

## a (differential) manifesto

There's a very subtle or no D I F F E R E N C E between understanding time as a whole/bubble of present-ness and understanding it as (the *trace* of) difference itself, in that never we might be living in the *present* intended as *synchronisation\**, since there's always some TIME DIFFERENCE between the present I perceive/live in and that which you perceive/live in, what you see and hear, and what I see and hear, how you react to what you perceive and how I react to what I perceive.

Time takes the form of oscillation itself between

m o n t a g e and the long take.

*And can we (really) choose? I.e. are "we" a/the screenwriter?*

We're also the oscillation between the screenwriter and the character, and our freedom lies in the **void** - differential space - between them. But are we free when we feel we act while having no choice or when we choose to choose?

Coming back to the previous point:

this *implete / intrico / groviglio* (entanglement?) of TIME VIRTUALITIES constitutes what we eventually might choose to call *present*.

Sonically, emphasising delay,  
or better,  
BUFFER (time) as a constitutive trait of the human experience.

Still therefore in the metaphysical realm here. (Metaphysical music?)

Is it really possible to overcome it? Maybe through this difference itself and its repetition\*\*: *the Ur-teilung from which the human horizon stems*.

*A very unoriginal insight (maybe just like every other possible insight).*

Reverb as the SHADES OF DIFFERENCE with *new* (really new?) harmonics that burst out (arise) every time in inevitably different ways according to how we play (and thus create sounds; but can we really create sounds? Or are they more fundamental than us\*\*\*\*) and how the delayed sounds themselves play.

*Asking such questions and finding primordial truths in harmonics.*

Also, finding out what it means to listen in a society that's visually dominated, or better, dominated by the *post-TV* approach to image. What's the *difference* between *homo videns* and *homo audiens*?

Have we always been both of them? What changes if we *shift* the focus towards **audio** (personally and socially)? *Is there something "to preserve"*? (In other words, has economics any right to be?)

Economics as the oscillation between A - the preservation of a human sense and the realisation of humans in their relationships with the world - and B - lightness -.

Economics as a source for unexplored insights, as soon as the perspective shifts a little.

*Only to eventually find out that such differences, or such a (primordial) difference / delay / buffer time (Ur-teilung), have/has always been inside ourselves.*

Never was it outside first.

-----CUT-----

Revitalising environments that have long been dead.

A different perspective sometimes allows to see life again in environments that we are given.

(Re)-creating experiences of co-belonging / co-dwelling in which **timbre**, its *style* and its development in time (i.e. its act of producing traces of difference) is so relevant that the relationship that is established with such elements produces life and completely covers its dead alternative, where *fictitious problems* take the lead.

In other terms, the miracle happens when the sound of a fridge actually becomes more relevant than those highly feared thoughts of virtualities. Is this a surrealist manifesto?

-----CUT-----

It might be that the answer to the question of economics (i.e. what has to be preserved?) is difference itself. What would happen if *primordial differences* were to be attentively taken care of?

Maybe life, as described before the montage cut, would *happen*.

Maybe rhythmic m o n t a g e would manage to take place and unleash its creative force.

But might it be the case that our sentence about the fridge conceals a desire for *lightness*?

Lightness as *freedom of movement*, one that however recognises **conditionality on living sounds** as its condition of existence. A trait (lightness) that incorporates the possibility of disaggregation of living sounds/beings, as well as that of their (at the same time individual and co-dependent) realisation, in the Aristotelian sense of *entelechy*.

The desire for lightness has to be acknowledged and taken care of.

Giacomo A. Ritucci

\* Does this attempt imply an original (Ur-) dissatisfaction stemming from the incapability of living in synchronicity?

\*\* It might be that the minimalist discovery of such *grovigli* of phased patterns really brings something else in. But can something be born out of repeating a cut? Is there the need of re-attaching fragments after *the dance of Urteilungen*?

\*\*\* It might be that we were never creators.