



## Research > LINES OF SIGHT

LINES OF SIGHT is a Ràdio Web MACBA series, curated by Barbara Held and Pilar Subirà, which takes its name from the interconnected points of the global resonant space created by radio and other wireless technologies. From out of the extraordinary array of music that plays on this world-wide stage, the series follows threads as diverse as musical notation and non-linear composition, and introduces artists who explore the ideas around transmission as a medium for creative expression.

When Tetsuo Kagawa and Yasunao Tone were asked to produce a radio collaboration for LINES OF SIGHT #7, they decided to use an email exchange on radio art, vocalize the text, and then both of them play it live in performance. This is the transcript of their dialogue.

### PDF Contents:

- 01. Transcript of a conversation between Tetsuo Kogawa and Yasunao Tone
- 02. Acknowledgments
- 03. Copyright note

Tetsuo Kogawa's (Tokyo, 1941) interests range over a variety of disciplines and critical approaches. After studying philosophy at Sophia and Waseda universities, he taught at Wako University for 17 years. He is currently Professor of Communication Studies at Tokyo Keizai University's Department of Communications. Kogawa introduced free radio to Japan, and is widely known for his blend of criticism, performance and activism. He has written over 30 books on media culture, film, the city and urban space, and micro politics. Most recently he has combined the experimental and pirate aesthetics of the Mini FM movement with internet streamed media.  
[anarchy.translocal.jp](http://anarchy.translocal.jp)

Yasunao Tone (Tokyo, 1935) is a Japanese interdisciplinary artist. He graduated from Chiba Japanese National University in 1957, majoring in Japanese literature. He became active in the Fluxus movement in the sixties and moved to the United States in 1972. He organised and participated in many experimental music and performance groups such as Group Ongaku, Hi-Red Center and Team Random (the first computer art group in Japan). His unconventional musical work brings together certain forms of traditional Eastern culture and post-structuralist theories, and since the mid to late nineties has become a notable influence on new generations of sound artists worldwide. He lives and works in New York.

# LINES OF SIGHT #7. Transcript

## 01. Transcript of a conversation between Tetsuo Kogawa and Yasunao Tone

10/05/2008

**Yasunao Tone:** You interviewed me six years ago for *Intercommunication #39*, Winter 2002. In that interview you asked me what I thought about radio art since you considered me a radio artist. 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 Home Run 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 of your texts on the theme of radio art, your series of essays entitled *From Mini FM to Polymorphous Radio*, and *A Radioart Manifesto*, an essay in *Spectropia – issue # 7*.

In *A Radioart Manifesto* 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 radio art implies a certain distance between sender and receiver, your notion of radio art has to do with the hands, which implies the proximity of hands with consciousness, which is an essence of manual technique. According to Jacques Derrida, Husserl's *Origin of Geometry* has something to do with the virtual community of geometry, where members of the community are not only physically distant, but also temporally distant. Derrida also mentions mnemology in relation to the topic.

So, my notion of radio art 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 media 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.' Therefore, 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 a live performance.

10/08/2008

**Tetsuo Kogawa:** 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 my concept of radio art, especially in relation to 'hands' first.

I think that hands are not opposed 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.' With hands, this very thing happens.

I don't consider hands as the representatives 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, 'hand-waving' performance of radio art, my hands were not controlled by my



[Tetsuo Kogawa]

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 radio art does not consist of the set concept of sender 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'. The 'trans' of transmission is the key. So, a transmitter is an arrangement of 'différance'.

10/14/2008

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 the manual technique which is called 'tewaza' in Japanese.

By the way, in *A Radioart Manifesto*, you quote the book by Michael Nyman, *Experimental Music: Cage and Beyond (Music in the Twentieth Century)*, in which Michael Nyman remarks on the hands and head. If you only read the quote it may fit your idea of radio art, 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', with the composer as head and performer as hands. What Nyman emphasized is merely the empirical fact that the composers of experimental music, he thought, 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 radio art or a radio art I have thought about after your suggestion or provocation. My notion of radio art was influenced by your essays, but it is also nurtured by my practice as a sound artist, so I have to elaborate on why I thought the remoteness between two transmitters (although I originally used the terms, 'remitter and receiver') was particularly important. That distance is real but rarely 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 pre-recorded sounds on CDRs. I should probably have asked you to explain why you thought I was a radio artist 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, practicing digital art. Before that, I thought that performances of my prepared CD pieces were completely unique even though the same CDR was used. Also, there was no preconceived or projected sound image, so the result should have been unedited, unrepeatable, 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 factors mentioned above are not necessarily exclusive in terms of straight reproduced sound. Last year I was trying to move sound files



[Yasunao Tone. Photo: Andy Newcombe]

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 can I perform this piece as an event? I asked myself. It was an event when I found it, but it actually happened before I heard it, so there was no way to perform this piece as an event if I didn'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 also 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 pre-recorded CDs that are combined together as one monaural sound file and are electronically or digitally divided into seven to eight different frequency bands on a seven to eight 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 the 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 were completely different. That was perfectly natural for me although I had even been using the same six CDRs. 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 facilitator 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 hold 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, belatedness is necessarily built in. Typically, in a live outdoor rock concert held in an arena, sound engineers hook up delay machines to the PA 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, 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 technique 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 that if you perform live on the radio, even then it is not really a live performance.



11/13/2008

**TK:** Since you sent me your stimulating mail on radio art, one month has passed. 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 Ménière'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 the Great Depression. Rather, it should be a 'normal' condition of the Informational Capitalism where semiological differences determine 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 Merleau-Ponty's terms, the 'visible' would precede the 'invisible'. Ironically, our age is more Cartesian and Leibnizian than ever. Consequently, a division of labor of extreme clarification and mystification goes on. The 'invisible' and the physical body are handed over to mysticism and cults. In the last 20 years, the brain has been a trendy field as 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 and 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 Zeno'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'?

11/14/2008

**TK:** After your experience of transferring your files to 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 radio art 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 in 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 of 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 would say, something 'corporeal' came along. Under the electronic technology, a machine is no longer the modernist machine. It becomes '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 as something other than external extensions of our consciousness. How to handle my hands in a 'machinic' way is a challenge of my radio art 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 refined 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 using delay machines entails 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 true when it has no sound input. That's why I insist on 'radio without content'. Nowadays, radio artists 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: Spark-gap Radio transmission. By parenthesizing the content, transmission can avoid being 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 event factors. 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 found it strange that I called you a radio artist. But I am still convinced of it. You are a radio artist using digital technology. You have transformed digital technology to radio art transmission. There should be various types of radio art. I have been involved in airwaves radio art 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 through which to create events without conscious effort and without even the human body.

**11/21/2008**

**YT:** How is your physical condition now? Do you have vertigo? The last issue of the Nation has a story on the incoming chairman of the UN General Assembly, Miguel d'Escoto from Nicaragua, who has had severe Ménière'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, which 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, Nikola Tesla also had a lab on Houston St. and on Grand St. in New York. The place where the lab was located 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 was 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 radio art, namely 'radio without content'. Radio ceases to be the means for transmitting. While you, Barbara Held and I were discussing our collaboration for Ràdio Web MACBA by Skype, you proposed that we 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.

11/21/2008

**TK:** I thought that I had talked about 'radio without content'. Most recently, I wrote about it in the *Acoustic Space Journal* (no. 7) that has just been published in Riga. Anyway, I think this should be a basis of radio art. 'Radio without content' would be an understanding of radio art from the perspective of art radio. When art radio loses its contents, it would meet the realm of radio art. 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' are the means of modernist re-presentation.

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 'transcendent' from '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 re-evaluating them.

You talked about your hard disk story as an argument that there is no 'live' performance. But it could be re-read as a conceptualisation of a new type of 'live' performance. What do you think?

12/12/2008

**YT:** Yes, I was in the 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 I'd stayed 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 emailed 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 radio art movement but a phenomenology professor too, you must already have your own answer to the first question you posited.

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 a 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 whether 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 as composer, it 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 the 'nowness of performance' I mentioned before (I was about to say the '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 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, 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 radio listeners cannot tell if 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.

**12/12/2008**

**TK:** I don't understand why you repeatedly explained that recording and making CDs is not repetition.

**12/12/2008**

**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 the mode of the present.

**12/12/2008**

**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 CD and player set, 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.

**12/12/2008**

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

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

**12/12/2008**

**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 a listener listens to the technologically reproduced sounds that the performer created, s/he could listen to something original in her/his idiosyncratic '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.

**12/12/2008**

**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 CD and player set, 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 a 'radio receiver'.

**12/12/2008**

**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 academic against the world of academia. 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 go beyond the dichotomy of theory 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 Radio Art*, but that was the title of the first essay, and the title of the series is *Electronics and Thoughts by Hands*.

**12/12/2008**

**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 mechanisms 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 complexity. Also, the concept of input/output must be redefined by oscillation/resonance.

**YT:** 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 (geisteerge Leiplichkeit)'. Derrida also draws 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)'. Maybe radio is tradition minus historicity, or temporalization. That's why it is always live.

**12/12/2008**

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

**12/12/2008**

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

**12/12/2008**

**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 'fold' of the modules remains). Soldered parts (modules) work autopoietically.

**12/12/2008**

**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 in the summer of 2007 when Barbara visited me and we had telephone conversation on Skype between Tokyo and New York on how to make a project. Tetsuo do you have any more comments?

**12/16/2008**

**TK:** We exchange readable texts that are not abracadabra but the text's mission is not readability for the 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*. In our making process, readability and eligibility for other readers are not so important. That's why I called our attempt a 'hodgepodge'.

**12/17/2008**

**YT:** This 'hodgepodge' – it doesn't matter you call it zakuska or potpurri. I hope it will make more deviant content and deviate beyond our imagination. But it seems to be around one theme, 'time'. Goodbye everybody.

---

## 02. Acknowledgments

This email conversation between Tetsuo Kogawa and Yasunao Tone took place in 2008. Thanks to Barbara Held and Pilar Subirà.

---

## 03. Copyright note

This conversation is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License.