Lucia FARINATI

Audio Arts Archive:
From Inventory Space to Imagined Space

Abstract

Audio Arts (1973-2007) was established by artist William Furlong and curator Barry Barker in 1973 as a magazine of contemporary art on cassette tape. Focused on artists' voices and sound works *Audio Arts* expanded the traditional scope of a printed magazine from the representation of visual art into an alternative art space in itself. This thesis addresses the complexities of *Audio Arts* through two strands of research. The first, *The Inventory Space*, traces the multifaceted history of the sound magazine by highlighting the relationship between the editorial, curatorial and artistic activity developed by Furlong and his collaborators. It also examines the relationship between the re-organisation of the Audio Arts Archive (since its acquisition in 2004 by Tate) and the way it was previously used creatively by Furlong in the production of new sound works. *The Imagined Space* elaborates a performative methodology through the curatorial project *Activating the Audio Arts Archive*. In collaboration with the Tate Archive I explored how listening to (and within) the archive contributes to a dialogic methodology which puts the voices of former collaborators of *Audio Arts* centre stage. By imagining the life of the Audio Arts Archive beyond its inventory, I establish a creative space for a co-constructed historical narrative through the contribution of written texts, new conversations, recordings and performative acts.

Structured in two parts, the thesis investigates the tension between inventory space and imagined space, the indexical and paradigmatic organisation of archival documents and its affective and performative activation. It comprises four written chapters, two audio chapters and the conclusion. The audio chapters include a body of new interviews I conducted with former collaborators of *Audio Arts* and four audio essays produced from the four public curatorial events. The research contributes to the field of art history, curatorial practice and sonic studies by providing a unified historical and performative methodology for understanding the complex legacy of *Audio Arts*. This legacy I conclude lies at the intersection of sound art and sculpture, critical and curatorial practice, and oral and aural art history.

Key Words

Art magazine, art publishing, artist voice, artist interview, aural history, curating, dialogue, expanded sound practice, listening, oral history, performative archive, performativity, sound, sound archive, sculpture, transduction, time-based media, vocality.

Acknowledgements

This thesis is in memory of Bianca Losi, my mother, Dario Farinati, my brother, and the artist Susan Hiller.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX - Volume 2

Appendix 1: Inventory Space

Appendix 2: Imagined Space: Activating Audio Arts Archive

Introduction

History has no content without stories

Alessandro Portelli

… a story never 'is', but always 'becomes'. It is not that we have, to listen to or think of a story and then we tell it or write it; the story becomes in the process of being narrated; it further 'becomes' as we perceive it, although what we narrate or feel can never be the same story. In this light narrative researchers should be aware of the incompleteness of any storyline or narrative mode and take this incompleteness, the becoming of the story, not as a defect but as its actuality, as what it is, a process.

Maria Tamboukou

i.   Aims and Objectives of the Thesis

In 2004 Tate acquired the Audio Arts Archive, a collection which comprises all the material relating to the inception, production and distribution of *Audio Arts* magazine. In 2013 as the result of an ambitious digitisation project, all published *Audio Arts* volumes and supplements were made accessible through a dedicated website. Although a large number of unpublished *Audio Arts* recordings are still in the process of digitization, the re-organisation of the Tate collection and its subsequent catalogue completed in 2019, has provided an ideal opportunity to study its records first hand. This thesis takes Audio Arts Archive as its main subject. This, however, is not an archival study which provides an in-depth analysis of the methods used by Tate to catalogue, preserve and digitize this unique collection. It rather explores the physical, technological and conceptual space of the Audio Arts Archive as a *performative affective archive*. This is an archive able to produce relations and stories alongside historical documents. It is an archive which does not simply provide the primary sources for unpacking and writing the multi-layered history of the *Audio Arts* project but it is equally a dialogic space for enhancing its archival material and opening up new possibilities for its dissemination. In other words: an active archive. How is an archive active rather than the ultimate trace of previous activity? How to present Audio Arts Archive as an active archive? How to negotiate between the *inventory*

space and *imagined space*?[1] Between the duty of cataloguing and preserving a collection and the creative, imaginative use of archival sources?

This art historical and practice-based thesis addresses these questions by presenting two strands of research: an historical overview of *Audio Arts* projects including all the activities conducted by William Furlong and his collaborators under the name of 'Audio Arts' - *The Inventory Space*; and a curatorial project I developed in collaboration with the Tate Archive which publicly presented a selected number of archival items from the *Audio Arts* collection in conversation with former collaborators of *Audio Arts* - *The Imagined Space*. By approaching mainly historical records, *The Inventory Space* investigates *Audio Arts* in relation to the wider cultural context in which the magazine was established. It also maps through an experimental classification system and related visuals - diagrams and posters - the full range of recordings produced from 1973 to 2007. *The Imagined Space*, by contrast, elaborates a theoretical framework for a performative curatorial methodology - *Activating the Audio Arts Archive* - which has been applied in the presentation, activation, and interpretation of original items from the Audio Arts Archive organised through four events and four related audio essays. At the intersection of *The Inventory Space* and *The Imagined Space* sits *The Oral History of Audio Arts* which comprises a body of new interviews I have conducted with former collaborators of *Audio Arts*.

The thesis is structured in two parts. The first part (*The Inventory Space*) comprises two written chapters (*Chapter 1* and *Chapter 2*) and one audio chapter (*Chapter 3*). The second part encompasses one written chapter (*Chapter 4*) and 1 audio (*Chapter 5*) which incorporates the creative project *Activating the Audio Arts Archive*. Each chapter has been organised in written or audio sections. Each section discusses specific topics and develops a specific historical account or narrative. While the writing is not simply reflective - does not act as a mere critical reflection of the creative project - the audio material (including the four audio essays) is an integral part of this thesis and not a side documentation of the curatorial project. In embracing the voices and the stories of former collaborators of *Audio Arts* and subsequently co-constructing a history of *Audio Arts*, the thesis results in a confluence of written texts, audio interviews, spoken texts, sound works and historical recordings.

In the second part of this introduction I will present the individual chapters and the methodologies adopted in the two strands of research. These are not necessarily antagonistic but rather complementary to each other. The interplay between *The Inventory Space* and *The Imagined Space,* between a paradigmatic/empirical approach to archival

---

[1] I am indebted to George Perec for the two categories of 'inventory space' and 'invented space' that he made in *Species of Spaces*, *Espèces d'Espaces,* 1974.

documents and a narrative approach which values the stories of lived experience, constitutes the primary condition for activating the Audio Arts Archive.[2] As oral historian Alessandro Portelli has succinctly put it: 'history has no content without stories'.[3]

ii.   Literature on Audio Arts

The critical literature on *Audio Arts* is very fragmented and pays no attention to its complex history. The publication *Audio Arts: Discourse and Practice in Contemporary Art* published by Academy Edition in 1994 (now out of print) was the last comprehensive publication presenting the multi-faceted aspects of the project and its diverse activities. Beside the *Audio Arts* recordings catalogue (2001) which followed and complemented the Academy Edition, the only subsequent volume exclusively dedicated to *Audio Arts* is the book *Speaking of Art* published under the imprint of Phaidon (2010). While this publication has certainly contributed to present *Audio Arts* to a wider public, its remit of including only a selected number of artists' interviews edited from transcriptions, appears very limited in the scope of presenting the complexity and varieties of recordings produced by *Audio Arts*. The lack of a comprehensive historical account which covers the whole life and aspects of *Audio Arts* therefore represents a significant gap in the historiography of the project. In addition to this *Audio Arts* has also suffered a lack of critical attention in the field of contemporary art history with special regard to its connection with British conceptual art on one hand, and within the recent literature on sound art on the other.[4] With the exception of written contributions by Mel Gooding (1992;1994; 2006; 2010), Michael

---

[2] By a narrative approach I refer to a methodology which differs from empirical observation and logical proof and is rather informed by a postmodern notion of knowledge as a relational and generative process. It is also informed by feminist ideas and practices of voice and embodiment partly discussed later in this chapter. Here stories are considered knowledge *per se* and refer mainly to the dialogue with former collaborators of *Audio Arts* incorporated in the audio sections of this thesis.

[3] Alessandro Portelli, *Introduction: The Battle of Valle Giulia: Oral History and the Art of Dialogue*, 1997, p. viii. As Portelli has written eloquently 'history, we had been taught, is facts, actual and objective events you can touch and see; stories, in contrast, are the tales, the people who tell them, the words they are made of, the knot of memory and imagination that turns material facts into cultural meaning. Stories, in other words, communicate what history means to human beings'. *The Battle of Valle Giulia*, p. 42.

[4] *Audio Arts* was not included for example in the exhibition *Conceptual Art in Britain, 1964-1979*, Tate Britain London (2016) and the accompanying catalogue edited by Andrew Wilson. With the exception of Dan Lander, Micah Lexier, *Sound by Artists* (eds.1990) none of the major studies on sound art published since 2000 has included references to Audio Arts Sound Works. However, the text by William Furlong, *Sound in Recent Art* (1992) has been republished in the anthology by Caleb Kelly, *Sound*, 2011.

Archer (1985; 1992; 1994; 1998) and Heidi Grundmann (2000; 2009) sparse critical texts have appeared about *Audio Arts* as an art project.[5]

In the past decade the critical references to *Audio Arts* have appeared mostly in studies dedicated to the history of the artist interview and on the role of the conversation in the field of curatorial practice, oral history and art criticism.[6] Although reference to *Audio Arts* appears also in short catalogue essays written as commentary on Furlong's art works presented in solo or group exhibitions, the fragmentation of the critical sources reinforce the idea of *Audio Arts* as mainly a magazine of artists' interviews rather than an expanded art practice.[7] A continuous interest in the project as a whole (editorial, curatorial and artistic) has nevertheless been manifested throughout the years by artists, curators, radio broadcasters and oral historians who have interviewed Furlong in different stages and moments of his life.[8] Recordings and transcripts of these interviews have been regularly kept by Furlong. Along with other historical records preserved at Tate, this body of interviews has been central to writing this thesis.

What has emerged in reading and comparing the different interviews and statements made by Furlong from 1975 to now, is that *Audio Arts* has always been recounted or 'narrated' as the result of what he did as an artist rather than in his editorial or curatorial role. The artistic identity of the project has remained the key concern for the artist.

As I will fully address in various parts of this study, from the inception of the sound magazine along with Barry Barker to the production of Audio Arts Sound Works in collaboration with Michael Archer, Furlong has always talked about *Audio Arts* as a space or as a context for artists to present their ideas and works in a primary form, stressing its

---

[5] Heidi Grundmann worked as cultural reporter, art and theatre critic, editor and program producer at the ORF (Austrian National Radio/TV). In 1987 she created the radio program Kunstradio-Radiokunst (original artworks for radio). *Audio Arts* recordings and interviews featured regularly on Kunstradio. Other art critics and curators were also active supporters of *Audio Arts* such as Nick Serota, Caroline Tisdall, Simon Herbert, James Lingwood and Richard Cork. Their critical contributions need to be seen more in terms of 'operative' criticism rather than in terms of critical writing. Serota was for example instrumental in the collaboration with the Whitechapel Gallery and the acquisition of the Audio Arts Archive by Tate.

[6] For instance, Michael Diers, Lars Blunck, and Hans Ulrich Obrist (eds.) *Das Interview: Formen und Foren des Künstlergesprächs*, 2013; Lisa Sandino, Matthew Partington (eds.) *Oral History in the Visual Arts*, 2013; Alexandra C. M. Ross, *Continuous Curatorial Conversations. An Exploration of the Role of Conversation within the Writing of a Supplementary History of the Curatorial*, PhD, 2014. See also the papers by Reva Wolf, *The Artist Interview: An Elusive History*, and by Claire M. Holdsworth, *Speaking out: Split Identities, Politics and the Ventriloquial Voice in Artists' Film and Video of the 1970s and 1980s* presented at the conference *The Artist Interview: An interdisciplinary approach to its history, process and dissemination* co-convened by the present author and Jennifer Thatcher at the Association for Art History Annual Conference, Brighton, 6 April 2018.

[7] As Heidi Grundmann observes in her exhibition essay *Re-Play* (2000) 'even some art critics have not noticed that *Audio Arts* is in itself an art project'.

[8] See for example the interviews by Cathy Courtney for the *Artists' Lives* project at the British Library.

collaborative dimension on one side, and highlighting the role of speech as a common denominator on the other. What, however, has appeared less dominant in these existing accounts, is the need to define *Audio Arts* in relation to a specific discipline, art form or art movement. Whereas Furlong has acknowledged the influence of conceptual art in his own work, he has often criticized or problematized any references to his practice in term of sound art.[9] His reluctance to encapsulate the emerging art practices of the late 1970s - including his own work - in new defined categories is clearly seen in his essay on *Performance Art or is it?* written in 1982 (see *Chapter 1*). The overarching term 'time-based art' has in fact been used more consistently than 'performance art' or 'sound art' in describing the artistic contributions made for and by *Audio Arts.*

The only field of creative practice in which Furlong has felt fully confident in presenting his practice and specifically the Audio Arts Sound Works is that of sculpture. This positive disposition towards sculpture is directly connected to his encounter with Joseph Beuys in 1974 (See *Audio Essay 1*) and the close collaboration and friendship with Bruce McLean established also in the 1970s discussed in *Chapter 1*. As Furlong declared in an interview with Heidi Grundmann: 'We have designated Audio Arts as a "magazine" because it presents concepts and ideas'. Concepts and ideas that in the case of Beuys as well as McLean were enmeshed with conceptual art, de-materialisation, and, to use Richard Cork's expression, the 'dissolution' of sculpture' (see *Chapter 1*).

By borrowing Rosalind Krauss's notion of the 'expanded field' I will argue that Furlong's art practice has embraced both the discursive and the spatial through one of the most immaterial yet sculptural materials: sound. The invitation to Audio Arts (Furlong and Archer) by artist Kate Blacker for *The Sculpture Show* at the Hayward Annual in 1983, as well as the theorisation of *Audio Arts* in terms of social sculpture elaborated by Gooding in the 1990s are in this respect two strong markers in the historiography of the project whose conceptualisation was promoted in the title and the essays of the book edited by Furlong in 1992: *Audio Arts. Discourse and practice in contemporary art*. Moreover, a central aim of this thesis is to demonstrate the continuity between the 'discourse' and the 'practice' both critically and historically.

Beyond the boundaries of a traditional editorial initiative, both in term of its organisation and material structure, *Audio Arts* acted, as I will argue, as a dynamic artist-run space: an audial technological space through which artists' conversations and interviews as well as artworks were produced, presented and disseminated. As Grundmann suggests:

---

[9] See for example the interview conducted by Angelika Stepken, April 2014, Villa Romana, Florence.

Audio Arts is itself medialized and unthinkable without recording and reproduction technology such as the audio cassette which Furlong recognized at the very early stage as the cheapest medium for a distribution on demand.[10]

iii.   Introduction to the Inventory Space

By looking at the wider cultural context in which *Audio Arts* was established and developed as well as at the set of activities and recordings produced from 1973 to 2007, part one of this thesis aims at bridging the gaps of the *Audio Arts* publications edited by Furlong between 1992 and 2001. The scope of the first two chapters is primarily to show the extraordinary range of recordings and approaches developed through the use of the tape recorder. *Chapter 1* shows how the creative use of the audio cassette initiated by Furlong was in tune with the experimentation of the 1970s across sound poetry, publishing, performance art, experimental music, sound and sculpture. By elaborating a critical inventory for the activities conducted by William Furlong and collaborators under the framework of Audio Arts, *Chapter 2* analyses the individual spheres of the editorial, artistic, curatorial and educational practice and how they are linked together. Through an inventory of the recording typologies accompanied by visual diagrams I will discuss the variety of formats and sound productions made within, as well as, in parallel to the publication of the volumes and the supplements. An in-depth account of the material production and distribution of the magazine sets out to map how the recordings were made, edited, published and disseminated.

iv.   Introduction to the Oral History of Audio Arts (*Chapter 3*)

Through a series of interviews conducted with Michael Archer, Violet Barrett, Mel Gooding, Bruce Mclean and Jean Wainwright I have created an oral history of *Audio Arts*.[11] The interviews have been conducted in their homes or places of work and are about one hour and a half long. Rather than following the protocols of a biographical

---

[10] Heidi Grundmann (2000).

[11] In chronologic order: interview with Michael Archer, Goldsmiths University, London, 10/12/2017; interview with Jean Wainwright, London, 10/10/2018; interview with Mel Gooding, Barnes London, 13/12/2018; interview with Adrian Glew, Tate, London, 11/01/2019; interview with Bruce McLean, Barnes, London, 17/01/2019; interview with Violet Barrett, Clapham, London,10/02/2019.

interview, focusing on the life of each individual interviewed,[12] I have structured the interviews around a set of common questions related to their collaboration with *Audio Arts*. The questions asked include:

- When and how did your collaboration with *Audio Arts* begin?
- What was your role in the production of *Audio Arts*?
- Please tell me the story about one recording you have done with *Audio Arts* or you remember.
- What is in your view the legacy of *Audio Arts* both in terms of the wider cultural and social context and your personal experience?

Part of the factual information gathered (e.g. name of places, people, dates, memorable events) have been incorporated in the written part of the thesis, others remain purely oral sources. Rather than transcribing the interviews I have chosen to present them in an audio collage constructed around the above questions. My rationale is that I consider this audio material as part of another kind of history in parallel to the present writing, the curated events and the audio essays. Although I have edited out most of my questions and my comments recorded during each individual interview, I also consider this material the result of a co-constructed narrative. As oral historian Alessandro Portelli has pointed out:

> As opposed to the majority of historical documents, in fact, oral sources are not *found*, but *co-created* by the historian. They would not exist in this form without the presence, and stimulation, the active role of the historian in the field interview.[13]

The principal argument (I embrace) here is that oral history is a co-constructed practice that challenges the idea of autonomous knowledge production. Portelli suggests that an interview is a dialogic exchange between the historian and the narrator (the interviewer and the interviewee). It is an exchange of words as well of gazes. In addition, he argues that 'just like memory the narrative itself is not a fixed text and depository of information, but rather a process and a performance'.[14] Orality is in this sense a 'discourse in the making' rather than a finished discourse. Although it can be argued that similarly to photography a sound recording is a trace of the real, the audio format proposed in *Chapter*

---

[12] As for example the methodology provided by the National Life Stories based on in-depth interviews of several hours long, covering family background, childhood, education, work, leisure and later life. See https://www.bl.uk/projects/national-life-stories (accessed 7 February 2020).
[13] Alessandro Portelli, 'A Dialogical Relationship: An Approach to Oral History', 2005, http://www.swaraj.org/shikshantar/expressions_portelli.pdf (Accessed February 2020).
[14] Ibid.

3 - as well as in the other chapters - is not intended to be mere audio documentation of a series of interviews and conversations, but it is rather considered as a sound event in itself. The dialogic narratives co-produced with the *Audio Arts*' collaborators are subsequently presented here as both oral and aural primary sources, bearing in mind what Portelli has said: 'each interview is an experience before it becomes a text'.[15] By retaining the spoken voice as an aural element, the audio component of this thesis wants also to stress the importance of the vocal part of *logos* in the co-construction of a narrative. This is not predicated on the authentic voice of the interviewee - as traditional oral historians often assume - but rather on the notion of 'vocal ontology of uniqueness' elaborated by feminist philosopher Adriana Cavarero.[16]

I finally concur with Portelli that in oral history 'meaning and practice are inseparable … the interpretation begins at the moment of collection and all presentations – including the most "objective" one – is an interpretation'.[17] I extend this principle to the audio presentations of this thesis. The way a voice has been captured through a microphone, the space and the time in which a recording has been made, and above all the context in which it is made accessible, transmitted or distributed, including minor or extensive editing, all these tasks are part of the process of interpretation. The montage of the selected extracts from the interviews presented here as *Oral History of Audio Arts*, is therefore a montage of situated dialogues. Their meaning is conveyed through the words of a dialogic exchange as well as by the way in which those words have been uttered, pronounced, recorded, edited, framed together and finally played-back and listened to. In short co-constructed.

In parallel to the interviews with former collaborators of *Audio Arts* I have also conducted a new body of interviews with Furlong about specific aspects of the projects including the design and production of the inlay cards, the editing process, the production of *Object & Spaces* and other sound works (2016-2017). In writing this thesis I have also drawn from my previous conversations and interviews recorded with Furlong

---

[15] Portelli (1997), p. xiii.
[16] I am indebted to Adriana Cavarero for introducing the notion of 'uniqueness' in relation to voice and what she termed the 'vocal ontology of uniqueness'. Cavarero proposes to pay attention to vocal expression (or 'vocality') as the cipher of embodied uniqueness. She writes: 'since the maternal scene onward voice manifests the *unique being* of each human being'. Voice she argues is a 'sonorous relation' which is expressed by a mouth, by a unique singular living person who cannot be universalised. Whereas the notion of the authentic voice is often connected to the realm of identity politics, which neglects uniqueness, Cavarero's theorisation of voice embraces instead acoustic vibration and relationality as key factors in rethinking the relationship between *logos* and politics. See Adriana Cavarero, *For More Than One Voice: Toward a Philosophy of Vocal Expression*, 2005. This work is fully discussed in an interview with the author in Lucia Farinati, Claudia Firth, *The Force of Listening*, 2017.
[17] Portelli (1997), p. xiii.

between 2006 and 2013 on different occasions. From over 12 hours of recordings I have made with the artist in his studio and on location I have selected 40 minutes of material presented here in a separate audio collage. The montage does not follow a chronological order; rather, it dips in and out from various recordings, intercutting the artist's talk recorded at Villa Romana in Florence (27 June 2013) with statements taken from the interview recorded at Flat Time house (London, 31 July 2010) and his studio/home in Clapham (London 2009/2015/2016/2017).[18] While the location continuously shifts, the conversation goes back and forth to recurrent themes and concerns discussed with the artist over time, including the issue of the interview versus conversation, the use of sound recording, the DIY production and the activation of the archive.

The possibility to directly consult Furlong and cross check references with him in the personal archive hosted in his home has been an invaluable and unique opportunity during the preparation of this thesis. Given the fragility of this archive material, his trust and support were critical in progressing the research.

v.   Introduction to the Imagined Space: *Activating the Audio Arts Archive*

Whereas the first part of this thesis follows a linear historical methodology informed by a mix of sources including archival records, information gathered through visual mappings, audio interviews and a timeline, the second part develops a performative methodology in response to the sound archive. Drawing from a literature on performativity and performative archives presented in the last part of this introduction, *Chapter 4* elaborates a theoretical framework for the creative project *Activating Audio Arts Archive.* This creative project is an integral part of the thesis, firstly looks at the composition of the Audio Arts Archive (TGA 200414). Secondly, it examines the creative use of the archive by Furlong through the creation of new sound works. And finally, it proposes a methodology for activating this specific sound collection.

In practical terms the project consisted in the organisation and curation of four public events in collaboration with Tate Archive. It included a reading group and a workshop at the artist-run space Five Years (London, 18 May 2018), a sound seminar at the Stanley Picker Gallery in conversation with Michael Archer (Kingston, 24 May 2018) and finally two events at Tate Archive as part of their monthly programme *Show and Tell*, one in

---

[18] See the score (*William Furlong: Conversations and Interviews by Lucia Farinati*) for the audio montage in the *Appendix 1*.

conversation with Susan Hiller (London, 7 September 2018) and the other in collaboration with Jean Wainwright (London, 7 June 2019) (see *Appendix 2* for the original proposal and press releases). From the audio documentation of these events I have generated a new body of writing and recordings (*Chapter 5*) which discuss specific topics and themes drawn from the collection. The four audio essays include:

1. *From Transcription to Transduction: The Voice of Joseph Beuys in Audio Arts*
2. *Listening to Audio Arts Sound Works in Conversation with Michael Archer*
3. *Listening to Audio Arts in Conversation with Susan Hiller*
4. *Women's Voices and Sound Works in Audio Arts - in Conversation with Jean Wainwright*

The rationale for the themes and invited guests have been devised by choosing key artists and collaborators who directly contributed to *Audio Arts*. *Audio Essay 1* traces the history of the meetings of William Furlong with artist Joseph Beuys in London and explores the challenges of transcription (of recorded speech) as a creative practice. The essay is centred on the emblematic recording of Beuys at the Institute of Contemporary Arts (1974). *Audio Essay 2*, looks instead at the Audio Arts Sound Works co-produced by Furlong and Archer in the 1980s and discusses the exhibition activity of *Audio Arts*. In *Audio Essay 3*, the narration by the late artist Susan Hiller on the collaboration between *Wallpaper* magazine and *Audio Arts* show how the use of the magazine as an alternative space for artists was shared by many artists in the1970s. *Audio Essay 4* exemplifies a number of contributions by women artists across generations and practices and were selected in conversation with former *Audio Arts* interviewer Jean Wainwright.

The creative project embraced three modes of inquiry: spatial, curatorial and discursive. Spatial, as it explored the use of the physical space of the archive and the gallery as a site for a series of listening sessions. Curatorial, as each event and listening session involved both the selection of audio recordings from the archive as well as items to be displayed and presented to an audience.[19] Discursive, as each event combined listening and speaking, presenting the material in conversation with former collaborators of *Audio Arts* but also inviting the wider audience to interact with the material (e.g. the workshop at Five Years) and to contribute questions and comments.

I have chosen to call the project *Activating Audio Arts Archive* rather than 'animating' the archive as the former term implies action and performance. The word 'active', from

---

[19] The temporary displays at the Tate Archive were organised together with the Tate Archive curator Claire Sexton. The displays took place in The Hyman Kreitman Reading Room, directly adjacent to the Tate Archive. The material was organised thematically through the classification system I have adopted in *The Inventory Space*, See *Chapter 2* and *Appendix 1*.

Latin *agere* (act) and *activus* (active), means lively, effective, operative, but also engaged in action. And here I would like to stress the word 'act' and its relationship with speech, tracing a link back to J.L. Austin's notion of the 'speech act' and 'performativity' which will be further discussed in the final part of the introduction.[20]

The other reason for the title *Activating Audio Arts Archive* needs to be seen in relation to my previous activity as a curator and producer of a number of key exhibitions on Furlong's art practice. The exhibitions investigated the dual and symbiotic relationship between the thirty-year process of publishing recordings for *Audio Arts* and the creation of new sound works which are independent from the magazine.[21] The term 'active archive' was first used in conjunction with a symposium I organised at the British School at Rome in parallel to the exhibition at the Sound Art Museum in Rome in 2006.[22] Although this symposium failed to discuss the many topics proposed under the agenda of the *Active Archive* this became a key curatorial framework and methodology in the following years up to Furlong's most recent exhibition presented at Villa Romana in Florence. A full account of this trajectory was presented at the symposium at Tate Britain in 2013.[23]

It could be argued that as a past collaborator of *Audio Arts* the creative project presented here in this study is heavily influenced by my direct experience of working with Furlong for over a decade. My main argument of showing the continuity between the editorial and exhibition activity conducted by Furlong under the collective name of *Audio Arts* has drawn on my own previous curatorial projects. In short, that there is not enough distance from the subject of my study, and therefore no objectivity. However, my overall curatorial practice has been drawn from the dialogic approach of *Audio Arts* in developing several projects focused on listening and sound, and the way in which I have embraced it in the PhD has therefore shifted my practice onto another level.[24] By inscribing my voice

---

[20] See J.L. Austin, *How To Do Things With Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, Oxford University Press, 1976.

[21] Solo exhibitions include: *Extraction/Construction/Abstraction*, Sound Art Museum/Radio Arte Mobile, Rome, 2006; *Hearing Me Hearing You,* Plymouth Arts Centre, Plymouth, 2006/7; *Not Speaking the Language,* Flat Time House, London, 2010; *Speaking to Others: Who Speaks to Who,* Villa Romana, Florence, 2013. I was also an interviewer for *Audio Arts* (2005-2007).

[22] I organized and chaired the symposium *Active Archive* at the British School at Rome (19 October 2006) with William Furlong, Mel Gooding, Daniela Cascella and Lorenzo Benedetti. The symposium papers mainly discussed the medium of sound in *Audio Arts* and other sound collections.

[23] *Off the Record: The Legacy of Audio Arts Magazine in Contemporary Art*, Tate Britain 13 October 2013. In the paper *Active Archive (2006-2012)* presented at the conference I re-examined the main issues of this early discussion and investigated the politics of listening inherent to each curatorial project, tracing a link with Sound Threshold and other recent projects.

[24] In 2007 I established Sound Threshold, an interdisciplinary curatorial project that explores the relationships between site, sound and text, see www.soundthreshold.org.

into each narrative of this research I have consciously inhabited both the role of the researcher, the archivist, the historian, the curator, the writer and the sound recordist. By introducing a performative approach into the archive I have explored the tensions between the inventory and imagined space, and questioned my own subjectivity in the very process of doing the research. As Sue Breakell's paper *Connecting Subjectivities: Archives and Creative Practice* poignantly addressed in the conference *Life on the Outskirts Symposium: inspiration and interventions in small creative archives* (2018), there is no such thing as an objective form of archiving. Breakell argues that although largely invisible, the mediations of the archivist do influence the user's experience.[25]

To think about the dissemination of a complex and choral project such as *Audio Arts*, is to consider different degrees of access and contextualization, and the material entity (cassette tapes, reel to reel tapes, audio CDs, publications, photographs etc.) that requires re-interpretation. How the contents of this material can be re-used and re-interpreted is one of the challenges of my curatorial project *Activating Audio Arts Archive*. From boxes to vitrines, from studios to storage, from reading rooms to exhibition spaces, the life of an archive seems very much that of a life of transmigrating documents in search of a new identity. Through this project I experiment with a form of dissemination that acts transversally and temporally across all these stages but also problematizes the politics of archiving. As Suely Rolnik suggests:

> … such politics should be distinguished on the basis of the poetic force that an archiving device transmits rather than on that of its technical or methodological choices … their ability to enable the archived practices to activate sensible experiences in the present, necessarily different from those that were originally lived, but with an equivalent critical-poetic density. Facing this issue, a question immediately emerges: how can we conceive of an inventory that is able to carry the potential in itself - that is, an archive 'for' and not 'about' artistic experience or its mere cataloguing in an allegedly objective manner?[26]

Audio Arts was indeed a platform set up both *for* and *about* artistic experience. Through the production of the magazine Furlong acted as a sympathetic listener. He and his collaborators gathered artists' voices as primary accounts un-mediated by art historians/art critics. Moreover, Furlong saw the cassette tape as a means through which art works could be realised, presented and externalised. With the termination of the

---

[25] Keynote paper delivered by archivist Sue Breakell at the conference *Life on the Outskirts Symposium: Inspiration and Interventions in Small Creative Archives,*Manchester School of Art Manchester Metropolitan University, 9 February 2018. At this conference I first presented a paper on the present research.
[26] Suely Rolnik, *Archive Mania*, 2011, p.4.

magazine in 2007, the production side of *Audio Arts* also ended. However, Furlong has continued to create sound works which partly use archival recordings (see *Chapter 4*).[27]

In the light of the Tate Archive & Access digitisation project and the learning resource 'Animating the Archive' my research has contributed to the aim of the Tate Archive to use collections-related research to enhance the collections knowledge and interpretation for a wider audience.[28] Through the project *Activating Audio Arts Archive* I have expanded and at the same time opened up a different space to that of previous out-reach projects which invited users of specific communities to develop their own personal narratives through archival findings.[29] The question of how to activate the archive has instead been addressed through the 'co-construction' of new stories about *Audio Arts* and its collaborators: stories which could be inscribed into *Audio Arts* continuous conversations. Here the archive does not simply act as a repository of the past; it is a dynamic, performative space. One of the objectives of *Activating the Audio Arts Archive* is to create the opportunity for dialogue, keeping the interpretation of the material open by stimulating new questions. The contributions from former *Audio Arts* collaborators as well as from the audience are part of this process. As Furlong wrote:

> The power and dynamic of art stems from its originality and independence. Art is not divisible by notions of audience and 'widening participation' and then realized. …. At the centre of any such engagement there has to be the dynamic of the artwork by the audience. …. Audiences … comprise individuals who participate in constructing the meanings and function of art: they should not to be underestimated![30]

As I will demonstrate in the rest of this introduction, the term *performativity* reflects the convergence and opposition between performance and archive, orality and history, theatrical and documentary approach to art documentation, affect and feelings in the archive as opposite to detachment and rigour, fixation/duration/domiciliation as opposite to ephemerality/disappearance/temporality. I propose to summarize these

---

[27] The question whether the Tate Archive is open to promote a creative use of the *Audio Arts* collection, for example the creation of new sound works by other artists, is a possibility that should be explored in connection with the copyright issues. Whereas Furlong still holds copyright of the recordings done with the artists he interviewed, the reproduction of *Audio Arts* recordings by other authors incurs a copyright from Tate as well as the authors and *Audio Arts*.
[28] See the conference *Unboxing the Archive: how Tate is Transforming Access to our Artistic Heritage*, 23 November 2015, Tate Britain.
[29] See for instance the project *All About Us*, a Tate's Heritage Lottery funded Archive & Access: Learning Outreach Programme coordinated by Alison Jones and Michaela Swan at Tate Liverpool, in which a creative digital engagement has been explored at Alder Hey Children's Hospital. Also the *Mining Josef Herman* project exploring the Herman archive with communities in the Swansea Valley and beyond.
[30] William Furlong, *Art for All*, Peer, 2000, p.136.

antinomies in the tension between inventory and imagined space: the indexical conventional archive which is informed by a rational organisation of items and folders into a systematic/scientific order; and the imagined archive, an archive that can be navigated through the subjective experience and serendipity, created through performative acts. In other words this activity is 'an affective and critical practice involved in the construction of memory'.[31]

My interest in performativity and in performing archives is connected here with the potential of interacting with the Audio Arts Archive not simply as a repository of audio documents, but also and primarily as a context which activates the memory of a past, as well as for new listeners. In my research Activating Audio Arts Archive means to investigate the possibility of writing its history through the multiple stories this archive contains but also triggers, a history which is anchored to its documents as well as germinating from the gaps in the archive. Thus, the archive is envisaged as a site where oral accounts, story-telling, performative writing, interactive transcripts and new speech acts supplement and expand the strict consultation of archival documents and their intrinsic historical value. It is at the intersection of the inventory and the imagined space, embracing a performative approach to archives which have much been discussed by feminist scholars, that I proposed to 'write' a history of *Audio Arts*.[32] It is a history bound to the stories narrated in the archive, a history which is always becoming history. As narrative researcher Maria Tamboukou as underlined in her study 'Feeling Narrative in the Archive: The question of Serendipity':

> …a story never 'is', but always 'becomes'. It is not that we have, to listen to or think of a story and then we tell it or write it; the story becomes in the process of being narrated; it further 'becomes' as we perceive it, although what we narrate or feel can never be the same story.[33]

---

[31] I borrow this definition from Giulia Palladini and Marco Pustinaz (eds.) *Lexicon of Affective Archive*, 2017. For the notion of serendipity in the archive see the article by Maria Tamboukou 'Feeling Narrative in the Archive: The Question of Serendipity', *Qualitative Research*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2016, pp. 151-66.

[32] In February 2019 I took part in the conference *Activating the Archive - Artistic Politics, Feminist Viewpoints* (28 February 2019, Goldsmiths, University of London) organised by researcher Barbara Mahlknecht and participants Catherine Grant, Althea Greenan and Maria Tamboukou. Here I provided a comparison between my project *As a possibility of an encounter* (a collective reading of the work *Autoritratto* by art historian and feminist Carla Lonzi) and Furlong's work *Conversation Piece*. Although *Audio Arts* was open to women's artistic practice, and space was given to the voices of various feminist artists, especially in the 1970s, it would be misleading to read Furlong's work and *Audio Arts* within the framework of feminist archives. However, the methodology I have applied in both projects is informed by feminist literature and practice in the shared use of performative embodied strategies such as storytelling, oral transmission, live acting, rituals and verbal strategies.

[33] Maria Tambouko (2016), p. 1.

In this light this thesis acknowledges the incompleteness of a narrative mode and takes this incompleteness, 'the becoming of the story' - as Tamboukou suggests – 'not as a defect but as its actuality, as what it is, a process'.

Whereas the inventory approach provides the grid for writing an historical outline of *Audio Arts*, the creative/performative/dialogic use of the archive allows for new forms of interpretation and transmission within and outside the confined repository space. Through the interplay of a traditional historical approach (writing history from past evidences and archival documents) and a curatorial discursive approach (generating new material from storytelling, talks, sound seminars in the archive) the ambition of this project is not to write *the* history of *Audio Arts*, but rather to provide the critical and historical ground for multiple histories to be written and further developed. As the counterpart of speaking (Austin's speech act*) listening to* and *within the archive* play a central role in the development of a dialogic methodology which will further elaborate on the notion of the performative and affective archive here briefly introduced.

vi.   The notion of Performativity

Coined by British philosopher J.L. Austin the term 'performativity' has largely been discussed in the context of philosophy of language as well as in more recent years in the field of performance studies.[34] In his book *How To Do Things With Words* Austin writes:

> The term 'performative' will be used in a variety of cognate ways and constructions, much as the term 'imperative' is. The name is derived, of course, from 'perform', the usual verb that the noun 'action' takes: it indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action - it is not normally thought of as just saying something.[35]

According to Austin, words are not purely reflective linguistic acts, they do not simply reflect a world but speech actually has the power to make a world. In his well-known distinction between constative and performative utterance,[36] Austin argues that performative utterance does not set out to describe a situation, an event, an action, *it is* an event or an action. In brief:

---

[34] The term 'performativity' was coined on the occasion of the William James lectures at Harvard University in 1955. See J.L. Austin, *How To Do Things With Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, Oxford University Press, 1976.
[35] Austin (1976), pp. 6-7.
[36] Austin distinguishes constative from illocutionary linguistic acts. While constative sentences aim at producing true or false statements or descriptions, illocutionary expression are according to his theory performative acts.

> … words do something in the world … the promises, assertions, bets, threats and thanks that we offer one another are not linguistic descriptions of non-linguistic actions – they are actions in themselves, actions of distinctively linguistic kind.[37]

These statements constitute the very premises of the speech act theory inaugurated by Austin in the late 1950s, a theory which was subsequently developed in the work of John Searle and later revised by Jacques Derrida, Judith Butler, and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick.[38] For the purpose of this introduction I will not attend this philosophical lineage (covered in the study of James Loxley) but rather focus on the use of the term 'performativity' outside the strict realm of linguistics and philosophy of language.[39] I refer here to the field of performance studies, visual art and art history, in particular to the recent literature on performative and affective archives.

As a concept diffused in the field of performance studies, performativity has largely been employed in relation to performance art and those embodied practices including Happenings, live art, body art, as well as the cross-pollination between performance, visual arts and traditional performing arts.[40] Peggy Phelan and Amelia Jones are, among many other writers, the two art historians who have focused their critical work on performance and performativity beyond the analysis of the linguistic nature of speech and utterance. For Phelan the main characteristic of performance consists primarily in its transient spatial/temporal mode if not in its own disappearance:

> Performance's only life is in the present'; that it 'cannot be saved, recorded, documented, or otherwise participate in the circulation of representations *of* representations: once it does so it becomes something other than performance'. […] Performance […] becomes itself through disappearance.[41]

According to Phelan ephemerality and embodiment are intrinsic characteristics of performance while disappearance represent its ontological status. But is performativity always the act of performing for an audience, or necessarily bound to live presence?

---

[37] Austin, (1976), p. 2.

[38] See for example: John Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, 1969; Jacques Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, 1978; Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, 1999; Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*, 2003.

[39] James Loxley, *Performativity*, 2007.

[40] The field of performance studies remain a difficult terrain to define. As Richard Schechner - one of the founders of performance studies - has pointed out, this field is distinguished by traditional performing arts including theatre, music and dance and includes many different art forms and practices. With the expansion of performance, the term performativity started to be applied to other research fields stressing the performative behaviour inherent to certain strategies and methodologies rather than anchored to performance art as a medium in itself. See Richard Schechner, 'What is Performance Studies anyway?', in *The Ends of Performance*, 1998, p. 361.

[41] Peggy Phelan, *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*, 1993, p.146.

Much has been written about the passage from painting to Happenings, and from Happenings to performance art and about the progressive de-materialisation of art.[42]

This includes the question of how, for instance, action painting in its gestural mode constitutes an important legacy for Happenings and process art and how, conversely, the very action of dripping paint on the canvas, can be framed in terms of performative painting. As Jones suggests, it is across the many art practices and experimentations of the late 1950s and the 1970s in Fluxus, Happenings, conceptualism, minimalism, body art, process art, performance and video art that the fixed boundaries of the artwork (what she has called 'the predictability and commodifiability of static objects)[43] were clearly dismantled and new performative strategies emerged. But how can we define those strategies? Are they new techniques or new ways of making and doing? And to what extent are body, action, and the interaction with the audience key elements of performativity?

As an extensive research project on performance and performativity led by Tate has recently demonstrated, the terms performativity have been employed beyond the strict terrain of performance art and the act of performing the body.[44] Although performativity is widely applied to live art, this does not imply that a live event always corresponds to the act of performing in front of an audience. Equally, performativity is not anchored to a specific media, nor has it been considered as a medium per se distinguished for example from painting, and sculpture.[45] In brief, 'performativity' does not refer to what an artwork is made of (e.g. a body action), nor to a specific artistic trend or movement (e.g. Happenings). Certain objects such as a photograph of a performance can also be classified 'performative' in the way it captures or manipulates an event. As scholar Philip Auslander has cogently addressed in his essay *The Performativity of Performance*

---

[42] See Lucy Lippard and John Chandler, 'The Dematerialization of Art',1968.

[43] Amelia Jones, 'Unpredictable Temporalities: The Body and Performance in (Art) History', in *Performance Archives/Archives of Performance*, 2013, p. 53.

[44] http://www.tate.org.uk/about-us/projects/performance-and-performativity (Accessed 30 April 2018). http://www.tate.org.uk/art/art-terms/p/performance-art/introduction-performance-art (Accessed 30 April 2018).

[45] In his article *Between Action and Image: Performance as 'Inframedium'* Jonah Westerman argues that performance has always been considered as a medium despite the fact that it is resolutely ephemeral. By comparing the antithetical positions of Peggy Phelan (based on ephemerality and disappearance of performance) and Philip Auslander's notion of performative documentation, Westerman suggests that a possible third position can be found in the term 'intermedium' provided in 1965 by artist Dick Higgins to describe new works of art that he understood 'to fall between media'. See: http://www.tate.org.uk/context-comment/articles/between-action-and-image-performance (Accessed on 28 April 2018).

Documentation (later discussed in this chapter) – the act of documenting an event as a performance is what constitutes it as such.[46]

This can be observed both in the act of documenting a true event as well as creating an event through a photograph. According to Auslander, a documentary approach, exemplified (in his article) by the documentation of Chris Burden's performance *Shoot* (1971), can be seen, at first glance, diametrically in opposition with the theatrical approach of a staged action such as the performance/photograph *Leap into the Void* (1960) by Yves Klein. Auslander argues that, in reality, the two strategies are mutually exclusive. Although it is true that the theatrical images normally do not have a significant audience other than a camera (because they never took place in a real place), it is equally true that both categories (the shoot and the leap) were staged for camera. While the aim of documentary photograph consists in capturing a true event which normally, but not necessarily, is experienced by an audience what - according to Auslander - brings together the documentary and the theatrical approach under the terrain of performativity is not the presence or less of an audience which testify a true or fictitious act, but the fact that both events (the shoot and the leap) are mediated actions through photography. In Auslander's view performativity does not pertain exclusively to the true act of performing an action (to its 'liveness'), but also and primarily on the ideological premises thorough which a performance is perceived as such by the viewer.[47] *Leap into the Void* not only is an event staged in a photograph, an artefact, but it is also a document that is perceived by its viewers as a performance itself. In this sense the effect and the affective impact of the *Leap* on the audience is equally surprising or shocking as the *Shot.* Although the former one did not happen in real life, the photograph operates as *facteur de la vérité.* This passage from action to artefact, from the ephemerality of the live event - considered by Phelan as a pure self-reliant action with no need of documentation - to the performativity of performance documentation, contributed to new critical perspectives in the field of performance studies.[48] I will address this shift in the next section of this chapter, through

---

[46] Philip Auslander, 'The Performativity of Performance Documentation', *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art,*, vol. 28, no. 3, 2006, pp. 1-10.

[47] To follow this trajectory a performative object can be also considered a document used in a performance, for example a script which originally provided the audience with a series of instructions to be performed, such as in the context of Happenings. In this case the performative object is the remains of an action performed in the past (a historical document). The script continues to put the viewer into the action by providing the instructions for an event to be potentially re-performed or re-enacted in the present.

[48] The article by Auslander, first published in the *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*, was re-published in the anthology edited by Amelia Jones and Adrian Heathfield, *Perform, Repeat, Record: Live Art in History,* 2012.

which performativity has been embraced as a strategy through which to re-think the relationship between art documentation, archive, and art history.

Before examining the subject of performative archives, I would like to return to the observations of Philip Auslander and Amelia Jones. It can be further argued that the theatrical, evocative, mediated, and interactive qualities of the performative underlined by Auslander in relation to two extreme examples of performative documentation, is not the pure prerogative of performance art. In parallel to the development of performance as an artistic practice itself, installation art has also involved the physical presence of the spectator into the work, in other words, its activation through the body of the viewer. This is what has succinctly been called 'activated spectatorship' by some art historians.[49] Although we can establish many points of conjunction between the language of performance and installation art (as for example in the work of Bruce Nauman or Robert Morris) what seems to distinguish performativity from activated spectatorship seems however the very potential of the former to elude a set of fixed positions and temporalities. To borrow the title of one the most celebrated and influential exhibitions of the late 1960s, performativity seems to occur 'when attitudes become form', in that possibility of an open work, but also, and perhaps more distinctively, when those attitudes become spatial-temporal postures, acts, gestures, intentions.[50] To return to Amelia Jones, the novelty of performativity consists in a mode of intervention not anchored to a specific time/space but rather stressing the interrelation between bodies and subjects in space and time.[51] For Jones the new performative strategies of *de-manifesting* and the *un-framing* of art has been effective and consistent in 'de-containing' art from modernist formalism. The potential of performance, and by extension of those art practices that rely on the manifestation of 'unpredictable temporalities', is according to Jones to de-construct the aesthetic ideology of modernism: 'the fully contained and framed' of the artwork theorised by the art critic and art historian Michael Fried. Jones refers in particular to the many art practices between the 1950s and the 1970s, mentioned here above, which in tandem with political activism, have been framed under the umbrella term situational art.

> These situational practices transform sculpture into installation, performance into artworks – and both into interactive experiences; galleries become cultural statements and bodies are activated in relation to spatial coordinates in ways that

---

[49] See for example the work of art historian Claire Bishop, *Installation Art,* 2005.

[50] The expression is from title of the exhibition *Live in Your Head: When Attitudes Become Form (Works – Concepts – Processes – Situations – Information)* curated by Harald Szeeman at the Kunsthalle Bern in 1969.

[51] Jones' notion of 'interrelatedness' echoes the reciprocal constitution of bodies articulated by Maurice Merleau-Ponty in *The Intertwining* (1961). It also resonates with the concept of 'Connective Aesthetics' coined by artist Suzi Gablik (1992, 1995).

put pressure on the containing function of the aesthetic. Situational works also, as per the contemporaneous pressures of identity politics, initially called for an acknowledgment on the part of audience members of their implication in the identification accruing to the work's cultural and political situation and, correlatively, reflexively back to the "artist" as an assumed or fantasized origin of the work.[52]

Along with performance art and other embodied practices, Jones refers here to feminist art, queer art, Black, Chicano art as well, in brief to those practices putting 'identity' front and centre as an aspect of making. All of these tendencies have subverted the artwork 'wholly manifest' within itself, 'calling upon later viewers to engage with them through situational and *performative relations* of meaning making'.[53]

In this chapter I will not enter into the rich debate about performativity, identity politics and political activism which has been informed by the work of Judith Butler.[54] Nor will I enter the recent critique of performativity raised in the context of post-fordism and immaterial labour.[55] Although *Audio Arts* was directly involved in the movement for social change of the late 1970s by taking part in many of those initiatives at the intersection of art and activism such as the Free International University, the purpose of this chapter is to limit the study of performativity as a methodology for the interpretation and activation of archival documents. Consequently, I will restrict the analysis of feminist methodologies to specific examples which relate to archives, looking in particular at the relationship between audio recordings, historical sources and performative objects.

vii.   Performative affective archives

A series of publications and articles have recently embraced the term 'performativity' to designate a creative and affective approach to archival practice both

---

[52] Amelia Jones (2013), p.58.

[53] Two examples for Amelia Jones exemplify this intersection of art and activism: the works of American artists Allan Kaprow and Suzanne Lacy.

[54] Along with the theory of performativity by J.L. Austin, the deconstructive work by Judith Butler has been important for the development of performativity at the intersection of art and activism. In particular Butler's notion of performativity applied to dominant or common sense claims about the identity categories of sex, gender and sexuality, had and still have a certain influence in critically framing the intersection between performance and political action, across feminist art, black art and the LGBT movement.

[55] See the work of Maurizio Lazzarato, *Signs and Machines: Capitalism and the Production of Subjectivity*, 2014.

within and outside the terrain of performance studies.[56] Rather than presenting a comprehensive literature review of the subject, in this section I will focus my attention on only a few examples which have helped me to orientate myself in this new field of enquiry and also to redefine my own research methodology. I will introduce ideas on performative and affective archives through the work of Judit Vidiella (2014), Rebecca Schneider (2011) as well as continuing from the reflections of Auslander and Amelia Jones (2013) on the tension between documentation and performance, writing and art history.

Most of the reflections on performative and embodied archives stem from a critique of the politics of archive that revolve around notions of fixation, repository, domiciliation, documentation, and indexicality. These notions are ones that have often been seen in opposition to categories and practices of disappearance, ephemerality, orality and that are normally attributed to the realm of oral history, rituals, folklore and performance art. As scholar Judit Vidiella highlights in her article:

> Many authors working in the field of performance studies (Phelan, 1993; Schechner, 2013; Blocker, 2004, etc.) have maintained a definition of performance that emphasise the effectiveness of transgression, immediacy, presence and improvisation, when in reality many performances are normative for the fact that they repeat social constructions, rituals and hegemonic cultural practices.
> These authors have understood archive in different ways: as antithesis of the ephemeral character of performance, as resistance towards the stockpiling of Western culture and the "ocular" logic. They reclaimed other traditions as the indigenous and oral ones, the corporeal and the affective as forms of "preservation" of memory which do not distinguish the "truth", the "false", the "visible" and the "invisible". And finally, as a political strategy which recuperates the silenced memory of collective minorities; as well as creative occurrence by turning the archive-register into a performative act and activating other possibilities as for example through writing.[57]

By drawing from the field of performance studies and reflecting on the conceptual genealogies of affective politics (Thrift, 2008; Ahmed, 2004; Butler, 1993),[58] Vidiella's article proposes to rethink the relationship between affects and the politics of archive

---

[56] For example Gunhild Borggreen and Rune Gade (eds.) *Performance Archives/Archives of Performances,* 2013. Amelia Jones and Adrian Heathfield (eds.), *Perform, Repeat, Record: Live Art in History,* 2012.

[57] Judit Vidiella, 'Archivio encarnados como zonas de contacto' (Embodied Archives as Contact Zones), *Efímera Revista,* vol. 5, no. 6, 2015, pp. 16-23, p. 18, translation from Spanish by the present author.

[58] Nigel Thrift, *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect,* 2008; Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion,* 2013; Judith Butler, *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*, 1997.

linked to performance. She conceptualized the archive as a zone of fiction, collision, circulation and contact. She writes:

> To understand affective archives as spaces of circulation and not of repositories, as shared fluxes where emotions act as a force field inside the body, and where subjectivities and objects produce a distribution of intensity which continuously change.[59]

Vidiella's study starts with Thrift's (2008) non-representational (or non-representative) theory which shares a common ground within the current of 'new materialism' in privileging social, political, affective, relational, dialogic practice. The emphasis, here, is on the time and place of experience, in the vital, ludic, interactive force. It also draws from performative methodologies, which allow participants to be implicated in dialogic action rather than to be subsumed by strategies developed from representation, memory, consciousness-raising and discourses. As an example of performative methodology Vidiella introduces the work of Della Pollock (1988) and her text on performative writing.[60] Vidiella also introduces the work of Diana Taylor as an example of a different perspective on performance.[61] The embodied strategies proposed by Taylor consists in practices that overcome the politics of documentation and include *memes*: history, songs, habits, abilities, inventions, ways of doing which imply to learn by means of imitation, by copying from one person to another. This is a mnemonic system in which a word, an object, etc., are used to remember something else. Vidiella picks up on Taylor's notion of repertoire as a form of embodied memory, which requires mediation and presence, gesture, movement, and singing. As she notes, the word *repertorium* derives from latin *repertus*, past principle of *reperire* (combination of *re*, another time, and *parire*, making). Through this very idea of the repertoire as a process of making and repeating, it is possible, according to Taylor, to rethink the space of the archive. As she puts it:

> … the repertoire, as the archive, is a mediation; its process of selection, memorisation, internalisation or transmission which find its place in specific systems of representation.[62]

Within this new spectrum of performative/embodied practices Vidiella also situates the material thinking of Paul Carter (2004) as well as the somatic language of Jane Blockner

---

[59] Vidiella (2015), p. 17.
[60] Della Pollock, 'Performing Writing', in *The Ends of Performance*, 1998.
[61] Diana Taylor, *Disappearing Acts: Spectacles of Gender and Nationalism in Argentina's Dirty Wars,* 1997.
[62] Vidiella (2015) p. 21.

(2004).[63] The embodied repertoire included in this case are verbal strategies such as the anecdotal, gossip, parody, pastiche and humour. According to Vidiella these strategies allow to recuperate a language which disrupts the idealisation of the body that occurs within the arts and visual culture.

To complete this diverse spectrum of embodied methodologies Vidiella finally includes storytelling, oral transmission and live acting, rituals and 'ethno-texts'.[64] These methodologies are represented by practices which are always unfinished and which do not come from the same intact origin. The original (that foundation stone of the traditional logics of archive) is rather displaced and disrupted by this kind of practice in their cycles of infinite repetitions. Vidiella concludes her article by arguing that most of these proposals represent a way to understand the *archive as a zone of contact*. By drawing from Ahmed's notion of affect as embodied practice, and her interpretation of archive as multiple forms of public and personal contact, Vidiella frames the affective at the intersection of the personal and public.[65] Vidiella suggests that to rethink the way in which emotions are exposed and recognised within the forms of representation, open the door to the debate about archive as a form that both creates practices in context and in contact. What she called, in the title of her article 'embodied archives as contact zones'.

Another counter narrative which values the effective/affective role of the embodied archive is provided by the seminal essay by Rebecca Schneider, 'Performing Remains'. In this essay, revised and reprinted in several anthologies, Schneider discusses the implication of disappearance in Western culture and its relationship with the notion of remains.[66] She argues that according to 'the logic of the archive, what is given to the archive is that which is recognized as constituting a remain, that which can have been documented or has become document'.[67] Performance instead, as understood predominantly in performance studies and art-history, is too often the equation of

---

[63] Paul Carter, *Material Thinking: The Theory and Practice of Creative Research*, 2004; Jane Blocker, *What the Body Cost: Desire, History, and Performance*, 2004.

[64] Vidiella borrows these concepts from Rebecca Schneider, 'Performance Remains', *Performance Research*, vol. 6 no. 2, 2001, pp. 100-8.

[65] An archive is the result of multiple forms of contact, including institutions (with libraries, books, the web) as well as daily life contacts (friends, family, others). Certain forms of contact present themselves as authoritarian through writing, while other forms will disorganise and disappear. Here the personal and the public intersects with the individual and the social.

[66] I refer here to the revised version of Rebecca Schneider, 'Performing Remains', *Performing Research*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2001, pp.100-08, published in *Perform, Repeat, Record: Live Art in History*, 2014. See also Rebecca Schneider, 'Performing Remains: Art and War in Times of Theatrical Re-enactment', New York: Routledge, 2011, pp. 87-110.

[67] Schneider (2014), p.139.

disappearance 'thus reiterates performance as necessarily a matter of loss, even annihilation'.[68] Schneider asked:

> [if we adopt this equation and] 'apply it to performance generally, to what degree can performance interrogate archival thinking? … does an equation of performance with impermanence, destruction, and loss follow rather than disrupt a cultural habituation to the imperialism inherent in archival logic?[69]

Schneider refers here to the prerogative of the archive, theorised by Derrida, as the architecture (or domiciliation) of a social memory linked to the law.[70] She observed that although the earliest Greek archive houses mnemonics for performance rather than originals themselves, archive logic in modernity came to value the document over event. Schneider pictures the document of the colonial archives, 'as an arm of empire which can arrest and disable local knowledges … The archive became [in synthesis] a mode of governance against memory'.[71] So the question becomes:

> … does the logic of the archive, as that logic came to be central to modernity, in fact demand that performance disappear in favour of discrete remains – material presented as preserved, as non-theatrical, as "authentic," as "itself," as somehow non-mimetic?[72]

Schneider acutely observed that the archive becomes a hostile force especially in relation to those cultures which do practice storytelling, visitation, improvisation or simply are the expression of embodied ritual oral practice.

> In such practices – coded (like the body) primitive, popular, folk, naive – performance does remain, does leave "residue." Indeed the place of residue is arguably flesh in a network of body-to-body transmission of affect and enactment – evidence, across generations, of impact.[73]

Despite their direct impact on cultural memory, these performance practices have been routinely disavowed as historical practice and considered merely rituals under the rubric of 'ethnic' or 'primitive' culture. In a better scenario, these practices have been incorporated in a 'new' history through the constitution of radically new kinds of archives: the oral archives.[74] The oral, however, notes Schneider, 'is not approached here

---

[68] Ibid, p.139.
[69] Ibid, p.140.
[70] See the Greek root of the word 'archive' which mean archon's house.
[71] Schneider (2014), p.141
[72] Ibid, p.141.
[73] Ibid, p.141.
[74] Schneider refers to the work of French historian Jacques Le Goff.

as already an archive, a performance-based archive. Rather, oral histories are constituted anew, recorded and "saved" through technology in the name of identicality and materiality.'[75]

In Schneider's eyes this 'new' archiving is to buttress the same paradigm of loss and disappearance founded on 'the phallocentric insistence of the ocularcentric assumption that if it is not visible, or given to documentation or sonic recording, or otherwise 'houseable' within an archive, it is lost', disappeared'.[76] Further questions are triggered here: how can the performative archive be equally valued as an important source for writing history, or how can it be valued as a historical practice in itself?

Schneider shifts her focus from performance art to theatre and historical re-enactment (e.g. battle re-enactment). She takes this example as a context in which performance can be approached as a means of re-appearance and 're-participation'. 'Remains', she highlights, do not have to be isolated to the document, to the object, to bone versus flesh. Here the body … becomes a kind of archive and host to a collective memory'.[77] Schneider refers here to the literature on collective trauma as a form of compulsory repetitions and also to 'counter-memory'.[78] For Schneider, in order to resituate a history informed by body-to-body transmission we will need 'to rethink the site of history in ritual repetition'.[79]

> Whether that ritual repetition is the attendance to documents in the library … or the oral tales of family lineage … or the myriad traumatic re-enactments engaged in both consciously and unconsciously, we refigure "history" onto bodies, the affective transmissions of showing and telling.[80]

Schneider argues that history is not limited to the imperial domain of the document (the bones). Through body-to-body transmission, or in other words, through the idea that flesh memory might remain, the conventional notion of the archive can be radically challenged. As she suggests, the real provocation of this reading is not anchored on the idea that performance disappears '(that is what the archive expects, this is the archive's requirement) … but that it remains in ways that resist archontic "house arrest" and "domiciliation": it remains, but remains differently or in difference'. [81]

---

[75] Schneider (2014), p.141.
[76] Ibid, p.142.
[77] Ibid, p.142.
[78] Schneider refers to the study on trauma by Sigmund Freud and Cathy Caruth as well as on memory by Michel Foucault and Friedrich Nietzsche.
[79] Schneider (2014), p.145.
[80] Ibid, p.145.
[81] 'The archive performs the institution of disappearance, with object remains as indices of disappearance and with performance as given to disappear.' Rebecca Schneider (2014), pp.145-

Through performance, we are asked, again, to (re) found ourselves – to find ourselves in repetition.[82]

I would like to end this section by going back to Auslander and Jones, to return to the issue of performance documentation and link this to the notion of performative archive. In his article Auslander quotes the work of Amelia Jones as one of the key reference points for a critique of the negative ontology of performance disappearance. He writes:

> Jones …takes up the idea of photographic documentation as a supplement to the performance to challenge the ontological priority of the live performance'. She offers a sophisticated analysis of the "mutual supplementarity of … performance or body art and the photographic document. (The body art event needs the photograph to confirm its having happened; the photograph needs the body art event as an ontological 'anchor' of its indexicality).[83]

As Auslander underlines, Jones argues for a mutual dependence of performance and document ('the performance is originary only insofar as it is documented'). By further developing this idea he also demonstrates that there is not such an opposition between documentary and theatrical documentation, that this difference is only ideological. The interplay (rather than the opposition) between performance and documentation, action and artefact becomes particularly eloquent in the context of the work *Photo-Piece* (1969) by Vito Acconci. Developed through a very simply performance instruction, the work consists in the artist holding a camera while walking and taking a photo every time he blinks. Auslander sustains that in this example:

> … the act of documenting an event as a performance is what constitutes it as such. Documentation does not simply generate image/statements that describe an autonomous performance and state that it occurred: it produces an event as a performance.[84]

Auslander argues that it is not the initial presence of an audience that makes an event a work of performance, but, as the work of Acconci demonstrates, 'it is its framing as performance through the performative act of documenting it as such'.[85]

146.
[82] Schneider (2014), p.146.
[83] Auslander (2006), p. 2. The citation from Amelia Jones is from 'Presence' in Absentia: Experiencing Performance as Documentation', *Art Journal* vol. 56, no. 4, 1997, p.98.
[84] Auslander (2006), p.5.
[85] Auslander (2006), p.7.

What are the implications for the art historian, the archivist and the curator in rethinking art documentation as well as (the) archive in the performative terms posed by Auslander and Schneider? It seems that since the appearance and diffusion of the notion of performativity within and beyond the strict realm of performance studies, the very challenge of writing art history and curating display based on archival documents is no longer or exclusively centred on the self-reliance and authenticity of material objects (the archival items), but rather, as Schneider has suggested, the way, or attitude in which this kind of information is accessed. She calls this process the 'architecture of access'.[86]

> The way in which the same detail of information can sound, feel, look, smell, or taste, radically different when accessed in radically different venues or via disparate media. … In line with this configuration performance is the mode of any architecture or environment of access.[87]

A reconsideration of the relationship between documentation and performance, and between document and archive, has also created the possibility to rethink, beyond the strict realm of performance art, what possible strategies and methodologies can be developed in writing about history but also in imagining other forms of archives (Vidiella). For example, recent anthologies on performative and affective archives have explored how the archive can be transformed into a dynamic self-reflective medium that intervenes in and challenges its own ontology: the performative archive. This is an archive that is performed by its audience and participants and where the role of the scholar and the artist might coincide.[88] On the other hand performance and performativity seem to ask the writer, the scholar, the art historian to pay attention in the way history is written and contextualised. Amelia Jones's ongoing interest in performativity stems precisely from this challenge. From the anthology *Performing the Body, Performing the Text* to more recent articles, Jones poignantly reminds the reader that the very potential of performance is to put pressure on how we write history and to thwart structures of art history and aesthetic judgment'.[89] Jones stresses the importance of refusing the boundary-making function of aesthetics and its corollaries: art criticism, art

---

[86] Auslander (2006), p.145.
[87] Ibid, p.145.
[88] See for example Paul Clark, 'Performing the Archive: The Future of the Past', in *Performance Archives/Archives of Performance*, 2013.
[89] In a seminal anthology of texts co-edited with Andrew Stephenson, Jones proposes that the viewing or embodied reception of visual artwork is a process that can be engaged as performative. 'Adopting the notion of performativity as a critical strategy within the study of visual culture … affords a critique of art criticism and art history as they have been traditionally practiced'. 'The notion of performativity highlights the open-endedness of interpretation understood as a *process* rather than an act with a final goal'. See Amelia Jones and Andrew Stephenson (eds.) *Performing the Body/Performing the Text*, 1999, pp.1-2. See also Amelia Jones, *Unpredictable Temporalities*, 2013, p.54.

history, the art market. But how to ensure that art criticism and art history do not re-propose the same aesthetic paradigms which artists have attempted to deconstruct and subvert? How, in other words, is it possible to reduce the tendency of creating new art trends on the back of what she named the 'divine theology' of aesthetics and the authoritative role of art critics without the risk of leaving out specific histories, and thus specific bodies?[90] These are a series of questions that seem very pertinent not only for a revised or an expanded history of performance art but also for those scholars and cultural practitioners, like myself, who interrogate the role of (the) archive in the construction of multiple narratives.

For Jones, as for Vidiella and Schneider, the notion of performativity seems key to de-construct and un-frame the conventions of aesthetics. The embodied reception (or the bodily strategies) are there to remind the art historian, the art critic as well as the artist and the activist where and how they position and frame themselves into the picture. Jones writes:

> The point is to activate and *become activated* by the traces of past performative works, all the while retraining an awareness of how these processes of activation are occurring.[91]

Jones ultimately proposes the notion of inter-relationality as a mode 'to look at each project individually as it enacts and affects specific bodies within the complexities of its unfolding over time in particular spaces'.[92] The question of which spaces and which bodies are engaged, for how long and in what ways, how are such moments of affect and potential change *registered historically* and finally how they have been accessed in present tense and interpreted, remains the crucial question. The return to the body, the 'thickness of the body', is clearly for Jones as well as the other authors, a return to durationality as much as to embodiment and inter-subjectivity. It is a conceptual framework that owes its legacy to feminist thinking as well as to feminist political practice. This is a framework that I return to in the *Conclusion* in relation to voice and vocality.

---

[90] Jones uses the example of 'relational aesthetics' coined by Nicolaus Borriaud and its critique by Claire Bishop.
[91] Jones (2013), p.68.
[92] Ibid, p.68.

viii. Performativity in Audio Arts

How and why is the notion of performativity important for the study of the Audio Arts Archive? Since its outset *Audio Arts* magazine explored the possibility of recording different kind of sonic events. As Furlong put it 'Audio Arts is a recorded space for contemporary art', a magazine in the format of an audial space which mostly feature artists' voices: interviews and conversations with artists, artists' talks in galleries and colleges, conferences and symposia, audio reportages recorded at the main international exhibitions (e.g. Venice Biennale/Documenta), as well as recordings of live performances and sound works. While a wider spectrum of creative practices is represented here through conversations that unpack the genesis, development and concerns of several art projects (installations, sculptures, performances, video, paintings, experimental music, sound and poetry), the overarching focus of the magazine - from its establishment in 1973 to its last number in 2007 - has been the medium of speech. This is speech as a form of human communication (e.g. the artists' interviews) but also as a primary medium in the making of performative art works, which spans conceptual art, performance and live art, concrete poetry, sound art, experimental music and those art practices which can be framed in the wider context of 'dialogic aesthetics'.[93] This fascination for recorded speech as a specific sound event is palpable, since the production of the first number of *Audio Arts* includes a performative reading of artist Ad Reinhardt's *Auto interview by* Jack Wendler, a statement by art critic Caroline Tisdall, an interview with philosopher Cyril Barrett, a reading by artist Richard Sladden and an extract from *Art Language Proceedings* with Philip Pilkington, Michael Baldwin, Dave Rushton and Chris Smith.

This issue inaugurated a long-term exploration of voice at the intersection of body and language, paying constant attention to speech, both in terms of performativity of language as well as a mode of artistic production. Hours and hours of tapes are dedicated to conversations with artists recorded in their work environment, the space of their studio or the exhibiting space. For example, Tracey Emin was interviewed by Furlong several times across years, in 1994 at the Cologne Arts Fair, in 1996 at her original art space (The Tracey Emin Museum) hosted in a former mini-cab office in Waterloo Road in south East London; finally in 1997 at the South London Gallery during her exhibition *I Need Art Like I Need God*. Playing back these recordings means to enter different registers of speech which illuminate the way certain art works have been conceived, made and displayed. From Austin's point of view it could be argued that these utterances are speech acts that describe works rather than performing them. They are in short mostly constative

---

[93] See Grant Kester, *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art,* 2004.

and non-performative utterances.[94] But beyond the pure linguistic act, these recordings are also acoustic events of a special kind: they capture and inscribe the original voice of the artist, her timbre, accent, colour, intonation, what Roland Barthes has called 'the grain of the voice'.[95] According to conventional interpretation of oral history, it might be also argued that these recordings are historical documents as they preserved the 'authentic' voice of the artist. But if we compare *Audio Arts* interviews with the ones produced in the same period by the *Artists' Lives* project, we soon realize that Furlong as well as the other *Audio Arts* interviewers, neither follow the protocols of oral history nor focus thoroughly on biographical entries.[96] Although *Audio Arts* represents an important contribution to aural history of contemporary art and its oral narrative, the assumption that this whole body of recordings can be critically contextualized in the field of oral history because they are aural recording of interviews, might be misleading. (I will return to this in the Conclusion).

My central argument here is that the legacy of *Audio Arts* interviews lies at the intersection of creative critical practice, oral art history and art criticism. And although one terrain does not exclude the other, it is ultimately the way in which these recordings are accessed and used which determines the critical frame in which we can interpret them either as simply documentation of sound events, as documents of oral history, as performative sound events, or as the sum of the three possible interpretations.

If we go back to the interview with Tracey Emin recorded in 1997 at the South London Gallery, the same *Audio Arts* number includes a recording of the artist performing *Wigwam Sam* at the age of ten. This is a recording that Emin describes as an art work itself rather than a source of biographical information. So how should this recording be framed outside the economy of oral history and, generally speaking, in relation to art history?

Beside the rich collection of artists' interview, another significant body of recordings published by *Audio Arts* was originated from the audio 'documentation' of performances *in situ* (in galleries or off site locations), subsequently post-produced in the studio. A number of recordings was also originated from sound performances specifically staged for the tape cassette production (see *Chapter 2*). Here, we enter another slippery terrain within performance and performativity which traverses that thin line between the

---

[94] According to Austin constative utterances are 'sentences and words which aims at producing true or false statements or description', Austin, (1976), p.7.
[95] Roland Barthes, *The Grain of The Voice: Interviews 1962-1980,* 2009, North Western University Press.
[96] *Artists' Lives* is a project initiated by National Life Stories in 1990. The charitable trust is based in the oral history section of the British Library and works in partnership with Tate Archive and the Henry Moore Institute.

theatrical and the documentary mode of documentation discussed above in relation to Auslander's examples.

Furlong has often dismissed the term documentation in regards to *Audio Arts*. Although he was often invited to document specific art events, Furlong's ambition has always turned and challenged these invitations into new forms of collaboration with artists, transforming the simple process of recording, editing and releasing a tape cassette into an expanded creative critical practice. As I will fully discuss in *Chapter 2*, the purely documentary approach is in fact one minor aspect of the magazine and is limited mostly to the audio documentation of symposia and talks.

Moving the attention from the artists' interviews - regularly published in the four annual issues from 1973 to 2007 - to the production of *Audio Arts* supplements, here is where the very collaborative aspects of the sound magazine is fully expressed. Take for example the supplement *Continuous Diary* of Ian Breakwell published in 1978. Based on a recording of a live reading by Breakwell at the Whitechapel Gallery in 1977, then post-produced in the studio with the addition of background sound and effects, this tape is an example of performative documentation. Many other similar examples could be added here to demonstrate how the use of audial space by Furlong and collaborators (artists and co-editors) functioned as an alternative art space, and how this has been developed into a multifaceted sound practice.

As a result, the expansion of the magazine from the 'pure documentation' of sound events to the production and distribution of art works represent an important legacy of *Audio Arts*. In my research I look at how the audio documentation is ultimately a means of production (documentation as production). In particular, in *Chapter 4*, I will address how the creative use of the Audio Arts Archive by Furlong's impetus of revisiting its 'own' recordings has resulted in the past two decades in the creation of new sound works. Finally I consider how Audio Arts Archive has never been conceived as a receptacle of audio documents but is the irremediable result of a living, active archive.

Editorial Note

      In this thesis the *Audio Arts* magazine is noted as *Audio Arts.* The *Audio Arts* archive is noted as Audio Arts Archive in the main text and TGA 200414 in the footnotes as this indicates the reference code assigned by the Tate Gallery Archive for the preserved items of *Audio Arts*. The Audio Arts sound works are noted as Audio Arts Sound Works.

Chapter 1: The Wider Historical Context

1.1 Inception of *Audio Arts*

> The uniting thread of Audio Arts is about conversations … to provide the knowledge about artists' work: what they do, why they do it, how they do it.[1]

> William Furlong, Tate Britain, 2007

At the inauguration of the *Audio Arts* display at Tate Britain in 2007, Furlong stressed that *Audio Arts* 'it all started from typically eccentric conversation between two artists in 1970s when it was the era of conceptual art'.[2] Furlong and Barry Barker, both trained as painters in the 1960s, respectively at the Royal Academy Schools and the Camberwell School of Art, first met at Epsom School of Art in the 1970s where they were both teaching. In the early 1970s Furlong was living in Brighton with his wife Violet Barrett, who subsequently became involved in the production and distribution of the magazine as an administrator. After an approximately one-year-long exchange, on the 20th April 1973, Barker and Furlong finally decided to meet in Brighton to discuss the strategy for the production of the first issue. Joined by Barrett, the conversation, although quite informal and practical in tone, was decisive for establishing the framework of *Audio Arts* magazine.

> BB: On Tuesday we've got to do the introduction. We've to write the introduction and get that sorted out. And the discussion inset thing, how are we going to do that?
>
> WF: Yes
>
> BB: Then we've got to write down the list of people who we want to contact, including Caroline Tisdall, who we want to contribute.
>
> WF: I think what we ought to do Barry if we can get hold of this tape recorder, is to do a trial run of discussions for the inset, an actual piece that we can put in. If we did about an hour and played it through and decided on one section of it, say a 5 minute section or perhaps talk for half an hour and then decide upon half an hour inset.
>
> BB: But we want to try and get all those things we were talking about yesterday into … you know about the nature of the mix.
>
> WF: In fact it wouldn't be a bad idea to do that first before we actually make the

---

[1] William Furlong speaking at the reception of the show *Audio Arts* display, Tate Britain, 4 May 2007. Recording made by the present author.
[2] Ibid.

formal statement just by talking about it. I think we've got to by Tuesday night then to have enough information to write out a number of specific statements. Don't you agree?

BB: Yes.[3]

As we can read in the first few lines, the conversation began by thinking about what kind of material it was possible to gather for the first issue, but also how to formulate a statement of intent which would introduce the project to an audience. Whilst this conversation was recorded and subsequently transcribed by Furlong after the meeting, it was never actually published as content for the magazine. However, a written statement was eventually produced a few weeks after this discussion and put together as an information sheet for subscribers. This would have been circulated in different London venues where copies of the magazine were available such as the Nigel Greenwood Gallery (where Barker was working at the time), Situations, the Institute of Contemporary Art, the Arts Council Bookshop and the Jack Wendler Gallery. The information sheet reads as follow:

> 'AUDIO ARTS' is the first audio tape cassette art magazine. The magazine will provide a source for ideas, information and knowledge concerning art. It will bring together people within the arts and others working in related disciplines using discussion, interviews and statements etc., building over the months into a sound archive. The magazine is jointly edited by Barry Barker and William Furlong.
> The magazine will build a structure complementary to and alongside existing structures within art. Its content will be based on a need for a critical examination of the presuppositions, on many, levels, relating to art and on a need to constitute/reconstitute frameworks of reference.
> By adopting a multi-disciplinary approach the content of the magazine will be of an embracing nature, creating links between art and other areas of intellectual activity.
> Throughout the period of research and planning for the magazine, a number of issues have been raised by the use of sound rather than the printed word. Sound facilitates the presentation of material through the spoken word without being 'once removed' in terms of a literary tradition. Not that a sound magazine is in any way attempting to compete with the 'printed word' but rather exists in relation to it.
> The first edition of the magazine is planned for October. Running parallel to the magazine, which will be published quarterly, a number of supplements will be produced throughout the year. Subscribers will be notified of supplement publications.[4]

The text above appears to be one of the first documents produced by *Audio Arts* prior to

---

[3] Transcription of a discussion between William Furlong, Violet Barrett and Barry Barker held in Brighton in 1973, TGA 200414/2/186, Working file titled 'Transcripts', folder 4; unpublished.
[4] Audio Arts Working Files Promotion, TGA 200414/2/2.

the publication of the first issue. It therefore represents an appropriate starting point for retracing the initial history of the magazine's inception. As we can read, the statement clearly set the aims and objectives of the magazine: producing recordings from discussions, interviews and statements within an art context as well as to connect art to 'other areas of intellectual activity'. Many years later Furlong reformulated this statement by simply describing *Audio Arts* 'as a primary medium and "space" for the articulation and dissemination of debate, theory and practice in relation to contemporary art'.[5] This was a description that was eventually edited down to just one line and printed on the cover of the late issues as 'a recorded space for contemporary art'.[6]

If on one hand the idea of establishing a sound magazine seemed a very simple one, technically feasible thanks to the introduction of portable tape recorders in the late 1960s, on the other 'it took time for the magazine to discover its conceptual identity and for Furlong to arrive at the compendious and commodious definition of its purposes that is implicit in the work'.[7] At the beginning of this publishing venture, Barker and Furlong simply saw the sound format as 'a complementary structure' to printed media. Whilst in fact new printed art magazines were established between the late 1960s and the early 1970s, none of the coeval editorial initiatives dedicated to contemporary art in the UK took the specific form of a cassette tape magazine.[8] *Audio Arts* appears in this respect a magazine of a new and special kind which did not have a direct point of reference. This leads to a number of questions. What were the actual priorities set by Furlong and Barker at the beginning of the project? And in which way did the magazine 'build a structure complementary to and alongside existing structures within art'? What were the 'frameworks of reference' to be constituted or re-constituted?

In the meeting in Brighton, Barker and Furlong brought to the table names of potential contributors and supporters: Caroline Tisdall, at that time art critic for *The Guardian*; the American gallerist and editor Jack Wendler who represented an important point of contact for American artists in London and artist Bruce McLean, who was also teaching at Epsom School of Art, and became a close collaborator of Furlong. Beside this promising line-up of people, Furlong has often mentioned two other protagonists of the art world of the 1970s who were instrumental in developing the idea of the magazine: Peter Townsend, the editor of the London-based contemporary art magazine *Studio International*, and the American art critic Barbara Reise who was also a regular contributor

---

[5] See William Furlong (ed.) *Audio Arts Recording*, 2001.
[6] See the volumes published on CD format: vol. 22/23 (2004), vol. 23/24 (2005-6), vol. 25 (2007).
[7] Mel Gooding, 'The Work', in *Audio Arts: Discourse and Practice in Contemporary Art*, ed. by Willian Furlong, Academy Editions, 1994, p.7.
[8] For example *Art Monthly* and *Artscribe*.

to *Studio International*. What emerges from this network of people is a constellation which directly or indirectly gravitates around the sphere of conceptual art, with a specific regard to the relationship between contemporary art and publishing. Although the collective Art & Language and their journal was never mentioned by Furlong as a direct influence in developing the idea of *Audio Arts*, the common interest in conceptual art shared by Barker/Furlong was a catalyst in the production of the first issue in which an extract from Art & Language Proceedings was published.[9]

Unlike an 'analytical type theoretical magazine' - as Barker refers to it in the meeting in Brighton - the way in which *Audio Arts* took shape and subsequently was conceptualised seemed to be influenced by the artists' pages of *Studio International* rather than the distinct theoretical and critical writing of the *Art-Language* journal. Under the new direction of Peter Townsend in 1969, *Studio International*, previously called *The Studio* and mainly reporting on art and craft, became one of the most important points of reference for conceptual art and new criticism. Embracing the idea of printed media both as information and artwork, the magazine provided one of the most experimental frameworks both for artists, art critics, cultural producers and editors. It notably hosted the project *July/August 1970* by the dealer Seth Siegelaub which consisted of an exhibition that took place solely in the magazine and featured works made expressly for the page. It also became an important platform that promoted artists' voices by regularly publishing artists' interviews. This was a field of action which must have attracted the attention of Barker and Furlong especially in relation to the possibility offered by the portable tape recorder of easily producing audio interviews. However, since the inception of the project, it was clear to both that the introduction of sound in the publishing arena was not a purely technical matter. The idea of using sound came about through artistic practice, through their reflections as artists and their concern about the artist voice.[10] This was felt an issue to be re-addressed or re-constituted: creating a space where many voices could be heard as primary sources. That space was the audio-cassette. And as Furlong wrote in 1976 for the workshop at the Free International University: 'The audio cassette offers a method of recording and distributing information over a wide area not defined by constraints often associated with printed media.'[11]

---

[9] This includes a conversation between Philip Pilkington, Michael Baldwin, Dave Rushton and Chris Smith.

[10] See the letter sent by Barker to the journal *Art News* on the 28th August 1973, requesting the permission to use the piece *Self-Interview* written by artist Ad Reinhardt first published by *Art News*. TGA 200414/1/2/20.

[11] William Furlong, *Workshop Project Audio: Information Distribution on Audio Cassette*. TGA 200414/2/2/2.

If is true that it took a few years to finally conceptualise the complex area of activity of *Audio Arts* it is also true that the possibility of embracing the audial technological space of the tape as a parallel to that of the gallery, was quickly put into practice and implemented. Within the relatively short span of one year from the meeting in Brighton, four *Audio Arts* issues were produced on Memorex tapes which formed Vol 1. This was followed by six separate supplements also published between 1973 and 1974 including recordings of Nice Style, Richard Cork, *Wallpaper* magazine, Richard Quarrell and R. Buckminster Fuller. In a review by Caroline Tisdall in *The Guardian*, the very difference between tape recordings and written articles is seen as one of the most generative elements of *Audio Arts*.

> … Furlong has been free of the risk constraints that are making publishers so wary and boring in their policies. He has above all been able to mix recordings of the very famous: Duchamp, Buckminster Fuller, Joseph Beuys, etc., with less known artists working now. This is the area in which he has really been able to exploit the difference between the tape you sit down to listen to for an hour and a magazine which invites skimming and flickering. He has been able to allow people working in the field of theory and social practice really to expand their ideas beyond the usual restrictions of the written article, giving them more direct contact with their audience.[12]

By 1977 Audio Arts was fully acknowledged (and further endorsed) by a number of other reviews and in interviews with Furlong in newspapers and magazines including *Studio International*'s survey on art magazines. In the invitation letter sent to Furlong from Richard Cork, editor of *Studio International* at that time, the special nature of the magazine is fully recognised as a valuable contribution to the field.

> I am enclosing a questionnaire which we are sending out to well over 80 mags throughout the world. Although I realise that the special nature of Audio Arts makes it a little outside the frames of reference for printed mags, I still think it could be valuable to have your replies in the issues it raises. Provided, of course, that you make clear that you produce a cassette rather than a verbal/visual organ![13]

In response to the questionnaire Furlong wrote a new statement in which the novelty of the magazine was articulated through two distinct elements: the production on audio-cassette on one hand and, on the other, the use of recorded speech as primary media.

---

[12] Caroline Tisdall, 'Whitechapel: Audio Arts', *The Guardian*, 1977. TGA 200414/2/39.
[13] Richard Cork letter to Furlong, 18/6/1976. TGA 200414/1/2/253.

Audio Arts is now owned by its editor and is independent, having spent the period of one year (1974-75) under the ownership of a publishing company. Due to the special nature of the magazine, which is produced on audio-cassettes, the primary policy has been that of using the potential of "live" sound tape to "open up" and provide access to areas of contemporary concerns. Interests reflected in the magazine have at all times been of an editorial nature, and is based on a desire to expand and develop the uses of the sound cassettes as an innovatory, yet serious method of publishing. In this respect it became evident that the magazine could, in addition to its concerns with current developments, perform an archival function. This led to the publication of original recordings by artists and writers, including Marcel Duchamp and James Joyce.

…Audio Arts is primarily concerned with information. I see the magazine acting as a resource that offers close contact with original sources on an intimate and kind of 'pre-literate society' basis. In others words coded method of communication, as in the case of printed text, are absent and the receiver is brought into close proximity with the information source. The processes involved in receiving such information relate more to personal interactive methods where impressions are based on a 'non-linear' reception of material. With the recorded human voice other factors came into play, such as intimation, emphasis, timing, wit, diction, accent, and are used by the listener as interpretative tools. As speech tends to be less 'dense' than prepared text, this gives substance to the notion of speech acting as a common denominator both through and across the various levels of specialism within social groups.[14]

To conclude this section on the inception, I would like to return to the very beginning of the conversation between Barker and Furlong. Another point stated in the early promotional material, which reappeared in a statement for *Studio International*, is the potential of the magazine of 'building into a sound archive' or to 'perform an archival function'. This is a potential that neither Furlong nor the other co-editors of *Audio Arts* have systematically developed. While the re-publication of historical recordings was something that was pursued in the early days of the project, *Audio Arts* never developed into a fully fledged archival practice. As Furlong underlined at the Tate reception in 2007, the Audio Arts Archive is the result of many years of editorial activity. The magazine was never conceived of as an archive. With the exception of the impromptu tape library set up in 1977 in the coffee bar of the Whitechapel Gallery the idea of building a sound archive publicly accessible remained only a sporadic episode.[15] We have to wait for the acquisition by Tate in 2004 for all the *Audio Arts* recordings produced between 1973 to 2007 to constitute an autonomous organised archive collection.

Another aspect which might appear secondary as it seemed completely absent in the early *Audio Arts* statements, is an acknowledgement of the system theory which was

---

[14] William Furlong, *Studio International*,1976. See TGA 200414/2/39.

[15] See *Chapter 2* and the *Chapter 3* for more details on the collaboration with the Whitechapel Gallery.

introduced as a point of reference from Furlong during the Brighton meeting. After his studies under the supervision of the abstract painter John Hoyland at the Royal College of Art in the late 1960s, where he experimented with geometric abstraction and ideas of structures, Furlong moved from painting to a more three-dimensional work experimenting with various objects and pieces of equipment. This included computer circuit boards, transistor radio, medical and scientific diagrams through which he was exploring systems for information storage. It was in conjunction with this research that Furlong got interested in systems theory and cybernetics. But whilst Barker saw the system theory as a possible reference to theorize and articulate structure, it was his pragmatic impulse of keeping the agenda focused and entrepreneurial that eventually twisted the conversation towards production albeit informed by theory.

> BB: Get it out and really get into the theorising. I think we've got enough material to get out an issue, the first issue, and I think the first issue is going to be about the first issue.[16]

At the end of 1974 Barker left *Audio Arts* to pursue the career of curator at the ICA. Although only a few issues saw the light of the day under the Furlong/Barker partnership, the initial contribution of Barker remained instrumental for the establishment of the project. Above all he recognised that the true value of this new enterprise was contained in the material itself.

In the summer of 1973 the first issue was finally published on a Memorex tape. It included on Side A Caroline Tisdall introducing Ad Reinhardt's *Auto Interview* read by Jack Wendler, an interview on art and philosophy with Cyril Barrett, and a reading on the system approach to art and design education by Richard Sladden. Side B featured an extract from Art & Language Proceedings with Philip Pilkington, Michael Baldwin, Dave Rushton and Chris Smith. All the targets set out in the Brighton meeting in April 1973 seemed to come to a successful fruition.

1.2 Sound Poetry, Experimental Music and Sound by Artists

Furlong, born in Woking (Surrey) in 1944, from Irish parents who migrated to the UK in the 20s, had an interest in Irish culture, especially literature and poetry. In 1974 he dedicated a full issue to the writer James Joyce. The tape comprises archival

---

[16] Transcription of a discussion between William Furlong, Violet Barrett and Barry Barker held in Brighton in 1973, TGA 200414/2/186.

recordings from Joyce's *A portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*.[17] Subsequently Furlong published a conversation between the Irish writer Edna O'Brien and Charles Merrill.[18] Several poetry readings by Irish poets appeared on the supplements: George Buchanan reading from the collection *Song For Straphangers* (1977); Patrick Galvin reading from *The Mad Woman of Cork* (1980) and finally John Hewitt reading from *Substance and Shadow* (1980). Ted Hickey's voice, the former Keeper of Art at the Ulster Museum was also recorded in singing a collection of Irish traditional songs.[19] Two of these issues were supported by the Arts Council of Northern Ireland, but this material was not put together as an expression of nationalist sympathy. In the first decade of the project other poets and authors featured in *Audio Arts* including the publication of a historical recording by W.B. Yeats and an interview with his daughter Anne Yeats,[20] readings by contemporary poets at Coracle Press in London,[21] a historical recording by Wyndham Lewis and an interview with Mrs Anne Wyndham Lewis,[22] as well as an interview with Bijou O'Connor remembering F. Scott Fitzgerald.[23] Finally, a whole supplement was published in 1995 dedicated to John Berger reading his *Pages of the Wound*.[24]

Beside conceptual art, modernist and contemporary poetry became, at least until the beginning of the 1980s, a quite relevant area of interest for *Audio Arts*. That it started from Joyce's recorded voice was almost an obvious choice in terms of experimentation with language and spoken words. Take for example *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. They have largely been considered key texts of literary modernism which anticipated avant-garde montage techniques. While *Ulysses* is a polyphonic work celebrating the multiplicity of language, *Finnegans Wake* appears to be one of the most significant and experimental books of fiction in the English language. Blending common lexicon with neologisms, idioms of puns and portmanteau words, *Finnengans Wake* is a literary work 'deeply invested in the sound of the words and the acoustic dimension of reading'.[25] A work that can be recorded and listened to almost like a sonic composition. And so it was for the ears of Furlong when in 1974 he compiled several of Joyce's archival recordings including the

---

[17] *Audio Arts*, vol. 1 no. 3, 1974.
[18] *Audio Arts*, vol. 2 no. 3, 1975.
[19] *Audio Arts* supplement 1976.
[20] *Audio Arts*, vol. 1 no 4, 1974.
[21] Readings by Glen Baxter, Basil Bunting, Thomas A. Clark, Roy Fisher, Thomas Meyer, Jonathan Williams, AA supplement 1981.
[22] *Audio Arts*, vol. 1 no 2, 1974.
[23] *Audio Arts* supplement 1975.
[24] *Audio Arts* supplement 1995.
[25] Helen Groth, 'How to Listen to Joyce: Gramophones, Voice and the limits of Mediation', in *Sounding Modernism: Rhythm and Sonic Meditation on Modern Literature and Film*, Edinburgh University Press, 2017, p. 65.

contested reading of the Anna Livia Plurabelle extract from *Finnegans Wake*. This recording was originally made in August 1929 at Ogden's Orthological Institute.[26] According to a recent study, the recording was from the beginning 'an experiment with sounding out the semantic limits of modernist style'.[27] If on one hand this recording raised many questions between linguists, writers and editors, discussing the potential of the 'Basic English' project promoted by Ogden, on the other it signposted the beginning of a new mode of reception of literary work through sound. Between the gramophone recording of Ogden and its reproduction on a Memorex tape by Furlong, exactly forty-five years have passed. However, we have to wait another seven years for a prestigious British publishing house such as Faber and Faber (also established in London in 1929) to actually see poets' work published on cassette.[28] What were the advantages of publishing poetry on cassette tape? Was *Audio Arts* the only sound magazine, in UK, which could publish poetry readings?

In his review of the Joyce issue, written at that time in *Feedback*, Clive Phillpot observed that while 'the oral rendering of a speech or a piece of writing can be advantageous when an author such as Joyce, give emphases to what he reads … it can be equally disadvantageous when, for example, one is subject to inexpert reading which comes between the listener and the context which the speaker wishes to impart'.[29] Phillpot pointed out that a 'potential conflict between content and communication' could occur when 'an oral delivered message tends to be conditioned by the generally obtrusive personality of the speaker, whether evident in the texture of the voice, the accent or the intonation'.[30] While Phillpot's critique seems to raise an important question about content and communication (which in the case of Joyce's voice was also connected to the poor quality of the original gramophone recording reproduced by *Audio Arts*), the true ethos of *Audio Arts* was not so much attached to readability of content, but rather to the possibility of creating a new form of communication through the increasing diffusion of the audio cassette. This would soon be recognised in terms of a 'cassette culture'.[31]

---

[26] The institute was established by linguist Charles Kay Odgen who was promoting literary works in the belief of creating a vocabulary of 800 words which would constitute a sort of International English or 'Basic English'.

[27] Groth (2017), p. 64.

[28] In November 1981 Furlong was approached by Craig Raine under the recommendation of Ted Hickey. Faber and Faber was considering the possibility of publishing cassette recordings of their poets but first they wanted to produce a pilot cassette of two poets. Furlong provided an estimate for the required assistance, however his offer was subsequently declined by Raine who opted for another lower estimate.

[29] Clive Phillpot, 'Feedback', c.1973, p.148, TGA 200414/2/129.

[30] Ibid.

[31] I refer here to the two-way communication introduced by the advent of cassette culture, as a

To (finally) answer the other question, the idea of publishing poetry in a sound magazine was not completely new. In the UK poetry recordings existed already on disc format. Journals such as *The Listener*, for example, developed since 1929 as a medium of recordings for the reproduction of BBC broadcast talks. What newly resulted, then, were the intersections between different art forms, across visual art, experimental music and poetry, which were combined in one sound format. Also new was the fact that the production and distribution of the audio cassette was far cheaper and more accessible than discs and records. Moreover, the diffusion and accessibility of the portable tape recorder in the late 1960s allowed cassette makers and listeners to bond in an exciting cultural and artistic support network worldwide. Although a history of sound magazines is beyond the scope of this research, I would like to mention some of the projects that indirectly prepared the ground for *Audio Arts* as well as those initiatives which intersected directly with it.

During the 1960s and early 1970s, many adventurous sound publishing projects were established by artists, experimental musicians and independent producers across France, Italy, Sweden, Canada, Australia and the US. This decade also saw the emergence of sound poetry both as a development from concrete poetry as well as in conjunction with electro-acoustic approaches in the field of literature and experimental music.[32] As sound artist Larry Wendt suggests, 'the term "sound poetry" would describe poetry which emphasized acoustical properties rather than the meaning of words', and 'would accentuate the poem's sonic, rather than semantic, qualities.' In reality, 'the term "sound poetry" has become a catch-all term for a very open-ended art form whose vague definitional boundaries are a result of its cross-disciplinary heritage'.[33] Within this cross-disciplinary field Wendt has included the text-sound compositions of intermedia artists

---

vital phenomenon of counter-culture. See for example Thurston Moore, *Mix Tape: The Art of Cassette Culture*, 2005.

[32] The term 'concrete poetry' was devised in 1955 by Eugen Gomringer. According to Stephen Bann concrete poetry 'it can appropriately be considered a visual art, though it is also a literary one'. See Stephen Bann, *Concrete Poetry*, 2003. From around 1965 concrete poetry was being celebrated throughout Europe and America in exhibitions, anthologies and magazines. However, in the 1970s it suffered an eclipse. Developed as an art form in the 1950s and 1960s by Brazilian and European avant-guard poets Augusto de Campos, his brother Haroldo de Campos, and Décio Pignatari also the Noigandres group in Europe. In their works words were treated as visual and phonetic counters to be manipulated without regard to their meaning. The concrete poem was considered an object in and of itself. Whereas traditional poetry operates on the conceptual level, concrete poetry is based on perception. See *Concrete Poetry*, Stephen Bann, 2003: https://doi.org/10.1093/gao/9781884446054.article.T018996. (Accessed 13 February 2020). See also Stephen Bann, *Concrete Poetry: An International Anthology*, 1967; and Willard Bohn, *Reading Visual Poetry*, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2010.

[33] Larry Wendt, 'Sound Poetry: I. History of Electro-Acoustic Approaches. II Connection to Advanced Electronic Technologies', *Leonardo*, vol. 18, no. 1, 1985, pp.11-23.

Bengt Emil Johnson and Lars-Gunnar Bodin from Sweden;[34] the work of European poets such as Francois Dufrene, Henri Chopin, Bernard Heidsieck and Paul de Vree, and also American poets such as Jackson MacLow, Charles Amirkhanian and John Giorno. Wendt frames their engagement with electronic music and poetry as 'electro-acoustic literature'. He finally considers the work of English poets Brion Gysin, Ernst Jandl, Clive Fencott and Bob Cobbing as examples of experimentation with the non-semantic, *concrete* dimension of language. In many cases, such for example in the work of Bob Cobbing and Francois Dufrene sound poetry is strongly entangled with visual poetry, using words for developing specific techniques of notation for live or recorded improvisation.

There are of course many other poets and artists that should be added here, above all from Italy where concrete and sound poetry was quite popular between the 1960s and 1970s as a kind of resurgence of futurist performances.[35] Poets and artists such as Arrigo Lora Totino, Sarenco, Franco Verdi, Maurizio Nannucci and Lucia Marcucci are a few examples.

Works of these 'intermedia artists' as Wendt prefers to call them, find their outlet on audio- cassette and record magazines published by the artists themselves or their close collaborators. One of the most tireless artists and editors who began to publish sound poetry was Henri Chopin. Among other works he published is the first review in France for audio-poems in 1958 with his *Cinquieme Saison magazine* active till 1961. From 1964 to 1972 he also ran a sound magazine called *Review OU* which combined printed matter and vinyl records containing works from the original practitioners of electro-acoustic poetry.

Two other editorial initiatives on vinyl record that continued to promote sound poetry in Italy in the 1970s and the early 1980s were for examples *Lotta Poetica* in Italy, established in 1971 by Sarenco (a joint project of the periodicals *Tafelronde* and *Amodulo*) and *3VITRE - POLIPOETRY ISSUES* (1983-1986) founded by Enzo Minarelli and Giovanni Fontana, published on 45 rpm vinyl. Other cassette magazines active in the 1970s and early 1980s which published electronic/experimental music and sound poetry also include: S Press Tonbandverlag (also known as S-Press Tapes and S Press Tonband) founded in 1970 by Angela Köhler, Michael Köhler and Nikolaud

---

[34] They coined the term '*text-sound composition*'. *Their work* used electronic and tape techniques to expand the expressive capacities of the human voice. They were among a group of Swedish intermedia artists connected to Fylkingen, a contemporary music organization in Stockholm *which organised the International Festival of Text-Sound Composition* in 1968 by Fylkingen at the Museum of Modern Art in Stockholm. '*Text-sound composition* is just one of the more well-known terms used to describe the technological aspects of this work and to isolate it both by history and connotation from *sound poetry.' See Larry Wendt,* 'Sound Poetry', pp.11-23.

[35] During the sixties and early seventies, the work of the Dadaists, the Italian and Russian Futurists, who first explored the sonic aspects of language, were also rediscovered in archives and re-published.

Einhorn; *Baobab* established in Italy in 1978 by Adriano Spatola; and *New Wilderness Audiographics* established in 1974 in New York by Jerome Rothenberg and Charlie Morrow.

Furlong who was actively networking with a diverse range of magazines was well aware of all these publications and collected several copies of them. He also kept copies of cassette magazines that were sent to him as an exchange between music promoters and cultural producers working with tape. Within his associated collection, we can find copies for example of *ADN Tapes* established in 1983 in Milan (Italy) by Marco Veronesi, Piero Bielli and Alberto Crosta; *FUCK OFF Tapezine* founded in London in 1979 by Keith Dobson and Jonathan Barnett and *Fast Forward Magazine* (Australia) founded by Bruce Milne and Andrew Maine which documented the post-punk scene of the early 1980s.[36]

In the early 1970s the major use of audio-cassette was for pre-recorded music. In parallel to the diffusion of tapes there were also visual artists engaging with the medium of the vinyl record as object.[37] Although *Audio Arts* produced six vinyl records and one flexi disc in the 1980s, the medium of cassette tape represented for Furlong the ideal format both in terms of production and distribution. The occasion to express his view on the popular ethos of cassette tapes 'against' the exclusive production of records was at the symposium *Audio Scene 79*. Organised by Grita Insam from the Modern Art Galeria, Vienna, and held at Schloss Lengenfeld in Krems in July 1979, the three days of performances and symposium was an international gathering of sound artists, producers, distributors, performers, curators, and critics gathered together to discuss sound as a medium of visual art and the related issues of production and distribution.[38] In the panel including Hank Bull, Bob George and Michael Köheler, Furlong stressed the cheapness, ease and speed of audio-cassette production/duplication compared to that of a record. He also argued that the cassette was more interactive than a record as the technology for the cassette recording was available to everybody without a huge investment. Recording

---

[36] See the 'associated collection' of Audio Arts Archive and related correspondence from the late 1970s encompassing enquires and exchanges with magazines and other sound projects. For example:
Letter from Rosemary Hart, editor of Kaleidoscope, 21 January 1977 (TGA 200414/1/2/125); Letter by Peter Cusack, August 1980, inviting Furlong to contribute to *Collusion* magazine (TGA 200414/1/2/69); Letter by Stephen Willats, *Control* magazine, 11 Aug 1976 (200414/1/2/70); Letter by Peter Anderson, 18-12-1979, *Embryo* magazine, Gothenburg (TGA 200414/1/2/91); letter by Peter R Meyer – Sveriges Rikradio (no date) (TGA 200414/1/2/175); Letter 3/3/1979 from Maurizio Nannucci (TGA 200414/1/2/189); Letter by Furlong to Sidonio Lobato Fernandes, *Xpecial*, proposing distribution in Spain and Portugal 15/2/77 (TGA 200414/1/2/302).
[37] See Germano Celant, *Record as Artwork: 1959-73*, Royal College of Art, 1973.
[38] Beside the audio documentation published in the *Audio Arts* supplement *Audio Scene* (1979), further documentation of the symposium is provided by Kunstradio: http://www.kunstradio.at/HISTORY/AUDIOSCENE/ (Accessed on the 31 Dec. 2019).

speech on cassette, such as conversation with artists, was seen by Furlong as an alternative form of communication precisely because the distribution was easier, cheaper and quicker. Contrary to his view, Michael Köheler, also a publisher of audio-cassettes who subsequently collaborated with him in presenting their magazines at book fairs,[39] argued that the recording process was a different thing from the actual mixing which eventually gave records a better result. While for Furlong the actual quality of sound was also an important factor, the immediacy and accessibility of the audio-cassette remained a building block of *Audio Arts*. Even when the opportunity of recording experimental musicians occurred, Furlong opted for the medium of cassette tape.

Between 1976 and 1980 two key issues dedicated to experimental music and sound were published: *Recent English Experimental Music* (vol. 3 no. 2) and *Improvised Music & Sound Works* (vol. 4 no. 2, 1976). Volume 3 no. 2 comprises musical performances by Howard Skempton, Christopher Hobbs, Gavin Bryars, John White, Michael Parsons, James Lampard and Michael Nyman. It was produced in collaboration with *Studio International* and is complementary to the November/December 1976 issue *Art & Experimental Music*. Volume 4 no. 2 comprises an archival recording of the futurist Antonio Russolo (1921), a sound version of Ian Breakwell's work *Circus* made in collaboration with composer Ian McQueen (1978) and an extract from the live concert by Hugh Davies and David Toop recorded at Riverside Studios, London in July 1978.

Although it was Furlong's intention to continue to collaborate with musicians, it became to some extent unfeasible for a small enterprise such as *Audio Arts* to carry on this venture. The small income received from the cassette sales and the Arts Council financial support, was not enough to cover the extra costs of hiring special equipment and mixing facilities which were required for a release to be finalised.[40] After these issues Furlong continued to interview important musicians such a John Cage, Philip Glass and Laurie Anderson. The ambition to produce experimental music on cassette was, however, gradually phased out. Not that the only radical sound works were at that time heard exclusively within the circuit of electro-acoustic and improvised music. The accessibility of recording technology also had an impact in other artistic fields such as visual art, theatre, poetry, performance and film. The work of Ian Breakwell - which re-appeared in an *Audio Arts* supplement in 1981 - represents well a cross-over between moving image,

[39] See correspondence from Michael Köhler about collaboration with *Audio Arts* for a possible co-production of John Cage *Empty Words* and exhibiting in same booth at the Frankfurt bookfair. TGA 200414/1/2/150.
[40] See fund-raising application sent by Furlong to the Arts Council for vol. 3 no. 2 *Art and Experimental music*, TGA 200414/1/2/16.

text-based performance and visual art. Before him another artist, who also collaborated with *Audio Arts* and worked with mixed media, was the German-Swiss artist Dieter Roth. In 1977 Furlong recorded the celebrated text-based play *Die Grosse Bockwurst* by Dieter Roth and Richard Hamilton, organised at the Whitechapel Gallery in the form of a collective reading. Roth, who was also running his own publishing house, subsequently collaborated with Furlong in the realisation of two special sound work editions.[41]

With the collaboration of Roth and Hamilton in 1977, and prior to that with Nice Style/Bruce McLean, Richard Quarrel and the group of artists and musicians of the Wallpaper magazine, the production of the *Audio Arts* supplements soon became the space in which the magazine explored the creative use of the technological space of the audio-cassette. It is here that besides the experimental music and its crossover with sound poetry, other time-based practices such as performance and sound by artists seemed to find its natural destination.

1.3 Sculpture towards Performance

> Consider, for a moment, the possibility that the event you are attending this evening is a lecture-sculpture, not a straightforward talk given by a writer who has been invited to prepare and deliver it in the ordinary way, but a carefully dramatized enactment which takes its place among other related works by a sculptor who sees expressive potential within the format of a conventional lecture … I am standing here in front of you not in order to disseminate my own opinions but to embody a sculptor's idea. Both you, the audience, and I, the speaker, thereby become a constituent of his living art work.[42]

> Richard Cork

> Patrician in its origin, performance art in Britain might be said to have its roots in hoaxes and practical jokes. [43]

> Antony Howell

---

[41] Dieter Roth's Verlag was founded in 1974 as Dieter Roth's Familienverlag, renamed in 1978 to Dieter Roth's Verlag. *Audio Arts* co-produced with artist and publisher Hansjorg Mayer, Dieter Roth's *Lorelei* (1981), an edition of 37 cassettes of piano music and a prepared radio cassette player and colour drawing; it also published Dieter Roth, *Harmonica Curse* (1982) a set of cassettes and polaroid photographs.

[42] Richard Cork, *Sculpture Now: Dissolution or Redefinition*, The Lethaby Lectures, 11/22 November 1974, Royal College of Art, *Audio Arts* Supplement 1974.

[43] Anthony Howell, 'British Performance: An Incorrect View', in *Blast to Freeze: British Art in the 20th Century*, p. 248.

The opening of the Lethaby lectures by Richard Cork in 1974, provocatively invited the audience to reflect about the related positions of artist/critic/audience in a 'lecture-sculpture'. The lecture delivered by Cork on behalf of a supposed artist was, as he remarked, 'an integral part of a sculptural proposition'. It was from this platform that the art critic, Cork himself, started to 'measure how many changes a beleaguered word "sculpture" has been forced to undergo'.[44] The sculpture principle, Cork argued, seemingly remained attached 'to some kind of solid, tangible, rounded presence in space' even in the most avant-garde modernist instance.[45] From the breakthrough of Duchamp's *ready made* to minimalist sculptures of American artists such as Dan Flavin, Robert Morris, Carl Andre, 'sculpture is all bound up with the physicality of its means to a greater extent than painting or any related media'.[46] While for Duchamp the sculptures conventions were subverted by the de-contextualisation of found objects, minimalism championed 'the re-affirmation of the object centrality even if the corporeal dimension disappeared'.[47] In opposition to these critical explorations of object-hood, a 'dematerialisation of art' was supported within conceptualism.[48] Cork refers to the work and writing of Joseph Kosuth, and his idea of anti-form as a good example of this tendency. Associated to this were also notions of 'process art', 'earth-form', and 'reactive work'.

What in short constituted the ground for a debate on sculpture at the beginning of the 1970s, was according to Cork, an ambivalent, polarized position: a traditional, orthodox approach attached to object and object-hood on one hand, and on the other the total disappearance of the object on the predicament that an innovative radical art beyond any formalistic concern would not require it to be framed in terms of sculpture. In Britain there was the legacy of Henry Moore, which had reigned for a long time; therefore the inter-disciplinary, post-object, dematerialised sculptural approach seemed not very well received especially in the context of art education. According to Cork, for many artists who taught sculpture in the UK after Moore, 'Dematerialised sculpture [was] not a contradiction in terms, [but]mere non-sense'.[49] Moore's formal principles were still very much at the centre of the sculptural practice: volume, three-dimensional mass, permanence of marble and display on a plinth. Cork observed that this approach

---

[44] Richard Cork, *Audio Arts* Supplement 1974. The lectures organised by the Royal College of Art.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.
[48] The term 'dematerialisation' was coined by Lucy Lippard and John Chandler in 1968, referring to the process of dematerialisation of the art object. See Lucy Lippard and John Chandler, *The Dematerialisation of Art, Art International*, February, 1968, p. 31.
[49] Richard Cork, *Audio Arts* supplement, 1974.

finds his roots back in the Renaissance period when the hierarchy of the medium of painting and sculpture was established, a hierarchy that was subsequently transmitted through the academia and gradually became a tacit concern among its supporters.[50] There have been of course some important exceptions. One of the most innovative initiatives within a sculpture department was the "A" course at St Martin's School of Art. According to Nick De Ville, 'This was an alternative to the St. Martin's tradition which had formed around the Advanced Sculpture course, launched by Frank Martin in the late 1950s and much celebrated for Anthony Caro's teaching and the success of the "New Generation" sculptors of the mid 1960s'.[51] Staff on this course included Peter Kardia, William Tucker, Garth Evans and Gareth Jones. Here the understanding of sculpture as a full and definable object pursued by Anthony Caro (former collaborator of Henry Moore) was finally put under threat through discussions and interventions. The response to that course was highly diverse. It encompassed the 'Living Sculpture' of Gilbert and George, Bruce McLean's fleeting outdoor sculptures with found materials, Richard Long's walks in the British countryside and his geometrical interventions in the landscape, and Braco Dimitrijeviç's series of photographs of passers-by.

Gilbert and George's lexicon of sculptural activity which include beside the 'Living Sculpture' many other definitions such as 'Singing Sculpture' and 'Lecture-Sculpture', offered, according to Cork 'a tailored made demonstration of sculpture in the very process of widening out, incorporating every aspect of sculptural existence', thus blurring the distinction between art and life. [52] Gilbert and George provided, in other words, a clue for a redefinition of sculpture rather than its total dissolution, and a proposition that Cork made his own in his lectures and exhibition at the Royal College of Art in 1974.[53] Twenty-six years later from this seminal sculpture show, the survey exhibition curated by Clive Phillpot and Andrea Tarsia at the Whitechapel Gallery under the title *Live in Your Head. Concept and Experiment in Britian 1965-75*, analysed more or less the same period discussed by Cork but perhaps with a more flexible, inter-disciplinary

---

[50] Until 1950s core subjects taught at art schools were drawing and painting. The first Diploma in Art and Design was introduced after the Coldstream Report by The National Advisory Council on Art Education published in 1960. See Elena Crippa, 'Teaching Conceptual Art', in *Conceptual art in Britain, 1964-1979,* 2016, London: Tate Publishing, p.108.

[51] Nick De Ville, 'British Art Schools and the Influence of Art Education in the Twentieth Century', in *Blast to Freeze: British Art in the 20th Century*, p. 300. The Advanced course was not a validated course, however many students continued to attend it voluntarily. See Elena Crippa, *Teaching Conceptual Art*, p.110.

[52] Richard Cork cited a comprehensive list of definitions used by Gilbert and George including 'Eating Sculpture', 'Book Sculpture', 'Painting Sculpture', 'Meeting Sculpture', 'Interview Sculpture', 'Video Sculpture'. See Richard Cork, *Audio Arts* supplement, 1974.

[53] The Lethaby Lectures included an exhibition with work by Andre, Bell, Bochner, Boshier, Burn, Esse, Flanagan, Flavin, Fulton, Gilbert & George, Graham, Judd, Kosuth, Long, Oppenheim, Ruckriem, Visser.

methodology. While it was recognised that so 'many experimental artists whose work defined the period were trained in the spatially and materially defined medium of sculpture', 'one of the key characteristics of artistic practices in the 1960s and 1970s was the degree to which artists not only worked in a variety of media, but also worked closely with practitioners in other art forms'. [54]

In his essay *Time and Immateriality* Tarsia suggests that a possible response to John Chandler and Lucy Lippard's proposition of 'dematerialisation' should be grounded not on the dichotomy between a material presence and its absence. 'Rather than considering dematerialisation as a result, it would seem more productive to view it as a process, enacted thorough the disintegration and transformation of a physical presence, or the use of immaterial elements such as water, air and particularly light'.[55] Tarsia stressed also that 'time was introduced as a recurring subject; not as an alternative to space but to re-define the spatial possibilities of art'.[56] Furthermore, he states that much of the artists' contribution of this decade was 'centred on an expansion of sculpture by the adoption of time-based media, notably performance, photography and film'.[57] Key examples made by Tarsia are the works of Bruce McLean notably his *Vertical Ice Sculpture* (1967), in which the artist employed 'found' melting slabs of ice, and also *Floataways* (1967), a temporary arrangement of bricks, pipes and pieces of wood set adrift down a London canal. These 'performed' sculptures, comments Tarsia, 'existed as temporally defined events beginning with a concrete physical presence that was gradually eroded by the work's activation'.[58]

Furlong met Bruce McLean in the early 1970s while teaching at Epsom School of Arts. In this period McLean was experimenting with his plinth pose sculptures and was also producing work with the collective Nice Style, who refer to themselves as 'The World First Pose Band'.[59] In an interview by Furlong asking why his involvement with performance art started from sculpture McLean replied:

> Yes, I started making sculpture, but when I moved to the School of Art in St Martins, I was in fact making sculpture. Most of the time was spent in various studios looking at the sculpture and discussing the sculpture and circumnavigating the sculpture and positioning myself in relation to the sculpture. The sculpture

---

[54] Clive Phillpot and Andrea Tarsia (eds) *Live In Your Head: Concept and Experiment in Britain 1965-75,* Whitechapel Gallery, 2000, p. 6 and p. 17.
[55] Ibid, p.17.
[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Nice Style was established in 1972 by McLean and a group of his students at Maidstone College of Art including Paul Richards, Garry Chitty, Robin Fletcher, Rob Cawthorpe.

seemed to be like a catalyst for a kind of positioning and grouping … a specific code of behavior.[60]

As Anthony Howell succinctly put it:

> Like Gilbert and George, Bruce and his team were sculptors first, performers second. He was inspired by plinths – his 'heavy metal' tutor at college had poured scorn on plinths and performances. Bruce created plinth sculptures with his own body.[61]

Nice Style at Garage, was the first supplement published by *Audio Arts*. The tape was conceived as a sound catalogue made for their performance at the Garage Gallery in 1974.[62] Furlong described this work in his text *Performance Art or is it?*.

> This piece involved an elaborate scaffolding structure, ropes, pulleys, and a forklift truck, all acting as props for the members of the group, who adopted poses and postures according to instructions being issued by another group member sitting in the audience. Extravagant consideration, checking and re-adjustment was given to the unimportant (cuff length, angle of collar etc.). The tendency to take issue with the unimportant while accepting the Status Quo, was clearly being questioned. This performance to me represented one of the most successful synthesis between intention and form, communicative clarity and audience engagement, seen in London in the last five years.[63]

After the production of Nice Style's tape other audio recordings of live performances by McLean in collaboration with other artists were published in the *Audio Arts* supplements including *Sorry. A Minimal Musical in Parts* with Silvia Ziranek (1977) and *The Masterwork Award Winning Fishknife* with Paul Richards (1979). In parallel to this the collaboration with McLean further developed into a number of performances, exhibitions and presentations. 1977, in particular, was a prolific year for the artistic collaboration between Furlong and McLean. It saw the germination of the acclaimed performance *Academic Board: A New Procedure*, the participation at Documenta VI in Kassel with McLean's performance *In Terms of*, and finally the presentation of *Nine works for tape/slide projection* curated and presented by Furlong at Battersea Arts Centre and the Whitechapel Gallery.

---

[60] Interview with Bruce McLean by William Furlong, 5 May 1979, Hayward Annual working file, TGA 200414/2/80/2.

[61] Anthony Howell, 'British Performance: An Incorrect View', in *From Blast to Frieze*, op. cit., p. 249.

[62] The supplement encompasses *High up on a Baroque Palazzo (Italian Style)* and new works (1972-1975), both performed by McLean and Duncan Smith at the Garage Gallery.

[63] William Furlong, *Performance Art or is it?*, 1978, p. 3, TGA 200414/2/3/1.

Devised over a period of seven months through a script written together, *Academic Board* became a production staged by seven performers at the theatre of the Battersea Arts Centre.[64] Furlong described the work as a 'play/performance as it brings together elements of theatre, visual performance art and choreography.'

> [It was] set in a board room of an academic institution and concerns a board meeting where topics are discussed and decisions reached. The play/performance deals with group behavior and personal identity being lost, this being expressed by interlocking visual clues, structuring of movement, verbal dialogue, humorous sequences and all manner of speech delivery.[65]

As John A. Walker pointed out in his book *Left Shift: Radical Art in 1970s Britain*, many artists at that time were earning a living by teaching in art schools and inevitably endured the relentless tedium of staff meetings and experienced the problem of administration and bureaucracy typical of most organizations. '*Academic Board* was a humorous, defensive response to such an experience.'[66]

One artist who attended the performance and reviewed it in *Studio International* was Marc Camille Chaimowicz who thought it was 'visually stunning' and totally hysterical. [67] Chaimowicz, himself a performance artist, contributed along with Bruce McLean and other artists, to *Nine works for tape/slide projection* curated by Furlong. A very popular media in the late 1970s and the 1980s, tape/slide projections were widely used by artists as well as by educators to show synchronized images with sound. Furlong who had established a dialogue with the Whitechapel Gallery since 1977 was the artist/producer involved in the regular production of tape/slide projections there. In 1983, on the occasion of Bruce McLean's exhibition at the Whitechapel Gallery, a tape/slide including an interview with the artist and visuals from the exhibition, was commissioned to him.[68] This was not the first interview and presentation made by Furlong with McLean. Another was done for the Hayward Annual show in 1979 and prior to that a two-hour conversation was recorded at the studio of McLean.[69] If *Academic Board* was an artistic collaboration *tout court*, the way in which Furlong developed a long-term collaboration with McLean was

---

[64] The production was on from 9-11 December 1977 at the Theatre of Battersea Arts Centre in Lavender Hill, London. Other 'procedurists included Stefan Crozet, Penny Stehli, Saul Kiddall-Ronroe, Fred Lancaster, Peter Lacoux, Cernelius Lancenbero, Rex Roads. TGA 200414/2/50.
[65] See letter by Furlong sent to the manager of Royal Court Theatre, Donald Howarth, 3 September 1976. TGA 200414/2/50.
[66] John A. Walker, *Left Shift: Radical Art in 1970s Britain*, IB Tauris, 2001, p. 180.
[67] Marc Camille Chaimowicz, 'Performance', in *Studio International*, vol. 193, no. 986, March-April 1977, Review Section, pp. 137-38.
[68] See interview with Bruce McLean by the present author, 17/01/2019.
[69] See the unpublished cassette tape titled *Bruce McLean, Interview with William Furlong*, 17/06/1978. TGA 200414/7/4/241.

that of a producer and promoter of his work. Conversely, McLean was very receptive in understanding *Audio Arts* as a platform for artists' conversation and art works, as well as also being a key supporter in the fund-raising events of the magazine in the 1980s.[70] Their continuous collaboration and friendship resulted as a catalyst for both artists who openly acknowledged their reciprocal influence and support.[71]

In the late 1960s and early 1970s McLean was included in all major international exhibitions as for example the influential exhibition *Live in Your Head: When Attitudes Become Form (Works, Concepts, Processes, Situations, Information)* curated by Harald Szeemann at the Kunsthalle Bern in 1969. However, it is curious to note that Cork did not mention McLean as one key example of expanded sculpture on a par with the work of Gilbert and George.[72] Nor did he stress the emergence of performance art as a new field of practice which intersects with sculpture. Retrospectively it could be argued that McLean's sculptures of this period are indeed *performative sculptures* and not simply 'performed' sculptures as Tarsia put it. While in some cases the body of the artist performing the action is essential, as in *Pose work for plinths* (1971), in other works the activation of the work, its performativity, simply required the involvement of the viewer and of an audience at large, if we think, for instance, of the work *King for a Day* presented at the Tate Gallery in 1972.[73]

As I have discussed in my introduction, the notion of performativity has been applied in various contexts after the diffusion of performance art and also in conjunction with the contribution of feminist thinking like Judith Butler's writing on gender and identity politics. Consequently, the notions of performativity in the early 1970s were predominantly connected to linguistics and the philosophy of language, and not so much to art practices. Furthermore, the very definition of 'performance art' itself was relatively new in this period. In the conversation between Furlong and McLean recorded in 1978, the two artists discussed at length the cross-over between sculpture and performance by

---

[70] McLean with Mel Gooding organised the acclaimed fund-raising event the Audie Awards Ceremony at Riverside Studios in October 1985. See William Furlong (ed.) *Audio Arts: Discourse and Practice in Contemporary Art*, p. 113.

[71] A concern for the performative element of speech within choreographed spatial settings was shared by both artists since the development of *Academic Board*. See the interview with McLean with the present author, 17/01/2019.

[72] In the1978 interview with Furlong, Bruce McLean recalled that in 1969 he contributed to three performances by Gilbert and George. The first performance was *Interview Sculpture* at the Royal College of Art. The same performance was repeated at St Martin's, while a third performance was called *The Impresarios of the Art World*. McLean explained that the idea of formalising the posing as a sculptural strategy was clearly influenced by this experience. Before this McLean was staging his 'event sculptures' in less formal contexts. TGA 200414/7/4/241.

[73] The work was conceived as a day-long retrospective, consisting of an installation that included the total 1000 copies of the publication *King for a day* laid on the floor of the Tate Gallery, London, March 1972. The audience could purchase a copy of the publication.

analysing McLean's 'event sculptures' and the work with Nice Style. In this conversation there emerged a shared position towards the issue of categorisation in performance. Seen by them as a purely institutional demand, the definition of 'Performance Art' applied to the work of artists such as Stuart Brisley and Kevin Atherton by the Art Council, for example, was in their opinion a detrimental rather than an effective promotional tool.[74] If McLean often adopted the strategy of the pose to subvert the codified language and behaviour of the art world, Furlong has always been suspicious of new critical framing in describing the work of artists. In his essay *Performance Art or is it?*, a text written for the Performance Art Festival in Brussels, October 1978, Furlong states:

> Most artists working here in ways normally associated with Performance Art, feel uncomfortable if not hostile at being categorised in this way. It's as if the label Performance is now too all-pervasive to be of use in describing an area of work taking place away from the hierarchies of painting and sculpture. The list of categories that have popped up over the last decade or so in contemporary art including Body Art, Land Art, Conceptual Art, Happenings and so on, now have a hollow ring about them, and appear to recall periods in Art History rather than particular creative endeavours. We should be rightly suspicious of the obsession to categorise, as who does it serve in the end? Valuable though it might be argued in the short term, it's soon discovered that a prefix . . . artist, becomes stifling. The term 'Performance', now takes its place alongside the other terms seeming only to refer to the 'cardboard box' rather than the contents. I prefer the descriptive term, time-based work, to avoid the connotation that 'Performance' has acquired, most notably that of doubly sealing it off from other forms of art practice and social concerns. If the term 'Performance', and I shall use the term with caution in this article, has stood for an identifiable shift in this country over the last five years, it should be seen more as a changing of attitude amongst its practitioners and audiences, than in any particular direction or manifestation. [75]

In this text Furlong enumerates the variety of situations, events and work seen in London at that time in alternative spaces and community centres such as Battersea Arts Centre, 28 Butlers Wharf, Artists Meeting Place, Acme Gallery. Examples of time-based work carried out in the London area included here was work by Kevin Atherton, Tina Keane, Hannah O'Shea, Marc Camille Chaimowicz, The Theatre of Mistakes, Gilbert and George, Stuart Brisley and the already mentioned Bruce McLean/Nice Style. The artists and spaces brought together in the article represented for Furlong a kind of spectrum of mixed media practices which broke with 'the traditional gallery/art establishment/artist relationship.' Quoting Stuart Brisley's words, Furlong stressed that 'Time-based practices

---

[74] In 1973 the Art Council of Great Britain established a Performance Art Committee. 'Their first meeting took place in March 1974, and this committee continued until its disbanding, rather abruptly in February 1976 due to, 'not wanting to single out performance as a special case'. This turn of events led to the Association of Performance Artists being established. See William Furlong, *Performance Art or is it?*, 1978, p. 3.

[75] Ibid, p. 1.

is, "to do with others"'.[76] Their fundamental nature consists in the interaction with an audience.

An account of British performance art that echoes most of the events mentioned by Furlong was written in 2003, by performer Anthony Howell, co-founder of The Theatre of Mistakes. With subtle irony and retrospective acuity Howell writes:

> Performance was an alternative practice. You didn't exhibit in galleries. You never kept anything but a scrap-book, because, man, this was about the dematerialisation of art. And you didn't work at it. It was supposed to free you from work. What mattered was your message (and that your message was Marxist).[77]

'The Theatre of Mistakes believed in being, not acting', as Howell underlined it in his account. Thus it was crucial in devising new strategies that allowed a new mode of interaction between the performers, who potentially could be replaced by others.[78] This belief, quite common at the time, left performance artists feeling ambivalent about repetition and about documentation. Combined with the fact that video-taping in the 1960s was also a primitive form of documentation, meant, according to Howell, that little survives of this rich era of activity in Britain today. To his surprise, more than what he expected actually survived in certain artists' studios. One place where ephemera of performances were kept was the 'headquarters' of *Audio Arts* at 6 Briarwood Road, London.[79] But was *Audio Arts* magazine a medium that somehow offered a space for documenting performance art?

In the early 1970s *Audio Arts* published various sound performances and recorded various art events. As mentioned above, in *Chapter 2*, it recorded and published McLean's live performances among other artists. Although McLean thinks that *Audio Arts* had an important role at that time in providing art documentation, the idea of retaining acoustic events was not always a straightforward business. Furlong was often directly involved in retaining those acoustic events and in many cases post-production in consultation with many of the artists occurred in the studio. As discussed in my introduction a performative rather than a documentary approach was often opted for in working with artists.

---

[76] Ibid.

[77] Anthony Howell, 'British Performance: An Incorrect View', in *Blast to Freeze. British Art in the 20th Century*, p. 249.

[78] Ibid, pp. 250-251.

[79] Furlong who regularly attended performances, exhibitions, conferences and talks, religiously kept documentation of what he had seen and recorded in *situ*. The ephemera included invitation cards, press releases, exhibition programs and pamphlets of a diverse nature. When Howell attended the Show and Tell event organised by the author at Tate in September 2018 a few items from the Theatre of Mistakes were on display. He exclaimed: 'Here there is more than what I have!'

However, an important event that was recorded by Furlong in a documentary kind of style was the intervention of Joseph Beuys at the exhibition *Art into Society, Society into Art*, held at the ICA in November 1974.[80] Today defined by many art historians as a lecture-performance (rather than a lecture-sculpture),[81] the intervention consisted in an ongoing conversation with the audience which lasted for the entire duration of the exhibition.[82] Talking to Beuys and recording his speech-action exerted a great influence on the development of *Audio Arts* as a dialogic practice. Beuys' engagement with speech as artistic material, appeared to be an integral part of his sculptural work, in brief 'verbal sculptures' that Beuys preferred to call 'social sculpture'. This was a definition that Cork widely analysed in his lectures as another good example of physical presence in space. Alongside with the 'patrician' sculptures by Gilbert and George, as Howell has defined them, Beuys' lecture-performances were symptomatic expressions of sculpture extending into life as well as into the social fabric.

What is relevant to stress here for the purpose of mapping the wider cultural context of the mid-1970s, is that Beuys's actions in London and the subsequent establishment of the Free International University, were key manifestations of the social turn of the 1970s.[83] Besides *Art into Society, Society into Art* another exhibition which investigated the social role of art was *Art for Society* at the Whitechapel Gallery. Organised by Richard Cork and Nicholas Serota with a diverse team of selectors, the show was another key moment for bringing to the attention 'a wide range of art which seeks by its subject and manner, to locate itself directly within the social fabric of our society'.[84] As one of the exhibiting artists Furlong presented three tape/slide works: a tape/slide version of *Academic Board* (1977-78) made with Bruce McLean, *Racism* (1978) a piece made with Duncan Smith in the Battersea/Clapham Junction area, and *Brick Lane* (1978) also made with Duncan Smith.

---

[80] The exhibition *Art into Society - Society into Art: 7 German artists* ran from the 30th October to the 24th November 1974 and included the artists Albrecht D., Joseph Beuys, K. P. Brehmer, Hans Haacke, Dieter Hacker, Gustav Metzger, Michael Ruetz, Klaus Staeck. The exhibition was part of the German Month at the ICA.

[81] For example: Patricia Milder (2011); Lerm-Hayes Christa-Maria (2006); Cara Jordan (2013).

[82] This was the first time Furlong met Beuys. See *Audio Essay 1, From Transcription to Transduction: The Voice of Joseph Beuys on Audio Arts.*

[83] On the 26-27 February 1972 Beuys performs *Information-Action*, at the Tate Gallery and Whitechapel Gallery, London. In February 1974 Beuys co-founded with Heinrich Böll, Georg Meistermann, Willi Bongard and Klaus Staeck the Free International University, for Creativity and Interdisciplinary Research.

[84] *Art for Society,* Whitechapel Gallery, London, 10 May – 18 June 1978. The show was organised by Richard Cork, John Gorman, Charles Gosford, Ian Jeffrey, David Logan, Toni del Renzio, Margaret Richards, Ken Sprague and Caroline Tisdall together with Nicholas Serota and Martin Rewcastle of the Whitechapel Gallery.

Invited to this show were also the artists Margaret Harrison and Alexis Hunter whose works were apparently censored.[85] Concerns about the social role of art were directly linked to their work as artists but also as women in society. As Michael Archer pointed out 'the increasing awareness that gender was as much an issue within the institutions of art as it was in society at large' was one of key aspects of the decade between 1965-75.[86] Women artists and feminist activists started to organise themselves and run their own spaces. For example Margaret Harrison and Alexis Hunter together with Mary Kelly, Sonia Knox, Tina Keane, Jane Low, and Linda Price took part in the Artists Union - Women's Workshop, one of the first initiative set up to support women artists' work.[87] Furlong, who was a member of the Free International University among Mary Kelly, Margaret Harrison and other London-based artists, soon acknowledged the importance of feminist debate and regularly hosted women artists on *Audio Arts*. A point to which I will return in the *Audio Essay 4 Women's Voices and Sound Works in Audio Arts (Chapter 5)*.

While public galleries such as the Whitechapel Gallery, magazines such as *Studio International*, alternative spaces such as Artists Meeting Place were presenting socially engaged practices, government institutions such as the British Council, the Arts Council of Great Britain and the Greater London Council continued to promote British sculpture on the basis of national achievement. Following on from the prize awarded to the British Sculptor Lynne Chadwick at the Venice Biennale in 1956, echoing the international triumph of Henry Moore in 1948, as well as from the international reputation gained by Anthony Caro with his retrospective at the Museum of Modern Art in New York (1975), British sculpture was largely promoted and supported through exhibitions, publications and above all funding. In 1983 the Hayward Annual, the Art Council's touring exhibition, was organised as a large two venue exhibition at the Hayward Gallery and Serpentine Gallery and titled *The Sculpture Show*. Artist Kate Blacker one of the selectors of the Hayward Annual, decided to invite *Audio Arts*, namely Furlong and Archer, along with Tony Cragg, Ian Hamilton Finlay, Richard Long, David Mach, Stephen Willats et al.

As Blacker states in the introduction of the catalogue accompanying the show, her task was to challenge the traditional parameters of a three-dimensional art form and address the current trends in sculpture prevalent at that time. She said:

---

[85] See the printed document for *Art For Society – An Exhibition Censored*, display on the occasion of Alexis Hunter exhibition at Goldsmiths Gallery, Winter 2019.
[86] Michael Archer, 'Out of the Studio', in *Live in Your Head*, 2000, p. 26.
[87] For a full account on feminist art of the 1960s and 1970s see Rozsika Parker and Griselda Pollock, *Framing Feminism: Art and the Women's Movement 1970-85*, 1987, London: Pandora.

> I have included Audio Arts which initially has nothing three-dimensional about it. But their inclusion, I feel, is essential for the further exploration of space through the use of sound.[88]

Blacker already considered *Audio Arts* to be an art practice. Furthermore, she recognised the sculptural dimension of sound as one important aspect of the new emergent contemporary art forms engaging with space, what seemed to be an unconventional choice at that time. Although new expanded forms of sculpture bordering on performance and other time-based practices were fully conceptualized in the late 1970s by Richard Cork in the UK and Rosalind Krauss in the States,[89] we have to wait about two decades after *The Sculpture Show*, for the medium of sound to appear centre stage within the context of art galleries and museums and also to be recognised as an art practice in itself.[90]

As I will address in my final chapter the symbiotic relationship between Furlong's creation of sound works for gallery exhibitions such as the Hayward Gallery, and the editorial activity of *Audio Arts* fails to be easily framed under a defined category. In embracing the ethos of social sculpture, experimenting with performative scripts and settings, providing sound documentation of art events, doing artist's interview and finally creating and producing his own sound works, Furlong's role of editor, curator and artist has covered different areas of artistic and critical practice. Cork's proposal to overcome the dichotomy between the dissolution and the re-definition of sculpture offers perhaps a viable approach to be considered here. Furlong, who recorded the Lethaby lectures, certainly shared with Cork a non-antithetical model by adopting a *modus operandi* which brought together a variety of approaches, practices and experiments under the same umbrella. Here the discursive conceptual approach which privileges language and spoken words coexists with the spatial practices and time-based works typical of the expanded sculpture that emerged in the 1970s. Unlike Cork, however, Furlong was never preoccupied to redefine the field of sculpture, or even his own work, but rather concerned with keeping *Audio Arts* a space as open as possible. While diverse opinions and the debate on contemporary art was recorded and circulated within a wider audience,[91] *Audio Arts*

---

88 Arts Council of Great Britain, ed. 1983. The Sculpture Show: Fifty sculptors at the Serpentine and the South Bank / selected by Paul de Monchaux, Fenella Crichton, and Kate Blacker. London: Arts Council of Great Britain, p.10.

89 Rosalind Krauss, 'Sculpture in the Expanded Field', in *October*, vol. 8 (Spring 1979), pp. 30-44.

90 See *Sonic Boom* curated by David Toop at the Hayward Gallery in 2000.

91 See the *Audio Arts* supplement *The State of British Art*, an audio documentation of the symposium held at the Institute of Contemporary Art, London (10/2/1978) including contributions by Richard Cork, Andrew Brighton, John Tagg and Peter Michael Fuller.

sound works and performances were presented in art galleries, festivals and public art programs as part of a new 'expanded field' or 'expanded sculpture'.[92] Although the primary identity of *Audio Arts* has been and also remain that of an art magazine, the intersection between sculpture and performance which occurred in the 1970s within the collaboration with Bruce McLean, and subsequently between sculpture and sound developed in the 1980s in collaboration with Michael Archer, leads me towards the argument that the *Audio Arts* sound works developed in parallel to the magazine were informed by it, or in some cases an integral part of it. Likewise, *Audio Arts* volumes and supplements were enriched by the artistic collaboration with visual artists working across (many) different medias. In this light I would argue that *Audio Arts* is a collaborative project that could be considered in terms of an expanded sound practice and not merely as a sound magazine, or the divorced activity of a singular artist.

1.4 The Magazine as Alternative Space

> One cannot begin to understand the reason for the extraordinary dynamism of the British art scene today if one does not consider the dominant role played by artist-run spaces. [93]

Laurence Bossé and Hans-Ulrich Obrist

> The first conditions of art's independence is not art's isolation but its contestation of the cultural field, either by setting up alternative spaces or occupying existing space differently.[94]

Dave Beech

In 1996 curators Hans-Ulrich Obrist and Laurence Bossé included *Audio Arts* in *Life/Live,* a survey of artist-run spaces in the UK. The survey combined the first inventory of independent spaces with an exhibition capturing the spirit of contemporary art of the early 1990s.[95] From the establishment in 1988 of City Racing, an exhibition space in a former betting shop in Oval in South London, to The Tracy Emin Museum opened in 1995 in a former old mini cab office, from the secrecy of the events staged at The

---

[92] See the *Audio Essay 2*, *Listening to Audio Arts Sound Works*.
[93] Laurence Bossé and Hans-Ulrich Obrist (eds), *Life/Live - Anthologie*, Musée d'Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris and Cultural de Belém, Lisbon, 1996, p.12.
[94] Beech (2006), p.10.
[95] The exhibition was staged at the Musée d'Art Moderne de La Ville de Paris (5-10-1996 /5-1-1997) and Centro Cultural de Belém (23-1-1997/21-4-1997). The survey was conducted in London, Belfast, Birmingham, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Halifax, Liverpool, Manchester, Nailsworth, Newcastle and Reading.

Institution of Rot (1992), to the public commissions organised by Locus + (1993), *Life/Live* included, beside a wider range of exhibition spaces, many other initiatives run by artists in their studios and living places.[96] The variety and industriousness of each space mapped in *Life/Live* simply demonstrated how this phenomenon had 'a decisive effect not only on the realisation of works but also on experimentation with marginal, ephemeral or subsidiary practices of implementation'.[97] According to Obrist and Bossé what these spaces had in common was an onus on participation and collaboration, a do-it-yourself approach and above all the capacity to forge links with others, and circulate information locally, nationally and internationally. Within these collectives, artists found themselves extending their role to include curating, publishing or administrating. As David Batchelor and Rebecca Gordon-Nesbitt pointed out in their essays published in this anthology, this phenomenon of artist-initiated projects was by no means novel or confined to the UK. Batchelor traced its origins back to the Paris of 1855 when Gustave Courbet organised his one-person show *Realisms*. He also reminded the reader of those 'found spaces' inhabited by the Dadaists, Surrealists and Futurists. In this context, Batchelor argued, the distinction of studio, gallery space and living space would be hard to make. Following on from these early experiences Gordon-Nesbitt also mentioned other key spaces in the UK which had anticipated the dynamic scene of the 1990s. These included the establishment of SPACE Studios in the late 1960s, the Artists Placement Group established by John Latham and Barbara Steveni in 1966, The Centre for Advanced Creative Study founded in 1974 by David Medalla, the *Destructive in Art Symposium* led by Gustav Metzger in 1966, and finally the establishment of Matt's Gallery by Robin Klassnik at ACME Studios in 1979.

In which terms were projects such as *Audio Arts*, *Control* magazine, and *Imprints 93* (just to mention the few included in *Life/Live*) considered artist-run spaces, and what was the rationale for defining them as 'alternative spaces'?

Considering their flexible decision-making, informal organisational structure, their level of inventiveness and experimentation, not to mention their relative discretion of outside support, most of the artist-run spaces included in the *Life/Live* survey, were seen - at least in their early days - as independent initiatives from the art market and mainstream galleries. It would be misleading, however, to accept that the anti-establishment label was shared unanimously or did remain an appropriate criteria to

---

[96] The inventory includes 50 artist-run spaces. For example Cabinet Gallery, City Racing, Cubitt Gallery, Cultural Instructions, Gasworks, Imprint 93, Independent Art Space, nvisible Museum, Locus +, Milch, Not Cut, NVA Organisation, The Tannery, The Tracey Emin Museum, Transmission, 30 Underwood Street.
[97] Bossé and Obrist (1996), p. 13.

define them. According to Gordon-Nesbitt it is important to acknowledge that the anti-establishment label used for example in the listings of a magazine such as *Time Out*, was eventually rejected.[98] Systems of patronage either linked to the art market or public funding were increasingly introduced from within the art establishment if we think of the history of the *Freeze* exhibition and its successors as well as the gradual institutionalisation of spaces such as Cubitt Gallery, Gasworks, and Matts Gallery.[99] While *Freeze* became the entrepreneurship model *par excellence* and allowed the Young British Artists to become the shining stars of the art market, exhibitions spaces often attached to studio provisions such as Gasworks became regular funded organisations by the Arts Council and subsequently managed by highly professional arts administrators.[100]

Nevertheless, this was not the 'destiny' of *Audio Arts*. Since the inception of the project Furlong and Barker realised the importance of running the magazine as an independent business and not being somehow attached to academia as for example the *Arts & Language Journal*. The magazine was never subsided by advertisements either. Financial support was eventually applied for from the Arts Council who supported *Audio Arts* for a quite long period of time. Its organisational structure and attitude did not however change much from 1973 to 2007. *Audio Arts* remained a small publishing enterprise run by Furlong with the help of Violet Furlong and one part-time editorial assistant. While the financial structure of *Audio Arts* and how this had an impact on its production and distribution will be fully addressed in *Chapter 2*, what I would like to underline here is the intertwined history of artists' magazines and artist-run spaces. A history to which *Audio Arts* belongs to as a magazine that inhabited the technological audial space of the tape as both an 'interactive' site of information and discussion, as well as an alternative space for the presentation and production of 'time-based art'.[101] One in-

---

[98] As Gordon-Nesbitt pointed out in: '*Time Out* magazine has used the heading "Alternative Spaces" in their art listing since March 3-10, 1993.' She named two examples: Simon Ford, 'Myth Making: on the phenomenon of the young British artists, *Art Monthly*, March 1996, no. 194, pp. 3-9; and Mark Harris 'Peter Lewis's Flag at Clink Street: Group Shows, Alternatives and Commodification' unpublished catalogue essay. See Gordon-Nesbitt, *Life/Live – Anthologie*, 1996, p. 150.

[99] *Freeze* was organised in an empty administrative block in London's Docklands by some art students from Goldsmiths College, Damien Hirst prominent amongst them. 'The exhibition has an impressive list of corporate sponsors, many of them associated with the service industries and urban redevelopment projects'. See Julian Stallabrass, *High Art Lite: The Rise and Fall of Young British Art*, Verso, 2006, p. 53.

[100] 'Artist-run galleries had become established with professional arts administrators who developed exhibition programmes and sought general audiences. Something is ostensibly lost in this process of institutionalisation'. See Dave Beech in *Institutionalisation for All*, in *Art Monthly*, March 2006, no. 294, p. 8.

[101] See the interview with Furlong by J.W., May 1979 (TGA 200414/3/7/2) in which the interactive aspect of *Audio Arts* is stressed compared to a journalistic approach and also its function as a platform for time-based works. Furlong stated: 'It is not just a flow of information that is

depth study which brilliantly narrates this intertwined history is the publication by Gwen Allen of *Artists' Magazines. An Alternative Space for Art*.[102] 'The book explores the significance of artists' magazines in the art of the 1960s through to the 1980s by examining magazines that were published by artists and their supporters as alternatives to the mainstream art press and commercial gallery system'.[103] Allen insists on 'the artists' magazine as a particular kind of oppositional site'. She writes:

> The magazines that comprise its case studies - *Aspen* (1965-1971), *0 to 9* (1967-1969), *Avalanche* (1970-1976), *Art-Rite* (1973-1978), *FILE* (1972-1989), *Real Life* (1979-1994), and *Interfunktionen* (1968-1975) - suggest that the significance of the artists' magazine during this time was deeply tied to the evolving notion of the alternative space. This term neatly captures how the two-dimensional printed page functioned as a substitute exhibition space for conceptual art - a corollary to the architectural interior of the gallery or museum. However, it also expresses the ways in which magazines paralleled and furthered the ideological and practical objectives of alternative spaces. Like other artist-run, independent, and non-profit exhibition spaces and collectives, magazines challenged the institutions and economies of the mainstream art world by supporting new experimental forms of art outside the commercial gallery system, promoting artists' moral and legal rights, and redressing the inequities of gender, race, and class. Indeed … magazines were not merely secondary or supplementary to other kinds of alternative spaces and institutions but were deeply enmeshed within the new cultural economies these institutions helped to bring about. To publish art - to literally make it public - was a political act, one that challenged the art world and the world at large.[104]

Although Allen's case studies mostly related to the New York scene strongly associated with conceptual art's aesthetic and ideological concerns in North America, the insight they do provide has been instrumental for rethinking the impact of a similar

---

going to the audience all the time. One would like the audiences, and by that I mean the listener and artists, involved to feedback into the magazine and to extend it accordingly.'… 'What I have learnt is the value of using tape for what I would call for interactive, generative discussion, by generative, I mean the way in which the idea, a concept, a coming together of two people, can generate ideas and thought that wouldn't have happened otherwise.'

[102] Gwen Allen, *Artists' Magazine: An Alternative Space for Art*, The MIT Press, 2011. *Audio Arts* is included in the appendix of the book among other UK artists' magazine such as *Analytical Art* (1971-72), *Ark* (1950-78), *Art Language* (1969-1985), *Artscribe* (1976-1992), *Black Phoenix* (1978-79), *Control* (1965), *Signal* (1964-66), *Stereo Headphone* (1969-1982), *Strange Faeces* (1970-75), ZG (1980-88). Although *Studio International* published artists' work and writings it is not included in the book because according to Allen, 'it was more geared toward the professional art world rather than artists' magazines'. See *Appendix: A Compendium of Artists' Magazines from 1945 to 198*9, p. 227.

[103] Gwen Allen (2011), p. 2.

[104] Ibid, p. 7. An example made in the book is the Art Workers' Coalition Open Hearing in April 1969, where several artists expressed indignation at the magazine's role in the art world status quo. In particular Lee Lozano call for an 'art revolution'. According to Allen magazines like *Avalanche* were key for building a radical counter-public within the alternative art community in Soho in the early 1970s, while magazines like *Art-Rite* (1973-1978) paralleled the goals of alternative artist-run gallery spaces which were proliferating in the 1970s in North America through the establishment of artist-run cooperatives and collectives.

phenomenon in the UK where a history of the alternative artists' magazine is still very much fragmented.[105] The recent studies by Joanna Melvin on Peter Townsend's editorial papers (1965-75) and J.J. Charlesworth on art criticism in Britain (1968-76) in particular, have pointed out the pivotal role of artists' writings and artists' pages that featured in a mainstream magazine such as *Studio International* as one of the important factors in the development of new forms of critical practice.[106] As I stressed at the beginning of this chapter, this is a legacy that influenced the inception of *Audio Arts*. Both Allen and Melvin have fully acknowledged the contribution of the dealer Seth Siegelaub to pioneer the use of printed publications - including books, catalogues, xeroxed booklets, posters, and magazines - in the display and distribution of conceptual art. His idea of using catalogues and books to communicate and disseminate art as the most neutral means was received positively by *Studio International* being inclined towards conceptualism and the idea of commissioning art works for the page. While Siegelaub's exhibition 'July/August 1970' hosted by *Studio International* remains one of most influential operations in terms of presenting works made expressively for the magazine page, Allen's study eloquently proved that many other magazines of the same period further expanded and went beyond that possibility. She pinpointed at least four aspects that partly informed the critical framework of the present research:

1. The magazine as a space for dialogue and debate linked to the dialogic structure of the public sphere theorized by Jurgen Habermas (e.g. the dedicated forum section set up in magazines such as *Artforum* combined with the experimental writing of artists including Dan Flavin, Robert Morris, Robert Smithson and Sol LeWitt);

2. The magazine as a new kind of artist medium and exhibition space connected to the expanded categories of artists' medium witnessed on minimalism, conceptual art, and related practices (e.g. the contributions of Brian O'Doherty and Dan Graham in *Aspen* magazine between 1966-1970);

3. The difference between document and work, between the page as a kind of primary site for documentation and the magazine as a site and medium in and of itself (see Siegelaub's distinction between document and the work itself in contrast with the

---

[105] While an equivalent comprehensive study of artists' magazines in the UK has yet to be written, its history can be traced back in individual accounts by their protagonists as for example in Stewart Home, 'Independent Magazine Production', in *Life/Live - Sommaire*, Musée d'Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris, pp. 238-239.

[106] Joanna Melvin, *Studio International Magazine: Tales from Peter Townsend's editorial papers 1965-1975*, 2013, PhD, London, University College London; J.J Charlesworth, *Art Criticism: The Mediation of Art in Britain 1968–76*, PhD, 2016, London, Royal College of Art. For the investigation of book and magazine as medium in the UK see also Andrew Wilson, *Publication as Information as Artwork*, in *Conceptual Art in Britain, 1964-1979.* London: Tate Publishing, 2016, pp.132-139.

blurring terrain pursued by *0 to 9* magazine in works such as *Following Piece* (1969) by Vito Acconci);

4. The impact of the artists' interviews in challenging the magazine's hierarchy of authority and, not least, the authority of the art critic (e.g. *Avalanche* artists' interviews as an example of anti-criticism).

(While the point on documentation has been discussed in the introduction, I will explore the other points in the next chapters).

To close this section and briefly return to the artist's magazine as an oppositional site, Allen argues that many of the artists' magazines of the 1960s-1970s were directly linked to radical media practice outside the art world. Together they documented and helped to construct new identities and experiences and distinguish themselves from the neutral, universal public space claimed by *Artforum* and mainstream magazines alike. If most of magazines investigated by Allen grew out from the disillusionment with exclusionary policies of elitist art institutions and the entanglement of magazines such art *Artforum* with the economies of the mainstream art world, *Audio Arts* was directly inspired by Peter Townsend's editorial vision of responding to the impetus of the artist's voice as a primary source of information. To the questions posed by *Studio International* in their magazines survey – 'Do you support a partisan area of art activity or remain open to every new development? To what extent do you consider your magazine is shaped by (a) your regular advertisers, and (b) the power of the art market?' Furlong replied:

> … *Audio Arts* supports what it considers important in terms of current art practice and theory, which would include new developments. Having said that, the practical problems involved in covering new manifestations as they take place are enormous, and outside the slim resources of most art journals. This situation could be improved if the art journal was seen more as an integral part of the externalisation of the artists' concerns rather than an aloof institution there to pass judgement.
>
> … Since *Audio Arts* does not carry advertising at present there are no pressures from that direction. The power of the art market is such that artists' careers can be promoted for reasons other than the quality of their work. Here the responsibility rests with the magazine and its editor, to ensure that the artists who receive support do so out of a concern and commitment for their work rather than a desire to 'back a winner'. … However, a healthy debate, exchange of ideas, views and problems such as *Studio International* is here involved in, can only further and promote the use of the art magazine not as an isolated entity but as a key resource in the development and understanding of contemporary art.[107]

---

[107] William Furlong, *Studio International*, 1976, p.157. See TGA 200414/2/39.

As I will analyse in the next chapters, the multifaceted activity of *Audio Arts* did occupy an alternative space in that no other art magazines in the UK was using recorded sound as a primary media and developed it into a specific format for editorial and artistic interventions both within and outside a gallery context. Rather than positioning itself as an 'oppositional site' to the art market and the mainstream press, *Audio Arts* wanted to offer a complementary space where both established artists represented by commercial galleries and artists working independently were given a voice. In a short interview featured in *Studio International* in 1978 asking Furlong his opinion about 'politically conscious art practice' and if the artist should become 'the mouthpiece for a community' Furlong stated:

> Not at all. I certainly wouldn't restrict the artist's function to one option. Since our culture consists of groups with different interests, priorities, concerns and aspirations, politically committed art would necessarily have to incorporate a wide spectrum …
> Finally, in making this statement, I should like to add that no polarization should take place between the artist and 'the gallery', for 'the gallery' represents a potentially valuable resource if extended into new models.[108]

What seems at stake here is therefore what it meant to Furlong to use the media and/or a gallery space differently. As Allen suggested 'unlike earlier avant-garde artists' periodicals, which were founded to support specific artistic movements' the magazines of the period between the 1960s and the 1980s 'were motivated less by the need to promote a narrow aesthetic agenda than by a desire to transform the art magazine itself.'[109] *Audio Arts* was one of the magazines that radically took up this role.

---

[108] William Furlong, *Studio International*,1978, p. 36. TGA 200414/2/39.
[109] Gwen Allen (2011) p. 41.

Chapter 2: Activities and Recordings of Audio Arts

> The biggest discovery in making the book was how closely interrelated the whole set of *Audio Arts*' activities and concerns have been, how it's been a collaborative project, how artists involved have realised the potential and seen that it was more than a magazine where critics wrote about their works. It's a unique document of contemporary art – it's not about it, it *is* it, based on the authentic commentator, which is the artist.[1]

William Furlong, 1992

2.1 Introduction to the Activities of Audio Arts

In this section I introduce the main activities run by Furlong under the *Audio Arts* framework. By this I mean all the initiatives that were presented and organized by Furlong in collaboration with the *Audio Arts* editorial team or carried out by Furlong under the name of 'Audio Arts'. It is my argument that most of the activities produced in parallel to the production of the *Audio Arts* volumes and supplements and presented under the name of 'Audio Arts', belong to the history of the magazine, here understood as an expanded critical and artistic practice. Although activities such as exhibiting and curating are in some cases not strictly related to the publication of a volume or a supplement, these activities are nevertheless informed by the same sound practice and its emphasis on speech as a common denominator. Put boldly, *Audio Arts* was more than a tape cassette magazine, and the people involved in its material production embraced it by extending their collaboration with Furlong beyond the mere process of recording and editing audio interviews.

The argument of understanding the multifaceted production of *Audio Arts* as part of a whole discursive practice developed by Furlong and his collaborators is twofold. Firstly, I will analyse how the activities of *Audio Arts* were originally presented in two key books edited by Furlong in the 1990s. Secondly, I will propose a new categorization for each activity by investigating key events and productions realized during the period 1973-2013. The period covers the production of the issues (1973-2007) and other parallel editorial, artistic, and educational activities up to the digitization of the Audio Arts Archive by Tate and the last solo exhibition by Furlong (2013).

To begin with the *Audio Arts* books, the first attempt of presenting the whole range of activities carried out as *Audio Arts* as part of the same project, appeared in the publication *Audio Arts. Beunruhigende Versuche Zur Genauigkeit*, published by Reclam Leipzig

---

[1] William Furlong, *Art Monthly*, no.160, October 1992.

(Leipzig, 1992).[2] The book documents the production of two decades of the *Audio Arts* magazine (vol. 1 to vol. 11 and supplements) through texts and transcriptions of selected recordings translated into German. It also includes related images used for the tape cassettes, descriptions of the Audio Arts Sound Works, essays by Mel Gooding, Michael Archer and William Furlong (German and English), a chronology of the exhibitions and projects, and, finally, an *Audio Arts* bibliography.[3] A revised version of the Reclam book with the addition of new material was subsequently edited by Furlong in 1994 and published by the Academy Editions under the title *Audio Arts: Discourse and Practice in Contemporary Art*. (See *Diagram1, Appendix 1*).[4] Beside the re-publication of the three essays by Gooding, Archer and Furlong, the Academy edition presents selected written transcriptions from *Audio Arts* interviews which have been collected in four main chapters titled as follows:

> ARTISTS TALKING: artists who engage with the structure and primary function of the interview;
> ARTISTS WORKING: artists who use the medium of speech as a primary strategy in the delivery or performance of their work;
> BEING THERE: the international exhibition as a source and catalyst for discussion, commentary, analysis and opinion;
> TAKING ISSUE: recordings that arise out of particular issues and debates.[5]

The book also includes a chapter dedicated to ARTWORKS which are presented through images, very short descriptions and a short intro which reads as follow:

> The underlying concerns of the artworks have included location, place, authenticity and identity, realized through a variety of media including soundworks/records, installation, performance, drawing and radio broadcasts'.[6]

From the installation and the flexi disc *Objects and Spaces* co-produced with Archer for the Hayward Gallery (1983) to *Time Garden*, an outdoor site-specific work by Furlong for the exhibition *HA HA, Contemporary British Arts* at Killerton Park (Devon, 1993), the artworks

---

[2] The title bizzarely translates into English as 'Worrying Attempts at Accuracy' or, in a more poetic way 'Unsettling Attempts at Precision'. The book includes translations by Peter Meir, Rudolph Remmert, Götz Burghardt and Stefan Welz.

[3] Mel Gooding, *Das Werk* (The Work), Michael Archer, *Offentlich und Privat* (Public and Private), William Furlong, *Der Ton in Der Zeitgenössischen Kunst* (Sound in Recent Art).

[4] For the process of making this book see the correspondence with Nicola Hodges at Academy Group Ltd Editions and William Furlong, 8 Sept 1993 - 27 Jan 1994, TGA 200414/1/2/4.

[5] For the list of artists included in the book *see Diagram 1, Appendix 1*.

[6] William Furlong (ed.) *Audio Arts: Discourse and Practice in Contemporary Art,* Academy Editions*,* 1994, p. 120.

featured here include both the Audio Arts co-productions by Furlong/Archer made in the 1980s as well as the solo projects by Furlong exhibited in the 1990s.

In another section of the Academy edition Furlong underlined that 'In addition to publication of the magazine and the production of artworks, Audio Arts has both initiated and been central to a wide range of collaboration with artists.'[7] The chapter on COLLABORATIONS shows images and descriptive captions of diverse activities as for example, among others, the *4 Seminars* organized by Furlong with Robert Self and Richard Cork at the PMJ Self Gallery (1975), the project *Live to Air* co-curated with Michael Archer (Tate Gallery, 1982), the performances *Academic Board* and *In Terms of* in collaboration with Bruce McLean (discussed in *Chapter 1*); the tape/slide projection presented by Furlong as a time-based event at Riverside Studios (1980) and not least the fund-raising event organized by Bruce McLean and Mel Gooding called the 'Audie Award Ceremony' (1985).[8]

An up-dated chronology is also included in the Academy edition. However, the details of dates and venues provided from 1967 to 1994 has been compiled almost like an artist's CV (Furlong's CV) rather than a timeline which clearly states and distinguishes the production of the magazine from Furlong's solo exhibiting activity. Although there are cross-overs between the published issues and Furlong's sound works it is not always clear how (and if) the two strands of his practice are directly connected. (I return to this in the section about the sound works and in the *Conclusion*).

What clearly transpires from these two publications is on one side the aim of gathering together written and visual documentation from the production of *Audio Arts* magazine, while on the other to underline the collaborative/artistic framework of the project whose activity has been expanded from publishing to curating and exhibiting. Within this wider critical framework the Audio Arts artworks co-produced by Archer/Furlong as well as Furlong's solo projects not only appear on the same page, but also under the same name.[9] What in short seemed relevant at the time of these publications was not the idea of setting clear boundaries between one activity and the other, but rather presenting *Audio Arts* as a unified artistic, critical practice developed by Furlong in collaboration with other editors and artists. As Archer underlined in a recent interview, he has always thought that the authorship of the project goes primarily to Furlong.[10] Although on many occasions, the name 'Audio Arts' was used to refer both to

---

[7] Furlong, ed. (1994), p. 111.
[8] Ibid, pp. 111-114.
[9] Ibid, pp. 120-127.
[10] Archer declares: '*Audio Arts* is Bill'. See interview with present author Michael Archer, 10/12/2017.

the magazine and a collective exhibiting name, since the early 1990s the centrality of Furlong to the project was fully recognized.[11] The critical essays by Gooding, Archer and Furlong, published in both the Reclam and Academy Edition, have clearly articulated the role of Furlong as editor, curator, and artist. (I will return to them in the final chapter).

A third and last publication edited by Furlong which needs to be mentioned here is the catalogue of *Audio Arts* recordings.[12] Structured in three parts, the *Audio Arts Magazine* (vol. 1 – vol. 19), the *Supplements* and the *Audio Arts Soundworks and Other Publications*, this book remains the most comprehensive catalogue of recordings prior to the acquisition of the Audio Arts Archive by Tate.[13] But whilst this publication still represents a key source for the history of the production of *Audio Arts*, the entries provided are limited to the body of recordings published up to 2000 (vol. 19).[14]

What follows is an attempt to critically re-organize the structure of these books into a new set of categories and formats that will help the reader and future researchers to navigate the multifaceted activities carried out by Furlong under the name of *Audio Arts*. The following outline will use key examples for each activity as a means to reveal their extent, though by no means intended to be comprehensive. The outline is accompanied by a diagram that summarizes and illustrates each category (See *Appendix 1*).

2.2 The New Categories: Publishing, Curating, Exhibiting, Academic/Educational Activity

The new four categories I propose here include: Publishing, Curating, Exhibiting, Academic/Educational Activity. (See *Diagram 2*, William Furlong/Audio Arts Activities, *Appendix 1*). These categories are distinguished from the archival series (and subseries) of the Audio Arts Archive at Tate (see *Diagram 5*, in *Appendix 2*). While the archival series refers to the nature of the material acquired - where and how the records were previously kept and handed over by Furlong to the Tate - the categories proposed here follow a completely different trajectory which is informed by the *Audio Arts* publications outlined

---

[11] In the exhibition *The Sculpture Show* at the Hayward Annual in 1983 the name 'Audio Arts' refers to Furlong and Archer as authors of the work on display. See the exhibition catalogue by the Arts Council of Great Britain (ed.) *The Sculpture Show: Fifty Sculptors at the Serpentine and the South Bank*, 1983.

[12] William Furlong (ed.) *Audio Arts: Recordings*, Audio Arts, London, 2001.

[13] This publication was a key reference for Tate cataloguing system. See also *Chapter 4*.

[14] They were key references in the cataloguing process of Audio Arts Archive see *Chapter 4*.

above.[15]

Under the category of **Publishing** I have included the wider publishing activity beyond the boundaries of the regular publication of the volumes and the supplements. Although the term **Curating** was never clearly applied in the context of *Audio Arts*, I have rerouted some collaborative projects, presentations and events (listed in the Academy edition) under this term.[16] Curating refers here to the practice of presenting and displaying artists' work to an audience whether this took place in the physical space of a gallery, in a slide/tape projection event or in the audial technological space of the tape. Under the category of **Exhibiting** I have grouped and distinguished artworks/exhibitions presented through the Audio Arts collective name (Archer/Furlong), from Furlong's solo projects/art works directly or indirectly connected with the production of the magazine. The **Academic/Educational Activity** finally covers the collaboration with the Educational Department of The Whitechapel Gallery (1977-1989) as well as Venice Agendas, a series of seminars organized by Furlong in collaboration with *Audio Arts* contributors and Wimbledon College of Art in conjunction with various editions of the Venice Biennale.

I have excluded from this inventory the category of 'collaborations' for two simple reasons. Firstly, collaborations with artists happened to a higher or a lower degree in most of the *Audio Arts* supplements as well as in the special editions. Secondly, editorial collaborations with the *Audio Arts* contributors, in particular with Michael Archer, Zoe Irvine and Jean Wainwright, were to some extent implicit in the very structure of the magazine. While Furlong has always been the main point of reference as the editor of *Audio Arts,* he was equally open to explore new terrains and give a certain freedom to the interviewers and his editorial assistant in proposing artists and ideas for the volumes, as well in doing the editing. The collaborative nature of the magazine is therefore the very inclination of the project and not an activity that stands alone.

I have also excluded from this framework occasional activities such as the use of the *Audio Arts* facilities and equipment as a recording studio for artists and musicians.[17] As

---

[15] The archive at Tate comprises both published and unpublished recordings and also contextual material collected during the production of the magazine. Excluded from this series are the artworks. See *Chapter 4*.

[16] Furlong always used the words 'presentation', 'event' and 'collaboration' to describe the activity of showing other artists' work to an audience. Only in the 1990s the word 'curating' started to be used in some proposals sent to the Arts Council. This can be seen in conjunction with the 'curatorial turn' of the mid 1990s and the rising literature on the subject.

[17] See for instance the recordings done by Michael Archer for Susan Hiller's installation *Monument.* The master tapes of those recordings are today in the archive. When I made Hiller aware about these items she requested Tate to return these recordings to her. At present the recordings are still in the Audio Arts Archive: TGA 200414/7/4/735; 200414/7/4/749;

I will further explain in *Chapter 4*, most of Furlong's original master tapes used for the production of his sound works are not included in the Tate Archive but are still in his personal archive. Unlike the catalogue of Audio Arts Archive devised by Tate, the inventory proposed here shows both the production of the magazine and its parallel activities, including Furlong's solo shows. With the exception of key examples, the artworks discussed in this research are strictly related to the body of sound works co-produced with Archer (see the *Audio Essay 2*, *Listening to Audio Arts Sound Works*).[18]

Instead of following the chronological order of the volumes and supplements which has been pursued in the Tate catalogue, in the *Appendix 1* I will also provide an inventory based on the different typologies of the recordings made by *Audio Arts*. While a complete account of *Audio Arts* would imply an in depth analysis of the issues across different periods, this aim has to be pursued elsewhere.[19]

To accompany the inventory of the *Audio Arts/William Furlong Activities* outlined here I have produced two posters reproducing the cover images of all *Audio Arts* volumes and supplements. I have also compiled an updated timeline, listing the main events related to *Audio Arts* magazine (1973-2007) and selected key contemporaneous events in London. Finally, the timeline includes Furlong's solo and group exhibitions from the inception of the magazine to the acquisition and digitisation of the Audio Arts Archive (2004-2019). These supplementary documents are enclosed in the *Appendix 1*.

2.2.1 Publishing

Publishing represents the main activity run by Furlong under the name *Audio Arts*. Between 1973 and 2007, 25 **Audio Arts Volumes** and 53 **Audio Arts Supplements** were published (see *Appendix 1* for the full list *Volumes and Supplements* and related individual issues). While the volumes were published at regular intervals of 4 issues a year except for the last volume, the production of the supplements varies year by year.[20] In parallel to the publication of the volumes and supplements occasional **Special Editions /**

200414/7/4/1026. See also the interview with Adrian Glew with the present author, 11/01/2019.

[18] A complete study of Furlong's sound works would require a dedicated study in its own. This will be possible after the digitization of all the master tapes in possession of the artist and the cataloguing of his personal archive.

[19] This study will be possibly continued once the digitisation of the unpublished material will be completed.

[20] The last volume includes only 3 issues: vol. 25 no.1 featured in a double issue together with vol. 24 no. 4., vol. 25 no. 2 and 3 is published as a double issue CD under the title *La Biennale di Venezia* 2007.

Supplements were also produced under the name of 'Audio Arts'. They include *A Round Of Desert Flowers,* a 7-inch vinyl record by Richard Long (1987); two works by Dieter Roth, *Lorelei. The Long Distance Piano Sonata*, co-produced with Hansjörg Mayer (1981) and *Harmonica Curse*, 1981); finally *Nine Works for Tape/Slide Sequence* (1978) an edition produced in conjunction with the event presented both at the Battersea Arts Centre and the Whitechapel Gallery (1977).[21] In addition to these editions, *David Bomberg …His Life and Work*, was 'the first of a series of tape/slide sequences produced by *Audio Arts* in collaboration with the educational department of the Whitechapel Gallery' (see section on *Academic/Educational Activity*).[22]

Under publishing I have inserted the three aforementioned **Audio Arts Books** edited by Furlong between 1991 and 2001. A more recent publication which includes edited transcripts of a selected number of *Audio Arts* interviews was published by Phaidon in 2010 under the title *Speaking of Art: Four Decades of Art in Conversation*. While in the previous publications Furlong was responsible for selecting the contents of the book, this volume was predominantly complied by the internal team of the London publishing house.[23] However, a revised version of the essay *The Work* by Mel Gooding re-titled *Audio Arts: The Archive as a Work of Art*, was published on the suggestion by Furlong as the introductory text of this anthology.

Two **Other Editorial Projects** can also be added here under the present category. The first one, is *Technique Anglai*se. *Current Trends in British Art*, edited by artist Liam Gillick and curator Andrew Renton (Thames and Hudson, 1991), which includes an edited transcript of the recorded conversation by Furlong featuring Lynne Cooke, Furlong, Liam Gillick, Maureen Paley, Andrew Renton and Karsten Schubert who discuss the current trends in British Art. The second editorial project (published by Gardners Books in 2002) is the illustrated book *Song of the Earth*, comprising interviews conducted by Furlong and Mel Gooding with landscape artists Herman de Vries, Chris Drury, Ian Hamilton Finlay, Nikolaus Lang, Richard Long and Giuseppe Penone.

---

[21] The edition was presented as a box with a set of 71 slides and 2 audio-cassettes.
[22] This tape/slide sequence is the only one listed in the *Audio Arts* catalogue of recordings. Presumably this is the only edition co-produced with the Whitechapel Gallery which was on sale via *Audio Arts*'s distribution channels. While clear arrangements were established between 1979/1980 for hiring *Audio Arts* to do the technical work for the production of the commissioned tape/slides series, no formal arrangement with Furlong in terms of distribution was ever taken up after the production of the Mario Merz tape/slide. See the memo of the meeting between Furlong and Martin Rewcastle sent to Nick Serota, 31 January 1980, WAG/EDUC/9/2.
[23] In May 2006 I assisted Furlong in the search of images to be published in the Phaidon volume. While I compiled a full list of images from the Audio Arts Archive, only a limited number of Audio Arts photos were included. The selection of the interviews was also decided by the Phaidon. Despite Furlong's desire to include other artists such as Susan Hiller, Phaidon opted for a very restricted selection of interviews. From the conversation of the present author with Furlong.

In this section I have not included the volume *Talking Art, Interviews with artists since 1976* published by Ridinghouse-Art Monthly (2007), as this was not a joint venture with *Audio Arts* but it simply reproduced four artists' interviews previously recorded and published by Furlong both on *Audio Arts* and *Art Monthly*.[24]

2.2.2 Curating

Nine Works for Tape/Slide Sequence appears to be one of the first projects curated by Furlong under the name of *Audio Arts*. It was first presented at Battersea Arts Centre in September 1977 and subsequently at the Whitechapel Gallery in October of the same year. The slide/tape projection included works by performance artists Kevin Atherton, Marc Camille Chaimowicz, David Critchley, Rose English, Bruce McLean, Paul Neagu, Sally Potter, Jacky Lansley and Reindeer Werk. In the description printed on the special edition produced in conjunctions with the events the novelty of the tape/slide medium is stressed.

> Nine works for TAPE/SLIDE sequence came about as a result of nine artists currently working in the area of performance being asked to produce an artwork for slide and tape sequence using up to 10 minutes of sound tape and 5 slides. The resulting sequences, which are seen and heard consecutively, represent both an innovation in the way art activity can be viewed and offers a unique opportunity to witness in terms of a 'live' event a wide range of contemporary art practices. From the outset it was felt important that the TAPE/SLIDE sequence shouldn't be documentation of a previously realised event but a new work specifically produced for this project.[25]

Chaimowicz reviewed the *Nine works for tape/slide sequence* in *Artnotes*, praising the initiative as one of the first opportunity to show time-based work.

---

[24] The volume included the edited transcript of the recorded interviews by William Furlong with the following artists: Joseph Beuys, 'Plight', *Art Monthly*, Issue 122 Dec -Jan 1987/88; Brice Marden, 'Drawing out ideas', *Art Monthly*, Issue 117, June 1988; Krystof Wodiczko, 'I want to be a catalyst', *Art Monthly*, Issue 120, Oct 1988; Ilya Kabakov, 'The unofficial line', *Art Monthly*, Issue 125, April 1989.

[25] See the original edition published in 1978 available for consultation at the Tate Archive, TGA 200414/7/3/2/21. The edition contains 71 slides, 2 audio-cassettes and presentation details. It was accompanied by the text *Performance Art or is it?*, an article by Furlong originally published in the catalogue for *Performance Art Festival*, Cultureel Animatiecentrum Beursschouwburg Brussels, October 1978, and as catalogue introduction to a Performance Art programme at the Arts Council of Northern Ireland Gallery in Belfast, November 1978.

> Given the lack of response to non-object art by our cultural institutions and the absence of any recording or archive of time-based work and performance this tape slide sequence is a light on the horizon.[26]

A second tape-slide projection simply titled **Tape Slide Sequence** was curated a few years later by Furlong and presented at Riverside Studios (1980). As in *Nine works* the emphasis on this medium as a context to present time-based work was seen as an event in itself:

> As with Nine Works for TAPE/SLIDE Sequence, the Riverside series extended the concept of original artworks being presented to an audience as time-based events.[27]

Devised over three nights the programme presented works by artists Ulay/Marina Abramovic, Rasheed Araeen, Kevin Atherton, Ian Breakwell/Ian McQueen, Stuart Brisley (1 November); Hank Bull, Marc Chaimowicz, James Coleman, Adrian Hall, Richard Hamilton/Dieter Roth (2 November); Tina Keane, Les Levine, Maurizio Nannucci, Arleen Schloss, John Stezaker and Steve Willats (3 November).

In 1979, Nick Waterlow, director of the Sydney Biennale *European Dialogue* invited Furlong to contribute to the exchange network initiated by the Biennale. Between 1981-82 Furlong undertook a lecture tour in Australia presenting tape/slide works and cassettes at the George Patton & Ewing Gallery in Melbourne and at the Australian Experimental Art Foundation in Adelaide. For the Sydney Biennale, in 1982, Furlong presented **Artists' Soundworks**, a selection of artworks which took the form of over 20 hours of artists' tapes.[28] According to Furlong this was 'the first time that a distinct sound work component *was* introduced into an international exhibition of contemporary art'.[29] However, the rationale he followed in the artists' selection was informed by an idea of sound as pervasive rather than an exclusive form of dissemination.

> In my selection for the Biennale I have tried to reflect a range of practices where sound is essential, but not necessarily exclusive in the dissemination and presentation of the artist's work. As well as individuals, I have also included initiatives such as audio magazines and artist's records as active means by which new sound works have been produced and distributed.

---

[26] See TGA 200414/2/39.

[27] See mailing card for the event reproduced in Furlong, ed. (1994), p.112.

[28] Artists included were Susan Hiller, Laurie Anderson, Bob George, Clive Robertson, Dan Graham among others. Selected recordings previously published on *Audio Arts* such as Luigi Russolo's *Intonarumori* and James Joyce's reading from *Finnegan's Wake* were also part of the exhibition.

[29] See invitation letter written by Furlong to Susan Hiller, 8 December 1981, TGA 200414/2/94/6.

It is important to add that all the work will be presented from tape rather than actual 'live presentation'. This is more than a mere convenience in terms of the practicalities of presenting work in a Biennale. In many ways the medium of magnetic sound tape, and the processes and possibilities of sound recording do represent a significant area of creative activity which only exists in, and is accessible through, the medium of tape. Furthermore, the potential of wide-spread dissemination is also present through the multiple production of records and cassettes, and through broadcasting.[30]

In the 1980s Furlong and Archer were involved in producing their own sound works for galleries and art festivals (see the *Audio Essay 2*, *Listening to Audio Arts Sound Works*) and also very pro-active in presenting artists' sound work in the magazine thorough specially curated compilations. Following up from the Sydney Biennale audial display, ***Live to Air***, featured in the issues no. 3 and 4 of volume no. 5, was one of the most celebrated sound compilations of the 1980s.[31] Forty-five artists were invited to make a work for the context of *Audio Arts* with an approximate duration of five minutes. The compilation was organized in four themes, spread over three cassettes and accompanied by a printed insert including descriptions and images for each contribution. The four themes were *Rock Idioms* – 'works that use rock idioms and their associated structures';[32] *Images and Narratives* – 'works that construct narrative through the juxtaposition and collaging of sounds and images';[33] *Technological and Audial Space* – 'works that are concerned with, and refer to the audial space created by recording technology';[34] and finally *Urban Reference* – 'works focussing on the relationship between the individual and the urban environment'.[35] As was underlined during the Sydney Biennale, in the 1980s the medium of magnetic tape represented a significant and growing area of practice that was largely overlooked. By embracing it both as an artistic practice and as a mode of display *Live to Air* was indeed a pioneering project. In the letter of invitation to the artists Furlong wrote:

I hope that artists will see this cassette as a means through which an art work can be realised/ presented/externalised, which is equivalent in many respects to the physical gallery context, but which avoids many of the associated constraints.

[30] William Furlong, text for Sydney Biennale, February 1982, TGA 200414/2/94/6.
[31] See Kevin Concannon, *Cut and Space: Collage and the Art of Sound*, 1990, Art Metropole, p. 174.
[32] Bruce McLean, Julia Heyward, Rod Summers, Art & Language, Barbara Ess, Dan Graham (side A); Clive Robertson, Yura Adams, David Garland (side B).
[33] Tina Keane, Jacki Apple, Adrian Hall, Arleen Schloss (side 3); Richard Layzell, Ian Breakwell, Bob George, Ian Murray, Hannah O'Shea, Rose Garrard, Gerald Newman, Silvia C. Ziranek (side 4).
[34] Lawrence Weiner/ Peter Gordon, Connie Beckley, Charlie Hooker, Anti Music, Maurizio Nannucci, Hank Bull (side 4); David Cunningham, Jack Goldstein, Tom Marioni, David Troostwyk, Dieter Roth (side 5).
[35] Kerry Trengove, Helen Chadwick, John Carson (side 5); Vito Acconci, Stuart Brisley, Les Levine, Uwe Laysiepen/ Marina Abramovic, Roberta M. Graham, Steve Willats, Elsa Stansfield/ Madelon Hooykaas.

There are also the possibilities of widespread dissemination not implicit in gallery presentation.[36]

The understanding of the medium of tape as a new area of practice and, that the audial/technological space was a kind of parallel exhibition space, as well as a complementary channel for dissemination (e.g. broadcasting), was clearly expressed in the *Live to Air* insert.

> This work has no form other than playback from tape, as opposed to the recording function being used 'passively' as a method of retaining an acoustic event, or acting as a strategy for other work. Furthermore, the processes of working with sound provide artists with similar manipulative, structural and ideological freedoms and possibilities to those normally associated with the traditional media, such as painting, sculpture and collage. In many respects this audial/technological 'space' is parallel to the physical space of a gallery, yet extends it through the potential of widespread dissemination inherent in the multiple production of cassettes and through broadcasting.[37]

The success and impact of *Live to Air* in the 1980s was not however strictly due to its innovative format. Produced in conjunction with the exhibition *Audio, Tape-Slide, Drawing and Performance* at the Tate Gallery, *Live to Air* was also presented as a kind of tape/library installation.[38] A table and sofas were set up in the middle of the exhibition space and visitors were provided with tape recorders and headphones to listen to the sound works. In addition, the original inlay cards of Audio Arts issues were displayed on the walls. Here a new mode of listening within an exhibition context was experimented with for the first time. (I will return to this point in *Chapter 4)*.

In the same year as *Live to Air*, Furlong was invited to present *Audio Arts* tapes in the **British Soundworks** exhibition at the Franklin Furnace space in New York (14 April – 14 May 1982). Other invited organisations in the show included 110 Records, Audio Transart, Inc., New Wilderness Foundation and Close Cassettes.[39] Finally two other projects co-curated by Archer and Furlong in 1985, signed off the end of the curating activity of Audio Arts: **Real Time**, *a* pilot live arts programme for television

---

[36] Furlong, Letter of invitation, 2/6/1982, TGA 200414/2/98.

[37] See the twelve page printed booklet titled *Live to Air* which was in distribution with a box containing the 3 audio-cassettes (TGA 200414/7/3/1/19). *Audio Arts* featured in many different radio broadcasts. For example the radio program produced by David Craig, Andy Dowden, Micah Lexier in conjunction with the Audio by Artists Festival, CKDU 97.5 FM, Radio Station, Nova Scotia – Halifax (1/8 April 1985).

[38] London, 22 August – 8 September. Included also records by artists, a sound installation by Helen Chadwick and a slide tape projection by Ian Breakwell. See the original press release TGA 200414/2/99.

[39] British Artists also included were Stuart Brisley, Gerald Newman, Charlie Hooker, Silvia C. Ziranek.

presented at the Institute of Contemporary Arts in London and a live visual art event at the **SFX theatre**, organised by the Grapevine Arts Centre in Dublin.[40]

2.2.3 Exhibiting

Between 1983 and 1987 Archer and Furlong co-produced a series of tapes, vinyl records, radio broadcasts, live multi-media events, performances and exhibitions in the context of various galleries and art festivals in the UK. In his essay *Public and Private*, Archer has emphasized that the opportunity to exhibit at the Hayward Annual in 1983 'seemed a natural development from the curatorial and editorial work that Audio Arts had done up to that time'.[41] The participation at *The Sculpture Show* at the Hayward Gallery for which was produced the flexi-disc *Objects and Spaces* - partly discussed in *Chapter 1* and in the *Audio Essay 2* - functioned as a spring board for a series of opportunities to present *Audio Arts* as an art practice in itself. The second invitation to *Audio Arts* to exhibit in a gallery space came about in 1984 through the encounter with Declan McGonagle, director of the Orchard Gallery in Derry. On this occasion Archer and Furlong produced their own first LP named after the gallery (*Orchard Gallery*) which was presented as part of a sound installation with slide projections. A second LP record, *Accent for a Start*, was then commissioned in 1987 by Projects UK in Newcastle Upon Tyne.[42] Similarly to Orchard Gallery, *Accent for Start* was not just a record. Commissioned as part of an educational project it was presented in Newcastle, London, and Bradford as the soundtrack for live performances by students. A third record, a 7 inch 45 release titled *Head Low/The Difference*, was also commissioned by Interim Art in 1987, a space run by the gallerist Maureen Paley in her Victorian terraced house in Beck Road, in East London. The production of the record was also accompanied by a sound installation at Interim Art.

In addition to the Orchard Gallery and Projects UK, two other significant commissions which can be seen in the trajectory of public art, came in 1986 from the National Garden Festival at Stoke-on-Trent and from the ICA's public works programme curated by James Lingwood. For the former the tape *Six Works for the Telephone* was produced which derived from recordings made at monthly intervals on site. For the latter, titled *Arris*, a series of field recordings which were played and performed at

---

[40] *Real Time* included performances by The Bow Gamelan Ensemble, Stuart Brisley, Mona Hatoum, Kevin Atherton, Richard Strange, John Walters, Susan Hiller and Waldemar Januszczak.

[41] Michael Archer, 'Public and Private', in *Audio Arts: Discourse and Practice in Contemporary Art*, 1994 p. 115.

[42] John Bewley and Simon Herbert.

the St James's Church in Piccadilly were also collected on a tape. I have grouped all these sound projects under the label 'Audio Arts Sound Works' after the definition provided in the Audio Arts books.

As I have fully addressed in the enclosed *Audio Essay 2 - Listening to Audio Arts Sound Works (1983-1987)* a concern for place and location was explored through the spoken word and ambient sound in each of these works. What Furlong, together with Archer, have mastered through this body of work, is the ability to capture the singularity of voices in spaces, sonically framing diverse social contexts by using the microphone as an instrument. Although the aims of these productions were engaging with the public sphere rather than the artistic milieu of contemporary art, in his essay *Public and Private* Archer has underlined that 'the continuity between the magazine and the artworks must be stressed'.[43] It would be in fact misleading to think that the editorial activity was, and somehow became, separate from the artistic developments of the project.

In the 1990s, Furlong continued the editorial activity with the collaboration of new editorial assistants, as well as the production of new site-specific works. Similar to the sound works co-produced with Archer in the 1980s, Furlong explored the relationship between voices and places, using vox pop interviews as a tool for gathering material in *situ.* Curiously he has continued, from 1989 onwards, to present these new sound works through the double name of William Furlong/Audio Arts. Given the complexity and the number of projects presented intermittently under this double name from 1989 to 2013, a full account of these works would require a separate dedicated study.[44] In the diagrams presented in this research I have outlined a possible subdivision of the works/exhibitions which are directly connected with the production of the magazine from the ones which purely use the name 'Audio Arts' as a reference. In the box **Sound Works related to the Audio Arts Archive** I have listed the sound works and sound installations which were constructed by using original recordings published on *Audio Arts* volumes and supplements. The work that inaugurated this practice is *Conversation Piece* (1998) a piece that I fully discuss in *Chapter 4.*

Key projects that address the dual symbiotic relationship between the process of recording artists' voices for the magazine and their creative use in making subsequent sound works are for example Furlong's solo exhibitions *William Furlong/Audio Arts in Bregenz* curated by Wolfgang Fetz and Heidi Grundmann (Bregenz, Austria, 1998), *To Hear Yourself as Others Hear You* at South London Gallery in London (2002) and *Extraction,*

---

[43] Archer (1994) p.115.

[44] This will be possible once the personal archive of Furlong will be digitized, and thus fully accessible.

Construction, Abstraction, Sound Art Museum - Radio Art Mobile in Rome (2006) curated by the present author.

In the group **Other Artworks** I have instead listed a series of exhibitions/art works also presented in parallel to the magazine but constructed from other audio sources as for instance *Anthem*, a site-specific installation for the De La Warr Pavillion in Bexhill-on-Sea in 2009 briefly discussed in the enclosed *Audio Essay 2 - Listening to Audio Arts Sound Works*.

2.2.4 Academic/Educational Activity

In 1977 Furlong organised a sound library at the coffee bar of the Whitechapel Gallery. The library combined both published and unpublished recordings made by *Audio Arts* as well as historical recordings. Furlong made available *Audio Arts* tapes for the audience to listen to. Visitors could select a tape and play it on the gallery equipment.[45] This temporary DIY set up was received with enthusiasm by the new director of the Whitechapel Gallery Nicholas Serota who became a strong supporter of *Audio Arts*. In that period the Gallery did not have a bookshop, however a development plan which included a resource centre was planned by Serota with the assistance of the educational officer Martin Rewcastle. At the core of the new development there was a clear mission of expanding the educational program of the Gallery through new activities and an AV resource centre. Furlong was in the right place at the right time. Although it took a few years to implement the plan, *Audio Arts* was soon involved by the Gallery in their production of tape-slide presentations. [46]

Between 1977 and 1989 a considerable number of tape-slides were developed and produced by Archer and Furlong in collaboration with their Educational Department.[47] After an experimental period during which five tape/slide works were produced in conjunction with the exhibitions of Gerhard Richter (14 March – 22 April 1979), David Bomberg (21 September – 28 October 1979), *The Arts of Bengal* (9 November – 30 December

---

[45] Caroline Tisdall reviewed this initiative as 'an exciting new sound project', 'a remarkable library covering a whole range of issues in contemporary culture and challenging the rule of the written word in spreading information'. See Caroline Tisdall (1977).

[46] A new gallery, a lecture theatre and an education room was developed in 1984. See interview by J.W. (author not identified) with Martin Rewcastle, 2 March 1979, in which he talks about the development programme of Whitechapel including a very large bookshop with an A.V. Resource area. While was discussed a possible distribution of magazine via the gallery the sale of *Audio Arts* tapes was according to Rewcastle something to be arranged by Furlong himself. See Audio Arts/Audio Tape Library 1977-78 WAG/EDUC/9/2.

[47] For a complete list of the tape-slide see *Appendix 1*. See Audio Arts/Audio Tape Library 1977-78 WAG/EDUC/9/2.

1979) and Mario Merz (18 January – 2 March 1980), Martin Rewcastle evaluated the possibility to involve *Audio Arts* in a regular production and distribution. This would have led the partnership in the production of packaged special editions for sale to be distributed by *Audio Arts*. Issues of higher production and distribution costs were raised and this possibility appeared not to be feasible.[48] As a result Furlong and Archer continued the collaboration with the Gallery only as producers. Among interviews with artists (e.g. Bruce McLean by Furlong, Jannis Kounellis by Caroline Tisdall) and introductions to an artists' work (e.g. Barry Flanagan by Lynne Cooke; Georg Baselitz by Norman Rosenthal), the tape/slide series also encompasses educational presentations by artists and art critics. *What is an Artist* was, for example, devised by Michael Archer and Jenni Lomax in 1983, and *An Early History of the Isle of Dogs* was produced in collaboration with the Island History Trust in 1985. In addition, special commissions to artists by the Whitechapel Gallery also took the form of tape/slide works as for example the celebrated piece by Susan Hiller *Magic Lanterns* (1987) and *Making Do and Getting By* (1985) by Richard Wentworth, both produced by Michael Archer.[49]

While teaching at Wimbledon School of Art Furlong developed, in collaboration with Mel Gooding, **Venice Agendas**, a forum for debate on contemporary art. Organised as a series of breakfast meetings in conjunction with the Venice Biennale in Venice, Venice Agendas involved the partnership of many UK art schools, colleges and universities and the participation of international artists, curators, and critics. The first edition of Venice Agendas was organised by Furlong in 1999 and involved the participation of curators Zdenka Badovinac, Charles Esche, Hou Hanru and Jonathan Watkins among others. The second edition was organised in 2001 in collaboration with Rod Bugg and Mel Gooding and involved the participation of *Audio Arts* interviewer Jean Wainwright and Zoë Irvine along with critic Matthew Higgs, Lynda Morris, Clive Phillpot, and Andrea Rose among others. The third (2003) and fourth edition (2005) organised by Furlong, Rod Bugg and Gooding saw the involvement of the curator Vittorio Urbani of Nuova Icona from Venice, and the partnership with the Metropole Hotel in Venice as the gathering place of the conference.

---

[48] Between 1980 and 1989 Whitechapel Gallery eventually produced 27 video tapes by transferring the tape/slides into VHS format. The original sound for the tapes was however technically produced by *Audio Arts*. For the complete list of videos of tape/slide productions see WAG/EDUC/9/2. All the master tapes for the slide/tape projections produced by *Audio Arts* in collaboration with the Whitechapel Gallery are in the Tate Archive, TGA 200414/9.

[49] Archer was hired as a freelance producer by Whitechapel. He produced *Magic Lanterns* with the Audio Arts facilities however this was an exclusive commission by Whitechapel Gallery and not a co-production with *Audio Arts*. As a result, a copy of the master tape for *Magic Lanterns* is still in the Audio Arts Archive (TGA 200414/9/1/6) while the paper records related to the productions are at the Whitechapel Gallery Archive (WAG/EDUC/10/3).

Audio Arts recorded each meeting and subsequently Furlong and Gooding edited three publications including transcriptions and reflections on each discussion panel.[50] In 2007 Furlong stepped down as the main organiser of the conference while Mel Gooding continued to be involved as one of the chairs of the conference. Malcolm Quinn, from Wimbledon School of Art, eventually took the lead as the main organiser of the edition of 2007. Since 2011, Venice Agendas has continued as an independent project run by workinprogress (Claire Fitzpatrick and Terry Smith) in collaboration with curator Mark Segal. The discursive format of the project has been extended into a series of art commissions staged in Venice and in other locations.[51]

2.3. The Material Production of Audio Arts (Volumes and Supplements)

The production of the *Audio Arts* magazine covers 34 years of making, editing and publishing original recordings within various audio formats. In this section I will briefly introduce the technological aspects of this production, looking at the main changes over the three decades, including the passage from the tape cassette format to CD, the design and the material assemblage of the issues as well as the composition of the editorial team and the collaborative structure developed by Furlong with contributing interviewers and artists. I begin with the very first step of the tape production: the recording process.

From the inception of the magazine in 1973 to the early 1990s recordings were made on a Uher portable tape recorder and then transferred to a 10" inch tape via a Revox A77 stereo tape recorder for the editing process. The edited recording was then copied onto a reel to reel master tape. As a self-taught sound recordist Furlong slowly learnt and perfected this simple yet essential process of gathering audio material onto a magnetic tape. He was eventually assisted by a part-time technician in recording specific events while gradually building a small recording studio in his home. As Furlong declared in his early interviews, the real scope of the magazine was not however to produce 'studio recordings' but rather gather recordings on site which would include, as in the first issue of Documenta in 1977, voices of artists, but also peripheral sound and ambience.

The choice of making recordings 'on the spot' - be it an interview, the documentation of a live event or an audio reportage of an exhibition - became from the late 1970s the real trademark of *Audio Arts* recordings. For this the best possible sound

---

[50] Edited transcripts from Venice Agendas were edited by Furlong and Mel Gooding and published by the Wimbledon School of Art. See Furlong and Gooding (1999; 2001; 2003; 2005).
[51] See https://www.veniceagendas.eu/about (accessed 27 September 2019).

quality obtained by portable equipment remained a constant concern for its editor. Technically speaking, Furlong always aimed to achieve a broadcast quality standard. This was a challenge that was not always possible given the (initial) limited resources and the difficulty of hiring professional equipment for recording live concerts. While the continuous thread running through *Audio Arts* recordings has been a concern for speech, voice was not the only sound gathered and mastered on *Audio Arts* tapes. An early ambition of the project was in fact to publish experimental music recorded at live concerts and to produce sound works by artists. In an interview from 1979 J.W. posed a key question: 'what have you learnt since the first tape?' Furlong replied:

> Well, what I have learnt is the value of using tape for what I would call for [example] interactive, generative discussion, by generative, I mean the way in which the idea, a concept, a coming together of two people, can generate ideas and thought that wouldn't have happened otherwise. […]
> The other thing I have learnt is that it should really also be used for things that couldn't be translated into any other medium and here I am thinking of music and sound and rehearsal and concert … All those things couldn't come into text. I am thinking areas of art practice too like performance which is time-based or time-based art that can't be put into print either because print is a static, non-time based medium, whereas the passing of time and tape is.[52]

As anticipated in *Chapter 1*, the ambition of publishing experimental music beside the production of artists' interviews and sound works became after the late 1970s an unfeasible activity for a small producer like Furlong. This required more professional recording equipment in addition to a portable recorder which enabled high-fidelity recordings of live performances. A very high standard post-production of music recordings was also very time consuming. Time and resources that, in addition to the regular publication of 4 issues a year, Furlong alone was unable to manage. The editing process with reel to reel machines was a truly slow physical process of cutting and splicing the tape. An analogic process which Furlong certainly enjoyed and continued to do in his small home studio for about three decades. Even when the digital area flourished with the introduction of new methods of recording in the 1980s, Furlong kept editing on reel to reel machines.[53] Only in 1993 did he start to use a portable Digital Audio Tape (DAT)

---

[52] There are good reasons to assume that the initials in the script of this interview correspond to the name of John Walters, a BBC producer who broadcasted recordings from *Audio Arts* in his programme. See TGA 200414/3/7/2.

[53] Digital recording methods were introduced in the 1980s. The analogue (magnetic) tape was substituted by digital audio tape with the introduction of Digital Audio Tape (DAT) recorder and subsequently the introduction of hard-disk-based systems for recording, which employed the digital compact disc (CD) for producing final mixes. 'Digital audio tape never became important as a consumer recording medium partially due to legal complications arising from "piracy" fears

recorder,[54] however he maintained the habit to transfer the recording back onto a 10"
reel to reel tape for a final editing. As a result most of the master tapes for the production
of *Audio Arts* cassettes were made on magnetic tape. We have to wait till 2003 for *Audio
Arts* to switch from a semi-analogic system to a fully digital process which employed
digital recordings published on a CD format. During this new phase an editorial assistant
was responsible for the editing of the sound material, while the mastering and packaging
of the CDs was eventually handled by a private company such as, for example, Sonica
Studio in London.

     Another value of the tape cassette which was often praised by Furlong (as
discussed in the context of the *Audio Scene 79* symposium) was the speed and the low cost
involved in the dissemination of the cassette tape as compared to the high costs of
printing books or vinyl records. The fast duplication system offered by the tape cassette
allowed another in-house activity which was easy to manage and cheap to maintain: 'the
master cassette is put into a high speed cassette duplicator, the button is pressed and
within two minutes you have six copies of that, if it's an hour long say.'[55]

     The last step of the production line was, finally, the packaging of the cassette for
sale. This involved the design and printing of the inlay card, the preparation of the label
to stick on indicating Side A and B of the tape, and the rubber stamp with the title to be
printed on the label. While the printing of the cards and the rubber stamps were done by
a local printer, all the other tasks were divided between Furlong and Violet Barrett who
spent their evenings assembling the tapes for distribution. Up unto 2003 most of the cards
produced for the tape cassettes were designed by Furlong himself. The style from one
card to another varied enormously. The early black and white covers included essential
information about the contents such as the name of the author/artist who contributed to
the tape, the date and location of the recording made by *Audio Arts*, and one image
related to the artist or the specific subject of the issue. In a second phase the inlay cards
were printed in colour and included extensive descriptions and statements for each
artist/event recorded, a few photographs, and other supplementary information related
to the time, location and copyrights of each recording. With the exception of few A4
printed inserts produced for three specific issues (*Live to Air*, vol. 6 no. 1 and vol. 6 no 2
and 3), the inlay card was the only space where supplementary information about the

---

on the part of the record companies.' See
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_sound_recording (Accessed 16 November 2019).
[54] See Audio Arts accounts, TGA 200414/3/1/13 May 1993. Expenses includes the acquisition
of a DAT tape recorder for the amount of £ 845.73.
[55] William Furlong in *Interview with William Furlong, Editor of Audio Arts*, by Graham Bartlett, Sydney
- Australia, August 1981, TGA 200414/2/94/5.

production and contents of each issue were provided in a written form. With the introduction of the CD format in 2003, the design for all *Audio Arts* publications was subsequently managed by Graziano Milano, a former student of Furlong who worked for *Audio Arts* as a designer on a freelance basis.

2.4 Finance and Distribution

Since the inception of the magazine it was decided that *Audio Arts* was as an entirely independent initiative. Unlike the *Art & Language* journal, Barker and Furlong did not seek any support from the art college where they were teaching but rather found financial support from a private company EO Ipso Ltd, directed by Christopher W. Roberts and E. Roberts. The association with Ipso Tapes however only lasted for two years from 1973 to 1975 while some minimal support also came from public funding.[56] In June 1974 *Audio Arts* received the first grant from the Arts Council of Great Britain for the amount of £155, followed by another grant of £300 towards the cost of purchasing recording equipment.[57] From the first *Audio Arts* book of accounts we learn that the total production costs for the first master tape was £175.[58] While the production costs were almost covered by the sale of the tapes and this extra financial support, Furlong's part-time work as editor was unpaid.

In July 1979 an ambitious joint application to the Arts Council was put together by Furlong and Nick Serota, director of the Whitechapel Gallery, who offered to monitor the activities of *Audio Arts*. The basis of this application was to 'enable Audio Arts to continue to record and produce original recordings of British Contemporary Art by creating a financially viable base for one person to work full time'.[59] The application was unsuccessful. In the 1980s the Arts Council did provide *Audio Arts* with a series of small subsidy grants. However, most of the production costs were covered by the sale of the issues and a growing number of subscribers both in the UK and abroad.

In the financial year 1998/9 the number of subscribers reached 160 individuals in the UK and 85 abroad, while the number of retail sales per issues was around 700, making a total income of £36,215. The readership was made up primarily from artists and students, however a significant number of national and international organisations

---

[56] In October 1975 the association with EO Ipso terminated. See *Audio Arts* Account books, TGA 200414/3/1/2.
[57] Letter of offer by Arts Council of Great Britain, 15 Feb 1974, TGA 200414/3/1/2.
[58] Audio Arts account 1968-1974, TGA 200414/3/1/1.
[59] Arts Council 1974-1990, TGA 200414/3/7/1.

were regular subscribers such as central libraries, art colleges and universities, art organisations and gallery bookshops.[60] For a contemporary art magazine which was not supported by private sponsors and advertising, except on rare occasions, these international sales as well the subscriptions proved to be vital for the survival of the project especially during the 1980s.[61] One of the real impediments for *Audio Arts* to maintain a consistent income from sales and subscriptions was however a lack of joined up resources for the distribution within the wider context of British art magazines. In the report written for the Arts Council on the 12 April 1984 Furlong lamented that:

> After 10 years of publishing. Audio Arts is still approached by individuals in provincial situations who have only recently discovered that such a publication exists. For individual magazines, it is extremely time consuming and costly to maintain regular distribution to art venues, to ensure adequate display, to issue invoices, chase sale or return copies and to generally administer this area. [62]

At the time when the Arts Council approached Furlong, *Audio Arts* and *Art Monthly* were discussing with the British Council a plan whereby a number of ACGB funded magazines could be brought together as a 'cultural package' for distribution abroad throughout the British Council's network of International offices. Two years previous to this *Audio Arts* also initiated a joint mailing list of 1500 addresses with *Art Monthly*, *Coracle Press* and *edition hansjorg meyer*.

This report for the Arts Council was consequently seen as a good opportunity for Furlong to renew his proposal to involve the British Council in supporting a new strategy for increasing international subscriptions but also to welcome the proposal by Charles Landry of having a combined distribution/promotion/subscription service.

> *Audio Arts* welcomes Charles Landry's report and feels that it raises crucial issues in relation to the development of British art magazines. It is true to say that however good a magazine is, it will be of little value if it does not reach an audience. The points in the report therefore about distribution are very important and it is clear that there is a much more substantial audience for specialist art magazines than

[60] These include libraries and bookshops of museums and galleries in the UK and abroad (e.g. Tate Library, Hayward Gallery, The Museum of Modern Art (New York), Van Abbenmuseum, Des Fundacio Antoni Tapies (Barcelona), Centre G. Pompidou (Paris), The Getty Research Institute). The higher numbers of subscriptions and sales was reached by art colleges and libraries both in the UK and abroad including various UK Polytechnics, the British Library, Scottish Poetry Library, National Theatre Bookshop. See Sales Ledgers: TGA 200414/3/2/1; TGA 200414/3/2/3, TGA 200414/3/2/6).

[61] This was possible for instance in the production of *Live to Air* which was sponsored by Capital Radio 194, E.H. Hickey - Keeper of Art, Ulster Museum and the editor of *Art Monthly* Peter Townsend.

[62] This was part of a report by Charles Landry concerning magazines subsidised by the Arts Council of Great Britain distributed by the A.C.O.B. on 21st March 1984, see Arts council 1978-1984, TGA 200414/3/7/2.

we can currently reach. I therefore fully support the idea of a distribution service as long as such a service did not dilute the existing resources available to magazines subsidised by the ACGB.[63]

In the early 1990s *Audio Arts* finally became a regularly funded organisation by the Arts Council. However, the regular grant allocated between 1993 to 2008 approximately covered less than one third of the total annual expenditure which reached £54,880 in the financial year 1998/9.[64] While Furlong continued to subsidy his editorial role with his full-time teaching, the grant allowed him to subsidy beside the production costs, a part-time administrator, and the costs of advertising, marketing and administration. It is important to stress that the regular financial support provided by the Arts Council was limited to the production of four issues a year and not to the whole range of activities including the publication of supplements and artworks. As a consequence the production of the supplements which were self-financing from sales became intermittent and eventually ended in 2003 due to the lack of resources. The payment of royalties to artists which was in use during the 1980s when a high number of artworks were published was also phased out.[65] With the suspension of support of the Arts Council on the 31st March 2008, Furlong eventually ended the editorial activity while he continued to present *Audio Arts* in the context of exhibitions that focused on his artworks.

2.5 The Editorial Team

From duplication to designing the cards, from liaising with artists and musicians to writing texts for ads and keeping the distribution side going, the organisation of *Audio Arts* was very straightforward. Not only was the production of the cassette entirely DIY, it also involved the work of a small editorial team of two to three people.[66] In this section I will briefly outline the roles and structure of the *Audio Arts* editorial team and who and how other people helped Furlong in the material production of the magazine.

Although the inception of the magazine saw the collaboration of Barry Barker, Furlong was the main editor from 1973 to 2007, working with the assistance of various

---

[63] Ibid.
[64] The support of the Arts Council ended on the 31 March 2008, email sent from the ACE to the present author, 25 July 2019.
[65] Royalties payed to artists include for example the amount of £104 payed to Laurie Anderson for the period November 1981- March 1983 for the interview on the supplement. The musician Michael Nyman received royalty for £ 4 for his work published on the issue Recent Experimental Music (3rd March 1981). A Royalty of £4 was paid to each artist who contributed a sound work for the compilation of *Live to Air*.
[66] Interview with William Furlong, Sydney 1981.

part-time technicians and editors. Violet Barrett, his wife, also became the other pillar of the project, acting since the production of Volume 1 as the managing editor.[67] Trained originally as an art teacher in Dublin, her role started as an administrator, providing support to Furlong's editorial activity which was partly subsided through his full-time teaching position.[68] Besides helping with the duplication and packaging of the cassettes – 'something that everybody was involved in' says Barrett - [69] her specific role was overseeing and managing most of the financial aspects of the project, including the overseeing of the annual accounts, VAT records and the contacting of suppliers. In addition to the day to day administration of the *Audio Arts* 'office', she was also responsible for taking care of orders and subscriptions, liaising with and shipping to retail and distribution outlets including galleries and bookshops.

In terms of the editorial activity, *Audio Arts* never had an editorial board as such. As the main editor Furlong planned the content of the structure of each issue often in consultation with collaborators that included Michael Archer, Mel Gooding and Gray Watson.[70] Besides planning the content and structure of each issue, Furlong's role involved conducting interviews within the UK and internationally, editing tapes, writing and editing texts for cassette inlay cards, inserts and promotional material, updating the catalogue, carrying out presentations, lectures, radio broadcasts, as well as attending conferences, international exhibitions, art fairs, and finally, running and managing the technical equipment, including the *Audio Arts* sound studio.

As a magazine published independently with some support from the Arts Council, *Audio Arts* never really managed to appoint any full-time staff. The production of each issue was often done with one or two part-time editorial assistants who were both involved in conducting interviews and also editing tapes. Various 'outworkers' who also performed administrative duties, cassette duplication, and transcriptions were also involved on a freelance basis.[71]

---

[67] Barrett cannot remember the exact date when she started helping with the project as an administrator, but only that happened in the middle of the production of vol. 1 (c.1974).
[68] When the magazine was a regular funded organisation by the Art Councils Barrrett's administrative role became an official paid part-time work. Meeting the deadlines for the Art Council, has been described by Barrett one the most challenging aspect of working for *Audio Arts*. See interview with Barrett with the present author, 10/02/2019.
[69] See the interview with the present author (10/02/2019).
[70] These are the names of 'individuals consulted on a regular basis' which are featured in Visual Arts Magazine Review by the Arts Council England, see TGA 200414/3/7/8.
[71] This include Jean Austin, former secretary of Furlong at Wimbledon School of Art, and artist Josephine Pryde a former student of Furlong at Wimbledon School of Art who provided additional editing alongside Lucy Coventry. Jean Austen, Becky Beasly, Chlöe Briggs, Eleanor Bowen, Jude James, Elizabeth Teece, Terry Teece acted as the transcribers of *Audio Arts* recordings.

The first editorial assistant who worked regularly with Furlong was the aforementioned art critic Michael Archer. He met Furlong in 1977 and continued to work with him over the following decade and a half, most intensively in collaboration during the middle years of the 1980s. Archer was involved in the recording, editing and production of many issues, as well as Audio Arts Sound Works – tapes, records, radio broadcasts, live multi-media events, performances and exhibitions (see the *Audio Essay 2 - Listening to Audio Arts Sound Work*). Selected interviews made by Archer for *Audio Arts* include Frank Stella (1985), Donald Judd (1987), Mona Hatoum, (1987), Michael Craig-Martin (1989) Rachel Whiteread (1992), Mike Kelly, (1993), Joseph Kosuth (1994), Susan Hiller (1994), Stan Douglas (1994), Marina Abramovic (1995), Orphan Drift (1995), Tony Oursler (1996), Eija-Liisa Ahtila (1999) and Marc Camille Chaimowicz (2000). Together with Furlong, Archer also recorded commentaries at the Venice Biennale and Documenta, organised critical discussions (e.g. the SFX event in Dublin 1985) and co-curated sound projects such as the *Live to Air* compilation/exhibition. He finally acted as the producer of many tape-slide projections done in collaboration with the educational department of the Whitechapel Gallery, editing and mastering the tapes at the *Audio Arts* studio. After his collaboration as editorial assistant ended, Archer has subsequently written on *Audio Arts* for monographs on the practice of the project as a whole, and for exhibition catalogues relating to Furlong's more recent work, a point to which I will return in the *Conclusion*.

The second editorial assistant of *Audio Arts* who took over the role of Archer in the 1990s was a former student of Furlong's at Wimbledon School of Art, the Scottish artist Zoë Irvine. Working primarily with sound, Irvine collaborated with *Audio Arts* from 1994 to 2007 where she was principally involved in editing and publishing. She recorded and conducted interviews with Kiki Smith (1995), Roman Signer, Attila Csorgo, Katarzyna Kozyra, and Howard Arkley at the Venice Biennale (1999), Guy Brett (2000), Roderick Buchanan (2000) and also Ana Laura Alaez, gelatin, Luc Tuymans and Liza May Post at the Venice Biennale (2001). Irvine's editing role was crucial in the passage from tape to the CD format. A passage, as Jean Wainwright pointed out, which allowed a more refined editing in terms of clarity of the recording.[72]

Another key contributor of *Audio Arts* who worked closely with Furlong both in conducting interviews, recording audial reportages and theorizing the *Audio Arts* practice, is the art critic Mel Gooding. Introduced to Furlong by the artist Bruce McLean in the late 1970s, Gooding contributed to many initiatives organised by *Audio Arts*, chairing symposia and panel discussions including Venice Agendas 2003 and Venice Agendas IV

---

[72] See interview with Jean Wainwright with the present author (10/10/2018).

in 2005. His contribution was pivotal in the recordings made on Documenta X and the Sculpture Project in Münster in 1997. Here the commentaries, co-recorded with Furlong on site, fully explored the sonic tableaux of the audial reportage in mixing talking, ambience and 'actuality' from the artworks, in eloquent, evocative soundscapes.[73] Gooding also conducted many other interviews for *Audio Arts* including Alan Johnston (1996), Siobhán Hapaska (2001) and Rimer Cadillo (2001) both interviewed at the Venice Biennale. As I will discuss fully in the *Conclusions*, Gooding has also written essays on Furlong's work and *Audio Arts* both for monographs and catalogues, providing a key conceptual framework for a critical reading and understanding of *Audio Arts* as an art practice and an artwork in itself.

And finally to introduce Jean Wainwright, another key contributor who alongside Archer, Irvine and Gooding conducted interviews for *Audio Arts* but was not involved in the editing process. In order to fully appreciate her role within *Audio Arts* we have to shift to the last two decades of the magazine. Art historian, critic and curator, Wainwright started to collaborate with *Audio Arts* in 1996 by conducting interviews with the artists of the YBA generation such as Sam Taylor Wood (1999), Gilliam Wearing (1997) and Sarah Lucas (1997). Since then she has been the most prolific interviewer and exuberant voice heard on *Audio Arts* tapes and CDs up to 2007. Her overall contribution to the magazine includes 177 published interviews with artists, curators and critics including many other women artists such as Tacita Dean (1999), Jean & Louise Wilson (2000), Catherine Yass (2000) and Vanessa Beecroft (2000) just to mention a few (see the *Audio Essay 4 -Women's Voices and Sound Works in Audio Arts*).[74] She was also involved and in the last public event by *Audio Arts* held at the Institute of Contemporary Arts in London in 2009, where she conducted a live interview with the artist Kutlug Ataman.[75] After the collaboration with *Audio Arts* Wainwright has continued the practice of interviewing, gradually building an extensive archive of artists' interviews which partly comprises several unpublished recordings originally proposed to *Audio Arts*.

Alongside Jean Wainwright other interviewers collaborated with *Audio Arts* during the last twenty years of the project although not in the same continuous and consistent measure. Curator and writer Gray Watson (co-editor with Rob La Frenais and Chrissie

---

[73] Commentaries by Mel Gooding include: *Sanctuarium* by Herman De Vries; *32 Cars for the 20th century: play Mozart's Requiem quietly*, byNam June Paik; *Philosophic Platform* by Bert Theis; *Standort Merry-go-round* by Hans Haacke; *Das Gegenlaufige Konzert* by Rebecca Horn. *Audio Arts* vol. 17 no. 3&4, 1999.

[74] Other selected published interviews on *Audio Arts* include: Mark Wallinger, Chuck Close, Ed Ruscha, 2000; Kenneth Noland, 2001; Jules Olitski, 2002; Wolgang Tillmans, Jeff Wall, 2005; Thomas Demand, James Rosenquist, John Baldessari, 2006.

[75] ICA, 14/05/2009, see: https://archive.ica.art/whats-on/william-furlongs-audio-arts (Accessed 1/01/2020.

Iles of *Performance Magazine* 1979-1992) contributed a significant body of interviews with performance artists including Mona Hatoum (1994), Annie Sprinkle (1996), Franco B (1997), Chris Burden (1999), Herman Nitsch (1999), Carolee Schneemann (2002) and Liesbeth and Angelique Raeven (2002). He also wrote a critical text for the accompanying booklet printed for the Audio Arts Sound Work *Arris* (1986). In 1994 the artist Liam Gillick produced an entire *Audio Arts* issue (vol. 14 no. 2) which encompasses 13 interviews with artists showing in the exhibition *Wall to Wall* curated by Maureen Paley at the Serpentine Gallery in London, Southampton City Art Gallery and Leeds City Gallery.[76] Previously to this issue Gillick contributed to the special issue of the 45th Venice Biennale by recording conversations with art critics and artists showing at the *Aperto* exhibition in 1993.

In addition to Furlong, Irvine, and Gillick, other interviews conducted by artists with artists published in *Audio Arts* included the archival recording made by Richard Hamilton together with Marcel Duchamp in London in 1959, Gudrun Bielz's interview with Valie Export (1997), Josephine Pryde talking to Sarah Staton (1997), Anne Tallentire interviewing Jaki Irvine (1998) and least but not last Claudia Wegener interviewing William Kentridge in his studio in Johannesburg (2005) and Colin Painter travelling to Mongolia and talking to the painter T.S Enkhjin (1992). Between 2002 and 2007 five freelance writers and curators including the present author, Chlöe Briggs, Kathy Kubicki, Rachel Withers, and Helen Sumpter, also contributed several interviews with artists.[77] One off contributions by other individuals featured also in the magazine as interlocutors in public talk or group conversations such as, for example, curator Norman Rosenthal, writer Marjorie Allthorpe-Guyton, dealers Martin McGeown and Andrew Wheatley (Directors of the Cabinet Gallery), publisher Rudolph Remmert, art critic Adrian Searle and artist Skye Holland.

What has emerged from the interviews with the key contributors including Archer, Gooding, Barrett, Wainwright and from my own short, yet direct experience of being an interviewer for *Audio Arts*, is the level of flexibility and openness demonstrated by

---

[76] Artists interviewed included Angela Bullock, Robert Barry, Barbara Kruger, Douglas Gordon, Graham Gussin, Julie Roberts, Lawrence Weiner et. al.

[77] Interview by the present authors include: Tino Sehgal (2005), Iain Forsyth and Jane Pollard (2006), Manuela Ribadeneira (2007), CM von Hausswolff and Leif Elggren (2007). Interviews by Chlöe Briggs include: Jemina Stehli (2004), Katy Dove (2004), Tom O'Sullivan (2005). Interviews by writer Kathy Kubicki include: Simon English (2004), Daniel Buren (2005), Fiona Banner (2006), Shirin Neshat (2006), Lili Almog (2006), Mark Segal (2007), Sophie Calle (2007). Interviews by Rachel Withers include: Mike Nelson (2002), Mark Fairnington (2002), Wolfgang Tillmans (2002), Sune Nordgren (2002), Michael Stevenson (2003), Imogen Stidworthy (2004), Nils Norman (2004), Catherine Yass (2005). Interviews by writer and editor Helen Sumpter include: Lali Chetwynd (2005),Keith Tyson (2005), Paul Noble (2004).

Furlong in valuing and accepting new proposals. Although he ultimately decided what was published or not, no protocols or guidelines were given to contributors to follow, nor criteria for the publication of certain artists' interviews, were clearly set or always discussed in advance with each interviewer. The reciprocal trust between editor and contributor has been somehow built by establishing a direct dialogue with Furlong. In the section dedicated to the interviews I will analyse how Furlong established a certain practice of interviewing artists and how this was eventually followed and/or 'imitated' by other *Audio Arts* contributors.

2.6 Recordings Typologies

From the first *Audio Arts* issue presenting Art & Language proceeding to the last one featuring recordings gathered at the 52nd Venice Biennale, the voices of artists, art critics, curators and dealers form a polyvocal texture in which the voice appears as the manifestation of recorded speech: interviews, conversations, talks, conferences, group discussions. While artists' interviews and conversations represent the very focus of *Audio Arts*, recordings of poetry readings and live performances as well as sound works and music compositions are an integral component of the magazine, especially of the Supplements. In this section I analyse the composition of the different types of recordings based on the descriptions provided on the insert cards of each issue and also from the *Audio Arts Recordings* catalogue (2001). I have also cross-checked this information with those provided on the Tate website and by listening to a selected number of recordings.[78]

The classification I propose here does not follow the presentation of the recordings adopted in the *Audio Arts* publications introduced earlier in this chapter.[79] Given the vast number of recordings, I use key examples and a diagram to illustrate each typology (See *Diagram 3 - Audio Arts Recordings* for the main typologies and also *Diagram 4 - Audio Arts Recordings* for the detailed typologies, both in the *Appendix 1*).[80] The diagrams detail each area/typology of (recorded) sound made and produced by *Audio Arts* and indicate an approximate number of recordings for each typology based on what has been

---

[78] This platform is not complete yet. *Audio Arts* vol. 24 and vol. 25 are missing.
[79] The three major groups: *Artists Talking*, *Being There*, *Artists Working*. See Furlong ed. (1994).
[80] From an approximate calculation of the recordings published in the volumes and the supplement, the total number of individual recordings is over 1200 items. Where possible the calculation was made by cross-checking the number of contributors with related number of audio tracks listed in the volumes and the supplement. The volumes include 85 tapes cassette and 17 CDs, while the supplements include 106 audio-cassettes and only 1 CD.

published.[81] Based on an approximate calculation, the majority of the recordings published in the volumes and the supplements are constituted by original interviews and conversations (c.700), while one third of the audio material recordings are artworks (c.364). These include sound works by artists, music pieces by composers and improvisers, recordings of live/recorded performances and recordings of poetry readings. The remaining 10% per cent of the recordings published by the magazine are formed by the audio documentation of lectures, talks and symposia. The tape/slide productions, the Audio Arts Sound Works and the recordings produced for special supplements/editions have not been included in this calculation, yet they represent an important part of the Audio Arts Archive.

2.6.1 Archive Recordings

Most of the material published by *Audio Arts* is constituted by original recordings: they have been made, edited and published by Furlong and his team of collaborators. However, a very small number of recordings published include archival material coming from other sources. These are mostly important recordings by artists and writers which largely feature in the early volumes dedicated to poetry and literature such as for example James Joyce reading part of the *Anna Livia Plurabelle* extract from *Finnegans Wake* (1929),[82] the interviews with Marcel Duchamp conducted by Richard Hamilton and George Heard Hamilton (1959),[83] the reading of Ad Reinhardt's auto-interview first published in *Art News* in 1965,[84] and Antonio Russolo's recordings of the Intonarumori by Luigi Russolo (Paris, 1921).[85]

2.6.2 Tape-Slides

The tape-slide (or slide-tape) medium was very popular in the 1970s and 1980s as a means to show both image and sound. By definition 'a slide-tape is an audio-visual work which consists of a slide show using a filmstrip machine with synchronised

---

[81] In the Tate catalogue the number of the items listed under the *Audio Recordings* in 2016 amounted to 2179. Under this series were listed the 559 items from the *Associated Collection*, 1489 unpublished recordings and 131 published cassettes.

[82] *Audio Arts,* vol. 1 no. 3, 1974.

[83] *Audio Arts,* vol. 2 no. 4, 1975.

[84] *Audio Arts,* vol. 1 no. 1, 1973.

[85] *Audio Arts,* vol. 4 no 2, 1995.

accompanying audio, traditionally audio tape'.[86] As I have extensively shown in the first part of this chapter, *Audio Arts* commissioned, curated and produced several tape-slide presentations in venues such as the Battersea Arts Centre and Riverside Studios (see section on *Curating*). It also produced many slide-tapes for the Education Department at the Whitechapel Gallery (see section below on Education). The only tape-slide that was turned into a special *Audio Arts* supplement was *Nine Works for Tape/Slide Sequence*.[87]

2.6.3 Actuality and Audial Reportages (Being There)

The terms 'actuality' and 'audial reportage' has been used by Furlong to describe field recordings made at international art events and exhibitions (e.g. Venice Biennale and Documenta).[88] These combined audio documentation of art works (e.g. sound/video installation and performances) with conversations and interviews 'on the spot'. An audial reportage often combines local ambience, an introductory description by Furlong, Archer or Gooding about the artwork *in situ* followed by a commentary by the artist, the critic or simply a visitor encountered at the venue. The term 'actuality' was first employed as a title of the first tape dedicated to the Venice Biennale in 1984. It described what ten years later, in 1995, became an explanatory statement:

> Audio Arts, in attending major artworld events believe that the associated conversation, discussion and debates that take place on occasions such as this, are an essential and integral part of exploring and defining the agendas and the issues of contemporary art. The recording heard on the tapes were therefore made 'on the spot' with artists, critics, curators and commentators. They offer an authentic, unrehearsed and spontaneous account of the 1995 Venice Biennale.[89]

From 1998 onwards the term 'actuality' was also used to describe field recordings gathered at specific venues/exhibitions from various installations and performances. The captions 'performance actuality', and 'installation actuality' appear often in the context of tapes made from recordings done at Documenta, the Venice Biennale and the Sculpture

---

[86] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slide-tape (Accessed 31/12/2019). See also http://www.vividprojects.org.uk/programme/slide-tape/ (Accessed 31/12/2019).
[87] For an online re-construction see: http://kunstradio.at/REPLAY/INSTALLATIONS/T_S/info.html (Accessed 31/12/2019).
[88] The term 'Audial reportage' was used for the first time in the tape for Documenta 8, published in 1988: 'This double issues of Audio Arts recorded at Documenta 8 in Kassel West Germany, comprises interviews, statements and commentary juxtaposed with audial reportage of soundworks, installations and local ambience'. See the inlay card for vol. 8 no. 4, *Documenta 8*, 1988.
[89] *Venice Biennale 1996*, *Audio Arts* vol. 15 no. 1 & 2, inlay cover.

Projects in Münster.[90] The first audial reportage at Venice Biennale was recorded and assembled by Furlong in 1984. From 1988 to 2007 *Audio Arts* volumes covered every single edition of the Venice Biennale, involving - besides Furlong, Archer and Gooding - a new team of interviewers (see section on the *Editorial Team*). Five editions of Documenta were also attended and well documented from 1977 to 2002, while only one audial reportage of the Sculpture Project was produced.

Along with the international exhibitions, the same recording style of reporting back from the event through short interviews and commentary on the spot was eventually applied to Art fairs and Prizes including The International Contemporary Art Fair at Olympia (London 1985/1989), Liste Basel 1996; Frieze Art Fair (London 2004, 2005, 2006), Cologne Art Fair (Cologne,1994) and the Turner Prize (London, 1985). The format of the audial reportage was finally explored as a kind of travelogue made in conjunction with a journey to cities and places visited abroad such as for example Hong Kong (1994),[91] New York (1980, 1983),[92] and Nova Scotia (1985). A special audio report on contemporary art from Nice, Cologne, Berlin, Leipzig, Dublin and London was produced by Furlong and Archer in collaboration with the magazine *Artscribe* in 1991.[93] Unlike the documentary style of BBC radio, these reportages are soundscapes constructed through the immediacy of impressions and opinions gathered on site rather than a result of a sophisticated montage done in post-production. By travelling and 'being there' at those international events *Audio Arts* provided a unique source to enter the art world through acoustic perception and the tactility of the spoken word.

2.6.4 Documentation of Lectures, Talks and Symposia

The audio documentation of artists' talks, symposia of contemporary art and lectures is another area well covered by *Audio Arts* supplements and volumes. Unlike the sensorial and performative characteristics of audial reportage, these are very straightforward recordings of artists or critics talking often in venues such as an auditorium or conference rooms. While they still have the characteristic of field recordings rather than a radio or studio quality, these recordings are not introduced or followed by any editorial commentary but rather have the purpose to document an entire event. In this context Furlong acts merely as a sound recordist who follows a purely

---

[90] See for example the description in the inlay card for *Audio Arts*, vol. 17 no. 3 and 4.
[91] *Audio Arts*, vol. 14 no. 1, 1994.
[92] See the *New York Tapes*, *Audio Arts,* vol. 4 no 3, 1980.
[93] *Contemporary Art in Europe*, *Audio Arts* vol. 11 no. 3 and 4, 1991.

documentary approach. Two early examples that serve to demonstrate this point are the Lethaby Lectures by Richard Cork recorded at the Royal College of Art (1974) and R. Buckminster Fuller's lecture at Art Net, both published in 1974. Another key example is the lectures by artists and critics recorded in the 1990s in the context of The Joseph Beuys Lectures at The Laboratory, Ruskin School of Drawing and Fine Art at Oxford University (1995, 1996, 1997).

Often these kinds of recordings were made in partnership with the venue hosting the event such as in the case of the Talking Art programme of the Institute of Contemporary Arts (ICA) in London where Furlong recorded the talks by Jeff Koons (1989), Michael Craig-Martin (1989), Nancy Spero and Leon Golub (1990) and Andres Serrano (1992). Given the purpose of documenting an entire event, the length of these recordings often exceeded the space of a single or a double issue (e.g. one or two tapes). Typically this happened when documenting over a 2 day symposia as for example *The State of British Art: A Debate*, ICA (London, 1978) and *Art Beyond the Gallery*, ICA (London, 1989), the *Audio Scene* symposium organised by the Modern Art Galeria Vienna (1979) and the festival/symposium *Recycling the Future* IV organised by ORF Kunstradio in 1997 to celebrate their 10th anniversary.[94] The long length of these symposia recordings find their destination in the tape supplements. With the exception of the supplement dedicated to the first Venice Agendas meeting, all these kinds of events were not organised by *Audio Arts* but simply documented by it.[95]

2.6.5 Interviews and Conversations

Interviews and conversations with artists make up the majority of the recordings published by *Audio Arts*.[96] Although they are different in length and style they represent

---

[94] http://www.kunstradio.at/FUTURE/RTF/index.html

[95] The supplement appears under the title *The Venice Biennale 1999 – Research Conference* and was the only one produced out of the Venice Agendas conferences. The audio documentation of the following editions remained unpublished. However two printed publications including transcripts of the talks presented at Venice Agendas 2003 and 2005 were edited by Furlong and Mel Gooding with the support of Wimbledon School of Art. See Bibliography.

[96] By an approximate calculation from the volumes and supplements, 682 interviews were published. c.450 interviews were recorded with artists while 175 with curators and critics. A small percentage of interviews were also recorded with dealers and gallerists (c.51). Most of the interviews with artists were published on the volumes (c.424) while 19 featured as supplements. The interviews with curators, critic and dealer appears mainly in the issues dedicated to international exhibitions and events published in the volumes. A small number of interviews were also made with composers and musicians (John Cage, Philip Glass, Laurie Anderson) and on writers' recollections (e.g. the interviews by Furlong with Anne Wyndham Lewis, Anne Yeats, Bijou O'Connor).

the main focus of each volume. Most of these interviews discuss specific projects and art works rather than providing biographical information about the artist. Typically, the interviews were made in art galleries, museums, artists' studios or in off-site locations where the work was presented and discussed with the artist. A large number of artists' interviews were made on the occasion of the international exhibitions previously mentioned. Here it was also possible to gather commentaries by art critics, curators and dealers. In regularly attending the Venice Biennale and Documenta besides other international events, *Audio Arts* believed that the unrehearsed and spontaneous interviews gathered in such occasions, proved first-hand insights into the agendas and preoccupation of contemporary art, criticism and curatorship. But what are the key characteristics of the *Audio Arts* interviews?

Throughout the years Furlong has established a certain practice of interviewing artists which was eventually followed by other *Audio Arts* contributors although in a rather informal manner. Whilst *Audio Arts* did not have guidelines nor an editorial board, three very simple principles became, to some extent, a tacit protocol: 1) propose a topic or an artist that stands for the present moment; 2) provide a good recording in terms of sound/acoustic quality; 3) keep the editing process to a minimum of manipulation, thus allowing background noise and ambience to enter the interview. Actuality, sound and site constitutes, in a nutshell, the very characteristics of the *Audio Arts* interview, which commonly begins with the voice of the interviewer saying: 'I am here with'.

As both Archer and Wainwright have highlighted, the real interest of *Audio Arts* to capture a moment in time was informed from what was buzzing at particular times and places as well as by what became a sphere of attraction for Furlong as the main editor. Always on the go and alerted about the up and coming events and exhibitions, especially in London, he could be described as a 'trend hound' as Gooding provocatively put it in an interview with him.[97]

Mel Gooding: Have you, perhaps, been something of a trend hound?

William Furlong: Well, I belong in the context of a moment in time of a period of history, and it's true that I've often responded to artists that seem to be on the buzz, that seem to be making the most vibrant contributions during that moment. I wanted to do interviews with Mary Kelly, Susan Hiller and more recently, Gilbert and George, Damien Hirst, and Tracey Emin, because they were – and are – very visible, and they engage people in what they do, and because they make work that seems to have something to say of the moment. That's the way I would describe it and it's been quite genuine. You could say that they've been on

---

[97] See the interview *The Table Turned. Mel Gooding tapes Audio Arts' Bill Furlong*, in *State of Art*, Autumn 2007, p. 11.

the cutting edge and at the front of the trends. But why are they there? Because what they've done has created an energy, and that's the thing that's drawn me in.[98]

One of the artists that can be regarded as a strong pole of attraction and influence on Furlong for his energy and charisma is the German artist Joseph Beuys. The recording of his action at the Institute of Contemporary Arts in 1974 and the subsequent interviews done with him at the Victoria and Albert Museum and at the Anthony D'Offay Gallery, stand for one of the most pertinent examples of the *Audio Arts* approach in recording and conducting an artist interview. As I have underlined in the *Audio Essay 1- From Transcription to Transduction: The Voice of Joseph Beuys in Audio Arts*, Furlong prefers to describe these interviews as recordings 'with Beuys', rather than 'of Beuys'. According to Furlong, Beuys always understood *Audio Arts* as a primary media through which to present his ideas and his 'verbal sculptures': a collaborative endeavour, which encouraged Furlong to continue and further develop *Audio Arts* into an artistic practice which has many points in common with the notion of social sculpture coined by Beuys as discussed in the *Conclusion*.

It could also be argued that the attraction of Furlong for recording the voice of Beuys was also based on the celebrity factor. But, as for Emin and the other artists, the first time these artists were approached by Furlong they were not so famous. Both Beuys and Emin were interviewed for *Audio Arts* several times in different moments of their lives and careers. However, what seems to attract Furlong is not the narrative about their lives and personal achievements. Each interview explores certain artworks and projects through questions that are in part prepared in advanced and in part prompted by the context where the interview took place (e.g. a solo exhibition, or the artist's space).[99] What the artist has to say in certain circumstances about his-her own work is key in each *Audio Arts* interview.

According to Furlong the possibility for the first time in history to make original recordings with artists (thanks to the introduction of accessible recording technologies) allowed a direct close contact with an artist and his/her way of thinking without the intermediation of written text (a point to which I will return in the *Conclusion*). As Furlong also stressed, he prefers the term 'conversation' to that of 'interview' in that it posits an equal authority between the interviewer and the interviewee rather than a hierarchical

---

[98] Ibid, p. 11.

[99] Exception of course exist as in the case of John Latham who asked Furlong to do a scripted interview due his anxiety of his language being misunderstood when explaining his theory of event-structure. See *Audio Arts,* vol. 8, no 2 and 3, 1987.

position based on the knowledge of the former over the latter.[100] A 'conversation', etymologically speaking, means to 'keep company with' by means of talking with someone. It is therefore a talk, especially an informal one, between two or more people, in which news and ideas are exchanged. On the contrary, an interview often implies a degree of consultation or 'investigation' which aims at revealing something unknown about a person of public interest.[101]

While *Audio Arts* adopted the question and answer format to find out about the genesis, the concerns and the ideas beyond the work of an artist, after a few initial questions, each *Audio Arts* interview develops usually into a conversation rather than an interview. Here both the interviewer and the interviewee are allowed to wander off and eventually to diverge from the artwork itself. The process of recording and conducting an artist's interview is, in this sense, a generative and creative process more than a kind of investigation or a mere recollection of the artist's life. The dialogue established with an artist is not therefore constrained within the overriding question/answer mechanism, nor becomes the site of mere storytelling as for example in oral history. It is instead a dialogic process through which the way an artist thinks is revealed, but also a learning process where a specific knowledge is acquired and co-produced.

> **Mel Gooding**: […] Conversation is, by its nature, aleatory, isn't; it's not necessarily focused. Interviews can focus and converge on an issue, but a lot of tapes you've made with artists go hither and thither, you're not quite sure where they are going; that's the beauty of conversation, isn't, that it's unpredictable?

> **Willian Furlong**: Well I've done a lot of interviews, and I usually have a number of questions, but after the first one or two, the conversation takes over, and then you don't have a script. It's an organic process of dialogue and of *learning*. I wouldn't say 'it goes hither and thither'. It has a structure that is to do with how both of the parties negotiate that process. You say something that sounds interesting, then I'm going to pursue that, and vice versa.[102]

Another important element of the *Audio Art* interviews/conversations is finally the recording of the actual voices of the artists, and their purely vocal qualities. According to the philosopher Adriana Cavarero, the devaluation of the vocalic part of *logos* within Western philosophy, goes hand in hand with the subordination of speech to thought and

---

[100] See the unpublished interview with Angelika Stepken, Villa Romana, April 2014.
[101] By extension an interview is also the process to assess the skills and the knowledge of the interviewee as in the case of a job interview or an exam, or even a form of 'interrogation' in the context of criminal offence.
[102] See interview 'The Table Turned. Mel Gooding Tapes Audio Arts' Bill Furlong', in *State of Art*, Autumn 2007, p. 10.

written text.[103] *Audio Arts* both championed the idea of speech as a primary mode of human communication as well as the idea of the artist's voice as a primary source compared to the 'third party' account of the critic or the art historian. Voice is understood by Furlong in its musical, sonic dimension and not simply as a metaphor of vocal expression and opinion.

The way things have been said, and the particular acoustic reception in which each utterance has been listened to and recorded, is something to which *Audio Arts* paid particular attention. Unlike the impeccable interviews of BBC radio and their smooth voices, the conversations of *Audio Arts* have a diverse palette and a high degree of background noise. What normally a mainstream broadcast would edit out, such as the sound of a siren in the distance or the chime of a bell, is something that instead *Audio Arts* would retain as part of the 'actuality' of the recording. The 'prelinguistic' or 'postlinguistic' phenomena, as scholar Madlen Dolar would call them, such as laughter, coughing, ums and ahs, are also vocal sounds that we can easily hear in *Audio Arts* interviews.[104] Some of the recordings that epitomised the *Audio Arts* editing approach in relation to voice are for example the interview with Cage where his gentle, ruminative and ironic voice is punctuated by his contagious laughter kept in its entire length,[105] or the fore-mentioned action/talk of Beuys at the ICA which has an 'hypnotic persuasiveness' despite the strong German accent and the amount of repetitions in the construction of elliptical sentences. Or, to switch to female voices, the silences and hesitations heard in Lucy Gunning's soft voice while interviewed by a lively Jean Wainwright.[106]

The epitome of *Audio Arts* liberty and level of experimentation in framing the artists voice could be finally exemplified by the provocative statement recorded by Furlong as the introduction of Franko B's interview by Gray Watson which reads: 'The metallic sound in the next interview are from the clicking of Franko B's gold teeth'.[107]

To return to the different length and format of the *Audio Arts* interviews. While in the audial reportages the conversations are generally quite short, almost impressionistic views that catch the fleeting moment of being at the Venice Biennale for example, the issues that are focused on one or two artists normally have longer and paced interviews. The length of each interview range approximately from an edit of 5 minutes in the context of an audial reportage up to 30 minutes long for a mix tape issue. Originally

---

[103] Adriana Cavarero, *For More Than One Voice: Toward a Philosophy of Vocal Expression,* Stanford University Press, 2005.
[104] Mladen Dolar, *A Voice and Nothing More*, Mit Press, 2006, p. 23.
[105] See *Audio Arts,* vol. 6 no. 2 and 3, 1983.
[106] Lucy Gunning, interview by Jean Wainwright, May 1997, *Audio Arts*, Vol. 16 n. 3 and 4, 1997.
[107] See *Audio Arts,* vol. 16 no. 2, 1997.

recordings, however, are much longer than that and could reach over an hour. The reason why most of the interviews have not being published in their entirety is often the result of fitting more than one recording on a tape. A 'curated' issue typically hosts a minimum of 2 interviews of 30 minutes for each side of a C60 tape, or up to 14 short interviews for a C90 tape as in the case of the Venice Biennale 1984.

There are of course exceptions, as for instance the few monographic tapes produced as supplements which are solely an interview with an artist. This could take various tape formats: C40, C60 or C90. Examples of monographic tapes include, for instance, the supplements *Laurie Anderson* interviewed at Riverside Studios (London, 1981), *Francesco Clemente* interviewed at his exhibitions at the Anthony d'Offay Gallery and the Whitechapel Gallery (London,1983), *Dennis Oppenheim* interviewed on the occasion of his exhibition at the Ikon and Lewis/Johnstone (1983) Galleries, and *Stuart Brisley and Maja Balcioglu* discussing their collaborative work (1989). Other tapes such as for example the supplement dedicated to Richard Long (1985), includes also artworks along with the interview.[108]

Group conversations and discussions with artists facilitated either by Archer or Furlong, and conversations recorded by two or more artists themselves which found their output on *Audio Arts,* could be also included here. Unlike the documentation of artists' talks and conferences listed above, these recordings are informal conversations set around a topic which are not necessarily convened for an audience, except the *Audio Arts* listeners. Examples include the conversation about *Women's Practice in Art* between Mary Kelly and Susan Hiller briefly introduced by Furlong (1977), Margaret Harrison in conversation with Lucy Lippard (1979), or the discussion about *Artists in Residence* with Helen Chadwick, Maggie Hambling and Ian McKeever chaired by Lesley Green (1981), just to mention a few.

ARTWORKS
(Performative Interviews/Poetry Readings/Performance/Sound Works)

2.6.6 Performative Interviews

In parallel to the vast production of interviews, *Audio Arts* was also open to the collaboration with artists in allowing them to engage with the tape format as a creative medium. This was an editorial choice which demonstrated the versatility of the

---

[108] Richard Long supplement includes eight text based works written between 1980 and 1983 and read by Long for the recording.

magazine. Unlike the documentary approach of most of the recordings outlined above a performative approach was embraced and developed in presenting and disseminating artworks. Under this category I have included here performances and sound works by visual artists as well as literary works by poets and music compositions. I have also included a distinct group of recordings which have developed from artists' interviews such as Ad Reinhardt's *Auto-Interview* (1965) read by Jack Wendler,[109] the supplement by Braco Dimitrijevic titled *Interview* - which comprises a collage of various interviews recorded in different times and locations- [110] as well as Michael Craig Martin's interview about his work *The Oak Tree and the Glass of Water*.[111] Here *Audio Arts* provided the context for enacting performative interviews through scripted readings performed for tape. Recorded readings which I argue can be experienced as dialogic constructs as well as artwork in themselves.

2.6.7 Poetry Readings

Recordings of poets reading their works is another area covered by *Audio Arts*. These appeared mostly in the early volumes as well as in the supplements produced in the 1980s. As discussed in *Chapter 1*, archival recordings of Modern Classic authors such as James Joyce (1929) and W.B. Yeats (1937) are followed by contemporary authors, especially Irish poets, published in the supplements: George Buchanan (1977), Patrick Galvin (1980) and John Hewitt (1980).[112] Poetry supplements were also made from readings recorded at Coracle Press in London in 1981/1982 including Glen Baxter, Basil Bunting, Thomas A. Clark, Roy Fisher, Thomas Meyer and Jonathan Williams. The reading of *Pages of the Wound* by John Berger was the last supplement published in 1995. Similar to the audio documentation of the talks and lectures, these recordings are merely documenting the readings of literary works. No special effects or soundscapes are added to the pure sound of the poet's voice reading their work.

---

[109] Vol. 1 no. 1,1973.

[110] Interviews featured here include recordings made between 1975-1978 in London at the Robert Self Gallery, in the artist's studio in Brixton and at the *Audio Arts* studio in Kennington. The first interview is scripted by the artist himself and see Duncan Smith and William Furlong in the role of readers/ interviewers rather than actual interviewers.

[111] *Audio Arts*, vol. 1 no. 2, 1974.

[112] *A question of James Joyce*, *Audio Arts*, vol. 1 no. 3, 1974; W.B. Yeats *Audio Arts,* vol. 1 no. 4, 1981.

2.6.8 Performances

Along with 'the articulation and dissemination of debate' *Audio Arts* provided 'a space' for the presentation and dissemination of time-based work. The context in which this was fully achieved was the production of the supplements. Three areas of contemporary art practice are particularly represented here: performance, sound art and experimental music. As Furlong underlined in his essay about performance art (see *Chapter 1*), this was an area of practice that was not clearly defined in the 1970s and which crossed-over with many other art forms such as sculpture, film, theatre and music. As a consequence of this the artworks which were presented in the early decade of the magazine might appear inconsistent both in the description of their specific media and the way they also featured as sound recordings on *Audio Arts*. For example, the recordings from the live performances of *Nice Style at Garage* (supplement, 1974) are described as 'a sound catalogue', while the recordings from the performance *Sorry* staged by the artists Bruce McLean and Silvia Ziranek at Battersea Arts Centre (supplement, 1977) are described as 'a minimal musical in parts' which featured on the tape as 'a sound work'.[113] Moreover the tape supplement that originated from the collaborative work between the artists Bruce McLean, Paul Richards and the musician Michael Nyman called *The Masterwork Award Winning Fish-Knife* (1979) has been presented in terms of 'a performance sculpture' including 'samples of the musical material' and 'readings from the "Masterwork" script'.[114]

There are also a body of recordings in which the 'medium of speech' results, as Furlong would say, 'as a primary strategy in the delivery or performance of the work'.[115] Under this category can be included text-based performances which took the form of public readings at the Whitechapel gallery such as the play *Die Grosse Bockwurst* by the artists Richard Hamilton and Dieter Roth (supplement, 1979), and the reading of the artist Ian Breakwell from his work *Continuous Diary* (supplement, 1978). In the case of *Die Grosse Bockwurst* the recording by Furlong retained most of the characteristics from the original group reading performed at the venue, while in the case of the *Continuous Diary*, special sound effects were added during the post-production in consultation with Breakwell. In another tape supplement produced in collaboration with Breakwell titled

---

[113] See Furlong ed. (2001), pp. 51-52.
[114] Ibid., p. 54.
[115] See Furlong, ed. (1994), p. 54.

Dialogues (1981), the recordings done in the studio consist instead of a series of readings from scripts previously published by Breakwell.[116]

Similar works also published as supplements are the readings by the artist Richard Quarrell from his book *Four Sums With The Same Answer* (supplement 1974),[117] a live reading by the composer John Cage recorded at the Antony d'Offay Gallery (on occasion of the group exhibition including works of Cage, Jasper Johns and Merce Cunningham) [118] and Silvia C Ziranek's declamation of 'eight recipes in pink and gold' (1983).[119]

Other speech based works that were disseminated via *Audio Arts*, are in addition the already mentioned lecture/performance by Joseph Beuys at the Institute of Contemporary Art (London) in 1974 and the lecture/event *The Painters Equipment* by the artist George Baselitz recorded at the Royal Academy of Arts, London (supplement 1987).[120] A scripted performative work which involved the collaboration of Furlong not only as sound recordist and producer but also as a reader, is the supplement *Concerning Twenty Works* by the artist Lawrence Weiner. The recordings done in the *Audio Arts* studio were originated from a series of text-based work exhibited by Weiner at the Anthony d'Offay Gallery (London in 1980). Along with Furlong and Weiner himself, the artist Miranda Frawley also contributed to this tape as one of the readers. Within the realm of performance that intersected with other media, the supplement produced with the artist Dan Graham and the band The Static (1979) is another good example of a collaboration with *Audio Arts* in which the audio documentation of a live performance is turned into audio material for tape.[121]

As for all the supplements mentioned here, the status of these recordings as being simply the trace of live performances (e.g. art documentation) or art objects in themselves (e.g. audio work done for tape) seems quite hard to decipher in some cases. Although the supplements were not signed by each artist (except the supplement done with Beuys), nor were they sold as limited art editions (except the editions by Dieter Roth), the mode of production of certain recordings seems however that of autonomous sound pieces in

---

[116] The tape was produced in conjunction with Ian Breakwell's exhibition at Carlisle Museum in 1981 and recorded at *Audio Arts* studio and Cambridge University Linguistic Department in 1980. See *Fiction texts*, Third Eye Publication, Glasgow, 1978 and *Ian Breakwell: Monologues and Dialogues*, Carlisle Museum Publications, 1981.

[117] The collection of text was first published on *Wallpaper* magazine, London-New York, 1974.

[118] John Cage, *Art is either a complaint or do something else*, *Audio Arts* supplement, 1990.

[119] Silvia Ziranek, *Cooking with G*D (I(H)ate Solitude)*, see Furlong ed. (2001), p. 58.

[120] Joseph Beuys at the Institute of Contemporary Art November 1974, *Audio Arts,* vol. 2 no 2, 1975.

[121] The supplement comprises unedited recordings from the live performance *Performer/Audience/Mirror* and the live concert by The Statics (Glenn Branca, Barbara Ess and Christine Hahn) both staged at the Riverside Studios (1979).

themselves.[122] I refer here in particular to the collaborative framework established with Breakwell, Brisley, Weiner, Hamilton and Roth in which the input of Furlong seems to exceed that of the mere sound recordist and/or producer. I will return to this point in the final part of this chapter.

2.6.9 Sound Works

Since the production of the early volumes Furlong was open to collaborate with visual artists who engaged with the medium of sound or were interested to present their works through the audio format of the cassette. The term 'soundworks' used by Furlong to describe these kind of contributions in the 1980s and 1990s was closely associated to/with 'sound by artists' or 'audio by artists'.[123] These terms were eventually translated, at a later stage, into the wider category (and concept) of 'sound art', a term which Furlong eventually came to dislike when it became 'institutionalized', as I discuss further in the final chapter.[124] Sound works appear in *Audio Arts* both as individual pieces in a mixtape or in curated compilations. An example of a mixtape is the double issue of Volume 6 no 2 and 3 (1983) which presents alongside artists' interviews sound works by artists Susan Hiller, Liliane Lijn, Sharon Morris and Sonia Knox. It is important to stress that while certain sound works were sound extracts from previous work (e.g. performance or sound installations), such as *Elan* by Hiller, others such as for example Knox's piece *Walking Glass*, were conceived and edited as a sound work in itself. For artists like Hiller the concession of publishing extracts from a sound installation was very much related to the context of *Audio Arts* and not, on the contrary, as an aspect of her own practice.[125] Artists were genuinely enthusiastic to collaborate with *Audio Arts* and very rarely the

---

[122] Beuys agree to signed about 80 tapes of the supplement including his interviews at the Victoria & Albert Museum in London.

[123] See the anthology *Sound by Artists* edited by Dan Lander and Micah Lexier, 1990 and the *Audio by Artists* festival in Nova Scotia, 1985, Canada. Furlong was involved in the festival and regular correspondent with Lander and Lexier.

[124] A wide range literature on sound art and audio culture started to appear in the first decade of 2000 with the publication of Douglas Kahn (1999); Allen S. Weiss (1995; 2002); Cristoph Cox and Daniel Warner (eds 2004); Brandon LaBelle (2006); Seth Kim-Cohen, (2009); Voegelin Salome (2010).

[125] This was clarified by Hiller during the conversation in preparation of the Show and Tell event at the Tate Archive, Sep. 2018. 'Perhaps you could mention to Adrian [Glew] that Elan tape, like the Monument tape, is part of an installation (shown at Whitechapel and other venues) and is not published separately. These two tapes were produced by Mike and Bill for use in my work and not for any other purpose. I am happy to discuss with him … but would like you to introduce the matter which is perfectly appropriate as we are discussing archival matters and this come up during our discussion.' Email from Susan Hiller to the present author, 27/06/2018.

request to do an interview, to be commissioned or to re-edit a sound work for tape was turned down or criticized.[126] A very successful *Audio Arts* project dedicated to sound works was the afore-mentioned *Live to Air* compilation which appeared as a double issue on Volume 5 in 1982. The project was very well received not only in terms of the positive response from the artists but also because of its adaptable format. Besides the display at Tate Gallery where the tapes were listened to by a large number of visitors, the compilation was also broadcast on John Walter's BBC programme. *Live to Air* was the only sound compilation curated and produced by Furlong and Archer which included special commissioned sound works. An attempt to produce a second compilation in the light of *Live to Air* was made by Furlong in collaboration with Archer and artist Liam Gillick about ten years later, in 1996. At the core of the project proposal titled *The Way it is: Artists Soundworks*, was the recognition that the position towards sound had changed compared to the 1980s in that the use of sound by artists was just as prevalent or more 'commonly integrated into practice.'[127] The project apparently failed to be realised due to an unsuccessful funding application.

Another kind of sound compilation was presented also in various Volumes in the 1980s by selecting extracts from existing art records and tapes.[128] Titled *Sound on Sound* these compilations were made possible through a lively network established by Furlong with sound artists and independent labels around the world above all Canada, USA, Australia and Italy. Some of the senders include artists Enzo Minarelli, Gregory Whitehead, Nicola Frangione, Christina Kubitsch, Funk'n Animals, Martha Wilson, Dan Lander, Micah Lexier and Milan Knizak.[129]

Through the close collaboration with artist Dieter Roth who spent some time in the studio of *Audio Arts*, two special supplements were produced and sold as artists' editions. The first one titled *Lorelei. The Long Distance Sonata* (1981) is comprised of 37 cassettes of piano music, a prepared radio cassette player and colour drawing by Dieter Roth with Bjorn Roth. This was co-produced with artist and publisher Hansjörg Mayer. The second one which is titled *Harmonica Curse* (1982) consists of a set of cassettes and polaroid photographs. Each photograph and cassette was produced every day for a year

---

[126] The only severe criticism came apparently from sound artist Roger Doyle who complained about the sound quality of his tape supplement *Rapid Eye Movement* (*Audio Arts*, 1981). From a conversation with Violet Barrett and William Furlong with the author, October 2019.
[127] See the Proposal for the Art Council England dated July 1996, signed by Michael Archer, William Furlong, Liam Gillick.
[128] *Audio Arts*, vol. 6 no. 4, 1984; vol. 7 no. 3, 1985; vol. 7 no. 4 1985; vol. 8 no. 1 1986; Vol. 8 no.1, 2 and 3, 1987.
[129] See the Associated Collections in the Audio Arts Archive, TGA 200414/7/1.

(14 February 1981- 13 February 1982) and include recordings of Roth playing a small accordion.

Finally, original sound works by Furlong and Archer were also created and published on vinyl records and tapes. These works were separate from the recordings published in the volumes and the supplements and they appeared in the *Audio Arts* recordings catalogue as *Audio Arts Soundworks*. In the attached *Audio Essay 2 - Listening to Audio Arts Soundworks*, I have outlined the history of each work by incorporating extracts from a recorded conversation with Michael Archer produced in conjunction with the sound seminar organised at the Stanley Picker Gallery in May 2018. (For the full list of the Audio Arts Sound Works see also the Discography).

2.6.10 Experimental and Improvised Music

As discussed in *Chapter 1* original music composition and excerpts from live concerts have been presented by *Audio Arts* in specific issues such as *Recent English Experimental Music* and *Improvised Music and Sound Works*.[130] Musicians and composers who contributed to *Audio Arts* include Hugh Davis, David Toop, Michael Nyman, Gavin Bryars, Bow Gamelan Ensemble and Charlie Hooker, just to mention a few examples. The cross-over between experimental music and sound poetry is also one of interest for *Audio Arts*. Supplements such as *Body Music* comprising a talk and performances by the artist Jean-Paul Curtay (1981), along with the supplement *Anti-music* compiled by musician John Nixon (1982) are two good examples.

2.7 Audio Arts as a Collaborative Project (towards the conclusion)

In an interview from1981 Furlong declared:

> One of the important, and I think central, areas of Audio Arts has been the collaboration with artists, and to make Audio Arts as a context available for their work. A context through which works can actually be realised and developed and expanded and disseminated.[131]

Ten years later in conjunction with the *Audio Arts* publication by Reclam Verlag, Furlong also stressed:

---

[130] *Audio Arts*, vol. 3 no. 2, 1976; vol. 4 no. 2, 1995.
[131] Interview by William Furlong by Graham Bartlett, Sydney, August 1981.

The biggest discovery in making the book was how closely interrelated the whole set of *Audio Arts'* activities and concerns have been, how it's been a collaborative project, how artists involved have realised the potential and seen that it was more than a magazine where critics wrote about their works. It's a unique document of contemporary art - it's not about it, it *is* it, based on the authentic commentator, which is the artist. [132]

From the range of recordings and activities mapped in this chapter, *Audio Arts* appears indeed as a unique collaborative project in that it expanded the potential of an art magazine from the representation/reproduction of artworks into a multifaceted practice itself which combines the communication of ideas through conversations and discussions with the dissemination of artworks in a primary form. As I have detailed above, key collaborators of *Audio Arts* have been Bruce McLean, Ian Breakwell, Dieter Roth, Dan Graham, Lawrence Weiner, among other artists. However, many other individuals including art critics and writers like Michael Archer and Mel Gooding, Jean Wainwright, Gray Watson and a team of passionate interviewers have been involved, to some degree, in one form of collaboration or another. In addition to this, a group of individuals such as Violet Barrett, Zoe Irvine, Graziano Milano have been key figures in the material production of the magazine, while curators and critics such as Richard Cork, Nick Serota and Heidi Grundmann have promoted and supported *Audio Arts* through institutional partnerships and in exhibitions.[133] Editorial, artistic, curatorial or purely technical or managerial, the collaborative structure of *Audio Arts* is delineated by a horizontal and not a hierarchical model, in which each collaboration triggered by Furlong can be seen more like a constellation. To which extent is it then possible to theorize *Audio Arts* in terms of an art practice in itself? Or as Mel Gooding has further proposed, as a work of art?

In *Chapter 1* I detailed the collaboration between Furlong and Bruce McLean both in the creation of performances and through the production of the supplements. In discussing with McLean the range of activities that emerged through this collaboration, a distinction needs to be made, according to McLean, between the artistic collaboration finalised to the co-production and co-authoring of artworks such as *Academic Board*, from what he considers, pure audio documentation of live performances published in the supplements. While McLean recognises the importance and the legacy of *Audio Arts* in his own work, he argues that *Audio Arts* has never been, in his eyes, an integral part of Furlong's art practice. In a similar manner artist Susan Hiller who contributed to several

---

[132] William Furlong, *Art Monthly*, no.160, October 1992.
[133] As a curator I have also presented several Furlong's sound works made in response to the Audio Arts Archive between 2006-2013.

Audio Arts issues, argued that the work by Furlong as an artist needs to be understood as a separate activity from the production of the magazine.

When the opportunity to establish a collaboration between *Audio Arts* and *Wallpaper* magazine was raised in 1974 by American artist Richard Quarrel and the other co-founders of the magazine including Hiller, it was to some extent typical of a context in which artists had very limited resources and infrastructures to produce and disseminate their work.[134] The *Wallpaper* supplement produced by *Audio Arts* was not only a successful collaboration. It was also a fruitful co-production through which it was possible to realise and disseminate a truly inter-disciplinary project including music compositions, poetry readings, sound works, and live performances. (See the *Audio Essay 3 - Listening to Audio Arts Wallpaper Supplement*). The collaboration with *Wallpaper* took place in the after climate of conceptual art when several artists' magazines, especially in New York, were at the forefront of the experimentation of printed matter as an artistic medium. American artists like Dan Graham, Laurie Anderson, Laurence Weiner who featured on *Audio Arts*, were deeply involved in the activity of magazines such as *Aspen* (1965-1971) and *Avalanche* (1970-1976), two of the most experimental magazines alongside *0 to 9* (1967-1969), *Art-Rite* (1973-1978) and *File* (1972-1989) to name just a few.

The invitation by Furlong to a number of conceptual artists reflects the strong interest on the materiality of language which was central to *Audio Arts* themes. It is relevant to say that the opportunity to develop a direct dialogue with American artists became more frequent in conjunction with their work being exhibited in the UK. This is the case with the example of Dan Graham. The invitation by *Audio Arts* came on occasion of Graham's exhibitions at the Oxford Museum of Modern Art in May 1978.[135] The performance *Performer/Audience/Mirror* took place a year later at the Riverside Studios (24th February 1979) in London. Although Graham was enthusiastic about being included in the *Audio Arts* program, he was initially hesitant about the idea of publishing

---

[134] Richard Quarrell came from New York for his exhibition at the Garage gallery in Covent Garden, London. It was on the occasion of a reading at the gallery from his 'number pieces' that the idea of publishing on *Audio Arts* was prompted. After the production of the supplement based on *Four Sums with the Same Answer*, recorded at the *Audio Arts* studio in 1974, follow up the idea of a collaboration with *Wallpaper* magazine. Instrumental role in this collaboration were beside Quarrell, Susan Hiller, David Coxhead and Anthony Howell. Other contributing editors of *Wallpaper* also included Richard Bernas, Susan Bonvin, Andrew Eden, Anthony McCall, Amikam Toren, Bill Shepherd and John Welch. From an email by Richard Quarrell to the present author, 19/09/2018.
[135] See postcard sent by Graham to Furlong, 30 November 1977, announcing his show at Oxford MOMA in May 1978 and thanking for being included in the future programme of *Audio Arts*, TGA 200414/1/12/116.

this piece as it seemed 'difficult to visualize it in an audio form'.[136] However, the unedited recording of the live performance became in the end the content of the supplement alongside the live concert by The Static given at the same venue. It was agreed with Furlong that the piece was briefly introduced by a short, written description printed in the inner sleeve of the cassette and this was accompanied by a short interview by Furlong with Graham talking about The Static. The interview was recorded on 11 February 1979 and partly transcribed for the cassette inlay. A few months later after the release of the cassette Graham wrote to Furlong saying that he was really satisfied with the result and that the tape should be widely distributed in New York.[137]

Although the *Audio Arts* supplement is not directly presented as an artwork (e.g. an art edition) but rather as an edited live recording of the performance (e.g. documentation), the tape cassette had and still has its own life as an object. The way the cassette was put together, including the recording, the text, the interview, the image, was in a sense the actual production and that had and still has an intrinsic aesthetic value. As happened with most of the video-tapes documenting live performances of the 1970s, tape cassettes are becoming collectors items today. However, at the time when these types of artefacts were in circulation they were mainly used as instruments to produce and disseminate artists' work rather than conceived as art objects of a special value.

Eventually magazines became, as the study of Gwen Allen's eloquently illustrates, an artistic medium in itself where artists experiment with new forms and formats within the realm of printing as well as with video and audio reproduction. As writer Brian O'Doherty declared in an interview with Gwen Allen 'With conceptual art, you needed a magazine more than a gallery'.[138] Artists such as Lawrence Weiner, Joseph Kosuth, Vito Acconci alongside Graham (just to mention a few), inhabited the pages of art magazines as a kind of alternative space through which to deconstruct the dominant mode of production and distribution of the art market. For Graham this goes back to his piece *Homes for America*, published in *Arts Magazine* (December 1966 - January 1967) as well as to his close collaboration with the multimedia magazine *Aspen* where he published *Schema* (*Aspen* no. 5+6) originally titled 'Poem, March 1966', followed by an entire volume edited by him (*Aspen* no. 8, 1970-1971).

Retrospectively, it could be argued that Dan Graham's *Audio Arts* supplement can be seen in a trajectory (or as part of a genealogy) of a series of interventions that from the

---

[136] See letter sent to Furlong from New York sent by Graham to Furlong 22nd November, c.1978, TGA 200414/1/12/116.
[137] See letter by Graham sent to Furlong from New York, 25 November c. 1979, TGA 200414/1/12/116.
[138] The interviewed is dated 4 December 2001, see Gwen Allen (2011), p. 49.

'literary' contribution to *Aspen* to the cassette format of *Audio Arts,* employed the site of the artists' magazine as critique of the modernist ideology of the white cube and the formalism perpetuated in the mainstream art world. The film *Rock my Religion* (1984) epitomised a few years later that attitude. By embracing rock music and the wider spectrum of counter-culture into his work, the choice of Graham of publishing his work on the tapes of *Audio Arts* magazine, seems therefore almost an obvious choice.[139] While the vital network of New York magazines and alternative spaces was key to contrast the plethora of mainstream art in the USA, *Audio Arts* seems to function along with magazines such as *Control, Art Monthly* among others, as its counterpart in the UK. This complementary role of providing another space for the presentation and dissemination of artwork becomes even more evident within the collaborations with British artists as for example with Ian Breakwell (as fore-mentioned), and the collaboration with Stuart Brisley. The *Audio Arts* supplement published with Brisley in 1987 as part of his project the *Georgiana Collection* was recognised as an integral part of his touring exhibition in different locations and venues.[140]

Returning to the initial question of how *Audio Arts* could be framed in terms of art practice or an art work, while in certain productions Furlong's editorial role was limited to that of framing and presenting the recordings gathered of live sound performances, in others where the dialogue established with the artist allowed a more dynamic interaction, his role exceeded that of the mere sound recordist. In the production of Dieter Roth's editions and Lawrence Weiner's supplement, for example, his whole input in the post-production process - besides editing, the design and distribution of the tape - is that of the artist-producer. As Furlong stated on various occasions, *Audio Arts* is the result of what he did as an artist.[141] With the eyes and above all the ears of an artist, Furlong tuned into a certain sound and visual aesthetic influenced by conceptualism, sound poetry and the cross over between performance art and sculpture. While his minimal sound works exhibited in gallery and museums have been very much influenced by this background, through *Audio Arts* his artistic practice went beyond the agenda of conceptual art and the concerns of time-based art which populated the 1980s. By embracing the role of the

---

[139] Graham also contributed a sound work for *Live to Air* titled *My Religion. Extract from a work tape: Ann Lee*, including music by Glenn Branca and Sonic Youth. See *Audio Arts,* vol. 5 no. 3 and 4,1982.

[140] The foreword of the accompanying catalogue of the exhibition states: 'This exhibition concentrates on sculpture and photography, and consists primarily of new work. The catalogue […] acts as a record of the Collection; equally important the cassettes, produced in conjunction with Audio Arts, which contained the majority of the sound works that form an essential component of the Collection'. See *The Georgiana Collection: Stuart Brisley*, The Third Eye Centre Glasgow and the Orchard Gallery Derry, 1986.

[141] See for example the interview with Angelika Stepken, Villa Romana, April 2014 and with the present author for the exhibition *Hearing Me Hearing You*, Plymouth Arts Centre, October 2006.

editor and the curator (the artist as producer) as well as the works and ideas of artists of new generations and movements such as for example the YBA (Young British Artists), *Audio Arts* became the manifestation of an expanded collaborative art practice in which the artist also acts, as Mel Gooding put it, as the 'listener-receiver, the field-worker anthropologist … the novelist':[142]

> *Audio Arts* constitutes, within the ambit of the visual arts, a major achievement both of Beuys's active 'social sculpture and of Bakhtin's 'dialogic imagination'. It is capacious, accumulative, open-ended, heterogeneous, multi-dimensional, multi-directional in time and space, immediate, historical, contemporaneous, multi-languaged and, in 'the zone of maximal contact with the present'. Like *Finnegan's Wake* it is (as Joyce describes it) a 'monsterwork', a 'misterpiece'. It is a masterwork of our time. Listen! Here comes everybody![143]

By keeping this very last line in mind, 'here comes everybody', in *Chapter 4* I further analyse the way in which the theorization of the magazine might overcome the antinomy, or polarisation, between the editor/curator and the artist, and how the magazine and the art practice can be finally understood as part of the same work.

---

[142] Mel Gooding, *On Audio Arts: a paper for a symposium in Rome,* October 2006. Archive of present author.
[143] Mel Gooding, 'Audio Arts: The Archive as a Work of Ar*t'*, in *Speaking of Art*, London, New York: Phaidon, 2010, p. 15.

Chapter 3 The Oral History of Audio Arts

This is an audio chapter. The files can be found on the Research Repository at http://eprints.kingston.ac.uk/id/eprint/46708

3.1 William Furlong: Conversations and Interviews by Lucia Farinati (duration 38:09 mins)

3.2 The Voices of Audio Arts Collaborators: Michael Archer, Violet Barrett, Mel Gooding, Bruce McLean and Jean Wainwright Interviewed by Lucia Farinati (duration 64:02 mins)

Please see *Appendix 1* for the score of *William Furlong: Conversations and Interviews by Lucia Farinati* detailing the structure of the audio collage and the relative recordings used in the montage.