of art.

The kind of domination exerted by the Academy in the market created contradictions and tensions which helped to galvanise new forms of artistic consciousness. In particular, the elitist and exclusive policies of the Academy, combined with a growth in both the numbers of producers and consumers, and forced many artists (in some cases painters in other cases engravers) to seek
alternative forms of institutional support. One possibility was the creation of separate professional organizations, another was to associate with specialist agents in the marketing of art - art dealers - who played an increasingly important role in the nineteenth-century artistic career. But, so far as engraving was concerned these developments were the bases of change in the relationship between painting and engraving that were to bring fruit only in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. During the nineteenth century the relationship between creativity and power was such that engraving tended either to be subordinated to painting, or publically unrecognized as an independent art.

It would be naive to believe that painters were acting consciously and crudely in their own interests. Rather the evidence suggests that painters and engravers were locked in a system of artistic production that sustained both the fact of the engraver's intellectual impoverishment (through his weak economic position) and the image of his inferiority (through the hierarchical status system of the Academy).

A new guild of craftsmen?

Do the old fine arts still exist and exercise the rights of artistic privilege that they possessed historically? Without a doubt the power and privileges of the fine arts have been eroded, the old boundaries of subject and medium have become blurred, losing much of their legitimacy. In 1900 the art master of Harrow could write:

"Painting and sculpture no longer arrogate to themselves the whole of the kingdom of Art."\textsuperscript{17}

And without a doubt that comment reflected a relative change in the balance of power within the art world, of which the growing importance of etching in the previous decades was one symptom.

But still, seventy-five years after that observation, there is evidence that the old distinctions persist and that some of old imperialistic claims of the fine arts continue to be made. In 1967 the print maker Michael Rothenstein maintained that:

"In painting and sculpture we are long past the day when study was broken down purely on the basis of different techniques ... In print making alone this attitude tends to persist; each area, etching, lithography and so on, boxed in with minimal overlap with related areas and with the school of fine art."\textsuperscript{18}

Even more recently, the contemporary debate about the 'polytechnicization' of the art colleges has sharpened the old lines of conflict. In attacking the Government's policy of integrating the art schools with polytechnics, the painter Patrick Heron has argued that the fundamental autonomy of the art schools (a condition of the dynamism of British art during the past decade) is now threatened. And in making this attack Heron has brought traditional artistic quarrels to the attention of the public. He argues that it is the non-fine-art departments that have been partly to blame, that they "become Trojan horse enthusiasts for polytechnicization" and helped to bring this great calamity down upon the fine arts.\textsuperscript{19}

But, as Heron argues, correctly, it is not they but painting and sculpture which have been at the focus of artistic activity in the past. Other activities, such as graphics, textile and ceramics have always "crystalised" around painting and sculpture. Heron is right to situate the problem in its historical context. Indeed his own arguments and beliefs have a long and respected pedigree, reaching back hundreds of years. Nearly two hundred years ago James Barry, Professor of Painting and the Royal Academy, subscribed to the same views when he asserted that "our tapestry workers do nothing excellent without a painted exemplar".\textsuperscript{20}
It is difficult to avoid taking seriously, at least the possibility, that the 'fine art' view feeds on some contemporary educational practices in our schools. Readers of this Journal will be familiar with the equivocal position occupied by craft courses in the curricula of our schools. A recent article has raised some critical issues concerning the academic status of crafts, their usefulness in the curriculum, and their relationship to design education. The author gives a brief report on the recruitment patterns into craft teaching, suggesting that craft and its teachers are denied a "basic equality" with other kinds of subjects and teachers. Furthermore,

"... the growing failure of college and education departments to attract adequately qualified entrants indicates that pupils and therefore parents and advisers who influence them, do not rate craft and craft teaching as sufficiently worthwhile activities."21

It would be a mistake to reduce the complexities of the situation to any simple formula. In some contexts art and craft are lumped together22 and seem to suffer almost equally under the vagaries educational decision making and the school time-table. On the other hand it is pretty clear that the education system does function as a transmitter of the distinction between the two spheres.23 At the very least children are socialized into definitions which may be grist for other educational mills.

It may be that a latent function of the school curriculum is to socialize children out of active artistic roles. The "Crowther" report showed how under the pressure of overcrowded timetables grammar school children were encouraged to abandon parts of the available curriculum. It also drew attention to the fact that whilst "art appreciation" was provided for six formers, there were few opportunities in the way of actually painting or sculpting.24 Here perhaps are the grass roots of socialization into the role of passive consumer, even if it is only consumption of reproductions. Much more recent evidence suggests that things may be different in comprehensive schools,25 although it is also clear that in England many different kinds of educational practice can go on behind walls with a common new sign posted up.
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