the research for this conference provides us with an image of a person with encyclopedic knowledge and an exceptional versatility of interests. According to the foreword, written by the compilers of the materials (editorial board members N.B. Avtonomova, D.V. Sarabyanov and V.S. Turchin), one could say there were three, five or 20 Kandinsky, the basic impulse of his creativity and his striving for self-realization being constant (p. 3).

To illustrate the idea of “20 Kandinskys,” the authors analyze the creativity of the artist within the intersection of very different cultural contexts: early twentieth-century Russian painting combined with the influence of theosophic, scientific, psychological and ethnological ideas. Such an approach does provide a view of the “versatile world of Kandinsky,” resembling in some ways postmodernist approaches where the person is seen as an intersection of various cultural contexts. But as is often the case, an approach based on juxtaposing many divergent characteristics and properties reveals gaps in the portrait of the subject, who remains enigmatic. This is inevitable, because it is impossible to reveal the lively soul of a creative genius via scientific analysis. One must then estimate this project as successful, at least in principle, as a “mosaic” form of reconstructing Kandinsky’s inner world.

But for the compilers of this book, the form is not the end in itself. The form is successfully combined with another principle of arranging the articles, one based on a gradual transition from analysis of external cultural and spiritual influences to analysis of the artist’s inner spiritual world, the essential principles and methods of his mental-creative work. The opening articles provide broad descriptions of the culture upon which Kandinsky’s spiritual milieu was built. These include an article on his place in artistic culture of the twentieth century (by M.A. Bessonova) and an article on “Russian Eros” (by V.S. Turchin and J.E. Bowlt), discussing the artist’s possibly theosophic views. D.V. Sarabyanov and V.M. Sokolov analyze the influence of iconic painting techniques and cheap popular prints on Kandinsky’s work. I.V. Messalnina completes the observations with results of his research into the artist’s creativity, using the example of the picture entitled On Points.

The next few articles convey some ideas about Kandinsky’s artistic theory (an article by N.P. Podzemskaya), his painting technique (by M.P. Vikturina) and a scientific view of his creative work (by V.G. Stepanov, T.M. Pertzova and N.B. Avtonomov).

The core of the book is comprised of several articles on synesthetic fundamentals of thinking and on Kandinsky’s ideas of arts synthesis (by B.M. Galeev, I.L. Vanechchina and A.S. Migunov). These attempt to explain, from a synesthetic point of view, the multiplicity of Kandinsky’s creative impulses and, correspondingly, the reason for his becoming a central figure for such heterogeneous fields in the twentieth century. The final part of the book consists of articles (by V.V. Barayev, O.A. Tarasenko and V.V. Bychkov) devoted to revealing subconscious aspects of Kandinsky’s creativity, in particular on the cultural roots of his creative worldview and archetypal structures in his paintings. The most original article is the one by V.V. Bychkov, entitled “The Spiritual Universe of Kandinsky.” It is written in a poetic, “avant-garde” form, resembling some of the experiments of the 1920s by the Russian futurists. This is the intuitive-essastic way the author tries to express his impressions of Kandinsky’s creativity.

As a whole, this book is of interest both in terms of its cultural and its theoretical aspects. Undoubtedly, a great merit of the book’s authors is the ability to delimit and outline a whole series of problems that still remain to be researched.

**MEMORY TRADE: A PREHISTORY OF CYBERCULTURE**


 Reviewed by David Cox, 2/60 Brighton Rd., Highgate Hill, Queensland 4101, Australia. E-mail: <d.cox@mailbox.gu.edu.au>.

As we come to the final curtain for the millennium, it is no surprise that books are appearing that seek to frame current debates on cyberculture into contexts foregrounding the role of memory, iteration, inscription and the relationship between orality and textuality. **Memory Trade** is a deliberate contribution in this vein, seeking to define a new discourse in which definitions of technology that once were distinctly separate—e.g., those provided by cybernetics and English literature—sit quite easily with those of punk rock, fine art and typography.

Part coffee-table book, part academic analysis, **Memory Trade** blurs boundaries with impressive results. Like Griel Marcus’ **Lipstick Traces** (a book on punk, situationism and dada), **Memory Trade** bills itself as a “secret history.” **Lipstick Traces** presented the proliferation of ideas between art-cultures that share a burning passion to live life as if outcomes did not matter. The dadaists never met the situationists, and the rangers of medieval England never met Johnny Rotten from the Sex Pistols, but they all shared a passion for disruption, found a common and deadly enemy in boredom and were united by the power of collage, dance, music and other radical gestures. **Lipstick Traces** was a work that sought both to define this story freshly and to frame it in the context of art. Marcus got the mix right and revealed the bankruptcy of official authority for the population at large in the idea of the work of art.

**Memory Trade** forges a similar history of exchange while focusing on memory and knowledge, components of cyberculture. Connections between memory and knowledge come together like objects in one of Joseph Cornell’s boxes. The book is as much a poem to its own process as it is a cultural studies text on the origins of cyber-ideas. When collage works, it is always a shock. **Memory Trade** resembles a Burroughsian “cut-up,” where secret meanings reveal themselves within the accidents of meaning and text. This is the classic culture-jamming gesture, the avant-pop strategy of defamiliarization; what the situationists called “detournement.”

**Memory Trade** not only posits the notion that writing was the original “cyberspace” but that cyberspace itself as an idea stems from processes of human memory wherein writing is viewed as a technology. Tofts argues that the consensual, shared, imagination-space that [inter]textuality makes possible long predates the cyberspaces that have followed the Cold War and the space age.

Thus, the book begs the question: To what extent does any technology based on stored (but primarily written or spoken) information result in new types of thinking about the process of human communication? How has the technology of writing itself affected writers and thinkers and how, in turn, have debates about writing had an effect upon how we now view the role of memory in culture(s)?
Computers, networks, satellites, virtual reality and military-industrial culture are framed in the book as almost incidental latecomers in the history of human engagement with processes of sharing and navigating ideas. This nihilistic techno-iconoclast bears some similarity to the kind of ambivalence about technology that cyberpunk author Bruce Sterling has expressed. Sterling’s Dead Media Project (an ever-growing Internet list of media forms no longer in use) discredits technological determinism with every newly added example of obsolete media. Thus Sterling and Tofts share a presumably healthy suspicion about “hype”—that which surrounds the official-ized technoculture of board rooms, R&D (research and development) facilities and the developments seized upon by trendy technomagazines or the stock market. Both authors posit writing as the ultimate proof of a media-form that has no particular vested interest in buttressing the proof of a media-form that has no parity to the kind of ambivalence about technology that cyberpunk author Bruce Sterling has expressed. Sterling’s Dead Media Project (an ever-growing Internet list of media forms no longer in use) discredits technological determinism with every newly added example of obsolete media. Thus Sterling and Tofts share a presumably healthy suspicion about “hype”—that which surrounds the official-ized technoculture of board rooms, R&D (research and development) facilities and the developments seized upon by trendy technomagazines or the stock market. Both authors posit writing as the ultimate proof of a media-form that has no particular vested interest in buttressing the corporate imagination’s aggressive claims to mechanistic Darwinism.

Of interest in Memory Trade is a lengthy section on James Joyce’s Finnegan’s Wake that examines Joyce’s embrace of cinema and television, and how his love of early audiovisual time-based media influenced his inventive, malleable language-fiction. Tofts outlines how Joyce (who knew Sergei Eisenstein) used puns—like montage—to rely on the clash of the visual and the sonic as a form of meaning. In Memory Trade, Tofts hyperlinks Joyce, with his original verbal sight gags and Norbert Wiener, with his cybernetic experiments in the feedback mechanisms of artificial intelligence. There is a kind of palpable glee at work in the book as the author embraces his ideas with the playful relish of an idea-hacker who has stumbled onto a cache of good info, breathlessly linking theorist to theorist, idea to idea. The classical and the contemporary meet head-on here. This tableau of memory-hackers has the appeal of any circus sideshow, here only the many and varied figures are luminaries in fields often kept discreetly pigeonholed by the realpolitik of academia and the narrow-mindedness of publishers and book retailers; hence my analogy to Marcus.

The book is lavishly illustrated with finely detailed monochrome photocollages by Murray McKeich, resembling the Gothic horror biomechanics of H.R. Giger—images of doll-like heads, skeletal bones, industrial piping, domestic objects and fish meld seamlessly with the counterpoint of Tofts’ elegant text. These often disturbing images appear like antique photographs, evoking the demented imagination of a Victorian occultist collector on opium. The overall effect of these images and text is the presentation of a new realm in which familiar notions have been stripped of their original contexts and are used as a counterbalance to arguments with which they are seldom traditionally associated. For example, Vannevar Bush’s ideas about building the Memex device find expression in Tofts’ book as evidence of the ways in which the technology of writing has long relied upon mechanisms of recall and storage. In this, Bush’s ideas bear resemblance to Sigmund Freud’s use of the “mystical writing pad”—the child’s toy that leaves a faint trace of an original text after the original has been erased—or they can be seen as a metaphor for the working of the mind itself. Humans store some things and erase others, but a trace is always left behind. For Tofts, it is the traces that matter. This non-space “otherzone” between form and utterance is the metaphysical domain to which the author, at one point, ascribes his own term: “c-space.” “C” (for “cyber”) is not pronounced, illustrating how virtual a text’s role is in shaping an idea.

Memory Trade opens up categories we have previously not known in cyberspace writing. To this end, it exemplifies its own objectives.

**IS C ACTUALLY RED? (IST C ROT? EINE KULTUR- UND WISSENSCHAFTSGESCHICHTE ZUM PROBLEM DER WECHSELEITIGEN BEZIEHUNG ZWISCHEN TON UND FARBE: VON ARISTOTELES BIS GOETHE)**


Reviewed by S.V. Sintzova and R.F. Saifullin, Institute Prometei, K. Marx 10, KGTU, 420111, Kazan, Russia. E-mail: <galeyev@prometei.kcn.ru>.

In “Ist C Rot,” Jewansky analyzes the historical development of music-color interaction, from Aristotle to Goethe. It is necessary to emphasize from the beginning the author’s highly critical approach to historical and bibliographical materials—Jewansky does not necessarily believe the information found in established bibliographies and indexes (compiled by Western European authors), noting the inclusion in them of false, nonexistent sources as well as numerous reprinted sources with inconsistent readings. Based upon new interpretations of known sources and discovery of previously unknown texts, Jewansky succeeds in making a precise analysis of this problem and reveals instances of the false determination of dates.

The monograph’s concept can be summarized in three theses:

1. There is no universal understanding of “color-sound.” This phenomenon has been understood differently in different epochs and different countries, and the way in which one analyzes the interconnection between color and sound depends on historical and cultural context. Jewansky is the first author to approach this subject in such a way.

2. In the period around Newton and Castel, Jewansky, however, writes of the existence of a series of attempts to provide different explanations of these analogies, underscoring this fact as evidence for the universality of such searches and disproving the accepted opinion that they are unique and occasional.

3. Jewansky emphasizes that previous research made use of a mechanistic approach to color-sound theory. He accepts the fact that information about synesthesia, the intersensory association of phenomena, played no role in explaining analogies between color and sound. However, as Bulat Galeyev has shown, synesthesia is manifest in Castel’s works: each octave reproduced in color is associated with a higher level of brightness where the register is higher.

As to the question in the title of the monograph—“Is C Red?”—the author provides a concrete answer. This color-sound analogy, formulated for the first time in the middle of the eighteenth century, substantiated by Newton and then interpreted in very different ways, is merely a statistical indicator of the preference for seeing C as red (this, in Jewansky’s opinion, is actually connected with synesthesia).

In spite of the author’s statement that his monograph features very thorough bibliographical research, it is with sorrow that we have to note that he