

Why noise is God.

1. Why noise is not different and so different.

Firstly in music sound art etc. noise has various interpretations and meanings, applications where it is applied, so I want to write about a specific type of noise I'll call "noise qua noise", two examples being "Harsh Noise" and "Harsh Noise Wall"- and its features.... which are randomness, a lack of structure - pitch, rhythm and a lack of criteria for judgement because of the lack of meaningful content. There maybe other sub-genres but what is particular in and to 'noise qua noise' is its essential 'emptiness'. Thus such works are simplicity in manufacture and therefore represent something quite unusual in music though not so in art generally. But nor is this the Dadaist anti art which is theory laden. Anyone can lean a snow shovel against a wall, or exhibit a wine rack, but as an art work these have a genius of originality (as an attack on western culture.... the bourgeoisie - capitalism et al. whatever!...) which makes them 'significant' statements, 'important', 'valuable' commentaries ...by X on Y. Noise qua noise in its 'emptiness' has no ability to communicate, and therefore requires little or no skill in production. A simple demonstration of this is anyone with a computer can use the free software Audacity, choose generate - white noise then choose effect, Bass boost and you will get an example of HNW. Other methods include using chains of guitar effects which given an input - from guitar, microphone or nothing at all, produce and distort the sound into an unrecognisable mess. And yet other methods use mechanical or natural recorded sounds of noise/noises, all produce an unstructured texture of sound which is unlike music as 'organised sound' and so the term 'noise' is apt. Some producers of this noise apply meaning to the product, i.e. a comment on society, environment, socio political systems, nihilist and or pathological systems, thoughts, conditions, illnesses. This reintroduces meaning, purpose and causality into the process or genre and as such they are works akin to abstract expressionism and can thus be regarded and measured or judged even if only in terms of the producers opinion of the quality of one piece with regard to another. However noise qua noise has no such ontology, and its noise qua noise I wish to discuss here. Noise as noise, is not information, therefore cant be an expressive art, its producers are better described as ~~ARTISTS~~ (under erasure). Noise qua noise is never (significantly) different and so very different to noise or anything else as music - or anything else as signifier.... Why is difference, non-difference significant?

A Swiss, a Dane and a Frenchman..

Saussure established and Jacques Derrida elaborated on the Danish linguistics of Jakobson that a signifier is arbitrary. That is the letters or sound of "CAT" and "DOG" are arbitrary in what they are - but signify two distinct types of creature- how they do this is not what they have in themselves - "C" + "A" + "T" but that they are different, just as Chien chat, kat hund, körgtehnoloogiliste ravimeetodite ... work, no language is privileged here, unlike the English idea that any foreigner will understand English if they shout loud enough or the example of a child raised on a lonely Scottish island by a deaf mute was supposed to naturally speak Hebrew...Signs work only by virtue of being different to one another. Cat is a different sound to dog and that is sufficient for language to take place. Or take an example using a word processor where the background colour is the same as the font colour.. without difference there is no text. At its extreme the minimal difference is binary- Yes/No, True/False, Being/Nothingness, Good/Evil.... Zero/One ..

Derrida established that there is neither anything inherent to the word that provides its meaning, or anything external. There is no Doginess inside Dog. Music is no different, remove pitch and rhythm and you would have ? - cacophony or silence? Not only do we use difference in sound - in speech, communication, but in information

processing, in thinking, in Meaning, in Being? Life itself codes differences in DNA as do molecules and atoms, solid objects are solid because of a “mathematical” difference. The laws of thermodynamics which explain the running of the universe rely of differences in energy states... the universe ends when the energy is all at the same level - nothing can take place, no information no difference - no life. Thinking, language, applies a use to these differences.

[Now someone might be thinking non of this has anything to do with noise, or music particularly, its just poor philosophising and theory. But I'm trying to write about the unwriteable, so this is the edge of a metaphorical linguistic / acoustic black hole. In order to show just how black and extensive it is one needs to see it in contrast to the known universe...]

An external arbiter (to meaning, a final fixed meaning or judgement) is possible but it relies on ideas of metaphysics, that is a transcendental plane above and beyond this world where ideas, or gods or God exist in perfection, and so are infallible judges and arbiters of meaning. Hints of this even exist in science where and when the idea of final and absolute truths are thought possible.

All these transcendental beliefs share a commonality in that they hold by faith that such absolute knowledge is available, and much of western culture is founded and riddled with it, as its origins are Greek and Jewish theologies/metaphysics of metaphysical transcendence. Unfortunately Western history revealed evidence for such a faith as being more psychological than ontological. (I will not resort to Gödel's incompleteness theory, Quantum uncertainty or the limits of set theory- proper classes etc.) If you hold such a faith in a transcendental horizon of meaning it appears it can only be just that, any measure of its force has only ever been coercive violence, as opposed to any proof. The Rosetta stone demonstrates that a lost language is undecipherable without an existing translation of it in a known language. In cryptology a 'One Time Pad' is an unbreakable code because the text could mean ANYTHING (and so Everything!). Not even the fastest of computers can break such a code. Why? Given “ergr wegfr ioiyo ec qweff regtgt ijyt xaqsdcdd” could be a code, but without some reference it could be translated into many sentences in many languages, or any possible language, to mean anything. So Derrida wrote “There is nothing outside the text” [Il n'y a pas de hors-texte] - where we can fix or find *a* meaning. This is why 'difference' figures in much of late 20th C philosophy, but is equally true in the development of music, i.e. the abandoning of privileged tonal systems...the revelations of non western musics..

Chimpanzees and Shakespeare.

It is true that given enough time or enough chimpanzees they will eventually type 'Hamlet', eventually they will type all the works of Shakespeare - all the works of literature, in all languages using the alphabet, and all translations of all texts into all other possible languages. Actually they might type aaaaaaaaaa forever - but if a computer was programmed to type out all possible sequences of letters then Hamlet et al. would be produced. (regard Borges "The Library of Babel") Of course the chimps will not know when and if they have done this anymore than I do not know the full meaning of “ergr wegfr ioiyo ec qweff regtgt ijyt xaqsdcdd” or its possible full meanings. This text itself will be and is gibberish to some, to others not about noise at all, poorly written, or to some a fine piece of poetry. I may say that IMO helps here (my intent), but it doesn't. That is IMO of this is not privileged. A mathematical object might be just a mathematical object to mathematicians, and that is all, but it can also be a tool for explaining the universe. Imaginary numbers get mathematicians out of a fix, but they also explain atomic interactions.. a tool has no fixed purpose. Einstein's equations were foundational in the creation of the Atom Bomb even though he had to be made aware of this possibility in his equations by other physicists, he was

unaware of all of the meanings of his work. This goes by other names, it would do now, i.e. 'The Intentional Fallacy', 'The Death of the Author'...

We credit Shakespeare with genius then not because of what he wrote!- but because he got there faster than the chimps? He didn't waste as much time, energy or paper! Natural Selection in evolution does much the same, it creates flying creatures over millions of years, where as a flying thing to occur purely randomly would take much longer, and flying things created by intelligence much shorter.

Why bank clerks wear T shirts with pictures of Che Guevara.

Derrida was also interested in how in 'difference' there hovers always the other, opposite, and a kind of unsettledness - 'aporia' as in his use of the zombie, the living dead. We don't have to go down that road of binary opposites and the privileging of one against the other- classical / popular male / female etc., or the many aporias to be found in and by the process of deconstruction which texts do unto themselves, but out of all of this comes the idea of a 'play' of differences. A sign isn't fixed in its value or meaning - either from the outside or the inside. Of course in some religions there is a transcendental fixer- God - for instance, who privileges Man over Woman - Mankind over all other creatures and the Jews over all other races. Such privileging is obviously problematic in many ways - take the swastika- a symbol of the Nazi fascists, a old Saxon design, a Jain symbol of the creation, a Buddhist good luck sign... Because words are arbitrary signs nowhere and no one can fix meanings on them, or invoke a final arbiter as to meaning. This makes life dynamic, perhaps even allows life.. it means a text has no definitive reading, and we can take music as organised sound to be no different in that. It also means a given text's meaning can change - which may seem odd? A painting of a river bank with some figures sitting on it is "A painting of a river bank with some figures sitting on it" and always will be. However paintings once thought violently anti-social, revolutionary, anti conformity, evil, wrong, degenerate are now the epitome of good refined taste, correctness, beauty and goodness. The museum D'Orcy is full of paintings which now underwrite the Capitalist Liberal good sense / common sense view of the world. So whatever the artist tries to express, their love of life, hatred of it, the work will by virtue of the above express all and everything to some and everybody. Communication, expression, is an illusion.

An average of all possible worlds.

The universe could be accidental or purposeful. Given the latter, and we have been up to now, we can have a music of the spheres. Mozart is the best of musicians only if he lives in the best of all possible worlds. Music has meaning only if it exists in the best of all possible worlds. If on the other hand this universe had no cause, and no destiny, if its one of many possible worlds that chance will actualize then stepping outside of temporality we will get something which is very like noise, just as if we mix all possible texts, pictures or sounds. Why this universe looks the way it does in this scenario is similar to the copy of Shakespeare's Hamlet that a chimp has just produced, from a certain point of view its as random as all the other chimp works, from another, some intelligence that can read English and has a cultural facility and knowledge it's not random nonsense but a work of great literature. That *this* universe is like it is, is why creatures can appear with intelligence and pattern making abilities and see a pattern in it, which has been called religion, philosophy, and science. This 'pattern' or meaning is put in after the event- unless its produced because someone or thing created it with an act of design. It doesn't even have to follow that these possibilities are real or not, it's the insistence on the specialness of creation that frees the artist from the chimp and elevates him above it. All art as art operates under that idea, all music as organised sound does, as does all theories which are accounts. (It's the very unaccountability of continental philosophy which gave it life whilst logical Anglo-American philosophy died, and which is now being killed by its exegesis.) Yet other cultures without such theories make sounds which we regard as music. And the

less culturally developed in their ideas regarding the world the more commonplace, generalized, their art is and the more noisy it appears to western tonal systems. We may want to call music organised sound, and art a special activity, but that is a particular refinement of activities from and by logical/religious/philosophical frameworks which credit it. Spontaneous creativity is not a special phenomenon, (most children behave so)- though it can be made one and it is only made one by an act of 'capitalism'. It assigns value to 'music' - a rarity of its production - and places noise as an unwanted common and worthless thing - "A simple demonstration of this is *anyone* with a computer can use the free software Audacity, Choose generate - white noise then choose effect Bass boost and you will get an example of HNW." It (capitalism) sees in the random patterns of the stars Kings and Queens. Or rather not Capitalism but an *ism* of value an *ism* of logic an *ism* of meaning.

Noise qua noise.

Removing meaning from creativity, it could be argued, is a bad thing to do, which to anyone with an ethical system it obviously is. So too removing meaning from existence? Or purpose? Non the less it is perfectly possible to maintain that the universe is accidental, and to make 'stuff' accidentally. Why? This 'why' is like Heidegger's Dasein, it can never get to grips with such an accident as life, the universe or that particular 'stuff' that has been transformed into art. Noise qua noise arrives before the explanation, before the cause. It is outside of causality, yet of course causality can explain - but not explain it away. Noise qua noise is like sex qua sex. One just finds oneself doing it. It is like Dasein, one finds oneself already in the world. "A simple demonstration of this is *anyone* with a computer can use the free software Audacity, Choose generate - white noise then choose effect Bass boost and you will get an example of HNW." Throwing in some contemporary theory, it is Laruelle's 'One', the already present, one doesn't have to work towards it, its already there, unlike philosophy which first has to make a decision, - one of forming a problem which then necessitates work, effort, skill to solve it. This is precisely the artistic act or intention, of first creating a "Why" or "What" of some kind and then working towards its solution, with effort and difficulty, with the chance of success or failure. It's the genesis and force behind the creativity, novelty and dynamics of western music, western culture, and source of its aesthetic, ethical value systems, it is not childish, or nomadic or cyclical or static. It's a decision which splits humanity, consciousness from the world to reflect back on it as if we were or could be outside of creation, even outside of language...so outside of music to look at it anew, to re-invent it, correct it, better it. The ability of the imagination to leave 'being in the world' in order to grasp it, is science, but also the source of a separate detached intelligence - or the idea of it, i.e. God (a certain conception of God).(However) Noise qua noise is simply there, already given at the drop of a hat...Its *pure immanence*... it seems (*this follows!*) OK for the 'religious' to do art, but odd for anyone who thinks the universe is an accident, that there is no "Why" or "What" of the universe - that it 'simply' 'is'. And modernity was *intent* on the truth as a finality of actions and thought in all its ethical, aesthetic and socio-political activities even if it never found it. Modernity had a programme, a goal. Noise qua noise is without- before "Why" or "What", simply is, it has like the universe no reason, judgement, value or goal. It is like no other artform. It exists as a homogenous whole which therefore cant be successfully differentiated, and judged, no part is more rare or valuable than the rest. And here we might or should stop.

The religiosity of the atheist French philosophers.

Given the suspicion of re-introduction of possible absolutes, possible Christs, possible deities of transcendence possible utopian politics, absolutes of Marxism, socialism, fundamentalism we need to address these possibilities by strangely invoking 'God.' To do so is to deny the use of theology to a humanist programme of

language, meaning, truth, law, justice etc. which would be catastrophic to noise qua noise. It would provide a limit, which as we have seen doesn't limit a creative process at some point but destroys its possibility at all by invoking the absolute. This re-introduction of a humanist act of once again providing purpose, a meaning, logos, is nothing other than a capitalization of a God which by definition is not capitalizable, I argue not from its non-existence or its remoteness, its transcendence, but because of its immanence, it is ubiquitous, its facticity. Given the contingency of the universe, Quentin Meillassoux's, and its valuelessness - Ray Brassier- there is nothing special about it, or life, or consciousness in it, I can't think of a better premise for a non-aesthetics of noise qua noise. However in such contingencies some see a future god of justice - Meillassoux, and so a hope for some aesthetics of salvation. So we need to pursue theology briefly now, as it offers if not a present deity to say what precisely is music, and what precisely is noise (and good bad etc) but the possibility of a future God who could or would do just this. Man is cruel, lions and Eagles are not, therefore the roar of the Lion is OK, but not the roar of Vomir? And it would be a bad god to allow cruelty? And noise? But both exist.

The Death of God and The Life of God.

The problem with the God in the bible is that he seems at once to give rules, and set about punishing the wicked, and yet at other times be cruel and horrific. However this is only a problem to the rational minded and ethical, for its deeply problematical and one reason for abandoning God in the first place, or in the various 'Death of God' scenarios. Its critique of God or its justification is that this god is 'humane', and reasonable. This further gives problems, where in an accidental universe earthquakes and extinction level meteorites are neither good or bad in themselves, just as Lions and Mountains are neither good or bad, a humane god shouldn't create earthquakes, cancer or man-eating tigers, but clearly they exist. Just as such a god should be kind so science should be benevolent? God as a separate transcendental being, answer to everything - in the form of YAHWEH or Physics or mathematics - Badiou's ontology of set theory- et al. might be fictions, I've shown how above. The failure to find a fixed point with which to define anything is in part the failure of God to live. But such a perfect being because it lacks difference, lacks the possibility for life at all. The concept of god, like reason, (as reason as logos) is already dead. Fixed, unchanging, without breath, without being here or there. That is a God of separate perfection, Physical theory or accounting for the unaccountable - Cantor's infinities. . . is a logical still born God, the blank canvas or black canvas, Cage's perfect and impossible Silence. So the God of the particular might be dead- the giver of right and wrong, a dualist God, but what of the randomness of the total possibility of things? Its indivisibility?

A dualist god in tune and a devil out of tune... A good God and evil devil - a god of privilege and meaning and value without aporias... a God removed from depravity or one bound up within it... the cruelty of creation... "man is like divine shit, he fell out of God's anus."(Luther) God of the earth. Such a god seems irrational.. Now we can put aside 'the problem of Evil' - but remarking that it seems similar to 'The Problem of Music' the philosophical decision of the problem, of wanting totality and value- the logic of a creator which can't move, can't be different seems a contradiction. And it is. A thought, like a sentence has a length, a before and after, an inside and outside, and the properties of Music, of Language, of thought all seem to be of this type, and sciences and deities which act similar. How the undividable can be divided, the ever-present be past or future.. is that it is *ever the same*. Omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient- means everything everywhere at once immanent and transcendent- *is* 'noise qua noise' - A.K.A. GOD.

Then the LORD answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said, Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me. Where wast thou when I laid the

foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it? Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the corner stone thereof; When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?

*I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet,
Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book.....
And I turned to see the voice that spake with me. And being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks;
And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle.
His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire;
And his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; **and his voice as the sound of many waters.***

"And do you know what "the world" is to me? Shall I show it to you in my mirror? This world: a monster of energy, without beginning, without end; a firm, iron magnitude of force that does not grow bigger or smaller, that does not expend itself but only transforms itself; as a whole, of unalterable size, a household without expenses or losses, but likewise without increase or income; enclosed by "nothingness" as by a boundary; not something blurry or wasted, not something endlessly extended, but set in a definite space as a definite force, and not a sphere that might be "empty" here or there, but rather as force throughout, as a play of forces and waves of forces, at the same time one and many, increasing here and at the same time decreasing there; a sea of forces flowing and rushing together, eternally changing, eternally flooding back, with tremendous years of recurrence, with an ebb and a flood of its forms; out of the simplest forms striving toward the most complex, out of the stillest, most rigid, coldest forms toward the hottest, most turbulent, most self-contradictory, and then again returning home to the simple out of this abundance, out of the play of contradictions back to the joy of concord, still affirming itself in this uniformity of its courses and its years, blessing itself as that which must return eternally, as a becoming that knows no satiety, no disgust, no weariness: this, my Dionysian world of the eternally self-creating, the eternally self-destroying, this mystery world of the twofold voluptuous delight, my "beyond good and evil," without goal, unless the joy of the circle is itself a goal; without will, unless a ring feels good will toward itself--do you want a name for this world? A solution for all its riddles? A light for you, too, you best-concealed, strongest, most intrepid, most midnightly men?-- This world is the will to power--and nothing besides! And you yourselves are also this will to power--and nothing besides!"

Noise is both the differentiation and the undifferentiated, open and closed, allowing multiple meanings and shifts, directly, sustained delayed, like language but more direct, more immediate, more immanent, in its incomprehensibility. Its total presence, and lack, its pure signification and lack of signification, its inability to fix a purpose, beginning or end, and its ability to express all that and overwhelm all systems. Noise withdraws from itself, fixes and unfixes, begins and ends, has surface and depth, like everything else- only not withdrawn, lacking the confidence of meaning and value, subsumes and is overwhelming all value. In its presence we become deaf, blind, and mute. It enfolds and contains all possible dimensions, all possible stories, and improbable and impossibilities. It is the bringer of life, the destabilization of itself.

Noise is the origin and end of ignorance and knowledge, truth and falsehood are contained within it as only a small fraction, it has an infinite remainder, an infinity of points which are joined by an infinity of lines, transcendent and immanent. Noise totalizes itself yet transcends any totalization, here is all music, all sense, all life and all other. Its growth is unchecked, and complete, its height and its decent, noise is a multiverse of trivialities. An infinite volume of histories, incomprehensibly boring, beyond delight, its pictures coalesce and ignore instants of time. It makes time as pictures, noise is a resolution of identification in a fixidity which moves and creates at infinite speed, backwards, A multitude of virtualities and realities. Noise both creates this description of it, affirms and rejects, knows and ignores, is both absent and present, incapable of fulfilment and so complete, the play of endless infinite difference of the same, and the finite moment of the kiss.

The absolute plane of transcendence.

Noise is the absolute plane or plateau of transcendence. Beneath its surface is everything, every logos and non logos, every pattern and every chaos can be filtered from it, seen in it. Every story, possibility, impossibility, history lies within it. From being with noise - complete noise qua noise - everything is completed and what is left is the un-real non-real of life, of reality. Being with noise qua noise is the great overcoming of the world. That of equalling the world and overcoming it and therefore overcoming everything, leaving only 'being' AND the world (that is outside any logos- "world") A self transience overcoming the worlds transience and so being with the trinity reversed. Self "world" and world, where self is in a part of worlds to "world" self and world, where "world" is overcome and being not qualitively different from "world" - to world's difference. Witness the total silence and total noise. To live above the noise of life (noise qua noise) is pure being in the universe independent of everything. To live on the plateau of noise qua noise is to be free of facts, laws, histories. Is to be out of place.