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Abstract: The topic of this paper is the challenges and possible methodologies for a musicologist dealing with radio art. As an experimental audio form at the intersection of music, sound art, poetry and drama, radio art was only occasionally the subject of musicology studies. When it was, the focus was predominantly given to particular works, in tradition with a long-standing musicological occupation with musical work. With respect to this kind of approach, I would like to suggest a slight focus-shift from the work being at the centre of attention to the work as being just one factor in a network comprised of different actors. Thus, after examining the specificities of defining radio art, I comment on the beneficial and challenging aspects of the chosen theoretical approach and methodology applied to radio art.
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As an experimental acoustic form at the intersection of music, sound art, poetry and drama, radio art has only occasionally been the subject of musicology studies. When it was, the focus was predominantly on the particular works themselves, in tradition with a long-standing musicological occupation with opus perfectum et absolutum.\(^1\) A significant number of those analyses focused on works created by composers – thus perhaps indicating that interest for the works in question came primarily because they represent those composers’

---

1 The research for this article was financed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia (RS-200176).

2 Musicological centeredness on the concept of musical work has been long addressed and discussed in a number of contributions, with Lydia Goehr’s study (1992) being among the most influential and highly cited.
achievements in another genre and not for the form itself or the specificities of the medium and its artistic potential. However, when the focus of the research is on the formal characteristics of the work, other elements constitutive for radio art as practice are not given due attention. This is not to say that historical frameworks or information about the contexts in which radio art was created was not mentioned in these research studies – just that the research methodology in those cases was focused elsewhere. Nevertheless, my goal is to examine a possible methodology which would enable a more nuanced comprehension of the micro history of radio art as practiced in Radio Belgrade during the 20th century: the one that would present the agencies of actors beside authors, partially based on their own accounts, in addition to an examination of institutional, material and technological conditions that formed a network in which Radio Belgrade’s radio art practice became what it is today.3 Because of the limited scope of the present paper does not allow for the methodology to be explained in full with nuanced examples, and the fact that this collection of papers is mainly aimed at presenting methodological aspects, the case study will not be developed in detail, but left for a future occasion.

I start this paper by discussing the definitions of radio art and the different terms in use to describe this practice and their differences/similarities, as well as examining how this form was perceived in relation to the concept of music. This is closely related to the aforementioned existing interpretations by musicologists in the local context (i.e. published in Serbia), which will be briefly listed. The main difference I am trying to introduce when proposing a new methodology is to move beyond the textual, work-centered approach.4 I will discuss the potentials of actor-network theory in music as proposed by

3 I stress that in the period of which I am mostly writing about is the time of tape recorders and radio broadcasting systems. Thus, the material, technological, institutional, and above all media ecological factors I refer to changed drastically in the advent of the Internet age and web platforms.

4 Although radio art examples in most cases exist only in recordings (meaning that the complete score is often missing), I understand sound recording as a form of text – a fixed entity available for ‘reading’, i.e. interpretation and decoding. In this manner, radio art is similar to electronic music, where the only ‘score’ is the recorded composition itself. Also, there is a problem of a lack of traditional means to analyze acoustic forms existing only in sound recordings. The interpreter only has analysis by association during the process of listening. Of course, there is a separate problem of how approachable radio art works really were for research and interpretation beyond the archives of radio institutions. However, I start from the assumption that interpreters base their comments on available recordings and digital versions of compositions. This coincide with the fact that most Serbian musicologists’ essays on radio art appeared after 2005, the year the first CD box containing examples of 25 years of production of Radionica zvuka and its prehistory was published (20 godina Radionice zvuka dramskog programa Radio Beograda. Beograd: Radio televizija Srbije).
musicologist Benjamin Piekut, an approach that considers historical ecology in which musical work exists as an entity in relation to others, without being the sole focus of attention and, simultaneously, not being deprived of its unique stature. Throughout the paper, I make short references to radio art as practiced in Radio Belgrade and aspects of that practice that could be further approached and understood with actor-network theory.

**CHALLENGE 1: DEFINING RADIO ART**

The term radio art is one of several terms circulating in the argot of practitioners and connoisseurs referring to the form composed of acoustic material of various origins, broadcasted via radio and designed to fit in the overall radio program scheme, while avoiding standardized formats of ‘mainstream’ radio. The official and internationally accepted term (by the European Broadcasting Union – EBU) is Ars Acustica (or Acoustic Art), introduced by Klaus Schöning, head of the Studio for Acoustic Art (Studio für Akustische Kunst) through his serial at the West German Radio – Westdeutscher Rundfunk (WDR). Moreover, the form originated in this studio in the late 1960s and during the 1970s. As Klaus Schöning explained “(f)or Acoustic Art all of the audible events are components of equal value. Acoustic Art is a melting pot of heterogeneous acoustic elements. Acoustic Art: a world of language and a world of sounds and noises from the acoustic environment (Schöning 1999; cf. Fiebig 2015: 204).

Although Ars Acustica is the established term for this type of art, several prominent practitioners distanced themselves from using it other than to refer to geographically and historically bounded practice, related to WDR. For example, Heidi Grundmann, founder and curator of Kunstradio – Radiokunst (ORF), preferred the term radio art (emphasized in the German translation of the phrase in the title of the serial) (Rataj 2010: 71–72). As Grundamnn remarked, Ars Acustica “was the special brand of European Public Radio that supported the development of artists in Neues Hörspiel, electroacoustic music and the radio program Ars Acustica, all of which contributed to the notions of the avant-garde at the beginning of the century – albeit mostly

---

5 See also: [http://www.kunstradio.at/EBU/ebu.html](http://www.kunstradio.at/EBU/ebu.html) [accessed on 30. 4. 2021].

6 Ars Acustica or Acoustic Art (Schöning uses these terms as synonyms) is very close to the Neues Hörspiel form of radio art that emphasized acoustic qualities at the expense of narrative and dramatic ones characteristic of classical, spoken radio drama. These tendencies flourished with the development and subsequent acceptance of the stereophonic sound system (cf. Schöning 1969). The German term Hörspiel is translatable as sound play in English and zvučna igra in Serbian.
within the traditional framework of the ‘original work’ by an ‘author’ with a copyright and, most significantly, within the conventional definition of radio as a specific medium in its own right” (as quoted in Rataj 2010: 72). Thus, radio art is still a bit of a broader term than Ars Acustica and I use it not only to refer to Kunstraadio production, but to the interdisciplinary artistic form aimed at creating media-specific acoustic compositions or projects.\footnote{For definitions of radio art see also Rataj 2010: 89 and Black 2014: 7.}

Beside the stated reason, when choosing the term radio art I had in mind similar terms in discourse on this artistic form in Yugoslav/Serbian context. While the term radio art (or the version with an en dash: radio-art) is used in literature in the Serbian language (cf. Stefanović 2010; Karan 2015), more common is radiofonska umetnost (radiophonic art) or, simply, radiofonija (radiophony).\footnote{Following the categories of this art established at the Prix Italia festival in the 1980s (Depolo 1999: 197), transformed as operative categories in Radio Belgrade’s Drama programme, Serbian authors wrote on three types of radiophony: radio drama, radio documentary and radio music, while referring to the last type as abstract radiophonic form (Jokić 1994, Ćirić 2005) and experimental radiophonic form (Ćirić 2012, 2015). Since radio art is at its core an interdisciplinary, liminal practice, clear boundaries between the mentioned types are hard to establish, and one could wonder whether those boundaries are even necessary. When dealing with predominately acoustic sound-based compositions usually created by composer by vocation (where voice, if used as an acoustic material, is more often than not treated non-verbally and in regard to its sounding/musical qualities), I find the term experimental radiophony the most adequate, since it addresses media and sound in its title, and emphasizes experimental artistic qualities. Some of the other terms found in the literature in Serbian are, for example: radiofonska kompozicija (radiophonic composition, equivalent to French composition radiophonique), radiophonic music, art radio, pisanj zvukom (writing in sound) (Kotevska 2015: 116), radiofonsko muzičko (musically radiophonic) (Radovanović 1979: 39). Ars Acustica is also used, usually in line with other mentioned terms. The elusiveness of radio art as an artistic form, ever-changing with changes to the technology it is mediated through, seems to be negotiated with an abundance of the related terms trying to pinpoint some of the characteristics of this art form, while losing others in that same attempt.} Since radio art is still more used in literature in English, I prefer it for this occasion over other internationally accepted names for this art, since it, as its Serbian counterparts, has the media in its title, and thus puts radio as media to closer attention (or, at least, does that more obviously than Ars Acustica does).

I believe this is important to stress already in the name of the art form. It was conditioned by the technical demands of radio broadcasts, the dynamics of process and protocol of working in the radio/studio environment. On a technical level, radio art uses tools such as a microphone, tape and tape recorder, loud speakers, transmitter and receiver as part of a broadcasting system. Humans working with this nonhuman aspect of the network usually work in teams, comprised of authors (of various vocations), directors, sound designers, technicians, actors, musicians, proof-readers, editors and curators,
and bureaucratic staff. The product of working in those material and institutional conditions, with divided (although occasionally changing and overlapping) roles for each actor, should be produced with media technology, its realization should not be possible in other ways than through those technologies, while dynamics and durations of the works should be planned so they fit the norms of the radio broadcast (cf. Radovanović 1979). Thus, in order to understand ‘historical ecology’ in which radio art as practice emerged, it is important to develop a methodology which includes an analysis of working conditions into the narrative.

In the context of attempting to define radio art, it seems that the most pressing question, at least from musicians’ and musicologists’ perspectives, is whether or not radio art is music, or how to differentiate specifically musical qualities of radio art compositions.\(^9\) Emphasizing media-specific qualities of artistic practice that make it different compared to other acoustic art forms seemed less important than finding those lines of similarities that make the argument for understanding radio art as music. In addition to more available recordings of radio art, one could notice that remembrance on the history of successful radio art works by Arsenije Jovanović, Vladan Radovanović and Ivana Stefanović (to name the most often mentioned authors active in the second half of the 20\(^{th}\) century) was further activated when Stefanović was awarded the Mokranjac Award for the radiophonic poem *Veliki kamen* (*The Great Stone*, 2017; see Kotevska 2018, 2019; Petković Lozo 2019), the highest Serbian recognition for composition. It seems that it was necessary to examine those points of similarities that exist between radio art and music before this change of attitude was reached. The question remains, what other knowledge of the practice of radio art could be acquired?

**CHALLENGE 2: APPROACHING RADIO ART FROM A MUSICLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE**

Arguments and attempts to justify treating radio art as music are plenty. From historical references to early avant-garde, to individuals “composing” with radios as instruments, radio provoked the imagination of composers, while radio stations for the better part of the 20\(^{th}\) century were among those rare places where electroacoustic music could be created. WDR in Cologne seems to be particularly potent center for *Neue Musik* and *Neues Hörspiel* alike. Similarities between the two are evident in searching for new sound

---

9 As explained in Piekut 2014. More on this later in the text.
10 As one of the first examples of this attempt, see Radovanović 1979.
worlds and exploring ways of their organization in coherent and artistically minded form, while experimenting with tape and electronic studio technology. These parallels prompted an understanding of radio art as a form of electroacoustic music (Radovanović 2010; Ćirić 2015) while the history of both forms are intertwined. For example, Pierre Henry’s and Pierre Schaeffer’s experiments would not be possible outside of the radio institution and Schaeffer himself was engaged in radiophony, which influenced his further work (Srećković 2011). Although Schaeffer’s preoccupations did not, however, stay with the medium of radio but were directed toward reformulating the canon of Western music, radio art practitioners, especially in Germany, embraced the results of his experiments and further worked with sound objects (cf. Fiebig 2015: 204). Moreover, Schöning’s series Komponisten als Hörspielmacher (WDR3 – Hörspiel Studio), in which numerous composers experimented with radio art, alongside essays, analyses and talks on the form (one of them being Musik als Hörspiel – Hörspiel als Musik), and presentations on radio play during the Darmstadt International Summer Courses for New Music, testify on the close links between radio art and avant-garde music.11

Such strong links with the history of 20th century music certainly make radio art a potent field of interest for musicologists. It became such over the last 15 years in Serbian musicology, although in line with a focus on the original work, author and an exploration of new possibilities of working with sound.12 However, what music practice and radio art also share are ontological qualities of ‘recordability’. Gerald Fiebig introduces this concept while explaining acoustic arts of the 20th century in relation to sound recording (Fiebig 2015).13 Its effects were understood and heard not only in the fact that music, as an art form that existed prior to the act of recording, was preserved in this way, but in the idea that a whole new range of acoustic events could be recorded and manipulated in creative ways. For Fiebig, the main point is that the listener perceives all three forms through sound recording and/or broadcasting, so the recording should be used as the main characteristic of all three forms and

11 For more on this topic, see https://www.inventionen.de/1986/Vortrag-Schoening.html [accessed on 30. 4. 2021].

12 This is also evident in Serbian musicological papers where authors deal with radio art: out of 17 referenced papers, 8 are about Ivana Stefanović’s compositions (of those papers, reference to Kotevska 2018 and 2019 present the same essay in different publications). In addition, Milanović (1997) includes narrative on one of Stefanović’s radio art works in her text. Since Stefanović is one of the most prolific and awarded authors in this field, who is a composer by main vocation, the interest of researchers is understandable.

13 As three main acoustic forms, Fiebig names electroacoustic music, sound art and Ars Acustica or Acoustic Art. His main concern is with the division of understanding sound art either as music or as gallery-oriented acoustic form, which he argues is a forced choice of reference frame (Fiebig 2015).
an ontological point of reference (Fiebig 2015). While this concept provides a strong argument for understanding both radio art and music as acoustic art forms that should and could be the subject of musicological research, it also puts focus on the role of media and recording in the reception and understanding of those forms, as well as production. If that role in production is to be subject of research, radio art works could not only be understood as subjected to radio technology, but as intrinsically related to it. In other words, they could not exist in such form without radio and material and the technological conditions it presents, or they would be mediated in other ways (as other acoustic forms). Thus, the idea of ‘historical ecology’ does bring the strong notion of entanglement between different elements of emerging groupings and in that entanglement ‘music itself’ and the acoustics of specific works contribute to the ecology. In that sense, they are neither seen as purely musical or purely acoustic entities, nor texts ready for interpretation in the abstract context, but entities with their own distinct agency mediated through their being in relation to other entities in complex, fluid groupings (Cf. Piekut 2014: 212–213).

Possible Methodologies: Building a Research Methodology Beyond a Work-Focused Approach

As noted earlier, most of the existing Serbian musicological contributions referring to radio art suggest authors’ concerns for particular radio art works, and in most cases, those are the works by composers (as opposed to works by authors coming from other arts or disciplines). For example, work(s) by Vladan Radovanović are analyzed in book sections (Veselinović 1991) or number of essays (Srečković 2011, Neimarević: 2012, Ćirić 2015). Works by Ivana Stefanović are subject of papers by Veselinović-Hofman (2011), Medić (2012), Kotevska (2015, 2018, 2019), Ćirić (2015), Torbica (2019) and Petković Lozo (2019, 2021). Some of the essays offer the narrative more oriented toward history of radiophony and its classifications and theorization

14 Ecology is understood as an emergent, hybrid grouping that connects many different kinds of things, entangled in a web of relations and amalgamation of organic and inorganic, as well as biological and technological (Cf. Piekut 2014: 212).

15 Veselinović-Hofman also included comment on Malo večno jezero by Vladan Radovanović in her study on postmodernism in Serbian music (1997).

16 In the reviews of the recordings of Serbian music, Biljana Milanović wrote about the CD music by Ivana Stefanović, where her radio art work Metropola tišine/Stari Ras was included. Although not a paper on radio art, this essay proves a valuable contribution to the existing analysis of the mentioned work (Milanović 1997). Ćirić 2015 and Nikolajević 2008 used the activity and works of Radovanović and Stefanović as examples.
(Ćirić 2005, 2012, 2015; Nikolajević 2008) or its history in international frameworks (Karan 2015). Methodologies of these papers and their main points vary. Thus, they cannot simply be put under the same umbrella without making due distinction. However, what those papers have in common is that they are predominately interested in the history of radio art as a history of its outstanding personalities and their compositional achievements, and less so with the emergence of radio art, the groupings which made it a recognizable entity, and changes in its practices through the years. Who were the initiators for sound experiments in Radio Belgrade? What was their relation to music? Was there a particular reason, other than unquestionable individual talents, such as organization of the institution, that enabled the emergence of “beogradska škola zvuka” (“Belgrade school of sound”)? Were there conflicts that helped shape the aesthetics of this school and were there personalities other than authors (or, authors in other roles) that made the practice what it is known to be today?

Those and other questions that aim at presenting and understanding practice as a whole in its micro history (and the attraction and possibilities composers felt for creative endeavors within this practice), could not be answered if approached with methodologies that single out particular works, even if they are understood in a broader theoretical context or in the context of a general social climate. This is also important to bear in mind because of the interdisciplinary and hybrid character of radio art. The answer to these questions could be, perhaps, reached through actor-network theory, as a way of dealing with entities (sonic qualities of acoustic forms – ‘music itself’ included) as related and mediated in ‘historical ecology’.

***

I will focus on Benjamin Piekut’s introduction of actor-network theory in musicology (Piekut 2014). His study is a detailed account on the ways in which actor-network theory, as a methodology of tracing actors and their associations, could be used when trying to explain the variety of music-historical situations. The goal of introducing actor-network theory is to provide an “empirically justified description of historical events, one that highlights the controversies, trials, and contingencies of truth, instead of reporting it as coherent, self-evident, and available for discovery” (Ibid: 193).

---

17 It is understood that actor-network theory is “a method to study how elements relate to each other, not a substantial theory of the character of these relationships” (Blok and Elgaard Jensen 2011: 23).
In an attempt to summarize the main characteristics of this methodology, it could be said that the goal of the researcher is to trace human and nonhuman actors that have agency: those whose actions or circulation (if we are talking about object, for example) or the way in which they interacted resulted in a noticeable difference in the state of matters before those agencies. What an actor is is not decided in advance, but traced empirically (through archive materials, historical facts, testimonials of the actors themselves and their narratives, material history etc.). The focus on action means being focused on the series of mediations and movements between actors, as opposed to an emphasis on fixed entities. Ontology in actor-network theory is concerned with the ways in which networks of actors constitute reality, with the main idea that being means being related and being in the world (Ibid: 200). Finally, the principle of performance takes into account those elements of music practice that are not reducible to discourses, but are nevertheless constitutive in the practice as a whole. Thus, my stance is that in approaching radio art as acoustic form, a more detailed historical account on the emergence of such experimental aesthetics would be provided if the researcher focuses not only on the work as an entity, but instead traces associations between various actors, their dynamics, the decisions that led to particular sonic results, technological frames in relation to which artists made creative choices, international festivals as gathering points of practitioners in the same field and politics, protocols and procedures of their local radio stations.

* * *

Introducing radio art in Radio Belgrade and affirming the platform for this practice through *Radionica zvuka* (serial started in 1985) was not given, but negotiated through decades. The introduction of stereo sound system in the 1960s and its popularization by Neda Depolo, the fact that it was being embraced by authors such as Vuk Vučo and Arsenije Jovanović (later whom charted his own path as radio art author and distinct pioneer), organized platform in the form of serial *Eksperimenti i ostvarenja* (*Experiments and realizations*); innovative solutions of directors such as Darko Tatić and Slabodan Boda Marković; early inclusion in international networks of radio art practitioners (mostly through *Prix Italia*, but also other festivals, and through working visits to WDR and ORF); the organizational structure of Radio Belgrade in regard to sound designers who, although formally part of technical sector, could ‘specialize’ in working with the drama program; several editors and directors – actors in decisive positions – who had understanding and openness towards modernist authors and innovation, such as Aleksandar Acković, Gojko Miletić, Đorđe Malavazić (later being initiator of *Radionica zvuka* whose preference for this type of art helped push the agenda of forming
the serial, at the expense of the predominance of spoken drama projects); the high density of creative figures ranging from directors, musicologists (Ivana Trišić, Jasmina Zec, Ana Kotevska, Jasmina Zec), composers (beside those already mentioned, Jugoslav Bošnjak, Mitar Subotić – Rex Illusivii, Predrag Stamenković, Srdan Hofman, Zoran Hristić, Jovana Stefanović – were among creators for the serial); the fact that Ivana Stefanović as the first editor opened the door to professionals from various fields, but also revived and included some hybrid works of Serbian culture (e.g. Sobareva metla by Miloje Milojević) in the archive of Radionica zvuka, and thus Radio Belgrade; the limited budget in terms of fees at the disposal for writers, actors and numerous crew, but sufficient in terms of available time slots in well-equipped studios; the list could go further. The rich and complex history of radio art, which brought those distinguished works usually at the centre of attention, cannot be told simply by naming actors through archive material (documents, press clippings, tape sleeves, personal notes) or interviews with actors, but by understanding their relations, conflicts, collaborations, and lesser known and perhaps even underwhelming projects, which will be left for another occasion.

By stressing that actor-network theory offers greater possibilities to understand the emergence of experimental radio art, I am not suggesting that prior theoretical contributions were lacking in any sense. On the contrary, I would say that researchers working with actor-network theory could build on already existing theoretical works. There are two ways in which these prior contributions add to the knowledge necessary for further inquiries. First is that in some of the cited papers, notably the one by Kotevska (2015), there is already a contribution in what we could, having in mind actor-network theory, recognize as drawing the network of associations. In other words, researchers already found it necessary to list many of the associations needed for the emergence of radio art. Yet, focus was again shifted to particular works, and not to the nuances of complex mediations negotiating radio art as we know it. However, in actor-network theory, this knowledge cumulated from close readings of the chosen compositions could be used as acoustic forms18 have their own agency and (their) “power is inseparable from other agencies, because it arrives in a tangle” (Piekut 2014: 213). This is the second way of building upon existing texts.

What is, then, the specific difference that actor-network theory brings into existing bodies of knowledge, rather than more detailed historical and social analyses? According to Piekut, it is a more nuanced and fresh way to study groupings, the role of nonhumans in the creation of those groupings and indeterminate shapes emerging as a result (Ibid: 212). In other words,

---

18 Piekut discusses music, but I believe the same could be stated for other acoustic forms.
more layers are added to the analysis when the distinct role of technologies and media (as some forms of nonhuman actors) is recognized. And, with indeterminate shapes, there is more emphasis on empirical research, as well as heightened awareness of what else could emerge as an actor with agency in the research process (since, as noted before, it is important not to determine actors in advance). This approach also proves sensitive to the perspectives of actors themselves, and their own narratives. Having in mind that in radio art music in the traditional sense could be treated as one of recorded acoustic events in the whole, this entanglement becomes more complex. In that sense, music as one of many acoustic elements used in the composition and the way it is mediated could be one point of interest. Although the other practices too are immersed in webs of humans and nonhumans, and practicing means working within the network formed of institutional hierarchies, material and technological conditions, while navigating interactions with actors of other professional profiles, it seems that in the case of radio art in the 20th century this is a particularly striking case.

In taking actor-network’s approach to Radio Belgrade’s experimental practice, the goal is to form a narrative that would explain the micro history of radio art in Belgrade, not only by taking the social and artistic context in the broad sense, but the actual particular motivations and decisions of the main actors, as well as material and technical conditions that led to the production as it is known today.
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Марија Маглов
Радиофонска уметност у музикологији: изазови и могуће методологије (резиме)

Прво истраживачко питање у овом тексту јесте како се на музиколошки начин бавити радио артом, а да истраживачки фокус не буде на појединачним делима (еквивалентима музичком делу). Без намере да овакав приступ (доминантан у музиколошкој литератури аутора из Србије у коју сам до тренутка писања рада имала увид) оспоравам, сматрам да би се ширем поља интересовања на актере процеса креирања радиофонских дела, те на материјалне, технолошке и институционалне услове у којима се то креирање дешава(ло), у значајној мери допринело да историјски увид у финесе ове праксе буде потпунији. Први део студије посвећен је проблему дефинисања радио арта, појашњењу терминолошких разлика између синонима за ову уметничку праксу, те методолошким импликацијама дефиниција и термина. Истицањем назива медија у називу уметничке праксе, намера ми је да скренем пажњу на оне аспекте практиковања ове уметности који указују на умреженост актера, технологија и институција, а који се не могу обухватити када се питања усмерена искушчиво на „читања“ појединачних дела. Да бих размотрила могућу методологију за приступ радио арту који сам изложила, позивам се на утицајни есеј музиколога Бенџамина Пикета (Benjamin Piekut), који уводи теорију актера-мреже у историју музике, сматрајући да је ова методологија корисна и за разматрање других акустичких форми. У том смислу, есеј је посвећен разматрању начина на која се могу добити одговори на питања о радио арту ван интерпретације појединачних звучно организованих целина.

Кључне речи: радиофонска уметност, музикологија, методологија, теорија актера-мреже.
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