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Get out of my mind. Get out of the room. Get out of my mind.

Get out of the room. . . .

—Bruce Nauman [1]

Continuing the trajectory of listening first established by the medical stethoscope, this essay discusses the role of headphones in shaping our acoustic perception of the world and the resulting spatial organization of our subjectivity. Instead of considering (a) the social relations of sound reproduction, as is the norm in the humanities and cultural studies [2], or (b) the “high fidelity” of headphone technology in scientific R&D and consumerist desire [3], this essay considers the psychoacoustics of headphone space from a phenomenological and topological position. In particular, I explore the strange effect of “in-head” acoustic imaging, which is usually deemed a “noisy” (or unwanted) artifact of technology.

A survey of literature on the topic reveals that little is written on the history and development of headphones compared to the length of their use (exceeding that of motion pictures, for example) and their present ubiquity in several fields, ranging from the military to the arts and from broadcasting to medicine [4]. The first part of this essay traces the history of modern listening as developed by the stethoscope and the technical system maintained with headphones. The second part presents three sound artists who work creatively with headphones, exploiting novel techniques for generating space within the body and extrapolates from them into contemporary uses of headphones in sound art. The first half of the essay explores the history, techniques and technology of “in-head” acoustics; the second half presents three sound artists who creatively generate headphone spatializations. The essay ends with reflections on how these sound “imaging” techniques topologically shape our subjectivities.

**INTERIORITY OR IN-HEAD?**

From the 20th century on, the concept of “interiority” has been treated with suspicion in many areas of science and philosophy. Ironically, as current neuroscience theories advance a bottom-up conception of consciousness, the ubiquity of headphones creates an effect reminiscent of Descartes’ error: the location of “the seat of soul” in the pineal gland. However, we need not look at current theories for a debunking of the “seat of the soul” concept. Thinking concurrent with the development of the stethoscope and the invention of headphones already expressed these contemporary objections. One of the strongest critiques came from Merleau-Ponty’s elegant reworking of Husserl’s notion of phenomenology, where the starting point lies in the subject embodied in the external world of the everyday. In this context, the term “interior” itself becomes a pejorative. As Merleau-Ponty pointed out, the idea of interiority arises partly out of a historical and religious tradition expressed in Christian mystical language, such as in Saint Augustine’s interiore sine corpore. However, Merleau-Ponty famously disagrees with Augustine’s conception: “Truth does not ‘inhabit’ only the ‘inner man,’ or more accurately, there is no inner man, man is in the world, and only in the world does he know himself” [5]. “Interiority,” however, is not solely the product of religion nor a derelict relic of it. What would it mean if, instead of conceptualizing interiority as a mystical utopia (or non-place), we were to think of interiority in either a Cartesian or even perhaps non-Euclidian sense? Our first step lies in considering what it means to conceive of a space that is not necessarily out in the world but in one’s head. I am not referring here to what the “mind’s eye” sees, but rather the spatial possibility of what acoustic engineers call “in-head” acoustic imaging. To experience such a phenomenon, a certain tool is needed: headphones.

A modern technological prosthetic, headphones are quite literally a bracketing of the world for a precise analysis of sound, allowing for a focused investigation into a “phenomenology of interiority” [6]. For with headphones, a unique
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**ABSTRACT**

Working from a phenomenological position, the author investigates “in-head” acoustic localization in the context of the historical development of modern listening. Starting from the development of the stethoscope in the early 19th century, he traces novel techniques for generating space within the body and extrapolates from them into contemporary uses of headphones in sound art. The first half of the essay explores the history, techniques and technology of “in-head” acoustics; the second half presents three sound artists who creatively generate headphone spatializations. The essay ends with reflections on how these sound “imaging” techniques topologically shape our subjectivities.
From this perspective, the 1816 invention of the stethoscope paved the way for the development of modern listening. Collecting the research of several historians, the longer historical evolution of modern listening with headphones within the head allows for spatial manipulations of sound within the skull. The acoustic experience can be created, unlike anything else in the history of listening—except, that is, for its immediate precursor: the stereo stethoscope [7]. It follows that the stethoscope deserves attention for its creation of a technique of listening that continues in the technology of headphones.

**FROM THE STETHOSCOPE TO HEADPHONES: CONSTRUCTING INTERIOR SPACES**

A brief history of the stethoscope allows us to determine two important attributes of the development of modern listening materialized in headphones. First, we can determine the difference between listening to an interior space of the body and creating an interior space in the body. Second, we can locate the technique of listening with headphones within the longer historical evolution of modern audition. Collecting the research of several philosophers and medical historians, Jonathan Sterne’s historical narrative of sound reproduction includes the history of the stethoscope as a pivotal artifact in the development of modern listening. From this perspective, the 1816 invention of the stethoscope becomes the site where cultural techniques of listening were both developed and reified. Working mainly from R.T.H. Laennec’s *Treatise on the Disease of the Chest and on Mediate Auscultation* (1819), Sterne constructs a history of doctor-patient relations, medical epistemology and listening practice. Crucial to his research is the observation that the medical paradigm shifted from listening to the meaning of the voice as a bearer of truth to studying the sound of the voice as truth in itself. In other words, instead of doctors listening to patients describing their maladies with speech from their mouths, the stethoscope fostered a different engagement with the patient by allowing attention to the voice’s sonic quality as it resonated in the body: “The pure voice becomes a kind of sound effect—a container of timbre and an index of the states that shaped it.” Focusing, intensifying and isolating the sound of the internal body with the stethoscope created an increased valuation of sound in medicine. The interior of the body was listened to with great care, because the “whole thorax becomes a kind of resonating chamber; the lungs especially become like the interior of an instrument” [8].

While the stethoscope provides a shift in patient-doctor relations, it also creates a new sonic frame that was previously unheard—literally. The binaural stethoscope provided the first means of “in-head” acoustic imaging. I refer not to listening to the interior of the patient’s body (which is actually the old practice of auscultation, dating back to Hippocrates) but rather to the reconstruction of the doctor’s psychological image of his own body and his resulting consciousness. With the use of the binaural stethoscope (and subsequently with headphones) a sound field can be virtually located within the head. More accurately, space is created within the mass of the body where sound masses float in an impossible space. This image makes us think of a similar situation described only a few years previous to the invention of the stethoscope. I am referring to G.W.F. Hegel’s description of the “night of the world”—the poetic description of the birth of consciousness. With the use of the binaural stethoscope (and subsequently with headphones) a sound field can be virtually located within the head. More accurately, space is created within the mass of the body (where sound masses float in an impossible space). This image makes us think of a similar situation described only a few years previous to the invention of the stethoscope. I am referring to G.W.F. Hegel’s description of the “night of the world”—the poetic description of the birth of the subject based upon the transcendental imagination:

The human being is this night, this empty nothing, that contains everything in its simplicity—an unending wealth of many representations, images, of which none belongs to him—or which are not present. This night, the interior of nature, that exists here—pure self—in phantasmagorical representations, is night all around it, in which she shoots a bloody head—there another white ghastly apparition, suddenly here before it, and just so disappears. One catches sight of this night when one looks human beings in the eye—into a night that becomes awful [9].

Perhaps not so much awful as awfully melodramatic, Hegel’s account of the birth of subjectivity articulates an uncanny parallelism between the birth of modern philosophical phenomenology and the birth of modern medical practice. For both Hegel and Laennec, describing the modern subject entails recognizing that behind the subject’s eyes is an “emptied” space where phantasms and phantom signals suddenly appear and disappear. The modern subject must face the creative necessity of generating his or her own intersubjectivity—a task that is fundamentally a spatial activity. However, this spatial organization is not a neat box but rather the complex topography of the urban environment and the topology of knots and Möbius loops.

The twisting tubes of the stethoscope begin to map out this newfound subject. For with the stethoscope there occurs a remapping of one body onto another. The interior space of the patient’s body coincides with the interior of the doctor’s body; the heart chamber is remapped to the cranial cavity. In this newly created space organs float in the abyss dissected by the skull. This is a play on the phrase “hole in the head.” For Montano, the head is emptied, or rather the space between the ears is pounded out to create a space for another interior space: the heart. One organ is remapped onto another organ, one space into another space. Lasting 3 days and not 4.33”, the “always sound” [11] of John Cage’s silences is rewired inside Montano as a sonic feedback loop between central nervous system and circulatory system. Practicing the audition of isolation as originally fostered by the stethoscope, Montano creates her own mobile anechoic chamber.

While the stereo stethoscope (whether binaural or differential) allows for a transposition of a real space onto an imaginary space, headphones allow for the creative manipulation of sound to create imaginary spaces within another imaginary space. Continuing the technique of isolation and amplification inherent in the stethoscope, headphones provide the ability to play any type of sound, from natural to technical to musical. We become keenly aware of the “space between the ears” if four technical attributes are maintained: First, an identical sound source is presented to both ears at the same vol-

**Fig. 2. Koss SP-3 Stereophone, 1958. (© Koss Corporation)** The first commercially available stereo headphones, which allowed for spatial manipulations of sound within the head.
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ARTISTIC MANIPULATIONS
OF IN-HEAD ACOUSTIC IMAGING

Headphones are the norm. The new ad-
diction replacing smoking, headphones
frame the head and the perception of
most urbanites today in some form or
other. Whether one is commuting with
an iPod, exercising to the radio, talking
on a hands-free cell phone . . . or atten-
tively listening to music, headphones
create a mobile and continually changing
architecture that follows the listener,
wrapping him or her in a private bubble.
Headphones appear publicly at science
museum exhibits and art galleries, as well
as in handset audio guides for tourists. In
these cases, however, the sounds played
through these headphones are not de-
signed for headphones; rather, head-
phones are selected for the practical rea-
sions of noise control and privacy—not
for conceptual or aesthetic reasons. On
the other hand, while it is quite the norm
for sound artists and musicians who deal
with the subtlety of sound spatialization
to recommend listening to their works
with headphones, few of these sound
artists make work specifically for head-
phone listening. Instead, headphones are
a cheap compromise in the face of ex-
pensive multichannel sound systems.
Rarely does a sound work require head-
phones to express its core intention. Fur-
thermore, there are other reasons to use
headphones to play sound that have
nothing to do with their unique spatial
characteristics [13]. In a few cases, how-
ever, some works do require headphones
as a necessary element for the produc-
tion of the piece. The final sections of
this paper discuss three sound artists who
utilize headphones’ unique capacity to
create dynamic aural architectures: Ryooji
Ikeda creates a psychoacoustic space out
of a precise matrix; Bernhard Leitner cre-
ates a phantom interior space based on
moving sound objects; and Janet Cardiff
and George Miller create mobile, hybrid
spaces that complicate notions of interi-
ority and exteriority.

RYOJI IKEDA

Ryooji Ikeda describes his work as having
a particular sonority whose quality is de-
termined by one’s listening point in re-
lation to the loudspeakers. Furthermore,
the listener can experience a particular
difference between speaker playback and
headphone listening. The sound signals
can be thought of in the same way as spot-
lights [14].

Echoing the precise techniques used
by audiologists and sound engineers to
work spans theatrical performance with
*Dumb Type*, expanded cinema perform-
ance and sound installations in collabo-
ration with architects [15], he also makes
solo audio work highlighting the specific
qualities of headphone listening. Almost
all Ikeda’s work could be described as
metric, with beats and blips piercing
space-time at consistent intervals. How-
ever, the psychoacoustic effect is anything
but the metric or striated space that
Deleuze and Guattari problematize [16].
Like that of the American Minimalists
who preceded Ikeda, his work generates
a topological space that is constantly in
flux—even if the sequencing of the mu-
sic is more precise than a quartz pulse.
In fact the sound’s exceedingly meticulous
interval forces the mind to react with a
paradoxically increased intensity. The
point of course is to modulate one type
space with the other. An odd piece in
Ikeda’s oeuvre, C7 :: Continuum, from
the album *0C*, does exactly this [17].
Underlying the piece is an organic heartbeat
—a rare choice for Ikeda—but the heart’s
natural sound is contrasted with his typi-
ical high-frequency oscillating pulse, and
the normal repetitive metric matrix is
created. Laying down a meditative frame-
work, an unusual sample opens a worm-
hole between the history and the future
of listening.
At first “Continuum” simply repeats
the spatial remapping established by the
stethoscope: the internal heartbeat sam-
ple from someone else’s chest mapped
into one’s own cranium. This subtle and
classic bodily exchange is further sup-
ported when halfway through the track
a spatial murmur punctures the sound-
field, creating a floating hole in the head
that opens into an ambiguous space that
reveals our leaky souls. The Baroque
monad may be windowless, but head-
phones are a neo-Baroque infrastructure,
allowing spotlights from hidden realms
to ripple an interior space [18].
Space-time becomes a Möbius loop in contemporary sound art.

The motion of what Deleuze might call a sculpts an abstract sense of space through the resonant inner space of the head. Sensing, hearing space in motion within the resonant inner space of the head. Hearing, contemplating the interior, the inside however unfathomable it may be [20].

By materially thinking, Leitner empties the head of linguistic thought and sculpts an abstract sense of space through the motion of what Deleuze might call a sound objectile, creating a situation where fluctuation of the norm replaces the permanence of a law; where the object assumes a place in a continuum by variation; where . . . the new status of the object no longer refers its condition to a spatial mold—in other words, to a relation of form-matter—but to a temporal modulation [21].

With Leitner’s work, a temporal fluctuation of sound objects sketches out a sense of space.

BERNHARD LEITNER

Bernhard Leitner is another sound artist who has released an audio CD of music specifically exploring an imaginary rendering of the cranial cavity (Fig. 3). Having originally studied architecture, Leitner has been creating dynamic “sound-spaces” since the early 1970s [19]. Often his work is permanently installed and balances the concerns of traditional metal sculpture with the ephemeral nature of soundfields. Arguing that sound is a building material itself, he attempts to create a sensory experience of space out of sound. In 2003 he took a break from the minimal metal sculptures and created an audio CD specifically to explore headphone space. The work is released on a CD called Kopfräume (Headscapes), and he introduces it with the following note:

**Fig. 4. Mobius 19566591.71717**, sound installation, 2006. (© Charles Stankievech)

Space-time becomes a Möbius loop in contemporary sound art.

**BERNHARD LEITNER**

**Janet Cardiff and George Miller**

While Ikeda and Leitner create soundscapes within the head, visual artists Janet Cardiff and George Miller contrast the difference between “in-head” acoustic imaging and exterior binaural soundfields, articulating the radical difference from a psychological standpoint. Cardiff and Miller’s sound work ranges from model cinemas to 40-channel recordings, but they are best known for audio walks that use binaural recordings, echoing the 1970s soundscape works of R. Murray Schafer, Barry Truax and Hildegard Westerkamp [22]. Listeners to Cardiff and Miller’s audio walks wear pairs of headphones with a pre-recorded soundtrack overlaid upon an actual route that they are instructed to walk. Deceptively simple looking, Cardiff and Miller’s audio walks recall William Gibson’s claim that Walkmans are the most effective medium for the separation of the character “Janet.”

The spatiality of Janet’s voice is also different from the rest of the binaural recording of the soundscape, and it is this difference that creates the strongest effect on the listener. First of all, the voice does not move; it is the one motionless component in the entire piece. Sound effects rush by the listener’s body, which in turn moves through a landscape, but Janet’s voice remains firmly implanted within the cranium: “It is an interiority of space, and not yet of motion; also, an internalization of the outside, an invagination of the outside that could not occur all alone if no true interiorities did not exist elsewhere,” Deleuze writes [24]. Furthermore, her voice is recorded in close proximity to the microphone and in mono. On a few pieces, such as A Large Slow River and Villa Medici Walk [25], her voice contrasts with that of her partner, George, whom we also hear on the recording. His voice is also not recorded binaurally; however, it is processed as a noisy tape recording. The result is a mediated voice that keeps its distance from the listener, further highlighting the unmediated and direct call of Janet’s voice, which is continually “out-of-field” or out of the frame. Janet’s voice thus seems to speak not only from within the soundscape but from within one’s own body. The out-of-frame is commonly associated with the process of perception itself—that which creates the frame and is thus excluded. This confusion between the exterior/interior creates a sense of what most critics usually refer to as the unheimlich (or uncanny), a reflection that is somewhat true. However, most people experience Cardiff and Miller’s work in an environment that is probably not familiar to them in the first place. Neither the...
walking route nor the generated sense of interior space in the head is probably part of the listener’s everyday life or childhood [26]. However, the two unfamiliar feelings combined impress upon the listener the sense that one should be familiar with this place.

Perhaps, however, a way to engage Cardiff and Miller’s work—and headphone listening in general—is not with Freud’s unheimlich, but with Lacan’s topologically structured term l’extimité. Developed in the later phase of Lacan’s writing, the idea of the l’extimité continues the importance of the voice in the psychoanalytic tradition since Freud first outlined the foundations for the “talking cure.” L’extimité is a neologism coined by Lacan that combines exterior and intimacy in a slide away from phenomenology and structuralism into mathemes, topology and knot theory. The underlying concept starts to take shape in Seminar VII, where Lacan begins by describing it as “something strange to me, although it is at the heart of me” [27]. Echoing the movement of Lacan’s tortuous career, an investigation into a phenomenology of interiority twists into a topological complication.

In effect, l’extimité could be used to describe the general experience of listening with headphones, but listening to a phantom voice with headphones would be the event par excellence (phone being Greek for “voice”). Moving through a dynamic space that blurs the exterior with the interior via the topology of a Möbius loop or better yet, a Klein bottle, the subject listens; or shall I say the outside is on the inside of the listener? (Fig. 4) The difference between contained and container dissolves, as does the difference between you and me [28]. We easily identify with our fantasies once we have become the Hollow Men making room for an Other. Janet’s words command me to listen, and touched by a phantom power, I do. I confess with the words of Roland Barthes, “The Other collects [her] whole body in [her] voice and announces that I am collecting all of myself in my ear” [29].
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