

## No Depth: A Call for Shallow Listening

If you Google “Billy Bao,” you may read of a Nigerian expatriate who left his native Lagos for Bilbao. You may learn that, after a period as a street musician, this Lagosian assumed the *nom de guerre*, Billy Bao, and joined up with Basque musicians Mattin and Xabier Erkizia to form a band that would share his name. Since 2005, the band, Billy Bao, has released a slew of recordings that combine the visceral politics of early punk and the density of noise with a postproduction cut-and-paste aesthetic. A couple of years ago, the band began making plans for Billy Bao to return to Lagos, to reconnect with the city and to make new music with Nigerian musicians. Last summer, Mattin and Erkizia published an account of their time in Lagos in the *Wire* magazine’s “Global Ear” column.

The resulting recordings are due to be released in late 2015. The band refers to them as *The Lagos Sessions*: four tracks, each about fifteen minutes in length, each envisioned as one side of an hour-long, double LP. The music is a departure from their previous work. Within the first minute of side A, we hear bursts of electronic noise, the sounds of street traffic, solo drumming, a capella singing, and snippets of the auto-tuned Naija-pop that dominates contemporary Nigerian radio. Around the two-minute mark, a man, as if issuing the first rallying voice at a political protest, chants, “Here in Lagos the future is ours!” He is followed shortly thereafter by a distorted guitar riff that sounds like a not-quite-copy of the Stooges’ “1970.” It is not the quick-cut collage work that separates this from previous Billy Bao material, but the intense, saturated appropriation of a set of cultural signifiers: street sounds, political discourse, news broadcasts, and a variety of Lagosian music, popular and traditional, taken from recorded sources, captured in the streets, or recorded in a studio specifically for this project. With this—or against it—Billy Bao sets sections of performed noise-punk. But they also manipulate recordings of the Lagosian

music, layering, editing, and effecting it to create new textures and structures. At times, relatively long passages that could pass for songs are allowed to play. Side B, for instance, begins with four minutes of a Stooges-style rave-up, complete with overdriven vocals in English. The chorus repeats, “We come from Lagos.” Eventually, the song is swallowed by electronic noise, which then cedes to almost three uninterrupted minutes of a Nigerian man describing the ethnic, religious, political diversity that feeds the dissensus of Nigerian national politics. Later, against a dissonant soundscape, a woman sings an R&B melody, without rhythmic or harmonic support, about infrastructural problems in Nigerian commerce, transportation, healthcare, and utilities, all the while, “leaders still eating from the massive economic cake.”

Everything about this project, from the title to the elaborate back story of Billy Bao’s return to Lagos, asks us to listen to these recordings as a kind of site-specific work. But the kind of site-specificity that we are forced to imagine and apply is skewed on a few counts. First, site specificity is a mode most commonly associated with visual art practice. There have been some attempts to theorize the site specificity of sonic works, but most of this literature ignores the vast and frequently revised thinking of site specificity in the visual arts. As a result, theories of sonic site specificity are generally not as sophisticated, thorough, or nuanced as those of their visual counterparts.

Second, site specificity most commonly refers to encountering the work *in situ*, in a particular location and set of circumstances that activate the work. The presumption is that if the work were reconstructed or reconvened in a different location, under different circumstances, it would not function as well. Or, possibly, it would not function at all. Although site-specific works are almost always made on site, that is, in the same location in which they are eventually experienced by an audience, the term site specific is usually more concerned with the spectatorial experience of the work in, and as, its site. Site specificity is not usually overly concerned with the site of production if that site is not also the site of reception. When work is made in the studio, for example, we don’t typically think of the work as specific to the site of the studio—if that is not also where it is displayed (although, perhaps, we should).<sup>1</sup>

This brings us to the third skew of site specificity demanded by this project. *The Lagos Sessions* exists solely as an audio recording. The site of production

is not the site of reception. More crucially, Billy Bao cannot control where, when, or under what circumstances, you or I listen to this recording. The site of reception is unstable and unpredictable.

One way to approach *The Lagos Sessions* as a site-specific work would be to abandon the site of reception and reorient attention toward the site of production. This would allow us to think about Lagos as the site of Billy Bao's intervention. But let's not take the easy way out. Stubbornly, yet with purpose, we will retain site specificity's attention to reception. Therefore, in order to engage *The Lagos Sessions*' specificity to its site, we will need to clarify the meaning of the term "site" and we will need to offer an account of the particular site (or sites) engaged by *The Lagos Sessions*.

In her book, *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*, Miwon Kwon has offered what is probably the most influential genealogy of site specificity.<sup>2</sup> Kwon establishes three "paradigms" of site specificity, which emerge in art history in roughly chronological order. The first, what she calls the "phenomenological," responds to the physical realities of the space in which the work is encountered. The second paradigm, the "institutional," goes beyond the parameters of the space itself to consider the agency and history of the gallery or museum. The third, and most recent, "discursive site-specificity," goes beyond the parameters of the institution, taking "site" as a product of various, intersecting narratives, debates, and practices. These intersections frame the work in a series of overlapping discursive matrices, generated intentionally and coincidentally by the artist, curators, critics, historians, patrons, spectators, commerce, and current events.

Lytle Shaw insists on recognizing that the discursivity that a work claims as its site can complicate the relations generated by the work. In his 2012 book, *Fieldworks: From Place to Site in Postwar Poetics*, Shaw highlights and modifies important implications of Kwon's account of site specificity. A discursive site does not simply reveal a locational site, nor is it merely an environment within which the work exists. Instead, discursivity makes and masks both what the work is *and* what the site is. Relying on observations made by the artist, Robert Smithson, Shaw notes that

despite various and often insightful engagements with theory, critics of site-specific art (including Miwon Kwon, James Meyer, and Hal Foster)

have persistently avoided the problem of rhetorical mediation—the ways that, as Smithson says, “language ‘covers’ rather than ‘discovers’ its sites and situations.”<sup>3</sup>

Thus, all three of Kwon’s categories fold into one another in complicated, and complicating, ways. The site is always constituted by overlapping matrices of reference, what Roland Barthes so famously called a “fabric of citations.” Even at the level of the discursive, we are no longer dealing, simply, with a linguistic text, but always with the (con)text or the *with-text*.

In order to account for the discursive site specificity of Billy Bao—in order to *hear* the discursive site specificity of *The Lagos Sessions*—we need to reattach the music to its often implicit, often ignored, but always present, socio-historic conditions of existence. So, not only do we need to revise our understandings of discursivity and site specificity, but we also need to devise and demonstrate an alternate model of listening. Such a model would locate the sonic work in the dispersed site of what is sometimes called the “extra-musical,” that is: additional forces, influences, and relationships that license the motivations, structures, and meanings of the composition. These considerations extend listening to include a broad inventory of concerns and conditions: tradition, expectation, convention, gadgets, subjectivity, institution, and history.

Acting on what was at first a flippant impulse, but now seems increasingly meaningful, I will call this model “shallow listening,” in contradistinction to Pauline Oliveros’s notion of “deep listening.” Deep listening suggests something to be quarried, something at the bottom, a bedrock, an ore, a materiality that contains riches. Oliveros, working along Cagean lines, imagines that sounds-in-themselves are deeply valuable entities, imbued with eternally rewarding sensual and experiential qualities. Imagine the same volume of listening attention. But instead of condensing it within a concentrated, narrow-gauge bandwidth, shallow listening pools at the surface, spreading out to encompass adjacent concerns and influences that the tunnel vision of the deep model would exclude. Billy Bao’s *Lagos Sessions* necessitates shallow listening. In fact, other models of listening, whether deep, or conventionally aligned with certain genres, are doomed to mishear this work.

With shallow listening, there is no there there—or there is no ore. Rejecting the material riches of sound-in-itself as an outright impossibility, shallow listening also rejects the transcendent ineffability to which sound often lays

claim. Shallow listening, insists on immanence. Shallow listening insists that we retain the ability to intervene and to effect the sites at play in the sonic work.

The discursivity that creates “Lagos” doesn’t map to any one geographical site. It is not bounded by the city limits, by the psyche of any individual Lagosian, or by Lagosians in general. The discursive sites of “Lagos” are many, overlapping, never mutually exclusive. One site may have been generated at another. For example, Lagos’s relation to its site as a center of the slave trade cannot have been generated entirely within the geographical site of Lagos but is largely generated in Britain and America. Additionally, a site may have been generated locally, exported, modified, and reimported as a new, recombinant site. One might think of Nigerian music traveling to America, only to mutate and return to Lagos as James Brown’s funk, before becoming the site of Fela’s Afrobeat. In shallow listening, there should be no confusion: What we are hearing is not sound-in-itself, nor the sound-of-Lagos-in-itself, but the sound of an intention to represent the fabric of citations that constitute Lagos. We would not be unjustified were we to create a contraction here, converting Barthes’s phrase, “fabric of citations,” into “fabrications.” This leaves us with “the fabrications that constitute Lagos.”

Interestingly, in annulling sound-in-itself, we end up creating a different kind of problem, a problem identified by Hal Foster, in his 1996 book, *The Return of the Real*. As late-twentieth-century art practices see the artist inhabiting and interacting with the site of the other—usually the exploited worker or the postcolonial subject—the artist is transformed into a kind of de facto ethnographer. Vis-à-vis this inhabitation, the artist identifies with the economic and social conditions of the other. The fantasy is that somehow the artist can assume the moral high ground of the oppressed, to absorb her wounds and degradation, thereby healing the other while absolving herself of the guilty conscience of privilege. Foster says the fantasy is based on

the assumption that the site of political transformation is the site of artistic transformation as well, and that political vanguards *locate* artistic vanguards and, in some cases, substitute for them.<sup>4</sup>

What’s worrying about this strategy is that it aspires to a particularly virulent variety of transcendence. When the artist—or the artwork, or the spectator—overidentifies with the other, this identification is based on and located on a

fictitious site, projected as a transcendent idealization of purity and innocence. This is the unattainable space of utopia. And, as Foster points out, it is a utopia forced into the service of the artist, the artwork, and the spectator:

This site is always *elsewhere*, in the field of the other. . . . This elsewhere, this outside is the Archimedean point from which the dominant culture will be transformed or at least *subverted*.<sup>5</sup>

The site of the other is elsewhere. It resides *beyond*—beyond our influence, beyond our control. The power this site bestows is absolute and inviolate, in a way and to an extent that only a fantasy can be. The innocence of the other indemnifies, inoculates, and absolves the privileged site of those with an investment in the artistic encounter and the culture that licenses it.

One of the fascinating things about *The Lagos Sessions* is that it puts this fantasy at the center of its project. But it neither assumes nor rejects its privileges. Instead, *The Lagos Sessions* compels the listener to engage this problem. In order to do so, we start by marking out some of the operative positions and sites of *The Lagos Sessions*. It seems plain that the cultural-aesthetic other of *The Lagos Sessions* is Lagos itself. But, as we've seen, the plainness of the itself is never so plain. "Lagos itself" nests in quotes, in a fabric of citations, itself a fabrication. We must also remain on our guard about Foster's problematics of ethnographic transposition. What symbolic violence does the *othering* of Lagos (or "Lagos") do to Lagos as a site? And what benefit does it provide for Billy Bao, for *The Lagos Sessions* project, or for me, the receptive listener?

Negotiating these problems depends on what Foster calls "framing" and "critical distance." After appearing to damn a lot of the art that he sees as taking ethnographic approaches, Foster concludes that the truer evils are (1) overidentification with, or (2) disidentification from, the other. These two positions do little more than shore themselves up as finalities, utopian in their communion or isolation. But, Foster suggests, there is a third way. This third way allows for contingency—utterly *topian*, that is to say *sited*—in its multiple, complicated, and contradictory relations with other sites. This way involves framing one's own artistic or ethnographic project, maintaining as much transparency as possible regarding the project's positions and sites. The project must maintain a critical distance without becoming satisfied

that it has successfully outrun the hounds. While fraught with danger and incontrovertibly compromised, this is the only type of engagement with the other that allows differences to remain meaningful.

In order to think more precisely about the framing and critical distance of Billy Bao's project, let's contrast *The Lagos Sessions* with *My Life In The Bush Of Ghosts*, released in 1981 by Brian Eno and David Byrne. Like *The Lagos Sessions*, *My Life In The Bush Of Ghosts* has a strong Nigerian connection. The title is taken, verbatim, from a 1954 novel by the Nigerian author, Amos Tutuola. Like *The Lagos Sessions*, Eno and Byrne's album is constructed from a combination of live playing and previously recorded sources: looping rhythms, samples of African music, Arabic singing, and Pentecostal preachers. As Byrne confesses in his liner notes for the album's 2006 reissue, he and Eno "fantasized about making a series of recordings based on an imaginary culture. We'd make the record and try to pass it off anonymously as the genuine article."<sup>6</sup> Ultimately, they abandoned this subterfuge, but Byrne admits that "this fantasy continued to guide us in a subconscious way."<sup>7</sup> Byrne goes on to explain how, at the time they made the album, he and Eno were immersed in African culture and music—listening to Fela Kuti, to field recordings on the Ocora label, and reading John Chernoff's *African Rhythm and African Sensibility*.

Byrne's liner notes function as a kind of just-so story of how he and Eno came to make *My Life In The Bush Of Ghosts*, to recount the various ideas and influences that came together to make a recording that is now celebrated for both its experimentalism and its accessibility. At the same time, these notes serve as a kind of framing, in Foster's sense. They establish Eno's and Byrne's *bona fides*; confirming that they are not casual cultural interlopers, that they have done their homework. But the reference to Chernoff's book cuts both ways, opening a can of orientalist worms. As Kofi Agawu points out, the notion of "African rhythm" that Chernoff identifies as central to African sensibility, and that Eno and Byrne rely on so heavily as an exotic and experimental component of their project, is largely a colonialist construct. Rhythm has been essentialized and idealized as *the* prevalent feature of African music. This idea collapses in two directions. First, to generalize an "African music" is to whitewash a continent's-worth, and centuries'-worth of differences. As Agawu notes, "A continent with a population of upward of 400 million distributed

into over forty-two countries and speaking some thousand languages is virtually unrecognizable in the unanimist constructions that some researchers have used in depicting African music.”<sup>8</sup> Second, the construction of “African rhythm” is transparently an attempt to other African music as a means of shoring up Western musical values, harmony most prominent among them. In mentioning Chernoff’s book, Byrne intends to substantiate his and Eno’s deep engagement, not just with African music, but also with its critical analysis. Tellingly, Agawu writes that Chernoff’s opposition of African music with what he presumptuously calls “our music,” is a problem at precisely the level of “framing.” Agawu points out that Chernoff is writing in the late 1970s. Yet, to establish what he means by “our music,” Chernoff “invokes the opening four bars of Beethoven’s *Sonatina in G Major*.”<sup>9</sup> Agawu takes musicologists to task for lazily making such comparisons between what is almost always “our music” and “theirs,” without actually doing the comparative legwork. “Instead, one side of the opposition is given short shrift, conveniently silenced, suppressed, ensuring that writers’ initial prejudices reemerge as their conclusions.”<sup>10</sup> As Agawu points out, a fair accounting of Western music in the late 1970s would have to include—beyond Beethoven—Bartók, Reich, and Stravinsky, to name a few “more or less at random.” Considering the Hungarian, Ewe, and Russian folk musics being appropriated by these composers in the Western, high-art tradition,

a determined researcher could easily show that the sum of isolated experiments in rhythmic organization found in so-called Western music produces a picture of far greater complexity than anything that Africans have produced so far either singly or collectively. One could, in short, quite easily invent “European rhythm.”<sup>11</sup>

But, ultimately, to compare *The Lagos Sessions* with *My Life In The Bush Of Ghosts*, one has to abandon any neat correlation (or opposition) of one object to the other. We are, as they say, comparing apples and oranges. Rather than identifying opposing tendencies in *The Lagos Sessions* and *My Life In The Bush Of Ghosts*, our understanding is better expanded by noting the divergent contexts which grant each work its legibility. The comparison then—or at least the one that bears fruit—is the one between a work in the self-critical tradition



of post-1960s art (*The Lagos Sessions*) and a work that, despite all its knowing references to, and incorporations of, avant-garde postures, is part of the culture-industrial complex (*My Life In The Bush of Ghosts*). Despite their art world connections and acceptance, Eno and Byrne, firmly operate in the world of pop and rock music, where framing and critical distance are anathema to both the expectations of the audience and to the functioning of the commercial apparatus. And although Billy Bao releases LPs and CDs, the project frames itself within the critical art-historical tendencies of the last forty-odd years. On *The Lagos Sessions*, Billy Bao is at pains to reveal its positions and contradictions, to avoid easy answers, and to disseminate authorial control of its content. The band's relationship to material on one side, and audience on the other, self-consciously generates the critical distance and framing described by Foster. Billy Bao engineers a nifty maneuver whereby the sites and forces that frame *The Lagos Session* become the semiotic grid within which the album's internal gestures register and make meaning. All works of art engage in this maneuver to greater or lesser degrees: converting situations into semantics, context into text. But *The Lagos Sessions*, as musically sited as it is, proves uncommonly adept at situating itself and its constituent gestures in the expanded context of a particular lineage of political, critical, conceptual art.

There are a lot of musical sites invoked over the full hour of *The Lagos Sessions*. I've mentioned some of these already. But the fabric of citations that constitute Lagos as a musical site is explicit. There is a reason that Lagos figures so prominently in Billy Bao's biography. And there is a reason that this is *The Lagos Sessions*, and not the Bilbao sessions, the Madrid sessions, or the Kinshasa sessions. Lagos is a port city and, in the mid-twentieth century, was a key slave-trading site. Now, the population of metropolitan Lagos is estimated at twenty-one million. Lagos is considered either the fastest or second fastest growing city on the African continent, multiplying and expanding at a rapid rate. As Mattin and Erkizia point out in their article in *The Wire*, resources in Lagos are scarce and most homes receive only a few hours of electricity a day. So the city growls day and night with the sound of gas-powered generators. Still, Lagos occupies a special position in the musical imagination. It is the birthplace of Afrobeat, the melded composite of traditional Nigerian, Yoruban, Beninese, and other West African musics with American funk and Latin

jazz. Fela lived in Lagos, including a seven-year stretch in the 1970s when he declared his home, the Kalakuta Republic, an independent state within the city limits of Lagos. Fela is a controversial figure, a great musical innovator, who studied in London, traveled in America, gradually becoming politicized, and turning his music and his celebrity into vehicles for resistance: first to the lingering effects of colonialism and later to internal Nigerian factionalism, corruption, and oppression under a succession of military regimes.

Billy Bao also uses music as a political tool. On albums such as *May'08*, *Buildings From Bilbao*, and *Urban Disease*, they direct sonic scorn at global capitalism, the co-opting of various cultural forms, and the deactivation of modes of anticonformist living. On their 2008 release, *May'08*, a lengthy section of Fela's celebrated and notorious song "Zombie" is woven into the mix. Billy Bao's Mattin is a prolific thinker and writer, having published widely on art, music, and politics. In 2009, with Anthony Iles, he coedited the volume *Noise & Capitalism*.<sup>12</sup> So it's safe to assume, that by situating *The Lagos Sessions* so specifically in this particular, named, West African city, Billy Bao means to invoke site specificity while also intervening in the conversation that is site specificity. Among the discursive sites that are implicitly invoked and inhabited are the texts I've cited here, most notably and most certainly, Miwon Kwon's *One Place After Another* and Hal Foster's "The Artist As Ethnographer." Additionally, the title of Foster's text echoes Walter Benjamin's "The Artist as Producer" while also borrowing and adapting some of Benjamin's political reasoning. Undoubtedly, as a politically engaged artist and thinker, Mattin is also engaged with Benjamin's text.

And, while it's less likely that Billy Bao is in dialogue with Lytle Shaw's *Fieldworks*, I nevertheless, want to take up a point that Shaw makes, drawing various discursive sites into productive friction. Shaw relates site-specificity—especially the discursive variety—to institutional critique. Discursive site-specificity is almost always involved in an archaeology of its sites, pitting texts against each other, teasing out internal contradictions, and in the best cases, excavating the work's own complicity in the relations being exposed and created. As Shaw points out,

Most of the artists Kwon discusses (including Mark Dion, Andrea Fraser and Renée Green) have been closely associated over the last twenty years with . . . [the Whitney Independent Study] Program.<sup>13</sup>

Shaw doesn't mention that Hal Foster served for a time as Director of Critical and Curatorial Studies at the Whitney ISP. In fact, Foster himself states that *The Return of the Real*, the book in which "The Artist As Ethnographer" appears, was conceived during his tenure there. Suddenly, the site of discursive site-specificity and the site of the artist as ethnographer, are revealed as overlapping. The adjacency of institutional critique to site-specificity brings the three sites, the three discourses, into contact with each other. The particular discourse of discursive site-specificity starts to mimic the concerns and methods of institutional critique. Shaw identifies the problem, not in the Whitney program's co-opting of these discourses (although it seems that such co-optation is the problem's mechanism), but in the likelihood that the ISP's concomitant dedication to site-specificity and institutional critique precludes certain varieties of analysis of both sites and institutions. The Whitney's influence on the employment of these discourses—how they are applied to the production and reception of works of art—"forecloses other avenues of analysis,"

AQ: Please suggest if "its seems that" can be changed to "it seems that".

Yes, this should be: "it seems that..."

focusing on the ways that museums in effect vaccinate themselves by inviting critical shufflings of their collections by artists, the ISP seems to have taught its artists and critics, including Kwon, to think of the dynamic between critique and containment in spatial rather than temporal terms.<sup>14</sup>

Here's the kicker: Mattin also attended the Whitney Independent Study Program. So, it's no stretch to say that the Whitney program becomes another key site of *The Lagos Sessions*. Mattin's participation in the ISP puts him, so to speak, at the scene of the crime: the discursive site where institutional critique, the artist as ethnographer, and site-specificity are transformed into the three heads of a beastly Cerberus, guarding the entrance to the art historical underworld. I don't invoke the Cerberus as a way of attacking Billy Bao or *The Lagos Sessions*. Instead, I put this three-headed discursive site into play in order to allow us to think about the operative discursive sites of *The Lagos Sessions*. One of the more problematic—and potentially productive—sites is the position staked out by *The Lagos Sessions* relative to Foster's anxieties about the ethical defensiveness of such ethnographic projects. The other engages Shaw's critique of the now common institutional strategy of inviting immanent critique as a way of holding more vicious dogs at bay.

Listening shallowly to *The Lagos Sessions* allows history back into our understanding of the project's site-specificity. Sounds-in-themselves are located entities. The sonic object is a spatial metaphor. The site of *The Lagos Sessions* cannot be merely spatial. The project only makes sense when attached to a sequence of events, a set of conditions, a fabric of histories, that all converge at a discursive (not merely spatial or phenomenological) site we call "Lagos," but could easily call "logos." It would be silly to listen to the sounds of these recordings as discrete phenomena, disconnected from the situation in which they were produced and in which we listen. It is impossible to listen to *The Lagos Sessions* untroubled by the context upon which its meanings depend.

But just as surely, it would be folly to imagine that *The Lagos Sessions* delivers Lagos. The reasons for this, as we have discussed, are twofold: First, there is no "real" Lagos, self-identical and true. Lagos is constituted by its discursive sites, overlapping and constantly shifting, text-tectonically, with and against each other. Second, transposition is a fantasy. Shifting facts or phenomena from one modality or sense to another, does not complete our understanding of the source material. A sound recording cannot reveal the truth of Lagos, or the world, because as Smithson says, that truth is just as much covered as it is discovered by transcription. We must listen shallowly to *The Lagos Sessions*, ever-aware of its relation to its discursive sites. Does *The Lagos Sessions* successfully frame its ethnographic complicity? Can it maintain a critical distance, even while making criticality so intrinsic to what it is? In other words, can it remain self-critical? What do its politics sound like? Can we speak of a "sonic ethics"? Even to focus our listening on the site of Lagos, the city and its history, is not enough. Likewise, listening for a critique of the institutional sites of African politics, global commerce, "political" music, or cross-cultural intervention, is insufficient. We must go shallower. The sites of *The Lagos Sessions* only become meaningful when they are allowed to leak out of their pipes, to seep into the groundwater of adjacent sites. Listening shallowly to *The Lagos Sessions* we must come to terms with the fact that there is no depth to what we are hearing. Meaning is spillage. Sound is spillage. Both spread out, ever shallower, ever more complex; more compromised, like Lagos itself. Whatever that means.

*A revised version of a talk delivered at the “Conference on Art, Sound, and Radio,” organized by Giorgia Zachia, in Halmstad, Sweden, May 2015.*

## Notes

- 1 See, Buren, Daniel, “The Function of the Studio,” Thomas Repensek, trans., *October*, Vol. 10, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1979, 51–58.
- 2 Kwon, Miwon, *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002.
- 3 Shaw, Lytle, *Fieldworks: From Place to Site in Postwar Poetics*, Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2013, 5.
- 4 Foster, Hal, *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996, 173.
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 Byrne, David, with Brian Eno, “The Making of *My Life In The Bush Of Ghosts*,” liner notes, *My Life In The Bush Of Ghosts* (liner notes), Nonesuch Records, 2006 (originally released, 1981), unpaginated.
- 7 Byrne, David, with Brian Eno, “The Making of *My Life In The Bush Of Ghosts*,” liner notes, *My Life In The Bush Of Ghosts* (liner notes), Nonesuch Records, 2006 (originally released, 1981), unpaginated.
- 8 Agawu, Kofi, “The Invention of ‘African Rhythm,’” *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 48, No. 3, Music Anthropologies and Music Histories (Autumn, 1995), 384.
- 9 Ibid., 386.
- 10 Ibid., 385–86.
- 11 Ibid., 386.
- 12 Howse, Mattin and Anthony, Iles, eds, *Noise and Capitalism: Politics of Noise*, Donostia-S. Sebastián, Spain: Arteleku Audiolab, 2009.
- 13 Shaw, *Fieldworks: From Place to Site in Postwar Poetics*, 338, fn. 12.
- 14 Ibid.