

Thinking Music as Divine Gift

Gerald C. Liu

Life and the Impossibility of Absolute Silence

When we ask the question of what it could mean to think music, an elementary and perhaps astounding fact about silence may help us imagine the possibilities. There is no such thing as absolute silence. ‘No such thing?’ Yes, even “The World’s Quietest Place,” a -20.6 dBA anechoic chamber so named and designed by Microsoft is not in fact a place “where sound goes to die.”¹ Rather, sound recedes far below human perception there, and technically into a special foundation made of state-of-the-art springs. But sounds most definitely continue to reverberate in the world’s quietest place and just about every other place in fact. Absolute silence requires a vacuum, a realm devoid of life. Wherever life is, sound is.

In his book entitled, *No Such Thing as Silence: John Cage's 4'33"*, Kyle Gann writes how in between 1951 and 1952, the composer John Cage visited an anechoic chamber. Once inside, he heard “two sounds, one high and one low.” When the engineer asked Cage to describe them, and Cage did, the engineer said that the high pitch was Cage’s nervous system operating and the low pitch was Cage’s blood circulating. While this might sound fascinating, Gann debunks the engineer’s identification of the high and low tones with a more likely explanation that Cage probably had tinnitus and had experienced it in the anechoic chamber. But the fact remains that human bodies still reverberate even in scientifically-described silent spaces.

Not long after Cage's visit to the anechoic chamber, and perhaps as soon as a couple of weeks afterward, on August 29, 1952, at an outdoor amphitheater that still stands as a wooden, honeycombed place of musical pilgrimage in the Catskill Mountains – Maverick Concert Hall – a relatively well-known and definitely broke John Cage debuted a landmark piece of musical withdrawal – *4'33"*. The occasion was an artists' welfare benefit concert. The *Premiere Sonata* by Pierre Boulez was the intended marquee piece. Boulez would go on to become a titan of new music and is now probably best remembered as a star conductor.

Yet when pianist David Tudor mounted the stage to introduce Cage's *4'33"* in the mid-twentieth century, he stole the spotlight. Tudor adjusted the height of the piano bench. He sat down. He opened the fallboard. He set his stopwatch. He even turned pages of a score. But he did not play a single note for 4 minutes and 33 seconds. Instead, Maverick Hall filled with the resonances of the surrounding forest, its critters, the pitter patter of drizzle upon the roof of the amphitheater, and the outcry of audience members who thought the piece was a hoax. They included vacationing members of the New York Philharmonic. The musical world was transformed.

The openness of *4'33"* lends itself to exponential interpretation. Its 3 movements of I) 30 seconds, II) 2 minutes 23 seconds, and III) 1 minute 40 seconds are most often performed silently. On a historical score of the piece, one sees the instructions "tacet" after each movement to indicate that instrumentalists should withhold from playing. Yet any number of intentional and accidental sounds end up giving *4'33"* its shape. Its performance instructions also allow for any number or combination of performers. Even the duration of time that frames the piece became arbitrary for Cage as the work became canonized. When Cage composed *4'33"*, four minutes and thirty-three seconds was the typical length of a vinyl record popular music single. Yet a 1960 version of *4'33"* updated by Cage only eight years after its debut allows for any duration that the performer chooses. The musical freedom empowered by the restraint of the piece exemplifies musical thinking.

So, when we ask 'what does thinking music entail,' the precedent of *4'33"* suggests that thinking music involves a thorough-going attunement to the world, by which the very definition of music no longer requires human authorship or even human attention. One could even go so far as to say that thinking music following *4'33"* does not necessarily require the ability of hearing. Recall that Cage still "heard" sounds in a soundless chamber. Scientifically, absolute silence is an impossibility if life is present. Thinking music – I assert here à la Cage – is consciousness and comprehension of life as musical. *4'33"* provides a pristine and clever example in an accessible demarcation of time.

Theology and the Possibility of Thinking Music

I have an undergraduate degree in music. But the majority of my training in higher education has consisted of theological studies, and in particular the ministerial arts of preaching and liturgy. In my book, *Music and the Generosity of God*, I combine the musical precedent of Cage's *4'33"* with phenomenological concepts such as givenness from Jean-Luc Marion to recommend a theory that all sounds instantiate divine generosity. Not only do I concur with the musical thinking behind *4'33"* that music permeates all of life or that life itself is at all times and places musical. But I also see in Cage's famous work an opening for musical thinking that makes concrete theological ways of perceiving the world. The piece by the way does not make the reality that music is everywhere. *4'33"* does not technically say a thing. Rather it sets conditions for reconceiving of music beyond human invention and recognizing it as an ever present reality. In particular, I see in the precedent of *4'33"* a musical opening to make sensible a theological assertion that the sonic world enunciates divine giving. Put another way, in the historical portal of *4'33"*, I see a musical opening to argue that all sounds instantiate divine generosity.

Marion and the Nonexistence of God

Jean-Luc Marion came to prominence as a scholar of Descartes. He was neither trained nor known as a theologian. Yet only 2 years after completing his doctorate, he had already written a theological masterpiece, *God Without Being*. In that book, Marion disentangles thinking about God from the *Seinsfrage* or question of being from Heidegger as philosophers may be inclined to use it as a starting point for refuting the idea of God. For Marion, questions and categories of being do not help us think about God because God is not a being. God stands outside the metaphysical framework of "beings" with a lowercase 'b' – beings as understood by the world of things and human understandings of existence. God also stands outside the metaphysical framework of "Being" with a capitalized 'B' – Being which conjures thinking regarding the meaning in and of life as we know it. No, for Marion, God is best understood as without Being and incomparable to any being. God does not therefore "exist" according to Marion. For him, the question of existence cannot possibly approach the question of God. God is unthinkable, and recognizable principally by how God loves and reveals, not by how God comes to be or Be for that matter.²

One principal revelation of God for Marion is "givenness." Givenness is Marion's inverse permutation of what he sees as a thesis common to the work of Husserl and Heidegger -- "So much appearance, so much Being."³ Another way to understand the thesis from the line of Husserl and Heidegger that Marion engages is

that Being permeates everything that appears in the world. For Marion, arriving at the realization of givenness requires a three step “reduction” of thinking about what appears. A first reductive step recognizes that the perception of what appears in the world concerns more than what is constituted by the I. A strictly transcendental perceptive approach is negated. Here, for Marion the type of transcendental perception is irrelevant whether it is Kantian, Cartesian or phenomenological. What he sees as lacking in a strictly transcendental perception of beings is failure to account for the wide array in which appearance happens – through consciousness, utility, and diversity in the world. The world of beings with a lowercase ‘b’ supersedes the transcendental I. A second reductive step challenges the comprehensiveness of *Dasein* or Being with a capital ‘B.’ Being does not account for what does not have to be. Here again we begin to get a glimpse as to how Marion can in other work appeal to God without Being. If thinking that depends too heavily upon categories of being and Being does not suffice to account for what appears in the world, for Marion, a third reduction must occur, that of perceiving the world from the perspective of an auditor, one who hears the *interloqué* or stunning call of the world. What Marion means by this is perhaps better summed up in his inverse formulation to the thesis from Husserl and Heidegger mentioned above. For Marion, “so much reduction, so much givenness,” is a clearer way to apprehend the world and how it appears. What calls out from the world is a givenness of all that appears.

Importantly, invisibility also constitutes an appearance for Marion. I concur with him and sound is one invisibility that appears.

In *Music and the Generosity of God*, I build upon Marion’s notion of call and especially the hearing of it, the *interloqué* he identifies as an all-encompassing givenness that lays a claim upon us and that outmaneuvers our modes of perception by constituting our thoughts about what appears. I connect Marion’s conceptualization of givenness to Cage’s argument in *4’33”* that all sounds offer musicality. What I suggest is that the musical *caritas* given shape by sonic ubiquity calls out to all of us to receive sounds in the world as instantiating divine generosity.

Concern about Christianizing Musical Thinking

Some may infer in my assertion that the ubiquity of sound instantiates divine generosity, an attempt to Christianize our hearing or musical thinking for that matter. I am indeed building an argument from a theological foundation. But this is not necessarily problematic, at least not at face value. For example, historians count the years according to a Common Era chronology based upon precursor abbreviations BC [before Christ] and AD [*anno Domini; in the year of the Lord*] that reference the incarnation. One might say that my example of common era dating precisely shows

the problem of religious or Christian hegemony. They might say this is why scholars no longer use BC or AD and have opted instead for the secular reformulations of BCE and CE. But the dating for the incarnation upon which common era time is based is a calculation from a 5th century monk, Dionysius Exiguus (AD 470-544), by which we have no reliable verification. In other words, the origin point for common era dating is an invented date as far as we know, perhaps based upon Alexandrian timetables and a combination of calendaring about which we can only infer. In short, while on the one hand common era time might be an instance of Christian imperialization of time, on the other hand, a more positive assessment might be to see it as an act of theological imagination that became generally useful for knowing and understanding history and the world. In other words, common era time could be seen less as an example of Christian hegemony and more as an instance of theological serendipity. What I am attempting to do is also far less precise and more far fetched. I want to suggest that thinking music may also lead us to think beyond what we can comprehend or count – a giving from God.

Two Examples to Open the Proposal

Allow me to display the sonic thinking that I am suggesting with two examples in order to allay reservations about the openness or versatility of the theological argument I am proposing regarding the ubiquity of sound and divine generosity. The first is a reflection upon redemptive change in a human life marked by movement from one soundscape of human seduction to another of animal affection. The second considers the problem of ambient anthropogenic or human-made noise and its threat to the livelihood of creaturely life, with particular attention to avian, insect, and marine species. Both examples exhibit how one might go about thinking music as a means to recognize remarkable change in an individual and the need for change ecologically.

When I first undertook research for what would become *Music and the Generosity of God*, I experimented with fieldwork in ethnomusicology. I wanted to find a way to ground my theological hunches about the givenness of music with observational study of actual sites of musicality. Cage's historical premise in *4'33"* that sounds surround us provided one version. But if music resonates wherever life is, as his *4'33"* suggests, then what were the theological interpretive possibilities for such musical ubiquity today?

My research began with a serendipitous invitation from Gregory Barz to learn and immediately apply ethnomusicological methodology in Kampala, Uganda. Barz is a pioneer in the field of medical ethnomusicology. At the time, he held a joint appointment in the Graduate Department of Religion at Vanderbilt University where I

was wrapping up my doctoral studies. Medical ethnomusicology considers how musical interventions contribute to public health. While on faculty at Vanderbilt, Barz traveled regularly to East Africa to document how traditional East African musical practices participated in initiatives related to HIV/AIDS relief. On my trip with him, he wanted to experiment with shifting his research agenda to popular music. As a result, we ended up recording an album of socially-conscious East African rap, *Kampala Flow: East African Hip Hop from Uganda*.⁴ A book chapter also resulted, "Positive Disturbance: Tafash, Twig, HIV/AIDS, and Hip Hop in Uganda" in *The Culture of Aids in Africa: Hope and Healing Through Music and the Arts* featured 2 female MC's who challenged male norms of the then burgeoning Kampala rap scene with fiery rhymes of cultural critique that addressed the deadliness of HIV/AIDS.⁵

Arrow & Cole Wakefield

After the *Kampala Flow* project, I felt comfortable that I could conduct an ethnomusicological study on my own. I wanted to try something closer to home. I also wanted a site of study that pushed the boundaries of where theological examination might go. I chose Arrow, an all-male strip club that had recently opened in downtown Nashville, not far from Vanderbilt's campus. My advisors at the time expressed concern whether examining it might raise controversy on the job market. Yet there would be no reason to worry. The establishment closed not long after I considered it as a site of study because it became embroiled in a series of scandals. I only had a chance to scout the location once. But I would like to return to my visit there as a departure point for displaying my theory regarding sonic ubiquity as an instantiation of divine generosity.

Arrow was the first male-only, fully-nude strip club in Nashville. It was likely the first in the Southern region of the United States. In 2010, I considered it as a site of study not only because of its precedent, but also and as stated earlier, because it represented a soundscape that most Christians and much of the general public would consider to be far from anything having to do with God, much less the giving of God. The *Nashville Scene* reported former Nashville City Council Member Michael Craddock giving his impression of the club in an interview on local affiliate WTVF-Channel 5, "I'm sick to my stomach – I'm just absolutely sick. It's different for a man to show himself than a woman."⁶ Craddock does not say why he finds the club sickening. He does not mention Christianity or religion as a reason. But his sentiment captured a shared public allergy toward Arrow at the time.

My first and only visit to Arrow occurred on a weeknight. I invited a neighbor to join me as I determined its suitability as a site of study. We pulled into a nearly vacant, dark, and damp parking lot of a warehouse on a crumbling parcel at the

edges of Nashville's downtown core. A buzzing neon sign above an entrance read "Arrow." The music from inside could be heard thumping at the doorway.

When we entered, a petit blonde-haired woman named Mercedes greeted us at the door. We showed our driver's licenses. She stamped our wrists with a black-light stamp and waved her arm toward the seating area which was an open floor with scattered booths surrounding a center stage that was flanked by smaller ones. Each platform had a dancing pole. Men appeared in their twenties and thirties and unclothed themselves to throbbing techno music. They also hurled themselves around the poles in various acrobatic and not-so-impressive moves. They swung from swings while twirling and manipulating their variously sized genitalia that were in various stages of tumescence. At one point, I went to the restroom. The room was covered in black tiles. The urinals were also black, had no walls in between them, and were uncomfortably close together. Prior to that evening, I had only been to one other strip club. It was in Chicago. The occasion was a friend's bachelor party. All the dancers were women. They wore g-strings and pasties on their breasts to follow city ordinances regarding nudity for entertainment (as I understood it). If I'm honest, I found the exposure of flesh in Arrow jarring and bizarre, whereas the Chicago club did not shock me the same way, or at all. Though I was not sickened like Craddock, the environment of Arrow did make me deeply aware of how even my own personal norms with respect to gender and human sexuality construed how I viewed the appropriateness of an exceptional entertainment culture in Nashville.⁷

Arrow closed before two years lapsed after its opening as a result of infighting amongst its primary investors and legal troubles. Shortly after its closure, Cole Wakefield, the founder of Arrow, and his partner, Jason Hunt, a former Vanderbilt University Law School administrator were sentenced to prison sentences of 10 years and 22 years respectively. Both were convicted of theft and statutory rape charges. Hunt's charges also included credit card fraud and forgery. Hunt had stolen approximately \$600,000 from Vanderbilt University Law School.⁸

I managed to locate Wakefield recently through some internet sleuthing. He now works as a Director of Animal Services at Good Shepherd Humane Society in Eureka Springs, Arkansas. I cold called the shelter and asked if I could speak with him. He took the call without reservation and was glad to engage in a dialogue with me about Arrow.

Wakefield explained that those involved with the opening of Arrow were trying to do something different. The 21st century was just coming up on its first decade, he explained. For Wakefield, "Nashville was up and coming."⁹ He saw an emerging gay market in the city as well as a constant stream of bachelorette parties. Though Wakefield would later be convicted and sent to prison, he assured me that the

investment in Arrow was “above board.”¹⁰ Wakefield was only involved for a year, he told me. The club closed six-12 months after he left.

Wakefield finished his prison sentence by serving seven years with three years' probation for good behavior. He first took a job in animal welfare with the humane society in Fort Smith because he “just needed a place to work.”¹¹ Yet while there he discovered an empathy with “animals in cages” and satisfaction in saving the life of a puppy.¹² Looking back on his time founding Arrow, Wakefield explained to me that he was in his 20's and that remembering that time was like looking at a different person. He could recall why he wanted to start “the first all-male totally nude strip club in Nashville” to use his language. “Who wouldn't?!” he joked.¹³ But he also acknowledged that for that period in his life, he had definitely taken more than he had given. Now, he finds joy in giving back in his work with the Humane Society. Wakefield told me, “I'm lucky to have ended up here. He considers himself radically different now, a different person.” He continued, “I work hard now.” He said that he is more self-conscious about what happened than anybody else, but that he is “really proud of what I'm doing now. That's the journey.”¹⁴

What I am trying to show with the brief recollection of my feasibility visit to Arrow and by recounting my recent conversation with Arrow founder Wakefield is how thinking music, and in particular, thinking about the musicality of the world as instantiation of divine generosity, can provide philosophical capaciousness for seeing how an innovative but also controversial establishment such as Arrow can be a departure point for a path of redemption that ends up in the Eureka Springs Humane Society. In short, even strip clubs and animal shelters can participate in the work of God.

Wakefield is a convicted sex offender and thief. Yet in his new role helping to run an animal shelter, the cacophony of clicking computer keys, whirring of fax and copy machines, clanging of chain link fences, growling, barking, and whining of dogs, hissing, meowing, and purring of cats, the spray of water, the ping of kibble hitting bowls, and the chatter, cooing, and calling of workers and prospective rehomingers of animals during his day-to-day have brought extraordinary peace and contentment to his life. Even his voice on the phone communicated serenity and relief. The soundscapes of Wakefield's life possess a reinventive power and keep giving what we can scarcely comprehend beyond ascertaining that his life has become better than it was.

Thinking about music as an instance of divine generosity also provides a conceptual framework for zooming outward from reflection upon a particular place and a particular life to consider the dynamics of the interplay between life and sound at a broad range on land, sea, and in the air.

Anthropogenic Noise

Biologists have more recently shown how anthropogenic, or human-made noise poses a life-threatening risk for various avian, insect, and oceanic life. In “Comparative effects of urban development and anthropogenic noise on birds,” J.L. Dowling, D.A. Luther, and P.P. Mara discover how bird song changes in correspondence to factors related to the rise of anthropogenic noise, such as increased ambient noise, as well as urban development that introduces “impervious surfaces” (the term connotes concrete, asphalt, wood, and brick for me) that affect frequency maximization and range from birds who communicate by song.¹⁵ The authors observe six species at 28 sites along an urban to rural gradient and across a broad range of noise levels. The number of birds and species studied are seven American Robins, 33 Carolina Wrens, eight Gray Catbirds, 16 House Wrens, 45 Northern Cardinals, and 36 Song Sparrows, bringing a total number of 145 individual birds studied. They find that as ambient noise increases the minimum frequency of bird song rises for two of the six species studied and five of six trend in a similar way. The birds most affected by ambient noise have bird songs of lower frequency. As urban development spreads more widely, the frequency and bandwidth of bird songs decrease for two of the six species. The birds most affected by urban development have higher frequency songs. In short, the authors find that birds modify their songs in “loud reverberant urban environments” in order to “optimize transmission.”¹⁶ Their study is the first “to investigate how noise and urban development affect song frequency characteristics of multiple bird species” and the first to consider the effects of reverberation and refraction from urban structures in constraining bird song.¹⁷ What is at stake in the work of Dowling, Luther, and Mara is the ability for birds to transmit signals undistorted so that the receiver of the song receives intelligible information. Because communication in bird songs includes species self-identification, mating invitation, and territorial and safety alerts, maintaining the integrity and distinct characteristics of any particular bird song is critical for species reproduction and survival.

The work of Dowling, Luther, and Mara shows how given sounds, in this case anthropogenic noise, may warrant something like divine judgment or at least human judgment and correction, rather than exhibit the mercy evident in the life transformation of Wakefield. The environmental complications and behavioral modifications for birds as a result of anthropogenic noise also applies to smaller winged creatures too.

In “Experience modulates an insect’s response to anthropogenic noise” Mario Gallego-Abenz, Nicolas Mathevon, and David Wheatcroft show how male crickets

decrease their chirping rates living on highway edges when cars pass.¹⁸ Their focus upon field crickets or *Gryllus bimaculatus* intends to complement research already undertaken with vertebrates such as the avian study by Dowling, Luther, and Mara. Similar to birds and their songs, crickets depend upon effective calling for mating. Yet it is critical for crickets not to broadcast the call too loudly as it also attracts predators. The study from Gallego-Abenz, Mathevon, and Wheatcraft suggests that car noise interferes with the ability of female crickets to perceive the mating calls of male crickets. If what they suggest is accurate, the disruption stands to impact insect population negatively, which may be welcome if we consider crickets a nuisance. But the negative impact of anthropogenic noise upon the mating potentiality of crickets shows again at a granular level how detrimental and even deadly anthropogenic noise can be.

Again, the musicality of anthropogenic noise still pronounces what God has given in my line of argumentation. But what gives here is a distortion and an environmental threat that needs intervention. The perversion of sound caused by human beings also affects creaturely life underwater.

In "The Soundscape of the Anthropocene," Carlos M. Duarte, et. al. report how human generated sounds or anthropogenic noise disrupts marine life to the extent that it alters the livability of the ocean environment. Sound travels faster underwater than in the air. Ocean animals including marine invertebrates, fish, and reptiles perceive and interpret sound frequencies from less than five kHz to as much as 200 kHz. A kilohertz or kHz equals 1,000 hertz and is a measurement of sound frequency bandwidth. One kHz is typically within the range of human hearing. Sea life hair cells, "fish ears," "ancillary hearing structures that connect to the swim bladder," other acoustic organs sensitive to pressure and vibration, and even jaws are used as receptors and interpreters of sound in water.¹⁹ Of course hearing range affects the vulnerability of species to different underwater noises. Yet building upon four decades of published research, M. Duarte, et. al. find that in general anthropogenic noise increases the mortality of marine animals and negatively affects the settlement of their larvae.

In other words, the proliferation of anthropogenic noise has become for marine life a matter of life and death.

In order to fine tune their argument for the reader, the scientists break down sounds produced by the geological (geophony), biological sources (biophony), and human sources (anthrophony). In preindustrial times, more oceanic sounds were of the biophonic and geophonic type. As sound sources such as low-flying airplanes, ships for freight, leisure, transportation, and fishing, submarines, drilling, and wind

turbines increased, as well as underwater craft and exploration for scientific inquiry, the anthrophony has increased dramatically.

In short, vessel noise has become prominent. The authors state that “[s]hipping noise has been reported to disrupt traveling, foraging, socializing, communicating, resting, and other behaviors in marine mammals; attenuate antipredator behavior of young fishes, leading to increased mortality and reduced ability to learn to avoid predators in future encounters; and impact the settlement and development of invertebrates.”²⁰ Furthermore, they find that COVID-19 restrictions that reduced shipping travel have shown “ample evidence of an unusual expansion of the movements of marine mammals and sharks to what were previously busy, noisy waterways, such as harbors and coastal urban areas, where they are not regularly seen.”²¹

In the air, on land, and even underwater, the noise of humankind is altering life in subtle but striking ways. Interpreting the problem of anthropogenic noise by following my line of argumentation concerning sonic ubiquity and divine generosity, and therefore, thinking that the music of all sounds in the world instantiates divine giving – even sonic gifts of God can be perverted by humankind. Perversions such as anthropogenic noise warrant critical attention. They also warrant social actions in the form of remedies that nurture life rather than endanger it.

Duarte, et al. suggest that one way to alleviate the disruption of shipping noise could be to use more efficient ships or to shift shipping and manufacturing logistics. They also note that “[a]coustic barriers like bubble curtains and noise-abating sleeves have been introduced in some European wind farms and can reduce sound from pile driving by up to 15 dB.”²² They share that “[t]he European Union’s MSFD and the US National Marine Fisheries Service encourage the use of such technologies.”²³ Even the deleterious effects of anthropogenic noise on marine life have practical and actionable solutions. Perhaps roadways could also be reimagined with respect to the mating choruses of crickets and building surfaces could be redesigned with the melodies of bird call in mind.

Thinking Musically for Now

In the meantime, the avian, insect, and marine studies exhibit how thinking musically happens beyond the anthropocene world. Creaturely life thinks musically all the time and that thinking enables creaturely life to survive and even thrive. Humankind also thinks musically by nature, especially if Cage’s implicit assertion that all sounds constitute music is right. What I attempt to introduce by weaving in Marion’s understandings of givenness and revelation is that noticing the saturation of music in the world may also provide an opening to think about thinking music as not only an

unavoidable fact of our world. But music is also a gift that we should celebrate and for which we should take responsibility, especially when our misapprehension and misuse of our musical lives threatens livelihoods of living things in nearly every habitable space of which we can conceive on earth – air, land, and sea.

We cannot afford to privilege human interests above the harmony and dissonance of the given world. We should not follow the beat of our own drummer if our inner sense of how rhythm and time in life ought to be excludes us from exposing ourselves to places we might rather avoid, like Arrow, or persons we might dismiss as done for, such as Wakefield. We must also keep our ears peeled widely to pick up when our musical lives are bringing judgment upon ourselves, as is the case with the ways in which anthropogenic noise appears to imperil avian, insect, and marine life. What I am trying to say is that when we return to the question of what it means to think musically, we must also consider how the thinking of music is not neutral, but regards life and death.

Notes

¹ dBA, also dBa and dB(a) is a decibel reading based upon the loudness perception of the human ear. “dB” stands for decibel. The “A” describes the reading as A-weighted, the most common form of octave and algorithmic derived decibel measurement for the perception of loudness from the human ear.

² Jean-Luc Marion. *God Without Being : Hors-Texte, Second Edition*. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 33-47.

³ Jean-Luc Marion, *Reduction and Givenness: Investigations of Husserl, Heidegger, and Phenomenology* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 1998), 203.

⁴ *Kampala Flow: East African Hip Hop from Uganda*, CD Baby: 2010.

⁵ Gregory Barz and Gerald C. Liu, “Positive Disturbance: Tafash, Twig, HIV/AIDS, and Hip Hop in Uganda” in *The Culture of Aids in Africa: Hope and Healing Through Music and the Arts* eds. Gregory Barz and Judah M. Cohen (New York: Oxford UP, 2011), 362-383.

⁶ Tracy Moore, “Male Strip Club Arrow Closes Due to Lease Problems,” *Nashville Scene*, December 16, 2010.

⁷ For more regarding how male gazes and surveilling eyes in a strip club environment reinscribe social profiling and the upholding of particular norms, see Tuulia Law and Chris Bruckert, “The Surveillance Web: Surveillance, Risk, and Resistance in Ontario Strip Clubs” in *Expanding the Gaze: Gender and the Politics of Surveillance* eds. Emily van der Meulen and Robert Heynen (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto, 2016), 256-58.

⁸ Staff Report, “Hunt, Wakefield plead guilty,” *Outvoices Nashville*, October 9, 2012.

⁹ <https://outandaboutnashville.com/hunt-wakefield-plead-guilty/>, last accessed Sept. 26, 2021.

⁹ Author interview with Cole Wakefield, February 4, 2021.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Dowling, J.L, D.A Luther, and P.P Marra. "Comparative Effects of Urban Development and Anthropogenic Noise on Bird Songs." *Behavioral Ecology* 23, no. 1 (2012): 201–9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arr176>.

¹⁶ Ibid, 204.

¹⁷ Ibid. 201, 205.

¹⁸ Gallego-Abenza, Mario, Nicolas Mathevon, and David Wheatcroft. "Experience Modulates an Insect's Response to Anthropogenic Noise." *Behavioral Ecology* 31, no. 1 (2020): 90–96. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arz159>.

¹⁹ Duarte, Carlos M, Lucille Chapuis, Shaun P Collin, Daniel P Costa, Reny P Devassy, Victor M Eguiluz, Christine Erbe, et al. "The Soundscape of the Anthropocene Ocean." *Science (American Association for the Advancement of Science)* 371, no. 6529 (2021): 583–. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba4658>.

²⁰ Ibid., 5.

²¹ Ibid., 7.

²² Ibid., 8.

²³ Ibid.

References

Author interview with Cole Wakefield, February 4, 2021.

Barz, Gregory and Gerald C Liu. "Positive Disturbance: Tafash, Twig, HIV/AIDS, and Hip Hop in Uganda." in *The Culture of Aids in Africa: Hope and Healing Through Music and the Arts* eds. Gregory Barz and Judah M. Cohen. New York: Oxford UP, 2011, 362-383.

Dowling, J.L, D.A Luther, and P.P Marra. "Comparative Effects of Urban Development and Anthropogenic Noise on Bird Songs." *Behavioral Ecology* 23, no. 1 (2012): 201–9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arr176>.

Duarte, Carlos M, Lucille Chapuis, Shaun P Collin, Daniel P Costa, Reny P Devassy, Victor M Eguiluz, Christine Erbe, et al. "The Soundscape of the Anthropocene Ocean." *Science (American Association for the Advancement of Science)* 371, no. 6529 (2021): 583–. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba4658>.

Gallego-Abenza, Mario, Nicolas Mathevon, and David Wheatcroft. "Experience Modulates an Insect's Response to Anthropogenic Noise." *Behavioral Ecology* 31, no. 1 (2020): 90–96. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arz159>.

Kampala Flow: East African Hip Hop from Uganda, CD Baby: 2010.

Law, Tuulia and Chris Bruckert, "The Surveillance Web: Surveillance, Risk, and Resistance in Ontario Strip Clubs" in *Expanding the Gaze: Gender and the Politics of Surveillance* eds. Emily van der Meulen and Robert Heynen (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto, 2016), 240-63.

Marion, Jean-Luc. *Reduction and Givenness: Investigations of Husserl, Heidegger, and Phenomenology*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 1998.

Marion, Jean-Luc. *God Without Being : Hors-Texte, Second Edition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

Moore, Tracy. "Male Strip Club Arrow Closes Due to Lease Problems, *Nashville Scene*, December 16, 2010.

Staff Report, "Hunt, Wakefield plead guilty," *Outvoices Nashville*, October 9, 2012.

<https://outandaboutnashville.com/hunt-wakefield-plead-guilty/>, last accessed Sept. 26, 2021.