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Abstract
This article is concerned with issues of perceived live-ness in *fragile.flicker.fragment* (2010) an electroacoustic suite in nine movements composed by the author. The role of, and recording of, instrumental sounds is discussed with reference to Bridger’s metaphoric/metonymic perception of sounds in electroacoustic music and Dellaira’s three modes of recording. The final section situates our perception of the composition within an understanding Richard Allen’s notion of cinematic projective illusion.
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1. Introduction
In contemporary electronic music an audience’s perception of live-ness often extends beyond traditional notions of bodily performance or instrumentality. In acousmatic compositions such as Jonty Harrison’s *Unsound Objects* (1995) the audience is presented with environmental recordings in which human presence is directly perceivable. The listener interprets these quasi-documentary recordings as indicators of real-time ‘live’ events. In the field of live-electronics there are those exploring new tactile or haptic interfaces in which the audience’s perception of live-ness rests on the perceptual correlation of action/gesture to sounding result. In both of these examples the ‘authentic’ experience is understood to be one that occurs when attending a unique event – be it a multichannel concert with an orchestra of loudspeakers or a concert of live-electronic music performance. In both instances, a recording is either a reduced (stereo or 5.1) rendering of the original sound diffusion, or merely a document of a live-electronic real-time performance. As the primary method for the consumption of music becomes ever more focused on the recorded medium this paper is concerned with how this affects our notion of live-ness and the repositioning of the recording as the ‘authentic’ experience.

In my large-scale composition *fragile.flicker.fragment* (2010) the lack of live-ness, in the traditional sense of a physical presence or performer, is an aesthetic choice – one centered on the aesthetic implications arising from the dematerialization of the acoustic (instrumental) source. (The term ‘dematerialization’ is a term borrowed from economics meaning the process by which objects in the social world tend towards intangibility.) This aesthetic is influenced by the writings of Susan Sontag who states that the distraction of the physical act of communicating the artwork ‘art is unmasked as gratuitous, and the very concreteness of the artist’s tools appears as a trap…the artist’s activity is cursed with mediacy. Art becomes the enemy of the artist, for it denies him the realization - the transcendence - he desires’ (Sontag, 2001:3). The lack of any physical performers in *fragile.flicker.fragment* thus allows the listener to concentrate on the music itself rather than it being mediated through the visual cues and physical gestures of the performers.

2. Why Instrumental Sources?
The choice of instrumental sounds in the composition is also a carefully considered one as it is important for me in this work, not to encourage an extrinsic listening
mode as often occurs when the listener is seeking to assign physical actions to unknown electronic sounds or concrete sounds and understand their relevance in the compositional fabric. The desire in *fragile.flicker.fragment* to promote a metaphoric/abstract mode of listening rather than an associative mode has its origins in the earliest tenets of musique concrète. Dack writes that ‘even at the earliest stages of musique concrète’s development he [Pierre Schaeffer] aspired to an idealistic notion of ‘pure’ or ‘absolute’ sound (Dack, 2002:8). Schaeffer himself said that ‘the whole problem of the sound-work is distancing oneself from the dramatic (Hodgkinson, 1986) – the recognition of concrete sounds and the construction of a narrative around them.

In its inclusivity of sound sources electroacoustic music encourages listening strategies that extend beyond those traditionally associated with western classical music. The way we make sense of what we hear in Western instrumental music is to listen metaphorically. Throughout the history of music we have become enculturated to interpret various musical configurations, what Steven Jan (Jan, 2000) refers to as memes, as metaphors for emotions or states of being. One such example is the descending semitone figure found in Baroque music and beyond, from Bach, Handel, and Purcell through to Mahler and Richard Strauss, and used to indicate grief and lament. A secondary, more localized example would be the descending third in the clarinet in Beethoven's *Symphony no.6 'The Pastoral'* (1808) symbolizing the song of the cuckoo. In contrast to instrumental music, when listening to electroacoustic music we must acknowledge that the modes of perception are different from those of instrumental music. In electroacoustic music, because of its extended sound palette and removal of visual/performance-based cues, we encounter a metaphoric/metonymic axis of perception - a model first proposed by Roman Jakobson.

Metaphor belongs... to the selection axis of language, allowing [for] the possibility of substitution. Metonymy, however, belongs to the combination axis of language, allowing for the perception of contexture (Jakobson, 1956).

Michael Bridger has applied the metaphor/metonym axis proposed by Jakobson to electroacoustic music. Bridger writes that,

It is arguable that much electroacoustic music operates in a largely metonymic mode, contrasted with other music's predominantly metaphoric operation... perhaps it could be argued that in conventional music an essentially metaphorical process is conducted by an overtly metonymic (syntactical) apparatus; and that in electroacoustic music these emphases are reversed... electroacoustic music, then seems to be a medium that commonly presents expressive potential in a metonymic rather than a metaphorical mode... certainly, in its use of concrete sounds, or non-musical human voice sounds, the inevitable Gestalt response is essentially metonymic (Bridger, 1990:16).

The issue of metonymy in electroacoustic music is significant as it encourages intrinsic-extrinsic listening strategies that are alien to the hermetic world of instrumental music. These extrinsic connections are both dynamic and fluid depending on both cultural and generational differences. Both Michael Bridger and Denis Smalley have further identified the tendency of listeners to try to assign a physical stimulus to the sound they hear when listening to electronic sound. As a
result of the listener’s interpreting electronic sound through known acoustic models
the mental imagery is directly associative rather than metaphorical as in traditional
instrumental musical expressivity. In Smalley’s terminology, these sounds are remote
surrogates, where vestiges of gesture and spectromorphological attributes may
stimulate extrinsic connections. Smalley writes,

The wide-open sonic world of electroacoustic music encourages imaginative
and imagined extrinsic connections because of the variety and ambiguity of
its materials, because of its reliance on the motion of colourful spectral
energies, its emphasis on the acousmatic, and not least through its exploration
of spatial perspective. There is quite a difference in identification level
between a statement which says of a texture, ‘It is stones falling’, a second
which says, ‘It sounds like stones falling’, and a third which says, ‘It sounds
as if it’s behaving like falling stones’. All three statements are extrinsic
connections but in increasing stages of uncertainty and remoteness from
reality (Smalley, 1997:110).

Depending on the intent of the composer these extrinsic connections may be actively
sought, enriching the layering of meaning to be found in a work. However, Bridger
implies that this initial metonymic mode of perception implies a certain poverty in
electroacoustic music. Bridger writes that there,

seems to be some justification for rewarding the imaginative leaps of
metaphor as a higher order mental activity than the more restrictive logic of
metonymy which is clearly close to primitive levels of perception vital to
survival, but because of that may be less likely to nourish artistic sensibilities
which are associated rather with reflection and enrichment (Bridger,
1990:16).

Bridger’s argument is more complex than he posits as the dichotomy between
metaphoric and metonymic modes of listening are not as clear-cut as is indicated. In a
work such as Francis Dhomont’s Espace/Escape (1989) we listen in a de-
synchronized dual mode of perception. Initially we listen in a metonymic mode
attending to the recognizable concrete sounds and their extrinsic implications. As the
work progresses we engage a secondary metaphoric mode of perception in which we
reinterpret sounds as metaphors signifying notions of space and mobility. It is
important to acknowledge this dual mode of perception as it differs greatly from our
perception of traditional instrumental music.

The use of instrumental sources is then not a simple return to tradition. It stems from
a conclusion that Schaeffer’s attempts to transcend the perceptual identification of
congrete sources in a work, to establish what he termed the en-soi of sounds through
reduced listening is a structuralist construct and is perceptually problematic.
Schaeffer’s proposed solution to achieve the ‘absolute sound’ he desired was to
elaborate on the traditional instrumental model – the pseudo-instrument. One of the
important characteristics of instruments for Schaeffer was their embodiment of
permanent modes of behavior and the potential for variation (e.g. timbre or
articulation) within these modes. For the pseudo-instrument Schaeffer noted that, ‘the
permanence of characteristics will be represented by the homogeneity of the genre…the
perceptual, cognitive processes involved in grouping sound objects on the basis of
their immanent features must be acknowledged’ (Dack, 2002:16). In fragile.flicker.
there is a conscious desire to extend the ‘instrumental’ through Schaeffer’s definition of the pseudo-instrument by pushing the perceptual boundaries of permanence and variation. In each of the nine sections of *fragile.flicker.fragment*, instrumental sounds provide the focal point. All processed sounds contribute to the creation of a pseudo-instrument around the original – a set of variants that extend the spectral and gestural characteristics of the instrumental source.

### 3. Instrumental live-ness and ‘other-ness’.

The use of instruments as source materials for an electroacoustic work is common since Schaeffer’s *Suite pour 14 instruments* (1949). The use of extended passages of ‘performed’ instrumental phrases in a fixed media work however, changes our perception of the instrument as a site for sounds to one that implies a performing presence, no matter how disembodied this presence is. There are two issues to be explored here: how we are encultured to listen to unseen ‘performers’ and the part the recording process plays in changing our perception.

The use of off-stage instruments or voices in classical music has often been used to suggest ‘other-ness’. Throughout the symphonies of Mahler off-stage instruments are used to imply a sense of transcendental renewal or the afterlife as in the final movement of the *Symphony no.2 ‘Resurrection’* (1888-1894). The final movement of Holst’s *The Planets* (1914) features an off-stage choir to suggest the gradual drifting off into space. More recently Simon Holt’s *Boots of Lead* (2002) sets Emily Dickinson’s ‘I felt a funeral, in my brain’ in which the leading roles are a mezzo-soprano and an off-stage clarinet which presents an unseen musical commentary on the psychology of the protagonist. All of these examples suggest there is a common cultural expectation of the meaning of these unseen instrumental sources and it is intended that *fragile.flicker.fragment* be heard as drawing on and extending this understanding. In *fragile.flicker.fragment* the listener has an instant recognition of a physical stimulus required to create a sound (a clarinet, organ or at least an instrument) but one that is physically absent. This dematerialization of the acoustic source whilst maintaining the temporal reality of a metaphorical presence through the obeying our understanding of performed instrumental phrases, nevertheless leads to a sense of ‘other-ness’. This understanding is further complicated when the music is presented in a recorded format. Here Dellaira’s three modes of recording can provide a useful model (Dellaira, 1995). Dellaira proposes the following:

1) recording as document,
2) recording as pseudo-document,
3) recording as abstraction.

In the first mode the ontology of the artwork remains predominant over the recording medium itself. The authenticity of the document is measured by the extent to which the recording process and technology used remains transparent. Often in such documents there is a desire to present the listener with an ‘in-the-hall’ experience. Dellaira writes that,

The literal or suggested presence of a score, both in the recording studio and in the living room, constantly raises questions of interpretation and compromise. Because the issue of authenticity is always on the surface we are always allowed to imagine a real-time performance. Our experience of
listening to the recording includes our being able to imagine being present at its performance - even though no such performance existed (Dellaira, 1995: 198)

In the second mode, the recording as pseudo-document, the final artifact is fabricated to create a performance reality that has never existed in real-time. In the recording of classical music the final product still aspires to present the recording as ‘document’ by maintaining the auditory neutrality of recording technology. The work of Richard Skelton provides a hybrid example (more common in popular music). On *Landings* (2010) the recording is presented as a pseudo-document, but one in which we as listeners enter into a complicit understanding as to the artificiality of the listening situation through the recognition that all of the instruments are played and overdubbed by Skelton himself. However, the artist who extends the notion of the recording as pseudo-document the furthest is the pianist Glen Gould. In 1964 Gould stopped performing live and concentrated his performing activity in the recording studio. Tim Hecker writes that Gould,

retreated toward the cloistered confines of the studio, the laboratory of sound that afforded new calibrations of instrumental virtuosity, studio techniques and social relations of creative labor… Gould viewed his turn toward the recording studio as an opening towards an almost utopian form of artistic liberation and social possibility… Gould’s recording philosophy was essentially an emancipatory strain of media futurology inspired in part by Marshall McLuhan, through which he promoted a mediated form of creative expression as interactive experience. He argued for a new form of creative communication that would break down the creator/listener axis by granting new interpretive agency to listeners and in turn liberating those listeners from the dominance of the artist as a singular visionary. Gould was promoting the idea of cultural communication as an ‘invisible’ network…what Gould promoted was nothing short of an utopian ideal of musical transmission and experience which contextualized and prioritized listening as a singular, atomized, private form of audition (Hecker, 2008:77-78).

Essentially what Gould did was to assert the primacy of the studio as the means for authentic creative expression. Gould opposed the recording as document, often using radical microphone placements that were then mixed and blended through the piece as well as radical editing techniques. This process is taken even further in the third mode – the recording as abstraction. This mode accounts for electroacoustic music and other forms of contemporary electronic music. Dellaira writes that,

If, as Jacques Barzun has said, ‘the moment man ceased to make music with his voice alone the art became machine-ridden,’ and all instruments are involved in the making of some illusion, then we can see the recording studio as a logical continuation - an instrument of instruments - able to fashion constructs otherwise impossible. For the recording studio is ‘played’ too, though not on stage and in real time. But it is played for an audience, an audience who, in the very act of bringing the concert hall to its living room, gladly embraces the illogical and willingly submits to illusion (Dellaira, 1995:198).

Paul Dolden’s aesthetic is one that extends the intentions of Gould to the nth degree.
As with Michel Pascal’s work *Puzzle* (1996) in which he creates ‘an orchestra born of a wave of the electroacoustic fairy’s magic wand’ (Pascal, 1997), Dolden’s work is recording as abstraction in Dellaira’s terms. In his compositions, Dolden often uses hundreds of multi-tracked instrumental recordings to create his often dense, maximalist aesthetic. Although the work is scored in a traditional manner, the studio is essential to the mediation of the work in that the post-production balancing of instruments and tuning systems that Dolden uses is unable to be performed live. Dolden creates a massive virtual orchestra at his disposal in the studio. In *Below the Walls of Jericho* (1988-89) Dolden used four hundred independent audio tracks and divided each of the seven-octave range of the piece into 1/8th tones. He has also explored non-octave tunings in *Caught in an Octagon of Unaccustomed Light* (1987-88) and the recent *The Un-tempered Orchestra* (2010) in which recorded instrumental parts were then ‘re-tuned’ to multiple eastern and microtonal tunings. Such precision could never exist live. Dolden’s work is not only about orchestral density, in any given section of music there can be tens of independent tempi present simultaneously each governing between five and twenty parts. In a discussion of his music with Jeremy Owen Turner, Dolden states that,

Ninety-eight per cent of the music that people hear, they hear through loudspeakers, without the presence of live performers; yet music continues to identify itself as a performing art… My own work springs from a desire to make recordings that are more than postcards from the concert hall. I am interested in using technology to create music that we cannot perform live, and that we can barely imagine when performance is the criterion for diffusion… The published audio work — the recording — becomes the final artistic statement. The recording becomes the art object rather than simply a documentation of a performance… In this sense, it is the recording as an art object that now contains the “authentic” experience… One significant advantage to creatively transforming the recording process from performance document to a stand-alone artwork is that it allows instrumental events to coexist in a way that could not be possible in the real world. If we also appreciate the recording itself as a discrete art form worth our aesthetic attention, we could learn to reawaken our hearing and musical sensibility and be able to transcend our stereotypes of what constitutes a live experience (Turner, 2006).

The orchestra is pushed to non-idiomatic extremes only possible in the studio. The additional perspective here is that the role of the engineer/producer – usually a transparent one in order to present the illusion of the documented concert performance, is now highly visible and the skill and technical prowess and craft of the composer/producer can be appreciated in its own right. By making recorded instruments do what they cannot do live, the composer highlights the recording medium itself and radically shifts the ontology of the work. The recording process itself is elevated from being a mere document to an autonomous artifact. Dolden continues,

There is no question about its [the recorded work’s] authenticity. (as opposed to Foucault’s argument that authenticity is the hallmark of all art)... We live in a world of simulacrum…The recording is very real for people. I am only trying to work with what is our common musical experience (Dolden, 2011).
Here we find an interesting dichotomy in the creative use of the studio as a mediatory space for recording. With Gould, no matter how many edits he uses, there is still the perceived illusion of the documentation of a perfect (albeit constructed) performance. Dolden’s work clearly uses extensive post-production to nullify this illusion, yet because of the ‘live’ trace of the musicians inherent in the recording, there is still the perception of a ‘performance’ of sorts. It is this perceptual recognition of an ‘impossible physicality’ that actually engenders the transcendental ecstasy Dolden seeks to attain in his work.

The music of *fragile.flicker.fragment* is situated between Dellaira’s second and third recording mode. The ‘performed’ elements of the work are understood as recording as pseudo-document and the electroacoustic pseudo-instrumental elements are understood as recording as abstraction. The ‘performative’ aspects of the work appear to the listener to afford reality as they are presented as if a document of a real-time experience. This reality is however, an illusion. The recording is a ‘form of signification that creates the appearance of a knowable reality and hence confirms the self-definition of the human subject as someone capable of knowing that reality; but in fact both reality and the human subject who appears capable of knowing that reality are ‘effect’ of a process of signification’ (Allen, 1995:2). Listeners actively participate in the illusion that the recording affords. The music of *fragile.flicker.fragment* hovers between several auditory fictions – the instrumental performance and the processing of this ‘performed’ material combine to form an illusionary unity, what the film theorist Richard Allen terms ‘projective’ illusion. For Allen, projective illusion is a process in which the viewer actively engages. Allen writes that

the experience of the impression of reality in the cinema takes the form of a benign disavowal where spectators entertain in thought that what they see is real in a manner akin to the experience of a conscious fantasy. The difference lies in the fact that in cinema this conscious fantasy is fully realized for the spectator in the form of a projective illusion (Allen, 1995:3).

Like Alexander Schubert’s *Semaphores* (2011) and *A Few Plateaus* (2011), which are based on highly edited and manipulated recordings of live-electronic improvisations with several instruments, it is possible to create performing versions of parts of *fragile.flicker.fragment*. However, the recorded versions remain a different manifestation of the same ideas rather than merely being a document of the performance. The return to the analogy of the cinema, the final recording of the composition is akin to the way we view films that use CGI environments. When we enter the cinema we are complicit in suspending our expectations that what we will see will comply with real-world scenarios. We readily watch people in virtual CGI environments performing hyper-real and surreal actions. Often, although these are far-fetched the physicality and unity of the body remains central to the action. In *fragile.flicker.fragment* what we hear constantly fluctuates between a mode of listening that is reliant on the perception of instrumental gesture and a knowledge of the physicality involved in creating that gesture (Schaeffer’s permanence) and the electroacoustic extension of these gestures (a pseudo-instrumental variance) all mediated through post-production techniques available in the studio. The perceptual unity of the instrument and the processed version is fundamental – just as in CGI for
us to accept the effects as ‘real’ then the technology creating them needs to be transparent. As soon as we become medium-aware the illusion is shattered.

4. Authenticity and Projective Illusion
Having expounded on my reasoning for using instrumental sources and the way in which I consciously construct a listening scenario that creates an ambiguity between recording as pseudo-document and recording as abstraction, our relation to the recorded object and how we perceive *fragile, flicker, fragment* in relation to cinematic projective illusion will now be considered.

In the first half of the twentieth century authenticity was understood to constitute the real-time interaction of a person-to-person exchange. This is embodied in Heidegger’s theory of *da-sein* (‘being there’) (Heidegger, 1996) and Benjamin’s notion of the aura (Benjamin, 1998). The discussion of perceived authenticity and presence becomes more complex when we are concerned with the phenomenon of technologically mediated presence, something that is inherent in *fragile, flicker, fragment* through the performed instrumental material and its presentation as a recorded artifact. With our contemporary preoccupation with virtual bodies and identities in cyberspace, second life, and the declaration of the body as obsolete by stelarc, the idea of live-ness in contemporary art is one in which traditional notions of the bodily, presence, actuality and artifact are continually being redefined. In the digital arts there is an increasing acceptance that the artwork is embodied in the interface – the construction and mediation of a space that facilities a meeting point between the audience and the work.

If we reposition the concept of authenticity and its antithesis, repetition, and instead think of repetition (or reproducibility) not of the object of perception itself but of the act of perception itself – i.e. a repetition of unique singular encounters, then we can establish an understanding of authenticity in relation to recorded works. In technologically reliant contemporary artworks the aura and authenticity is less about physical and geographic spaces and interaction rather it is more about the psychological approach to the artwork on the part of the listener – the negotiation of a space in which the work is appreciated. What I am therefore proposing is a redefinition of Benjamin’s notion of aura - one that resides not in the physical interaction of performer/audience but rather in a mediated virtual space between art-object and the listener/user. This psychological approach, focused on the listener rather than the artifact itself, can be further developed through an understanding of Deleuze’s notion of ‘becoming’. Cull writes that,

Deleuze is, perhaps first and foremost, a process philosopher for whom relations of force have ontological primacy with respect to the ‘things’ – that is, objects or subjects – they constitute. In this sense, we could say that Deleuze, like Heidegger and Derrida, wants to break with the privileging of being-as-presence. ‘Being’, for Deleuze, is not about fixed identities but about an unstable flux that is understood to found those identities (Cull, 2009).

Here the most important element is the Deleuzian concept of process. In *Nietzsche and Philosophy* Deleuze states that ‘there is no being beyond becoming’. For Deleuze, presence is ‘becoming’. The focus here is on the individual. This sense of ‘becoming’
has a significant impact on our perception of *fragile.flicker.fragment*. Through the process of listening and re-listening to the composition the listener does not experience an impoverished aura through reproduction, rather through refocusing the experiential nature of the work back onto the listener and the psychological space in which the work is perceived, the listener is with each re-listening in a process of ‘becoming’.

Through accepting the reproducibility of the artifact as part of the postmodern condition, technology has transformed the status of presence: the instrumental sounds in *fragile.flicker.fragment* do not in themselves constitute presence but become a metaphor for presence. The listener’s perception of this metaphor of presence can be explained through Michel Chion’s notion of ‘visu-audition’ proposed in his book *Le Son* (Chion, 1998). Chion describes visu-audition as perception that is primarily driven by that which is audible. Such an instance is the concert, where what we hear is often reinforced by the visual gestures of the performer. What *fragile.flicker.fragment* proposes is a virtual visu-audition. There is no image other than that stimulated in the mind of the listener. The listener applies an appropriate culturally accepted image of expectation to the sound. Such a process of assignation is also evident in the perceptual processing of the voice in ventriloquism. Connor writes,

> Often magical and/or spiritual in its various manifestations, the disembodied voice impels hearers to overcome its impossibility by imagining its source as an excessive and frequently malign, corporeal presence, for ‘it is we who assign voices to objects, phenomenologically, the fact that an unassigned voice must always imply a body means that it will always partly supply it as well’ (Connor, 2003:36).

The same perceptual processes are at work when listening to recorded sound. When we listen our unconscious immediate reaction is to supplant the sound with visual data that either confirms or negates our initial interpretation of the sound data. One such example is the key sounds present at the opening of *Ode* (pt. 6 of *fragile.flicker.fragment*). The implied physicality of the sounds and gestures of an accordion being prepared for play promotes a sense of ‘da-sein’ by capturing quasi-documentary outtakes before the music proper starts. We perceive a fragment of unscripted actuality, an action that is spatially and temporally present. The unassigned sound of the accordion keys always implies an instrument and human agency and so our cognitive processes supply it. This process is one that Allen terms ‘reproductive illusion’ which he demonstrates by means of our perception of objects in paintings. He writes,

> we may imagine or visualize that the object of the painting is before us, unmediated by representation. When we entertain the painting in this fashion we do not think that the represented object is actually before us in the space of the real world, yet we visualize that the object in the painting is fully realized before us. We imagine that we inhabit the world of the painting in the manner of an internal observer (Allen, 1995:88).

As a listener, because of the absence of extrinsic references in the music of *fragile.flicker.fragment* we approach the recording as presenting a self-contained soundworld that we actively engage with and experience as an internal observer. This
cognitive process is exactly the same as Allen’s concept of projective illusion in cinema. Allen writes,

When we experience projective illusion in the cinema, we make believe that the experience is real, or suspend our disbelief, but we do not believe that the illusion is real. The experience of projective illusion is like a trompe l’œil: We see the illusion while we know it to be an illusion. However, trompe l’œil illusion has a level of objectivity that projective illusion in the cinema does not. Projective illusion requires a contribution of the spectator, a predisposition to see the image as a fully realized world (Allen, 1995:139).

Understanding that the role of the spectator (listener) is an active one in projective illusion is essential for how I intend fragile.flicker.fragment to be approached by the listener. In Sontag’s quotation cited at the beginning of this paper she implies that physical mediacy denies the transcendence that the artist desires. In fragile.flicker.fragment the lack of physical mediacy is not intended to facilitate transcendence. Such a state does not inherently imply an active role on the part of the listener – it is akin to merely hearing the music. Rather the perceptual state that fragile.flicker.fragment seeks to engender is one of immanent listening, a state that implies the enfolding of the listener in a soundworld with which they have a conscious, active and on-going interaction and engagement. Deleuze’s notion of the plane of ‘immanence’ (a term he regards as the opposite of transcendence - a divine or empirical beyond), is one that suggests ‘an unqualified immersion or embeddedness, an immanence which denies transcendence as a real distinction’ (Deleuze, 2001:27). On the plane of immanence there are only complex networks of forces, particles, connections, relations, affects and becomings.

In order to convey this sense of unqualified immersion the musical argument has to be abstract and free of metonymic modes of perception as any such suggestion would imply a re-engagement with physicality and an awareness of spaces in which the listener is situated rather than one which the listener is inhabiting and embedded within. Such a loss of physical/medium awareness is a pre-requisite for projective illusion. For me, the live performer in a concert is like Allen’s live actor in drama. He writes that ‘in order to experience drama as projective illusion, as a fully realized world, we must imagine that the actors and props are neither physically present nor a part of this world’ (Deleuze, 2001:89). Through having the performers absent and presented only via the recorded medium the listener engages in the projective illusion of live-ness. fragile.flicker.fragment thus proposes an anti-live aesthetic in order to promote a state of immanence through projective illusion in the part of the listener.
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