task often meant going through hell, and the lives of the best artists one knew then were hardly models for the young.

In Cage's cosmology (informed by Asiatic philosophy) the real world was perfect, if we could only hear it, see it, understand it. If we couldn't, that was because our senses were closed and our minds were filled with preconceptions. Thus we made the world into our misery.

But if the world was perfect just as it is, neither terrible nor good, then it wasn't necessary to demand that it should improve (one begins to know what to do with difficulties without making such demands). And if our art was no longer required to provide a substitute world, it was okay to give up trying to perfect and control it (hence the chance operations and noises). What happened for some of us was that our newly released art began to perform itself as if following its own natural bent. It may have occurred to us that we might live our lives in the same way.

Most Westerners would find this hard to accept, while for those who accept its wisdom it is much easier said than done. But here, I believe, is the most valuable part of John Cage's innovations in music: experimental music, or any other experimental art of our time, can be an introduction to right living; and after that introduction art can be bypassed for the main course.

Allan Kaprow, 'Right Living' (1987), in Kaprow, *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life*, ed. Jeff Kelley (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993) 223–5.

Douglas Kahn
The Latest: Fluxus and Music//1993

The future therefore belongs to philophonics.
– Erik Satie[1]

Fluxus was the most musical of the avant-garde (or experimental or neo-avant-garde) art movements of this century. Surrealism had gone as far as working up an antipathy toward Western art music; other avant-gardes incorporated music but rarely created it; and, with the exception of Italian Futurism, achievements in music certainly could not stand next to those of the visual arts, literature, performance and cultural thinking in general. Fluxus became the beneficiary of this 'tardiness of music with respect to the arts' John Cage once noted,[2] tardiness stemming from the relatively minor role music played in the important avant-gardes that preceded it.

Fluxus was the first of the avant-garde movements to have counted among its members so many involved in musical composition and performance, and key participants such as La Monte Young, Nam June Paik, and Benjamin Patterson were, in fact, highly trained. Many of the acknowledged influences on the formation of Fluxus were events conducted under the auspices of music, ranging from Cage's legendary classes at the New School for Social Research in the late 1950s to the numerous musical performances associated with the string of events at the loft of Yoko Ono (married at the time to the composer Toshi Ichiyanagi), at George Maciunas' AG Gallery, and elsewhere. The inaugural Wiesbaden festival was presented under the guise of 'new music', and many of the Fluxus events that followed were billed as 'concerts'. Even the eventual major split in the Fluxus ranks was understood as having been occasioned by a music-world controversy – the protest over the 1964 New York performance of Karlheinz Stockhausen's music-theatre event *Originale*.

That it was more musical than its predecessors, however, is not to say that Fluxus itself should be considered predominantly musical. Much of the Fluxus corpus defied categorization along the lines of established artistic disciplines – music, performance and the written word often coalescing into hybrid forms, exchanging places, or fitting themselves into the cracks between existing media. But because its ostensibly 'abstract' nature provided good ground for a malleability of meaning, because the highly codified nature of its practice served as the perfect foil for an anti-practice, and because it was historically unexploited, music played a central role in the overall conception and evolution of Fluxus; and ideas about music, especially those that concerned the relationship of art to nature, society, mass media and the everyday, played a significant part in the formulation of theoretical positions in important Fluxus documents.

The Limits of Avant-Garde Music

The strategy that had propelled music into an avant-garde practice in the first place was the progressive incorporation of extramusical sounds into the circumscribed materials of music. Based on a response to existing conceptions of what was and what was not a musical sound, it asked the questions: Which extramusical sounds should be imported into the domain of music? and How should such an importation be accomplished? Within this inquiry, there was a presumption that the central component of music was its sonicity – that composition was to start with a notion of sound. This may seem a fairly mundane proposition, but in the context of Western art music at the time and to a surprisingly great extent today, it was very radical, set as it was against the entrenched

conservatism of musical thought and practice. Western art music had treated musical sound in an unproblematic way: the range of instruments and the types of sounds the instruments were supposed to make did not vary fundamentally from one composer to the next or from one generation to the next; the primary task at hand was how to organize this finite set of sounds. Why these sounds should be privileged to the exclusion of all other possible sounds was of little or no concern.

The Italian Futurist Luigi Russolo inaugurated avant-gardism in music when he questioned the nature of musical materiality. In his famous 1913 manifesto 'Art of Noises' (and 1916 book of the same title) he proposed that, because musical sound was self-referential and thereby had no link with the world and its sounds, music had stood still and become self-occupied, while everything that happened in life all around it had energetically advanced into the modern world. His stated goal was to open up music to all sounds, the 'subtle and delicate noises' of nature and rural settings, the brutal noises of the modern factory and city. But he also stated, both in his writings and in the way he designed his class of *intonarumori*, the noise-intoning instruments he built to play his music, that he wished to avoid imitation of these worldly sounds. It is hard to have it both ways, to invoke the sounds of the world – say, by phonographically reproducing them, by bringing the actual sound-making device or event into the concert hall, or by simulating them through other means – without to some degree being imitative. Thus Russolo's embrace of 'all sounds' became conditional upon the tenacious requisites of musical signification. If he had chosen to create a compositional and performance practice based upon the tension between sound and musical sound, he might have created a (relatively) autonomous art of noises. Instead, his 'great renovation of music'[3] became one that would not confound the representational bounds of what stood as musical sound. For the next half-century it represented the strategy propelling or repelling composers with avant-garde motives. They, too, were allured by extramusical sounds but refused to become too associative, too referential. Edgar Varèse's 'liberation of sound' actually domesticated the implications of Russolo's radicalism enough to be ushered into mainstream orchestral practice, while Pierre Schaeffer's *musique concrète*, with its notion of *acousmatiques*, served only to repeat the general presuppositions of Russolo's project.

It was Cage who took Russolo's impulse to its logical conclusion when he proposed that any sound can be used in music; there need not be even any intention to make music for there to be music, only the willingness to attune to aural phenomena. In other words, sounds no longer required any authorial or intentional organization, nor anyone to organize them – just someone to listen. This new definition of music served to extend the range of sounds that could qualify as musical raw material as far as possible into the audible, or potentially audible, world. Categories like dissonance and noise became meaningless, and

the line between sound and musical sound disappeared; every sound had become musical sound.

In practice, however, Cage (like Russolo) could go only so far if he was to remain within the bounds of music. Despite the expansiveness of his theoretical programme, he too had to keep sounds from referring to phenomena too far afield from the restricted realm of musical sound.[4] When he used recorded or radiophonic sound, for instance, he manipulated it either in order to decrease or destroy its recognizability (as in *Williams Mix*, 1952) or to decrease or destroy any context that might make a sound, or set of sounds, sensible in other than a received musical way (as in *Variations IV*, 1964). His famous *4'33"* (1952) silenced the expected music altogether and thus tacitly musicalized the surrounding environmental sounds – including the sounds of an increasingly restless audience.

To musicalize sound is just fine from a musical perspective, but from the standpoint of an artistic practice of sound, in which all the material attributes of a sound, including the materiality of its signification, are taken into account, musicalization is a reductive operation, a limited response to the potential of the material. For Cage himself, the reductions and impositions that came with the musicalization of worldly sound were at odds with the core precepts of his own aesthetic philosophy, especially as expressed in his famous axiom 'Let sounds be themselves.' To ask, as Cage did, for sounds bereft of their associations was to dismiss the vernacular, deny experience, and repress memory – for there are no sounds at the material level heard by humans that are heard outside culture and society. There are no sounds heard through a pure perception – only an apperception 'contaminated' by sociality. Cage's ideas, in fact, can be understood as protecting Western art music against an aurality that, during this century, had become increasingly social.

Sounds have always carried a multiplicity of extant and potential, real and imaginary associations and codifications, changing all the time with different contexts and through different modes of transformation. But with the advent of the acoustic and electronic mass media, the number of sounds and their associations actually accumulated, proliferated and became accelerated; what once may have been assuredly 'natural' sound, for instance, might have become both common and oblique, immediately familiar but ultimately understandable only at the end of a fairly fragile, long string of associations.[5] This was certainly the state of aurality by the 1950s, for there had been more than two decades of sound film and radio broadcast, and television was on the rise. This was also the time during which Cage's ideas on sound were first registered in any pronounced way and the time that served as an incubator for the Fluxus artists.

It was Cage, in fact, who exerted the greatest initial influence on that loose, continually reconfiguring group of individuals associated with Fluxus. Indebtedness

to Cage was widely and freely proclaimed – Nam June Paik confessing, for instance, that 'my past 14 years is nothing but an extension of one memorable evening at Darmstadt '58'.[6] La Monte Young also had become well aware of Cage while he was studying with Stockhausen in Darmstadt (his important 'Lecture 1960' derives from Cage's own 'Indeterminacy' lecture, published in 1959 in Stockhausen's journal *Die Riehe*) and the stark conceptual reductions of his early events resonate with the theatrics of Cage's *4'33'*. In the historical genealogies that George Maciunas (and others) drew up for Fluxus Cage is positioned as the bridge between the avant-garde of the earlier part of the century and artists of the postwar period. Maciunas. in fact, devised one genealogical chart for Fluxus structured specifically by the influences on Cage himself:

> We have the idea of indeterminacy and simultaneity and concretism and noise coming from Futurism, theatre, like Futurist music of Russolo. Then we have the idea of the Ready-made and concept art coming from Marcel Duchamp. Okay, we have the idea of collage and concretism coming from Dadaists … They all end up with John Cage with his prepared piano, which is really a collage of sounds.[7]

After funneling all these historical moments into the person of Cage. Maciunas attributes successive developments to his singular influence: 'Wherever John Cage went he left a little John Cage group, which some admit, some not admit his influence. But the fact is there, that those groups formed after his visits.'[8] While in New York, Cage faithfully attended many performances of lesser-known artists, who often looked upon him – with his pedigrees from North Carolina's Black Mountain College and elsewhere – as a father figure. His classes at the New School for Social Research attracted the likes of George Brecht, Al Hansen, Dick Higgins, Allan Kaprow and Jackson Mac Low, all of whom went on to participate centrally within Fluxus and/or associated activities.[9] In one of the classes led by the electronic composer Richard Maxfield, who had taken over for Cage, George Maciunas met La Monte Young and was thus introduced to the new music, performance and intermedia scene he later helped to transport to Wiesbaden and beyond. 'That the introduction of Fluxus at Wiesbaden was presented as a 'Festival of New Music',' the writer Bruce Altshuler has noted. 'points to a critical influence from this [Cagean] direction. And the equipment list for the subsequent 1962 concerts in Copenhagen and Paris – with its radios, candles, broken glass and junk metal, wooden blocks and vacuum cleaner – displays as much as anything else what came out of the [Cage classes at the New School].'[10]

To have freshly confronted the Cagean aesthetic in the late 1950s would have been both exhilarating and frustrating: so much was allowed that nothing, it might seem, was left to be set free. 'Every young artist tried to define himself/

herself as going past Cage but this was very difficult because the Cagean revolution was very thorough', recalls the composer James Tenney, citing an influence so total as to have 'created a situation where we don't have to kill the father anymore'.[11] Yet it was no accident that Nam June Paik, in an act of symbolic emasculation, chose to cut off Cage's tie as part of his performance *Étude for Pianoforte* (1959–60), for throughout Fluxus literature and activities there are repeated attempts to supersede or escape the Cagean aesthetic, to get to the point somehow of being 'post-Cage'.

Teased by Cagean avant-gardism, and simultaneously provoked by the difficulty of advancing a musical practice based upon its expansive rhetoric of all sound, Fluxus artists chose to exercise a number of strategic options. These break down into two general, often related categories, the first concerned explicitly with the sonic materials of music, and the second with the relatively unexplored territory of musical practice and performance. Both were grounded in an exploration of the boundaries of music – the inside-outside dilemma – that had challenged the musical avant-garde from Russolo through Cage.

Fluxus and the Properties of Sound

The first strategy that informed the Fluxus aesthetic was a response to the difficulty of conjuring up and recuperating into music the figure of a plenitude of sound that exists on the outside of music. Rather than focusing on the expanse of all sounds, one group of artists who were influential in the early formation of Fluxus concerned themselves with the more circumscribed investigation of sound in its singular, existential and elemental state, concentrating on questions of border cases of sound production and audition, of the integrity of the various integrities of a sound per se. Thus, the historically earlier question of What sounds? receded in Fluxus and was replaced with questions such as Whether sounds? or Where are sounds in time and space, in relation to the objects and actions that produce them? or What constitutes the singularity of 'a sound'?

Cage had already thrown the last dirt on dissonance and noise; in the Fluxus venture the question of noise was forgotten once and for all, and musical sound and sound moved very close to each other. However, Fluxus questions about sound were framed almost entirely in terms of its acoustic, physiological and kinaesthetic properties. Focusing on these states and activities did little more to challenge the status of musical materials as entities divorced from their worldly associations than had the practice of Cage and his predecessors.[12] So although the exploration of the 'borderline', as it was called in the Fluxus vernacular, did not introduce fundamentally new artistic aural practices, it did extend existing processes and configurations and produced a number of compelling pieces, with La Monte Young's foray into sustained sounds, in

particular, pointing to a rich and unexplored artistic area of sonic spatiality in relation to physical acoustics.

One way Fluxus explored the margins of musical sound was to separate these sounds from their normal connections. In the performance of music, the making of a sound is always connected with a task. For example, sounds will always occur if the task is to play a violin or smash it. But the converse – that every task produces a musical sound – is not always true. There are many tasks executed in the midst of an orchestral performance from which no sounds are supposed to emanate. Fluxus took the next logical move: whereas these small or silent sounds in an orchestra are repressed in favour of the production of the musical work, in Fluxus sound-producing tasks do not need to produce musical sound each and every time, or even produce audible sound, in order to produce works. Some sounds, for instance, are produced only 'incidentally', as in George Brecht's *Incidental Music* (1961):

> INCIDENTAL MUSIC
> Five Piano Pieces,
> any number playable successively or simultaneously, in any order and combination, with one another and with other pieces.
> 1.
> The piano seat is tilted on its base and brought to rest against a part of the piano.
> 2.
> Wooden blocks.
> A single block is placed inside the piano. A block is placed upon this block, then a third upon the second, and so forth, singly, until at least one block falls from the column.
> 3.
> Photographing the piano situation.
> 4.
> Three dried peas or beans are dropped, one after another, onto the keyboard. Each such seed remaining on the keyboard is attached to the key or keys nearest it with a single piece of pressure-sensitive tape.
> 5.
> The piano seat is suitable [sic] arranged, and the performer seats himself.[13]

Brecht himself described the incidentalness:

> What you're trying to do is to attach the beans to the keys with nothing else in mind – or that's the way I perform it. So that any sound is incidental. It's neither intentional nor unintentional. It has absolutely nothing to do with the thing whether you play an A or C, or a C and a C sharp while you're attaching the beans. The important thing is that you are attaching the beans to the keys with the tape'.[14]

Mieko (Chieko) Shiomi referred to incidentalness a few years later in her *Boundary Music* (1963):

> Make the faintest possible sound to a boundary condition whether the sound is given birth to as a sound or not. At the performance, instruments, human bodies, electronic apparatus or anything else may be used.[15]

La Monte Young's *Piano Piece for David Tudor #2* (1960) made use of an incidental sound connected with the normal act of playing a piano and sequestered it, through the skill of the performer, so that the small sound produced by this act would become perceptible only to the performer, and not the audience. The point of the piece, in fact, was to eliminate even this remaining degree of incidentalness.

> Open the keyboard cover without making, from the operation, any sound that is audible to you. Try as many times as you like. The piece is over either when you succeed or when you decide to stop trying. It is not necessary to explain to the audience. Simply do what you do and, when the piece is over, indicate it in a customary way.[16]

Young's *Composition 1960 #5* (1960), known as 'the butterfly piece', split the tasks of sound production and sound perception between species, further isolating the question of audibility by eliminating the human performer altogether. In this case, the human listener must consider that sounds may exist even though humans may not be able to hear them unaided:

> Turn a butterfly (or any number of butterflies) loose in the performance area. When the composition is over, be sure to allow the butterfly to fly away outside. The composition may be any length but if an unlimited amount of time is available, the doors and windows may be opened before the butterfly is turned loose and the composition may be considered finished when the butterfly flies away.[17]

Audibility, for those who dare wonder, is usually the absolute minimum requirement for the existence of music. The music semiotician Jean-Jacques Nattiez has written, for example, that 'we can ... allow (without too much soul-searching) that sound is a minimal condition of the musical fact.'[18] In this respect Young's *Composition 1960 #2*, written concurrently with the butterfly piece, was

easier to think of as music since the work, 'which consists of simply building a [small] fire in front of the audience'[19] at least produced sounds that would go in and out of audibility. (As Satie wrote, 'Here, we are in pyrophonics.')[20] Yet, according to Young,

> I felt certain the butterfly made sounds, not only with the motion of its wings but also with the functioning of its body and ... unless one was going to dictate how loud or soft the sounds had to be before they could be allowed into the realms of music ... the butterfly piece was music as much as the fire piece.[21]

Young's line of reasoning marked a departure from Cage's ideas about what music requires in order to exist. For Cage – firm in the belief that there is no such thing as silence and following a strategy of all sounds – to bring certain small sounds into audibility through amplification was to bring them into music. He was even willing to entertain the idea that sounds produced by molecular vibrations might one day be amplified and musicalized, echoing the conjecture of a 1933 Italian Futurist radio manifesto:

> The reception amplification and transfiguration of vibrations emitted by matter. Just as today we listen to the song of the forest and the sea so tomorrow shall we be seduced by the vibrations of a diamond or a flower.[22]

Cage's interest in amplified small sounds went back to 1937, when in his essay 'The Future of Music: Credo' he called for 'means for amplifying small sounds', and can be found later scattered in various of his scores and writings.[23] It is no coincidence that he cited amplified small sounds in referring to his *0'00'* (1963), for this work can be considered Cage's response to the Fluxus developments of that time, especially to its emphasis on performance and everyday life.[24]

> 0'00' ... is nothing but the continuation of one's daily work, whatever it is, providing it's not selfish, but is the fulfilment of an obligation to other people, done with contact microphones, without any notion of concert or theatre or the public, but simply continuing one's daily work, now coming out through loudspeakers.[25]

Cage claimed that 'the piece tries to say ... that everything we do is music, or can become music through the use of microphones ... By means of electronics, it has been made apparent that everything is musical.'[26]

But while Cage was saying that the amplification of a small sound to make it audible creates music, Young was beginning to say, with respect to *Composition 1960 #5*, that any sound could be music as long as the existence of sound was conceivable; in other words, the arbitrary limitations of the human ear or technology (imagine the difficulty of placing a microphone on the butterfly) should not define the bounds of music. Young was nevertheless still quite Cagean in the way he argued for musical sound existing apart from human audition. Like Cage, he said he did not want to impose sense upon sounds because that would be anthropomorphizing them – 'the usual attitude of human beings that everything in the world should exist for them'.[27] But he was willing to think of the butterfly sounds as music, as though music were somehow not exclusively a human activity but practised by other species as well.

Small sounds were on the mind of Milan Knizak when he composed a Flux-radio piece in 1963 that, barring wind, would be very quiet: 'Snowstorm is broadcast.'[28] The previous year Alison Knowles, in her *Nivea Cream Piece for Oscar* [Emmett] *Williams* (1962), had already used the microphone to amplify the small sound of a daily task:

> First performer comes on stage with a bottle of Nivea Cream or (if none is available) with a bottle of hand cream labelled 'Nivea Cream'. He pours the cream onto his hands and massages them in front of the microphone. Other performers enter, one by one, and do the same thing. Then they join together in front of the microphone to make a mass of massaging hands. They leave in the reverse of the order in which they entered, on a signal from the first performer.[29]

The fascination with small sounds and sounds going in and out of audibility has a definite fetishistic quality about it. Any attempt to possess a sound, to become engrossed in it, however, will be frustrated by the very transience and ephemerality of sound itself. The problem in such an enterprise, then, becomes how to hold onto a sound, keep a sound around long enough to hear it truly: to make the minute, fleeting and banal into something captivating or even profound. Both Young and Takehisa Kosugi attempted to address this problem of 'holding on' to a sound by experimenting with techniques of repetition and sustainment. Breaking through traditional notions of the integrity of a single sound, their work in this area demonstrated that any single sound contained exceedingly complex processes of production, of internal configuration: that a single sound's interaction with corporeal and environmental space transformed it from one moment to the next; and, therefore, that a simple musical structure of repetition or sustainment was not simple at all.

Perhaps the most outstanding repetition piece was Young's *X for Henry Flynt* (1960), in which a loud sound is repeated steadily every one to two seconds, a great number of times, with instrumentation and the number of repetitions left

unspecified. While repetitive works such as Satie's *Vexations* (1893) and *Vieux séquins et vieilles cuirasses* (1913) have often been cited as precursors of *X for Henry Flynt*, there were, in fact, significant differences in the enterprises. Satie's works repeated units of organized musical sounds (not individual sounds, as did Young's), and thus any attempt to perceive the interiority of a sound first had to contend with how that sound might relate to others. (This condition also pertains to the subsequent 'minimalist' work of such composers as Philip Glass, Steve Reich and Terry Riley.) Young's piece, moreover, made evident the fact that, despite attempts at repeating a sound, true repetition is actually impossible: factors of performing the task, of the physics of the instrument, the acoustics of the setting, the vicissitudes of listening, and the resonant complexity of the chosen sound itself forbid it. And, although repetition may have been understood by some individuals with a certain religiosity to enable access to a sonic 'essence', a piece like Young's confirmed that no such thing as essence or identity could exist: even the mechanical act of skipping a record will fail to yield such an inviolable musical entity. Thus, the repetition of a single sound, as it invokes the influences of all those external factors usually overlooked or excluded from consideration, is neither repetitious nor singular, nor conducive to possession.

Through its simplicity, one of the factors that *X for Henry Flynt* highlighted was the disciplined, task orientation of the performance. Kosugi's Fluxus events, such as *Theatre Music* (circa 1964) 'Keep walking intently' – integrated this type of performance with aural aspects, in this case the sound of the repetition of footsteps. But Kosugi also created an intermediary form – set between the techniques of repetitive sounds and sustained sounds – that employed the idea of gradual processes. Perhaps the best-known gradual process pieces were his *South No. 1 to Anthony Cox*, in which the word south is pronounced for a 'predetermined or indetermined duration', and *South No. 2 to Nam June Paik* which more specifically instructs the performer to prolong the task of pronunciation for a minimum of fifteen minutes. Shiomi's *Disappearing Music for Face* (1964), a performance, film and flip-book that all involve a smile very gradually dropping (over the course of about five minutes in performance to twelve minutes in film) to no smile, employs a similarly slow transformation, no matter how mute. Shiomi's 'music' was entirely visual, and thus it could be filmed at high speed to extend its duration. But in the Kosugi process pieces, slowing down the utterance 'south', using the technology of that time, would have altered the pitch beyond recognition. The yogic discipline of Kosugi's pronunciation of 'south' over a very long duration derived from an unusual vocal technique that turns in on its own minute operations, a rough technology that allowed a possible phonetic interior of the word to be divulged and further revealed that this interior was comprised not of syllabic segments but of an interpenetration between and among sounds. The

entirety of the sound 'south' – its integrity – was shown to be at once indivisible and exceedingly complex, and thus the specific integrities of other sounds or other things, like the words that roll so easily off the tongue, were revealed to be potential worlds in themselves.

Kosugi's gradual process takes place in a temporal dimension, its duration unfurling like the distance travelled (south). Sustaining an individual sound for a long period, on the other hand, promotes an experience of time decidedly different from the measured time of traditional music, including that of Cage, who preferred rhythm to harmony and championed Satie the 'phonometrologist'.[30] It was not until several years after Young's Composition 1960 #7 (1960), in which a B and an F sharp are 'held for a long time', that Cage himself began to depart from measured time. As he described it:

> [*0'00'*, *Variations III* and *Variations IV*] have in common no measurement of time, no use of the stopwatch, which my music for the previous ten years had – the structure of time, or the process of time; but in these pieces I'm trying to find a way to make music that does not depend on time.[31]

Young's *Composition 1960 #7*, however, was so much within time, so drastically simplified, that the very idea of time (measured or nonmeasured) in the conventional sense was dislodged and removed altogether. Time could no longer be measured as units of sound passed by, nor could any sequential organization of sound exist. The idea of a 'single sound' that would normally have some type of morphological standing ceased to exist and was replaced by an emphatically phenomenal and experiential situation, as attention shifted fully onto the interior, vertical dynamics of the sound and upon the act of listening.

Practically any sound contains elements within it that may need a duration longer than the life of the sound itself to come into being and to interact with other elements of a sound: sustaining a sound allows these activities to exist. The sustained sound, in all its dynamics, is not only to be heard but also to be transformed by the act of listening itself, with changing positions of the head, with the more noticeable thresholds and durations of attention. The unfolding of the dynamics of the sound within a particular space, relative to the heightened experience of a constantly modulating mode of listening, provided the markers for this new sense of time. The diminishment of time also accentuates the spatiality of sound. Sustained sound can occupy and be heard differently in different rooms and from different places within a room, and it also may 'drift' from one spot to another. A space 'filled' with an almost palpable sound develops around one's body, thereby heightening a sense of corporeality, especially when the body is vibrated by amplified sound.

Thus the turning inward on sound that constituted the strategic impulse of Fluxus to this point inverts with Young's sustained sounds from the fetishistic preoccupation with the constitution of the isolated, ever-smaller unit to the general structure of the entire work based upon time that has no meaning, to the expanses of spaces and mobility of bodies, to an autonomy of internal dynamics. In other words, a sound turns inside out. In relation to avant-garde practice from Russolo through Cage, this is an extremely important moment: a self-exhausting, inward-directed trajectory that suddenly creates, in its paradigmatic state, an entirely new form, signalling an end with elegance, a beautiful flourish as the last device. But as it marks such an end, Young's *Composition 1960 #7* at the same time makes possible music and acoustic works based upon new elaborations of space and the body (factors also repressed within the traditions of Western art music). Although Young and a few other composers and artists have continued to pursue this area, it remains largely unexplored. [...]

1 Erik Satie, 'Memories of an Amnesic (Fragments)' (1912–13), in Robert Motherwell, ed., *The Dada Painters and Poets: An Anthology* (New York: Wittenborn, Schultz, 1951) 18. The reader can assume that much of the content of this important book was familiar to many who were vital to the formation of Fluxus.

2 John Cage, 'Happy New Ears', *A Year from Monday* (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press. 1963) 31. However, in the same essay, Cage says in a deterministic spirit that 'changes in music precede equivalent ones in theatre, and changes in theatre precede general changes in the lives of people.' Historically, the term avant-garde music is almost entirely oxymoronic for the first half of this century. The mythic audiences that rioted at performances of compositions by Schönberg or Stravinsky were too bourgeois to represent an honest reaction. Other activities within the avant-garde (such as painting, performance, and writing) did not require the big technology of a symphony orchestra in order to be realized: all they needed was the modest technology of paint and a brush, a pen, an audience. Most composers, with only a few exceptions such as Antheil, Matiushin, Satie and Varèse, had little regular contact with the avant-garde.

3 Luigi Russolo, 'The Art of Noises. Futurist Manifesto', *The Art of Noises*, trans. Barclay Brown (New York: Pendragon Press, 1986) 23–30. The main source on Russolo is G.F. Maffina, *Luigi Russolo e L'Arte dei Rumori* (Torino: Martano Editore. 1978). Russolo's tactic was to provide extramusicality, noise and the realm of worldly sound by providing an expanded timbral range. For many timbral effects, even those residing unused within conventional orchestration, had themselves been restricted within Western art music. This strategy allowed him to make a discursive appeal outside the confines of musical materiality, while not fundamentally disrupting those confines.

4 See Douglas Kahn, 'Track Organology', *October*, no. 55 (Winter 1991) 67–78; and Frances Dyson, 'The Ear That Would Hear Sounds in Themselves: John Cage. 1935–1965', in Douglas Kahn and Gregory Whitehead, eds, *Wireless Imagination: Sound, Radio and the Avant-Garde* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1992).

5 Because of the climate of repetition established by the mass media, metonymic snatches of sound could stand for an instance, class or context of sounds (and not just those in the mass media proper) and replace these at a greatly increased pace. Sounds, in other words, could be perceived at shorter and shorter durations and, thereby, in a compositional respect. Citation could occur at an elemental level and not, as was the case in musical practice, only at an organizational level, as in a melodic fragment. Cage's ideas at this time – his desire for a comprehension of a greater range of sounds (not just musical sounds) and for an apprehension of their singular integrity – are thus part of an understanding of this fundamental social transformation in aurality as delimited by the theoretical vein of Western art music.

6 Nam June Paik, 'Letter to John Cage' (1972), in Judson Rosebush, ed., *Video 'n' Videology: Nam June Paik (1959–1973)*, exh. cat. (Syracuse, New York.: Everson Museum of Art. 1974) unpaginated. Paik first met Cage in 1958 in Darmstadt, the centre for musical experimentation that included the circle of the composer Karlheinz Stockhausen. For a discussion of the 'major sensation' Cage created at Darmstadt with his new ideas on music, see Andreas Huyssen, 'Back to the Future: Fluxus in Context', in *In the Spirit of Fluxus*, ed. Elizabeth Armstrong and Joan Rothfuss (Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 1993) 140–51.

7 'Transcript of the Videotaped Interview with George Maciunas by Larry Miller, March 24, 1978', in Jon Hendricks, ed., *Fluxus etc/Addenda I: The Gilbert and Lila Silverman Collection*, exh. cat. (New York: Ink &, 1983) 12.

8 Ibid.

9 See Bruce Altshuler, 'The Cage Class', in Cornelia Lauf and Susan Hapgood, eds, *FluxAttitudes*, exh. cat (Ghent: Imschoot uitgevers, 1991) 17–23.

10 Ibid, 17.

11 James Tenney, interview with the author, 21 March 1991.

12 Russolo's strategy had been possible only because Western art music excluded whole classes of sounds – and Cage's only because Russolo had settled for timbre and not for a general sonicity. Fluxus, in turn, was possible only because Russolo and Cage were not directed inwardly upon the unexploited ground of traditional Western art music.

13 George Brecht, *Water Yam* (1963); re-editioned (Brussels and Hamburg: Edition Lebeer Hossmann, 1986).

14 Michael Nyman, 'George Brecht: Interview', *Studio International*, vol. 192, no. 984 (November/December 1976) 257.

15 Reproduced in Ken Friedman, ed., *The Fluxus Performance Workbook*, special ed. of *El Djarida* magazine (Trondheim, Norway: Guttorm Norde, 1990) 47.

16 La Monte Young, ed., *An Anthology* (New York: La Monte Young and Jackson Mac Low, 1963) unpaginated.

17 Idem, 'Lecture 1960', *Tulane Drama Review*, vol. 10, no. 2 (Winter 1965) 73; 83.

18 Jean-Jacques Nattiez, *Music and Discourse: Toward a Semiology of Music*; trans. Carolyn Abbate (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1990) 43.

19 Supra, 75, note 17.

20 Supra, 18, note 1.

21 Supra. 75, note 17.

22 F.T. Marinetti and Pino Masnata, 'La Radia', in F.T. Marinetti, *Teoria e Invenzione Futurista* (Verona: Arnoldo Mondadori editore, 1966); trans. Stephen Satarelli, in Kahn and Whitehead, eds, *Wireless Imagination*, op. cit., 176–80. [...]

23 Cage's magnetic audiotape piece *Williams Mix* (1952). for example. calls for 'small sounds requiring amplification to be heard with the others' as one of the six categories of sonic raw material, and Cartridge Music (1960) requires 'amplified small sounds'. In a rumination on the sound of mushroom propagation he proposed the following: 'That we have no ears to hear the music the spores shot off from basidia make obliges us to busy ourselves microphonically' (supra, 34, note 2). 'The Future of Music: Credo' (1937) is included in *Silence* (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1961).

24 What was often termed 'everyday' in the Fluxus vernacular, however, oddly denied the increasing incursion of media technologies and mass media into daily life. The Fluxus events taken to be emblematic of the everyday were in fact reduced to a generally asocial state in the same way that the Cagean aesthetic promoted a reduction of worldly sound to musical sound.

25 John Cage, quoted in Richard Kostelanetz, ed., *Conversing with Cage* (New York: Limelight Editions, 1988) 69–70.

26 Ibid., 70.

27 Supra, 75, note 17. We should probably look to save for the final word: 'We cannot doubt that animals both love and practise music. That is evident. But it seems their musical system differs from ours. It is another school ... We are not familiar with their didactic works. Perhaps they don't have any.' (Satie quoted in John Cage. 'Erik Satie' [1958], in supra., 77 note 23.)

28 Hendricks, ed., supra, 194, note 7.

29 Supra, 33, note 15.

30 Russolo addressed complex sounds in the way he designed his *intanorumori* (noise-intoning instruments), basing them on a rotary action that could sustain sounds, hurdygurdy style. Other sustained sounds were decidedly mechanical. For example, Russolo tuned the exhaust manifolds of the airplane of the aviopoet Fedele Azari while, elsewhere in Italian Futurism, motorcycles were used in a theatrical setting for their sustained raucousness. Varese's klaxons or Cage's test-tone records, instead of rotating to hear a sound, were used to build a better glissando. Today, sustained sounds are regularly heard in motors, fans, transformers, and the like.

31 Cage quoted in supra., 69–70, note 25.

Douglas Kahn, extract from 'The Latest: Fluxus and Music', in Elizabeth Armstrong and Joan Rothfuss, eds, *In the Spirit of Fluxus* (Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 1993) 102–8.