

According to Walter Benjamin, western art moves away from art having a sacred value toward having exhibition value. Art's value becomes secular, aesthetic and social. It moves from sacred buildings to private ones, and gradually becomes more public: aristocrats and monarchs build collections of art and curious objects, which are displayed to their peers, the bourgeois class follows suit, and the public museum is created. Eventually, the public, including members of lower classes, are allowed in, to be educated into the great heritage of the culture that sits atop them. Exhibition value constrains works to being portable, of recognizable form (e.g. a framed painting, a statue on a plinth), and exchangeable. From the late seventeenth century onwards, art as an institution develops, including galleries, museums, criticism and a public of connoisseurs. This setting of art excludes noise—audiences must behave correctly, demurely; buildings must clearly show works that are autonomous, and simultaneously part of a narrative. Far from disrupting this, modern art leads to a booming of the art institution, and fuels the idea of art history as a narrative where we move from one picture to the next. But modern art does introduce noise, in the form of avant-gardism, and even if ultimately this adds to the teleological story of art, at any given stage, from the 1850s onwards, some part of art was regarded as noise: as not carrying meaning, lacking skill, not being appropriate, disturbing of morals, etc.

Music, too, is harnessed in the modern concept of a concert where the audience sits silent, except for regulated participation, and the musicians are separated, elevated in more than one sense. Even as late as the eighteenth century, audiences at musicals are raucous, but gradually they are disciplined,¹ and however we might imagine a Wagnerian *Gesamtkunstwerk* as a sort of noisy crossing of artforms, it completes the subjugation of the audience. Sound is totally banished from the gallery—where art is to remain visual. The framed painting on a wall allows rational contemplation, and so massages the verticality of appreciation and analysis, over the potential messiness of horizontality.² Futurist and dada performances occurred elsewhere—with their collisions of theatre, early sound poetry, film, dance, shouting, music and fighting happening in theatres for the most part, but also on many occasions outside of any cultural institution. It is only really with Fluxus in the late 1950s that sound is tentatively staged in galleries. Where dada's radicality was in not being in a gallery, Fluxus, as a second generation of the same impulse, was able to be radical precisely for performing in official art settings (as well as elsewhere). This is the early days of performance art (also in Japan), and Fluxus flows into the outpouring of movements, or approaches of the 1960s: conceptual art, happenings, installations, body art performance. As well as the acceptance of art's radicalization and disrespect for categorical borders between artforms, there is also the question of technology. Sound creeps into galleries in the wake of affordable technologies, notably in tape technology in the 1960s, and the development of video in the late 1960s. This is the first point at which, I would claim, we can begin to talk of sound art, and, just as the (temporally amorphous) advent of Japanese noise music authorizes a retrospective rethinking of 'precursors' in noise, so the sound installations that begin to appear in the late 1960s

allow, or suggest ways in which sound was used to construct art, or was made as art rather than as music.

The Pompidou Centre in Paris proposed an intimate connection between sound and modern art in its *Sons et lumières* show (2005), looking at how artists were inspired by music (like Kandinsky), made sound-producing sculptures (Moholy-Nagy), or incorporated sound as content. Duchamp's *With Hidden Noise* plays with the possibility but unlikelihood of the trapped ball of string etc. producing audible sound. Duchamp's actual musical experiments do not produce sounds that are particularly challenging. Kurt Schwitters' sound poetry is there of course.³ The second part of the show looks at actual sound performances/installations/objects that were designed for the gallery setting, and usually had been located there in the first place. I am not complaining about the hindsightfulness of the show, rather using it to show a problem at the heart of definitions of sound art: namely, that it comes to apply to pretty much anything that has to do with both together. Sound art, like 'noise music', is a noisy genre, something porous and very hard to define, but as I will argue below, following Krauss' take on minimalist sculpture, it is too self-contained, and sets up the listener as self-contained, in order to challenge not sufficiency, but only the way in which that has been constructed (i.e. it's going to 'make you think', and in so doing reveal to the listening subject some part of a hitherto hidden sound reality).

Sons et lumières goes on to gloss over the longstanding incompatibility of sound with the gallery/museum setting. Sound in the gallery is noise—not only inappropriate until recent times, but it spreads beyond its location, or demands more of a sense of location than a painting, say, requires. Sound-based art in a show can be overbearing, and, if there are several pieces, they risk clashing. Contemplation of any given piece is disrupted, and in turn the sound piece becomes an ambience rather than a discrete work. To get round this, space can be allocated away from other works—a sort of quarantine. Alternatively, the piece can be totally isolated and accessed through headphones. So sound art continually raises the question of noise, even if often to be closed off (sometimes by the artists themselves). Once it is safely positioned, it then becomes a highly appreciated commodity of the gallery, as a CD, sound files, or even messier older media are transportable, convenient and probably not unique (however, aleatory the actual playing out of the piece might be). This convenience must be part of art's acceptance of sound art in its most restricted form.

Sound art takes many forms: sound installations, performances, recordings, whether for direct public consumption, or as purchasable objects to listen to domestically, interactive pieces, pieces designed for headphone use, transmission of sound (often from other locations). Each one of these has many variants. The sound source could be the most important factor, or the process of listening it establishes. Sound art is not just sound working as art. Brandon LaBelle notes that

in bridging the visual arts with the sonic arts, creating an interdisciplinary practice, sound art fosters the cultivation of sonic materiality in relation to the conceptualization of auditory potentiality. While at times incorporating, referring to, or drawing upon materials, ideas and concerns outside of sound *per se*, sound art nonetheless seems to position such things in relation to aurality,

the processes and promises of audition, and sonic culture. (*Background Noise*, 151)⁴

The communal element of performance might be what counts, or the enclosedness and peculiar isolation of headphones. It can also basically just be experimental or avant-garde music brought into an art location. This is part of this music's attempt to get away from music and its standard settings, but, again, it is also a way of getting music heard that maybe does not function in concert settings, and that has found a new outlet. Sound art often reflects on its own production, and this can be the effective content of the piece (1960s/1970s art using tape recorders is fond of this). It does this in combination with an exploration of sound—as in Paul Kos' *Sound of Ice Melting* (1970), which has blocks of ice in the gallery, surrounded by microphones. Here sound becomes spectacle of its own production. Sound art extends this into a questioning of listening, and the position of the listener.

Labelle insists that the importance accorded listening and sound production means sound art is process at least as much as product (sound consumption requiring the time of its playing feeds into this): 'sound art as a practice harnesses, describes, analyses, performs, and interrogates the condition of sound and the process by which it operates' (*Background Noise*, ix). That this often supplants the 'what' of what is being listened to might be a problem on occasion, but it is essential to the process. Sound art is also about space, he argues, writing that it is 'the activation of the existing relation between sound and space' (ix). Sound and space are inherently linked, as sound for us is what disturbs air, and that is not going to happen in the absence of space, but sound also structures space, and sound art aims to both illustrate that and do it. Space is not fixed, but permanently forming and reforming, with sound as one of its constituent parts, and this occurs through human intervention and perception (as far as we can hear: humans cannot functionally have any other perspective). Following on from that, 'the acoustical event is also a social one' (x)—it is not just the interaction of human subjects with an object world; it is also interactivity as society. Hence, from these three points, the centrality of Cage's *4' 33"*, which opens these perspectives. Once we have these ideas as ways of thinking and listening, then our whole body is involved, as it is not just a matter of deciphering an encrypted block of sound—i.e. a musical piece. The performances of Fluxus accorded sound a significant part (on Cage, see chapters 1 and 2; on Fluxus, see chapter 2 of this volume), as did the later happenings, and performance art. These approaches sought to break open the rigidity of artwork and viewer, and sound's mobility offered a heightened connectivity.⁵

If sound art is to do all these things, then it either has to be an installation where the sound occupies a certain space (or exceeds it) or a performance. Transportable works can be sound art (particularly if we take self-description as a useful marker), if they are headphone pieces that 'guide' you around a town aurally (Hildegard Westerkamp, Janet Cardiff) or maybe set up an environment, through site-specific sound recordings, other than the one you are in (Richard Long, Chris Watson), even if only listening on headphones in the gallery. A CD of sound art that gets played at home seems less fully part of sound art—despite the growth of field recordings, ambiences, and recordings of installations. The key in any case, is the installation, of which Labelle has the following to say: 'the developments of sound

installation provide a heightened articulation of sound to perform as an artistic medium, making explicit 'sound art' as a unique and identifiable practice' (*Background Noise*, 151). Some of those 'ideas and concerns outside of sound' are to do with disjunction, for LaBelle, and I will return to that below. The installation does not have to do any explicit bridging itself, as it can be sound in a place where the visual is supposed usually to be. The visual is supplanted through a display of the machinery of production or reproduction of the sound, and the visitor to the gallery is now made primarily an auditor.

As sound art expands its remit (colonizing other forms?), and the innovations brought by Cage, Fluxus, conceptual and video art are now taken for granted, the performance of sound art can often be very straight—i.e. basically a concert. So to define itself as sound art, it reverts to the 'what' is being played—supposedly non-musical objects, homemade instruments, odd noises, field recordings . . . at what point this stops being a concert is hard to tell. Conversely, sound art performance that looks uncannily like a concert generates its own audience—i.e. sound art expectations are different from events described as concerts—the quality or type of sounds takes on an autonomous importance, and the listening is thought to be more creative, as the work establishes an ambience (however aleatory or loud or monotonous or dynamic) that encourages reflection or its loss (as opposed to engaging with the content/form of music). Artists like Scanner play to these expectations, with different approaches according to context (in a sound art setting, he would use a radio scanner to sample the city's speech; in a club, he would play electronic dance music). Of course, defeating those expectations works too—it's win-win. An audience in a major gallery might also not recognize sound moves familiar to those who listen to avant-garde music, so are more easily 'disturbed' in their expectations.

On this question of the audience, it is worth going back to Cage. He was highly didactic in his advocacy of listening, and this has been inherited ever since by sound art followers, who have become incredibly deferential to sound in the guise of liberating their listening. A sweeping statement, but in my experience, the only exceptions are the sanctioned 'play' of a 'subversive' disco style party in a gallery setting, or of an art event in a club (like Paul O'Neill's *Mingle-Mangled* [2005]), where the deference is to the curated setting. Cage's 4' 33" is a time and space for sounds to occur in, a space, as LaBelle rightly notes, for bodies to make noises, for ears to hear beyond the confines of the pianist in front of them (one of the less-commented on elements of the silent pieces is that there to be a performer, even if it is you deciding on a duration on which to hear in). By all accounts on its first performance people got restless, some left, and it was not met with rapturous applause afterward, but there can be no failure, because whatever happens, listening has occurred.⁶ The most likely unwitting purpose seems to be to discipline those bodies into correctly listening bodies, static, tensed, if excited in anticipation, about someone or something else intruding. This is no dismantling of music but a heightening of its conventions' hierarchies. Only now the musician is included too in the enforced silence.⁷ Today's attendance at sound art performance is docile—and this can be interesting too, with quietness of the sounds produced an even better strategy than silence for heightening listening. But if we are thinking about noise, it seems to me it is being swept away even as it is being listened for. At

some point, noise has to be allowed to come into hearing, not be caught and musicalized before coming into fleeting being.

Acoustic ecology (or sound ecology) has tried to capture the soundworld in a concerted way. Started and inspired by R. Murray Shafer, and his notion of the soundscape, it pursues the soundworld that we now conceive as opened up for listening by Cage. As with Cage, the principal idea is that there is a soundworld 'out there' and we should appreciate and be part of it. It is more interventionist, though, more of a purposeful bringing of the soundworld to the newly sensitized ears of the listener, in the form of examples of that soundworld. Drawing attention to sounds from around the world becomes important, as does the preservation of 'soundmarks', whether natural or well-established social sound. Acoustic ecology also seeks to limit noise, especially human noise that interferes with the soundscape of 'the world'. It does not quite see human culture as noise, but identifies numerous points at which humanity overpowers its own good sounds and those of nature—basically refusing Russolo's love of industry and advanced technology as noise creator. It is absolutely against noise, and for familiar sounds, and familiarizing people with sounds that elsewhere are a more or less natural part of the soundscape. LaBelle sums it up well in writing that

what acoustic ecology lends to a history of sound art is a social, musical and ontological register, for in proposing sound as a category for bureaucratic consideration, sociological study, and environmental concerns and design, acoustic ecology raises the bar on auditory understanding and its relational nature. (*Background Noise*, 203)

Sound becomes part of what we inhabit, our inhabiting has consequences, and we should alter our thoughtless noise production and consumption to properly dwell in the soundworld. The production of field recordings or works that draw our attention to our surroundings in terms of sound and noise is a means of doing this, not a fully separate mission, so in that sense acoustic ecology has a different kind of open listening to that of Cage, and it is one that *judges*. Noise is always a judgement that certain sounds (or actions, practices, attitudes) are noise, but many would agree that this judgement does not only dismiss things as noise, it discerns good and bad noise. This might be theoretically untenable, but it is what is being done by the Merzbow listener as much as by noise abatement, or 'authentic' sound recordings. In terms of sound art, as well as bringing in elements to the gallery, or onto recordings, acoustic ecology emphasizes that listening should not be restricted to those occasions, and sound artists, at least as much as any other type of artist, have looked beyond the institutions for its works, and situated them or identified listening places in many different types of location.

Sound art is an essential part of both conceptualism and minimalism, writes LaBelle (*Background Noise*, 143), and ultimately separates off from them, while still pursuing their objectives—in the case of the former, in drawing attention to listening, to sound as object, to sound as questioning of perception, and as for the latter, this is the environmental or spatial element, particularly in the case of sound installations. The minimalist Robert Morris made a corridor of wood, entitled *Pasageway* (1961), Bruce Nauman making a very similar piece, *Sound Corridor* (1969). Both establish an oddly differentiated space in the gallery, on the inside

resonating from the body that visits it, and the sounds from the rest of the gallery partially excluded from it. This intrusion in the gallery restructures the space around it, as minimalist sculpture aims to, introduces listening, and alters the movement of the visitor, setting up a disjunctive space. For Krauss,

Minimalism was indeed committed to this notion of the 'lived *bodily* perspective', the idea of a perception that would break with what it saw as the decor-porealized and therefore bloodless, algebraicized condition of abstract painting in which a visuality [was] cut loose from the rest of the bodily sensorium [...] its insistence on the immediacy of the experience, understood as a bodily immediacy, was intended as a kind of release from the forward march of modernist painting towards an increasingly positivist abstraction. ('The Cultural Logic of the Late Capitalist Museum', 433)⁸

Sound is initially part of this project, then sound art reverses its priorities, so that creating an environment is *part* of what sound art does. But all the while, it offers a regenerated perception of situatedness. There are limits to the realization of such an aim, as it is based on a simplistic view of the body, of how experience relates to it, and how a controlling mentality then processes the experience:

Minimalism's reformulation of the subject as radically contingent [i.e. transformed through experience of the artwork] is, even though it attacks older idealist notions of the subject, a kind of Utopian gesture. This is because the Minimalist subject is in this very displacement returned to its body, regrouped in a kind of richer, denser subsoil of experience. (*Ibid.*)

Sound art tries to affect the individual that encounters it, drawing a sense of disjunction from incongruous sound (its presence in the gallery in the first place, then the way in which it makes the visitor think about listening, the oddness, in some occasions, of the sounds themselves), but in so doing, requires belief in an otherwise fixed subject. Put differently, sound installations relocate the individual as a centred subject encountering an object situation, with neither troubled in its respective unities. Nonetheless, despite Krauss' warning, sound art's attempts to fix the listening subject could, despite itself, actually signal the continual de-centredness of individuals.

Sound art also ties in with the development of video art. Sound is a long underplayed element of video art, being a crucial part of Nam June Paik's work, and now a commonplace in video art that tends toward narrative film or music video (i.e. where either sound or vision purposely *accompanies* the other). 'New Wave' filmmakers like Jean-Luc Godard had a keen sense of disruptive use of sound, and 1960s art as a whole exploits all the potentialities of sound and visual media, including where sound is absent, because now it has been made absent, rather than being a result of technical insufficiency. Video art (or experimental film) introduces the moving image to the gallery, thus already questioning the position of 'the' image (as Duchamp's did to a certain extent with his 'rotorelief' machines). It subtly brings an added disturbance in the form of sound, notably exploited by Nauman in numerous videos, where sounds are repeated, voices distorted, and other sounds (like feet jumping) occur. Video artist Bill Viola, known for his grand-

iose reworking of 'the great themes of the human condition' is part of this noisy interference. In a 1999 show at San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, some of his works are described as video/sound installations. The silent ones take part of their supposed emotional power from the contrasting silence (as well as the silences and gaps in the 'video/sound' pieces). This is a more disjunctive use of silence than that of Cage, at least in the museum context, as your attention is drawn to sound and its absence, across something else, as opposed to setting up a purist space of listening creativity. With an early work, *Hallway Nodes*, consisting of two bass speakers positioned opposite each other, Viola configures space as heavy air. The piece is cordoned off by plastic curtains, with a warning about disorientation. This is sound made physical (resonating the air almost visibly) and has a deep effect on the visiting body, which has to readjust to the unbased air outside. This installation, then, not only structures space, but it also makes the structuring itself physically perceptible.

Nauman revisited his video oeuvre for *Raw Materials*, in London's Tate Modern. The long turbine hall was lined with speakers, from which Nauman had constructed a sound piece. It is a radical move to not only place sound in this vast setting, but to remove all other elements. Unfortunately, it illustrates the limitations sound art often encounters. Nauman took the audio tracks from his video pieces, and channelled them through individual speakers. The polite sound levels (or perhaps the presence of bodies) prevented cacophony, or any interference, and isolated what were now sound tracks, such that no interesting recombination was possible. The problem with this work is that the idea of it has taken over, and the idea is very small: here's the sound from video artworks, put together. This is an emptied conceptual art that might be interesting as a critique of conceptual art, but offers an unwitting critique of how sound art's move to the materiality and/or reproduction of sound displaces not only content, the interestingness or noisiness of content, but also any purpose beyond self-sufficient existing.⁹ This problem crosses into the audience, who are too often called upon to marvel at the fact of the work existing rather than anything else. This is not exclusive to sound art of course, and applies to swathes of large scale and/or public art, but sound art is not incidentally or cynically doing this; it is a fundamental condition of its working.

Sound art can do more than this, and it deals in perception, both structuring it and positing it as a question, but too often this is not enough; it is kept at a level of sufficiency, the presentation of sound in its own right, in a rejection of formal experimentation and judgement alike. Maybe like other noise 'forms', it does not bear repetition too well, but more than most types of noise music, it seems caught within its remit to explore perception, to the exclusion of all else. Ryoji Ikeda's *matrix* CD recalls the installation where a visitor would move within the sound, and interactively structure the sound, becoming aware of the processes of physical as well as mental listening. The long tones are also difficult for the listener, highlighting a problem for sound art as it requires a durational participation (i.e. you're not supposed to identify the sound or type of sound, then move on), so noise is going to be thwarted by itself. Sound art has to self-censor to begin to be noisy, rather than be simply rejected as *mere* noise.

Alternatively, sound art can take a musical turn. The Pompidou Centre's *Sonic Process* show of 2002 (first presented in Barcelona) purposely blurred the lines between music and sound art,¹⁰ exploring sound production in a primarily digital

form, or as created in the context of an era of digital reproduction. Janet Cardiff achieved a popular success with her *Forty Part Motet* (2001). As presented at Tate Liverpool in 2003, it consisted of the forty speakers placed in eight groups, forming a circle, occupying one room. The sound is of a piece of sixteenth-century music, as performed by the Salisbury Cathedral Choir, with each speaker allocated to a voice. The piece includes peripheral sound in the form of the moments before the music begins. Cardiff states that with this piece she 'want[s] to be able to "climb inside" the music, connecting with the separate voices. [She is] also interested in how the audience may choose a path through this physical and virtual space'.¹¹ This piece investigates sound as produced in a musical context: audiences are kept from the performers, and the performers are perceived as a bunch, rather than as individuals, thus undermining the voice in favour of the effect. Cardiff's point seems to be that music has lost something, and that this can be restored through restructuring, or, feasibly, deconstruction, but it falls into the problem that Krauss identifies in minimalism, where a hitherto buried authentic experience is restored by the new artwork. Doesn't *Forty Part Motet* deny the sociality of choral sound production, in favour of individualism? A riposte to that would be that they are not ultimately separated off, but that the interaction between individual and group is brought out.

The speakers do more than stand in for the individuals of the choir; they represent them, and do so as specifically absent—one of the recurring themes of sound art being the uncanniness of the playing of sounds both present and signalling a presence now gone, whether of people, of place, or of the sound artist as recorder of another place, then present, there, at least, and now not. The visitor's involvement is to do with them rethinking music as spatializing, as positioning (of the listener). At one level, this is not much different than the aural positioning of stereo, except with 40 channels, or perhaps the questioning of this by Brian Eno, who aimed for a more total sound with his ambient music (see sleeve notes on his *Discreet Music*). In other words, it is part of a quest for aural perfection and authenticity. However, *Forty Part Motet* is messier than that, as the number of channels questions notions of 'surround sound'—the unity of the listening is not achieved by the number of channels, as these are so rigorously discrete.

To return to the gallery's staging of sound art, it seems as if sound art can successfully be allocated a space, and it can also be given control of a space (I mean this literally, not in terms of sound's spatialization and critique of same). The *Sons et Lumières* exhibition not only took an entire gallery space, but it also configured it as separate sound cells, allowing, for example, the reconstruction of Lamonte Young's *Dreamhouse*, whose 'total environment' principally located it forcefully in its historical moment, with its 1960s futurological décor, rather than it highlighting Young's quest for infinite and eternal sound. Once sound art makes up a whole show, the noisiness of sound is reduced, becoming expectation on the part of the listener, while, conversely, certain areas are permitted to be more disruptive, loud, unpleasant. Headphones are never far away, though, especially in new media shows such as the Whitney's *Bitstreams* (2001) in New York. Here visitors were presented with the rather sad spectacle of the sound art component being a row of headphones with accompanying seats. Maybe this illustrates the refusal of the visual or spectacular, in favour of a pure listening, but if this is sound art, it is too little: no spatial structuring, a poor substitute for personal stereos, and

a rigid separating off from the real art. The presentation of video art was closer to the aims of sound art. Indeed, as video art increasingly pays more conscious attention to sound, headphones are provided for the viewer/listener.¹²

Headphones can work, though, in sound art, providing another means for reconfiguring the individual as a listening subject, interacting with space.¹³ Place as well as phenomenological space can be invoked, evoked or disturbed. Cardiff, often with George Bures Miller, specializes in recorded walks.¹⁴ The listener takes a personal stereo out of the gallery and retraces a walk done by Cardiff and making up the recording you are now listening to. This system parodies the audio guide available in museums, offering so much detail it disturbs the walker. Things observed by Cardiff become uncanny—if they are there, there is a hallucinatory doubling of what is in front of you and an odd sense of being followed (even though preceded); or, if not there, the place of the recording separates off from the present location. The walk takes sound into a wider sensorium—and heightens awareness of even a familiar place. The boundary between recorded sounds and those occurring now becomes fuzzy. The whole adds up to a respatialization of the self, actually enhanced through submission to instructions or recorded events. The anarchistic Situationist movement had proposed a similar strategy with the *dérive*, where a walker could reconfigure a place, generally a city, as something they intervened in, rather than passively reacted to, or got moved around in ('parcours'/par-kour' tries this through playful physicalization of the city). It also recalls Fredric Jameson's idea of 'cultural mapping', where the individual in postmodern, globalized society could position themselves, so as to not ignore the connectivity of that society, which is often oppressive.¹⁵

If such strategies mobilize sound, and use sound as mobilization, then we also have to note sound art that occupies a location, framing it for aural observation, instead of providing a contrast. Akio Suzuki tries to get people to listen to the city, usually the city they inhabit. His 'Oto-date Cork 2005' consisted of twenty locations marked with ears, a map helping you find these locations. Once in place, the person takes in the soundscape as present at that spot, at that time. This draws attention to sound as such, to sounds as usually neglected, and to the listener's relation to the cityspace. Such work recalls the holistic outlook of acoustic ecology, but is hard to conceive of as functioning as sound art, except insofar as sounds other than music are worth listening to. Other artists are not just recording a place, but their intervention in it, interaction with it (Scanner's early performances and recordings using a radio scanner, or, more generally, a recording from a specific time and place, i.e. 'when I, the recorder, was here'). In this case, the subjectivity that sound installations want to deal with is represented rather than brought into direct confrontation with the individual who has now become listener. Whether such work is sound art is a matter for another study, or for record shop genre-defining, but like much of sound art, it is not noise, nor is it engaging with it. Where it does, it tends to be where the line between it and noise music is at its finest. This line is not even noisy, as so many artists do both, or do the same thing but get defined in two different ways according to institutional location. The disjunctions are mostly in the relational aspect of sound art (how it makes us aware of relatedness, and our position as related to environments), in its other relation to the visual arts and its homes, in the relation set up between a here and a there in the representing of sound from somewhere else or another time.

NOTES

1. See Leppert, 'Desire, Power and the Sonoric Landscape: Early Modernism and the Politics of Musical Privacy' in Layshon, Matless and Revil (eds), *The Place of Music*, 291–321 and 301–2 in particular.

2. On this opposition, and how certain art, mostly since the 1950s, undermines it, see Yve-Alain Bois and Rosalind Krauss, *Formless: A User's Guide* (New York: Zone, 1997).

3. The exhibition does not consider the sound poetry field to any more than a minimal level, peculiarly given the central role of Henri Chopin and Bernard Heidsieck in the spread of the style. Bob Cobbing and Sten Hanson offer more playful versions of sound poetry. Sound poetry makes noise of language, but seeks a return to a primal human communication through voice, and a deconstruction of language that would reveal its true arbitrariness (as in Schwitters' *Ursonate*). For more on sound poetry, see www.ubu.com/sound.

4. LaBelle, *Background Noise: Perspectives on Sound Art* (New York and London: Continuum, 2006).

5. On this point, I think LaBelle is hasty in dismissing Marina Abramovic and extreme body art of the 1970s, on the basis that it is trying to be cathartic (103–4), unlike Vito Acconci in *Seedbed*, who is dealing with questions of interaction. LaBelle is right to dwell on this piece, where Acconci masturbates from under a raised floor in the gallery, as the speaker conveying his declamations is a central part, and is generally ignored. LaBelle refers to Abramovic's piece *Freeing the Voice*, a lengthy endurance piece, where she vocalizes for the full duration, recalling Artaud, but how is this not a piece that demands listening, or does something to and with listening, and complicity? Other works, such as *Rhythm 10*, where she stabs between her fingers, and then tries to repeat the exact pattern, would surely be worth attention in terms of sound, music and noise. I think the same could be said of much of her 1970s work, even if the point about ecstatic catharsis is probably right.

6. Sound artist Danny McCarthy curated an event (Cageday 4' 33") at the Crawford Gallery, Cork, in 2002 to commemorate fifty years since the first performance of 4' 33". One of the two performances of the piece featured considerable intervention from people working in the venue, just outside the door, while the other was incredibly silent.

7. Kahn has a similar outlook to this, in his *Noise Water Meat*, which LaBelle dismisses (*Background Noise*, 14–16). I think LaBelle's view works, but I'm with Kahn, and his critical take on Cage is not an attack, but an examination of the philosophical limits in Cage's conceptualizations.

8. Krauss, 'The Cultural Logic of the Late Capitalist Museum', in Krauss et al. (eds), *October: The Second Decade, 1986–1996* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997), 427–41.

9. Colin Harrison has suggested to me that the failure of Nauman's piece is a rejection of the drama usually required or expected for the large space, and that this makes it a refusal rather than a failure, or more accurately, failure as refusal.

10. The same can be said of *Sonic Boom: The Art of Sound*, staged at London's Hayward gallery in 2000, and curated by David Toop.

11. www.tate.org.uk/liverpool/exhibitions/janetcardiff/default.htm

12. Video art, and many other art forms, carries its own noise, or potential for noise. This can involve critique of art institutions, questions about and to publics and so on, as well as involving the formal properties of specific artworks. Site-specificity in or for any medium would be one rich source of noise, or of noise prevention or domestication. Only sound art connects directly with the issue of noise and its relation to music within the boundaries here, though.

13. Early concerts of the band Cornelius featured them dispensing headphones to the audience, which is how they would hear the music. Recent years have also seen the spread of the 'silent disco' or silent club, where clubgoers listen through headphones, if they want.

14. Hildegard Westerkamp also works in this area (see LaBelle, *Background Noise*, 205–15).

15. Jameson, *Postmodernism: Or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, 1991).

12
CUT