

# Santa Fe Institute Public Lecture, August 15, 2001

David Dunn

It is probably a bit of a surprise to have a musician up here as part of the Santa Fe Institute public lecture series. As I was thinking about what I was going to say this evening under sponsorship of such a prestigious intellectual community, it occurred to me that I've witnessed an interesting transformation in the context where my work is presented. In recent years I've been invited less and less to music festivals and more and more to institutions like SFI. While I see this as consistent with an overt shift in my personal thinking as a composer and musician, I think it also signifies a more general shift that is taking place in the world of Western musical practice.

In many ways I have always been less interested in the expressive side of musical behavior and more interested in the questions that are raised by the mere existence of musical phenomena. I've now reached a point in my personal development where I'm no longer apologetic for this.

In recent years there has been what I consider to be a profound change in the world of music through the emergence of a number of new genres of musical form and research. Amongst these is a new research area tentatively termed Bio-musicology that attempts to understand the biological origins of music. A somewhat older research area that has come to be known as Acoustic Ecology, aims to understand the integrative role that sound has in our natural and urban environments. There is the whole genre called Sound Art that attempts to define acoustically based art forms that do not arise from a musical paradigm per se, such as text-sound composition, radio art, gallery type installation sound works, site-specific sound installations and performances, and soundscape recording. Tangential to these new forms, but informing them and being informed by them in essential ways, are two areas of science: Bioacoustics which studies the sounds made by non-human living organisms and Scientific Auralization, the sonic equivalent to computer visualization techniques through which streams of data are made more direct and experiential to researchers and the general public.

Some commentators have seen the development of these new genres as directly hostile to traditional musical values, while many sound artists try to characterize what they do as unrelated to any musical practice or concern. One thing I hope to allude to tonight is that these new fields are a logical consequence of an evolution in musical practice rather than a break with it. If music in anyway reflects the evolving human condition, than we are probably right on target. This is what we should expect music to become in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

While my own background and work has been woven through all of these fields, and I have scattered small contributions amongst most of them, my work addresses itself to two specific areas of questioning:

- 1) What does music contribute to our understanding of the question of mind? How is it structured and where is its locus?
- 2) What is accomplished by strengthening our aural sense within a culture that is visually dominant in that most of the metaphors that we use to construct and describe our experience of the world are based upon the sense of sight? What is gained or lost by a shift towards an aural perception of the world?

Before attempting to tackle these broad questions, let me back up a bit and address this idea of what I mean by the questions that are raised by the mere existence of musical phenomena.

Let me be very clear that the purpose for music that I am going to refer to is only one small aspect of the total superabundance of music and musical phenomena. I have no interest in pitting what I do against the vast scale and diversity of musical realities nor am I delusional in imagining that I am in anything other than a minority position. I'm only going to attempt to point at some very broad generalizations about what music may mean that ask some difficult questions. In so doing I hope to be seen as asking more for tolerance of musical diversity than merely a source of criticism of current musical practice. One of the consistent factors in many people's lives is to reject musical phenomena that do not fit within their set of musical use preferences. I believe that music has always served, and always will serve, many masters. I'm just hoping that we might come to regard it as something more fundamental as an active agent in the world than many of us currently seem capable of imagining.

The variegated uses to which music has been put appear at times to be inexhaustible. From opera to hip hop, from therapy to dolphin communication, from selling laundry detergent to preparing troops for battle, from alarm clocks to torture mechanisms, music has been there. It is this very superabundance of use, purpose and meaning that convinces me that we really do not know what music is. It is truly one of the great-unsolved human mysteries.

Even a cognitive scientist of Steven Pinker's stature, who otherwise regards music as a form of "auditory cheesecake" that does not fulfill an evolutionary need, has said:

**“ I suspect that music still is a mystery, and we shouldn’t fool ourselves into thinking that we understand it. I think it genuinely is an unsolved problem.”**

To drive this point even further into the ground, here is a lovely quote from the physician/writer Lewis Thomas:

**“My...question, addressed at large to the world of biology, concerns music. Surely music (along with ordinary language) is as profound a problem for human biology as can be thought of, and I would like to see something done about it. A few years ago the German government set a large advisory committee to work on the question of what the next Max Planck Institute should be taking on as its scientific mission. The committee worked for a very long time and emerged with the recommendation that the new Max Planck Institute should be dedicated to the problem of music-- what music is, why it is indispensable for human existence, what music really means—hard questions like that. The government, in its wisdom, turned down the idea, muttering something in administrative language about relevance, and there the matter rests.”**

With these ideas as background, I would like to put my cards on the table in the form of a few controversial questions and assertions. While these are meant to be provocative, they also provide a kind of ecology of ideas for you to wallow in during the next part of the lecture, a kind of audience participation listening session.

### **Proposition 1:**

I wonder if music might be our way of mapping reality through metaphors of sound as if it were a parallel way of thinking to the visually dominant metaphors of our speech and written symbols. I think that most musicians can relate to the idea that music is not just something we do to amuse ourselves. Music may be a kind of conserving strategy for ways of communicating that are only tangentially related to human linguistic structures. Many characteristics of the thing that we call music, throughout the evolutionary trajectory of our species, have been closer to how other forms of life may communicate.

I think music may be a conservation strategy for keeping something alive that we may now need to make more conscious, a way of making sense of the world that might help us to refashion our relationship to nonhuman living systems. I personally believe that we have yet to articulate the importance of music and the immense cognitive and social terrain that it addresses. The fact that we have yet to discover a human society without it says something very profound. Recent discoveries about the ability of music-making to alter the very hard-wiring of brain development say even more. I have a gut intuition that

music, as this vast terrain of human activity and inheritance of our species, may uniquely provide us with clues to our continued survival.

### **Proposition 2:**

In many ways our most cherished uses for music and our assumptions about values of authorship, communicative intention, emotional expression and musical genius may be, in evolutionary terms, short-term aberrations. Despite the beauty and entertainment value that such assumptions afford our lives, they may even be distractions from a more profound significance for music.

From a much wider cultural and environmental viewpoint I believe that music has been a significant means through which humans communicate with, participate within, and give back to the larger systems of mind that comprise our natural and social environments. In the daily circumstances of life, we are surrounded with a fabric of sound that is the voice of a generative source. When we make music, it is to match this fabric that speaks to us. Most of human music making throughout our history has been outdoors. It hasn't been made in cathedrals or concert halls. That is a very recent circumstance. We may believe that we are somehow divorced from that generative source when we move indoors but I think that one of the meanings of music has to do with conserving that original intention. I believe that when we talk about the integrative and spiritual aspects of music, what we are really doing is trying to re-stimulate, or trying to find some recapitulation to these other levels of music as a communicative source with a living world.

### **Proposition 3:**

The meaning of music cannot be found within the mere structure of notes and/or their semiotic referents. There is no simple point-to-point correspondence of communicative intent and reception, and the extent to which there could be, would betray its triviality. For myself, the familiar 19<sup>th</sup> century model of emotional and expressive communication through music has outlived its usefulness. Even though I probably never did accept it, I now consider it to be an extreme case of consensus-misplaced concreteness. The attempt to identify objective content of expression within the musical object smacks of all the failed post-Kantian attempts to assign mind to a specific locus. Music is the same as mind, a distributed ecology of communal signification where meaning arises from the conditions of mutual conspiracy. Expression and meaning in music exist in the agreement to circumscribe a boundary upon a seemingly infinite set of superabundant associations and uses. In other words, how much you buy into the culture you are born into is not merely a matter of personal taste, but to assume that the meaning you have attributed to any music is a universal attribute is simply absurd.

Now that I have probably intrigued some of you and infuriated others, I'd like to try a little audience participation experiment that might help illustrate my assertions.

I'm going to play for you two pair of listening examples. After each individual example, I'd like you to demonstrate with a show of hands, your consideration of the example in the light of the following question:

Does the musical example convey to you a sense of intentional communication, emotional or otherwise?

After each pair of examples I will explain their source and authorship. Each example is approximately two minutes in duration. Please just give me an honest response. There are no right or wrong answers.

**Example 1:**

Fake Scarlatti by David Cope's *Experiments in Musical Intelligence Program*.

Issues raised:

Who is the author?

If emotion is communicated, how can this be the intention of a computer program?

**Example 2:**

Excerpt from *Form IV: Broken Sequences for Piano* by Stefan Wolpe.

Issues raised:

Given the composer's deeply serious intention to communicate something to the listener, was he successful?

Was some aspect of this communicated to you before I told you?

If it was, and you do not have Parkinson's disease, was this an emotion that you could identify?

Is a kinesthetic experience the same as an emotional one?

**Example 3:**

*Ecological Plantron* by Mamoru Fujieda

Issues raised:

Again, who is the real author?

Assuming that the plants can participate in some sort of feedback with the resultant sounds, can plants compose or are the plants performers and/or instruments?

If you perceived this as a musical experience, is it through intentional design or are you projecting something familiar onto it?

#### **Example 4:**

**Weddell Seals recorded by Doug Quinn**

**Issues raised:**

**Assuming communicative intention, is it also music?**

**Is music only a human activity?**

I think it's obvious that when one listens to all of the previous examples many issues and problems arise. I think everyone would be more comfortable if there could be some kind of objective criteria for their musical experience that is perhaps physiologically based. It's not that I don't think there are aspects to our experience of music that are physiologically determined, I just think that we know next to nothing about them and that most such claims have crumbled under serious investigation. Knowledge about the hard-wired aspects of our cognitive perception is fascinating but doesn't necessarily map very well onto our actual experience of the world, especially with a phenomenon as tenaciously elusive and diverse as music.

My hope in providing these examples has been to illustrate just how much of our assumptions about what we believe music to be are culturally determined and therefore colored by our culture's cherished belief in the privileged ideals of self-expression, emotional content, intentionality and authorship. My argument is not with the cultural value of these concepts but only with the almost ubiquitous insistence upon always identifying musical experience with them. So what is left of music in the absence of these concerns and what can we learn from it?

One response to this question concerns a redefinition of the role of the listener: Music not only primarily consists of the perception of sound in time but it is the perceiver that is engaged in both organizing that perception and assigning it meaning. Beyond this is the realization that this capacity takes place regardless of the intention of a composer or the specific nature of sounds occurring in an environment. It is the nature of perception that is the fundamental ground from which all music arises and not its materials, structures or communicative intent. As Elaine Barkin says, "Listening is primary composition."

The historical events that have led Western music to this realization are summarized by Sean Cubitt: "Music and information dominate the hearing of the twentieth century, and their dialectic has only recently begun to evolve a third mode of hearing, the soundscape. Music from Russolo to Cage strips itself of inessentials---melody, harmony, counterpoint---to encompass all hearing, transferring the musician's mode of listening to the sounds of the world."

While this capacity to hear the soundscape as music is probably the most modern of ways of listening, it is probably also one of the most archaic. I think of it as a classic example of what Arthur Koestler called, a “draw back to leap.” New evolutionary strategies often need to pull back to a less specialized stage of development for new mutations and adaptations to form. To amplify what I proposed earlier: I think that music may simultaneously represent an intuition to a future communication modality that may afford us a certain necessary survival adaptation and a conserving action for keeping alive a mode of communication that is similar to the way that other forms of life actually think. For example, Gregory Bateson came to believe that dolphin communication probably had more similarity to human music than to human speech.

While I agree with Chomsky that human language is a unique species-specific adaptation, I don't think music is. I believe it to be an aspect of a much more generalized behavior that we share with other forms of life.

At this point I'd like to give you a couple sonic examples, from my own work, of what I'm trying to get at.

#### **5) Nexus 1**

#### **6) Mimus Polyglottos**

After listening to these examples, this is probably the appropriate time to return to this question of mind and mental structure. If my use of the term is to be anything other than a mere heuristic device then I must provide some sort of definition.

What I have to offer by way of a definition of mind is the cybernetic epistemology of Gregory Bateson. I have yet to come across an argument that either negates or improves upon it. So, not so simply put, Bateson proposes:

*“I suggest that the delimitation of an individual mind must always depend upon what phenomena we wish to understand or explain. Obviously there are lots of message pathways outside the skin, and these and the messages they carry must be included as part of the mental system whenever they are relevant.*

*The elementary cybernetic system with its messages in circuit is, in fact, the simplest unit of mind; and the transform of a difference traveling in a circuit is the elementary idea. More complicated systems are perhaps more worthy to be called mental systems, but essentially this is what we are talking about. The unit which shows the characteristic of trial and error will be legitimately called a mental system.*

*We get a picture, then, of mind as synonymous with cybernetic system – the relevant total information-processing, trial-and-error completing unit. And we know that within Mind in the widest sense there will be a hierarchy of subsystems, any one of which we can call an individual mind.*

*The individual mind is immanent but not only in the body. It is immanent also in pathways and messages outside of the body; and there is a larger Mind of which the individual mind is only a subsystem. This larger Mind is comparable to God and is perhaps what some people mean by “God,” but it is still immanent in the total interconnected social system and planetary ecology.”*

**I think that it is fairly obvious how significant Bateson’s ecological model of mind as emergent to basic information systems has been towards how we might redefine our relationship to the non-human living world. It is probably not so obvious how relevant it is to understanding our future relationship to our networked technologies and machines.**

**It is precisely at this nexus between mind, ecology and technology that I wish to assert the potential role of the aspects of music that I have been alluding to. This is also the specific content of my own work with sound: to recontextualize the perception of sound as it pertains to a necessary epistemological shift in the human relationship to our physical environment and the nonhuman world, whether that world be living or machine. My belief is that there is an important role for the evolution of an art form that can address the phenomenon of sound as a prime-integrating factor in the understanding of our place within the biosphere's fabric of mind. The same applies to our burgeoning technosphere.**

#### **Example 7:**

##### **Simulation 1: Sonic Mirror**

**When considering the current human predicament of still behaving according to a pre-cybernetic epistemology, it seems clear that we require new modes of experience that can both recover those aspects of human integrity rooted in a fundamental sense of connectedness with the non-human living world, while allowing us to integrate them with our rapid expansion of mind through machine. These demands not only require a heightened awareness of the role of art and the artist but of the very metaphors we use to organize reality.**

**Neuro-physiologist Francisco Varela has pointed out that visually based, spatiotemporal metaphors are perhaps the worst for describing the denseness of interpenetration of**



phenomena that gives rise to the world. When we predominantly speak of the world in topological terms, we impose a fixed time/space relationship on the rich dance of living things. We constrain our understanding of the true interdependence of life. In Buddhism the concept of Sunya (a Sanskrit word translated as "emptiness") describes the complex chain of connection that forms the world. Each "thing" is so densely connected to everything else that it resides nowhere. We cannot isolate the thing from all the states of matter or energy that preceded it or to which it will become. Music is perhaps one of the best means we have for thinking about this fabric of mind that resides everywhere. The experience of sound as a vibrant plenum reminds us of the profound physical interconnectedness that is our true environment. Music may be one of the most direct means we have for experiencing and practicing participation in a larger system of mind, redefining the boundary of self to include larger pathways of interaction with the world.

After asking these provocative questions, I wish I could give you some definitive answers but I can't. I have a few hunches to go on and these have been the signposts that I have followed in my creative work. One of these is a sense that music is a tool that we have been collectively fashioning for a very long time and along the way have tried out for various uses. While it seems to have fit well to many circumstances, it still remains at the periphery of our consciousness, awaiting any definitive purpose. But that may be the crux of my argument. While music evolves with us, and is without doubt a measure of what makes us human, it may also be a measure of how we can remain connected to larger patterns of life and mind, and a measure of what we have yet to imagine ourselves becoming.

**Example 8:**

**Chaos and the Emergent Mind of the Pond**