Introduction

Breaking Sound Barriers

Gustavus Stadler

> I got more records than the K.G.B.
> —M.I.A. (Maya Arulpragasam), "Paper Planes"

This special issue of *Social Text* emerges from the current excitement, audible across a number of disciplines, about new ways of studying sound and sound reproduction from cultural and historical perspectives. It offers a range of such work—produced by scholars in history, African American studies, English, history of science, and performance studies—positioning the production and consumption of recordings as social and cultural practices; from this perspective, the essays herein illuminate both the political contexts surrounding such practices and the way these practices mediate understandings of such contexts. A number of the articles are also concerned with historiographic questions and seek to complicate simplified, apolitical narratives of the "evolution" of sound recording. The archive drawn upon by this issue is extraordinarily promiscuous. Sources include scientific experiments with the deaf; newspaper accounts of recordings of lynchings; CDs by Anglo–Sri Lankan dance music/hip-hop sensation M.I.A.; street sounds from a Puerto Rican neighborhood in 1950s Manhattan; a school bus ride in 1980s Broward County, Florida; histories of pianos and music boxes; and the writings of novelist William Gaddis. Still, one concern can be said to lie at the core of each piece and that is the idea that recording takes place within, and is ineluctably shaped by, the social and formal properties of networks of power.

In the epigraph to this introduction, which I take from the hit song "Paper Planes" (discussed in this issue by Jayna Brown), Maya Arulpragasam juxtaposes two different meanings of the term *record* as well as two

Social Text 102 • Vol. 28, No. 1 • Spring 2010
DOI 10.1215/01642472-2009-057 © 2010 Duke University Press

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019

different social contexts in which the term has meaning: one is her identity as an individual musician making (and sampling) records; the other is a state institution of surveillance, keeping records on citizens. Bringing these two contexts together in the form of a boast, she suggests that they are somehow mutually implicated, and that breaking the conceptual barrier separating them is part of the revolutionary project she ascribes to her music. Placing her own recording work on a continuum of power with that of the intelligence agency of the modern state, she insists that a "record" is a flexible thing of far denser, potentially more ominous social and political meanings than we may generally assume it to be. In the spirit of this lyric, the essays in this issue seek to further expand our understandings of the range of contexts in which recording and recordings play important socially and politically formative roles. Also in that spirit, it asks questions about what actually constitutes a recording and what relationship sound recording has (and has had) to other forms of data collection, information storage, and music production. Indeed, that the boast is coming from a British woman of South Asian descent working in a genre (hip-hop) generally considered American- and male-dominated harmonizes nicely with the concern these essays show for exploring the many ways that modalities of social difference such as race, gender, class, nation, and ability structure practices of making and listening to recordings, as well as the manners in which we think about those practices.

The most typical image of sound recording in the Euro-American cultural imaginary is probably that of the genius music producer, always male, mostly but not always white, sitting at an immense mixing board as a rock, hip-hop, or pop act runs through its paces in the studio. Canonical figures like Phil Spector and Lee "Scratch" Perry have further fortified this image with their spectacularly eccentric and, in Spector's case, homicidal behavior.[1] In this author-oriented understanding of recording history, a few masterful record producers have brought the process to which Thomas Alva Edison gave birth in 1876 in his Menlo Park, New Jersey, laboratory up to the level of an art form in itself. One reason this narrative remains strong is that its energy is periodically refueled by programs like VH-1 Classic's *Classic Albums* series of one-hour documentaries about the making of landmark rock albums. A less visible and perhaps more influential reason is that, until recently, our histories of recording have been histories of recorded music, and music has been considered to be the sine qua non of recording, the content that lifts it from mere message carrier into the realm of aesthetics.[2] In histories of this sort, virtually every event in the development of recording has been designed to improve the "fidelity" with which music is reproduced, and these events have taken place in an idealized space isolated from any historical phenomena other than technological "advances."

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019

Typically, such histories tell a story that goes something like this: Edison invented the phonograph in 1876 as an instrument capable of both recording and playing back sound. He introduced it to the public in 1877, believing that its marketability would hinge primarily on its potential to improve bureaucratic efficiency as a device for dictation. He also imagined that it would succeed as a tool of historic preservation, enabling the voices of loved ones, political leaders, and great poets to be heard beyond the point of bodily death. However, after a decade or so, it became increasingly clear that the greatest source of profit from the phonograph would lie in listening to recorded entertainment like songs and comedy sketches — first in public exhibits and parlors, and soon after, by the turn of the century, in the privacy of the middle-class home. Contemporaneously with these developments, Emile Berliner's gramophone appeared, a device that could not record but which could play discs fashioned from a master recording — thus allowing production of recordings on a previously impossible scale. As consumers' relationship to sound recording came to involve playback exclusively, the content of the recordings they were buying was, increasingly, studio-recorded music. And things stayed this way, with a series of milestone innovations bringing improvements in sound fidelity and methods of studio production (e.g., the increasing number of tracks able to be made available for recording and mixing instruments), into the late twentieth century. The onset of the cassette, the boom box, and the Sony Walkman complicated to some degree what had been assumed to be the essentially domestic nature of listening to recorded music. But the most significant change of recent years has been the digital "revolution," a seemingly unprecedented, unpredicted eruption of technical, material, and paradigmatic advances that, among other things, allow any budding musician or DJ with a laptop to perform and mix her own magnum opus in MP3 format and market it over the Internet.

This story's focus on inventions and inventors treats recording as, in Michael Warner's phrase, "a medium itself unmediated" and feeds what Lisa Gitelman calls "a tendency to naturalize or essentialize media — in short, to cede them a history that is more powerfully theirs than ours."[3] Gitelman's *Always Already New* constructs a broad critique of "technological determinism," extending and deepening a countertradition that developed in response, originally, to Marshall McLuhan's influential screeds on the history of media. Indeed, the early segment of the history of the mechanical reproduction of sound has already been drastically and productively complicated by the work of both Gitelman and Jonathan Sterne; in Sterne's *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction*, the book's subtitle tersely rebuffs the techno-driven account from the get-go. Both Gitelman and Sterne have shown, in deeply textured theoretical frameworks, how Edison's invention was itself shaped by a mass of social,

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019

cultural, and historical forces: ideas about inscription, writing, presence, and stenography; understandings of deafness and how the ear works; shifting attitudes toward death and the embalming of dead bodies; even the history of medical instrumentation, as in Sterne's examination of the early-nineteenth-century emergence of "mediate auscultation," also known as stethoscopy.[4]

The alterity of the early history and prehistory of phonographic recording is perhaps not all that surprising. But, in fact, the history of recording has been an inchoate narrative in its entirety, as David Suisman's article in this issue helps to show, with a diversity of recording practices and uses that belies music-, fidelity-, and even phonograph-centered accounts. (And even in those accounts, some notable complications immediately emerge, such as Spector's hazy, stereo-resistant "wall of sound.") To be sure, office dictation did not have the motive power to popularize the phonograph that Edison believed it would, and spoken-word commercial recordings are not as marketable now as they were during the 1890s. But the diversity of sound recordings' content, contexts, and functionality has never disappeared. At the same time Folkways Records was releasing the Tony Schwartz *Nueva York* recordings that Jennifer Stoever-Ackerman discusses in her essay in this issue, they were also commissioning and marketing records like *Understanding of Sex, Vol. I: Sex Principles for Adults/The Psychology of Love and Sex*, *Sounds of Medicine* (sample track title: "Stethoscope Sounds: Sounds of the Bowels — a Normal Hungry Man Smoking a Cigarette before Dinner"), and numerous instructional recordings, including one that, at the height of the cold war, helped listeners learn Russian language and history.[5] In the 1950s and 1960s, William S. Burroughs and Andy Warhol used tape recorders to "write" novels; in a particularly striking illustration of the diverse uses of sound-recording technology, Warhol referred to his portable cassette recorder as his "wife."[6]

As the first decade of the twenty-first century comes to a close, it can sometimes seem as though the diversity of recording practices has been tamed under the sign of digitality. For instance, as I sit eating lunch in the food court of a large urban mall, my iPhone lies beside my plate. On this single small device, I can listen to or download music in MP3 or another digital format, which I can do legally at a retail site like the iTunes store or illegally via file sharing and BitTorrent. I can record memos to myself or, without too much effort, covertly record a conversation with someone else or between the people at the table next to me. Using one of at least five similar applications, I can listen to tiny samples of actual birdcalls so as to identify the birds I encounter as I walk home through the park. I can go home to compose and demo a new song using an application that turns the phone into a digital four-track recorder. I can listen to voice mail or rerecord my outgoing message. Then, I can get back on the Web and

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019

participate in a musicians' discussion forum full of complaints that Apple has not yet produced an iPhone "app" allowing them to sequence the many thousands of loops, made by recording live instruments, that are currently available for purchase at multiple Web sites.

As my own wide-eared wonder at the device (which I still, more often than not, refer to as my "cell phone") begins to resemble the teeming technological determinism of advertising copy, it is important to ask, what's "political" about all this? Primarily, paralleling all these *can*s is a series of *can't*s. What seems at first like a collapse of the barriers separating all of these sound-recording-related practices into a single device is also a refinement of technologies, media, and multiple economic, cultural, and social institutions and practices, a process that has caused many of recording's existing cultural modes to disappear altogether. Record stores and labels, recording studios, concert halls, bootleg concert tape dealers, notebooks, pens, books (or at least ornithological manuals), answering machines, microcassette recorders, and four-track cassette recorders are among the many things, commodities, businesses, and institutions whose existence, at least in the form in which they are familiar (and admittedly, this familiarity is becoming evermore generationally specific), is threatened by the emergence of this small handheld instrument, which in acting as hosting device produces a sense of universal commonality across all of these formerly separate and specific recording-related phenomena/practices/modes of production and consumption. At the same time, new opportunities emerge — for small software developers, for musicians, and so on.

But the many different recording-related functionalities of the iPhone have to be seen as only one of the latest instances of the ways that understanding audio recording are always directly and structurally effected by broad sites of social, political, cultural, and economic struggle. What seems, on the one hand, like a liberating level of access and a conceptually stimulating dissolving of boundaries is, on the other, symptomatic of the ever-increasing control of the flow of capital by large corporations such as Apple, who now realize profits previously dispersed across many subfields of the music and telecommunications industries, among others.[7] The wealth of such corporations enables their depiction of their products as constituting, extraneously to the market, the very frontier of modernity. This story is spread widely, even as, in a significant number of settings, other technologies and formats continue to be preferable and their uses continue to be diversified.[8] And this attempt to wed corporate capitalism and technological innovation in the public imaginary is continually undercut by controversies, such as the one surrounding Apple's criteria for rejecting certain applications at its "App Store."[9]

Another set of assumptions surrounds the "I" of the iPhone. The "I" that I have described as its user is an unmarked self, free to enjoy the

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019

device's many sound-related functions during leisurely and hassle-free time spent in a number of different types of space: public, private, and virtual. Like so many new technologies of the past 150 or so years, not least the phonograph, the device seems to offer a form of disembodiment that promises individuals expanded social fluidity, transcending the particulars of their bodies — the sites at which politics and history literally touch them. The portability and sleekness of the iPhone accelerate such fantasies, and in many ways it does make sound eminently more manageable. But as a number of essays in this volume show, these fantasies of fluidity arise out of historically and politically loaded circumstances. As Mara Mills's piece demonstrates, the development of the spectrogram, the most common visual form for representing sound, depended centrally on experiments with deaf people, and its developers continually promoted its progress as a philanthropic boon for the deaf, even as they continually invested more energy in other arenas. Or, to cite Stoever-Ackerman's work again: Tony Schwartz's ability to construct what he saw as a fair urban ethnography of an "ethnic" neighborhood depended on the access to technology and space that his whiteness and masculinity provided him (and those traits may also have constrained him in certain ways). Such politics underlie even my leisurely day with my iPhone. As a white person not bearing obvious signs of homelessness, I am not asked to leave the mall by security, even as I sit at a table for over an hour after I have finished consuming my food from the food court. I do not appear mentally ill, even though I may sound as though I am talking to myself while recording a memo about groceries or the *Grundrisse*. As a man, I feel relatively safe slipping headphones on and off and looking up at trees, rather than my surroundings, as I walk through a wooded area in a city park. My ability to take part in the musicians' Web forum may depend on my willingness to ignore, or take part in, a discursive context often rife with sexism and homophobia. And, of course, my access to the device itself depends upon my having at least two hundred dollars to spend on it, as well as ninety dollars per month for the mandated phone and data service contract with AT&T.

What these essays are all striving for are diverse ways of thinking recording as a "system of living," to use the phrase Alexandra T. Vazquez, channeling Jorge Ignacio Cortiñas, makes central to her essay on freestyle. In this regard, ethnomusicologists like Louise Meintjes and Norman Stolzoff, in their respective studies of South African mbaqanga and Jamaican dub reggae, have proven adept at breaking down the walls of the recording studio, showing the embeddedness of that seemingly vacuum-sealed space in a larger world where people live race, gender, class, language group, and so on.[10] But other approaches can bring more attention to the various practices that surround recording and the uses of recordings, employing the archival and methodological resources of their fields. It may be satisfying

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019

to argue that, say, Missy Elliott is one of the most important two or three producers of the past thirty years, as I would. But it is a more vital and politically engaged project to depict the ways that gender and ethnicity help to shape musicians' relationship to recording and the recording studio, as both Vazquez and Jayna Brown do in this collection.

At times this call for more and more inclusivity, more and more modes of study, more and more breaking of conceptual and disciplinary barriers may seem to drift toward simply asserting the banal truism that "everything is political." It is worth reminding ourselves, especially having embraced a constructionist view of technology and sound itself, that the various phenomena that construct them do nevertheless bear specific traits, patterns of use, and symbolic resonances, even as they are never fully defined by them. One of these traits may well be a tendency to associate sound and its reproduction with various forms of liberation. Particularly prominent among these forms is emancipation from the body, as is evident in the phonograph's longtime association with the possibility of preserving the voices of the living after death, or in the *poesis* and timbre of the African American "sorrow songs," written into notation and anthologized — recorded — contemporaneously with the early years of the phonograph, which place longing for the afterlife front and center. To many, sound seems to escape the seemingly innate structure of subject-object that anchors so much thinking on the nature of vision. It is relatively uncontainable and irresistible, though this quality can also be quite oppressive; during the George W. Bush administration blasting loud music became a "standard" CIA interrogation technique, despite the fact that the United Nations and European Court of Human Rights consider it a form of torture.[11]

But our aim should not be to wish away these liberatory associations as mere false consciousness, as is evident in Jayna Brown's treatment of the utopian strains in contemporary global pop. We need to be sure that the critique of technological determinism, with its distrust of the wonder inspired by technology, does not become a way of wiping affect off the analytical map; to do so would be to affirm a retrograde, ahistorical, apolitical view of affect, as well as to reduce the meanings of affect in relation to this technology to the simplest and most naive forms of significance.[12] Sound and recording deserve more attention from the new work in the politics of affect, and vice versa; this is particularly true in the case of recorded sound artifacts and practices that are not commercial music (my own article in this issue, on 1890s lynching reenactments, is relevant here). And indeed, to argue implicitly or explicitly that any "wonder" at the technology is always already ideological mystification would seem to rehash the most hackneyed nineteenth- and twentieth-century projections of technological naïveté vis-à-vis phonography onto women and people of color.[13]

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019

In inviting readers to use these essays to think more deeply, and in new ways, about the sound recording, I have divided the six articles into three pairs. Although the two articles grouped together are often very different in methodology or historical period of concern, each pair embodies one or more of the concerns I have been discussing. The first pair examines the deeply unstable, historically flexible understanding of the ontological status of sound and its reproduction. The second looks at the way race, specifically, has motivated and shaped some relatively unknown experiments in commercial recording. The third is concerned with refashioning approaches to gender, race, and postcoloniality in the role of recording in pop music made in the last twenty years.

The opening essays by David Suisman and Mara Mills are foundational as theoretical and historiographical interventions; they raise questions about the ontological status of recordings and demonstrate how perceptions of such an essence are deeply embedded in historical contexts and the narratives to which they give rise. Working with very different, but equally intricate, historical archives, they each situate sound recording and reproduction as conceptual fields within broad understandings of inscription and information, thus bringing the supposedly predigital history of sound's mediation into conversation with digital media studies. Intervening in a history that reflexively places the phonograph at the center of the study of modern sound technology, Suisman demonstrates that the player-piano was equally, and at times surpassingly, a dynamic force shaping concepts of the relationship between sound and modernity. Because player-piano rolls, anticipating computer punch cards, were an informational medium, their centrality to this early history demands a rethinking of the widely accepted, evolutionary narrative of the emergence of analog and digital forms of media. More broadly, the player-piano exemplifies the pull between alienation and "political optimism about the relationship between art and mechanical reproduction," echoes of which Suisman discovers by pairing the very different depictions of the player-piano evident in the work of the novelist William Gaddis and the composer (and political exile) Conlon Nancarrow.

A piece that draws from work in sound studies, disabilities studies, and a deep archive in the history of sound technology, Mara Mills's "Deaf Jam" traces a detailed history of the spectrography, the most well-known and widely used visual representation of sound, focusing on the central role played by deafness and deaf people in both theoretical and practical development of the technology. Mills depicts deafness being used as what she calls an "assistive pretext" in "the resourcing of disability within technoscience." With this phrase, she refers to the repeated instances in which deaf people served as conceptual models or experimentees for spec-

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019

trographic methods, only to see the technology devoted to other forms of communication engineering. She traces this history's persistence through the sequence of dominant theoretical paradigms of sound-guiding spectrography: inscription, reproduction, and information.

That race has been a dynamic, contested presence in the history of recorded music is well known. The next two essays in this issue examine ways that racial politics have shaped nonmusical instances in the history of commercial recording in the United States. In Jennifer Stoever-Ackerman's essay "Splicing the Sonic Color-Line: Tony Schwartz Remixes Postwar Nueva York," the author adapts W. E. B. Du Bois's famous dictum that "the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line" to "provide a framework for understanding the crucial and undertheorized relationship between listening and oppression." Her object of study is the 1955 LP made for Folkways Records by folklorist-activist Schwartz, who addressed the crisis in postwar white identity, widely known as "white flight," by documenting the aural life of Puerto Rican immigrants in his own Manhattan neighborhood, the West Side. Stoever-Ackerman shows Schwartz responding to the oppositions being drawn in the mainstream press between "noisy" urban neighborhoods such as the West Side (now the site of Lincoln Center) and "peaceful" suburbs, as well as between "loud" nonwhite immigrants and "quiet" Euro-Americans. As Stoever-Ackerman also demonstrates, such accounts summarily elided the clamorous sounds of urban renewal taking place in neighborhoods like the West Side at the height of developer Robert Moses's ascendancy.

My own essay, "Never Heard Such a Thing: Lynching and Phonographic Modernity," shares Stoever-Ackerman's concerns with the ways race has mediated some of the less well-known corners of the record-making business. Examining reports of recordings of the lynching of African American men in the 1890s, I offer a historical and theoretical account of how such items would have come into existence in the studio-based commercial market of the time, despite the many claims that the recordings were made on the site of actual lynchings. Although none of the recordings are now known to exist, by examining memoirs and newspaper articles mentioning them, I place them as both a nonaberrant instance in the range of recordings sold in the 1890s and as outliers marking the racialized boundaries of civility and moral propriety. But in examining the varying responses of African American and Euro-American listeners, they also point to the need for a more historicized and particularized approach to the phonographic listener, as well as for approaches to the early history of phonography that problematize what has become an overly dominant paradigm of generalized "disembodiment."

Stoever-Ackerman's and my essays share an interest in instances

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019

in the history of commercial recording that embody experimentation and fantasy vis-à-vis the space of production. Although the articles by Alexandra T. Vazquez and Jayna Brown are both focused on commercial music recordings made in the past twenty-five years, they also, in different ways, offer critiques that radicalize the space of recording. Vazquez's essay examines the freestyle genre of the 1980s through the lens of the female vocalist whose labor is too often erased into anonymity in favor of attention to the male producers whose sampling and sequencing often dominate what many consider a studio-based form of music. As part of an overall project of imagining freestyle as, in the words of Jorge Ignacio Cortiñas, a "system of living," Vazquez depicts fans' creation of an "ex post facto authorship that places the vocalists center stage." This feminist tactic of reimagining the relationship of recording and authorship is part of an overall politics that embraces both the details of the music and a kind of kinesthetic recording of those details legible in gestures, walks, and facial expressions of its largely female fan base.

Jayna Brown hears in the "Buzz and Rumble" of music by Congotronics-associated musicians and M.I.A. new sounds rising out of the ruins of the genre/marketing category known as "world music"—a category set up primarily for Western interlocutors. She argues that "these forms are increasingly mediated by technology at the same time as they are less defined by Western curatorial mediation." Brown places this music in the context of notions of utopia—theories with a specifically vital charge in a historical moment rife with war, state violence, and displacement of people. A key example in Brown's analysis is the democratic, deinstitutionalized, locally focused recording practice of Vincent Kenis, the producer of Congotronics albums, which takes place in hotel rooms in Kinshasa. Meanwhile, in the turbulent, frenetically sample-based sounds of M.I.A., DJ Riot, and others, Brown sees an emergent model of an "alter-human," for which the relationship between body and technology is integral rather than oppositional.

Sound recording is a huge topic with an inexhaustible number of subtopics; six essays are, of course, in no way meant to encapsulate the subject or even to approximate a representative sampling of its subsets. The multiple geographical, historical, and theoretical concerns in these pieces are meant, rather, to showcase the variety of work being done on the topic in and across disciplines. They are offered with faith that readers who approach them as a group will trace out useful dialogues and arguments taking place over questions of content and method. Finally, what is productive about this issue depends not just on what the essays do for the study of sound and its mediation, but on what they do to reassess and replenish political critique. What matters here is learning how to hear what

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019

power, history, culture, and difference sound like. Those categories are, ultimately, the "technology" of sound recording.

Audio files and images connected with the essays in this issue are available at www.socialtextjournal.org.

Notes

1. Phil Spector was convicted of the murder of actress Lana Clarkson in Los Angeles Superior Court on 13 April 2009.

2. The exception to this might be film sound tracks. But much work on film sound tracks is itself focused on music, and is only recently beginning to reach out to realms beyond film studies. See, for example, James Lastra, *Sound Technology and the American Cinema: Perception, Representation, Modernity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).

3. Michael Warner, *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), 5, and Lisa Gitelman, *Always Already New: Media, History, and the Data of Culture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006), 3.

4. Lisa Gitelman, *Scripts, Grooves, and Writing Machines: Representing Technology in the Edison Era* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999), and Jonathan Sterne, *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003).

5. The liner notes for these recordings and the entire Folkways catalog are available free of charge at www.folkways.si.edu/index.aspx (accessed 22 August 2009).

6. Andy Warhol, *The Philosophy of Andy Warhol: From A to B and Back Again* (San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975), 26.

7. Also pertinent here is the agreement between Apple and AT&T giving the latter exclusive rights to contract phone and data services with purchasers of the iPhone.

8. See, for example, Charles Hirschkind, *The Ethical Soundscape: Cassette Sermons and Islamic Counterpublics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), and Peter Manuel, *Cassette Culture: Popular Music and Technology in North India* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993). See also a number of the essays in "Media and the Political Forms of Religion," ed. Charles Hirschkind and Brian Larkin, special issue, *Social Text*, no. 96 (2008).

9. See, for example, Rob Pegararo, "The iPhone Gets Easier to Dislike," *Washington Post*, 4 August 2009, www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/08/04/AR2009080401576.html (accessed 22 August 2009).

10. Louise Meintjes, *Sound of Africa! Making Music Zulu in a South African Studio* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), and Norman C. Stolzoff, *Wake the Town and Tell the People: Dancehall Culture in Jamaica* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000).

11. The 2004 CIA Inspector General Report citing loud music as a "standard" (i.e., not "enhanced") interrogation tool is available at aclu.org/oigreport/ (accessed 24 August 2009). On 24 August 2009, Barack Obama announced the formation of the High Value Detainee Interrogation Group, overseen by the National Security Agency (NSA); this group's methods follow the guidelines of the Army Field Manual, which bans the use of loud music.

12. And I would argue that we also need to be careful not to only take affec-

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019

tive experience seriously when it is experienced by fans, etc. The affective dimensions of an intellectual's encounter with sound or music — Theodor Adorno, for example — are just as well suited to productive study.

13. See Michael Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity* (New York: Routledge, 1993), for a powerful recasting of this dynamic.

Downloaded from https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-pdf/28/1 (102)/1/474257/ST102_01_Stadler_FF.pdf
by guest
on 23 May 2019