

dialogue 2.02

Tetsuo Kagawa and Yasunao Tone

Lines of Sight #7. RWM 2008

10/5/08

YASUNAO TONE: You interviewed me six years ago for Intercommunication #39, Winter 2002.

In that interview you asked me what I thought about radioart since you considered me a radioartist. In the eighties I worked with you to experiment with a mini-FM radio station in New York, but that was it and I have never been involved in radio again, except for your interview with me on Radio Homerun in the year 2000, so I was surprised to hear you say such a thing. I didn't answer your question then but now I think that it can be answered for this occasion.

I recently read some texts of yours on the theme of radioart, your series of essays entitled "From MiniFM to Radioart", and "Radioart Manifest", an essay in SPECTROPIA - issue # 7.

In "Radioart Manifest", you talked about corporeality and the importance of hands but on the contrary, in the interview I talked about corporeality as virtual (it is almost anti-corporeality). We can probably start our discussion with this subject. While radioart implies a certain distance between remitter and receiver, your notion of radioart has to do with the hands, which implies the proximity of hands with consciousness, which is an essence of manual technic.

According to Jacques Derrida, Husserl's Origin of Geometry has something to do with the virtual community of Geometry, that members of the community are physically distant not only but also, temporally distant. Derrida also mentions mnemology relating to the topic.

So, my notion of radioart might be different from yours because my activities as a sound artist have something to do with my idea of radio, something about remoteness. Let me explain the difference between my recent work and my older work, the former can be summarized as essentially digital art that is always transformable to different medium with certain devices so that the influence of corporeal reality is irrelevant and there is no temporal distinction. The latter, although it involved digital technology, was for me an event, *an irreplaceable and irreversible empirical particular*. Then, I always considered my work as an event, which was impossible to change by my sensibility or taste by effectors, for instance, and which was always live performance.

10/8/08

TETSUO KAGAWA: From the start, we may go into the difficult topic of time. You refer to radio in relation to "remoteness", "temporal distance" and "mnemology". That inspired me a lot. But let me explain about my concept of radioart especially in relation to "hands" first.

I think that hands are not opposite to the virtual. Gilles Deleuze wrote, "The virtual is opposed not to the real but to the actual. The virtual is fully real so far as it is virtual." In hands, this very thing happens.

I don't consider hands as the representative of "consciousness" that you used with the connotation of "metaphysic of representation." Hands are the matrix of 'différance' to delay and accelerate. They could work without consciousness. Basically, as an unworthy follower of Maurice Merleau-Ponty on the ideas of body, (he refers to hands developing the idea of Husserl---dual functions of "subject" and "object".) So, I don't think that hands "change by one's sensibility or taste". In my "hand-waving" performance of radioart, my hands were not controlled by my senses nor by my taste. They played with airwaves as my body was led by the singularities of the airwaves. This act is not mediated by my consciousness. Also, I have to say that radioart does not consist of the set concept of emitter and receiver. The radio receiver is basically a transmitter. In transmission, one need not be conscious of receiver or of being received. Transmission itself has a kind of feedback in it: that's why it is called "<trans>mission". "Trans" of transmission is the key. So, a transmitter is an arrangement of "différance".

10/14/08

YT: You clarified my doubt. I was worried when you brought up the hands because it could be the hands by which you control a certain device or play an exact pitch with a Theremin. When I thought about that I imagined that manual technic which is called "tewaza" in Japanese.

By the way, in your "Radioart Manifest", you quote the book by Michael Nyman, "Experimental Music", in which Michael Nyman remarks on the hands and head. If you read only the quote it may fit your radioart, but Nyman's remark distorted Duchamp. What Duchamp really meant was that he was opposed to 'the hands' that paint and only appeal to the retina so he wanted to appeal to the mind. But Nyman changed the word 'mind', or 'l'esprit' to 'head'. The 'head', in the context of western classical music, has been based on the dichotomy of 'head' and 'hands' for the composer as head and performer as hands. What Nyman emphasized is merely the empirical fact that the composers, he thought, of experimental music had then started making improvisational music, but that does not automatically constitute the notion of experimental music. Nyman, in this particular context, even ignored the composers of experimental music such as the Sonic Arts Union who had started to build handmade electronic devices in the late sixties. The hands in music performing actually meant the 'virtuosity' and 'agility' of the hands which is not limited to the hand but also to the agility of the voice such as bel canto in western classical music, which has been important because of its proximity to the consciousness. For Nyman, the head is denied because it doesn't perform but writes music, however he never imagined that most improvisational musicians play sounds as a reflexion of their representational consciousness exactly as the head writes music. Nyman never understood experimental music in a Cagean sense, although his exemplifications of experimental music are mostly appropriate, and neither has he been an experimental composer.

I was about to deviate from the topic and talk about the current global economic crisis but the detour was too much so I skipped it.

Let's talk about our practice of radioart or a radioart I have thought about after your suggestion or provocation. My notion of radioart was influenced by your essays, but it is also nurtured by my practice as sound artist, so, I have to elaborate about why I thought the remoteness between two transmitters (however, originally I used terms, 'remitter and receiver') particularly important. That distance is real but hardly said to be physical because it is between two points in the network of transmitters, telephone wires, servers and computers which is always unspecified. In my performance, I also use many prerecorded sounds on CDRs. Probably I should have asked you to explain why you thought I was a radioartist as I mentioned in the beginning.

In the beginning of this dialogue I forgot to talk about how and why I recently came to the conclusion that the real time/live element of my performance was less important in the context of not necessarily but mainly in practicing digital art. Before that, I thought that performances of my prepared CD pieces were completely unique even though the same CDR was used, and also, there was no preconceived or projected sound image, so the result should have been unedited, unrepeated, uncontrolled and temporally and spatially singular. The sound I generate should have been neither from my conscious mind nor a projection of my mind. I shouldn't have known beforehand what was coming out. I thought that was why I had stuck with the *nowness of live performance*. In short, my performance had to be an event, so I thought that I couldn't simply perform reproduced sound. But the mentioned above are not necessarily exclusive with straight reproduced sound. Last year I was trying to move sound files from one hard disk to another after digitally processing many sound files so that the hard disks were severely fragmented and the heavy use of digital processing had destroyed the tree structure of my computer. As a result, I got a completely new piece, titled *GGGong*, without any conscious effort. But how I can perform this piece as an event, I thought, it was an event when I found it but actually it happened before I heard it, so there was no way to perform this piece as an event if I don't burn it on CDR and prepare it. Then, it wouldn't be the same piece. I have actually performed the piece several times, so I have sinned against my credo - not repeating myself. For the audience it didn't seem to matter. Moreover, digital technology has changed the concept of reproduction although analog technology too changed my notion of reproduced sound as in the following example.

The performance of the following pieces I am going to describe use both analog and digital technology and don't require hands explicitly. For example, I have performed "Paramedia Mix" and "Paramedia Music", "Paramedia Centripetal", they consist of many prerecorded CDs that are combined together as one monaural sound file and are electronically or digitally divided into 7 to 8 different frequency bands on a 7 to 8 channel speaker system. I had someone build a device that is able to alter frequency ranges from the narrowest single octave to

full range, 200 Hz to 20 KHz. When the outputs play seven divided frequency bands, the alteration of frequency ranges interact with each other and make a totally unexpected automatic collage of sounds. Also, if you simply change volumes the outcome produces another unexpected effect, something like automatic ring modulation, and the changes are totally unexpected. Again, if each CDR starts at a different time it alters the outcome.

The Paramedia pieces (analog version and digital version) are almost ideal for this purpose. Each performance is unique, each time, indefinitely and every time you listen it sounds different, also, it sounds different depending on what part of the space you are in. At the last performance I did at MACBA, my friend and musician Roc Jiménez de Cisneros helped me to set up. While we were doing about three or four rehearsals Roc told me he was amazed that every time the piece was played the sounds are completely different. That was perfectly natural for me although I had even been using the same six CDR's. The original sounds are created and recorded at different times so the pieces are intertemporal collages. When performing my Paramedia pieces I put myself inside the system of devices that makes my body irrelevant as facility and makes my body act like a virtual corporeality.

I have performed, and as an installation I had the audience perform, *Musica Simulacra*, a CD ROM that makes it possible to contain 4,516 pieces of music on one CDR, so that I am able to listen to 4,516 different sound pieces with a program through a computer, which is a reproductive device. I am also planning to produce a new way of generating sound using a *lossy compression* method such as MP3, which could produce a totally different sound from the originally compressed sound by interfering with the program when it is decompressed.

I think that when you use digital technology for sound, a belatedness is necessarily built in.

Typically, in a live outdoor rock concert held in an arena, sound engineers set up delay machines to the P. A. system lest feedback echoes happen, which means the sound rock musicians play reaches the audience with subtle belatedness. The situation is supposed to be that of a live concert, but in fact the audience is forced to listen to reproductive sound.

Why? The sounds the audience hears are not live but reproduced because the sounds are not those that are played by the musicians but they are transmitted sounds. In the process of transmission the original sounds are transformed into electric signals and they are amplified to be listened to.

If you record music and play it back that is the same process, and broadcasting in general uses the same technic as live rock concerts. When wireless microphones are used it is nothing more than broadcasting. In a sense we are listening to the broadcasting of a rock concert in the same place and at the same

time. The implication of this is if you perform live on the radio, even then it is not really a live performance.

11/13/08

TK: Since you sent me your stimulating mail on radioart, one month has past. It is a shame for me not to respond to you promptly, but my situation was not good for thinking about such things. Also, my wake-up time has changed from daytime to very early morning. This has a lot to do with the recent change of weather here that has pockets of low atmospheric pressure. I have a chronic "autonomic imbalance" and a slight "Meniere's syndrome". The depression pockets sometimes induce me to such syndromes. I am still unfamiliar with thinking in sunshine.

Meanwhile, the world economy has gone into air pockets. But I don't think this is a return of Great Depression. Rather, it should be a "normal" condition of the Informational Capitalism where semiological differences decide the profits rather than the exchange values of physical goods. Information Capitalism would be a final stage of capitalism but no one knows if it will end soon or not.

In these situations, our self-consciousness of our physical body and objects will become weaker and weaker. Epistemological references would shift to something semiological. In Meleau-Ponty's terms, the "visible" would precede the "invisible". Ironically, our age is more Cartesian and Leibnizsche than ever.

Consequently, a division of labor of extreme clarification and mystification goes on. The "invisible" and the physical body are handed to mysticism and cults. In the last 20 years, the brain has been a trendy field of the last part of our physical body. The brain has been expected to be "visible" rather than "invisible".

By "visible" I mean that a "visible" thing has no contingency or singularity.

In your previous mail, you brilliantly argued that "live" performance is not live. It is not singular but a repetition. But I am not sure if you argue that there is no one-time element but only the repetition exists. When you talk about your performance in terms of digital procedures and the final work for the audience, I can agree with you. I was not talking about the artist's consciousness on his/her work but tried to talk about the relationship between the artist's body (hands) and objects including instruments and machines and also between the total action of artists and the audience.

I understand that there is no "live" performance in a sense. But it seems to be similar to the argument of Zenon's paradoxes. We should start with the final stage of Bergson or Deleuze's re-interpretation of Bergson. I wonder why Husserl left his "phenomenology of inner time-consciousness" for his "living presence" that Merleau-Ponty creatively recaptured later, and why Heidegger didn't continue his "Sein und Zeit".

You are talking about "event". Is it possible to talk about it in relation to "live"?

11/14/08

TK: After your experience transferring your files on the HD, you found a new way to use your burned CD not as a means of reproduction but as a way to start an event. This is revolutionary. But let me recapture our basic lines. We started with radioart and you mentioned my argument about hands. And then you came to the story: your computer betrayed your expectation that the files would be the same: the transferring process was beyond your representing consciousness.

We can now extend the concept of hands to the body general here. If I summarize your argument in the HD-CD story, I could conclude that to create an event there is neither necessity of conscious effort nor human body. Digital technology enables it. Is this right?

I can agree with you. But I think that in this context we have to re-construct the concept of "body" too. In the discourse of digital technology, the body must be re-defined as a matrix of "bugs" or accidental events. In your HD, I should say, something 'corporeal' came along. Under the electronic technology, a machine is no more the modernist machine. It becomes a "machinic" (Guattari). You can handle your computer and your body seamlessly.

When I talked about hands, I understood them as the minimal element of such a 'machinic' body. We can use our hands not as external extensions of our consciousness. How to handle my hands in a 'machinic' way is a challenge of my radioart performance. It is not that first such a notion exists and then my performance starts. Between the motive and the very process of my performance a 'rupture' must exist.

You are talking about the "belatedness" of digital technology. I think that this is the very aspect of the re-fined body. The term 'redundancy' could cover "belatedness" too.

You talked about an interesting example of "a live outdoor rock concert", but I don't think that to use delay machines commits reproduction. Given the difference of time operation, the frequencies and the environments, even the delayed sounds cannot be the same as the sound that the musicians played. You wrote, "In the process of transmission the original sounds are transformed into electric signals and they are amplified to be listened to." This is true when the transmitter has an input. But it is not when it has no sound input. That's why I insist on "radio without contents". Nowadays, radioartists are interested in the "Tesla coil". It would be quite natural because it has no input. However, there were attempts to use it for radio with contents: "sparkgap radio transmission". By parenthesizing the contents, transmission can avoid being a reproduction. Now I can come back to the question of "live". Why do I insist on "live" transmission? Because as long as I use live airwaves, there are many factors of event. I don't think that we can reproduce every aspect of harmonic frequencies, due to the ionosphere's conditions and so on. First and foremost, the airwaves cannot be controlled by our consciousness.

In the beginning, you doubted that I called you a radioartist. But I am still convinced so. You are a radioartist using digital technology. You have transformed digital technology to radioart transmission. There should be various types of radioarts. I have been involved in airwaves radioart where I have to rely on the "natural" ionosphere. But you have found a virtual ionosphere in the HD and CD. Your play and performance is transmission to create events without conscious effort and without even the human body.

11/21/08

YT: How is your physical condition now? Do you have vertigo? The previous issue of the Nation has a story on the incoming chairman of the UN General Assembly, Miguel d'Ecosta from Nicaragua, who has had severe "Meniere's syndrome" for 40 years and he has to live with it, but according to him, 70% of the disease cures itself. Since you just have slight case, it should not be a problem. Take care of yourself.

Since you brought up redundancy we can make our dialogue a little more redundant now. Regarding Tesla, the Berlin media art center dedicated to sound installations - Tesla Berlin that became defunct at the end of last year, was named after him and its brochure had an image of a Tesla Coil sparking. It was a very nice place run by Carsten Seiffarth, giving artists studio residencies and plenty of support to produce new works. Coincidentally, Nicolas Tesla also had a lab on Houston St. and on Grand St. in New York. The place where the lab was happens to be just a half block from my house, and when we made our mini FM experiment I had my friend who lives on Grand St. listen and confirm his reception on his radio. Tesla has already connected to us more than 20 years ago.

Despite your claiming "insistence on radio without content" you have never talked about it to me. Now we have reached the most important aspect of radioart, namely "radio without contents". Radio ceases to be the means for transmitting. While you, Barbara Held and I were discussing our collaboration for radio web macba by Skype phone, you proposed to make our collaboration nothing but idle chatting in Japanese. Now I understand it better, it is a sort of "without content." From the idle chatting you can tell the signal is on at least but if we just transmit nothing there wouldn't be a distinction between just signing off and simply empty transmission. That is an example of "parenthesizing the contents".

It was my intention that when talking about "live performance" we also define new aspects of reproduction because digital technology has brought about a different mode of reproduction.

11/21/08

TK: I thought that I had talked about "radio without contents". Most recently, I wrote about it in the Acoustic Space journal (Nr. 7) that has just been published

in Riga. Anyway, I think this should be a basis of radioart. "Radio without contents" would be an understanding of radioart from the perspective of art radio. When art radio loses its contents, it would meet the realm of radioart. Maybe, "idle chatting" on Mini FM would be closer to it too. You wrote, "if we just transmit nothing there wouldn't be a distinction between just signing off and simply empty transmission." In this situation, we have to introduce another (not empirical but conceptual) dimension: for example using a level meter of the transmitting airwaves. The point is that the airwaves are not used as a carrier of sound waves. Airwaves as "carrier waves" (搬送波) are the means of modernist representation.

Every notion of modernist re-presentation presupposes repeatable reproduction. I am interested in the body because it cannot escape from its indispensable shade without which no perception or autopoiesis can function. "Live" has something to do with this point. When I insist on "live", I may try to open such an unknown dimension. You can extend this argument even to Kant's concept of "transcendental". He argued that differentiating from "transcendent" "transcendental" is immanent. The transcendental aspect is the shadow of being. Now we have to discuss how such a shadow is conceptualized in digital technology. Given that this shadow is ultimate, we cannot represent it. This is the very realm of philosophy as creating concepts. Conceptual arts may be a bit closer to this realm but I am not talking about reevaluating them. You talked about your hard disk story as an argument that there is no "live" performance. But it could be re-read that you conceptualized a new type of "live" performance. What do you think?

12/12/08

YT: Yes, I was in a middle of trying to tell you about a different notion of "live". I had to detour the answer when you posited the following question that directly connected temporality, you asked:

I wonder why Husserl left his "phenomenology of inner time-consciousness" for his "living presence" that Merleau-Ponty creatively recaptured later, and why Heidegger didn't continue his "Sein und Zeit"? You are talking about "event". Is it possible to talk about it in relation to "live"?

I had a cold after staying home for a couple of months on a post-operation break, and then musician friends of mine from Germany and UK had concerts on two consecutive days that probably caused me to get a cold. I e-mailed you that I needed a few days rest but before that, I had written a reply in part. I had reservations on my reply so I revised it as the following:
Since you are not only the pioneer of the radioart movement but a phenomenology professor too, the first question you posited must have your own answer already.

I thought I could answer your first question easily, which was my hubris. Husserl analyzes "now" as "living present", which is a temporal field that is construed to be a field that is made of "*retention*" (retention of the past impression) and "*protention*" (anticipation of impression to come). I thought it might have been easily negotiated because his temporal structure including his diagram was not right according to my understanding of remembrance in recent studies of memory. I realized that I had tried to answer you without re-examining my past reading closely. Then I started skimming Husserl's "Internal time-consciousness" and "Cartesian Meditation", Merleau-Ponty's "Phenomenology of Perception" and "Eye and Mind". Merleau-Ponty made a more nuanced view on Husserl's phenomenology in general in "Eye and Mind". Regarding temporality in particular, I found that there are very careful and delicate revisions of Husserlian ideas of temporality in "Phenomenology of Perception".

I need much more time for closer reading of the books I mentioned above, but we don't have time. On top of that I am merely a sound artist who shouldn't be ashamed of being ignorant in philosophy. Nevertheless, I made a comment on your remark anyhow;

[Merleau-Ponty on the ideas of body (he refers to hands developing the idea of Husserl---dual functions of "subject" and "object".)]

I think that ever since St. Augustine, Kant, Husserl and Heidegger, temporality is a dimension of subject. There isn't a listening subject that is being listened to at the same time as a seeing subject supplemented by being seen by others. There is no bi-univocality or ambiguity in listening. You hear sound if you like it or not. It comes into your ear. Sound is not what is at first intended. Simply listening is not on the dimension of intentionality. My first piece in a series of paramedia pieces was originally conceived for a choreographer/dancer and was trying to make sound move as the dance was moving.

After this prelude, I am going to tell you about the performance of my wounded CD pieces. It looked like I was performing a piece of music but to tell the truth it was an act of listening. I played back the wounded CD and I listened to sound that I did not create. Then, only when the CD player was stuck, I assisted the CD player to proceed. It was a passive act and this passivity is related to the act of listening. This does not necessarily have to be done by me only as composer but could be done by anybody else. Besides, every performance of the Wounded CD pieces is not only a live performance but is always my first performance and my first listening. The audience, including me, shared sounds as well as "here and now", and that was an event.

So, I have performed as many CD pieces as the number of my CD performances. Each time I listened to sounds that I had never heard before in my wounded CD pieces. This had been my notion of "live" performance and it was "nowness of performance" as I mentioned before, (I was about to say that "living present of performance"). But if I perform the CD performance on radio as live

performance, there is a blurred boundary between live and recorded. As Merleau-Ponty says, "This desk encloses traces of my past life. I inscribed my initial in and put a smudge of ink on it. But, these traces themselves don't show the past. They belong to the present. And if I find signs of bygone events in them since I get the understanding of the past from somewhere else and I am carrying their significances in myself". ("Phenomenology of Perception" Maurice Merleau-Ponty)

Live performance in front of an audience is one thing but air-transmitting the performance is another. If Merleau-Ponty is right, then the listeners of radio can not tell it is really live or not. You're not so sure of that even when it is announced that the performance is live.

So, I started to have doubts about this idea after my paramedia pieces were performed a number of times. If the performance is broadcast live is it really live? As a performer I know it is a live performance but can the audience tell without the broadcaster announcing that it is live? This must be related to the subjectivity of temporality. Also, I said that a new notion of reproduction has to be declared. You ignored that part and didn't pay any attention to the Paramedia series and my upcoming piece involving lossy compression devices. You should read that part more carefully.

TK: I don't understand why you repeatedly explained that recording and making CD are not repetition.

YT: I didn't insist on discussing my work but on trying to talk about the instance of live performance from my experience. Also, if I try to talk about live performance I have to talk about mode of the present

12/12/08

TK: In our context, the CD should be a transmitter. It could be possible that every "recorded" medium should be a transmitter. By using a set of CD and player, they transmit rather than repeating the "original". The same thing happens in radio broadcasting. The listener doesn't receive anything but transmits something by using the "radio receiver". About the concept of broadcasting and airwaves, we have some discord. I wonder how we will find an accord.

12/12/08

YT: I talked about reception of live performance on broadcast in general. Not particularly airwaves as you have said.

If I have to tell about airwave per se there are still Input and output. You take input you get to hear something that is apparently not from your own input. Then, what you perceive is the incoming sound is live and you can't tell it as recorded or not.

12/12/08

TK: In this context, the performer as well as the audience could say, "this is live". They talk about the level of consciousness. Even when the audience listen to the technologically reproduced sounds that the performer created), s/he could listen to something original in her/his idiosyncratic and 'singularity'. So, I have to bracket the aspect of receiving (as well as delivering of sender=shooter). When we are beyond the concept of sending and receiving (this is a bit 'transcendental' that is "philosophical" but never 'transcendent'), we have to talk about what's happening inside of our body/brain/nerve-system.

12/12/08

TK: I appreciate your self-description on your Paramedia, but the point is not whether I understand your work or not. About the concept of broadcasting and airwaves, we have some discord. I wonder how we will find an accord. In our context, a CD should be a transmitter. It could be possible that every "recorded" medium should be a transmitter. By using a set of CD and player, they transmit rather than repeating the "original". The same thing happens in radio broadcasting. The listener doesn't receive anything but transmits something by using "radio receiver".

12/12/08

YT: Tetsuo, we had another discord, namely your insistence on hands, on this I actually have a more sympathetic view. My understanding of you is that you are an academia against the academic world. I think that has made you more interested in hands than supposedly hand people like us, artists. The hands for you are not merely hands or a tool but beyond the dichotomy of theoria and practice. That reminds me of the title of your essay series. By the way I have to apologize to you for the mistake I made, which is giving the title of your series of essays as "Free Radio to Radioart", but that was the title for the first essay, and the title of the series is "Electronics and Thoughts by Hands".

12/12/08

TK: I agree with recent ideas on the brain and robotics that consider our body as a multiplicity of autopoietic and autonomous modules. There is no center in our brain. Even our hands and legs would be a sort of brain. Brain is everywhere. Thus the concept of brain is meaningless. As artificial mechanism such as an advanced robot become more autopoietic and numerous couplings and arrangements of artificial and organic modules (of not only internal but also external level)--"tools" and 'body"-- layer and nest, even one circuit of radio transmitter must be considered as a comparable autopoietic module. This is my basic understanding when I talk about hands and transmitters. My "insistence" upon hands is only a metaphor to show such a complexity. Also, the concept of input/output must be redefined by oscillation/resonance. (12/12)

YASUNAO TONE: Regarding the body of writing or something written, Husserl considered it corporeal. According to Derrida's "An Introduction to the Origin of Geometry", Husserl always says that "the linguistic or graphic body is a flesh, a proper body(Leip), or a spiritual corporeality (geisteege Leiplichkeit)". Derrida

also arrests our attention, in the same book, to Husserl's use of the word "tradition"- "(in the ambiguous sense of this word which includes both the movement of transmission and the perdurance of heritage) " - Derrida. Maybe radio is tradition minus historicity, or temporalization. That's why it always live.

12/12/08

TK: I said radio without contents and transmission without receiving. This might have something to do with Nicola Tesla's attempt of "mind reading" and some sort of telepathic communication. Recent interest of radioartists in VLF (very low frequency) suggests their desire to be directly involved in airwaves not through the medium of audio devices (receivers). But I think the same thing would be happening in the VHF, UHF and even HF too.

12/12/08

YT: Your realization of insistence on hands for me, is 'your having given 'numerous mini radio workshops, that you've had students make mini fm radios, starting from how to use soldering iron. You philosophize with a soldering iron like Nietzsche 'philosophizes with a hammer.

12/12/08

TK: Certainly, the soldering iron is an interesting tool. It literally couples and arranges modules. It is interesting in gluing them temporarily (not dissolving into permanent integration; still each 'folds' of the modules remain). Soldered parts (modules) work autopoietically.

12/12/08

YT: Now, We are about to conclude this dialogue. Thanks Tetsuo and Barbara. It has been a long process to materialize this project, which started the summer of 2007 when Barbara visited me and we had telephone conversation between Tokyo and New York on how to make a project on Skype phone. Tetsuo do you have any more comments?

12/16/08

TK: We exchange readable texts that are not abracadabra but the text's mission is not readability for general reader. As soon as we read, it could disappear. The text that you and I have been making here would be just like Man'yo poems for your "Wounded Man'yo". At our making process, readability and eligibility for other readers are not so important. That's why I called our attempt a "hodgepodge".

12/17/08

YT: This "hedge podge" - it doesn't matter you call it zakuska or potpurri. I wish it makes more deviant contents and to deviate beyond our imagination. But it seems to be around one theme, "time". Goodbye everybody.