This was originally intended to be part of the Sonic Matters Lab @ Bath Spa University, However for various reasons I withdrew from the presentation, chief among these were the universities instance on my obtaining a "Right to Work" from the institution. Here is a slightly edited version of my presentation, which would have been used as a guide, so isn't a final completed 'paper'.

"but recently I've begun to see why ones biography is important... "I" matter."

In support of proposed presentation / discussion of my work at Bath Spa University, re 'sonic materiality' May 2019.

To begin the word 'matter' is not at first used to denote material but significance. It will latter denote 'stuff'.

First off just a brief background history which might help you with the perspective of my work and thinking...

My serious involvement with music began at Falmouth School of Art in 1970. I was a painting student, and I had no previous involvement with music making, and a limited exposure to music, especially contemporary music.

Falmouth was then a very small college with Foundation, Sculpture and Painting departments. Though back in the 70s art colleges did have connections with avant garde music, and notably Falmouth did.

Visiting performers who also gave lectures included AMM, Keith Rowe Eddie Prévost and John Tilbury, Tilbury was a part time lecturer. Also Harrison Birtwistle gave classes and performances with Alan Hacker. Intermodulation visited and performed– and also Derek Bailey & Spontaneous Music Ensemble (SME)

There was an electronic music workshop in the painting department consisting of a VCS3 and two revoxes.. run by Howard Rees a graduate of the royal college of music. As group of students we met John Cage at a performance of his at the Albert Hall.

So it was there I not only began making electronic works, but was also introduced to contemporary music, not only of Cage, Stockhausen, but also Terry Riley and Steve Reich and the American minimalists.

On leaving college I set up my own studio based on a Synthi AKS and two tape recorders. I also did some field recording work but eventually moved to making videos.

In the meantime I was earning a living working as an art teacher, but then re-trained and became a computer programmer, worked as a systems analyst and eventually became a lecturer in computer science.

I began re-making sound works back in the 1980s. And have done so since.

My work with sound has covered pieces such as drone works, digital work, when I began writing low level programs to explore the possibilities of directly working with PCM data and latter MP3 and Midi.

From the 1990s onwards I was interested in the genre of Noise "Music" and the problematics of considering it 'music'. I'll use Merzbow, The Rita and Vomir as placeholders. I review "noise" for Vital weekly.. and wrote quite extensively about noise and its difference from music, for noise if regarded in a certain way seemed devoid of any of the normal criteria of music or art.

I've also made 'field' works, creating artificial sonic landscapes and also works based on ideas regarding time and music, some long works using custom software, such as a one terabyte work, a piece which lasts just under 2 years.

Other work involves the use of thought experiments using texts.

These last areas have been underpinned by my interest in philosophy.

In the digital domain I've made such works as the CD 6 types of silence, digital data which never changes is silent, so in the PCM CD format there are 65536 possible types of silence. I also made the shortest possible CD work of 1 / 44100 of a second. As for the theoretical pieces, there is "All possible CDS.." (2 to the power 6 billion) I've made other 'conceptual' works. "The Grands" is where I imagined ever bigger grand pianos from the size of the solar system through to that of the known universe. Another was the Schroedinger symphonies, a set of disks with sound works some of which were randomly deleted anonymously, so only by playing can this be detected, or not.

The digital work and interest in noise led me to applying theory to underpin these interests. For instance the nature of noise can be explored via computer science and information theory, but also its 'nature' as being less 'ART' and more 'REAL' has philosophical implications.

In terms of theory -

Back in the 1970s I was very interested in the movement of conceptual art such as the work of Joseph Kosuth, Art Language and Victor Burgin amongst others, very different to what is generally now considered as conceptual art. Then, conceptual art was not ideas as art but art as concepts regarding what art was. Here a knowledge of philosophy was fairly important, but philosophy of the Anglo-American analytical tradition. So the key figures were Wittgenstein, Carnap, Strawson, A.J. Ayer... nothing much was heard of Derrida, Heidegger and continental philosophy. But I also came across Nietzsche in my late 20s who was quite influential in a shocking way. Though I'm certainly no Nietzschean!

My interest in philosophy and theory has persisted. I took an OU degree in which it was a significant part. Since then I've explored the post-structuralists, in particular Derrida, Deleuze, and the more recent work of a group loosely and questionably termed the 'Speculative Realist' movement.

Even more recently I've begun to concentrate on Kant and the German Idealists... Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel.

And Kant is an important figure for understanding some very contemporary thought, which I will need to talk about later.

So I should now introduce my theme "I matter". And I will latter attach the "sonic".

But before I do so please be aware that what I'm going to say is not "prescriptive", even if it may at times sound so. It is then descriptive of my activity, my thinking in order to overcome perceived crises..

I'll use a few quotes – starting with Jacques Atali, who in "Noise The Political Economy of Music" sees the history of music as moving through five stages, Listening, Sacrificing, Representing, Repeating, and finally Composing. The fourth, repeating, is the period of recorded sound, the final period,

> Beyond the rupture of the economic conditions of music, composition is revealed as the demand for a truly different system of organisation, a network within which a different kind of music and different social relations can arise. A music produced by each individual for himself, for pleasure outside of meaning, usage and exchange.[1]

 I'm not in total agreement with what Atali wrote in 1977 but it does have some features which do matter to me. One of which is of departure from the Art **Work** of Modernism, to the **Art Maker** of post modernism. The replacement of the thing, with the person. And rather than 'pleasure' I see my work more as *a 'dealing' with the world.*

Art, it can be said, is an engagement with the world. Simple, well not really, the only problem being just what is the world. A world whose rationality is now so complex that it is outside of the scope of any one thinker, a knowledge which is fundamentally limited, and in its objectivity, its idea of truth seeks truths which are absolute, universal but are therefore generalizations. But we never find, see , feel or touch a generalization. Here is a specific important- for me - 'event'...

"It was 2017, and the first Sunday in October, raining , and as we approached the Centre Pompidou by the queue's length it became obvious we had planned this all wrong. So deciding not to join the queue we headed towards the left bank and the Musée du quai Branley, a museum of ethnographic art from around the world.... And so the slow realization was confirmed, so called primitive peoples could just get on and make stuff we now call art, without particular recourse to a complex system of galleries, collectors, curators, academic and commercial institutions, capital and expertise. If the term 'Art' was now secured and verified by such institutions and frameworks it was one with which I was only minimally engaged. My 'practice' became no longer that of music or art but of 'I make stuff that others might call art' "

This autobiographical 'insight' was into work I had been producing for many years prior to October 2017.

And from it I 'bracketed' "ART"... that is the concept, replacing it with 'I do stuff, with stuff'. Bracketing is to quote wiki.. the

> process also known as the - Epoché - The term was popularized in modern philosophy by Edmund Husserl. Husserl elaborates the notion of 'phenomenological epoché' or 'bracketing' - "suspension of judgement" but also as "withholding of assent"..In its philosophical usage "epoché" describes the state where all judgements about non-evident matters are suspended in order to induce a state of ataraxia (freedom from worry and anxiety).[2]

So this is my suspension of the worry of 'is it art' and the 'anxiety' of – and 'is it any good?'

There is a significance in the objects of ethnography, which is not contextual, unlike that of Modern Art and Post Modern Art in which context is significant. The Duchamp urinal, the Cage Silence, dependent on their context. This creates a negative crisis, if it's in a gallery it's art, if it's played in the Albert Hall it's music, and if it's not it's not.

---

1   Jacques Atali in "Noise The Political Economy of Music" p. 137.
2   https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Epoché, accessed 8/1/2019.

I need to briefly touch on technology:

A crisis of Technology. Heidegger wrote a famous piece on technology. A difficult text but ends with,

> Thus we bear witness to the crisis that in our sheer preoccupation with technology we do not yet experience the essential unfolding of technology..

> Because the essence of technology is nothing technological, essential reflection upon technology and decisive confrontation with it must happen in a realm which is, on the one hand, akin to the essence of technology and on the other, fundamentally different from it.
> Such a realm is art.[3]

With music there is technology. How do we use it, scientifically for its purpose, teleologically, or because it's sexy and we like it, ontologically – for its being nice stuff, nice matter. There is especially in music both the fetish of its objects and a guilt born out of a desire to seem objective and treat the gear as necessary equipment, and not nice stuff, nice matter. I think this is deep as well as mistaken. Children like stuff and play with toys which are not real, so to be grown up is to be mature and rational, scientific even. Which is why Hegel and others called their work Science. But it's a clear and obvious fact that a music store is a toy shop. The denial of this is a remnant of Modern Art's desire for a scientific objectivity, a Kantian universality of judgement. A universal aesthetic. Keeping things in proportion, AKA rationality. The denial of the rationality of technology is precisely what the primitive, so called, or child can do, play with stuff regardless of its purpose, its teleology, and this I offer as the non technological confrontation with technology of which Heidegger speaks. This is a reversal of the rational maturity of Modern Art, where now unlike the reasonable idea of 'truth is beauty' of modernism one can do things without recourse to reason. To work not underpinned by what Deleuze calls , good sense or common sense, which for Deleuze prevents effective and constructive repetition[4]. (By the way his use of the terms ' good sense and common sense' might be misleading, he is referring to Kant, and the categories.) Which opens the way to a philosophical crisis.

The Object Oriented Philosophies, Speculative Realism, Speculative materialism, and Object-Oriented Ontology. Graham Harman, Ray Brassier, Quentin Meillassoux Timothy Morton.

Kant famously was woken from his dogmatic slumbers by Hume's scepticism. To be short, Hume argued that cause and effect was merely a psychological condition of seeing repeated events, forming in the mind the belief in the necessity of an event having to have a cause. That there is, he argued, no existing rational necessity for one event to follow another. Here we are talking philosophically and so we mean no absolute for certain reason. Such scepticism places doubt on any "real" knowledge, which may not bother some- but was and maybe is still significant to others.

Kant's solution in his first major work, The Critique of Pure Reason was both a triumph and a disaster. He refuted Hume by arguing we need certain intellectual categories before we can even think . One of these being cause and effect. They are a priori necessary. A disaster, because in the Kantian system we perceive a world via the senses as disorganised chaos and organise this via our categories of understanding and judgement. We then never see the world un-mediated by these, we never have access to 'Things in Themselves'.

This became a huge issue for many philosophers following Kant. And still is.

Speculative Realism focused on the perceived inability of philosophy to talk about things, the materiality of stuff, of objects. Meillassoux in his book 'After Finitude' sees Kant as a disaster, preventing philosophy access to the "great outdoors" enjoyed by contemporary science. And so historically, philosophy, the humanities and Art, influenced by such, became interested in their own structures, language, formalisms. They became introverted. We had the 'linguistic turn', 'The intentional fallacy', death of author, the structuring of and destructuring of systems of representation.

Meillassoux like others associated with Speculative Realism make some interesting and startling points. Importantly for me was the renewed interest in The Real, as opposed to introverted formalisms. I related noise as being natural, and so real. Rather than it being a signifier, noise could be a signified, a thing in itself, and not music for us. It could astonishingly be Kant's forbidden "Thing in itself".

Unfortunately the downside to these new philosophies was in being so radical a kind of metaphysical sawing off the branch one was sitting on occurs. Meillassoux wants an absolute, which he decides is contingency. One can be certain of change for no reason. Uncertainty is certain, or certainty is uncertain.

Harman's Objects are real, but we can never access them fully, or can they access themselves fully. In which case how can he 'know' this. *(– his answer is vicarious causation via a sensual object accessing the real object, which looks not much different from Kant's access to, or rather prevented from, the 'Thing in Itself' - the noumenon, by perception , the Phenomenon[5].)*

---

3   Martin Heidegger, Basic Writings, The Question Concerning Technology, p. 238.
4   See Deleuze – Difference and Repetition, p. 169.
5   For a long and detailed critique of Harman see Wolfendale's book 'Object- Oriented Philosophy, The Noumenon's New Clothes', Urbanomic Press.

They have also been accused of attacking strawmen... I'll give a couple of examples... Meillassoux conflates 'being' with 'intending'... to argue many philosophers never believed in a real world outside of consciousness.

Meillassoux's critique is based on the correlation between the thinker – and thing thought, the critique is the Correlational philosopher's inability to know things, the world, as they are when no philosopher is around to perceive and understand them. However he wrongly supposes the philosopher says things cannot "be", cannot exist without the thinker, rather than they cannot be intended in the philosopher's mind without the philosopher. That is things cannot be thought about without the thinker, not that they can't exist . He does this in order to make the astonishing claim that philosophy from Kant onwards got everything wrong, and that many philosophers in effect actually didn't believe in a real world outside their minds. It makes for a dramatic critique, but isn't true,it's a strawman argument[6].

Timothy Morton does something similar with Heidegger, stating that Heidegger claimed before Newton there wasn't gravity. Actually Heidegger said before Newton, Newton's theory of Gravity was neither true or false[7]. That is it, the theory, didn't exist.

Speculative Realism arose from a conference at Goldsmiths College of Art in April 2007 and has been very influential in the arts, and I think still is. These philosophies were and are refreshing, but one maybe needs some caution. They can become at times confusing and divergent voices and can create for some another crisis.. here is Ray Brassier... i

> The 'speculative realist movement' exists only in the imaginations of a group of bloggers promoting an agenda for which I have no sympathy whatsoever: actor-network theory spiced with pan-psychist metaphysics and morsels of process philosophy. I don't believe the internet is an appropriate medium for serious philosophical debate; nor do I believe it is acceptable to try to concoct a philosophical movement online by using blogs to exploit the misguided enthusiasm of impressionable graduate students. I agree with Deleuze's remark that ultimately the most basic task of philosophy is to impede stupidity, so I see little philosophical merit in a 'movement' whose most signal achievement thus far is to have generated an online orgy of stupidity.[8]

Ends with a Deleuze remark which I can't track down, but this is from Deleuze...

"Stupidity (not error) constitutes the greatest weakness of thought, but also the source of its highest power in that which forces it to think" [9]

For me the value of Speculative Realism is it opens things up, the world, but for me this becomes a subjective world of experience, not an world of universal absolute knowledge, which they seem to be seeking or offering.

"I matter" There seems with this statement, if one makes it of oneself something potentially wrong. It sounds selfish, and so bad. It sounds arrogant and unjustified, why should anyone, me!, matter more than anyone else. To think so in some way demeans others, and is not justified. It sounds inconsiderate, and of course it is. But in order to be considerate one first needs to exist. The me-ness of me must become before any judgement I make, even regarding myself. It must be prior, a priori, before I make any evaluation or judgement.

Heidegger uses the term Dasein, for a particular awareness of being, a being there, there in the world. A sense of being thrown into the world. And if this seems reasonable it is because we have already taken for granted that the world exists independent of our / my being, existed before me and will exist after me. But even before being in the world, before thinking one needs to be, to be conscious of ones simple being, before any thought can occur or any knowledge be obtained, one needs to be before even having any mood or emotion. Something exists prior in order to have something [10].

I have to exist before I can say, or think or do anything. This is nothing new, it was the successor to Kant, the philosopher Fitche who begins with the Ego, and the not-ego. This not ego, subsequently the ego figures out, is the world, is other people and the ideas of temporality, and all that follows.

In a way this is opposed to many of the Speculative Realists who propose a "flat ontology". A flat ontology is where the being of all objects in the world is equal, nothing is more 'being' than anything else. It seems a good idea, to see things as they are in and for themselves, as they REALLY are. Not as we see them. So the world is full of objects interacting, snowflakes with mountains, pizza with house flies...[11]

---

6   There are many other examples of these 'liberties', and also those taken with modern science and mathematics. See Alan Sokal and Jean Bricmont 'Fashionable Nonsense: Postmodern Intellectuals' Abuse of Science.'

7   Martin Heidegger, Being and Time, p. 269 (Oxford 1978 edition) Part VI, 44. (c)

8   https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Speculative_realism.

9   Giles Deleuze, Difference and Repetition, p.345.

10   Even in order to be stupid one first has to be! And being is for many of paramount importance, i.e. Heidegger 's idea of the magnitude of there being something rather than nothing. "The Fundamental Question of Metaphysics" in 'An introduction to Metaphysics', Martin Heidegger, Yale University Press.

11   This type of 'list' is typical of Harman and Latour. Harman also allows an ontological equivalence of fictions like micky mouse and unicorns with galaxies and pineapples. This is why he uses the term Object and not Matter.

I think this is wrong for two reasons, the first is an inconsistency, which I can accept, the second that it is an absolute description of the world, and not an individual viewpoint.

Firstly logically, one is suspect of a theory which proposes equality, as in order to do so it demands its acceptance rather than any other theory. It is transcendental.   At least it attempts to rise above the flatness it proposes.

This flatness of being found in Object Oriented Philosophy is a creditable attempt at seeing some universal truth, is an attempt to give value to objects without any human centred hierarchy. In other words to see the world as it is as if we were not in the world. To see objects as things in themselves as they really are without the Kantian prohibition, without the filtering and forming of the human senses and thoughts. It seems a worthwhile task, to see the REAL. This flatness is by the way also found in Deleuze's rhizome idea, that "structures" or de-structures the world as a chaotic network, rather than a hierarchy. I can see the merit in this line of thought, and its liberation from structures that are powerful and controlling. Structures which are oppressive to individuals, which are to be opposed by such as the Me Too movement. Certainly individuals coming together can exert far more power than individuals alone in a society which is intolerant and exploitative. However there is a contradiction in giving up ones individuality in being part of an identity. In being an identity one is no longer an individual. The existential 'To be or not to be?' question is answered by gaining a purpose...

Unlike the transcendentalism of this Object Oriented Ontology, as it's called by Harman and Morton, I'm not saying my being is transcendental, I'm saying in a way the opposite, it is a bare minimum foundation, and one that is necessary for anything else to follow. So I matter. Without the materiality of me there really is nothing. (you will no doubt disagree, but you have to 'be' in order to do so!)

So before meaning and any signs, propositions, art works, dreams, music was an object called me. Before the plurality of the world is the duality, me and the not me.

So now we, or rather I, have the priority of not the world, but of 'my', material world over the abstract generalization of propositions, but now the 'I matter' faces its opposite, 'I do not matter' in the real world. Which is alienation or in the case of Baudrillard more than this...

> We no longer partake of the drama of alienation, but are in the ecstasy of communication. And this ecstasy is obscene.... not confined to sexuality, because today there is a pornography of information and communication, a pornography of circuits and networks, of functions and objects in their legibility, availability, regulation, forced signification, capacity to perform, connection, polyvalence, their free expression.[12]

This quote pertains to my feelings on seeing the ethnographic work, and my thoughts and feelings on the current situation, such as typified in social media and its networks.

This is the current world – my world – but - in a few years I will die, those who knew me also, in a few thousand years I'm lost, within the infinity of the future all knowledge will be lost. Even seeing one as being a small part in man's progress, is eventually nothing. This next part is depressing maybe, but it is I think the landscape in which we now live. And it binds me strangely to humans who lived 40,000 years ago and made what we now call art and music, who lived in a dangerous world physically, our world is now ontologically dangerous. They knew little compared to the contemporary epistemological catastrophe, we know and have access to too much information. We even know we can never fully know[13]. In such a world our, my, being becomes null. In the wiki timeline of the far future[14] in 50 thousand years time regardless of global warming we will enter a new ice age, by 300 thousand years a super nova could have caused a gamma ray burst destroying all life on earth. Planets and moons will collide, and by 700 million years life will cease due to carbon dioxide levels falling to the point at which C3 photosynthesis is no longer possible. Ironic, all life will end for a lack of CO_2! By 7.9 billion years the Sun becomes a red giant, likely swallowing the earth... and by some staggeringly long period but finite period all matter collapses into neutron stars or black holes, which then (on these timescales) instantaneously evaporate into sub-atomic particles. This nihilism is rehearsed in Brassier's book 'Nihil Unbound' as well as by others such as Freud, in the death drive, Lyotard and here as Nietzsche puts it...

> Once upon a time, in some out of the way corner of that universe which is dispersed into numberless twinkling solar systems, there was a star upon which clever beasts invented knowing. That was the most arrogant and mendacious minute of "world history," but nevertheless, it was only a minute. After nature had drawn a few breaths, the star cooled and congealed, and the clever beasts had to die. One might invent such a fable, and yet he still would not have adequately illustrated how miserable, how shadowy and transient, how aimless and arbitrary the human intellect looks within nature. There were eternities during which it did not exist. And when it is all over with the human intellect, nothing will have happened. [15]

---

12   Jean Baudrillard, The Ecstasy of Communication, p. 22.
13   From Gödel's incompleteness theorem, Turing's 'Halting Problem' through to "there are known knowns; there are things we know we know. We also know there are known unknowns; that is to say we know there are some things we do not know. But there are also unknown unknowns.." Donald Rumsfeld, February 2002. "Note that since there are uncountably many undecidable problems, any list, even one of infinite length, is necessarily incomplete." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Undecidable_problem. !!!!!!!!!!!!!! ;~
14   https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_the_far_future
15   Friedrich Nietzsche - On Truth and Lies in a Non moral Sense p.1.

Maybe someone will imagine humanity making new worlds, but there are laws of thermodynamics which give an inevitable end.[16]

There are other cosmological alternatives to this depressing end, unfortunately they are no different to Nietzsche's most gruesome of ideas, "The Eternal Return of the Same".

However gloomy these ideas seem, Nietzsche and others, including Camus and myself! see way out, which they called art.

-----x-----

However the self as expressed in art has become 'technological' in the complexity of its social, political, economic, philosophical structures and networks. It too brings therefore an alienation [17] for any individual. The individual is now becoming part of a network [18], group or industry. Culture is now an industry.

I'll now sketch a background to art's affects using Benjamin's ideas of Aura, and the rise of social media...

Art was defined by Walter Benjamin as being once that of objects which had traditional and ritualistic values. Art in the Pre-Industrial age consisted of singular objects, a statue, painting or or Musical Composition. For Benjamin Art had no intrinsic Aura, Art's Aura was given to it by the bourgeoisie. The 'powerful' would collect artworks, commission art, musical compositions, and latter endow institutions. Benjamin's argument is that with mechanical reproduction of the industrial age the 'original' was no longer needed. In the post-industrial age digital reproduction is ubiquitous and 'perfect'. Art today in the broadest sense as a communal activity exists as perfectly reproducible and transmittable digital data. Art is now entertainment. It is music, drama, film. We spectate via TV, Computer and smart phone.

Social Media is interesting – it has no necessary external material or cultural content as its focus, it can be and often is just social interaction without any particular object. It mediates individual directly with individual without anything other. The only requirements for its engagement therefore is to be an individual who uses it. It is Baudrillard's "Ecstasy of Communication". The individual object maker of a 'thing' is replaced by an industry facilitated for all by complex software and hardware from corporate providers. Or is predicated by institutions. Where once the art object gave a venue its prestige now the products located in these venues become art by being in such prestigious situations.

With the industrialization of art now an artist gains his or her status by virtue of the venues in which they appear and the associated media.

These systems make the art, an individual is subsumed into the system or is alienated from it.

So the world is far too complex to be open to understanding or affect by any individual, notably 'me'. To make any impact now seems to require the giving up of individuality in systems, networks, collectivities which historically destroy... and anyway given the known world in space and time not only am I insignificant, these collectives are also. And importantly within a collective the individual loses her or his individuality ethically. And so also aesthetically[19]. The loss of individual judgement and so "generative power". In Deluzean terms one loses difference and so the ability to effectively repeat.

OK – this seems V Bad. and so?

So to now to quote Vladimir Ilich Lenin… "what is to be done?"!

Sonic Materiality.

Firstly the origin of things, especially language and linguistic thinking and naming needs reversing.

Again there is the significance of certain recent linguistics, its focus is on concepts regarding language..

In some linguistics words are arbitrary signs which signify things in the world. For Derrida a play of differences. The arbitrariness of signs is for instance demonstrated by denying the onomatopoeic, the sound of a clock may be expressed as tick tock in English, tictac in Spanish, dī dā in Mandarin, katchin katchin in Japanese. Linguistics offers us the idea that language is

---

16   John Barrow, The Book of Nothing, p.318.

17   Ray Brassier has picked up many strands of alienation – see https://monoskop.org/images/2/24/Brassier_Ray_Alien_Theory_The_Decline_of_Materialism_in _the_Name_of_Matter.pdf and elsewhere https://contingentpower.net/tags/ray-brassier. And an accompanying nihilism in which he equates philosophy to extinction. See Nihil Unbound pp.238-239. His trope is extinction, part perhaps of a leftish Accelerationism.

18   Networks are an obvious contemporary feature, ones which become for many their environment for work and leisure. There are sociological models such as ANT. Key to a network is connectivity and opposed to individuality. A mesh network (the internet) is non hierarchical & so rhyizomic. "The multiple must be made... subtract the unique from the multiplicity to be constituted... A system of this kind could be called a rhizome." Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari 'Capitalism and Schizophrenia' p.6.

19   See Wittgenstein, Tractatus 6.421 Ethics and aesthetics are one and the same.

learning arbitrary sounds attach to things, so giving words a power. Or seeing power in them, which is like magic, a spell or incantation which can alter matter. But Harry Potter and The Bible get it wrong. And this idea is even found in Marx-

> The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways. The point, however, is to change it[20].

Here language, texts, propositions seem powerful. More powerful than matter. I'm disagreeing with this. There is a wonderful analysis of how we don't learn the meaning of words in Wittgenstein's Investigations, but I'm not going there, instead I'm going back to when I was about two or three to show how experience is prior to words. Here is the story...

I must have been two or three years old, I remember a door to a yard with a gap at the bottom where I could see a dog's nose, I then remember being at a gate, and my hand was hot. "Hot" was the name of the feeling.

I can now assume the dog had bit me, and the heat was in fact pain, and so the word pain was given to me by a dog bite via the word 'hot'. Given to me in a material event that mattered to me. An event which I still remember as strange and baffling, an aspect of using the word "pain" I no longer have. So language comes from things, autobiographical things...

Subsequently I found this quote from On Truth and Lies in a Non-moral Sense, by Nietzsche,

> Every word instantly becomes **a concept** precisely insofar as it is not supposed to serve as a reminder of the unique and entirely **individual original experience** to which it owes its origin..[21]

Nietzsche has displaced Kant by proposing the pre-eminance of the "individul experience" prior to any concept.

We have the juxtaposition of 'concept' and 'individual original experience'. The individual original experience is an alternative engagement with the world from the deployment of concepts. The former is the individual psychological experiences of the individual, as in the case of Hume, the latter the Absolute a priori transcendental structures which pre exist being and are universal, as in the case of Kant.

Kant wanted to provide an absolute foundation for Science, not that science seems bothered. But he also wanted, as have others, a universal and absolute aesthetics, (which in his case wasn't 'pure' a priori). Such ideas typified modernism and its 'experimental' works defining what art was. My thoughts and experiences have been that this in fact failed[22], but this is not relevant here. What is, is the alternative to an absolute and universal conceptualism which is of "individual experience".

A thing , a material object, can't be true or false, only a proposition or concept can be true of false. A measure of a proposition's truth is its agreement with other propositions and its agreement with some thing in the world. Some matter, which is neither true nor false. A tree can neither be true or false, good or bad, but a statement such as 'this is a larch' can be true or false. Likewise statements such as this 'music', this is 'good music' are propositions but in 'materializing' sound its materialization[23] can be prior to language, concepts and judgement[24].

More, I think that propositional language therefore can say nothing ethically, and so aesthetically, of the materiality of the world as it is. The world, the total matter and energy is not a being which is true or false and so in itself is a material sonic object neither true nor false.

40,000 years ago someone took some vulture bones and drilled holes into them, making what we now might call a flute, a musical instrument, a technology. It's impossible to say one way or the other if these words were in the mind of the maker but I doubt it. Its 'materiality' was clear for sure, as is its sonic ability to render sound. In Pre-agrarian art, objects could never be known, shared or communicated with more than a handful of others. Performance to any large audience impossible, as would be any recording. The significance of these works or in Benjamin's terms their Aura, could not therefore be social, as Benjamin maintains, as they existed and were created for many millennia before societies and civilizations existed.

Pre-agrarian "art" had an essential quality which an individual now, 'a me now', as attempting to be an "artist" and make art works, can also utilize. The resource the individual today has is simply a need or desire to make a work, a thing, an object, a sound, a noise despite an alienated world around them.

Children also use and make 'art-like' objects which have non-social auras. One particular very pertinent example is the use of a blade of grass held between the thumbs, and blown through to make a sound. I, like many, did this as a child. Why this is

---

20 Karl Marx, The Eleventh Thesis on Feuerbach.
21   Friedrich Nietzsche, On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense, p.16.
22 The Art Language 'movement' famously 'imploded' in the mid 1970s for want of a 'Framework', a set of objective criteria. My point would be no such criteria need be made or looked for given the individualism I'm discussing here.
23 See Lucy Lippard 'Six years: the dematerialization of the art object from 1966 to 1972'
24 Nietzsche makes the point in The Genealogy of Morals (Third Essay , 6.) "that Kant, like all philosophers... considered art ... purely from that of the spectator ..." has a similar echo. Some thing needs to be to (then) think. In much the same way as the unique making, of say hitting a piano key is not necessitated necessarily by any idea. No more did humans invent fire as they invented sound and sound making. The origin of music, art was not a cognitive act. Watch any child as evidence, they discover sound and sound making, they do not consider doing so prior. Of course concepts can and do follow, but pace Kant, they are not original.

pertinent is it that had no name. I know I did this when young, and it was for me certainly not a musical instrument, not a technology, anything teleological or conceptual. It wasn't even a 'thing' , just a noise making, a sonic materiality. Neither right or wrong good or bad true or false. So the nature of such 'objects' are difficult to analyse because they occur even before we acquire or employ conceptual language.

The 'aura' of my work now is not pre-linguistic, but it relates to an "individual experience" over any universal conceptualism. And with these objects I can be resist and escape the nullification by conceptual explanations and understanding.