__Appendix 1:__

Definition of Terms Utilised by the Conceptual Tools

Attempting to define the concepts of the discussed philosophers, particularly Deleuze and Guattari, is challenging. The density and abstractness of their language defies attempts to reduce terms into definitive statements. In his introduction to Deleuze's *Spinoza*, Robert Hurley writes, "…this book on Spinoza is difficult. But the situation is helped by the author's word to the wise: one doesn't have to follow every proposition, make every connection–the intuitive or affective reading may be more practical anyway. What if one accepted the invitation–come as you are–and read with a different attitude, which might be *more like the way one attends to poetry*?" [my italics] (Deleuze, 1988, p.iii). It is my contention that Hurley's advice can be extended to the philosophies of Deleuze and Guattari that are referred to in the exegesis. In this way, the definitions may be understood as a poetic rendering of philosophies that are peculiar to the discussed sound(scape) design practice. I want to make clear that the meaning of terms I have drawn from the discussed philosophers are particular to my practice and may not necessarily be shared by others; however, it should be considered by the reader that the ideas presented have a direct application to the discussed practice, and as such it is inevitable that the explored ideas, in turn, will be reshaped by the application of the practice. The definitions provided may not sit comfortably within philosophical discourse, but this is *not* intended as a contribution to a philosophical domain; this PhD is a description of practice that includes the synthesis of diverse philosophical ideas as a means for understanding and realising an urban sound(scape) design practice.

A potential limitation of the definitions is that they are restricted to the context of human experience, whereas (particularly) Deleuze and Guattari's ideas are not human centred. For example, Steve Goodman (2010) preferences Delueze's Spinozian argument for a "non-anthropocentric notion of a body" in which a body can be made up of anything (p. 100). Goodman's understanding "rests on an ontology of vibrational force in which a body becomes merely another actual entity in a vibrational event, assuming not necessarily any more significance than the resonances between other entities within this nexus" (p.46). The conceptual tools have been constructed specifically to understand how spatiotemporal controls homogenise affective sonic ecologies, and the role of sound(scape) installations in diversifying affects on human experience. However, like Goodman's non-anthropocentric descriptor, the city is considered to exist with or without human perception and as such the interventions may be considered a way to diversify not only human perception, but also the diversity of interrelationships between non-human, and non-corporeal aspects of the city. Having said this, the conceptual tools primarily concentrate on the effects of spatiotemporal controls on human experience.

Actual and virtual (potential) realties in space

Space that is accessible to the senses can be described as actualised realities. But also existing in space are virtual realities. Virtual realities are potential realities that have not manifested in space. As such, the virtual exists, but is not actualised. A practical example is the urban dweller who walks the same route more-or-less the same way, everyday, to work. The gestures, sounds and chosen route of the city worker are an observable and audible actualised reality of the urban dweller's presence. But inherent in the daily acts of the urban dweller are the virtual realties of alternative gestures, sounds and routes that have not been actualised. Sound(scape) installations can actualise potential in numerous ways. *Silencing Urban Exhalations* removes dominating sounds to bring to the foreground unheard human sounds. In this case the urban dweller's sonic manifestations have not been actualised, but simply uncovered. However, an electroacoustic installation presents scenarios in which the potential behaviours of the urban dweller are actualised. For example, Max Neuhaus' installation *Times Square* creates a spatial interruption in which city dwellers can be seen to stop and listen, searching for understandings of the strange sonic presences they encounter.

Territorialisation, deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation

Deleuze and Guattari use birdsong to describe these terms in their chapter *On the Refrain* (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004, p.356-8). When a bird sings, it territorialises space. The audible locus of its song becomes a territory which the bird claims. When the bird stops singing the space is deterritorialised and becomes an open space for the songs of other birds to territorialise. When the bird starts singing again it may territorialise the space with the same song, or it may reterritorialise the space with a new song. For example, rather than a song that excludes others of the same species, the song may be one that attempts to attract a mate. The important point here is that the refrains of birdsongs are constantly reshaping a space into multiple experiences and power relations. A comparative urban example is a ventilation outlet that emits the sound of rushing air. Its "song" does not change from day to day; and thus, the ventilation outlet territorialises space on an everyday basis.

Subjectivities

A subjectivity is a creative expression or response that emanates from within a city dweller. Multiple subjectivities (many creative expressions or responses) can emerge simultaneously within a single person or a group of people. For example, a city dweller may encounter a sound installation and be simultaneously surprised by its sudden appearance, curious about its purpose, and manifest thoughts, gestures and actions relating to this – this is referred to as the emergence of subjectivities. Additionally, there may be others in the space also having multiple experiences; in this scenario there are multiplicities of subjectivities. A captured subjectivity is a subjectivity that occurs as a repetitive expression or response on an everyday basis. Large groups (such as societies) of people who express the same subjectivity are considered to be captive to the collective assemblage of enunciation (see below). Late on a winter's evening while visiting the site of *Revoicing the Striated Sound(scape)* I observed two men in dark glasses and long overcoats dancing to rhythmic sounds produced by the sound(scape) installation (Audio Sample 19). This is an example of the emergence of subjectivities that one would not expect to encounter, which was a creative expression unique to the listeners' lived experiences.

The collective assemblage of enunciation

An enunciation can be considered a spoken word, or perhaps a gesture or thought (expressions). An assemblage, loosely speaking, is considered a collection of parts. The *parts* within collective assemblages of enunciation in urban settings are considered the subjective expressions of people. Therefore, a collective assemblage of enunciation is considered the thoughts, ideas, or gestures collectively embodied by a group of people. In this paper a collective assemblage of enunciation can be considered a subjectivity (an expression) that has captured a large number of people. Entire cities and nations can be thought of as being caught within a collective assemblage of enunciation. For example, the mass-media can inform a collective assemblage of enunciation in which the thinking of whole populations are defined by the manner in which news items are reported in media outlets. Likewise, the response of people to an emergency siren can be considered a collective assemblage of enunciation (which suggests its positive attributes) as is evidenced by the similarity of gestures in those within a siren's sonic range. The dominance of a collective assemblage of enunciation is challenged by the emergence of subjectivities, which can fracture a collective assemblage of enunciation into multiple creative expressions.

The a-signifying rupture

A city can be considered a system of signs that represses the potential of subjective emergences; everywhere, spatial controls are signified – commodity fetishisation, power relations, social obligations – and as such the experience of the city dweller can be said to be determined by the system of signs. An a-signifying rupture occurs when the signs that inform a space momentarily disappear. Within this space there is a vacuum of perception, which subjectivities instantaneously fill. As such, an a-signifying rupture can be defined as an absence of signifiers from which emerge subjectivities. Public sound(scape) installations are particularly effective in creating a-signfying ruptures, by subverting systems of signs that are signified by site-specific sounds. Max Neuhaus' *Times Square* and Bill Fontana's *White Sound – An Urban Seascape* are examples of the creation of a-signifying ruptures within which subjectivities (creative expressions and responses) emerge in the city dweller.

Second (new) nature

Nature is a complex, and possibly indefinable term, that is dealt with extensively in Chapter 6 of the exegesis. Lefebvre uses the term second, or new, nature as a way to differentiate spaces. In *nature spaces* systems of signs are absent, and honest, unmediated experiences can occur; the urban (or social space), on the other hand, is duplicitous (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 81). The system of signs allows the city to present itself as something other than how it is experienced. For example, the advertising billboards of the city promise a life of comfort and ease, while in reality the city dweller must contest with spaces defined by power relations. New natures within urban spaces are considered codeless, honest and creative spaces in which multiple subjectivities can emerge due to the absence of spatiotemporal controls. As will be discussed at length in Chapters 6 – 8 of the exegesis, my sound(scape) design practice attempts to create such diversely affective ecologies in urban spaces.