



CATOLICA  
ESCOLA DAS ARTES

---

PORTO

## (UN)CENSORSHIP AND SOUND ART

Dissertação apresentada à Universidade Católica Portuguesa  
para obtenção do grau de Mestre em Som e Imagem

*Duarte Couto Maltez*

Porto, Julho 2022



CATOLICA  
ESCOLA DAS ARTES

---

PORTO

## (UN)CENSORSHIP AND SOUND ART

Dissertação apresentada à Universidade Católica Portuguesa  
para obtenção do grau de Mestre em Som e Imagem

- Especialização em –  
(Sound Design)

*Duarte Couto Maltez*

Trabalho efetuado sob a orientação de

Prof. Dr. José Alberto Sousa Gomes

Porto, Julho 2022

## Agradecimentos

Antes de mais, gostaria de oferecer um sincero agradecimento ao meu orientador, Professor José Alberto Gomes, pela sua orientação, instigação positiva e saudável para tornar esta investigação tão interessante quanto possível, devidamente abordada e bem enquadrada dentro do tempo e recursos limitados.

Em segundo lugar, quero agradecer e reconhecer Mariana Costa, que não só apoiou plenamente esta investigação como minha namorada, minha verdadeira amiga com a sua honestidade brutal, mas também por estar sempre disposta a trocar ideias, encorajar-me a aprofundar ainda mais esta investigação e promover diferentes pontos de vista ao longo de todo o trabalho que me levou a expandir os meus pensamentos, e por isso, tenho um enorme respeito.

Um sincero obrigado a Diogo Tudela, Maria Coutinho, Pedro Rocha e Miguel Carvalhais pelos seus contributos directos e pensamentos, pela vontade e prontidão em participar nesta investigação de uma forma incrivelmente útil. Gostaria particularmente de destacar os agradecimentos ao Diogo Tudela pelo seu contributo nas fases iniciais desta investigação, ajudando a formar uma melhor compreensão das direcções que esta investigação poderia tomar, e sobre esta observação, gostaria também de agradecer a João Pedro Amorim da Escola de Artes que também deu conselhos perspicazes sobre como poderia estudar a questão desta investigação.

Agradecimentos ao Prof. José Vasco Carvalho e ao Prof. Nuno Crespo pelas suas recomendações bibliográficas sobre arte sonora e censura.

À Prof<sup>a</sup> Cristina Sá, apresento os meus agradecimentos pela sua ajuda no desenvolvimento e melhoria da proposta de investigação.

A Pedro Oliveira, responsável pelo arquivo da Escola de Artes, apresento os meus agradecimentos pela sua recorrente disponibilidade e honesto interesse em ajudar da melhor maneira todos os alunos da Escola de Artes, ajudando esta investigação especificamente na logística de reunir os participantes do *think tank* da melhor maneira possível, ainda que, em última análise, o encontro tenha sido realizado virtualmente, ele esteve sempre atento às necessidades do trabalho.

Gostaria também de agradecer aos meus colegas, Luana Cardoso, Mariana Rocha, Alexandre Bezerra e Filipe Monteiro, pela troca de ideias, pelo interesse demonstrado nesta investigação em particular e pelo apoio geral que acredito ser mútuo.

Por último, mas não menos importante, gostaria de agradecer à minha mãe e ao meu pai por todo o apoio dado ao longo dos cinco anos de estudo nesta instituição, mas mais importante ainda nestes últimos dois anos, pelo encorajamento para continuar a estudar, para obter um mestrado na área que mais gosto, para suportar tudo o que isto implica, emocional e financeiramente.

## Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to offer my heartfelt thanks to my supervisor, Professor José Alberto Gomes, for his guidance, positive and healthful instigation on making this research as interesting, properly addressed and well framed as possible within the limited time and resources.

Secondly, I want to thank and acknowledge Mariana Costa, who not only fully supported this research as my partner, my true friend with her brutal honesty, but was always willing to exchange ideias, encourage me to further deepen this research and promote different points of view throughout the entirety of the work driving me to expand my thoughts, and for this I have a great deal of respect.

A sincere thank you to Diogo Tudela, Maria Coutinho, Pedro Rocha and Miguel Carvalhais for their direct input and thoughts, for their willingness and readiness in participating in this research in an incredible useful manner. I particularly would like to highlight acknowledgments to Diogo Tudela for his input on the very initial stages of this research, helping to form a better understanding of what directions this research could take, and on this remark, I would also like to thank João Pedro Amorim from the School of Arts who also gave insightful advices as to how I could study the matter of this investigation.

Acknowledgements to Prof. José Vasco Carvalho and Prof. Nuno Crespo for their bibliographic recommendations regarding sound art and censorship.

To Prof<sup>a</sup> Cristina Sá, I offer my acknowledgments for her help in developing and improving the research proposal.

To Pedro Oliveira, person in charge for the archive of the School of Arts, I offer my thanks for his ever availability and honest interest in helping all students of the School of Arts in the best proper manner, helping this research specifically in the logistics of gathering the *think tank* participants in the best possible way, even though, ultimately, the meeting was held virtually, he was always attentive to the needs of the work.

I would also like to thank my fellow colleagues, Luana Cardoso, Mariana Rocha, Alexandre Bezerra e Filipe Monteiro, for the exchange of ideas, interest shown in this particular research and for the general support that I believe to be a mutual one.

Last but not least, I would like to acknowledge my mother and my father for all the support given throughout the five years of study in this institution, but most importantly for these last two years, for the encouragement to continue studying, to get a master's degree in the area I like the most, to bear all that this entails, emotionally and financially.

## Resumo

Parece haver falta de instâncias—se é que há alguma—onde a arte sonora tenha sido censurada. Isto torna-se intrigante e coloca algumas questões, para além do que é exactamente arte sonora e do que é exactamente censura, pode-se perguntar se a arte sonora pode ser censurada. Há, certamente, inúmeras modalidades e obras artísticas que têm sido censuradas de muitas maneiras, no entanto, encontrar casos específicos de arte sonora alvo de censura não é uma tarefa fácil. Por este motivo, existe uma falta de literatura que estude a relação entre os conceitos de arte sonora e a censura.

A arte e a censura têm uma relação de longa data e, no entanto, esta é insuficiente para formar uma compreensão clara da mecânica de ambos, particularmente das suas formas de funcionamento. Olhar para esta relação entre censura e arte sonora—uma prática artística muito recente historicamente falando—é necessário para discutir se a arte sonora é susceptível à censura. Esta investigação propõe-se a formar um quadro conceptual que permita um melhor enquadramento da problemática e da questão da própria investigação, levantando consequentemente um conjunto de questões mais relevantes que nos permitam explorar esta questão de uma forma mais fiável.

A fim de compreender melhor como isto poderia ser conseguido, esta investigação baseou-se principalmente na revisão da literatura e, mais tarde, nos significados e intervenções de múltiplos participantes com envolvimento artístico e experiência para montar e formar esse mesmo quadro conceptual. Este grupo de participantes foi confrontado com a questão da investigação, discutiu a problemática e acabou por reunir um conjunto de questões e possíveis abordagens futuras sobre a forma como esta investigação deveria prosseguir.

**Palavras-chave:** Censura; Arte Sonora; Epistemologia Artística Sonora; Moralidade;

## Abstract

There seems to be a shortage of instances—if there is any—where sound art has been censored. This becomes puzzling and poses some questions, aside from what exactly is sound art and what exactly is censorship, one might wonder if sound art can be censored. There is, certainly, a myriad of artistic modalities and works that have been censored in many ways, nonetheless, to find specific cases of sound art targeted with censorship is not an easy task. On this account, there is a lack of literature studying the relation between the concepts of sound art and censorship.

Art and censorship have had a long-standing relationship and yet, this is insufficient to form a clear understanding of the mechanics of either, particularly their ways of operating. To look at this relationship between censorship and sound art—a very recent artistic practice historically speaking—is necessary in order to discuss whether sound art is susceptible to censorship. This research proposes to form a conceptual framework to allow a better framing of the problematic and the question of investigation itself, consequently raising a set of more relevant questions that allow us to explore this issue in a more reliable way.

In order to further understand how this could be achieved, this research relied primarily on the literature review and later, on the meanings and interventions of multiple participants with artistic involvement and experience to assemble and form that very same conceptual framework. This group of participants was confronted with the question of investigation, discussed the problematic and ultimately gathered a set of questions and possible future approaches on how this investigation should proceed.

**Keywords:** Censorship; Sound Art; Sonic Artistic Epistemology; Morality;

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Resumo</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>i. Object of Investigation and Problematic</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>ii. Methodology</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>iii. Dissertation Structure</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SOUND ART AND CENSORSHIP: FRAMING OF THE CONCEPTS</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1. Sound Art</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.1 Conception of the Art Form</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.2 Main Clusters: Sculptures and Sound Installations</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2. A Taxonomy of Censorship and its Place on Art</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3. An Epistemic View on Sound</b>	<b>23</b>
Conclusion of chapter one	25
<b>CHAPTER TWO</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>THINK TANK</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4. Participants</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>5. Discussion and Results</b>	<b>28</b>
Conclusion of chapter two	32
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Final Considerations and Perspectives</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Think Tank Transcriptions</b>	<b>40</b>
(Versão Portuguesa)	40
(English Version)	70

## INTRODUCTION

### i. Object of Investigation and Problematic

Since late 2020, I've been persistently thinking about a statement I've encountered then and it stated the following, "(...) as long as there are no words or lyrics involved, sound is harmless to the state" in response to the question, "And, is there censorship for sound, experimental music, sound art?" (Yao, n.d.). This statement is part of an essay Dajun Yao wrote for *Revolutions Per Minute: Sound Art China*. In his essay, Yao unveils the political element in the art form in China, and, this somewhat of a naïf and courageous portrait of the non censorable potential that sound embodies, struck to the very core of my interests. I believe in art as a motor—specially, not exclusively—for healthful provocations. Something that involves extensive research and has the potential to explore deep, meaningful questions is going to be, inevitably provocative. Perhaps because deep and meaningful questions tend to be stretched to the limit. Limits exist, but when confronted or transgressed tend to catch attention from a certain public, and that attention can later manifest itself on a continuous search for knowledge, or expose controversy. As a consequence of the latter, censorship may arise to the surface. That extent of impositions and suppressions in order to determine and consider some expressions as objectionable or controversial on moral, political, military, or other grounds (Shusterman, 1984).

This research sits on a problematic that, as we are aware, is somewhat of an unremitting problematic in practices that explore liberally—in some sense—the individual and/or collective artistic expression. The censorship in art.

As always, this topic has been incredibly difficult to approach. There is, evidently, different types of censorship in itself, different socio-political approaches or even jurisprudential (Ireland, 2012; Sen, 2014; Vincent-Arnaud, 2007), but this investigation addresses a very concrete question, can Sound Art be censored? On a prime consideration, one may assume without a doubt that the answer to that question is, yes, because on one hand, there is no shortage of artistic work that have been censured throughout art history in almost every artistic modality, and on the other hand, it's frequently assumed that everything can be subject to censorship. However, the answer is as much complex as its problematic, so it requires some considerable examination. With this research, what is being proposed is a possible conceptual framework that allows to properly identify the problematic, raise and frame a better set of questions in order to circumscribe the investigation in a suitable manner. Following Yao's thinking, this research shapes itself along the lines of his statement but that requires third-party reflections, and for that, collecting multiple meanings of different participants is necessary. An analysis of the literature was the starting point (Attali, 1985; Kociałkowska, 2020; Mackay, 2009; Maes, 2013; Morais, 2016; Sen, 2014; Shusterman, 1984; Voëgelin, 2021) but ultimately, a good testing of this would be achieved by gathering participants of different areas of the artistic field—such as artists, curators, art historians—in order to have a closer look on how this would be manifested practically. The question of whether sonic artistic expression can or cannot be censored requires a complex approach to the problematic. Nonetheless, it's imperative that we open this discussion in order to understand and grasp as much knowledge concerning this. Knowledge that, which Salomé Voëgelin so eloquently considered as "the invisible", that being sound. This investigation—to a certain degree—wants to understand how, and if, censorship is ineffective in the midst of what is, as Voëgelin would've present, the sonic possibilities. Could it be that (un)censorship is part of that possibility? If so, this would certainly expose the artistic freedom and possibilities, regarding sonic artistic expressions, in a very different way.

Indeed, Salomé Voëgelin opened the discussion on sonic knowledge and the depths on how



much she influenced many artists and other researchers are profound. For that, her work is going to be, undoubtedly, a central piece to this research and a strong carrier of ideas for this work. This dissertation explores the overlap of ideas presented, especially, by Voëgelin and Yao, in order to reach a more conscientious understanding on sound, and, study if the potential that it embodies enables it to escape the requirements of censorship by presenting these ideas to a specific group of people no strangers to art. This is necessary because there are no studies comprehending the relationship of censorship and sound art, and even less categorical and precise knowledge regarding both of these concepts, therefore, the object of this investigation focuses on the relationship between these concepts.

## **ii. Methodology**

Throughout the course of this research, many perspectives and ideas, were considered. The inherent complexity of the problematic itself, exposed a variety of knowledge, a variety of literature and testimonies that explore the depths of censorship, the recent thriving on sonic epistemology, the political lenses on artistic practices from different cultures, to mention some. However, no sufficient literature regarding specifically the problematic at hands here was found. Other than the statement of Yao concerning sound and the ineffectiveness of censoring it, concrete material of censorship in the realm of sound art is practically inexistent. For this reason, this research is going to be centered and supported on the meanings of multiple participants. This participants, with experience on artistic creation, curation, sonic arts and new media practices, philosophical and historical knowledge on arts, form the think tank. With this think tank, the objective is to establish a plausible and acceptable set of principles that permits us to propose how one could approach the problem that is posed in this research—apparently something unreviewed hitherto. The investigation will follow, mainly, a constructivist worldview for it seeks to be underpinned on its social and historical construction, and, on its theory formation (Creswell, 2015). It was essential that this sort of method of investigation would be addressed for it gathers a substantial amount of information, unbiased information of experts from different fields of work, that is fundamental and the foundation for this research. In the process of choosing the best possible methodology, the consideration of a think tank was obvious because it promotes a free and open dialogue and exchange of ideas and not merely a one-on-one basis where there would simply be questions and answers between the researcher and interviewer respectively.

The question of investigation is not easy to frame, specially because it deals with two broad concepts, censorship and sound art, but in its very essence, it thinks of an artistic creation—with limitation that will be enunciate ahead—which does not seem to be immediately susceptible to the act of censoring. For this reasons, it is a necessary and pivotal debate to have, where my responsibility as researcher is “to look for the complexity of views rather than narrowing meanings into a few categories or ideas. (...) The goal of the research is to rely as much as possible on the participants’ views of the situation being studied.” (Creswell, 2015, p. 37). The chosen method opened up two possible approaches, both seemingly effective to this work, where I design an investigation that makes me describe the participants' experiences in relation to a certain phenomenon, which in this case will be the phenomenon of (un)censorship and sound art, which would resemble more to a phenomenological research (Creswell, 2015), or, an approach where I induce a general and abstract theory of a process, action or interaction according to the participants' views (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2007 cited by Creswell, 2015).

These two typologies seem to resonate well with this type of work. First, because the entire methodological approach of this work has a philosophical and sociological weight inherent to the theme, as we cannot discuss censorship and freedom of artistic expression

without deriving from these aspects; second, both approaches allow us to reflect and theorize around a phenomenon proposed by this same investigation, the incomprehensible potential that sound embodies, and how new artistic paradigms can blossom from there, and how, or even if, the ontology of the artist and his own role as such can be affected, or infected.

The method involves placing the participants, artists and non-artists, in contact with an idea that may be controversial and abstract but with potentially interesting ramifications regarding even artistic epistemology itself.

A large part of this research has its backbone on the comment of Dajun Yao written on an essay entitled ‘Revolutions Per Minute: Sound Art China’ celebrating a decade of sound art in China. In this essay, there’s a chapter where he talks about the apolitical potential of sound, and how sound is harmless to the state, granting it a *non-censorable* potential. The whole process of researching the possibility of such a regime made me pay attention to what was being discussed regarding the epistemology of sound, the conscientious knowledge we must accept through sound, giving that there is much more to understand of the world and that can be guided through sound itself. The necessity of apprehending this sort of knowledge was imperative to go on this investigation. In order to understand sound as a potentially *non-censorable* regime, we first have to address the characteristics of sound that enables it to escape the requirements of censorship, and also, understand censorship itself. For these reasons, the on-line lecture ‘To Know from the Invisible’ by Salomé Voëgelin in 2021 in Porto, Portugal, articles concerning artistic, social, and jurisprudential perspectives on censorship (Ireland, 2012; Sen, 2014; Velasco, 2018) established a primary framework for this investigation for its delimitations on these very same issues.

This theoretical survey, as an initial approach to the problematic, offered a better understanding in the way we perceive sound—which will have a substantial importance to this specific problematic—so that became naturally the initial step for this research. Once that apprehension was enough, the following step was to prepare the *think tank*. First and foremost, it had to be well established and synthetically presented the problematic at hands as well as the question of investigation, so, a proposition for the *think tank* was created. This proposition, contextualized the research, explained what was going to be debated and what was important to retain and to think about putting aside what was not relevant to this discussion. The next step was to think about relevant participants to gather at the *think tank*. Several names were considered but the list had to be condensed to five participants in order to have a productive conversation manageable enough to transcribe the entire debate—which can be found in Appendix A.

### iii. Dissertation Structure

This dissertation analyses and explores the interrelation between sound art and censorship. The research is organized into two main chapters. The first chapter—**Sound Art and Censorship: Framing of the Concepts**—and the second chapter—**Think Tank**—which is dedicated exclusively to group conversation where participants reflect around the research question.

Chapter one, addresses sound art and understand the conditions in which it lives. Sound art is still a discipline with a fluid concept that is under permanent construction, a natural and reasonable phenomenon due to its inevitable cross and amalgamation of different disciplines. Nevertheless, this chapter will talk about the concepts of sound art.

It will assess and apprehend the conditions of censorship by delineating a taxonomy for

ensorship, what it is, what are the several typologies of censorship and how it generally manifests but more specifically, how it manifests in the arts. The chapter closes with an observation of sound and its epistemology and the way we commonly perceive it. It is based around the work of Salomé Voëgelin on what we can know from the invisible, what we can apprehend from the world through sound itself and how can we deal with a regime that can be perceived as an epistemic tool. This will serve as a prelude to the following chapter, giving a context of some of the ideas covered throughout the *think tank*, which was encouraged to engage and think about—in part but not only—ideas addressed on the closing of the first chapter.

Chapter two, will introduce the participants of the *think tank* and explain in detail the choice for these specific participants. The chapter is dedicated exclusively to what was discussed throughout the conversation, what topics and questions were presented to the group, how the conversation was conducted and what observations and conclusions are worthy and creditable to this investigation. The chapter does not reveal the conversation in its entirety, nonetheless, a full transcription of the *think tank* is presented in Appendix A for survey and general interest in the details of the conversation. A number of ideas concluded by the group are presented in this chapter as proposition for assembling a conceptual framework to facilitate the study of the question of investigation that is being addressed in this research.

## CHAPTER ONE

### SOUND ART AND CENSORSHIP: FRAMING OF THE CONCEPTS

The first part of this first chapter is going to be dedicated to sound art and to establish a description of this multidisciplinary practice, going through its concepts and sub-disciplines. Much of what is going to be discussed here will be supported by Laura Maes's own investigation *Sounding Sound Art - A study of the definition, origin, context, and techniques of sound art* (Maes, 2013), for this PhD thesis takes a deep look at this multidisciplinary practice, analyzing it in order to create a more consistent epistemology of the practice. This initial part of the chapter looks at the conception of it as an art form, the distinctions inside the sonic artistic expressions and its ramifications and main sub-groups that present a relevance and natural attendance in the art form.

The second part of this first chapter focus more on establishing a taxonomy for censorship, understanding what exactly is censorship and how it can be manifested, particularly on art. There are a myriad of interpretations for censorship and sometimes they can get confused so it is essential to go through the several types of censorship and understand their mechanics and ways of operating. Without a precise and categorical notion on both of these concepts—censorship and sound art—it is certainly even more difficult to study the object of this investigation and assess a proper way to approach it.

#### 1. Sound Art

*“We are musicians because we are performers and play in concert; sculptors because with our hands we shape sheets of metal into forms, and assemble iron and other metals; poets, because we attempt to create the “supernatural element” – a universe of light, shape and sound; craftsmen, because with our hands we build musical instruments, referring also to our sensoriality; stage directors because we have staged productions where music, lighting effect, and shapes enter with the participation of actors, dancers...” (Baschet, 1975, as cited in Maes, 2013)*

##### 1.1 Conception of the Art Form

Sound art tends to be generally describe as art which uses sound both as its medium (what it is made out of) and as its subject (what it is about) (Tate, n.d.). However simple this description may seem, it isn't that helpful on its one, and because sound art is so diverse, one cannot overlook the many aspects that contribute to the practice. This form of art is described by Laura Maes (2013) as such:

Sound art accommodates a high number of artists with very diverse backgrounds. Whereas in painting the majority of the artists have a background in visual arts, this parallel cannot be drawn with sound art. (...) Sound art is not one trade that can be taught. Its manifestations are extremely diverse, from mechanically moving sculptures to home-made software. Sound art invokes all sorts of disciplines and many trades can be involved. (p. 27)

Because of this diversity, defining sound art becomes an increasingly difficult thing to do, and simplifying it does not make it easier. However, this dissertation is not studying sound art in its essence, so a synthesized description is required.

The use of the term sound art presents a myriad of conflict and opposing views but the term has been used frequently since late 90's of the past century in association with artistic works that use sound as the central piece for the artistic metaphor, without musical compositional pretension (Carvalho J., 2019). According to Alan Licht, it was William Hellermann that in 1982 pioneered the use of the term sound art using Sound/Art to name a catalogue that documents presentations crossing experimental music with exhibitions of sound sculptures at the New York Sculpture Center (Licht, et al., 2007 as cited in Carvalho J., 2019). We can think about and affirm sound art as the following:

Sound art differs from music and from other art forms in which sound plays an important role (cinema, for example) by establishing new possibilities of appreciation and listening. Its distinctive use of sound, the absence of a linear temporal discourse, the exploration of the referential potentialities brought by sound, the effective interaction between the audience, and the space and time in which the work occurs, all of these aspects collaborate to distinguish sound art as a discrete artistic modality. (Campeato, 2009, pp. 35-36)

As mention previously, sound art is an art form that combines several disciplines. For that to be true, it means that its makers are multi-faceted or they come from different technological and/or scientific backgrounds. To refer to this multidisciplinary of the sound art intervention area, Laura Maes presents the relationship of four disciplines as well as the work of four authors as a reference of interconnection, namely: the visual arts by Ulrich Eller, music by Max Neuhaus, architecture by Bernhard Leither and physics by Felix Hess.

It is very common to find works of sound art that unveil the diverse valences of their makers, going from plug-and-play devices to soldering irons and create circuits themselves. There is hardware design and software programming, and, whilst acoustics, architecture, electronics and information science seem natural disciplines to deploy by sound artists, less obvious disciplines are also called in. "Some artists use electromagnetic induction to uncover sounds, while others make an appeal to electrodynamics and create works based on the theory of electric currents." (Maes, 2013). All of these different disciplines, diverse intellects, makes up the art form as it is. It is common to attribute this multidisciplinary trait to the Anglo-Saxon perspective of the concept, where one has to incorporate implication such as the socio-cultural context as well as sound as a medium in the practice (Garrelfs, 2015 as cited in Carvalho J., 2019), and as to the sonic relationships, the concept of sound art can be reinforced as a "(...) practice that describes, analyzes, performs, and interrogates the sound condition and its process of operation..." (Labelle, 2006).

Alan Licht presents three different categories that offer a definition of sound art: the first category, Licht affirms the sonic environment defined by space, not by time, which is presented like any given Fine Arts work—something that Leigh Landy identified as **sounding art** as it reflects a more traditional French usage of *arts sonores* meaning music that existed alongside the *arts scéniques* (performing arts) and *arts plastiques* (fine art) (Landy, 2016); the second category, has to do with an artistic object with the ability of producing sound, much like a sound sculpture—which would be identified as **sound art**; and the third category, where

sound is defined as complement or an extent of a work where the focal point is a different medium of artistic expression (Licht, et al., 2007 as cited in Carvalho J., 2019)—frequently documented as **sonic art**.

Licht's definition is not at all sufficient to the author Laura Maes and according to her own investigation, there are thirteen parameters with various conditions that once analyzed, do facilitate the definition of sound art. "This demarcation of sound art is not a priori given, but it is based on the empirical review of a large amount of art works." (Maes, 2013). I will not go through the thirteen parameters, one by one, in depth as it is not considerably necessary for the purpose of this investigation, however, those same parameters shall be briefly addressed given that they exist intrinsically in the art form and they become self-explanatory once we read a brief and synthesized definition of the art form by Maes herself:

We consider sound art to be a hybrid of visual arts and music: art works that have both an aural as well as a visual component [**parameter visual component**], but where the production, muffling or reflection of sound forms the starting point of the work [**parameter concept**]. The static nature of visual arts reveals itself in the fact that the sound has no beginning or end [**parameter open form**]. Therefore, the emphasis no longer lies on the time dimension of sound, but has moved to its spatial dimension [**parameter space**]. As a consequence, most sound works are not narrative [**parameter narrativity**]. The visitors come and go as they please and can determine independently how long they attend the "performance". Sound art is like a performance lasting 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Consequently, very few sound works make an appeal to performers to produce sound [**parameter performer**], instead sounds are generated electronically, electro-acoustically and/or acoustically [**parameter production of sound**]. The operation of most sound works relies on homemade hardware and/or software or on adapted commercially available technologies and techniques [**parameter implementation of techniques and technologies**]. The sounds are automated or activated either by natural sources, external input, animals or by acts of the visitors [**parameter interaction**]. The distance that is commonly kept between the spectator and the work of art or the performer[s] in both museums and concert halls has largely evaporated. The visitor can often walk around or into the sound work or is even encouraged to touch it [**parameter perception**]. Most sound works are temporary [**parameter endurance**] and they will rather be found in public space, alternative locations, museums and galleries than on the stage of a concert hall [**parameter place of presentation**]. Thus, the sound works are regularly based on specific characteristics of that location [**parameter site-specificness**]. (Maes, 2013, p. 74)

This analysis presents a categorical approach to the practice because it reveals three different ramifications or concepts—already briefly mentioned with Licht’s categorizations in attempting to define sound art—and we can deepen these three concepts in the following manner: firstly, the **sonic arts** for the unitary form that it provides a syntax in sound in art; secondly, **sounding arts** for the novelty it carries because it incorporates music based on the sonorous, the environmental, and art concepts that are broader than sound arts, and thirdly—**sound art**—given the relevance of this artistic expression in contemporary art and in affirming the sound in art, and although all of the three concepts and their syntax are constructed by exploratory musical premisses, sound art is the one that mainly moves away from this musical concepts (Carvalho J., 2019). Surely, sound art is the most frequently used term, and for this investigation I’ve been focused mainly on this third concept.

Sculptures, *site-specific* sound events, installations are all areas applicable to the concept of sound art. Additionally, Landy adds, just like Follmer (2015), the radio and the media arts as possible habitats for sound art as well—a perspective that demonstrates the interconnection of mediums, something that can be verified when looking at the World Soundscape Project<sup>1</sup> or even at every multimedia art (Carvalho J., 2019).

All of these distinctive considerations of the unit of relationship between sound and art leaves much less room for interpretation, and therefore, less confusion. It is certainly an attempt towards a clear-cut definition of the art form. Maes’s parameter analysis allows to take any sound work, side-by-side these thirteen parameters and draw much more concrete conclusions whether a particular sound work can or cannot be considered sound art. The parameters allow to work on a definition of the general category of sound art, nevertheless, once a large number of art works, or sound works, are analyzed and described through these parameters, “we will obtain clusters that give insight in the nature of the works.” (Maes, 2013). These ‘clusters’ are what Maes refers to as subdivisions of the former general category of sound art, and the reason why that’s necessary is because, according to Maes, “we believe that sound sculptures and sound installations form two separate identities within the general category of sound art.” These identities, are going to be looked at ahead in order to understand, and to be able to separate, the two main groups within sound art.

## 1.2 Main Clusters: Sculptures and Sound Installations

Sound art can be subdivided into two main groups, sound sculptures and sound installations, because of their natural attendance in the art form and their distinguishable identities. On her thesis, Maes disagrees with Alan Licht’s (2007) idea on subdividing sound art into three categories, because if Licht’s categorization is applied, “any art work that produces sound can be labelled sound art.” (Maes, 2013). The mere fact that any work of art that produces or generates sound, does not grant it status of sound art. It is through this observation, that Maes goes on and expands on the idea of clusters, and subdividing sound art into clusters. She adds that sound art can be clustered into two main groups, sound installations and sound sculptures and that in both categories sound forms the focal point, which goes accordingly to the brief description of sound art mentioned early in the beginning of this chapter, “art which uses sound both as its medium (what it is made out of) and as its subject (what it is about)” (Tate, n.d.). The subject is truly important to the art form, because it constitutes the focal point, what the artwork is about. With that thought in mind, I shall address the main differences between sound

---

<sup>14</sup> The World Soundscape Project (WSP) was established as an educational and research group by R. Murray Schafer at Simon Fraser University during the late 1960s and early 1970s. It grew out of Schafer’s initial attempt to draw attention to the sonic environment through a course in noise pollution, as well as from his personal distaste for the more raucous aspects of Vancouver’s rapidly changing soundscape.”

sculptures and sound installations with conform to Maes's review on the subject with aid of the thirteen parameters that help categorize sound art.

The principal difference between these two main groups can be attributed to the parameter space and related to that, also to the parameter perception as Maes argues. We can find smaller differences within the parameters of visual component, endurance and site-specificity. Maes invokes Allan Kaprow—pioneer in establishing the concepts of performative art and the one who influenced a lot of the work in Fluxus, performance art and installation art. In his *Assemblage, Environment & Happenings* Kaprow makes a distinction between ‘assemblages’ and ‘environments’, which he considers them to be, at root, the same with only a difference in size. “Assemblages may be handled or walked around, while Environments must be walked into.” (Kaprow, 1966, as cited in Maes, 2013). Maes establishes a relation between assemblages and environments with sound sculptures and sound installations respectively. “In sound installations the visitor steps into the work in order to experience the work, with a sound sculpture this is not the case.” (Maes, 2013). Sound installations, in contrast with sound sculptures, are often dependent on the configuration of a certain space or situation when this is far less representative of sound sculptures. In the process of creating a sound installation, the artist frequently treats a complete space as a context or situation that can be entered by the visitor. In this case, the intrinsic variables of a particular space, or environment, also play a role in the artwork, variables like the acoustics of the space, its materials and the existing sounds are treated as a whole and become a substantial part of the artwork. Other conditions that can play a role in sound installations are “non-physical qualities such as the historic, current or future function of the space or the cultural and social conventions of the given location” (Maes, 2013) and these also become essential elements of the work. One is less likely to find these specifications—these spatial elements—on sound sculptures and as a consequence, they are less often created for a specific location. Once an artist is dealing with location, reproduction of the same work become impracticable, making sound installations unable to be identically repeatable while sound sculptures can. This observations was also highlighted by sound artist Christina Kubisch. “When I install something, whether it’s an invisible loudspeaker or 20000 meters of electric cable, that’s an installation in my eyes, simply because I’ve installed something in space. Sound sculptures, on the other hand, are objects that you can transport and repeat, unlike sound spaces, that can’t be reconstructed two times in the same way.” (Meltzger and Kubisch, 2000, as cited in Maes, 2013).

In spite of that, this distinction is not always as clear as this, because some art work can be sound installations as well as sound sculptures depending on its arrangement. In her thesis, *Sounding Sound Art*, Maes expands on this with an example:

In 2003 the German artist Erwin Stache presented his *Waschmaschinenprogrammscheibenorchester* in a completely darkened room at a warehouse of the Belgian railways in Kortrijk, Belgium. The crackling sounds of mechanical program disks from old washing machines form the acoustic material of this installation. A rotation of such a disk normally lasts one up to two hours. Stache headed the disks with engines and the long washing programme was reduced to less than one minute. The sixteen disks were programmed to play at several speeds so that a composition is created. The acoustic sound of the disk is reinforced. When a disk moves and makes sound, a light burns. When only one *Waschmaschinenprogrammscheibe* would be exhibited, we would speak of a sound sculpture. By presenting sixteen disks



through which the audience walks, the Waschmaschinenprogrammsscheibenorchester becomes a sound installation, even though the work has no direct links with its location. (Maes, 2013, pp. 84-85).

With this in mind, we can apprehend that it is not imperative for a sound work to respect every single one of the parameters presented by Maes, that would be impracticable and possibly even restrictive. Nevertheless, all of this serve as remarks and references and as mentioned before, sound art, of everything, is an amalgamation of disciplines, and very often we see this exchange and interconnection of different dimensions within the art form.

Sound art and its conception as an artistic practice exists in a multidisciplinary way, with a myriad of layers that come together to form the artwork and that diversity makes it difficult to define it concretely and clearly, leaving a constricted margin for a transparent description of it, which makes it consequently difficult to understand and assess the relationship between it and censorship. This sub-chapter proposes to synthesize a current concession that we have of sound art in order to reach a better comprehension of how one can relate sound art to censorship.

## **2. A Taxonomy of Censorship and its Place on Art**

“Art’s quarrel with censorship seems as old as its ancient quarrel with philosophy; and ever since Plato’s proposal to ban mimetic art for its moral and epistemological evils, the champions of art have tried to protect art’s freedom and right to exist.” (Shusterman, 1984) We are continually witnessing a moralistic expansion often associated with artistic censorship “(...) we live in an institutionally fragile world whose line separating reality and absurdity seems dangerously (not creatively) blurred.” (Osorio, 2018). Controversy seems to be what urges censorship, but does sensitivity—against what is morally objectionable—have a hegemonic role in relation to artistic expression? The second part of this chapter is dedicated to censorship, and creating a taxonomy for it in order to establish the different types of censorship and how it manifests specifically on art.

Art and censorship have been disputing for a long time, but despite that fact, this research will not engage directly on this particular quarrel, only look in depth and analyze this phenomenon in order to understand the dynamics of it and how it manifest. It will not bring to the surface judgmental perspectives but observing and exposing those observations. It is important, nevertheless, to get to know this process of impositions, this phenomenon that can be perceived as an unnecessary curb on one’s basic right to liberty, and, at the same time, on a closer examination, it can be understood and looked at in the form of a necessary evil (Sen, 2014). This duality of a mechanism that can either be interpreted as something required and at the same time dispensable, makes it even more complex to discuss, so, a synthesize taxonomy for this mechanism is going to be helpful. Much like sound art’s entanglement of meanings and definitions, censorship shares a similar complication.

From an etymological perspective, the word 'Censorship' is derived from the Latin word '*censere*' which means “*to estimate, rate, assess, to be of opinion*” (Tribe, 1973, as cited in Sen, 2014). But this description may be troublesome:

However, the intrinsic value-neutrality that this definition offers is misleading. The 'assessment' is preceded by an active consideration of the canons of the rights and the wrongs, the dos and the don'ts, and based on such largely majoritarian and hegemonic constructions, an act of ultimate exclusion. Sometimes, this act of exclusion takes place at an individualistic level, sometimes it is performed at the level of the society, but the more well-documented and well-known form of censorship is the traditional form, where it is carried out by formal means. This diversity between different types of censorship often leads to confusions when one tries to construct a definition of the process in terms the organic structures operating behind it. (Sen, 2014, p. 176)

In fact, there is no shortage of information about censorship, whether from a socio-political, artistic or advocacy perspective (Ireland, 2012; Morais, 2016; O'Higgins, 1972). In order to systematize this concept, Shameek Sen (2014) reflects precisely on this topic, making a jurisprudential analysis, clarifying and separating censorship from freedom of expression "(...) FREE SPEECH is one of the constitutional guarantees of a liberal democracy — a right recognized by all international human rights documents. It is an amalgamation of the right to freedom of conscience. Censorship, on the other hand, is the process of imposing checks, direct or indirect, governmental or otherwise, on the exercise of one's right to free speech."

First and foremost, such a process can and should be systematize for a matter of simplification. This body of research is going to study the relationship of censorship with sound art, particularly from the lenses of moralism, because, while censorship works through a variety of dimensions—political, military etc—the moral dimensions arise quite frequently in art. However, censorship is without a doubt a complex mechanism with a myriad of layers intertwined with each other of which we must address in order to elaborate an acceptable taxonomy for censorship. Censorship and its mechanisms are usually seen and analyzed into formal and non-formal classifications and those very often encompass the grounds by which censorship occur. This alone does not evidence the motives and reasons for the act of censoring. For that, and only for the purpose of this research, I will divide censorship into two different structures. Grounds, and manifestation, where the former is relative to precisely the grounds by which something or someone is suppressed or even banned, and the latter, concerns with the manifestation by which censorship is acted upon, i.e., who exercises that process. With concern to the grounds, Shusterman talks about other kinds of censorship, besides the moral one, e.g., political and military. But for censorship to arise in artistic contexts, such artistic expressions must be controversial and objectionable either on the grounds of moral, political ad/or military. Only then, after the controversy is presented, can it be manifested. This manifestation represents the other part of the structure of censorship that is being presented here. As Shameek Sen put it, these impositions can occur "direct or indirect, governmental or otherwise". It is here where the modes of censorship are usually highlighted as formally and non-formally. Sen analyzes the typologies of censorship staged by Paul O'Higgins (1972) where he distinguished this phenomenon into the following types:

1. Autonomous — Self-censorship brought about by conscious or unconscious motives, which makes an individual wither to refrain from expressing his or her views or alter the same.
2. Social — Discouragement of the expression of certain ideas, either through socialization or sanctions, which led to the emergence of taboos.

3. Legal — Enforcement of restraint by legal institutions such as the government, police and the courts. This can involve both prior censorship, where the material has to meet certain approved prior standards, or penal censorship, where no such approval is needed but punishment is at hand for violation of legal limits.
4. Extra-legal — Telephone Tapping, d-notices, limited release of information about defendant at trial.
5. Voluntary — When an individual or a company, with no legal power, imposes upon others limitations on what they might say or do without sanctions. This may be exercised by an institution like the Press Council, or by an employer, and is usually based on a shared code of beliefs.
6. Subterranean — When an individual or institution uses powers set aside for another purpose to impose censorship without direct government involvement — political censorship.

Looking at this classification, we can apprehend that it amply highlights the prevalence of the non-formal modes of censorship which co-exist with the formal modes, and interestingly presents two types of manifestation for censorship - legal, and extra-legal, whereas legal would include formal impositions of prior restraints and post-dissemination sanctions, extra-legal would largely be practiced through means not strictly authorized by law (Sen, 2014). For the interest of this chapter in analyzing censorship's relation with art, it makes every sense to consider autonomous, social, legal and voluntary modes of censoring giving that these are the most common modes to be applied in art. As to extra-legal and subterranean modes, these will not be considered for their mainly judicial and political aspects, respectively, and the lack of illustration of how this is contextualized with the arts. Thereby, we should look in depth at the aforementioned modes of censorship most commonly applied in art.

### **Autonomous**

Defining censorship as only the state-mandated pre-censorship would be seen as extremely narrow in the context of such an all-encompassive classification of censorship, capturing the formal and the non-formal alike. If one looks at censorship merely as an exercise of power, hegemony and zeal towards ensuring a homogeneity of beliefs, that narrow definition is only a partial view of the problem. When it comes to autonomous modes of censorship, frequently, conscious or unconscious motives lead to a person willingly shrinking his or her territories of expression. The fear of exclusion and repression can lead to a chilling effect where an individual gets intimidated into not expressing himself to the fullest. This kind of psychological self-censorship is more problematic because in the absence of a formal legal authority ordering such shrinkage of the expressional domain, the matter cannot even be judicially reviewable at most times. Thus, very often, the chilling effect thus created leads to suppressions of creativity in an atmosphere of fear, without there being a tangible legal or social remedy out of it (Sen, 2014). This type of self-restraint censorship has a meaningful impact on one's creativity and, therefore, on one's work. This was also the case for Portuguese pre-revolution creative practices. "Censorship of the press, theatre and cinema was more rigorous than that of books, since the former were seen as artistic and cultural expression for the masses, ones that communicated more directly with the public. (...) filmmakers of the time — whether directing films aligned with the regime or working independently — were forced into self-censorship to secure the approval of their films." (Morais, 2016). Similarly, there is extensive literature on Russian avant-garde and its relationship with censorship, e.g. Aleksandr Rodchenko, one of the founders of Russian Constructivism and Russian Modern Design. "It is particularly evident in the way in which Western scholars described Rodchenko's career as a photographer; Barr states that the turn towards the camera was his only choice after he 'gave up

on painting 'having 'left art'" (Barr, 1936, as cited in Kociałkowska, 2020). "The oppressed artist, in other words, had to sacrifice his painterly skills for the cause of creating state propaganda" (Kociałkowska, 2020).

It becomes clear the impact that this particular mode of censorship has on an artist, not just professionally but most of all, psychologically. The examples addressed above, live in a context of oppression and are bound by a severe political regime almost impossible to contradict. However, this mode, when transposed to a liberal and democratic context, it's still recognizable and relatable, not as much in the political sense—in general—but in the sense of morality. If we listen carefully to what psychoanalyst Suely Rolnik (2018) said in reaction to the gestures of censorship, one would immediately relate art with life and an attack to the former is an attack to the latter. Rolnik pointed out that attacking art is attacking an activity essential to the health of a society. She also, briefly, lays out the function of art as creating a visible, audible, tangible body for what life requires every time it sees itself suffocated in our ways of existing, in our ways of interpreting the world and reacting to events. Considering this analyze, an artist who engages in autonomous modes of censorship is attacking himself. The meanings of this have been laid out by Rolnik and seem to be deeply rooted in the psychophysiological realm. Every time we need to redefine our existence, interpretation of the world, i.e. the way we perceive it, and the way we react to phenomenons of life, art enables it to happen. All of this conceptualizations, redefinitions and general navigation in the world, art is the mechanism, the tool for artists to make sense of that world.

## Social

O'Higgins established this mode of censorship as a continuous discouragement of expression of certain ideas, and by doing so, inevitably, taboos are formed. That disheartenment of thoughts is the foundation of this mode of censoring. Regarding art, sexuality and violence have almost always been protagonists of this type of social suppression because of its intrinsic 'amoral' nature. That is self-evident when we look at the artistic course of artists such as Chris Burden, John Duncan, Rudolf Schwarzkogler, Marina Abramovic, Judy Chicago, Judith Bernstein, Hannah Wilke, etc. Artists that explore sexuality and violence, either through direct or more indirect means, were easily targeted with censorship, particularly—or even especially—in the realm of morality. "Some of this sexually explicit work has provoked attempts at censorship, disregarding the frequently metaphoric force of the subject." (Levin, 2007). This allows us to understand the degree of capacity that human perception has in relation to interpretations, especially when dealing with metaphors or abstractions in the artistic domain. There is the possibility for perceiving controversy through this type of indirect artistic communication. But the direct and provocative relation that the artist establishes with the spectator seems to be the knife that cuts deeply to the bone of civilization. To evoke, once again, the words of O'Higgins (1972) himself, social mode of censorship is "a discouragement of the expression of certain ideas". It is difficult to assess what exactly constitutes discouragement and its effects. On one hand, it can be apprehended as immediate suppression of ideas preventing those ideas from entering the public realm, on the other, that same discouragement can only live as cautionary tales waiting to be tested and if so, boundaries tend to be pushed. That can be seen all through the work of the famously contemporary artistic movement *Wiener Aktionsgruppe*, or Viennese Actionism—an artistic performative group distinguished by Günter Brus, Otto Mühl, Hermann Nitsch, Rudolf Schwarzkogler and Chris Burden on the second half of the twentieth century—as well as in the work of the american artist, John Duncan. Testing the limits of the body, both psychological and physically, were the *motifs* underpinned in their practice, and that certainly raised questions for censorship.

Social taboos such as violence, sexuality, nudity, sadomasochism, mutilation—autonomously and not—constitute some of the contents that have been highly linked to the

discouraged subjects to be expressed in society, and that made its way into the art domain as well. If one analyzes the work of John Duncan for example, it is comprehensible that one might feel provoked—even if that is not the intention of the artist. One of his artworks, *Blind Date* (1980) is still today a considerable example of extreme performances. This work, a performative act, consists on Duncan himself having sex with a corpse, registering the act only with an audio recorder, having no authorization for photographic and/or videographic record, and later, going through a vasectomy and in that sense, having waisted his last potent seed on a dead body. Duncan was clearly in search of something, intending to offer himself as a negative example of male conditioning, he took on violent behaviours and he victimized his viewers, frightening his audiences – and himself – with the dangers of violent masculinity. (Gonzalez Rice, 2014) “*Blind Date* holds a unique place in the contemporary performance art canon, included in survey texts and serving as a cautionary tale for young artists. The infamy of this widely reviled performance persists despite limited scholarship and critical writing, and despite an absence of visual documentation. Unlike the striking photographs that visualize other famously transgressive endurance actions – including Chris Burden’s *Shoot* (1971) and Marina Abramović’s *Rhythm 0* (1974) – only limited documentation of *Blind Date* exists. Duncan audio-recorded his sexual encounter, and he photographed a later action in the performance, a vasectomy procedure. However, the core performance action, his abject sex act, remained invisible” (Gonzalez Rice, 2014). This particular action of artistic expression holds its place as well on the foundation of this dissertation. That is because the only objective record of this performance is an audio recording—and the photo of his vasectomy taken by Paul McCarthy although that is not the moment of the work considered abject. For spectators, a very limited set of possibilities is offered for interpretations, and in this case, only an audio recording and the testimony of the artist himself was provided. This made me think about the sonic possibilities, specifically in relation to human perception.

“Once again, art offers the possibility of transformation” (Elce, 2018). If art has this capacity for molding society, then the question of differentiating provocation from the possibility of transformation should be addressed. Is the feeling of being provoked hegemonic to a transformation of society?

## Legal

Looking at O’Higgins’s considerations on legal censorship, this consist on the enforcement of restraint by legal institutions such as the government, police and the courts. This can also involve both prior censorship, where the material has to meet certain approved prior standards, or penal censorship, where no such approval is needed but punishment is at hand for violation of legal limits. These censorial acts were representative of the *Comissão de Censura aos Espetáculos* (Performance Censorship Commission) that existed during the *Estado Novo*<sup>2</sup> (New State) in Portugal. This is how this commission was known until 1957 where it changed to *Comissão de Exame e Classificação dos Espetáculos* (Committee for the Examination and Classification of Shows). The function of this commission was precisely to examine artistic,

---

<sup>2</sup> In 1933, the constitution that gave birth to the *Estado Novo* (New State) came into effect, substituting the 1911 constitution that, in practice, had not been applied since the military coup of 1926. The document subordinated Parliament and also limited individual liberties.

The new Constitution, designed by the military and Oliveira Salazar, came into effect on April 11, 1933, after a plebiscite held on March 19 of the same year.

The regime will last until 1974, a period during which individual and collective liberties are limited.

For almost 50 years Portugal will have military Presidents of the Republic, although power is in the hand of Oliveira Salazar.

cultural works—often theater, cinema and books, although cinema and theatre frequently and most commonly went through this examination because they were considered to be a more encompassed mean of communication until the appearance of television in 1957—and determine whether these works were suitable or not according to the beliefs of the State. Ana Bela Morais (2016) briefly explains the difference between the former commission and the latter commission:

Although there were various small changes over time, the system of censorship worked in one of two ways: initially there was the so-called ‘prior’ censorship of the intended scripts; later, there was the examination of all films on completion by the Comissão de Exame e Classificação de Espectáculos, which could impose cuts or even a total prohibition. (p. 92)

The Comissão de Exame e Classificação dos Espetáculos was created with the notion that scripts were not enough to make a clear judgement about what to censor, therefore, this commission came to an understanding that what they needed to censor was in fact the images and dialogue that were included in the completed film. The majority of portuguese films and theater works produced throughout Estado Novo were made for an audience considered uncultured and/or even illiterate, for whom these cultural works should present role models that were morally appropriate and socially acceptable (Morais, 2016). Cinema, radio and theater were considered to be on of the most all-embracing means of communication up until the appearance of television, and for that reason, these means of communication were seen by official ideology and by critics in general as popular education, and by the 1970s “the Comissão was allowing certain films to be shown, but in many cases only in studio cinemas, restricted to educated audiences; the showing of such films to the general public, in normal cinemas, remained prohibited” (Morais, 2016).

After reviewing this example, this mode of censoring artistic and cultural works fits well with the description of O’Higgins for legal censorship. Firstly, it is clear that prior censorship existed in the examination phase, where the material had to meet the moral, social and political standards advocated by the portuguese state; secondly, if these standards were not respected the commission had the power to prohibited the presentation of any given work.

### **Voluntary**

As already have been established, the mechanism of censorship does not always need to be part of a formal mode of manifestation. Voluntary is one typology that fits within the non-formal modes of censorship. It needs no legal power or governmental agency, and it does not presume any sanctions activity. Something similar to this presented itself in 2018 surrounding the controversial work of Robert Mapplethorpe when an exhibition of his photographies took place at the Museu de Serralves, in Oporto. Mainly, the events of tension that hovered the artistic community, specifically the community most connected with the institution, resumed in a word, censorship. But one should carefully look at the events in order to establish a more righteous analysis of that particular event.

In truth, Mapplethorpe’s work circumscribes what constitutes the moral limits of art as someone who constantly pushed boundaries. And one could also say that for that same reason, and for the place he—deservedly—occupy in modern art history, an homage to him, to his work, was something imperative to take place in one of the highest regarded institutions of art

as it is Museu de Serralves. Nevertheless, when one apprehends what happened throughout the course of this exhibition, one can easily come to the conclusion of a moral censorship that manifested itself through a voluntary typology, i.e. it became clear that if in fact censorship arise in that particular moment, that it had to do with the provocative sexual nature of Mapplethorpe's work, and that some common, shared codes of beliefs, had to be safeguarded. It is in this sense, that the facts point to a moral censorship manifesting itself voluntarily. Synthetically, this was a moment where a division between curatorship and administration was clearly distinguished, to the point of rupture and mistrust. Initially, the exhibition was designed not to be complacent with restrictions of age and separation of artworks through different rooms of the museum—separation particularly of the most sexually explicit works. The administration had precisely a version that contradicted the initial of the curator. In sum, the curator dismissed himself the day after the inauguration, when 18 artworks had been relocated, and 2 were allegedly ordered to be removed, a version that the administration firmly denied despite the statement of the curator. The dismissal alone of the director of the museum, who was also curator at the time, was reason for controversy, but the fact that 18 works had been relocated and 2 additional works removed from the exhibition was enough of a concern. Questions of censorship were naturally raised. The more explicit part of the exhibition was accompanied by an advisory that stated 'We would like to draw attention to the provocative and possibly shocking nature of the sexual imagery in some of the works on display. Only persons aged 18 or over may enter this room.' An advisory that soon after that changed at the entrance of the reserved rooms to allow minors to enter the space as long as they were accompanied by an adult. A notice that according to the administration, simply followed the legal requirements, this being a decision took with necessary reservations in order for the institution not to be targeted with penal censorship, i.e. punishment for violation of legal limits, something that voluntary modes of censorship does not require since it "imposes upon others limitations on what they might say or do without sanctions." (O'Higgins, 1972 as cited in Sen, 2014).

### 3. An Epistemic View on Sound

A look at the way we perceive sound and the knowledge we can obtain through it is going to be addressed to complete this chapter. Here, I shall introduce some ideas from Voëgelin (2021) and Mackay (2009) in order to complement the ideas surrounding the statement of Dajuin Yao (n.d.). This last part of the chapter, seeks to apprehend some of the recent thrive in sonic epistemology. The way sound, as an agent, is perceived and what knowledge does it embody. The reason why this is relevant for this investigation, is because there is in fact a need to understand this epistemological element of sound in order to establish a correlation between it, and the idea of censorship being ineffective towards sound art. With this in mind, I shall briefly address matters such as semantic, and the invisible and abstract element of sound (Voëgelin, 2021). However, the semantic nature of language, of words, are not going to be considered here. If we look at the statement of Yao (n.d.) once again, "as long as there are no words or lyrics involved, sound is harmless to the state. (...) noise (or sound) in itself cannot be seditious (...) without the assistance of language." This, immediately suggests that discriminating language by not considering it to formulate the theory that this investigation proposes, is a necessary thing. This sub-chapter will serve as a prelude for the next chapter. It intends to apprehend, a priori, some of the aspect covered in the *think tank*, and therefore, contextualizing some of the reviewed literature that serves as the foundation for the *think tank*, and consequently, for this investigation.

Salomé Voëgelin (2021), to introduce sound as a potential element, or agent of knowledge, presents six different types of knowledge that contrast with the traditional

empirical, measurable and quantifiable knowledge. These, developed throughout Voëgelin's investigation, are the **[tacit knowledge]**, the knowledge we have because we do something very often and we understand them because of that repetition rather because we've read the manual. **[Embodied knowledge]**, that has to do with how we are in the world, how we experience something. **[Communal]** and **[Participatory knowledge]**, knowledge that we build together as a community, that we have of each other and with each other. **[Contingent knowledge]**, knowledge that is of the moment (...) knowledge that I have to understand in these particular situation (...) And **[sensory knowledge]**, knowledge that comes from sensing and feeling. According to Voëgelin, these are knowledges still considered as non-objective, non-systematized and therefore are excluded, seen as excess and ignored. And this would be the case of sound, for it embodies these non-traditional knowledges. Sound withholds specially the tacit, the embodied and the sensorial knowledge, and for these reasons it is difficult to assess it as a valid epistemological regime—"the anxiety of tacit, embodied, and sensorial knowledge and the criticism of immersivity, meaning, sound is continuously being discounted as a valid regime for knowledge, precisely because of its immersivity, this being sensorial and even sensual, being a feeling, an emotion, and therefore, it is not a legitimate knowledge." (Voëgelin, 2021). The term 'immersivity' suffers a lot of critique in sound art studies because it is axiomatically related to the sensorial, emotional and uncritical affects that sound has on us, and for this reason, Voëgelin encourages not to think about sound as immersive but as voluminous, thus making a distinction between 'sound' and 'listening'—"they are not immersive in a passive, emotionally incapacitated way (...) if we speak of volumes, I don't mean decibels, I mean the luminous sphere which sound in its invisibility makes apparent to us, this volume between people" (Voëgelin, 2021). One of the examples she uses is the one of the indoor swimming pool and to listen to the reverberation of sound and its voluminousness, and to listen as a volume still retains a criticality about who we are in there and how we work with that.

The systemic epistemological disregard for sound seems to have some correlation with the question of this investigation, is sound art susceptible of being censored? Because then, one has to question the validity of censoring a regime—without the assistance of language, and without being music, as already has been establish—that renders to the sensorial, emotional and abstract elements of its nature. It is not concrete in the sense that it is unsystematized and therefore unclearly understood, unlike visual regimes, which can be perceived more tangibly. "Visualization is our culture's default data representational process" (Gresham-Lancaster, 2012). All of these considerations, reveals sound as something non-objective, and because it renders more to the tacit, sensorial and embodied, it becomes abstract, unsystematized. In contrast to empirical knowledge, which is taxonomical, these knowledges do not follow principles of scientific classifications. So it is not common for us to assess sound other than in an abstract or metaphorical way. Voëgelin addresses sound's invisibility and what we can know from there "(...) sound creates another image of the world, from its invisible depth." (Voëgelin, 2021). But it is, nevertheless, an invisible regime, that once discard the semantic element—such as words—it becomes a non-semantic regime. When Yao considers this scenario, a sonic scenario without assistance of language, he is inevitably considering a non-semantic regime. And he states that, if so, sound presents no harmful elements.

Robin Mackay (2009) wrote some sleevenotes for Florian Hecker's *Acid in the Style of David Tudor* released in 2009 by Editions Mego. In this text, Mackay talk about the 'ofness' of a sound, meaning, what is a sound of? He establishes a connection between image and the world, this being the representative *ofness*, and states that "a sound can be 'of' x either in the sense that it resembles or represents x, or in the sense that it retains a genetic or causal link to x – even if, no doubt, these two types of 'ofness' are often intertwined and mutually complicated." (Mackay, 2009). This presumes that, a sound, is almost always a symbolic or genetic and even casual representation of something. Furthermore, Mackay adds:



Representative ofness – the connection between image and world – is never simply given, but depends upon the competences of the audience, who not only, as Duchamp pointed out, complete the work, but also play their part in configuring the image-world relation, partitioning the iconic and expressive aspects of the image according to their varying background knowledge and inherited techniques of seeing or hearing. (Mackay, 2009, para. 2)

This participation may involve the non-traditional knowledges which Voëgelin presents, specially the tacit, embodied and sensory knowledge when one has to “play their part in configuring the image-world relation (...) according to their varying background knowledge and inherited techniques of seeing or hearing”. In this sense, there is a connection that can be drawn between what Mackay argues and what Voëgelin apprehended about sound. Because it is difficult to assess an epistemic validity to sound for its inherent non-objective and non-systematized quality, one has to turn to its abstract and merely representative characteristics.

The question that this investigation pursues derives from here. Can sound, being continuously disregarded epistemologically, and bound to a representativeness that arise artificially from who perceives it, be subject to moral censorship? And consequently, can sound art be subject to it as well?

## **Conclusion of chapter one**

Throughout this chapter, analyses on sound art regarding its conception as an art form as well as its sub-divisions, a taxonomy on censorship and how it manifests through art, and the recent thrive on sonic epistemology and the way we perceive sound were established.

In the first part of this chapter, sound art, a description of this multidisciplinary practice was established, going through its concepts and sub-disciplines. It became clear that it accommodates a high number of artists with very diverse backgrounds, going from different artistic practices such as design and sculpture, to engineering and other scientific and technical backgrounds, hence, a multidisciplinary practice. Maes’s thirteen parameters to determine an artwork as sound art were briefly touched upon, giving a more concrete understanding of what a work of sound art should content. These parameters don’t have to manifest themselves in the work in precisely the same way but the sound, as the object of the work, should always be the focal point of the same. Because these parameters manifest differently, sub-divisions of the art form emerge, making room for sound installations and sound sculptures.

The second part of this chapter was dedicated to the creation of a taxonomy of censorship and how it relates with art. That was first and foremost achieved by determining what censorship is based on the empirical review of literature regarding censorship, either from a jurisprudential perspective (Sen, 2014), a scholar perspective (Morais, 2016; O’Higgins, 1972;) or from a social and artistic perspective from those who experience it personally (Osorio, 2018; Velasco, 2018;). Thereafter, the different typologies of censorship staged by Paul O’Higgins (1972) were analyzed where he distinguished this phenomenon into the following types: autonomous, social, legal, extra-legal, voluntary and subterranean. A detailed look of autonomous, social, legal and voluntary was made giving that these are the ones most commonly applied in art.

The last part of this chapter searches, a priori, for a possible approach to understand in what way is sound unsusceptible to censorship. It present the recent thrive in sonic epistemology

(Voëgelin, 2021) and how we perceive sound and establish a relation between it and the world (Mackay, 2009). This sub-chapter functions as a prelude for the discussion in the focus group, analyzing briefly some of the topics to be discussed within the group.

## CHAPTER TWO THINK TANK

In this chapter, I will address the circumstances of the *think tank*, introduce the participants and their importance for this context and this conversation and finally, present the results of the *think tank*. The tank serves the purpose of establishing a framework of investigation to the question addressed throughout this research—is Sound Art susceptible to censorship? As I mentioned previously, this chapter introduces topics that were already approached in the sub-chapter ‘An Epistemic View on Sound’ where ideas such as how do we perceive sound and what knowledge can we obtain from it, what is a sound of, were addressed. With this in mind, a lot of these ideas are going to be presented again in this chapter but now from the perspective of the participants of the *think tank*. I shall conclude this chapter with some brief and personal notes about what was discussed by the participants.

### 4. Participants

This *think tank* was designed not to exceed four to five participants. This is because, on one hand, there was the need of bringing multiple participants that think and reflect from different areas and backgrounds to establish a more diverse set of perspectives and overall stronger conclusions. On the other hand, restricting the number of participants without neglecting the former argument was important as well so that the conversation could be manageable enough to transcript and still be able to look for more consistent results. Another aspect to be considered was the proximity factor of the participants, this would allow for the conversation to happen locally, however, ultimately this was not attainable—a on-line conversation via Zoom was the chosen alternative. That being said, I shall introduce the participants, their basic information and why were these particular individuals chosen.

**Diogo Tudela** - Artist whose practice involves theoretical fiction, speculative computing, simulation practices, and mechatronics. His most recent work focuses on objects of textual genesis, synthetic reason, systems theory, modeling, and the epistemological limit of the manipulation of matter.

With experience working in media art, sound is also a tool often used by media artists, in addition to the multidisciplinary approach that the practice itself comprises—a mutual feature with sound art. This contribution is important from a practical point of view, not only because he brings something to the discussion for his experience as a researcher but as an active agent in the artistic practice.

**Miguel Carvalhais** - Designer, musician and Assistant Professor with Habilitation at the Faculty of Fine Art of University of Porto, and researcher at i2ADS and INESC TEC. Author of the books *Art and Computation* (2022) and *Artificial Aesthetics: Creative Practices in Computational Art and Design* (2016). Carvalhais also collaborates with Pedro Tudela in the @c project since 2000 and in 2003 they started the Crónica label where they have been releasing experimental and electronic music. Co-founder of the xCoAx conference on Computation, Communication, Aesthetics and X, with previous editions in Bergamo 2013, Porto 2014, Glasgow 2015, Bergamo 2016, Lisbon 2017, Madrid 2018, Milan 2019, Graz 2020, Online 2021, and an upcoming edition in Coimbra in 2022. He also helped to organize the Invisible Places symposium (2014 in Viseu, 2017 in Ponta Delgada), ICLI 2014 and 2018.

Being used to work in the realm of sound, as a musician but as a sound artist as well, Miguel brought to the discussion his own experience and doubts concerning the boundaries of sound art, where does it begin and where does it end.

**Pedro Rocha** - Music and Sound Art Curator at the Museum of Contemporary Art from the Serralves Foundation. He has worked temporarily as a Guest Music Curator at the Pirelli HangarBicocca in Milan (2014-2020), Guest Curator at the No Bounds Festival in Sheffield (2019) and as a Curator at the Trama Festival for Performative Arts in Porto (2006-2011).

His experience as a Curator in, particularly, artistic fields such as Music and Sound Art was truly essential not only to discuss about censorship but to discuss about Sound Art practice itself, sharing useful perspectives on both of these subjects so vital to this investigation.

**Vânia Maria Coutinho** - PhD in Art History, specializing in Art Theory from FCSH-NOVA (Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisboa). Invited Assistant Professor at the School of Arts of the UCP (Universidade Católica Portuguesa - Porto). Areas of scientific interest such as Aesthetics, Art Theory, Art Historiography, Theory of Image, Visual Culture, Visual Poetry, Illumination and Illustration.

The historical knowledge as well as the knowledge for art theory, particularly connected to the visual culture and art historiography, revealed as an important contribution for this *think tank* because it allowed to formulate, to some degree, a better understanding on how censorship tends to manifest itself through art and why, and particularly, establishing a parallel with censorship in abstract art.

## 5. Discussion and Results

Here I will summarize what was discussed in the *think tank*—full transcription of the *think tank* are presented in the Appendix A—and exhibit some important notes retrieved from the same. These notes reflect possible approaches to the question of investigation and in this sense establish a more concrete and define framework for future researches. I will go through these notes chronologically, as they were introduced in the *think tank*. **(1)** The parallel established between abstraction—and abstract art in particular—and sound art. **(2)** Understand how sound is referential. **(3)** Make a clear distinction between sound and hearing since in sound art there is more than just sound, there's listening as well. **(4)** What is producing sound? Can that be subject to censorship? **(5)** Clarify what exactly is censorship and understand what can be removed from this analysis to further help the research. **(6)** Analyze the relationship between the moral canons established in society and the religious dimension—this is because there is the need to ascertain and more clearly define moral censorship. My role in the *think tank* was as moderator. By intervening as little as possible to let the judgment of each participant flow naturally and uninfluenced, I gathered the participants—in an on-line format—briefly introduced myself and the objective of the *think tank*, asked the participants to introduce themselves to bring everyone involved closer together and proceeded by starting the discussion introducing questions previously arranged—note that a list of the topics that would be covered in the *think tank* was sent to the participants in advance.

**(1)** The immediate parallel established between abstract art and sound art was something to be expected because of its similarities as to the absence of referentiality, i.e. it's not immediately obvious looking at an abstract artwork and determine any given reference, and in the same sense, sound presents a similar problem with its potential for manipulation giving

its theoretical lack of objectivity that allows this permeability on people as Pedro Rocha argued, however, it is a parallel that unveils certain details and enables us to study, by comparison, what exactly are the elements of sound art that can possibly be subject to censorship.

When we think about abstract art, we can start by pointing out a formal reduction and exclusion of, at least, an immediate referentiality, nonetheless, this artistic movement was in fact subject to censorship, not because of its comprehension or the level of intelligibility of the artistic creation, not by the identification of forms and its significations, but as Maria Coutinho stated, it has to do precisely with how one deals with these formal devices or with the medium itself. Such observations of this exploratory freedom inherent in the history of abstract art points to the direction of something that was censored because it violated compositional protocols, and because it violated a prevailing aesthetic concession. In truth, as Maria Coutinho stated, this is a more extreme example, but, it definitely seems promising to understand the context of such an artistic movement and the circumstances in which abstract art was subject to censorship in order to connect any of that with sound art. It's an approach substantiated only by comparison but it seems to be a righteous parallel—despite their obvious differences—firstly, because of the lack or practically inexistence of cases of sound artworks targeted with censorship, so by doing such comparisons we can estimate what would it take for a sound artwork to be censored, secondly, the term 'abstract'—whether correct or not—is constantly associated with sound itself and therefore it must have something inherently and in its essence that forces us to perceive it as such. But is sound 'abstract'? What exactly means to be 'abstract'? This necessity of defining and comprehending the true meaning of the word is not at all disposable like Diogo Tudela claimed, since “we all agree that it's not abstract but it's just the go to place when we start talking about sound isn't it, and I think it's wrong but it would be cool to understand why we use that” (full *think tank* transcripts are presented in Appendix A). In reality, abstraction came from within a political conjecture and as it developed from the universe of physics and mathematics, and accordingly to Tudela, it means the possibility of decision between matter and form. But the question still prevails, why do we tend to describe sound as an 'abstract' element? Tudela shared his doubts about this and some thoughts as to why this happens and is possible that it has something to do with the regime of sound itself and, in the West, we haven't been able to manage our epistemological relationship with it. Its 'abstraction' comes from a linguistic, not in the sense of language but linguistic as symbolical—“not being able to deal in an obvious way with the operational, active, temporal character that sound has and that escapes a lot from the nominal and substantive logic that we have to discuss, and sound has this verbal logic, doesn't it, that is, this verbal side of action”.

(2) One other aspect discussed was sound as an element of referentiality. An element that embodies references and an element that unveils references living within us. Sound does not cease to have references, and those references can possibly be the thing subjected to censorship. The difficulty of detaching ourselves from referentiality is there, constantly, whenever we are dealing with any given artwork. Coutinho unfolded this idea—“I can't help but feel connected to references, even if my goal is not interpretive, creation in a complex meaning, when I deal with a piece it provokes things that take me back to things” (full *think tank* transcripts are presented in Appendix A).

Further on this subject, the ideas surrounding Voëgelin's investigation were presented to this *think tank*, and they conflicted with the notion of referentiality. Following on Maria Coutinho's reasoning, Voëgelin's perspective on sound lays down the idea that, even as a more sensory, corporeal, ancestral if we want, and therefore less permeable to institutionalized devices, it means that it is less stipulated by a logocentric regime and in turn is therefore not recognized as having epistemological potential. It seems reasonably fair to argument about the connection that this might have with the question of this investigation, the fact that sound hasn't been portrayed as an epistemological potential might influence the difficulty to, effectively, censor sound and consequently sound art. But, just because any given artistic practice that does not

embody that sort of representative immediacy—something to consider seriously when even abstract art has referentiality despite the low immediacy of such references—does not mean inexistence of representation. The fact that that referentiality is lower just makes it even harder to point it out politically and even morally, and therefore it is fair to assume that sound itself can escape more easily to the discipline of protocols and consequently less susceptible to censorship. But Coutinho continued on this line of thought and adds that this doesn't mean that we should not consider everything else that contributes to the practice of sound art, like listening which is something to be looked in the item below.

(3) Pedro Rocha contributed expressing emphatically the importance of 'listening' especially in the context of sound art. Such an element seems of great importance and is worth understanding since "in sound art, there is not only sound, there is listening, and therefore listening is not abstract, listening is done by people, people are not abstract (...) the works do not exist unless they are listened to" (full *think tank* transcripts are presented in Appendix A). The idea that listening clearly has been deteriorated in terms of sense hierarchization, at least in the Western culture, is something that also contributed to the conversation, in particular, when discussing the element of listening and its role in sound art. What, essentially, is at stake here is the subjectivity inherent in the act of listening, and not only that, but the potential that sound has for manipulation, something that Rocha extended on—sound is still very much used as an instrument for manipulation, exactly because of this theoretical lack of objectivity that allows people a permeability that perhaps what is given by sight no longer allows because there is an immediate reading.

To listen is to allow the affective facet of sound to infect us involuntarily. Nonetheless, we are able to consciously rationalize on the reverberation—or the affects—that sound has on us. For Diogo Tudela is not so much about the validity of sound in itself, but, sound as a vehicle or instrument to assess trauma and how does it reverberate on bodies. He, essentially, takes on the work of Mhomad Safa who also gave a lecture at the School of Arts to discuss this idea of the listening experience in the context of trauma. He discusses that the work of Safa, instead of focusing on sound as seconded, is more about what methodologies or cognitive structures does sound offer by coming into play. When we try to understand the trauma effect—for example, in warring contexts, which was the discussion in the aforementioned lecture by Safa—we need to apprehend the idea of 'tail', because if the trauma happens in the 'tail' of sound we can infer that the explosion itself is not relevant, the focal point of trauma is precisely when we can access the event that caused the trauma and without that there is no trauma. According to Tudela, sound allows you to tangentially access the thing and that's what you have to do in a trauma context. This seems to have something to do, at least in parallel, with the idea of 'listening' addressed here because in any censorious context we can attribute the controversy of any given subject or artwork to the susceptibilities and moral beliefs of individuals and/or institutions. That will generate discomfort, to say the least, which is not the same thing as trauma by any stretch of the imagination, nevertheless, to understand that very same 'tail' or reverberation that a specific sound causes on someone, might be helpful for this necessary distinction between 'sound' and 'listening' since sound art only exists by listening.

(4) The fourth aspect to be noticed was precisely what is producing sound in a work of sound art. Rocha expressed this notion by saying that sound can be produced by many things, and what is producing the sound can be subject to censorship. At this point, it became clear that one cannot merely "look" to the sound itself while listening, experiencing, navigating through the artwork. There's another dimension—apart from 'sound' and 'listening'—that requires special attention, and that is the device by which sound is being produced. It's not arbitrary to make such a consideration because there are a plethora of elements coming together to form

any given artwork, and sound art is no exception—“So I think it is important to identify all of this, everything that goes into a work of sound art that goes from the sound that is produced, to what produces the sound or where it happens, who hears it”. I acknowledge the aforementioned dimension, the device producing the sound, but there is also another one that may incur censure, which is the place as Pedro Rocha also mentioned. Where a work of sound art is presented can influence the circumstances that promote the act of censorship, and this observation forces us—in some sense—to consider all the dimensions that make up the artistic practice so, inevitably, we are led to admit certain regimes where it wouldn’t be possible to present the artwork without considering all of these dimensions. The relevance that this has in regard to this particular investigation is that in order to allude, properly, censorship, we have to precisely determine what are the element of an artwork that are likely to promote censorship, something that has been established as hard to define and describing categorically. Because this investigation deals with two very large, very complex and poorly defined phenomenons—for lack of a better word—which are censorship and sound art, everything that concur to the artistic body of work must be analyzed and, specially, curbed.

(5) The group circled many times around the definition of censorship itself, drawing interesting and insightful observations, e.g. if we encounter something unpopular that does not resonate with an audience or the popular culture, it’s unwise to axiomatically conclude that this is a representation of censorship. Miguel Carvalhais exemplified this by pointing out that when Stravinsky composed and presented *The Rite of Spring*, the fact that critics and audiences revolted at the time, is not an act of censorship but a negative reaction of the public to that specific composition, which is acceptable but not to be mistaken with a censorial act. Carvalhais further adds that—as artists—no one desires that negative reaction, nevertheless, artists have no control whatsoever over the audience’s reactions and sometimes they experience negative feedback, although, often “what we try as an artist is precisely to go against what the public expects, against what the prevailing norms, so to speak” (full *think tank* transcripts are presented in Appendix A).

It was concluded that it would be advantageous not to explore self-censorship, or autonomous censorship, only because—as Carvalhais putted it—it can arise from a myriad of motivations, and it is tremendously subjective in some cases, unless we’re discussing cases so evident that has to do with a clear political or religious censorship. This subjective element inherent of self-censorship is something to be avoid.

Defining clearly censorship was something regarded as beneficial by the group. Carvalhais and Rocha eventually addressed the matter of legality. We might exclude from the notion of censorship what operates in the illegal domain—“Censorship operates, in principle, only on what is legal” according to Carvalhais. But he also admits the possibility of something legal ‘magically’ transform into illegal, by discriminatory motivations and in a subjective way. At this moment Rocha called attention to the reality of autocratic regimes where the law is an instrument used to produce censorship. The climate of fear lived in Russia at the present, where by law, one cannot speak critically about the war in Ukraine. This law, preemptively, is adopting the function of censorship without the necessity of calling it censorship. This is what Pedro Rocha refereed to as laws that materialize censorship in an institutionalized way. To look for the complexity of censorship might mean that we are forced to look at the legal regimes currently available, which necessarily forces us to circumscribe it in geographical terms according to Carvalhais—“it is very different to discuss this here or there, in Russia or in China”.

Nonetheless, the group continued to highlight the trouble in defining censorship and bringing into the discussion legal matters wasn’t sufficient to draw a plausible assessment of censorship but it might be worth to understand all of the operative dynamics that underlie censorship.

(6) Finally, there is one last dimension to look at that can help on curbing and defining in a better way moral censorship. Rocha noticed that in regimes where religious fundamentalism exists in many of them, there is this relationship between music and God or with some other entity (...) everything that is produced in terms of sound, and that can be understood as a musical production even if it is not, therefore the fact that it is a monster that is made with sound but that is not music can perhaps be object of censorship, exactly because it does not correspond to the canons that establish this relationship between music and God.

It seems obvious once we start to discuss morality that eventually the conversation has to work its way onto a religious dimension, these two things are historically, culturally and forever mutually connected. It makes sense to study this relationship, as Rocha pointed out, since “religion establishes the moral principles... that govern society.” (full *think tank* transcripts are presented in Appendix A). One element that seems to have something to do with this dimension is taboo which was something also briefly mentioned in the conversation, but if we in fact try to understand what taboo means we will find that it has a direct connection with social and religious customs. It is not clear how exactly they are formulated firstly, if it is by social means or by religious means but it seems to be a predominantly religious custom. Historically speaking, we are talking about protocols escapes as Coutinho mentioned—since the 15th century, in fact, we have had polemics because there are escapes from protocols, so to speak, and that can be thought of as censorship, why? Because it goes outside the institutionalized schematism of teaching, or because there is a moral dimension there.

Any given institution appreciates protocols, they are built in that way, and, naturally, religious institutions share this same appreciation. As we are aware, art and religion have a relationship that goes back thousands of years when most of the artistic body of work that was produced was commissioned by ecclesiastical institutions. Diogo Tudela contributed with something that correlates with this—there are and have been many limitations when it comes to the production of artworks and its presentation as well, and sometimes these limitations are not clearly and specifically grounded on moral foundations, but perhaps deep down they are, and they can relate or even be a reflection of the Judaeo-Christian perspectives on the preservation of the body. “Ultimately we are in a Judeo-Christian society and the biological question of comfort, of the physical question (...) ultimately yes, we can mention that there is here a logic of corporal preservation, of the body that is not ours” (Tudela, 2022). Perhaps we could even argue that, not only is a question of corporal preservation but also a matter of preservation of moral beliefs, as that seems to be what drives moral censorship.

## **Conclusion of chapter two**

This chapter was solely reserved to the *think tank*, presenting its participants and discussing the results retrieved from that conversation. A clear and brief description of the participants was established by introducing each of them, understanding academic background and interests, past and present work as well as areas of expertise. Additionally, the reason for each of them to have been asked to participate and contribute to this discussion was briefly touched upon, making it clear that a contribution of art historical nature, image symbology, new media practices and thinking, music and sound art, and of course, a curatorial contribution from professional experience was something of great importance to enrich the group and the conversation in consequence.

As to the discussion and results in itself, there were six major observations considered to be important of further discussion and of research, even more. I will use this closing space to talk



briefly about one additional note that didn't make the six major topics because it didn't evolve in the conversation as much as the other topics, nevertheless, it seems to be promising as well to follow up, but first, the six major observations.

**Number one**, finding a parallel between abstract art and sound art. It became clear that this parallel, would necessarily had to be made by a principle of comparison, and only as that. We understand that abstract art is not sound art, but we also came to the understanding in the midst of the *think tank* that actually, 'abstract' is a term often used to describe sound itself, and that we don't really know why that is, so, the parallel established there is not entirely arbitrary, quite the contrarie. This parallel matters to the extent that it is uncertain—and often speculative—what elements of sound art may incur censorship and the frequent description of sound as 'abstract' indicated a certain advantage in understanding what has been censored in abstract art in order to better assess, by comparison, what may cause sound art to be censored.

**Number two**, apprehending the referentiality inherent in sound. As it came to be expressed many times during the *think tank*, art is almost always referential. Sound embodies a similar, if not the same, characteristic since even when a sound is manifested in anyway, and we don't have the visual reference of that sound in front of us, this process of referentiality starts to take place, it provokes things that takes us back to other things. But the question of whether is the sound presented to us or the references that we formulate of it that are subject to censorship still remains. Can that referentiality be eliminated from this consideration?

**Number three**, forming a logical relation with number two, is listening. As it was expressed very clearly, in sound art, there is not only sound, there is listening (...) the works do not exist unless they are listened to. So 'listening' represents a very important aspect of the practice itself specially when we are discussing censorship and how it relates with sound art. The subjectivity inherent in the act of listening is likely to be related to the censorious act—mainly because the aforementioned referentiality is not going to be the same for every single individual that listens to the same thing.

**Number four**, calls special attention to even more elements that come together to make up a work of sound art. These elements are the devices that produce sound and the place where it is being presented. Both of these are concrete and active constituents of a work of sound art, they concur to the artwork and for that reason they cannot be disregard when questioning if sound art is susceptible to censorship. This question forces an examination on all of the elements that concur to the sound artwork.

**Number five**, insists on reaching a better definition of censorship. The question of investigation addressed throughout this entire research cannot be studied and even discussed fairly if there isn't a clear understanding of what is censorship. For that, it is essential to consider the jurisprudential analysis on censorship, which will necessarily confine the discussion about censorship in geographical terms. Having this discussion considering every form of censorship is also unrecommended—e.g. autonomous censorship—otherwise it is difficult to leave the spiral of subjectivity and find a more categorical definition for this phenomenon. It is also worth distinguishing between negative reactions and feedback from the public and the actual act of censorship of a particular work of art.

**Number six**, examining the relationship between the moral canons established in our society—moral beliefs—and the religious dimension. Living in a society marked by mainly Judaeo-Christian values, and it is not unreasonable to think that those same values, firstly, are predominantly formulated by religious institutions and became apart of the social principles by which we take advantage of them—to some degree—in order to live socially, secondly, it is not surprising that those values influence the artistic practice—whether to celebrating them or denying them—and of course, being incorporated into the artistic vein those values, when expressed, are definitely subject to some censorship, very likely moral censorship.

I mention one additional note that didn't make the five major topics but that is worth of consideration and that is to discover why exactly sound art only had its first appearance in China in the year 2000 since this is a practice that exists in the Western world since the 80's—at least recognizable as 'Sound Art'. This is not arbitrary as well because this whole investigation derived from the comment of the Chinese sound artist Dajun Yao saying "(...) as long as there are no words or lyrics involved, sound is harmless to the state". It was brought to my attention during the *think tank* that it would be productive to get in touch with artists of that particular scene in that particular geographic context to understand what led to the appearance of sound art in China much later than in the Western world and how exactly is their understanding of these relationship between censorship and sound art.

## CONCLUSION

### Final Considerations and Perspectives

In this chapter I will synthesize the contributions in all of the different areas of study and also contribute with perspectives for future work. This research was developed at the intersection of two complex and broad concepts—censorship and sound art. Their relationship was studied by identifying each of them, understanding their complexity and meanings, getting to a better comprehension of their relationship in order to understand how can we properly approach the question of investigation presented in this research—Is Sound Art susceptible to censorship?

I set out to investigate if this question can be righteously addressed. Naturally, the complexity of censorship and the broad, sometimes multiple interpretations regarding sound art, was challenging to the core. Nevertheless, this research analyzes and delineates—to some degree—the extensive definitions of censorship with particular focus on moral censorship, the modes of censorship regarding its manifestation, and it apprehends, accordingly with some literature review, the meaning of sound art and its conceptions as an art form. The necessary contextualization of both of these concepts are unavoidable if one wants to answer, or even address, the question of this investigation. It is absolutely incumbent to understand in an unambiguous way these concepts, there is the need to understand clearly what constitutes censorship as well as sound art if we want to be able to answer the question that is proposed in this investigation. This research also aimed to gather a group of experts and individuals with experience, both theoretically and practically, to put forward the question raised by this investigation not only to understand third-party perspectives on this problematic but mainly to form a set of possible directions, a conceptual framework that allows to identify the problematic and frame a better set of questions in order to circumscribe the investigation properly.

In the first chapter, I go through a contextualization of sound art and censorship. So what is sound art and what is censorship?

To answer the question of sound art, we first realize the diversity of the practice and all the different backgrounds that accommodates to a very large number of artists—as seen in the beginning of sub-chapter 1.1 of the first chapter. We also learned by authors such as Licht, Landy (2016) and Maes (2013) about the three concepts encompassed in sound artistic practices, **sonic art** (which has to do with the unification it provides to syntax in sound in art), **sounding art** (incorporation of musical principles in the sonorous, environmental and art concepts broader than sound art), and **sound art** (artistic dimension with contemporary relevance by affirming sound in art) with the latter being the main focused concept in this investigation. It is also important to establish, categorically, how can we identify an artwork as sound art. That was achieved by looking at the thirteen parameters proposed by Maes (2013). And finally, we manage to understand the two main groups or clusters that represent almost two different identities of sound art given their constant recurrence in sound artistic expression—sound sculptures and sound installations.

To answer the question of censorship, we start by understanding the broader definition as it is described as a process of imposing checks, direct or indirect, governmental or otherwise on the exercise of one's freedom of expression, or free speech as it is argued by Shameek Sen (2014). Through literary review, this research proposes to look at censorship, when trying to approach it categorically, as a two dimension phenomenon, with one dimension being concern with types of censorship that has to do with the ground by which something or someone is in fact censored, and the other dimension being related to the modes of censorship that O'Higgins (1972) takes a look at, and these modes has to do—from this research perspective—as to how censorship manifests itself, who exercises this process. We came to make a distinction between these two dimensions, the types of censorship are frequently described as **political**, **military** and **moral**.

The modes of censorship, on the other hand, are presented by O’Higgins as such: **autonomous, legal, extra-legal, social, voluntary** and **subterranean**—as they are described in depth in the sub-chapter 2 of the first chapter.

Both of these two dimensions addressed in this research—censorship and sound art—aren’t flawlessly defined because in reality they operate in ambiguous ways. It is still unclear where the boundaries exist, both for censorship and sound art. This investigation became very much aware of this challenge but it is important to promote this discussion in order to get to a more define, clear and unambiguous description of the two dimensions addressed here. Only then can we understand better how they relate with one another, and even if they can relate with one another. For these reasons, this research brought together a relatively small group of people—known as *Think Tank*—in order to grasp a possible framework to study properly the question of investigation proposed by this research.

As we came to apprehend in the chapter of the *Think Tank*, there is still a need for a better assessment of what exactly is moral censorship, and what exactly are we talking about when we talk about sound art. These are concepts that must be very well curbed. But, as it was the objective with this *think tank*, we can know formulate better questions in order to come closer to that categorical definition so necessary, and we can also establish proper conceptual frameworks to help future researches to clarify this problematic in a suitable way. Our proposition is: **Number one**, to draw a parallelism between abstract art and sound art. It was explained why this makes sense in the sub-chapter 5 of the *think tank* chapter, but briefly, this would allow us to understand, by comparison, what led to abstract art to be censored and if that could be applied as well to sound art since we commonly describe sound as being ‘abstract’; **Number two**, understand how sound is referential. Even without words or lyrics it is hard to deviate ourselves from references and sound, similarly to art, is almost always referential, i.e. it provokes things that takes us back to other things; **Number three**, it is necessary to consider the importance of listening. By not considering sound on its own, we understand that in sound art there is not only sound, there is listening as well, and this element must too be considered by looking at the inherent subjectivity of the act of listening—which relates to the referentiality itself—and by making a clear distinction between sound and listening. This is a topic already covered by many authors (Voëgelin, 2021; Nancy, 2002; Schafer, 1994; Oliveros, 2005); **Number four**, what is producing sound may also be subject to censorship. We have to consider everything that concurs to sound art as it is the devices that triggers the sound; **Number five**, better define censorship itself. This is imperative in order to discuss what this research addresses. That might be achieved by considering the jurisprudential analysis on censorship, which will necessarily confine the discussion about censorship in geographical terms. Defining it, also implies a necessary distinction between disliking and criticizing an artwork and actually censoring one. **Number six**, analyze the existent relationship between the moral canons established in society and the religious dimension. It is essential to make a clear assessment of morality, without which we cannot refine this conception and therefore making it impossible for us to discuss clearly about moral censorship.

This research does not propose to find categorical answers to the question of investigation as it looks at two distinct phenomena—censorship and sound art—but both have similar traits. Both operate in very ambiguous ways. To be able to study the question of whether Sound Art is susceptible to censorship or not, one has to emphatically answer against the ambiguity aforementioned.

It would be opportune to extend this investigation by following the suggestions of the *think tank*, reformulate some of the questions that are being addressed, achieve better defined frameworks so that one can circumscribe the research in a manner that properly identifies the problematic.

The knowledge and methodologies developed and argued in this investigation, provides a much more solid foundation to study the relationship between censorship, particularly moral, and sound art, in order to promote this discussion and awareness of these two dimensions that haven't been addressed together, and that there is not a way of answering categorically to the question hovering this research, is Sound Art susceptible to censorship?

## Bibliography

Attali, J. (1985). *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*, trans. B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985.

Campeato, L. (2009). A Metamorphosis of the muses: Referential and Contextual Aspects in Sound Art. *Organised Sound*, 14(01), 27-37.

Creswell, John W. (2015). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA. SAGE Publications.

Dajuin, Y. (n.d.). *Revolutions Per Minute: Sound Art China*[Site web]. Retrieved from <http://revolutionsperminutefest.org/SoundArtChina/#Events>

Elce, E. B. (2018). Introduction: Unsettling the Spectator. *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, 51(2), 5–12. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45151153>

Gonzalez Rice, K. (2014). No Pictures, Performance Research, 19:1, 15-24, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13528165.2014.908080>

Gresham-Lancaster, S. (2012). Relationships of sonification to music and sound art. *AI & SOCIETY*, 27(2), 207–212. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00146-011-0337->

Kociałkowska, K. (2020). *The Aesthetics of Censorship and the Russian Avant-Garde: Abstraction Beyond Art* (Doctoral thesis). <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.52045>

Labelle, B. (2006). *Background Noise Perspectives on Sound Art* [Electronic Version of Printed Book]. Retrieved from: [https://textinart.files.wordpress.com/2018/10/labelle2cbrandon-backgroundnoise\\_noocr\\_sompagesmissing\\_copy.pdf](https://textinart.files.wordpress.com/2018/10/labelle2cbrandon-backgroundnoise_noocr_sompagesmissing_copy.pdf)

Landy, L. (2016) *But Is It (Also) Music?* Retrieved from: <https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315770567.ch1>

Levin, G. (2007). Censorship, Politics and Sexual Imagery in the Work of Jewish-American Feminist Artists. *Nashim: A Journal of Jewish Women's Studies & Gender Issues*, 14, 63–96. <https://doi.org/10.2979/nas.2007.-.14.63>

Mackay, R. (2009). *Climate of Bass Hunter: Sleeve notes for Florian Hecker, Acid in the Style of David Tudor* (Editions Mego)[Site web]. Retrieved from <http://readthis.wtf/writing/climate-of-bass-hunter/>

Maes, L. (2013) *Sounding Sound Art: A study of the definition, origin, context, and techniques of sound art* [Electronic Version of Printed Book] Retrieved from: <http://up.laura.annaville.net/LauraMaessoundingsoundart.pdf>

Morais, Ana Bela. (2016). Censored and Banned: Portuguese Films during the Government of Marcello Caetano (1968–74). *Portuguese Studies*, 32(1), 88–107. <https://doi.org/10.5699/portstudies.32.1.0088>

Osorio, L. C. (2018). La Bête - Depois da intolerância, alguma conversa. **In** L. Duarte (Ed.), *Arte, Censura, Liberdade: Reflexões à Luz do Presente* (pp. 41-48). Cobogó.

Pereira, A, & Almeida, Rui P. (2011). O Estado Novo[Site web]. Retrieved from <https://ensina.rtp.pt/artigo/o-estado-novo/>

Rolnik, S. (2018).O Abuso da Vida - Medula do inconsciente colonial-capitalístico. **In** L. Duarte (Ed.), *Arte, Censura, Liberdade: Reflexões à Luz do Presente* (pp. 184-227). Cobogó.

Shusterman, R. (1984). Aesthetic Censorship: Censoring Art for Art's Sake. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 43(2), 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.2307/429991>

Voegelin, S. (2021, 3 11). To Know from the Invisible[On-line Lecture]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ND2m4-Dw8Eo>

## APPENDIX A

### Think Tank Transcriptions (Versão Portuguesa)

1 moderador : Duarte Maltez — DM

4 oradores : Vânia Maria Coutinho — VMC

Diogo Tudela — DT

Miguel Carvalhais — MC

Pedro Rocha — PR

1 orientador: José Gomes — JG

**DM:** Diogo...

**DT:** Sim?

**DM:** Estava aqui só a começar a fazer uma breve introdução e uma contextualização da investigação, e a explicar mais ou menos como é que.. o porquê desta mesa redonda... hum, se quiseres posso, posso, hum, comentar novamente o que estava a falar com o resto dos participantes. Pronto, basicamente, a minha investigação é acerca da censura na sound art e estava só a tentar explicar que gostava de balizar aqui algumas coisas para não nos perdermos e para estarmos todos no mesmo pé de situação nesta conversa, que era, quando estivermos a falar de censura gostava que nos focássemos mais na censura moral, e hum, e quando falo de arte sonora, gostava de excluir a música porque é isso que estou a fazer na investigação, estou a excluir a música e estou a excluir o auxílio ou a assistência da linguagem, da palavra daquele regime semântico, no som. E esses eram dois grandes elementos que eu gostava só de balizar antes de mais para podermos estar todos em sintonia, hum, e estava a explicar também porque é que decidi fazer este focus group. Essencialmente porque, da análise de literatura que eu fui fazendo ao longo deste ultimo ano, vi que era insuficiente para responder a esta questão que eu coloco, que é, se a arte sonora é passível de ser cesurada. E por essa mesma razão, senti a necessidade de trazer participantes da área, do meio artístico, sejam curadores, programadores, artistas, académicos etc, pessoal que já esteja a par e dentro do meio para poder abrir o diálogo e esta discussão de uma forma mais, enfim, mais fixe mais alargada para podermos ter uma reflexão em conjunto sobre, sobre este assunto e sobre esta questão específica. Ia pedir-vos agora só, brevemente para fazerem uma pequena apresentação vossa, a vossa área, o background etc, e se calhar podíamos começar, eu tenho aqui em primeiro lugar a Maria Coutinho, se não se importar...

**VMC:** Não me importo nada Duarte, obrigada por este convite tenho a certeza que vai ser uma conversa interessante. Hum, em primeiro lugar cumpro dizer que eu não tenho qualquer conhecimento nem teórico nem empírico se quisermos, sobre o campo da sound art. Portanto a minha participação aqui vai ser, exclusivamente se quisermos como historiadora da arte, como alguém que tem trabalhado... não só no campo da história de arte especificamente, mas também na teoria de arte, historiografia de arte e da estética, e esse é o meu background a minha



experiência quer de ensino quer de investigação, portanto vai ser nesse sentido que eu farei, hum, se assim se justificar, hum comentários neste debate.

**DM:** Claro... hum Miguel, quer?

**MC:** Ah, posso posso. Olá, eu sou professor na Faculdade de Belas Artes, no departamento de Design, onde ensinou sobretudo design para meios computacionais, para pôr a coisa assim. Sou também músico ou artista sonora, ou ambos. Hum não sei muito bem onde é que estão as fronteiras muitas vezes, hum e nesse, nessa minha vida, ou nesse lado da minha vida trabalho com o Pedro Tudela, há um ror de tempo... em performance em, fazemos muitas instalações sonoras e de vez em quando fazemos outras coisas, como música para teatro e coisas desse género. Mas, temos estado muito ativos naquilo que se pode inscrever no campo da arte sonora, nomeadamente com as instalações que fazemos. Hum, para além disso também trabalho com outras colaborações algumas que também envolvem o Tudela, como, sei lá, o quarteto Máquina Magnética que temos agora mas a minha colaboração mais regular é com o Pedro. Hm, não sei muito bem o que é que eu tenho, isto para continuar na cena do que a Maria disse, não sei muito bem o que é que eu posso dizer sobre censura, porque, felizmente acho que não tenho experiência nenhuma nisso. Mas, mas enquanto músico enquanto académico e também enquanto, hm, editor porque outra das coisas que eu faço é dirigir uma editora chamada Crónica também há um ror de tempo, hm, talvez possa ser útil para a conversa, mas acima de tudo estou, sei lá, estou aqui muito interessado em ouvir e colaborarei no que conseguir.

**DM:** Claro. Pedro, quer seguir?

**PR:** Olá a todos e olá Duarte, muito obrigado pelo convite. Hum, eu trabalho como programador e curador, antes era programador agora é curador. E, hum, de música, performance e projetos de arte sonora também como instalações, trabalho fundamentalmente na Fundação de Serralves, faço isso desde 1999. Hum, e paralelamente também tenho feito outros projetos também ligados à curadoria, hum noutras instituições e alguns festivais e alguns projetos, mas pronto, basicamente a minha área de trabalho é curadoria ligada à música, à performance, nomeadamente à performance sonora, e à arte sonora também com os projetos que organizei. Relativamente a este assunto confesso também que não é propriamente um assunto sobre o qual me tenha dedicado a pensar e, talvez porque, provavelmente em Portugal, hum, seremos mais privilegiados no que diz respeito a esta problemática, hum, mas também estou aberto, hum, claro e é um assunto que me interessa refletir sobre esta... sobre a censura ligada à Arte Sonora.

**DM:** Muito bem. Diogo?

**DT:** Está tudo Duarte? Tudo bem disposto?

**DM:** Tudo bem.

**DT:** Olá a todos, tudo bem? Hum, eh pá, apresentar-me não é? Então pronto, dou, vendo aulas aqui na católica, onde tu as compras também. Hum, eh pá, de vez em quando lá vou trabalhar com alguma coisa com sound art. Domino muito pouco o tema e tenho alguma curiosidade

porque, nos discutimos isto já brevemente, há um par de meses atrás, que é um tema, é assim um ângulo, pah, gabo-te a coragem porque te apercebeste que não há bibliografia sobre o assunto e ainda assim assumires o assunto enquanto tal, hum, pah tanto pode correr muito mal mas acima de tudo...

**DM:** Exatamente...

**DT:** ... coragem ninguém te pode dizer que não a tens, isso aí, já é, já é alguma coisa não é. Hum, não domino o tema, tenho algumas curiosidades sobre, sobre que particularidades materiais é que o som poderá ter para de alguma maneira, segundo o que tu viste, se pode esquivar ou ter esquivado a este tipo de, hum, de filtros não é, de qual especificamente de, de censura moral não é, que é algo muito específico. E para isto, estou aqui para trocar repetidos com toda a gente, não é, hum, e pronto e acho que, convém, no tema de censura, falar, mencionar que o Professor Doutor José Alberto Gomes está ali, está a ouvir tudo e a tomar notas de toda a gente, tipo Stasi, por isso é preciso ter cuidado com o que vai acontecer aqui ah...

**DM:** Ahah. Muito bem.

**DT:** Duarte, e obrigado Duarte, até já.

**DM:** De nada, obrigado eu. Hum, é assim eu percebo, eu percebo que todos vocês também estejam a sentir um bocado, hum, não sei muito bem o que é que posso estar a... qual é que pode ser o meu contributo mas, mas essencialmente eu, acho que pode ser uma conversa interessante, precisamente por ter pessoas também de áreas, próximas mas distintas, curadoria, historiadora de arte, músicos, artistas sonoros, e acho que pode ser uma conversa interessante a ter nesse sentido, hum, e quando falo de censura moral essencialmente é porque, dessa literatura que também fui, fui, fui analisando, percebi que a censura moral, normalmente é a que esta mais associada a práticas artísticas, e como eu, para efeitos da investigação, precisava de me focar um bocadinho mais na censura, hum, num tipo específico de censura e daí a censura moral por ser a mais, a mais, o alvo mais comum da prática artística, hum, mas enfim, acho que pode ser uma conversa interessante por isso mesmo também, e sem mais demoras também, iniciava então a conversa. E gostava de partir com uma citação, e de vos expor a uma citação que eu li há uns tempos atrás e que me intrigou muito e que foi quase como o trigger para esta investigação, que é uma citação de um artista sonora chinês, Dajuin Yao, que escreveu um ensaio para a *Revolutions Per Minute: Sound Art in China* e falou precisamente da censura na sound art e aquilo que ele diz é muito resumida... é muito, muito brevemente diz que, and is there censorship for sound, sound art and experimental music? E a resposta dele é que, the disappointing fact is that, sound, without the assistance of... the assistance of language, words or lyrics, sound is harmless to the state, ou seja, sem a assistência da linguagem, sem palavras e sem letras, o som não revela qualquer tipo de, de coisa negativa para o estado. E esta citação intrigou-me muito e foi um bocado a partir daqui que, que esta investigação começou e que, a questão de investigação foi-se construindo, se a arte sonora é passível de ser censurada. Eu acho que a partir dessa citação eu gostava que vocês, se calhar, refletissem um bocadinho e, enfim, falassem um bocadinho do que é que acham desta citação... Hum, Diogo, queres começar tu?

**DT:** Eh pah, sim claro, eh pah eu fico com algumas comichões com essa, com essa, hum, com a citação desse senhor. Hum, pah, com bastantes mesmo na verdade. Hum, porque se isso for verdade, pah, e em várias escalas, ou seja se isso for verdade para... para o som é verdade para qualquer outra coisa que não tenha essa carga semântica ou linguística... hum percebes não faz sentido... percebes então uma imagem também não o fará, o cinema também não o fará e... eh pah esta história revela-nos o oposto. Além disso, e eh pah eu sei que tu te queres esquivar à questão musical nesta altura do campeonato mas eu acho que é possível ainda assim, hum, que será mais fácil pelo menos para já nesta fase, hum, aderirmos à questão musical, hum, ou seja, à música, não há parte musical, mas à parte sónica ao complemento sónico musical mas se fores a ver toda a história que tu terás eventualmente de, pah, desde ritmos que são, que são proibidos, de instrumentos que são proibidos, não é ou seja, tu em Trás-os-Montes era proibido na altura da, ditadura tu não podias tocar gaita de foles, não tocas, não é, estás a recuperar toda uma paisagem sonora, toda um densidade que não pode estar a jogo no Portugal de Estado Novo. E isso repara, é, esta proibição, o Zé está a ouvir e vai, vai-se já, ficar já mal disposto, mas é essa proibição, proibição do... do registo sonoplástico, não é, não estamos a falar de uma canção que é proibida, ou, ou de umas notas que são proibidas ou escalas que são proibidas, também, isso também aconteceu mas estás a falar de um instrumento, de um som que é proibido porque vai aludir a um universo qualquer não é, e se tu pensares nisso, também não é, toda a história, acho que nós já falamos sobre isso algumas vezes, hum, toda a história que tu tens, e é preciso fazer aqui uma distinção daquilo que é a música africana como música que é negra não é, são coisas diferentes... toda, todo o lado de guerrilha de estrutura, estruturação espectral sónica que o Dub tem por exemplo, opa há aí qualquer coisa que me está a falhar na observação, hum, pah isso nem... se tu subscreveres, ou se alguém subscrever esse tipo de... de leitura, válida como outra qualquer, estás a subscrever qualquer possibilidade plástica não, não... não queria estar a usar o termo semântico não é, mas, não literal não discursiva nesse sentido mais prosaico que um objeto sonoro ou artístico poderá ter, se isso for verdade está tudo fodido, peço desculpa o francês.

**DM:** Sintam-se à vontade de... de intervir.

**MC:** Okay... Não, estava... estava aqui a pensar. Eu também acho que não concordo muito com isso até porque... lá está, as palavras obviamente ou para, para te... parafrasear o regime semântico da linguagem é muito importante mas não é facilmente... não é fácil circunscrevê-lo. Não é fácil dizer que a música não tem significado semântico. Por exemplo, eu estava... a primeira coisa que me veio à cabeça quando, quando comecei a pensar nisto foram aquelas cenas do Amarcord de Felini em que alguém põe a Internationale a tocar no cimo da igreja não é, sem letra porque a letra não é necessária... E lá está tu tens, e... e se começar a pensar nisso a sério encontro muita coisa sei lá, ali no meio dos meus cd's onde temos significados semânticos e temos um papel semântico muito forte, quer de música, ou de coisas que podemos identificar como música ou de outras coisas que são... pura e simplesmente tímbricas não é, e lá está viu não sei, não sei muito bem... é-me difícil perceber onde é que está a fronteira entre a arte sonora e a música não é, porque lá está em alguns casos é evidente, é imediatamente óbvio mas, mas existe uma zona cinzenta muito... uma zona de porosidade muito grande que... que me pode ser difícil distinguir, e aliás, também existe muita arte sonora que faz uso da linguagem, faz um, um uso muitíssimo apurado da linguagem e... lá está, não podemos destrizar as coisas tão claramente quanto isso na minha modesta opinião.

**VMC:** Contribuindo aqui para uma... Ah desculpa Pedro.

**PR:** Desculpa Maria avança, avança.

**VMC:** Não força. Se calhar tu vais continuar no mesmo registo eu vou sair um bocadinho fora, portanto se quiseres...

**PR:** Eu também ia sair um bocadinho fora ia só colocar uma questão relativamente à, ao... ao que é objeto de censura que eu acho que essa, essa citação é um bocadinho focada, hum, na... na apresentação pública de um trabalho não é, e eu acho que a censura pode estar, hum nascente ou a jusante da criação artística portanto, não é só... a censura sobre um determinado objeto, determinada obra, mas pode estar, a censura pode estar no acesso que os artistas têm a determinado, a determinada coisa que eles querem explorar não é, e acho que também é preciso ver que às vezes as cosas não são censuradas porque antes, ou já há uma censura prévia sobre o que é que é possível de ser produzido e... queria só deixar esta nota que acho que é importante a deslocalizar um bocadinho estes... princípios operativos da censura.

**DM:** Hm hm.

**DT:** Desculpa posso só... desculpa lá, hm, conseguias me dar um possível exemplo, eu não consegui apanhar, eu acho que consegui apanhar mais ou menos a posição que tentaste fazer aí mas conseguias-me exemplificar um bocadinho mais, é possível? Só para eu...

**PR:** Não tenho propriamente um exemplo mas imagino que, se... para um artista...

**VMC:** Poder editar... poder editar um disco. Eventualmente não é?

**PR:** Ou um artista que na China que queira fazer um trabalho que explore... sei lá... sons ligados a... ao corpo ou... ele nem sequer vai, se calhar nem vai conseguir fazer... partir para, fazer o projeto porque já há uma censura prévia àquilo que ele tem acesso ou sobre, um projeto sobre, hum, princípios democráticos de produção, ou....

**DT:** Falas nisso como... da censura moral ou seja prévia na... vá numa fase de produção ou seja, tu não acederes a...

**PR:** Sim, sim.

**DT:** ... material para produzir?

**PR:** Extramente sim.

**DT:** Okay, já percebi. Desculpa desculpa...

**PR:** Portanto já há assuntos que são tabu não é, e portanto os próprios artistas já não, já nem sequer se vão dedicar a eles porque sabem que à partida o resultado irá ser censurado portanto, também há esta auto-censura que tem a ver com o meio onde os artistas se, se inserem não é, por isso também há que pensar nesta, que... que censura não se encontra só depois não é, tens o objeto artístico e queres apresentá-lo e não te deixam, é censurado e não sei quê. Também há, algo que está também antes... queria só deixar esta, esta nota porque acho que também é importante de se refletir, sim. Maria desculpa tinha-te interrompido...

**VMC:** Não, não. Diogo queres continuar o diálogo?

**DT:** Não não, eu depois... eu entro a seguir.

**VMC:** Está bem, pronto. O que eu queria dizer Duarte, um coisa que me chamou logo à atenção com, o documento introdutório. A ideia de censura moral, é uma ideia também ela bastante expandida. E... não sei se pode ajudar nesta reflexão tentar, introduzir alguma... orientação tipológica do que pode ser essa censura moral, porque pensado nisto no campo da arte, mesmo que eu esquematize entre política, militar, no caso académica tradicional, há uma dimensão moral sempre inerente a qualquer gesto condenatório ou inibidos quer da prática artística quer da sua exibição e portanto a dimensão moral nunca está ausente, no fundo a censura moral é, neste sentido não é, podemos pensar que é toda ela, todo o gesto de interditar, ou interditar ou banir ou... já é por si mesmo uma ação moral com uma dimensão ética associada mas pronto isto é, é paralelo. O que eu penso relativamente a esta dúvida e por isso é que a citação me faz alguma espécie mas enfim eu não sou mesmo do meio, é que, pensando na arte e o campo da imagem é, mais complicado porque mesmo que nós, e podemos fazer uma espécie de redução formal ao máximo, levando para a abstração ou explorações meramente plásticas, retirando toda a referencialidade pelo menos imediata, há problemas de censura na mesma que não têm que ver com o entendimento, com o nível de inteligibilidade da criação artística, não tem a ver com a identificação das formas dos seus significados, portanto não tem a ver com o entendimento de uma linguagem imediata, ou da participação de uma linguagem imediata. Tem que ver justamente com a forma como se lida com esses dispositivos formais ou com o próprio medium. E essa forma, esse, essa liberdade exploratória como aconteceu no início em algumas circunstâncias da história do abstracionismo, mas este é um exemplo mais radical, ela foi censurada porque violava protocolos compositivos, e porque violava uma concessão estética vigente, uma espécie de discurso histórico que está inerente à música, pergunto se, na mesma medida, não se pode pensar isto para a música, sendo que o facto de não ter as palavras ou não ser melódica, só faz com que ela escape mais facilmente porque não é tão facilmente apreendida por quem tem mecanismos de poder e portanto de censura, mas ainda assim não deixa de poder de ser alvo de censura, porque sai fora dos protocolos compositivos porque tem outra estética, porque, exercita as suas formalidades de uma forma bastante expandida não é, e temos connosco duas pessoas que trabalham na contemporaneidade aqui, e a ideia de sound art é, é o intuito porque tivemos esta discussão não é, é uma coisa mesmo muito alargada, portanto é fácil poder entrar em campos onde o próprio campo, balizando as suas fronteiras, entenda aquilo como estando já a desviar-se... não sei se me fiz entender.

**DM:** Sim sim sim, de facto. Hum, eu acho que se calhar, depois de ter investigado um bocadinho mais comecei a perceber, a perceber que se calhar é mais fácil, entre aspas, é melhor começar a estudar um bocadinho que tipo de regime é que se trata o som, e por causa de ser um regime invisível e mais abstrato mas por causa desta invisibilidade também, o que é que existe nele que lhe confere, ou que lhe pode conferir, hum, censurabilidade por assim dizer.

**DT:** Hum podes repetir essa palavra, desculpa Duarte. O que lhe pode conferir?

**DM:** Censura, ser alvo de censura.

**DT:** Ah okay.

**DM:** E tentar perceber, de que forma é que este regime que é o som, que é abstrato que é invisível, como é que ainda assim pode ser alvo de censura, neste caso moral, e depois isso era claro, fazer a ponte do som para a sound art, mas, mas a lógica era tentar entender um bocadinho melhor do que é que estamos a falar quando estamos a falar de som, e de som sem assistência da linguagem e de palavras...

**DT:** Mas oh Duarte posso só, posso só deixar aqui uma coisa que acho que é importante, só aqui... isto ainda... se não se importar claro. O Pedro disse uma coisa que me pareceu importante, e que acho que aqui pode ajudar aqui um bocadinho a definir, o enquadramento da tua investigação não é. Eu por acaso estava a pensar no que o Pedro estava a dizer, e penso que tendo em conta o enquadramento que queres dar, e tu estas a tentar investigar uma realidade muito específica, e a seguir por acaso gostava de te perguntar o que é que tu queres dizer com abstrato que é muito complicado usares esse termo para o que quer que seja mas para o som, se calhar ainda mais ainda. Hum, há aqui hum... se de facto existir uma censura do ponto de vista de produção não é, ou seja, até posso estar a pensar fazer uma peça sonora sobre, sei lá vaquinhas, não interessa, e isto pode estar num contexto em que não posso estar a gravar vacas porque, algum motivo, eu não sei se essa censura que decorre num episódio destes, e acho que seria mais ou menos esta a tipologia que estavas a definir não era Pedro, ou seja, eu não conseguir ter acesso a um material qualquer para produzir uma peça... não é... certo não é, que o regime material dessa censura esteja associado ao som por si só, ou seja eu posso ter, eu posso estar a pensar numa peça sonora qualquer, e quero fazer uma peça sobre documentos, eh pá sei lá, sobre os documentos, olha da Stasi, ainda há bocadinho falamos sobre... foi o José. Hum e eu não tenho acesso aos documentos, essa censura não está, grounded no som. Ou seja, ou na materialidade do som. Faz sentido isto, ou nem por isso Pedro?

**PR:** Sim faz, mas eu acho que, o som mesmo não tendo, hum, não sendo associado a uma linguagem, a palavras e não sei quê, não deixa de poder ter referências, hum...

**DT:** Sim, sim sim.

**PR:** E essas referências serem, serem alvo de censura. Estou-me a lembrar, por exemplo, que tenho um CD dos Ultra-Red em que eles fazem, é um CD de field-recordings basicamente, em que eles vão para um parque onde há engate e gravam os sons do engate naquele caso. Portanto o som, apesar de não existir, não existe em palavras mas há uma referência que é clara naquele som. Portanto, hum, eu não sei até que ponto é que é, possível de desligar completamente o som de referências. Acho... acho isto difícil.

**DT:** Não mas eu concordo contigo a 100% Pedro, tanto é que daí parte da minha provocação ao Duarte, o porquê do abstrato aqui no meio, que é que isso quer dizer não é, e acho que nós temos uma péssima tradição de usar o termo abstrato no contexto artístico, que é tipo, é mesmo... *wrong*, e não serve nada nem a ninguém na minha modesta opinião. Mas a minha questão é imagina, nesse caso específico tu... imagina, neste caso específico, vamos pegar nesse exemplo não é, desse disco, falamos que o pessoal vai fazer, vai gravar som de pessoal a engatar-se nos parques. Mas vamos imaginar num contexto, não é... isto só para perceber que vias é que podem existir aqui. Vamos pegar neste exemplo e imaginar um contexto em que, estamos no local em que questão de posição apolítica e etc, não há engates no parque, não existe engates no parque. Por isso essa obra sonora, não poderia existir não é... Hum, e isso acho que é, era um bocado este o cenário que estavas a descrever na tua primeira intervenção. Mas aquilo, a censura que decorre ou que incorre no facto de não existir engates no parque não é ... não será o sítio mais *hot* em termos de *dating* em parque... hum, o Miguel pelo vistos teve outros conhecimentos sobre o assunto... hum, mas essa censura não é uma censura que esteja fundada, ou pelo menos não está totalmente fundada, não é ou seja... está fundado num regime legal qualquer que tem que ver que não há *dates* nos parque ou que não há engates nos parque ou o que quer que seja, e não, obrigatoriamente... no evento que é veiculado sonicamente. Faz sentido isto, ou nem por isso?

**PR:** Sim, sim faz sentido. Hum... mas se... isto foi um exemplo que eu dei muito, muito prático porque, realmente... a própria... nas próprias gravações, sendo que aquilo são sons ligados a práticas sexuais globais. Mas, hum... não precisas de legenda, aquilo é... o facto de não existir, estás num regime em que não existe um parque para engatares não quer dizer que, no imaginário das pessoas que vivem esse... regime, não exista esse imaginário, que não exista uma vontade por exemplo de explorar uma coisa como essa. Portanto ele não deixa, hum, e é isso, é aí que acho que... e depois também o carácter do próprio resultado, hum... no próprio resultado é habitado por essas referências em que óbvio donde é que aqueles sons vêm.

**DT:** Não claro, sim sim... Claro okay.

**MC:** Sim, sim os sons são, lá está, nesse sentido os sons não são abstratos. Mas... eu não conheço essa peça, ou se ouvi não me lembro dela, isso é assim tão claro sem, se a assistência de paratextos, ou seja...

**PR:** Acho que, neste exemplo é bastante claro, que dizer ouvem-se cintos a despertar... é...

**MC:** Ah okay.

**PR:** Portanto é, tudo é bastante óbvio. Mas... também eu acho que pode ser mesmo em caso que não seja tão óbvio também pode haver uma censura moral sobre a própria qualidade do som e eu acho que... se calhar em alguns regimes o som, o *noise* por exemplo, uma coisa muito brutal pode ser encarada como um desafio ao que é moralmente aceite enquanto o universo sonoro ao qual as pessoas têm acesso...

**DM:** Mas nesse sentido de que forma, ou que fundamentos possíveis é que podem existir para existir censura nesse contexto, nesse contexto mais radical, mais físico, de fiscalidade do som?

**PR:** Acho que tem a ver com ideologias não é, de quem, da ideologia de quem censura... hum, não sei exatamente. Hum... não sou um expert no assunto mas acredito em que haja... a Maria falava de à pouco, da censura da arte abstrata, eu acho que se bem me lembro o primeiro quadro de arte abstrata do Kandinsky foi censurada pelo regime soviético, e esteve décadas sem ser mostrado, portanto... não era, acho que tinha a ver com princípios sobre o, que são... o que é que é, o que é que é mostrado ou o que é que as pessoas podem ter acesso.

**MC:** Sim, mas a minha questão é, isso é censura moral, ou é censura política? Porque eu não sei muito bem onde é que está a fronteira entre as duas...

**VMC:** Pois, pois...

**MC:** Como o Duarte foi tão peremptório nesta questão, estamos a falar de censura moral, não estamos a falar de outras coisas, eu não sei exatamente, mas se calhar, o Duarte é a melhor pessoa para nos esclarecer não é.

**VMC:** É que não é muito fácil de pensar, porque se eu pensar nos exemplos mesmo da academia e não precisamos de ir para coisas tão radicais como estava a dizer à pouco, de abstracionismo, representação de temas polémicos, desde, desde o século XV na verdade que temos polémicas porque há fugas aos protocolos por assim dizer, e aquilo pode ser pensado como censura porquê? Porque sai fora do esquematismo institucionalizado de ensino, ou porque há uma dimensão moral ali. Porque o problema era, as cores eram provocantes, o mau tratamento das figuras era demasiado violento, ou dada altura como Monet, a maneira como se retratam as mulheres vai contra protocolos sociais portanto há uma dimensão moralizante e por aí fora... Eu acho essa fronteira difícil, hum...

**PR:** Mesmo os acordes proibidos não é que tinham a ver com uma dimensão religiosa... também essa, não deixam de ser abstratos não é, e ao mesmo tempo há ali conotações que têm a ver com, com o que é que é permitido de... dos cânones... o que é que é aceite pela instituição religiosa que comandava... portanto é muito difícil essa fronteira entre política e moral, porque as duas coisas existem juntas...

**MC:** Claro.

**DT:** Eu acho, posso, há aqui uma coisa só, fazendo aqui um bocado papel de advogado do diabo só para, para mexer a coisa, eu acho que portanto, há bocadinho quando falamos, sei lá, sobre sons super intensos, tanto em termos de altura ou de amplitude não é, existe às vezes também limitações colocadas politicamente que não têm fundamentos morais... muito lá no fundo terão, tem que ver com a perspectivas muito judaico-cristã de preservação do corpo não é mas eu não posso reproduzir som a partir de, abaixo de  $x$  frequências ou acima de  $x$  frequências, a  $x$  amplitude porque isso é logo um ato que vou entrar nos limites da dor e então, sim em última instância estamos a entrar, estamos numa sociedade judaico-cristã e, algo que, questão biológica de conforto da questão física muito clara, e em última instância sim, podemos hum, podemos mencionar que existe aqui uma lógica de preservação corporal, do corpo que não é nosso, mas... acho que há aí um limite qualquer, não é, para mim, podendo desconstruir a coisa, um bocado



até ao nível do ridículo, se estiver até um componente moral, como por exemplo, nós falamos nos limites que nós temos na altura do campeonato, a partir das dez da noite ninguém pode fazer barulho a partir de dez db, eu não diria assim à cabeça, não sei se é o melhor termo, mas não diria à cabeça que é, uma censura moral.

**MC:** Sim, hum...

**DT:** Faz sentido, não sei se faz sentido isto, hum... não é bem a mesma coisa, política será com certeza, moral, será mais... poderá...

**MC:** Oh Diogo, eu até questiono se nesses casos podemos falar de censura não é, porque se tu pretendes fazer algo que é ilegal, então, podemos falar de censura não é?

**DT:** Pois...

**MC:** E obviamente que essa fronteira continua a ser muito turva não é... porque podes...

**VMC:** Pois é...

**MC:** Há determinados países, lá está, se fores para o Médio Oriente há muita coisa que é ilegal lá e não é ilegal aqui, não é?

**DT:** Pois, eu acho que há aqui uma coisa que é importante, ou seja, há todo um regime de localidade ou posição de... que eventos em que locais não é? Perceber também que peso os registos sonoros, ou áudio ou, assumem nesses locais, e acho que há aqui uma coisa também muito importante que é... tu, à bocado quando estava a falar dos acordes... só um parênteses, estar agora a fazer isto... o Zé está ali a coçar-se todo...

**MC:** Ahh...

**DT:** ... por não estar a participar, está a ser brilhante vê-lo ali tipo... ahhhh a camisa do Portas. Mas quando estava a falar dos acordes proibidos etc, eu não sei se, a música aqui por ser uma fuga do Duarte, a música aqui é um registo complicado, então quando falamos assim da lógica dos acordes, o acorde muitas vezes já é proibido até numa questão notacional sem precisar de ser tocado sequer, ou seja, há aí uma lógica musical que não é necessariamente sonora não é, o regime notacional já é proibido à cabeça então já foge um bocadinho ao domínio que o Duarte, acho eu, está a tentar discutir, mas ainda assim acho que há aqui uma coisa bem importante porque, que é, esta noção de abstração que nós temos associado ao som, para mim é muito muito estranha. Ou seja, eu gostava de perguntar a todos, já agora, de que forma é que, ou seja, o que é que, para vocês, o termo abstrato e o que é que o som é abstrato, ou porque é que nós temos tanta facilidade em conferir essa categoria ao som, tenho muita dificuldade com isso por acaso.

**VMC:** Eu passo.

**MC:** Ah ah.

**DT:** Ah ah ah.

**VMC:** Até porque ouvindo o Pedro à bocado e o próprio trabalho do Miguel, como completa ignorante no assunto eu não consigo deixar de me sentir ligada a referências, mesmo que o meu objetivo não seja interpretativo, criação num significado complexo eu quando lido com uma peça ela provoca-me coisas que me remetem para coisas, pronto. Neste sentido, se quisermos tirar o abstrato da sua histórica estética, neste sentido abstrato não é. Pronto.

**DT:** Claro.

**VMC:** Hum, agora abstrato, eu vejo é o abstrato nesse sentido notacional, não é, se pensarmos na matemática da coisa, abstração do som é o seu regime. A impotência. Hum, mas não sei...

**DM:** Nesse sentido, referenciação faz-me lembrar uma coisa que o Attali falava em relação ao som, no aspeto da música mas, mas concretamente em relação ao som, que era o significado que nós damos aos sons, que apesar de serem necessários de uma forma rudimentar são sempre, hum um atributo artificial que nos lhe conferimos, e isso também foi uma das coisas que me deixou um bocadinho a questionar esta questão porque, porque como vocês, também parti para esta investigação a pensar, mas nós temos referências, o som é referencial.

**PR:** Sim porque eu acho que é importante pensarmos que na arte sonora, não há só som, há escuta, e portanto a escuta não é abstrata, a escuta é feita por pessoas, as pessoas não são abstratas portanto, pergunto-me se realmente faz sentido focar a atenção nessa tal potencial abstração do som em termos de arte sonora quando, quando as obras não existem senão, quer dizer, senão são escutadas e... e também senão... e também se existem num espaço, é muito diferente tu estares a usar um som num espaço museológico ou de repente levores esse som para um espaço público, uma praça... a leitura de... que se faz da mesa coisa pode ser radicalmente diferente, portanto... há todas essas variantes que têm que ser postas em jogo.

**DT:** Mas eu... mas eu acho...

**VMC:** E vocês não dizem que o som é sempre matéria, ou... que é... não é? Não sei.

**DT:** Não mas é que é mesmo... eu acho que há aqui alguma coisa que eu achei alguma piada... desculpem, eu acho que tem piada, ou seja, eu acho que o som não é abstrato mas eu também não acho que nenhuma forma de arte seja abstrata muito menos os quadros, aliás, os quadros... considerados ou classificados como imagens abstratas ou pintura abstrata, aí é que não são mesmo de todo, de todo não é... logo à cabeça. Abstração é uma palavra que tem uma tradição que não... a abstração quer pura e simples... quer somente dizer decisão entre forma e matéria,

pronto e isso não acontece em qualquer objeto artístico, ponto não é. Mas para mim é curioso que...

**DM:** Diogo podes só repetir o que disseste à pouco...

**DT:** Sim, não que abstração, ou seja, a palavra abstração, a ideia de abstração não tem uma tradição, não vem do universo da arte, aliás aí a Maria até será muito mais versada nisto do que eu, o uso do termo abstração num contexto artístico vem mesmo dentro de um problema político...

**VMC:** É um projeto político, é um projeto político.

**DT:** Claro e assumido não é, e que aquilo colou ali de repente precisamente mais por definir negativamente uma prática que aconteceu no outro lado do mundo, ou seja, é definir por negação não é, e acima de tudo tornou-se numa coisa muito importante não é, ou seja, aquilo que abstração é do ponto de vista, porque a abstração vem do universo da física e da matemática, é pura e simplesmente a possibilidade de decisão entre matéria e forma, e arte, opá isso não, se há sitio onde a cena não rola, é nesse campeonato. Mas agora parece-me curioso e isto só para, deixar aqui esta pergunta que é, ainda assim nós temos muito esta tendência, pronto falar erradamente, acho eu, da imaterialidade do som, a sua invisibilidade sim está bem, mas a falar da imaterialidade e da abstração, eu acho que tem muito que ver com o próprio regime, hum, e assim sim linguístico, não no sentido de linguagem mas linguístico, vá, simbólico que nós temos no ocidente, de não conseguir lidar de forma óbvia com o carácter operacional, ativo, temporal que o som tem e que foge muito às lógicas nominais e substantivas que nós temos de discussão, e o som tem essa lógica verbal não é, ou seja esse lado verbal de ação, e se calhar pode haver aí uma série de mecanismo, em que precisamente tu não conseguiste encontrar grande traquitana a jogo porque, para além de ser historicamente, a sound art é, eh pá sound art enquanto sound art o que é que isso quer dizer, opá é uma coisa mais ou menos recente, historicamente foi tipo anteontem não é, então havia uma série de merdas que estavam já resolvidas porque houve outros, hum, veículos que resolveram esta traquitana, mas ainda assim ela consegue permanecer, pelo menos num contexto do prosaico ocidente não é, consegue *rockar* doutra maneira. Não sei, só acho piada, todos nós concordamos que aquilo não é abstrato mas é logo o *go to place* quando começamos a falar de som não é, e eu acho que está errado mas era fixe perceber porque é que nós usamos isso, pode haver umas pistas para o Duarte não é, não sei...

**DM:** Sim, se calhar nesse sentido acho que... pode fazer, pode ajudar se calhar incluir, introduzir aqui outra questão e que tem a ver mais com o trabalho da Salomé Voegelin porque também foi uma das... uma das investigadoras que me ajudou a impulsionar um bocadinho mais, tentar perceber o que é que isto quer dizer em relação ao som ser abstrato, porque de facto como estava a dizer Diogo e bem, se calhar a palavra abstrato não é a melhor forma de descrever o som mas ela dá aqui algumas pistas que eu acho que pode ajudar e ela fala muito do som ser um regime ainda hoje desacreditado como válido de conhecimento e a forma como ela explica isto é, porque o som não é... o conhecimento que temos, que podemos ter através do som não é um conhecimento sistematizado, não é um conhecimento que siga protocolos, não é um conhecimento tradicional nesse sentido, e por isso é que ela fala neste lado abstrato do som, porque o conhecimento que temos dele, não é... é mais tácito é mais sensorial, tem mais a ver com emoções com estas, com estes elementos que nós consideramos à partida abstratos, sejam

sensoriais sejam tácitos sejam o que for, e ela começa a escavar, a escavar, a escavar um bocadinho sobre este assunto e eu acho que é mais neste sentido que se calhar consideramos o som abstrato porque ele não se define como uma, como um regime de conhecimento válido... um artista que também trabalha muito sobre esta questão é Lawrence Hamdan, Lawrence Abu Hamdan, que tem trabalhado muito a questão do som como possível ferramenta para... um ferramenta para testemunhar um determinado crime. Nós temos por exemplo testemunhas oculares, que são sempre consideradas como testemunhas válidas e o testemunho deles é válido de conhecimento, no entanto quando considerarmos uma testemunha auditiva, que tenha ouvido determinada coisa se calhar isso não é considerado tão válido no ponto de vista de conhecimento, e acho que estes... o trabalho da Salomé também toca um bocadinho neste aspeto de, de que forma é que o som é abstrato, okay, se calhar é abstrato por causa disto, porque ele não se rege a estes tipos de conhecimentos mais tradicionais, não nos trás conhecimento mais tradicional mas sim conhecimentos mais sensoriais, mais tácitos mais participatórios e comunitários, e se calhar, não sei, o que é que vocês acham em relação a isto? Acham que neste sentido, se considerarmos então o som com um regime desacreditado ou, ou que não seja um regime válido de conhecimento isto pode contribuir para a dificuldade em censurar o som?

**PR:** Acho que tem que haver uma distinção entre som e audição não é... E claramente a audição, hum, na cultura ocidental foi sendo, hum, deteriorada em termos de hierarquização de sentidos e tudo mais e portanto de dependências de, hum de visualidade e tudo mais. Hum, portanto acho que tem, há que distinguir o som e a audição acho que é importante. Há um filme também interessante, que é um filme com o John Travolta que é o *Blow Out* acho eu, em que ele é testemunha de um crime porque ouve um disparo e depois é envolvido na... também se calhar vale a pena ver esse filme porque é interessante porque aborda exatamente esta questão. Já não me lembro qual é o realizador. O filme não é nada de especial mas é interessante porque não é um assunto que é muito abordado no cinema.

**DT:** Se tem Travolta é fixe meu. Tem o Travolta à mistura tem que *rockar*... Não mas eu acho... Duarte há aqui uma pouca que quando falas do trabalho do Lawrence não é, ou seja, cuidado que de repente tu falares de... um contexto...

**VMC:** Zé tem de cortar o som. Diogo o Zé tem de cortar o som.

**DT:** Zé, o Zé está ali mesmo mortinho de...

**VMC:** O Zé tem de cortar o som senão não dá.

**DT:** Já cortaste Zé? Já cortou. Há ali um coisa importante Duarte, imagina, se as provas auditivas não é, não fossem altamente válidas no, em contextos legais em tribunal, eh pá tinhas ali uma série de árbitros e diretores desportivos que estavam super bem na vida, e a nível de escutas rocka, sempre rockou não é, essa... A Vida dos Outros não é de pá, não me lembro do nome do realizador e não domino o alemão, mas A Vida dos Outros é isso, é tudo à base da escuta, escuta escuta não é. Eu acho que, o que é sim importante, eu ouvi, ainda ontem na aula com, como é que chama, o seminário de conferência ou que se chama aquela merda não sei, do Safa não é, quando utiliza no registo muito próximo do Lawrence, o som enquanto veículo para, enquanto instrumento para aferir trauma, eu acho que não é tanto o facto do som ser ou não válido... tens razão no que estás a dizer e aquilo que o Pedro está a dizer é claro não é ou seja

nós no contexto ocidental temos tendência de alguma maneira, pelo menos de alguma forma a secundarizar o som. Mas eu acho que o mais importante no trabalho dele não é o facto do som ser secundarizado ou não, não é, é mais que metodologias ou estruturas cognitivas é que o som abre por vir a jogo não é, ou seja, aquilo que te acontece por exemplo quando... se tenta compreender o efeito de trauma, pá em contextos bélicos que foi o que se discutiu aqui, o que houve ontem, o nosso amigo Mhomad Safa consegue, pensa muito mais na idea do *tail*. Porque se acontece, no *tail* do som ou seja da reverberação e da reflexão por isso logo à partida evento por si só da explosão não é o relevante, isso é muito importante quando falamos sobre trauma porque o ponto focal do trauma, o trauma é precisamente onde consegues dirigir ao evento que te provocou o trauma, porque sem isso não tens trauma, o som permite-te aceder de forma tangencial à coisa que é o que tens de fazer num contexto de trauma não é, e que o som te faz a certa altura, ele consegue ser *entanglement* puro não é, por isso a certa altura já estás na lógica de, não do som de tal da explosão da colisão mas mais na reverberação que ele vai ter em corpos ou o que quer que seja, e há esse registo um bocadinho, eu não queria usar o termo risomático mas quase radial que som tem, que se calhar pode ter aí umas pistas curiosas que corrobore na ideia de ação e de reverberação e que torne mais difícil de tu isolares o objeto de alguma maneira mas portanto se o som ser ou não relevante do ponto de vista legal enquanto prova é mais, sendo por si só como é que nós, hum, quais são os mecanismos que abrimos para analisar e ver o som dentro da sua próprias modalidade não importares regimes de outras modalidades para o som, não sei se isto fez algum puto de sentido, hum mas pronto era isso.

**DM:** Alguém quer... tem algum *input* em relação a isto?

**DT:** Ahhh ahhh.

**MC:** Eu perdi um bocado, perdi também um bocado da conversa porque, a minha rede aqui não colaborou, hum por isso acho que não não tenho nada a acrescentar assim de imediato.

**DM:** A Maria parece ter ausentado um bocadinho...

**VMC:** Sim, tive uma emergência familiar mas já voltou.

**DM:** Sem problema, sem problema. Hum, sim hum... a questão que eu se calhar colocaria a seguir, mas acho que vai um bocadinho de encontro àquilo que estava a falar anteriormente, que já falamos anteriormente, não sei até que ponto é que pode ajudar alguma coisa ou não, mas neste sentido de, que a Salomé também tem trabalhado muito, se nós considerarmos o som como um regime desacreditado de, ou válido de conhecimento porque é uma coisa não sistematizada, não quantificável segundo o que ela também tem percebido, hum a minha questão era mais se há alguma relação entre isto que a Salomé observou e o facto de a arte sonora poder ser passível de ser censurada ou não.

**VMC:** Duarte, quando...

**DM:** Peço desculpa Maria, acho que estamos a perdê-la.

**VMC:** Quando a Salomé diz isso... estão a ouvir? Espero um bocadinho para se ouvir. Conseguem ouvir? Agora, sim?

**MC:** Melhor.

**DM:** Melhor sim.

**VMC:** Quando a Salomé diz isso está a referir a som, som sem música, som em que sentido?

**DM:** Está, não está a referir-se a som... a música, está a referi-se ao som, hum, eu parece-me que ela se refere ao som de uma forma mais... genérica por assim dizer, hum mas acho que é, o que ela está a tentar perceber é que, o som como tem sido continuamente desacreditado como um regime válido de conhecimento de perspetiva tradicional...

**VMC:** Okay.

**DM:** E como ele faz mais parte de um conhecimento que é sensorial, que é tácito que é participatório e que é um conhecimentos que se calhar nós aprendemos uns com os outros e de uns com os outros, nesse sentido será que isso tem alguma relação com a questão que eu coloco de a arte sonora poder ser passível de censura?

**VMC:** Ou de escapar à censura não é porque... a leitura que eu...

**DM:** Ou neste caso de escapar à censura exato.

**VMC:** Sim, porque a leitura que estou a fazer aí é, no fundo o que isso significa então que sendo mais sensitivo mais corporal, mais se quisermos até ancestral, portanto menos permeável a dispositivos de institucionalização significa que está menos estipulado por um regime logocêntrico e por sua vez não lhe é reconhecido portanto potencial epistemológico. Certo?

**DM:** Exatamente.

**VMC:** E se assim é voltávamos àquela coisa que estava a dizer à bocado. Se pensamos num... num, não sei muito bem como é que hei-de dizer isto mas, numa prática sem essa imediatez, hum, sem essa imediatez representativa, não quer dizer que a representacionalidade não haja não é, e à bocado eu não sei se se gerou esse equívoco quando falei do abstracionismo, o próprio Goodman veio dizer, não é possível existir arte abstrata neste sentido, ela existe sempre, referencialidade, representação, existe sempre, mas é menor, e não é imediata para regimes políticos, não é imediata nesse sentido de moral, e portanto consegue escapar mais facilmente à, à disciplina dos protocolos, então aí percebo que ela seja menos passível de censura. Ou porque é que ela possa ser. Não significa que eu não ache que se deva ver tudo o resto, e a pergunta até que eu faço, mas pronto já deixo os colegas falarem, a pergunta até que eu faço é, e se nós invertêssemos isto, ou seja, parta quem trabalha arte sonora, quantas vezes, o aceso que

tem público de visibilidade, de circulação de publicação de, de exercício e de prática artística é igual a quem faça música com letras e com... e com melodia?

**DT:** E com dó ré mi. E com dó ré mi.

**VMC:** Exato, e com melodia. É que se calhar não é igual, e portanto a censura joga-se aqui noutra, é mais subtil. Portanto eu não sei se mesmo percebendo o que o Duarte está a dizer a partir da Salomé, mesmo percebendo isso, é menos logocêntrico logo necessariamente é visto numa matriz ocidental como menos potenciador de epistemologia se quisermos ou de conhecimento de uma forma geral, eu não sei se não acho que continuava a haver censura.

**PR:** Sim até porque este facto da audição, ou este carácter assim menos... não sei... isso também é... mas por outro lado a audição é menos filtrada ou seja os próprios regimes também usam esta falta de filtro não é, à conta do que estás a ouvir, para, como instrumento para manipulação portanto ao mesmo tempo há uma consciência do poder que o som tem...

**VMC:** É verdade, é verdade.

**PR:** E do poder que a audição tem, porque tem... desta forma hum, vejo aqui uma, um paradoxo não sei... hum, estava-me a lembrar disso, de que, o som ainda é muito usado como instrumento para manipulação, exatamente por causa dessa teórica falta de objetividade que permite uma permeabilidade nas pessoas que se calhar o que é dado pela visão já não permite porque há uma leitura imediata não é, não sei tenho, tenho algumas dúvidas. Ah ah.

**DT:** Duarte, acho que uma coisa importante é, isto é só uma opinião não é, eu acho que a Salomé é bastante *cool*, mas terá algumas dificuldades com a Salomé quando ela entra nessa *vibe* completamente *New Age*, eu também sou um bocado bronco. Mas a questão passa também um bocadinho por isto.

**VMC:** O que é que é *New Age*?

**DT:** Eh pá pois, não é aquela, é aquela cena... Quando ela começa a falar do som como local primordial de comunidade, e o ático e o tácito e por aí fora, sinto um bocado, sinto a certa altura que é um bocado eh pá se eu perguntar a um talhante qual é o melhor prato do mundo ele vai-me dizer picanha, se eu perguntar a um pescador ele vai-me dizer bacalhau. Percebes é um bocadinho... há aí uma cena, há aí por vezes coisas dessa tua citação que é, parecem-me de repente que podem ser verdade para sons mas para imagens, esculturas ou raio que o parta, mas aí um ponto muito específico e acho que pode ir a jogo até com o que estava a dizer agora o Pedro, e que o Miguel até será, terá melhor competência para falar sobre o assunto que é, quando tu falas de não haver grandes regimes de, acho que foi de medição, tu usaste o termo medição ou...

**DM:** Quantificável.

**DT:** Quantificável... eh pá, se há coisa que até se tornou bastante permeável posteriormente às questões computacionais etc, foi o som precisamente porque o que tu mais tens desde a música ao som são regimes perfeitamente, muito operacionais de leitura, análise, identificação, catalogação, muito mais do que uma imagem por exemplo, e pá não quero entrar naquela dualidade estúpida entre som e imagem, mas parece-me que a quantidade de escalas, regimes, registos, metodologias que tu tens para som, tanto para gerar como para analisar, aliás repara, tens o som musical que é regido precisamente por regimes notacionais, quer dizer, num contexto perfeitamente ocidental não é. E agora só uma pequena nota, que eu acho que é importante, vê aquela entrevista do Arthur Jafa, acho que se chama *In Your Face* ou coisa assim do género, precisamente porque, se tu fores... a diferença entre a música africana e a música negra, porque a música africana é música precisamente de regime, okay é música de corte. Pah, super estratificada ou seja contradiz logo por completo por isso acho que é fixe percebermos qual é, do som que queres falar qual é o regime, qual é vá, a delimitação até se quiseses geográfica onde te queres referir. Mas gostava mesmo de perguntar ao Miguel isto, porque é importante que, ou seja, que estruturas são essas que parece-me, da pouca experiência que tenho em trabalhar com som e imagem e video e essa traquitana toda, que aquilo que mais ferramentas que tu aferires, tudo e mais alguma coisa é precisamente o som, neste contexto parece-me a mim, mas pronto, hum...

**MC:** Hm, é uma boa questão essa oh Diogo, mas eu sinceramente não sei, eu quanto mais trabalho com som e quando mais conheço as tecnologias do som mais surpreendido fico por encontrar o som em contextos tecnológicos, não mediados tecnologicamente, e se calhar isso é uma das coisas que me atrai muito para, olha para o trabalho que temos feito com instalações sonoras mais do que para, sei lá, um regime mais halográfico se quiseses em que o som é gravado e é distribuído em suportes físico e depois é reproduzido, não é, e eu gosto muito do lado situado do som nas instalações sonoras não é, e da sua efemeridade do facto de não o podermos destacar dali, não o podermos levar para outro lado, e não podermos embalar de outras formas. Eh pá, agora também não sei se não será isso no caso da arte sonora, em particular que, conduzirá, eu não sei por vezes tenho ouvido aqui a palavra censura em contextos que me custam um bocadinho a compreender, não é, porque se o facto de uma coisa não ser popular não quer dizer que ela esteja a ser censurada, não é, o facto de uma coisa não ressoar com a cultura popular não quer dizer que ela esteja a ser censurada. Até próprio facto sei lá, do Stravinsky ser apupado quando apresentou a Sagração da Primavera não é, isso não é censura, isso é, pá o público não gostar daquilo e reagir negativamente mas tudo bem. Obviamente que ninguém quer que isso aconteça enquanto compositor ou músico ou artista mas isso acontece e muitas vezes aquilo que nós tentamos enquanto artista é justamente ir contra aquilo que são as expectativas dos públicos não é, contra aquilo que são as normas vigentes digamos assim. Mas... e eu não sei se uma reação contra isso pode ser classificado como sendo censória, e eu acho que nos falta aqui... Acho que nos falta definir...

**VMC:** Apurar, censura.

**MC:** Definir censura de uma forma mais clara, não é. E censura moral em particular se o Duarte está focado sobretudo nisso não é. Mais uma vez é diferente de censura política e até de censura religiosa não é, e obviamente que tudo se intersecta não é, mas, e é diferente de auto censura também, não é. E eu não sei se a censura moral nestes termos é algo que é sempre imposto exteriormente, se é sempre algo exógeno não é, porque se for endógeno é auto censura, presumo. É isso.



**DT:** Arranjaste um nó aqui Duarte.

**PR:** Também acho que é preciso clarificar um bocadinho o campo de arte sonora que tu te referes ou seja, a arte sonora não é exclusivamente instalações ou, também há por exemplo a performance sonora, supostamente por exemplo também é considerada dentro do campo da arte sonora e, e nesse sentido o que é que produz o som, também é importante, ou seja, o som pode ser produzido por muitas coisas e o que é que está a produzir o som pode ser objeto de censura.

**DM:** Hm, okay.

**MC:** Sim estou a ver.

**PR:** Há esse aspeto que tem que também que ser, desde que pode ser o facto de ser... usarem-se sistemas de som, sistemas de amplificação, ou colunas numa praça, ou num... de repente fazes um... ocupas... umas colunas que existem num espaço público, não é, fazes um... isso pode ser censurado por um regime qualquer ou então, hum... sons produzidos pelo corpo não é... hum, admito que haja regimes onde isso não seria, não será possível apresentares uma performance, hum, sei lá, da Annis Flinkel ou uma coisa assim do género... hum, portanto acho que é importante identificar todas estas, tudo o que concorre para uma obra de arte sonora que é desde o som, desde o som produzido não é, até o que é que produz o som ou onde é que ele acontece, quem escuta não é, tudo isto faz parte...

**VMC:** Pois porque o risco que eu vejo aqui seguindo a reflexão agora também do Miguel e aquilo que eu já tinha dito à bocado é que... a forma mais segura que temos de aludir a censura e intuitivamente a forma mais segura que todos nós temos estado a aludir a censura passa sempre por uma institucionalização política, através de aparelho, regime ou outro, ou outro sinónimo, e portanto quando falamos em censura moral, nessa vertente mais supostamente aberta não é, que tu aludias Duarte, coloca problemas nos exemplos que o Miguel deu, porque pensarmos hum, em situações de má reação de público, ela... e se essa má reação de público tiver consequências, for programática de alguma forma, ela pode integrar uma noção de censura moral, nomeadamente de auto censura.

**DM:** Exato, aquele ato... exato, aquele ato não foi propriamente...

**VMC:** Exatamente, e portanto a dimensão moral é o que eu acho mais perigoso aqui, enquanto não for completamente balizado por ti, porque ou o termo está completamente definido, e fica como eu te dizia no início, tipologicamente escalonado, moral é de cada vez que gera um comportamento reprovador ou isto ou aquilo ou aquilo, ou moral é de cada vez que de alguma forma está institucionalizado mas a forma como é ou o modo como é censurado tem um predicado moralizante, não é, não significa só ser político, é uma espécie de subdivisão dentro do político, okay, político no sentido institucional, qualquer aparelho de poder, na academia volto a dizer, numa escola de música ou um governo etc. Mas tem numa associação moralizante, ética incorporada, então okay, nós temos de fazer este caminho para poder balizar as circunstâncias em que é censurado, porque de outro modo nos estamos aqui a flutuar entre diversas possibilidades para tentar encontrar circunstâncias em que há ou não há censura não é, dentro da tua proposta, isso é difícil torna-se difícil dar respostas mais categóricas e afinar até

a tua pesquisa de literatura ou bibliográficas, porque em que circunstâncias, o público censurar não é censura moral? O público censura, a opinião pública, claro eu concordo inteiramente com o Miguel não é, há uma longa tradição adorniana de questionar o que é isto de produzir não conforme à massa e muito bem, mas no teu entender isso pode ser censura moral, porque não é veiculado, validade, completamente circulante e etc, percebes? Faz-nos falta aqui uma noção mais clara de censura.

**DM:** Hm hm... em relação a isso acho que a única coisa que se calhar posso dizer é aquilo que vi de censura, é que de facto existe maioritariamente uma grande distinção entre censura política moral e militar, religiosa com o Miguel também estava a falar, mas essa censura manifesta-se de diferentes formas, e estas tipologias de manifestação de censura também acho que geram um bocadinho de confusão de uma forma geral porque nós podemos ter auto censura podemos ter censura social, podemos ter censura legal, extra legal, voluntária, estes modos de censura acho que geram aqui um bocado de confusão porque afastam-nos um bocadinho do fundamento pelo qual estamos a censura, que é o fundamento moralista, ou seja, alguma coisa que é controversa suficiente, que gera controvérsia suficiente do ponto de vista moral pode manifestar-se depois, eventualmente, hum num destes modos, seja auto censura, seja censura social seja censura moral ahh censura legal ou extra legal, hum é de facto uma... um tema bastante alargado porque há muitas opiniões e parece que todas elas fazem sentido e parece que todas elas parecem estar corretas mas parece-me a mim da análise que eu fiz de censura que há de facto uma confusão quando falamos de censura, auto censura ou censura social porque parece-me mais estar ligado ao modo de manifestação da censura mas é preciso primeiro haver um fundamento para o qual possamos dizer, okay isto pode ser censurado porque é controverso o suficiente da perspectiva moral, ou é controverso o suficiente pela perspectiva política, hum não sei se me estou a fazer entender.

**VMC:** Eu acho que te estás a fazer entender, tu fazes-te entender, eu não sei é se essa distinção é limpa o suficiente para podermos operar nela, ou para tu poderes operar nela, por várias razões, para já porque as coisas são mutuamente exclusivas, e depois porque mesmo em circunstâncias de censura política, a moral está a montante e isso deixa-nos, okay então o que é que vale o que está a montante ou o que está a jusante? É o facto da origem ser moral? Ou da decisão depois de ser política ou jurisdicional ou o que for, e... pronto. Portanto eu acho que conceptualmente percebo essa divisão, em termos pragmáticos não sei se ela te ajuda a ti.

**DT:** Por acaso, partilho com a Maria nisto Duarte, ou seja, como é que era? Censura política, censura moral, censura militar...

**VMC:** Religiosa...

**DT:** Censura religiosa... Opá, lá está, houve aqui uma coisa muito importante não é, acho que tanto a Maria e o Miguel trouxeram para cima da mesa... lá quando o Stravinsky é apupado ou quando o Bizet, quando a Carmen do gajo não *rockou* não é, opá, a manifestação de um desagrado por parte de um público não implica logo censura a seguir, o facto do pessoal se calhar no dia seguinte ninguém vai ver o segundo dia, e obviamente o teatro fecha isso, fecha aquilo, fecha porque, bro se não vendem bilhetes não vamos voltar a pôr a Carmen em palco, não é, e isso não será censura. Eu acho que é preciso ter muito cuidado com... primeiro olha, a cena da auto censura, não te aconselho a entrares nesse campeonato...

**MC:** Ui...

**DT:** Só porque vais entra numa cena que... que é mesmo tipo, meu, é mesmo agreste não é... hum, a ideia de censura social, opá, eu não sei se isso, assume o termo de censura que te interesse, nós censuramos socialmente constantemente não é, mas eu não sei se isso é uma censura, funcional... funcional será sempre mas ser do género, isto não passa porque... se há uma censura social de alguma forma aquilo já foi a jogo socialmente já... mas, na minha ignorância quando falas do termo de censura parece que, há ali um jogo qualquer da peça que... da peça e assumindo como o Pedro disse a peça, num largo espectro de tipologias não é, que, ou nem sequer foi a jogo porque quando foi instanciada nem sequer pôde ir a jogo, não entrou nesse regime de sociabilidade não é, porque alguém lhe passou com o lápis azul antes... ou porque isso aconteceu, logo a seguir... percebes há aí qualquer coisa de, não é propriamente GG Allin não é, que o pessoal, obviamente que nós, socialmente regra geral censuramos maior parte da cena que o GG Allin e o pessoal do punk hardcore fazia nos anos 70 e 80, mas isso é uma censura opá, percebes? Acho que esse instrumento que tu tens foi claro, e concordo com a Maria, foste claro em explicá-lo, mas é muito *muddy* sabes, é assim uma coisa...

**DM:** Sim, sim.

**MC:** É. E acho que confunde algumas coisas que tinhas talvez vantagem em distinguir melhor, e eu retiraria daqui auto censura porque auto censura pode ter muitas motivações diferentes, não é, e é muitíssimo subjetivo em alguns casos, a não ser naqueles casos que são tão evidentes que se calhar já entram, lá está, censura política ou religiosa ou... por aí adiante. E em todo o caso será sempre difícil de avaliar...

**VMC:** A origem.

**MC:** De alguma forma que não seja, lá está, com reporte direto dos artistas envolvidos e das pessoas que se auto censurarem, não é, parece muito difícil com a visão externa de uma obra, a não ser que isso esteja documentado, conseguir analisar isto. E depois, e depois também interessa-me... ou começo a pensar que talvez tenhas vantagem em definir mesmo melhor a palavra censura, não é, porque, como é que podes definir a censura aqui, pá, por um lado podes excluir tudo aquilo que entra, claramente que é ilegal, não é, já falamos disso à pouco. A censura só opera, em princípio, sobre o que é legal. Ou o que pode ser legal, e algo que discrimina, não é, que de uma forma mágica transforma o legal em ilegal, não é, de uma forma discriminatória e de uma forma também subjetiva. Porque se, se tu conseguir avaliar isto objetivamente então estás a falar de questões de legalidade, e estás a falar de questões que estão no código civil ou na lei, seja lá qual for, lei formal ou lei informal atenção, porque... depois desse...

**PR:** Miguel, mas eu acho, desculpa interromper. Mas acho que a lei pode ser um instrumento de censura, portanto... não sei.

**MC:** Pode, obviamente que pode, não é, mas tu quando....

**PR:** Essa coisa das, ser legal ou ilegal, nos regimes autocráticos, a lei é um instrumento que é usado para censurar.

**MC:** Eu sei, eu sei. Mas por isso é que me parece importante definir isto, opá, sei lá, pensa nestas legislações recentes na Rússia sobre, sei lá, olha sobre criticar o governo, sobre criticar a guerra na Ucrânia, não é, isto é a lei neste momento por isso já não é necessário fazer uma censura, a lei já tratou disso preventivamente, mas ja torna a coisa...

**PR:** Mas acho que essa lei é a materialização institucional da censura.

**MC:** Sem dúvida, sim sim sim, concordo. E lá está, por isso é que eu estou a ter esta dificuldade também em perceber o que é que entendemos por censura percebes, porque se é aquela coisa do lápis azul do tempo da antiga senhora ou se é outra coisa qualquer.

**VMC:** Mas mesmo essa também não era fácil de perceber e... também...

**MC:** Sim, pronto. Claro. Claro que sim.

**VMC:** Também há coisas que tu podes, que o Duarte pode tirar daqui que é a própria ideia da definição de censura torna, *muddy* como dizia o Diogo, a sua identificação, e talvez isto seja em si mesmo um estudo, uma análise a fazer não é, não só o termo como a própria composição do campo são tão pouco, hum... e ainda bem não, mas não sei, se calhar são tão pouco categóricos que é isso que dificulta respostas objetivas a questões ainda de um foro tão subjetivo.

**DM:** Não, faz sentido. Tipicamente aquilo que eu também... porque eu me foquei muito também inicialmente nesta questão de censura e tentar definir ou, tentar encontrar uma definição de censura, pareceu-me sempre um bocadinho também, um bocado ambíguo porque a forma mais tradicional por assim dizer, e mais alargada, porque lá está, as próprias definições de censuras acabam por ser sempre bastante alargadas, e uma das definições que mais encontrei foi, que é um mecanismo de supressão contra a liberdade de expressão, e esse mecanismo de supressão existe para prevenir que elementos controversos do ponto de vista político, do ponto de vista moral, do ponto de vista militar ou religioso, hum, sejam, enfim, não há essa... há essa supressão de liberdade de expressão nesses fundamentos, com esses fundamentos, nessas bases. E portanto acabam por ser sempre definições um bocado ambíguas porque não foge muito disto e tenta sempre contextualizar o máximo possível.

**VMC:** Mas aí eu recomendaria que se calhar o Duarte fizesse alguma pesquisa no campo da história política. Não faz mal nenhum. Nós podemos fazer estas transições, e, independentemente do conceito de ser difícil de balizar, para a sua tese e para a sua investigação vai ser útil balizá-lo. Porque senão corre o risco de continuar nesta, neste terreno exploratório, que numa mesa redonda é, faz todo o sentido mas depois numa tese é menos convencional se quisermos não é, para o resultado que quer chegar no final. E portanto encontre uma definição mais concreta mais balizada que vai deixar coisas de fora e justifica aquilo que está de fora, e se quiser falar de coisas que estão de fora pode pôr em nota de rodapé, mas encontra aqui uma

baliza um bocadinho mais sólida para se poder defender argumentativamente, porque senão é difícil, é difícil para nós e vai ser seguramente difícil para si.

**MC:** Sim, concordo.

**DT:** Se me permites Maria, eu iria até um bocadinho mais longe, até, eu acho que antes de... podia ser fixe tu definir quase... eh pá eu hoje estou mesmo bronco só falo inglês, o *golden spike* ou seja, um ponto pivô, ponto... chamemos-lhe, não sei como fazer isto... que é...

**VMC:** Tinha que vir o analítico.

**DT:** Não, não...

**MC:** Ah ah ah.

**VMC:** Que é o dispositivo, que é o dispositivo que acende a censura. Tá.

**DT:** Eu vou abandonar agora se.... Ah. Seria isto se calhar perceber até nem tanto ir à história política mas perceber imagine, está aqui no edifício ao lado ir à faculdade de direito, e perceber que regimes legais é que nós temos no código penal neste momento, ou seja, como é que a censura está neste momento num local qualquer está estruturado. Okay, ou seja, começar isso com esse ponto, como é que ele opera não é. Ou seja, pode ser fixe, tendencialmente aquilo vai ter lá assim uma série de coisinhas muito básicas que poderão ajudar a perceber neste contexto como é que a definimos para já, ou seja, eu concordo com a Maria, percebo que a história política, eu iria ao campo legal não é.

**MC:** Sim, o que te vai também depois obrigar, necessariamente a circunscrever isto em termos geográficos, não é. Não...

**DT:** Pois, e é mesmo importante isso nesta altura do campeonato.

**MC:** Pois, é muito diferente discutir isto aqui ou lá está, na Rússia ou na China não é.

**DT:** Fazendo um bocado de *shit talk* não é, eu já ouvi este termo cinquenta vezes a pessoas, eh pá eu tentei expor uma peça, sonora ou não, naquele local, eles não aceitaram, fui censurado, e tu dizes, não bro se calhar não curtiram da tua cena. Ah ah, é bem mais simples está tudo não é? Tipo, calma não é, alto e pára o baile. E então, felizmente não é, nós já estamos no regime, isto sem querer ser linear na coisa, mas já andamos aqui um bocado *play loose* com a palavra censura porque...

**VMC:** Sim, não não é mas a *cancel politic* está outra vez em cima da mesa e isso...

**DT:** Pois opá, também não sei se há censura agora uma coisa que tem piada é essa dificuldade em definir a censura porque, a dificuldade em definir censura acaba por ser uma excelente característica para a censura em si...

**VMC:** Sim, é.

**DT:** Ou seja, ela precisa se calhar precisamente dessa mobilidade e se calhar é nessa mobilidade em que ela e o som estão ali os dois a dançar kizomba e é do género, olha estamos aqui... ninguém se define então, eu não me meto contigo tu não te metes comigo e então a cena, avança, mas eu acho que é fixe pensarmos, esta dificuldade que o Duarte está a ter, é o que permite que a censura funcione não é? Porque eu tenho ideia, isto só para, concordo com o que estava a ser dito ou seja, que é possível censurar e essa censura vir através da lei, agora eu sei que existem contextos em que, é suposto ter um tipo de censura então a lei que é feita é de tal forma interpretativo, não é, que ela acaba por ser um *proxy* do que se quer fazer ou seja, porque o Miguel estava a falar por exemplo da questão, isto agora não tem nada a ver com sound art ou o raio que o parta mas só como modelo, a questão agora de não se poder na Rússia falar diretamente com a guerra, ou seja a lei daquilo... não vale nada. Mas por exemplo em dois mil e... ajudem-me agora não sei se foi em dois mil e catorze, dois mil e doze, treze, quando veio a lei contra a propaganda homossexual, que é uma lei que é uma lei *proxy* para outra coisa, não é, ou seja, a certa altura o que é propaganda homossexual? Se andar de mão dada com o meu companheiro ou a minha companheira, já é propaganda? Ou seja, então há aí uma lógica de *proxy*, eu não sei, e assumo aqui a minha ignorância, como é que estava balizada a censura no campo legal português na altura do Estado Novo, ou seja, estava lá claramente, vocês não podem fazer a b c ou d, ou estava dentro de uma coisa qualquer mega genérica ou, a apontar a chutar para campo, mas havia normais não regulamentadas em que já se sabia... ou seja há aí um jogo interessante de perceber não é, hum.... Tenho ideia que muitas vezes, questões constitucionais não é possível com regimes que são implementados, facilmente implementar um regime de censura então, implementa-se uma série de leis que vão fazer o serviço precisamente por serem tão vagas e redundantes que permitem que esse tipo de coisa seja efetivada apesar da censura não estar contemplada num regime legal daquele país, eu tenho ideia que isto é um coisa mas posso estar...

**VMC:** O que acontecia aqui era tu tinhas um órgão que estava respon... tudo aquilo que tu produzias tinha de ser validade por esse órgão, e a partir daí tinhas a premissa da autoridade de não validar.

**DT:** Exato. Ou seja, por isso ou seja, aí quase que podes falar que não existe censura não é, quer dizer existe censura claramente, mas do ponto de vista legal existe... Claro que existe, isto soou-me mal, do ponto de vista legal, isto agora era apanhado cortado e soava muito mal. Não, não era isto que queria dizer, ou seja, tu podes dizer que formal... censura existia, mas ela está legalmente balizada ou seja, tu dizes que uma autoridade que de acordo com princípios próprios opá, define o que passa e o que não passa não é... hum...

**PR:** Sim a opacidade da censura ajuda a própria censura, porque dá-lhe liberdade para...

**DT:** Censurar. Ah ah.

**MC:** Mas nem tudo... estou longe de ser especialista aqui, mas creio que nem tudo era opaco nem tudo era tão, indiscriminado quanto isso. A censura dava, e hoje em dia em regimes que usam censura isso ainda acontece, censura dava instruções precisas sobre o que é que a partir de dada altura não podia ser dito, não podia ser discutido não é, quanto mais não seja para poupar trabalho a si próprio acho eu não é... por isso lá está, se na União Soviética alguém era apagado da história presumo que isso até certo ponto se tornasse mais ou menos público pelo menos nos canais que tinha contacto direto com a censura não é, e com esta pessoa nunca existiu. Ponto final, por isso não podemos falar desta pessoa.

**DM:** Então se calhar neste sentido poderia fazer... poderia ajudar mais tentar perceber não olhando para contextos e circunstâncias, hum, que de facto não havia, não eram de todo democráticas não eram de todo livres, eram regimes, e se calhar aí pode fazer menos sentido analisar esta questão nesse contexto e se calhar fazer mais sentido esta questão que coloco num contexto mais atual e se calhar não... mesmo na atualidade não na Rússia não na China... mas... mas se calhar mais...

**PR:** Não nos países Árabes, não na... ah ah.

**MC:** Não na América do Sul... ah ah ah.

**PR:** Ainda é uma grande parte do planeta, ah ah.

**VMC:** Sim...

**DT:** Não saia do distrito do Porto, aqui... ah ah.

**DM:** É melhor.

**MC:** Mas não vás a Gondomar.

**DT:** Mas oh Duarte, já agora, porque não precisamente, se calhar, ir a esses locais?

**MC:** Ui... hum... pois.

**DT:** Pergunto eu só mesmo assim naquele de... é que o que pode acontecer-lhe neste caso específico é, não encontrar casos... e acho que o seu trabalho, acho, neste caso vai depender muito de *case studies* não é, não sei, digo eu.

**VMC:** E por comparação, não acontece o que aconteceu ali.

**DT:** Ali, ou acolá, não é ou seja...

**VMC:** Ali ou acolá. Ou se o termo de comparação for a este ou aquele então aqui... mas isso também não... pode não ajudar a fazer um apuramento mais fino, porque isso também pode ter interesse não é? Depois de definir censura, o que é que não é categórico mas que ainda assim é censurado à luz da sua definição.

**DT:** Pois, mas isso, imaginem, eu isso.. eu acho que há aqui... está ali o orientador do Dr. Duarte Maltez que é pago a peso de ouro por orientar o Dr. Duarte Maltez. Mas, hum, o que eu diria, é que, clarificar estas, estas balizas, estas categorias é mesmo importante mas eu acho que neste caso específico quando estamos num campo já, no domínio do legal não é, que é mesmo preciso haver aí casos de estudo ou seja, se tu não consegues... o que nós chamamos lá em cima não é, andar à caça de mafarricos de quatro papos não é, e em última instância pode ser uma coisa altamente aqui que é, eh pá nunca aconteceu eu agora ponho aqui o parlapie que me apetecer depois é difícil dependendo do arguindo que apanha na altura do fuzilamento, mas... eu diria que isto ou, com episódios fora do seu perímetro de ação ou de análise, vai ter de alguma forma de pegar nessas categorias e vai ter que haver um, vai ter que ser fundado nalguma coisa não é, porque senão é aquela do, eu não encontrei, não existe, e não existe porque... opá é um argumento sempre válido mas muito fácil de ser desmontado porque... flutua aí sonicamente.

**MC:** Pa, falsifica-se com o primeiro exemplo.

**DT:** Pois é isso, é do género, os *counter factual* para isso vão ser tipo, vão ser xuxu. Eu acho que é mesmo importante de haver *case studies* mesmo, do género, o episódio a, b, c, características e tentar depois, daí, talvez sintetizar alguma coisa, porque o Duarte tem algum episódio assim claro de, de censura? Na Sound Art?

**DM:** De censura, na sound art. Pois, não... que a... há um episódio...

**DT:** O seu orientador está aqui a dizer para responder John Duncan.

**MC:** Ah ah ah.

**DM:** Exatamente, era o que eu ia falar. Não mas há um episódio...

**DT:** Shh que ele ia falar nesse.

**DM:** Tem calma.

**DT:** Calma Zé.

**DM:** É assim, há um episódio de uma peça... de uma peça deste artista John Duncan, chama-se *Blind Date*, de 1980. Basicamente a peça trata-se, do próprio artista numa... num ato performativo, ter relações sexuais com um cadáver... e depois fazer uma vasectomia logo a



seguir a esse ato, como um fim, dado como finalizado por assim dizer... a intenção dele era gastar a última semente dele num corpo morto. E porque é que esta... enfim, esta peça marcou, claro, e, só que...

**DT:** O morto acima de tudo não é?

**DM:** Sim, bastante. Mas ele registou, a forma como ele registou este ato performativa de ter a relação sexual com este cadáver foi por vias de um gravador de áudio, ou seja, a única prova, por assim dizer, a única prova que existe desse ato, é uma gravação de áudio, e, sinceramente é uma gravação de áudio que não se entende patavina o que é que está a acontecer, podia ser outra coisa qualquer, ou seja, nós temos de acreditar na palavra do artista, que aquilo aconteceu, e que aquela gravação existe e que representa aquilo apesar de não parecer representar aquilo. E esse foi o único, o único... hum, a única peça por assim dizer que eu encontrei que tem aqui características de sound art, *radio art*, performativas também, hum, mas só pela questão da gravação áudio. Foi a única peça que eu encontrei que gerou controvérsia.

**MC:** Mas foi censurado ou gerou controvérsia?

**PR:** Ele teve de sair da... ele está exilado na Itália.

**DM:** Sim, ele exilou-se e na altura da apresentação dessa peça creio que tenha sido mesmo censurada... hum, lá está, posteriormente, não previamente.

**MC:** Hm, okay.

**DT:** Mas aí posso fazer uma provocação assim meia gratuita. Eu lembro-me na altura, o... faz parte dos prazeres de partilhar gabinete com o Prof. Dr. José Alberto Gomes ele gosta de ouvir essa peça em altos berros aqui no gabinete, coisas doentias que ele faz... e aconteceu, ou seja, eu ouvi essa peça com ele também, e eu aí quase que fazia uma provocação, aí, okay, pode haver censura, mas eu acho que o som não tem nada a ver com o assunto.

**PR:** Tem a ver com a descrição da peça não é.

**DT:** Porque se aquilo...repara há um exemplo que não conheço da peça que o Pedro falou do tilintar do cinto a ser desapertado não é se calhar há alguma coisa... mas essa brincadeira, é assim o senhor estar a violar, por a sua última, poeticamente colocar a sua última semente num cadáver ou se estava a fritar dois ovos estrelados para comer com bacon... é mesmo igual ao litro. Por isso, há aí... a meta informação da peça, é que fez com que...

**VMC:** Ah pois, a meta informação da peça senhor Tudela...

**MC:** Pois...

**DT:** É por isso que... o som aí não sei se vem a jogo. Digo eu.

**PR:** Estás em *mute* Duarte.

**VMC:** O som Duarte.

**DT:** Estás censurado Duarte.

**DM:** Não me deixam falar. Ah ah, eu próprio... Hum, ou seja estava a dizer que nesse sentido não é o som, o objeto sonoro que podemos censurar, porque de facto, para dizer aquela palavra feia, é demasiado abstrato, mas sim essa qualidade meta física da peça que estavas a referir.

**MC:** Meta física? Não é meta física.

**VMC:** Não é meta física não.

**DT:** Meta informação.

**DM:** Meta informação, desculpa exatamente.

**VMC:** A informação sobre a peça não é, tudo aquilo que a define, toda a informação que é colocada e é índole dessa documentação que é polémica e que gera a censura.

**DT:** É porque o som por si só...

**VMC:** Por ele ter viajado não é, estava a ler aqui, para Tijuana, ter comprado o cadáver, ter usado o cadáver, tudo isso é que se torna...

**DT:** Eu acho que aí Duarte, é a parte que para mim interessante do seu trabalho é balizar isto desta maneira, é quando é que o som é censurado, não é. O som. Pela sua materialidade, é censurado. Neste caso específico, eh pá, temos uma descrição, alguém a assumir que foi comprar um cadaver a Tijuana e o som a certa altura...

**PR:** Pois...

**DT:** Eh pa, ah ah... acho que o último problema dele é o facto de ele ter gravado o som daquilo não é, acho que o último problema dele acho que...

**PR:** Sim.

**DT:** E aliás, e o som não nos trás isso, ou seja, em termos de agressividade ou... seria mais agreste.

**MC:** Sim, é menos abstrato.

**DT:** Pois...

**PR:** Sim, se for a junco, hum, aos berros já, aí já é uma coisa mais...

**DT:** É curioso Duarte, o que é interessante, quer dizer... se isto for um argumento válido, o Duarte, a única peça que tem, também não tem...

**VMC:** Pois. Eu não sei se interessar ter, se não vai ter de vir para aquilo se falava no início não é, de pensar no que é que produz o som, quando é que é o corpo, o que é que... hum, instrumentos, musicalidades, todas que mais facilmente possam dizer, neste regime não era possível música festiva ou neste regime no português claríssimo não é, como no espanhol não era permitida determinada música tradicional, determinada sonoridade porque não era só a música, instrumentos, sonoridade, hum, que apelasse para dimensões populares, para auto organizativas, comunitárias etc, entre outras coisas. Para conseguir chegar porque senão, bem não sei... mas, não percebo do assunto.

**DM:** Hm hm. Okay, hm, acho que também estamos a aproximar-nos aqui do limite de tempo que tinha estabelecido e também não queria estar a ocupar mais do vosso tempo, hum, se quiserem... se houver mais alguma coisa que haja para dizer que tenham para dizer que se lembrem...

**DT:** Lembrei-me agora Duarte... O documentário não é assim grande merda, mas é o que é, mas lá está, é um regime... que o som... há um documentário qualquer sobre dois miúdos pá, dezasseis, dezassete dezoito anos, que no Irão querem ser produtores de *techno*, e hum... organizam umas festas aqui e acolá no meio do deserto...

**DM:** Clandestinas, acho que... acho que vi isso.

**DT:** Já viste isso... agora lá está, aí entramos aí num jogo que eh pá, eu não tive, não tenho um domínio muito, de coisa nenhuma mas muito menos disso que é, porque é que as festas são, porque é que as festas de *techno*, porque acho que não é, a música toda é ilegalizada não é ou seja, a não ser música específica por isso, e estamos a falar de música não estamos a falar de som...

**PR:** Sim mas em regimes, em regimes que... onde fundamentalismo religioso há em muitos deles, há esta relação entre música não é, e a relação com Deus ou com uma entidade qualquer... aí tudo o que é produzido em termos de som, hum, e que pode ser entendido como uma produção musical mesmo que não seja não é, logo o facto de ser um monstro que não... que é feito com som mas que não é música pode ser objeto se calhar de censura, exatamente por não corresponder aos cânones que estabelecem a... esta relação da música com Deus e... não sei

isto também pode ser um caminho mas... e claro que a dimensão religiosa também tem a ver com a dimensão moral, que a religião estabelece os princípios morais... que regem a sociedade.

**DT:** Duarte, arranjou aqui um tema muito complicado vou-lhe dizer uma coisa...

**PR:** Ah ah ah...

**DT:** Arranjou aqui uma coisa e acho nós só, não.... Mesmo agreste isto. Mas, pergunto ao Duarte, que luzes é que para além daquilo que partilhou connosco, que luzes é que tem para além disso se não é indiscrição.

**DM:** Não percebi desculpe.

**DT:** Para além das referências que partilhou connosco, e das citações que partilhou connosco, e do nosso amigo John Duncan, que outras luzes é que tem da sua investigação, nem que sejam tangenciais, que mais é que tem aí na sua carteira de surpresas.

**DM:** Hm, boa questão, neste momento acho que...

**VMC:** Coitadinho...

**DT:** Não não...

**PR:** Não, é uma questão que se calhar pode ajudar, e por exemplo em, na sound art na China, a primeira exposição de sound art na china foi para aí em 2000.

**DM:** Sim.

**PR:** Enquanto no Ocidente, sound art já era, já estava bastante estabelecida, e se calhar perguntar porque é que isto aconteceu, porque é que, porque é que a sound art se foi... institucionalizada na China e foi objeto de uma primeira exposição só em 2000 e não foi antes, falar com artistas chineses nesta área pode ser um caminho, perceber os mecanismos que levaram a este atraso tão grande... hum, e, não sei se calhar perguntar, falar diretamente com os artistas que vivem estas realidades poderá ser também algo de útil.

**DM:** Sim. Okay, hm, bom, acho que...

**DT:** Beba uns copos hoje Duarte, beba uns copos.

**DM:** Ah ah, é melhor. Não mas obrigada a todos por terem contribuído.

**VMC:** Obrigada. E muito prazer, Pedro.

**DM:** O prazer foi meu. E se calhar dava agora então por terminado, porque realmente estamos a aproximar-nos aqui das duas horas de conversa, e não podia... não queria exceder muito mais do que isso.

**MC:** Sim agora passamos ao José Alberto Gomes.

**DT:** O Zé vai corrigir tudo agora.

**JG:** Eu só vim aqui para vos agradecer, obrigado pela vossa disponibilidade e pelos vossos *feedback* só isso.

**VMC:** Parabéns pela tua capacidade de contenção Zé.

**JG:** Foi difícil, foi difícil, mano bom sentido. Queria mesmo participar porque o assunto é, é vastíssimo, como vocês viram, o próximo que podemos fazer é com uma grande jantarada sem limites de tempo nem...

**MC:** Nem de censuras.

**VMC:** Nem auto censura, a tua não?

**JG:** Ah ah.

**DT:** Se convidarem o John Duncan vou.

**DM:** Ah ahh, vamos ver. Bem.

**VMC:** Obrigada mais uma vez.

**JG:** Obrigado a todos.

Think Tank Transcriptions  
(English Version)

1 moderator: Duarte Maltez - DM  
4 speakers : VâniaMaria Coutinho - VMC  
                  Diogo Tudela - DT  
                  Miguel Carvalhais - MC  
                  Pedro Rocha - PR  
1 supervisor: José Gomes - JG

**DM:** Diogo...

**DT:** Yes?

**DM:** I was just starting here to give a brief introduction and a contextualization of the research, and to explain more or less how... why this round table... um, if you want I can, I can, um, comment again on what I was talking about with the rest of the participants. So, basically, my research is about censorship in sound art and I was just trying to explain that I'd like to mark out a few things here so that we don't get lost and so that we're all on the same footing in this conversation, which was, when we're talking about censorship I'd like us to focus more on moral censorship, and um, and when I talk about sound art, I'd like to exclude music because that's what I'm doing in the research, I'm excluding music and I'm excluding the aid or assistance of language, of the word from that semantic regime, in sound. And those were two big elements that I'd like to mark out first of all so that we can all be in tune, and I was also explaining why I decided to do this focus group. Essentially because, from the analysis of the literature that I have been doing over the last year, I saw that it was insufficient to answer the question that I am asking, which is whether sound art is susceptible to being understood. And for that very reason, I felt the need to bring participants from the area, from the artistic world, be they curators, programmers, artists, academics, etc., people who are already familiar with and within the medium to be able to open up this dialogue and this discussion in a more, well, cooler and wider way so that we can have a joint reflection on this subject and on this specific question. I was just going to ask you now, briefly, to make a small presentation of yourselves, your area, your background, etc. Perhaps we could start with Maria Coutinho, if you don't mind...

**VMC:** I don't mind at all Duarte, thank you for this invitation I am sure it will be an interesting conversation. Um, first of all I must say that I have no theoretical or empirical knowledge about the field of sound art. So, my participation here will be exclusively, if you like, as an art historian, as someone who has worked... not only in the field of art history specifically, but also in art theory, art historiography and aesthetics, and that is my background, my teaching and research experience, so it will be in that sense that I will make, um, if justified, um, comments in this debate.

**DM:** Sure... um Miguel, do you want some?

**MC:** Ah, I can. Hi, I'm a professor at the Faculty of Fine Arts, in the Design department, where I taught mostly design for computational media, to put it like that. I'm also a musician or sound artist, or both. Hum I don't really know where the boundaries are very often, um and in that, in that life of mine, or that side of my life I work with Pedro Tudela, for a lot of time... in performance in, we do a lot of sound installations and once in a while we do other things, like music for theatre and things like that. But we have been very active in what can be inscribed in the field of sound art, namely with the installations we make. Um, apart from that I also work with other collaborations, some of which also involve Tudela, like, I don't know, the quartet Máquina Magnética that we have now, but my most regular collaboration is with Pedro. Hm, I don't know very well what I have, to continue with what Maria said, I don't know very well what I can say about censorship, because, fortunately I don't think I have any experience in that. But, but as a musician as an academic and also as a, hm, editor because another of the things that I do is run a publishing house called Crónica also there's a lot of time, hm, maybe I can be useful to the conversation, but above all I'm, I don't know, I'm here very interested to listen and I'll collaborate in whatever I can.

**DM:** Sure. Pedro, do you want to follow?

**PR:** Hello everybody and hello Duarte, thank you very much for the invitation. Um, I work as a programmer and curator, before I was a programmer now I'm a curator. And, um, of music, performance and sound art projects also as installations, I work fundamentally at Serralves Foundation, I've been doing that since 1999. Um, and in parallel I have also done other projects also linked to curatorship, um, in other institutions and some festivals and some projects, but basically my area of work is curatorship linked to music, performance, namely sound performance, and also sound art with the projects I have organised. In relation to this subject I also confess that it is not exactly a subject that I have dedicated myself to thinking about and, perhaps because, probably, in Portugal, um, we are more privileged in what concerns this problematic, um, but I am also open, um, of course and it is a subject that interests me to reflect on this... on censorship connected to Sound Art.

**DM:** Very good. Diogo?

**DT:** Everything OK Duarte? Everything in a good mood?

**DM:** All right.

**DT:** Hello everyone, how are you? Um, hey, introducing myself, right? So, I teach, I sell classes here at the Catholic University, where you buy them too. I have very little knowledge about the subject and I'm curious about it because we discussed this briefly a couple of months ago, it's a subject, it's an angle, man, I praise your courage because you realize there's no bibliography on the subject and yet you take on the subject as such, it can go very wrong but above all...

**DM:** Exactly...

**DT:** ... no one can tell you that you don't have it, that's already something, isn't it. Um, I haven't mastered the subject, I have some curiosities about, about what material particularities the sound might have in order to somehow, according to what you saw, it might evade or have evaded this kind of, um, of filters isn't it, of which specifically of, of moral censorship isn't it, which is something very specific. And for this, I'm here to exchange repeated comments with everyone, isn't it, and I think it's convenient, on the subject of censorship, to mention that Professor José Alberto Gomes is there, he's listening to everything and taking notes from everyone, like Stasi, so we have to be careful with what's going to happen here...

**DM:** Ahah. Very good.

**DT:** Duarte, and thank you Duarte, see you soon.

**DM:** You're welcome, thank you. Um, I understand, I understand that all of you are also feeling a bit, um, I don't really know what I might be doing... what my contribution can be, but, but essentially, I think it can be an interesting conversation, precisely because I have people from similar but distinct areas, curators, art historians, musicians, sound artists, and I think it can be an interesting conversation to have in that sense, and when I talk about moral censorship, it's essentially because, from that literature that I was also analyzing, I realized that moral censorship is usually the one that is most associated with artistic practices, and as I, for the purposes of this research, needed to focus a little more on censorship, hum, on a specific type of censorship and hence moral censorship, because it is the most, the most, the most common target of artistic practice, hum, but anyway, I think it could be an interesting conversation for that very reason, and without further ado, I would start the conversation. And I'd like to start with a quote, and expose you to a quote that I read some time ago and that intrigued me a lot and was almost like a trigger for this research, which is a quote from a Chinese sound artist, Dajuin Yao, who wrote an essay for *Revolutions Per Minute: Sound Art in China* and spoke precisely of censorship in sound art and what he says is very briefly... it's very, very briefly says that, and is there censorship for sound, sound art and experimental music? And his answer is that, the disappointing fact is that, sound, without the assistance of... the assistance of language, words or lyrics, sound is harmless to the state, that is, without the assistance of language, without words and without lyrics, sound does not reveal any kind of, of negative thing to the state. And this quote intrigued me a lot and it was a bit from here that this research started and that the research question was built up, if sound art can be censored. I think that, based on this quote, I would like you to reflect a little and talk a little about what you think of this quote... Hum, Diogo, do you want to start?

**DT:** Eh pah, yeah sure, eh pah I get a few itches with that, with that, um, with the quote from that gentleman. Um, pah, quite a few actually. Um, because if that's true, pah, and on various scales, that is if that's true for... for sound is true for anything else that doesn't have that semantic or linguistic charge... um you see it doesn't make sense... you see then an image won't do it either, cinema won't do it either and... eh pah this story reveals the opposite. Besides, I know that at this point of the championship you want to avoid the musical question, but I think that it is still possible that it will be easier, at least at this stage, to adhere to the musical question, that is, to the music, there is no musical part, but to the sonic part, to the sonic musical complement, but if you look at the whole story you will eventually have to, I mean, in *Trás-os-Montes* it was forbidden at the time of the dictatorship, you couldn't play the bagpipes, you can't, you're recovering a whole soundscape, a whole density that couldn't be played in Portugal under the *Estado Novo*. And that's, look, this ban, Zé is listening and he's going to, he's going to get sick



already, but it's this ban, this ban on the... of the sonoplastic register, isn't it, we're not talking about a song that's forbidden, or, or some notes that are forbidden or scales that are forbidden, that also happened, but you're talking about an instrument, of a sound that is forbidden because it's going to allude to some universe, isn't it, and if you think about it, it's also not, the whole history, I think we've talked about it a few times, um, the whole history you have, and we need to make a distinction here from what is African music as music that is black isn't it, they're different things... all the guerrilla structure, the sonic spectral structuring that Dub has, for example, there's something there that I'm missing in my observation, well, that's not even... if you subscribe, or if someone subscribes to that kind of... of reading, valid as any other, are you subscribing to any plastic possibility, no, no... I don't want to use the semantic term, it's not, but, not literal, not discursive in that more prosaic sense that a sound or artistic object could have, if that's true it's all fucked up, I apologize for the French.

**DM:** Feel free to... to intervene.

**MC:** Okay... No, I was... I was wondering here. I also think I don't agree with that very much even because... there it is, the words obviously or to, to you... to paraphrase the semantic regime of language is very important but it's not easily... it's not easy to circumscribe it. It's not easy to say that music has no semantic meaning. For example, I was... the first thing that came to my mind when, when I started thinking about this were those scenes in Felini's *Amarcord* where someone puts the Internationale playing on top of the church isn't it, without lyrics because lyrics aren't necessary... And there you have it, and... and if I start thinking about it seriously I find a lot of stuff, I don't know, in the middle of my CDs where we have semantic meanings and we have a very strong semantic role, either of music, or of things that we can identify as music or other things that are purely and simply timbric isn't it, and there you see I don't know, I don't know very well... it's difficult for me to understand where is the border between sound art and music isn't it, because in some cases it's obvious, it's immediately obvious but there is a very grey area... a very porous area that... that may be difficult for me to distinguish, and besides, there is also a lot of sound art that makes use of language, makes a, a very refined use of language and... there you go, we can't delineate things as clearly as that in my humble opinion.

**VMC:** Contributing here to a... Ah sorry Pedro.

**PR:** Sorry Maria go ahead, go ahead.

**VMC:** Don't go ahead. Maybe you're going to continue in the same register I'm going to go out a little bit, so if you want to...

**PR:** I was also going to leave a little bit out I was just going to ask a question regarding the, the... what is the object of censorship that I think that this, this quote is a little bit focused, um, on the... on the public presentation of a work isn't it, and I think that censorship can be, um nascent or downstream of artistic creation so it's not only... censorship of a certain object, a certain work, but it may be, censorship may be in the access that artists have to a certain thing, to a certain thing that they want to explore, isn't it, and I think that we also need to see that sometimes things are not censored because beforehand, or there is already previous censorship about what may be produced and... I just wanted to leave this note, because I think that it is important to displace these... operating principles of censorship a little.

**DM:** Hm hm.

**DT:** Sorry can I just... sorry about that, hm, could you give me a possible example, I couldn't get, I think I could get more or less the position you tried to do there but could you give me a little bit more example, is it possible? Just so I...

**PR:** I don't exactly have an example but I imagine that if... for an artist...

**VMC:** Being able to edit... being able to edit a record. Eventually isn't it?

**PR:** Or an artist in China who wants to make a work that explores... I don't know... sounds connected to... the body or... he won't even, maybe he won't even be able to make... set out to, to make the project because there is already prior censorship of what he has access to or about, a project about, um, democratic principles of production, or....

**DT:** You talk about it as... moral censorship or that is prior in... go in a production phase or that is, you don't access to...

**PR:** Yes, yes.

**DT:** ... material to produce?

**PR:** Extremely yes.

**DT:** Okay, I get it. I'm sorry I'm sorry...

**PR:** So, there are already subjects that are taboo, aren't there, and so the artists themselves no longer even dedicate themselves to them because they know that the result will be censored, so, there is also this self-censorship that has to do with the environment in which the artists are inserted, isn't it, so we also have to think about this, that... that censorship is not only found afterwards, isn't it, you have the artistic object and you want to present it and they won't let you, it's censored and I don't know what. There's also something that's there before... I just wanted to leave this, this note because I think it's also important to reflect, yes. Maria, I'm sorry I interrupted you...

**VMC:** No, no. Diogo do you want to continue the dialogue?

**DT:** No no, I'll then... I'll come in afterwards.

**VMC:** OK, fine. What I wanted to say Duarte, is something that immediately caught my attention with the introductory document. The idea of moral censorship is also a very expanded idea. And... I don't know if it can help this reflection to try to introduce some... typological orientation of what this moral censorship might be, because when I think of the field of art, even if I schematize it between political, military, in the case of the traditional academic field, there is a moral dimension that is always inherent to any condemnatory gesture or inhibited gesture, whether in artistic practice or in its exhibition, and therefore the moral dimension is never absent. is already in itself a moral action with an associated ethical dimension, but that's it, it's parallel. What I think about this doubt, and that's why the quotation makes me feel a little uneasy, but I'm not really in the field, is that, thinking about art and the field of image, it's more complicated because even if we, and we can make a kind of formal reduction to the maximum, leading to abstraction or merely plastic explorations, removing all referentiality, at least immediate referentiality, there are problems of censorship in it that have nothing to do with understanding, with the level of intelligibility of artistic creation, it has nothing to do with the identification of the forms of their meanings, therefore it has nothing to do with the understanding of an immediate language, or the participation of an immediate language. It has to do precisely with the way in which one deals with those formal devices or with the medium itself. And this form, this, this exploratory freedom, as happened at the beginning in some circumstances in the history of abstractionism, but this is a more radical example, was censored because it violated compositional protocols, and because it violated an aesthetic concession in force, a kind of historical discourse that is inherent to music, but even so it can still be subject to censorship, because it is outside the compositional protocols because it has another aesthetic, because it exercises its formalities in a very expanded way, isn't it, and we have two people with us who work in the contemporary field here, and the idea of sound art is, it's the reason why we had this discussion isn't it, it's something very broad, so it's easy to enter fields where the field itself, marking its borders, understands that it is already deviating... I don't know if I made myself clear.

**DM:** Yes yes yes, in fact. Hum, I think that maybe, after having investigated a little bit more I started to understand, to understand that maybe it's easier, in quotes, it's better to start studying a little bit what kind of regime sound is, and because it's an invisible regime and more abstract but also because of this invisibility, what is there in it that gives it, or that can give it, um, censorship so to speak.

**DT:** Um can you repeat that word, sorry Duarte. What can you confer to him?

**DM:** Censorship, being the target of censorship.

**DT:** Ah okay.

**DM:** And trying to understand how this regime that is sound, which is abstract and invisible, how it can still be subject to censorship, in this case moral censorship, and then, of course, bridging sound to sound art, but the logic was to try to understand a little better what we are talking about when we talk about sound, and sound without the assistance of language and words...

**DT:** But oh Duarte can I just, can I just leave something here that I think is important, just here... this still... if you don't mind of course. Pedro said something that I thought was important, and I think it might help here a little bit to define, the framework of your research isn't it. I was actually thinking about what Pedro was saying, and I think that taking into account the framework that you want to give, and you are trying to investigate a very specific reality, and then I would like to ask you what you mean by abstract, which is a very complicated term to use for anything, but for sound, maybe even more so. I mean, I might be thinking of doing a sound piece about, I don't know, cows, it doesn't matter, and this might be in a context where I can't record cows because, for some reason, I don't know if that censorship that takes place in an episode like this, and I think this would be more or less the typology you were defining, wasn't it Pedro, that is, me not being able to have access to any material to produce a piece... It's not... right, it's not, that the material regime of this censorship is associated with sound in itself, that is, I might have, I might be thinking about some kind of sound piece, and I want to do a piece about documents, I don't know, about Stasi documents, we were just talking about... it was José. And I don't have access to the documents, that censorship is not grounded in sound. That is, or in the materiality of sound. Does this make sense, or not really, Pedro?

**PR:** Yes it does, but I think that, even if the sound doesn't have, um, isn't associated with a language, with words and whatnot, it can still have references, um...

**DT:** Yes, yes yes.

**PR:** And those references being, being censored. I'm remembering, for example, that I have an Ultra-Red CD where they make, it's a field-recordings CD basically, where they go to a park where there is a hitch and record the sounds of the hitch in that case. So the sound, although it doesn't exist, it doesn't exist in words but there is a reference that is clear in that sound. So, um, I don't know to what extent it's, possible to completely disconnect the sound of references. I find... I find this difficult.

**DT:** No but I agree with you 100% Pedro, so much so that that's part of the reason for my provocation to Duarte, why the abstract here in the medium, what does it mean isn't it, and I think we have a very bad tradition of using the term abstract in the artistic context, which is like, it's really... *wrong*, and it doesn't serve anything or anyone in my humble opinion. But my point is imagine, in this specific case you... imagine, in this specific case, let's take this example, right, of this record, we're talking about people making, recording sound of people hooking up in parks. But let's imagine it in a context, isn't it... this is just to understand what avenues might exist here. Let's take this example and imagine a context where, we're in the place where matter of apolitical position and so on, there's no hooking up in the park, there's no hooking up in the park. So that sound work, it couldn't exist isn't it... Um, and that I think is, that was kind of the scenario you were describing in your first intervention. But it's not the *hottest* place in terms of *dating in a park*... Miguel obviously had other knowledge on the subject... But this censorship is not a censorship that is founded, or at least it is not totally founded, it is not... it is founded in a legal regime that has to see that there are no *dates in the park* or that there are no *dates in the park or whatever*, and not, necessarily... in the event that is sonically broadcasted. Does this make sense or not?

**PR:** Yes, yes, that makes sense. Um... but if... this was an example that I gave very, very practical because, really... the very... in the recordings themselves, being that those are sounds

connected to global sexual practices. But, um... you don't need a subtitle, that's... the fact that it doesn't exist, you're in a regime where there's no park for you to hook up in doesn't mean that, in the imaginary of the people who live in that... regime, that imaginary doesn't exist, that there isn't a will, for example, to explore something like that. So he doesn't let it, and that's it, that's where I think... and then also the character of the result itself, hum... in the result itself is inhabited by those references in which it is obvious where those sounds come from.

**DT:** No of course, yes yes... Of course okay.

**MC:** Yes, yes the sounds are, there you are, in that sense the sounds are not abstract. But... I don't know that piece, or if I have heard it I don't remember it, is that so clear without, if paratextual assistance, that is...

**PR:** I think, in this example it's quite clear, that saying you hear belts loosening... it's...

**MC:** Ah okay.

**PR:** So, everything is quite obvious. But... I also think that even in cases where it's not so obvious there can also be a moral censorship of the quality of sound itself and I think that... maybe in some regimes sound, *noise* for example, a very brutal thing can be seen as a challenge to what is morally accepted as the sound universe that people have access to...

**DM:** But in that sense in what way, or what possible grounds can there be for censorship in this context, in this more radical, more physical context of taxation of sound?

**PR:** I think it has to do with ideologies doesn't it, of who, of the ideology of who censors... um, I don't know exactly. Um... I'm not an expert on the subject but I believe there is... Maria was talking about earlier, the censorship of abstract art, I think if I remember correctly Kandinsky's first abstract art painting was censored by the Soviet regime, and it was for decades without being shown, so... it wasn't, I think it had to do with principles about what, what are... what is it, what is it shown or what can people have access to.

**MC:** Yes, but my question is, is that moral censorship, or is that political censorship? Because I don't really know where the line is between the two...

**VMC:** Yeah, yeah...

**MC:** Since Duarte was so peremptory on this issue, we are talking about moral censorship, we are not talking about other things, I don't know exactly, but maybe Duarte is the best person to enlighten us isn't he.

**VMC:** It is not very easy to think about, because if I think of the examples from the academy itself, and we don't need to go to such radical things, as I was saying earlier, of abstraction, of

the representation of polemic themes, since, since the 15th century in fact, we have polemics because there are escapes from protocol, so to speak, and that can be thought of as censorship, why? Because it goes outside the institutionalized schematism of teaching, or because there is a moral dimension there. Because the problem was, the colors were provocative, the mistreatment of the figures was too violent, or at a certain time, like Monet, the way in which women were portrayed went against social protocols, so there was a moralizing dimension and so on... I find this boundary difficult, um...

**PR:** Even the forbidden chords didn't have to do with a religious dimension... also that, they are still abstract aren't they, and at the same time there are connotations that have to do with, with what is allowed from... from the canons... what is accepted by the religious institution that commanded... so it's very difficult this boundary between politics and morality, because the two things exist together...

**MC:** Sure.

**DT:** I think, I can, there's just one thing here, playing devil's advocate here just to, to stir the thing up, I think that therefore, a little while ago when we talk, I don't know, about super intense sounds, both in terms of height or amplitude isn't it, there are sometimes also politically placed limitations that have no moral grounds... deep down they have to do with the very Judeo-Christian perspective of preserving the body isn't it but I can't reproduce sound from, below  $x$  frequencies or above  $x$  frequencies, at  $x$  amplitude because that's immediately an act that I'm going to enter the limits of pain and then, yes ultimately we are entering, we are in a Judeo-Christian society and, something that, biological issue of comfort of the physical issue very clear, and ultimately yes, we can hum, we can mention that there is a logic here of corporal preservation, of the body that is not ours, but... I think that there is some kind of limit, it is not, for me, it can deconstruct the thing, a bit to the level of the ridiculous, if there is even a moral component, as for example, we talk about the limits that we have at the time of the championship, after ten o'clock at night no one can make noise above ten db, I wouldn't say it, I don't know if it is the best term, but I wouldn't say it is a moral censorship.

**MC:** Yes, um...

**DT:** It makes sense, I don't know if it makes sense this, um... it's not quite the same thing, political will be for sure, moral, it will be more... it might...

**MC:** Oh Diogo, I even question if in those cases we can talk about censorship can't we, because if you intend to do something that is illegal, then we can talk about censorship can't we?

**DT:** Yeah...

**MC:** And obviously that boundary is still very blurred isn't it... because you can...

**VMC:** That's right...

**MC:** There are certain countries, there you go, if you go to the Middle East there's a lot of things that are illegal there that are not illegal here, right?

**DT:** Yeah, I think there's something here that's important, that is, there's a whole regime of locality or position of... which events in which locations isn't it? To also understand what weight the sound recordings, or audio or, take on in those places, and I think there's also something very important here which is... you, earlier when I was talking about the chords... just a parenthesis, to be doing this now... Zé is scratching himself all over...

**MC:** Ahh...

**DT:** ... because he's not participating, it's brilliant to see him there like... ahhhhhh the Portas shirt. But when I was talking about the forbidden chords etc., I don't know if, the music here, because it's a Duarte fugue, the music here is a complicated register, so when we talk about the logic of the chords, the chord is often forbidden without even needing to be played, There is a musical logic there that is not necessarily sound, isn't it, the notational regime is already forbidden upfront, so it's a bit out of the domain that Duarte, I think, is trying to discuss, but even so I think that there is something very important here because, which is, this notion of abstraction that we have associated with sound, is very strange to me. That is, I would like to ask you all, by the way, in what way, that is, what is, for you, the term abstract and what is sound abstract, or why do we find it so easy to confer that category to sound, I have a lot of difficulty with that by the way.

**VMC:** I pass.

**MC:** Ah ah ah.

**DT:** Ah ah ah ah.

**VMC:** Also because, listening to Pedro and Miguel's work, as a complete ignoramus on the subject, I cannot help but feel connected to references, even if my aim is not interpretative, creation in a complex meaning. In this sense, if we want to take the abstract out of its aesthetic history, in this sense abstract is not. That's it.

**DT:** Of course.

**VMC:** Um, now abstract, I see is the abstract in that notational sense, isn't it, if you think about the mathematics of the thing, abstraction of sound is its regime. The powerlessness. Um, but I don't know...

**DM:** In that sense, referencing reminds me of something that Attali talked about in relation to sound, in the aspect of music, but specifically in relation to sound, which was the meaning that we give to sounds, that although they are necessary in a rudimentary way they are always, um an artificial attribute that we confer to them, and that was also one of the things that left me a

little bit questioning this question because, because like you, I also started this investigation thinking, but we have references, sound is referential.

**PR:** Yes because I think it is important to think that in sound art, there is not only sound, there is listening, and therefore listening is not abstract, listening is done by people, people are not abstract, therefore, I wonder if it really makes sense to focus attention on this potential abstraction of sound in terms of sound art when, when the works do not exist but, I mean, they are listened to and... and also if they exist in a space, it is very different if you are using a sound in a museum or if you suddenly take that sound to a public space, a square... the reading of the thing that is made of the table can be radically different, so... there are all these variations that have to be put into play.

**DT:** But I... but I think...

**VMC:** And don't you say that sound is always matter, or... that it is... isn't it? **VMC:** I don't know.

**DT:** No, it's just that... I think there's something here that I find funny... sorry, I think it's funny, that is, I think that sound is not abstract but I also don't think that any form of art is abstract, much less paintings, in fact, paintings... considered or classified as abstract images or abstract painting, that's where they really aren't at all, not at all... right off the top of my head. Abstraction is a word that has a tradition that doesn't... abstraction is pure and simple... it only means a decision between form and matter, and that doesn't happen in any artistic object, that's not the point. But for me it is curious that...

**DM:** Diogo can you just repeat what you said earlier...

**DT:** Yes, not that abstraction, that is, the word abstraction, the idea of abstraction doesn't have a tradition, it doesn't come from the universe of art, in fact Maria will be much more versed in this than me, the use of the term abstraction in an artistic context comes even within a political problem...

**VMC:** It is a political project, it is a political project.

**DT:** Of course and it is assumed isn't it, and that it suddenly became stuck there precisely because it defines negatively a practice that happened on the other side of the world, that is, it is defining by negation isn't it, and above all it has become a very important thing isn't it, that is, what abstraction is from the point of view, because abstraction comes from the universe of physics and mathematics, it is purely and simply the possibility of deciding between matter and form, and art, well no, if there is one place where the scene doesn't roll, it is in this league. But now it seems curious to me, and this is just to leave this question here, which is, even so we still have this tendency, I think, to speak wrongly of the immateriality of sound, of its invisibility, yes, that's fine, but speaking of immateriality and abstraction, I think it has a lot to do with the regime itself, hum, and thus, yes, linguistic, not in the sense of language but linguistic, go on, symbolic, that we have in the West, of not being able to deal in an obvious



way with the operational, active, temporal character that sound has and that escapes a lot from the nominal and substantive logic that we have in discussion, and sound has this verbal logic, doesn't it, sound has this verbal logic, doesn't it, that is, this verbal side of action, and there may be a series of mechanisms that you have not been able to find in it, because, apart from being historically, sound art is, well, sound art as sound art, what does that mean? historically it was like the day before yesterday isn't it, so there was a lot of shit that was already sorted out because there were other, um, vehicles that sorted out this travesty, but it still manages to remain, at least in a prosaic western context doesn't it, it manages to *rock in* a different way. I don't know, I just think it's funny, we all agree that it's not abstract but it's the *go to place* when we start talking about sound isn't it, and I think it's wrong but it would be cool to understand why we use that, there might be some clues for Duarte isn't it, I don't know...

**DM:** Yes, maybe in that sense I think that... it can make, it can help to include, maybe introduce here another question that has to do more with the work of Salomé Voëgelin because she was also one of the... one of the researchers who helped me to encourage a little more, to try to understand what this means in relation to sound being abstract, because in fact, as Diogo was rightly saying, perhaps the word abstract is not the best way to describe sound but she gives some clues here that I think can help and she talks a lot about sound being a system that is still discredited today as a valid form of knowledge and the way she explains this is, because sound is not the knowledge that we have, that we can have through sound is not a systematized knowledge, it is not a knowledge that follows protocols, it is not a traditional knowledge in that sense, and that is why she talks about this abstract side of sound, because the knowledge that we have of it, is not... it is more tacit and more sensorial, it has more to do with emotions with these, with these elements that we consider to be abstract from the outset, whether sensorial, tacit or whatever, and she starts to dig, to dig, to dig a little about this subject and I think that it is more in this sense that we consider sound to be abstract because it is not defined as a, as a regime of valid knowledge... an artist who also works a lot on this issue is Lawrence Hamdan, Lawrence Abu Hamdan, who has worked a lot on the issue of sound as a possible tool to... a tool to witness a certain crime. We have for example eyewitnesses, who are always considered as valid witnesses and their testimony is valid from a knowledge point of view, however when you consider an ear witness, who has heard a certain thing maybe that's not considered as valid from a knowledge point of view, and I think that these... Salomé's work also touches a little bit on this aspect of how sound is abstract, okay, maybe it is abstract because of this, because it is not governed by these more traditional types of knowledge, it does not bring us more traditional knowledge but more sensorial knowledge, more tacit, more participatory and communitarian knowledge, and maybe, I don't know, what do you think about this? Do you think that in this sense, if we consider sound to be a discredited regime or, or not a valid regime of knowledge, this may contribute to the difficulty in censoring sound?

**PR:** I think there has to be a distinction between sound and hearing isn't it... And clearly hearing, um, in Western culture has been, um, deteriorated in terms of the hierarchization of senses and everything else and therefore dependencies on, um of visuality and everything else. So, I think it's important to distinguish between sound and hearing. There is also an interesting film, which is a film with John Travolta, which is *Blow Out I think*, in which he is a witness to a crime because he hears a gunshot and then he gets involved in...it is also probably worth seeing this film because it is interesting because it addresses exactly this issue. I can't remember which director. The film is nothing special but it's interesting because it's not a subject that is tackled much in cinema.

**DT:** If it has Travolta it's cool man. It's got Travolta in the mix it's got to *rock*... No but I think... Duarte there's a bit here that when you talk about Lawrence's work it's not, that is, beware that suddenly you talk about... a context...

**VMC:** Joe has to cut the sound. Diogo Zé has to cut the sound.

**DT:** Zé, Zé is right there dying to...

**VMC:** Zé has to cut the sound or else it won't work.

**DT:** Have you cut it off Zé? There's something important Duarte, imagine, if auditory evidence weren't highly valid in legal contexts in court, you'd have a series of referees and sports directors who were doing very well in life, and at the level of eavesdropping, it always rocked, isn't it, that... The Life of Others, I can't remember the name of the director and I don't speak any German, but that's what The Life of Others is, it's all based on eavesdropping, eavesdropping, isn't it. I think that what is really important, and I heard it just yesterday in class with Safa's, I don't know what he calls it, the conference seminar or whatever the fuck it's called, when he uses sound as a vehicle, as an instrument to assess trauma, I don't think it's so much whether the sound is valid or not... you're right in what you're saying and what Pedro is saying is clearly not, which is to say that in the western context we tend in some way, at least in some way, to relegate sound to second place. But I think that the most important thing in his work is not the fact that sound is sidelined or not, it's not, it's more than methodologies or cognitive structures that sound comes into play isn't it, that is, what happens for example when... if you try to understand the effect of trauma, man, in war contexts, which is what we discussed here, what happened yesterday, our friend Mhomad Safa manages to think much more about the idea of *tail*. Because if it happens, in the *tail of* the sound, that is the reverberation and the reflection, therefore, from the outset, the event of the explosion alone is not relevant, this is very important when we talk about trauma, because the focal point of the trauma, the trauma is precisely where you can direct yourself to the event that caused the trauma, because without that, you don't have trauma, sound allows you to tangentially access the thing which is what you have to do in a trauma context isn't it, and that sound does to you at some point, it manages to be pure *entanglement doesn't* it, so at some point you're already in the logic of, not the sound of such of the explosion of the collision but more in the reverberation that it's going to have on bodies or whatever, I don't want to use the term "risomatic" but almost radial, that sound has some curious clues that may corroborate the idea of action and reverberation and make it more difficult for you to isolate the object in some way, but whether or not the sound is relevant from the legal point of view as evidence is another question, being in itself how do we, um, what are the mechanisms that we open up to analyze and see the sound within its own modality not importing regimes of other modalities for the sound, I don't know if this made any sense, um but that was it.

**DM:** Does anyone want to... have any *input in* relation to this?

**DT:** Ahhh ahhh.

**MC:** I missed a bit, I missed a bit of the conversation as well because, my network here didn't cooperate, um so I don't think I have anything to add so immediately.

**DM:** Maria seems to have absented herself a little bit...

**VMC:** Yes, I had a family emergency but it's back now.

**DM:** No problem, no problem. Um, yes um... the question that I would probably ask next, but I think that it goes a little bit towards what I was talking about before, what we talked about before, I don't know to what extent it can help or not, but in this sense of, that Salomé has also worked a lot on, if we consider sound as a discredited regime of, or valid of knowledge because it is something that is not systematized, not quantifiable according to what she has also perceived, um my question was more if there is any relationship between this that Salomé observed and the fact that sound art can be censored or not.

**VMC:** Duarte, when...

**DM:** I'm sorry Maria, I think we're losing her.

**VMC:** When Salomé says that... are you listening? I wait a little while to listen. Can you hear it? Now, can you?

**MC:** Better.

**DM:** Better yes.

**VMC:** When Salomé says that she is referring to sound, sound without music, sound in what sense?

**DM:** She's, she's not referring to sound... to music, she's referring to sound, um, it seems to me that she's referring to sound in a more... generic way so to speak, um but I think it's, what she's trying to understand is that, sound as it has been continually discredited as a valid regime of knowledge from a traditional perspective...

**VMC:** Okay.

**DM:** And since he is part of a sensorial knowledge, which is tacit and participatory, and is a knowledge that we perhaps learn with and from each other, does this have any relation to the question I raise about sound art being susceptible to censorship?

**VMC:** Or of escaping censorship is not because... the reading I...

**DM:** Or in this case of escaping exact censorship.

**VMC:** Yes, because the reading that I am making there is, basically what this means is that being more sensitive, more corporal, more ancestral if you like, and therefore less permeable to institutionalizing devices, means that it is less stipulated by a logocentric regime and in turn is not recognized as having epistemological potential. Right?

**DM:** Exactly.

**VMC:** And if that is the case we would go back to that thing I was saying earlier. If we think of a... I don't really know how to say this, but in a practice without that immediacy, without that representational immediacy, it doesn't mean that representationality doesn't exist, and earlier I don't know if this misunderstanding was created when I spoke of abstraction, Goodman himself said it is not possible for abstract art to exist in this sense, it always exists, referentiality, representation, it always exists, but it is smaller, and it is not immediate for political regimes, it is not immediate in this sense of morality, and therefore it manages to escape more easily from the discipline of protocols, so I understand that it is less susceptible to censorship. Or why it might be. It doesn't mean that I don't think that everything else should be seen, and the question I would like to ask, but I'll let my colleagues talk, is, what if we were to invert this, that is, if those who work in sound art had the same access to public visibility, circulation, publication, artistic exercise and practice as those who make music with lyrics and with... and with melody?

**DT:** And with C, D, E. And with C-flat E.

**VMC:** Exactly, and with melody. It's just that maybe it's not the same, and therefore the censorship is played here in another way, it's more subtle. So, I don't know if even if I understand what Duarte is saying based on Salomé, even if I understand that it is less logocentric and therefore necessarily seen in a western matrix as less of a potentiator of epistemology, if you like, or of knowledge in general, I don't know if I think that there would still be censorship.

**PR:** Yes, also because this fact of hearing, or this less... I don't know... this is also... but on the other hand hearing is less filtered, that is to say the regimes themselves also use this lack of filter, don't they, on account of what you're listening to, to, as a tool for manipulation so at the same time there is an awareness of the power that sound has...

**VMC:** It's true, it's true.

**PR:** And of the power that hearing has, because it has... this way hum, I see here a, a paradox I don't know... um, I was remembering that, that sound is still very much used as an instrument for manipulation, exactly because of this theoretical lack of objectivity that allows a permeability in people that maybe what is given by sight no longer allows because there is an immediate reading isn't it, I don't know I have, I have some doubts. Ah ah.

**DT:** Duarte, I think one important thing is, this is just an opinion isn't it, I think Salomé is quite *cool*, but you will have some difficulties with Salomé when she gets into that completely *New Age vibe*, I'm a bit of a bronco myself. But the question also goes a little bit through this.

**VMC:** What is *New Age*?

**DT:** Well, it's not that one, it's that scene... When she starts talking about sound as the primordial place of community, and the attic and the tacit and so on, I feel a bit, I feel at a certain point that it's a bit like, if I ask a butcher what the best dish in the world is, he'll tell me picanha, if I ask a fisherman, he'll tell me codfish. You know, it's a bit... there's a thing there, there are sometimes things in that quote of yours that seem to me to be suddenly true for sounds but for images, sculptures or whatever, but there's a very specific point there, and I think it might even go along with what Pedro was saying, and that Miguel will be even better qualified to talk about the subject, which is when you talk about there being no great regimes of, I think it was measurement, you used the term measurement or...

**DM:** Quantifiable.

**DT:** Quantifiable... hey man, if there's one thing that has become quite permeable afterwards to computational questions etc, it's sound precisely because what you have most from music to sound are perfectly, very operational regimes of reading, analysis, identification, cataloguing, much more than an image for example, I don't want to get into that stupid duality between sound and image, but it seems to me that the quantity of scales, regimes, registers, methodologies that you have for sound, both to generate and to analyze, in fact, look, you have the musical sound that is governed precisely by notational regimes, I mean, in a perfectly western context it is not. And now, just a little note, which I think is important, look at that interview by Arthur Jafa, I think it's called *In Your Face* or something like that, precisely because, if you go... the difference between African music and black music, because African music is precisely regime music, okay it's cut music. It's super layered, which means it completely contradicts itself, so I think it's good to understand what it is, what sound you want to talk about, what the regime is, what the delimitation is, even if you want to geographically refer to it. But I would really like to ask Miguel about this, because it is important to know what these structures are. It seems to me, given the little experience I have in working with sound, image and video and all that stuff, that the most important tool for you to assess everything and anything is precisely sound.

**MC:** Hm, that's a good question oh Diogo, but I honestly don't know, I the more I work with sound and the more I get to know the technologies of sound the more surprised I am to find sound in technological contexts, not technologically mediated, and maybe that's one of the things that attracts me a lot to, look at the work we've been doing with sound installations more than to, I don't know, a more halo-graphic regime, if you like, in which sound is recorded and distributed on physical supports and is then reproduced, isn't it, and I really like the situated side of sound in sound installations, isn't it, and its ephemeral nature, the fact that we can't remove it from there, we can't take it elsewhere, and we can't pack it in other ways. Man, now I don't know if this is the case with sound art in particular, which will lead to, I don't know, sometimes I have heard the word censorship in contexts that I find a little hard to understand, because if something is not popular it doesn't mean that it is being censored, doesn't it, the fact that something doesn't resonate with popular culture doesn't mean that it is being censored. Even the fact that Stravinsky was shouted down when he performed *The Rite of Spring* is not, that's not censorship, that's the public not liking it and reacting negatively, but that's OK. Obviously nobody wants that to happen as a composer or musician or artist, but it does happen and often what we try as an artist is precisely to go against the expectations of the public, against

the norms in force, so to speak. But... and I don't know if a reaction against that can be classified as being censorial, and I think that we are lacking here... I think that we are lacking in defining...

**VMC:** Clear up, censorship.

**MC:** Defining censorship more clearly, it's not. And moral censorship in particular if Duarte is mainly focused on that isn't it. Again it's different from political censorship and even religious censorship isn't it, and obviously everything intersects isn't it, but, and it's different from self censorship too isn't it. And I don't know if moral censorship in these terms is something that's always externally imposed, if it's always something exogenous isn't it, because if it's endogenous it's self censorship I presume. That's it.

**DT:** You've tied a knot here Duarte.

**PR:** I also think that we need to clarify a little bit the field of sound art that you refer to, that is, sound art is not exclusively installations or, there is also for example sound performance, supposedly for example also considered within the field of sound art and, and in that sense what it is that produces the sound, is also important, that is, sound can be produced by many things and what is producing the sound can be object of censorship.

**DM:** Hm, okay.

**MC:** Yes I see.

**PR:** There's that aspect that also has to be, since it can be the fact of being... using sound systems, amplification systems, or speakers in a square, or in a... suddenly you make a... you occupy... some speakers that exist in a public space, don't you, you make a... that can be censored by some regime or else, um... sounds produced by the body are not... um, I admit that there are regimes where that wouldn't be, it wouldn't be possible for you to present a performance by, um, I don't know, Annis Flinkel or something like that... um, so I think it's important to identify all these, everything that contributes to a work of sound art that is from the sound, from the sound produced isn't it, to what it is that produces the sound or where it happens, who listens to it isn't it, all this is part...

**VMC:** Well, because the risk that I see here, following Miguel's reflection and what I said earlier, is that... the safest way that we have of alluding to censorship, and intuitively the safest way that we have alluded to censorship is always through a political institutionalization, through an apparatus, a regime or another, or another synonym, and therefore when we talk about moral censorship, in this more supposedly open form, isn't it, that you alluded to Duarte, it poses problems in the examples that Miguel gave, because if we think about situations of bad public reaction, it... And if this bad public reaction has consequences, if it is programmatic in some way, it can be part of a notion of moral censorship, namely self-censorship.

**DM:** Exactly, that act... exactly, that act wasn't exactly...

**VMC:** Exactly, and therefore the moral dimension is what I find most dangerous here, as long as it's not completely buoyed up by you, because either the term is completely defined, and it becomes as I was telling you at the beginning, typologically scaled, moral is every time it generates a disapproving behavior or this or that or that, or moral is every time it's somehow institutionalized but the way it is or the way it's censored has a moralizing predicate, it's not, it doesn't mean just being political, it's a kind of subdivision within the political, okay, political in the institutional sense, any apparatus of power, in the academy I'll say again, in a music school or a government and so on. But it has a moralizing, ethical association built into it, so, okay, we have to follow this path in order to determine the circumstances in which it is censored, because otherwise we are here floating between various possibilities to try and find circumstances in which there is or isn't censorship, isn't it, within your proposal, this is difficult to give more categorical answers and even fine-tune your literature or bibliographical research, because in what circumstances, is public censorship not moral censorship? The public censors, public opinion, of course I entirely agree with Miguel that it is not, there is a long Adornian tradition of questioning what it is to produce that does not conform to the masses, and rightly so, but in your view this may be moral censorship, because it is not broadcast, valid, completely circulating and so on, do you understand? We need a clearer notion of censorship here.

**DM:** Hm hm... In relation to this, I think the only thing I can say is what I've seen of censorship, is that there is in fact a great distinction between political, moral and military censorship, religious censorship, as Miguel was also saying, but this censorship manifests itself in different ways, extra-legal, voluntary, I think that these modes of censorship generate a little bit of confusion because they take us a little bit away from the basis for which we are censoring, which is the moralist basis, that is, something that is controversial enough, that generates enough controversy from a moral point of view may then manifest itself, eventually, in one of these modes, be it self-censorship, be it social censorship or moral censorship, ahh legal or extra-legal censorship, it is in fact a... a rather broad topic because there are many opinions and it seems that they all make sense and it seems that they all seem to be correct but it seems to me from the analysis that I did of censorship that there is in fact a confusion when we talk about censorship, self censorship or social censorship because it seems to me to be more connected to the mode of manifestation of censorship but there first needs to be a foundation for which we can say, okay this can be censored because it's controversial enough from the moral perspective, or it's controversial enough from the political perspective, um I don't know if I'm making myself clear.

**VMC:** I think you're making yourself clear, you're making yourself clear, I don't know if that distinction is clean enough for us to operate on it, or for you to operate on it, for several reasons, for one thing because things are mutually exclusive, and then because even in circumstances of political censorship, morality is upstream and that leaves us, okay so what's worth what's upstream or what's downstream? Is it the fact that the origin is moral? Or the decision after being political or jurisdictional or whatever, and... well. So I think conceptually I understand that division, but pragmatically I don't know if it helps you.

**DT:** Actually, I share with Maria in this Duarte, that is, what was it like? Political censorship, moral censorship, military censorship...

**VMC:** Religious...

**DT:** Religious censorship... Oops, there you go, there was a very important thing here isn't it, I think both Maria and Miguel brought it up on the table... When Stravinsky is shouted down, or when Bizet, when the guy's Carmen doesn't *rock*, it's not, well, the fact that an audience expresses their displeasure doesn't imply censorship afterwards, the fact that maybe the next day nobody will see the second day, and obviously the theatre closes this, closes that, closes because, bro, if they don't sell tickets we're not going to put Carmen on stage again, that's not censorship. I think you have to be very careful with... first of all, look, the self-censorship thing, I wouldn't advise you to get into that league...

**MC:** Ui...

**DT:** Just because you're going to get into a scene that... that's really like, man, it's really rough isn't it... um, the idea of social censorship, opá, I don't know if that, take the term of censorship that interests you, we censor socially constantly isn't it, but I don't know if that's a censorship, functional... But I don't know if that's functional censorship... functional it will always be, but if it's like that, it won't happen because... if there's social censorship in some way, it's already been socially censored... but, in my ignorance, when you talk about censorship, it seems that there's some kind of play in the play that... of the play and assuming, as Pedro said, that the play, in a wide spectrum of typologies, isn't it, that either it wasn't even played because when it was instigated it couldn't even be played, it didn't enter that regime of sociability, because someone had passed it with a blue pencil before... or because it happened right after that... you know, there's something about it, it's not exactly GG Allin, isn't it, that people, obviously we, socially as a rule, censor most of the stuff that GG Allin and hardcore punk people did in the 70s and 80s, but that's censorship, you know? I think that that instrument you have was clear, and I agree with Maria, you were clear in explaining it, but it's very *muddy*, you know, it's a thing...

**DM:** Yes, yes.

**MC:** YEAH. And I think it confuses some things that you would perhaps benefit from distinguishing better, and I would remove self-censorship from here because self-censorship can have many different motivations, right, and it's very subjective in some cases, except in those cases that are so obvious that perhaps they already include political or religious censorship or... so on. And, in any case, it will always be difficult to evaluate...

**VMC:** The origin.

**MC:** Somehow that is not, there is, with direct reporting of the artists involved and the people who self-censor, isn't it, it seems very difficult with the external view of a work, unless that is documented, to be able to analyze this. And then, and then I'm also interested in... or I'm beginning to think that maybe it's to your advantage to define the word censorship better, isn't it, because, how can you define censorship here, man, on the one hand you can exclude everything that comes in, clearly that is illegal, isn't it, we've already talked about that. Censorship only operates, in principle, on what is legal. Or what may be legal, and something that discriminates, isn't it, that in a magical way transforms the legal into illegal, isn't it, in a discriminatory way and also in a subjective way. Because if, if you can evaluate this objectively



then you're talking about questions of legality, and you're talking about questions that are in the civil code or in the law, whatever it is, formal law or informal law, attention, because... after that...

**PR:** Miguel, but I think, sorry to interrupt. But I think the law can be an instrument of censorship, so... I don't know.

**MC:** You can, obviously you can, can't you, but you when....

**PR:** This thing of, being legal or illegal, in autocratic regimes, the law is an instrument that is used to censor.

**MC:** I know, I know. But that's why it seems important to me to define this, oops, I don't know, think about these recent legislations in Russia about, I don't know, look about criticizing the government, about criticizing the war in Ukraine, it's not, this is the law at the moment so it's no longer necessary to do a censorship, the law has already taken care of it preemptively, but it already makes the thing...

**PR:** But I think that this law is the institutional materialization of censorship.

**MC:** Absolutely, yes yes yes yes, I agree. And there it is, that's why I'm having this difficulty also in understanding what we mean by censorship you know, because whether it's that blue pencil thing from the old lady's time or whether it's something else.

**VMC:** But even that one was not easy to understand and... also...

**MC:** Yeah, okay. Sure. Of course.

**VMC:** There are also things that you can, that Duarte can take from here, that is the very idea of the definition of censorship makes, *muddy* as Diogo said, its identification, and maybe this is in itself a study, an analysis to be made, isn't it, not only the term but also the composition of the field itself are so little, um... and I'm glad they are not, but I don't know, maybe they are so little categorical that this is what makes it difficult to give objective answers to such subjective questions.

**DM:** No, it makes sense. Typically what I also... because I focused a lot on this issue of censorship initially too and trying to define or, trying to find a definition of censorship, it always seemed a little bit too, a little bit ambiguous because the more traditional way so to speak, and broader, because there you go, the very definitions of censorship always end up being quite broad, and one of the definitions that I found the most was, it's a mechanism of suppression against freedom of expression, and this mechanism of suppression exists to prevent controversial elements from a political point of view, from a moral point of view, from a military or religious point of view, um, from being, well, there's no such... there is this suppression of freedom of expression on those grounds, on those grounds, on those bases. And

so they always end up being definitions that are a little ambiguous because they don't run away from this and they always try to contextualize as much as possible.

**VMC:** But then I would recommend that perhaps Duarte should do some research in the field of political history. There is no harm in that. We can make these transitions, and, regardless of the fact that the concept is difficult to define, for your thesis and for your research it will be useful to define it. Because otherwise you run the risk of continuing in this, in this exploratory terrain, which makes perfect sense at a round table, but then in a thesis is less conventional, if you like, for the result you want to achieve at the end. And so find a more concrete, more balanced definition that will leave things out and justify what is left out, and if you want to talk about things that are left out you can put them in a footnote, but find here a slightly more solid basis to be able to defend yourself argumentatively, because otherwise it is difficult, it is difficult for us and it will certainly be difficult for you.

**MC:** Yes, I agree.

**DT:** If you allow me Maria, I would even go a bit further, even, I think that before... it could be cool that you define almost... eh man I'm really bronco today I only speak English, the *golden spike* i.e. a pivot point, point... let's call it, I don't know how to do this... which is...

**VMC:** The analytic had to come.

**DT:** No, no...

**MC:** Ah ah ah ah.

**VMC:** Which is the device, which is the device that ignites censorship. There.

**DT:** I'm leaving now if... Ah. It would be this, maybe not so much to understand political history as to understand, imagine, it's in the building next door, go to the law school, and understand what legal regimes we have in the penal code at this moment, that is, how censorship is structured at this moment in some place. Okay, that is, start with that point, how it operates isn't it. I mean, it may be cool, but it will tend to have a series of very basic things in it that may help us understand, in this context, how we define it, i.e., I agree with Maria, I understand that political history, I would go to the legal field, wouldn't I.

**MC:** Yes, which will then also force you, necessarily to circumscribe this in geographical terms, isn't it. No...

**DT:** Yeah, and it's really important at this point in the championship.

**MC:** Yeah, it's very different discussing this here or there is, in Russia or China isn't it.

**DT:** Doing a bit of *shit talk* isn't it, I've heard this term fifty times from people, hey man I tried to show a piece, sound or otherwise, in that venue, they wouldn't accept, I was censored, and you say, no bro maybe they didn't like your thing. Ah ah ah, it's much simpler all that isn't it? Like, calm down it's not, stop the dance. And then, fortunately it's not, we're already in the regime, I don't want to be linear about it, but we're already a bit *loose* with the word censorship because...

**VMC:** Yes, no it's not but the *cancel politic* is on the table again and that...

**DT:** Well, I don't know if there's censorship either, but one thing that's funny is the difficulty in defining censorship because the difficulty in defining censorship turns out to be an excellent characteristic for censorship itself...

**VMC:** Yes, it is.

**DT:** I mean, maybe she needs precisely that mobility and maybe it's in that mobility in which she and the sound are both dancing kizomba and it's like, look, we're here... nobody defines themselves so, I don't mess with you, you don't mess with me and then the scene moves forward, but I think it's cool that we think, this difficulty that Duarte is having, is what allows censorship to work, isn't it? Because I have an idea, this is just to, I agree with what was being said i.e. that it is possible to censor and that censorship comes through the law, now I know that there are contexts in which, you're supposed to have a type of censorship then the law that is made is so interpretative, isn't it, It ends up being a *proxy for* what you want to do, because Miguel was talking about the issue, for example, this now has nothing to do with sound art or whatever, but just as a model, the issue now of not being able to talk directly to the war in Russia, that is, the law of that... is worth nothing. But for example in two thousand and... help me now I don't know if it was in two thousand and fourteen, two thousand and twelve, thirteen, when the law against homosexual propaganda came, which is a law that is a *proxy law* for something else, isn't it, that is, at a certain point what is homosexual propaganda? If I hold hands with my partner, is it already propaganda? I don't know, and I assume my ignorance here, how censorship was regulated in the Portuguese legal field at the time of the Estado Novo, i.e. it was clearly stated there, you can't do a b c or d, or it was within something mega-generic or, aiming to kick into the field, but there were unregulated norms in which we already knew... so there's an interesting game to understand, isn't it, hum.... I have an idea that many times, constitutional issues is not possible with regimes that are implemented, easily implement a censorship regime then, you implement a series of laws that will do the job precisely because they are so vague and redundant that allow that kind of thing to be effective despite the censorship not being contemplated in a legal regime of that country, I have an idea that this is a thing but I may be...

**VMC:** What happened here was that you had a body that was responsible... everything that you produced had to be validated by that body, and from then on you had the premise of the authority not to validate.

**DT:** Exactly. I mean, that's why you can almost say that there's no censorship, isn't there, I mean, there clearly is censorship, but from a legal point of view, there is... Of course there is, this sounded bad to me, from a legal point of view, this was now caught cut off and sounded very bad. No, that's not what I meant, I mean, you can say that formal... censorship exists, but

it's legally regulated, I mean, you say that an authority that, according to its own principles, defines what passes and what doesn't, isn't that... um...

**PR:** Yes the opacity of censorship helps censorship itself, because it gives you the freedom to...

**DT:** Censoring. Ah ah.

**MC:** But not everything... I am far from being an expert here, but I believe that not everything was opaque and not everything was as indiscriminate as that. The censorship gave, and nowadays in regimes that use censorship this still happens, censorship gave precise instructions about what from a certain point in time could not be said, could not be discussed isn't it, if only to save work for oneself I think isn't it... so there you are, if in the Soviet Union someone was erased from history I presume that to some extent this became more or less public at least in the channels that had direct contact with the censorship isn't it, and with this person there never was. Full stop, so we can't talk about this person.

**DM:** So maybe in this sense it might make... it might be more helpful to try to understand not looking at contexts and circumstances, um, that in fact there were no, not at all democratic, not at all free, they were regimes, and maybe there it might make less sense to analyze this question in that context and maybe it might make more sense this question that I pose in a more current context and maybe not... even today not in Russia not in China... but... but maybe more...

**PR:** Not in the Arab countries, not in the... ah ah.

**MC:** Not in South America... ah ah ah.

**PR:** It's still a big part of the planet, ah ah.

**VMC:** Yes...

**DT:** Don't leave the district of Oporto, here... ah ah.

**DM:** It's better.

**MC:** But don't go to Gondomar.

**DT:** But oh Duarte, by the way, why not precisely, perhaps, go to those places?

**MC:** Ui... um... yeah.

**DT:** I ask you just really like that on the one of... is that what can happen to you in this particular case is, not finding cases... and I think your work, I think, in this case is going to depend a lot on *case studies* isn't it, I don't know, I say.

**VMC:** And by comparison, what happened there doesn't happen.

**DT:** There, or there, it's not or either...

**VMC:** There or there. Or if the term of comparison is to this or that then here... but that also doesn't... it may not help to make a finer tabulation, because that may also be of interest isn't it? After defining censorship, what is it that is not categorical but is still censored in the light of your definition.

**DT:** Yeah, but that, imagine, I think that... there's Dr. Duarte Maltez's advisor there, who is paid top dollar for guiding Dr. Duarte Maltez. But, um, what I would say is that clarifying these, these boundaries, these categories is really important, but I think that in this specific case, when we are in the field of legal matters, there really need to be case studies, that is, if you can't... what we call up there, it's not, it's not, it's not, and in the final instance it can be something very important here, which is, it's never happened, I'll put whatever I want in here and then it's difficult, depending on the defendant you get at the time of the shooting, but... I would say that this or, with episodes outside your perimeter of action or analysis, you're going to have to somehow pick up those categories and there's going to have to be one, it's going to have to be based on something, isn't it, because otherwise it's like, I didn't find it, it doesn't exist, and it doesn't exist because... well, it's always a valid argument but it's very easy to dismantle because... it floats there sonically.

**MC:** Pa, you falsify it with the first example.

**DT:** Yeah, that's it, it's like, the *counter facts* for that are going to be like, they're going to be like, they're going to be like. I think it's really important to have *case studies*, like, episode a, b, c, characteristics and then try to synthesize something, because does Duarte have any clear episodes of censorship? In Sound Art?

**DM:** Of censorship, in sound art. Yeah, not... that the... there's an episode...

**DT:** Your advisor is here saying to answer John Duncan.

**MC:** Ah ah ah ah.

**DM:** Exactly, that's what I was going to talk about. No but there's an episode...

**DT:** Shh he was going to bring that one up.

**DM:** Take it easy.

**DT:** Calm down Zé.

**DM:** It's like this, there's an episode of a play... of a play by this artist John Duncan, it's called *Blind Date*, from 1980. Basically the play is about, the artist himself in a... in a performative act, having sex with a corpse... and then having a vasectomy right after that act, as an end, given as finalized so to speak... his intention was to spend his last seed on a dead body. And why did this... anyway, this play scored, of course, and, just...

**DT:** The dead above all isn't it?

**DM:** Yes, quite a lot. But he registered, the way he registered this performative act of having sexual intercourse with this corpse was by means of an audio recorder. In other words, the only proof, so to speak, the only proof that exists of this act is an audio recording, and, honestly, it's an audio recording that makes it impossible to understand what's going on, it could be anything else, I mean, we have to take the artist's word for it, that it happened, and that the recording exists and that it represents that, even though it doesn't seem to represent it. And that was the only one, the only... um, the only piece, so to speak, that I found that has sound art, *radio art* and performance *art* characteristics, but only because of the audio recording. It was the only piece that I found that generated controversy.

**MC:** But was it censored or did it generate controversy?

**PR:** He had to leave the... he's in exile in Italy.

**DM:** Yes, he went into exile and at the time of the performance of that play I think it was actually censored... um, there you go, subsequently, not previously.

**MC:** Hm, okay.

**DT:** But here I can make a half gratuitous provocation. I remember at the time, the... it is one of the pleasures of sharing an office with Prof. Dr. José Alberto Gomes, he likes to listen to that piece at the top of his voice here in the office, sick things that he does... and it happened, I heard that piece with him too, and I almost made a provocation, okay, there may be censorship, but I think that the sound has nothing to do with the subject.

**PR:** It has to do with the description of the piece doesn't it.

**DT:** Because if that...look there's an example I don't know of from the play that Pedro talked about of the tinkling of the belt being loosened isn't it maybe there's something... but that play, is it like that you're violating, for your last, poetically putting your last seed on a corpse or if

you were frying two fried eggs to eat with bacon... that just doesn't matter. So there's there... the meta information in the piece, is that it made that...

**VMC:** Ah yes, the meta information of the play Mr. Tudela...

**MC:** Yeah.

**DT:** That's why... the sound there I don't know if it comes into play. I say.

**PR:** You're on *mute* Duarte.

**VMC:** The Duarte sound.

**DT:** You are censored Duarte.

**DM:** They won't let me speak. Ah ah, myself... Hum, that is, I was saying that in that sense it's not the sound, the sound object that we can censor, because in fact, to say that ugly word, it's too abstract, but rather that meta physical quality of the piece that you were referring to.

**MC:** Physical target? It's not a physical target.

**VMC:** It is not a physical goal, no.

**DT:** Meta information.

**DM:** Meta information, sorry exactly.

**VMC:** The information about the play is not, all that defines it, all the information that is placed and it is the nature of that documentation that is controversial and generates censorship.

**DT:** It's because the sound itself...

**VMC:** Because he travelled isn't it, I was reading here, to Tijuana, bought the corpse, used the corpse, all that becomes...

**DT:** I think that there Duarte, that's the part that for me that's interesting about your work is that you mark it out in this way, is when is the sound censored, isn't it. Sound. Sound, by its materiality, is censored. In this specific case, hey man, we have a description, someone assuming they went to Tijuana to buy a corpse and the sound at a certain point...

**PR:** Yeah...

**DT:** Eh pa, ah ah ah... I think his last problem is the fact that he recorded the sound of that isn't it, I think his last problem I think...

**PR:** Yes.

**DT:** And by the way, and the sound doesn't bring us that, I mean, in terms of aggressiveness or... it would be more harsh.

**MC:** Yes, it's less abstract.

**DT:** Yeah...

**PR:** Yes, if it's the reed, um, screaming, then it's something more...

**DT:** It's curious Duarte, which is interesting, I mean... if this is a valid argument, Duarte, the only piece you have, you don't have either...

**VMC:** Right. I don't know if it's interesting to have, if it isn't, to come back to what was said at the beginning, isn't it, to think about what produces sound, when is it the body, what... um, instruments, musicality, all those things that can more easily be said, in this regime festive music was not possible or in this regime in Portuguese, clearly not, as in Spanish, certain traditional music, certain sounds were not allowed because it wasn't only music, instruments, sounds that appealed to popular dimensions, to self organization, community, etc., among other things. To get there because otherwise, I don't know... but I don't know what I'm talking about.

**DM:** Hm hm. Okay, hm, I think we're also approaching the time limit here that I had set and I also didn't want to be taking up any more of your time, um, if you want to... if there's anything else that there is to say that you have to say that you remember...

**DT:** I just remembered Duarte... The documentary isn't that shit, but it is what it is, but there you go, it's a regime... that sound... there's a documentary about two kids, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen years old, who want to be *techno* producers in Iran, and um... they organize some parties here and there in the middle of the desert...

**DM:** Clandestine, I think... I think I saw that.

**DT:** You've seen that... now there it is, there we get into a game that eh man, I haven't had, I don't have a mastery of much, of anything but much less of that which is, why are the parties,



why are the *techno* parties, because I don't think it's, all music is outlawed isn't it i.e. other than specific music for that, and we're talking about music we're not talking about sound...

**PR:** Yes but in regimes, in regimes that... where religious fundamentalism exists in many of them, there is this relationship between music, isn't it, and the relationship with God or with some entity... there everything that is produced in terms of sound, um, and that can be understood as a musical production even if it is not is not, so the fact that it is a monster that is not... that is made with sound but is not music may be subject to censorship, precisely because it does not correspond to the canons that establish the... this relationship between music and God and... I don't know if this could also be a path but... and of course the religious dimension also has to do with the moral dimension, that religion establishes the moral principles... that govern society.

**DT:** Duarte, you've got a very complicated subject here, let me tell you something...

**PR:** Ah ah ah ah...

**DT:** You got something here and I think we just, no.... Really rough this. But, I ask Duarte, what lights beyond what you've shared with us, what lights beyond that do you have if it's not indiscretion.

**DM:** I don't get it sorry.

**DT:** Apart from the references you've shared with us, and the quotes you've shared with us, and our friend John Duncan, what other insights do you have from your research, if only tangential ones, what else do you have there in your portfolio of surprises.

**DM:** Hm, good question, right now I think...

**VMC:** Poor thing...

**DT:** No no...

**PR:** No, it's a question that might help, and for example in, in sound art in China, the first sound art exhibition in China was around 2000.

**DM:** Yes.

**PR:** While in the West, sound art was already, was already quite established, and maybe asking why this happened, why sound art was... institutionalized in China and was the object of a first exhibition only in 2000 and not before, talking to Chinese artists in this area could be a way, understanding the mechanisms that led to such a long delay... um, and, I don't know maybe asking, talking directly to the artists who live these realities could also be something useful.

**DM:** Yeah. Okay, hm, well, I guess...

**DT:** Have a few drinks today Duarte, have a few drinks.

**DM:** Ah ah ah, that's better. No but thank you all for contributing.

**VMC:** Thank you. And a pleasure to meet you, Pedro.

**DM:** My pleasure. And I would probably call it a day now, because we are really approaching two hours of conversation here, and I couldn't... I didn't want to go much further than that.

**MC:** Yes, now we go to José Alberto Gomes.

**DT:** Zé will correct everything now.

**JG:** I just came here to thank you, thank you for your availability and your *feedback that's* all.

**VMC:** Congratulations on your containment skills Zé.

**JG:** It was difficult, it was difficult, in a good way. I really wanted to participate because the subject is, it's vast, as you saw, the next thing we can do is with a big dinner party with no time limits or...

**MC:** Nor of censure.

**VMC:** Nor self-censorship, not yours?

**JG:** Ah ah ah.

**DT:** If they invite John Duncan I'll go.

**DM:** Ah ahh, let's see. Well.

**VMC:** Thank you once again.

**JG:** Thank you all.