

Sounding the Museum: A Shared Reflection on the *Chou Hayda (What is this?)* Intervention at the National Museum of Beirut

AMANDA ABI KHALIL, ANNABEL DAOU, AND NADIM MISHLAWI

Abstract In November of 2017, people from across Beirut came to the National Museum and gave their voices to a number of archaeological objects in the collection. The people spoke to, for and about these objects from the past, and, in doing so, they revealed fragments of the present. They did not attempt to disclose a cohesive historical narrative. Nor did they attempt to create a fiction. They did not lie and they did not try to tell the truth. Mathaf Mathaf/Chou Hayda is a project and artwork which takes the format of the museum audio-guide. Grounded in the field of participatory social art practice, it reverses the traditional way an audience engages with a museum collection. Objects from the past were activated by a series of questions the participants responded to, referencing elements from their own lives and reflecting on Lebanon's current social and political reality. The objects took on a new role by being given a voice in the present, and the participants occupied an engaged and enduring position in the framework of the museum by virtue of having their responses recorded for an audio-guide that will be used by other visitors to the museum. The final audio (visual) piece includes a myriad of voices: the artist's voice, the responses of the participants and two recurring voices of professional actors whose narrations weave through the piece, giving a hint of formality to the structure of the work. The contribution takes the form of a conversation in three voices between the artist (Annabel Daou), the curator (Amanda Abi Khalil) and the project's sound artist and composer (Nadim Mishlawi). It focuses on vocality's role in knowledge production within museum/institutional contexts and its power to shift received notions of authority and access within and outside of the institution.

Chou Hayda is an audio work by Annabel Daou and the people of Beirut, created in collaboration with Nadim Mishlawi. Commissioned by Beirut Museum of Art (BeMA) and produced by Temporary Art Platform, it takes the form of an audio guide for The National Museum of Beirut. The work is now available indefinitely at the National Museum of Beirut, where visitors can request a tablet that is loaded with the audio work along with maps and images that guide visitors through the museum to the objects that are included in the work. The audio can also be streamed from a <https://www.chouhayda.com/> website dedicated to the project.

This article addresses the project from the vantages of three individuals involved in its creation: (1) curator, Amanda Abi-Khalil; (2) artist, Annabel Daou; and (3) sound designer/composer, Nadim Mishlawi. Each of the three responses that follow addresses different aspects of the work's artistic, political, curatorial, and museological implications.

A MUSEUM FOR A (VOCAL) PUBLIC? (A CURATOR'S RESPONSE)

“Participatory art is not a privileged political medium, nor a ready-made solution to

Amanda Abi Khalil (abikhalilamanda@gmail.com) is a Lebanese curator. She is the founder of Temporary Art Platform. Annabel Daou is a Beirut-born artist. She is represented by Galerie Tanja Wagner in Berlin. Nadim Mishlawi (nadim@db-studios.net) is a composer and filmmaker based in Beirut. He is the co-founder of db STUDIOS-Beirut.

a society of the spectacle, but is as uncertain and precarious as democracy itself; neither are legitimated in advance but need continually to be performed and tested in every specific context (Bishop 2012).”

In the context of contemporary Beirut, the word “*mathaf*” – “museum” in Arabic – has numerous associations and connotations, which tend to vary depending on a given person’s sociological background or cultural tastes and practices. For some, “Mathaf” could refer to a geographical location: the area between Badaro, Sodeco, and the Hippodrome horse track, near the Horsh – Beirut’s largest park, which has been closed for the past 25 years, allegedly due to maintenance issues. For others, “the Mathaf” marks a central point in Beirut’s political map: the demarcation line during the civil war, also known as “museum alley,” which separated the army and several militias. For working-class commuters, it is an access point to work: it is the roundabout intersection where you can catch a shared cab-ride; and it is a stop for the microbus line, which links the popular residential neighborhoods of Dora and Barbir. For local residents, or street-food connoisseurs, the area is famous for the sandwich place, Snack el Mathaf. For history aficionados, the neighborhood is known as the headquarters of the French generals during the Mandate period (1923–1946) (the area continues to be a French enclave in the city). For me, the word “Mathaf” recalls notable contemporary art projects that have reflected on the damages that were inflicted on the building and its collection during the civil war, in particular Lamia Joreige’s multimedia installation *Underwriting Beirut – Mathaf* (2013). It is important to note that the number of local visitors to museums in Lebanon remains very low, mainly due to the absence of a nationally-led cultural policy or education and outreach

programs; and thus, very few residents of the city will associate “the Mathaf” first and foremost with The National Museum of Beirut.

In Beirut, street names are hardly ever used. So although few may know the official name of the street where the National Museum of Beirut stands, it is recognizable to all by its grand Roman columns and facade. Built in 1930, and inaugurated in 1942, the National Museum of Beirut has a collection of over 100,000 artefacts that date from prehistoric times, the Bronze and Iron ages, as well as the Roman, Hellenistic, Byzantine, and medieval Mamluk periods. Listed under the category of endangered museums during the Civil War (1975–1990), the museum was severely ravaged by shelling and gunshots. A large number of artefacts were damaged, and some were destroyed. Following its renovation, and the colossal work done for its re-opening in the 1990s, little effort has been made to attract local audiences. As such, working on museum culture and practices in Beirut today requires an embedded understanding of what “the Mathaf” connotes to its public. It also requires an understanding of socio-cultural barriers, or what Bourdieu calls “symbolic violence”: the social forms that dominate and prevent the public from feeling that (elitist) cultural spaces are for them. We see this violence enacted at the institution’s doorstep through the intimidating officiality of the building. In order for participatory works in this context to be successful, artists and practitioners must inquire into their own and others’ socio-political relationship to the city and its future.

Driven by a desire to reflect Beirut’s diversity of voices – those of permanent citizens, the large refugee population, migrant workers, and visitors to the city – my curatorial practice has very often engaged with questions of the institution’s relationship to the public. When Beirut Museum of Art (BeMA) approached Temporary Art

Platform to conceive of an audience outreach program in anticipation of the opening of BeMA's future museum, I came up with *Mathaf Mathaf*: a series of contemporary art commissions centered on museum culture and practice. *Chou Hayda* is the first iteration in this framework.

The curatorial vision for *Chou Hayda* was guided by an understanding of the museum as an, at times, alienating space; but one that also triggers imagination and enables shared experiences. My decision to approach artist Annabel Daou for our first intervention stemmed from her focus on speech, writing, and forms of public address that aligned with the initial project's aims. The first time I met Daou was at an art fair, where she was reading the fortunes of visitors. It was not a performance, per se, but rather an intervention that sought to establish a form of silent communication between artist and fairgoer. It borrowed a format structured around intimate interaction and situated it in the impersonal setting of the art fair. This act prompted participants to reflect on dynamics of trust, exchange, and power. A year later, I invited her to take part in *Works On Paper*, a series of art commissions in daily newspapers in Lebanon.

Daou was born in Beirut but now lives in New York, so in preparation for our second collaboration (*Chou Hayda*) we built a relationship via email correspondences and phone conversations. Daou's relationship to Beirut is largely based on childhood and teenage memories from before and during the war, and throughout the project I could feel the weight of this burden coupled with her fresh eyes on Lebanese society and her activist approach to politics. Her intuitive conceptualization of the project and my curatorial input flowed together seamlessly. Daou proposed a project in which people's voices are the main artistic medium. The intention was to break down authoritative barriers, to

give people access (physical, cultural, and symbolic) to the National Museum's collection, while at the same time imbuing the objects with the voices of the people. My curatorial voice frames the National Museum as a form of public space and situates the project as one of reclaiming the commons in Beirut; however, it is the voices of the people that are most audible in *Chou Hayda*. The public's utterances were woven together by Daou and her sound collaborator Nadim Mishlawi with the intention of creating an institutional audio tool in which the voices of authority – performed by the actors Julia Kassar and George Khabbaz – are intertwined with the voices of the visitors to the museum. This gesture, as Mishlawi explains below, becomes a sonic platform for diverse voices in a country whose diversity of voices is often repressed.

The *Chou Hayda* audio-guide reflects on twenty-five cultural artefacts housed in the museum. Through questions such as "Who has authority here?" "Are you Lebanese?" "What have you seen?" "Did you kill anyone?" "Can you hear me?" Daou sought to provoke intuitive answers that animate the objects in relation to today's world. *Chou Hayda* invites reflection on the ways in which history is written by institutions and shaped around privileged identity formations that archeological discourse often has a hand in affirming. Socially engaged participatory projects in the art world generally operate on an allegorical level: they create an autonomous zone of equality that is disconnected from the way social structures operate outside the cultural field. By inviting the masses to take an active role in the space where the nation's cultural objects are housed, we aimed to blur the line between being inside and outside the institution. Throughout the intervention we repeatedly returned to the following questions:

What audience is this work produced for? And who can access it?

Daou’s light touch questions and her ability to create a sense of complicity with her respondents have resulted in a work that foregrounds the public’s complex relationship to gender, collective memory, the legacy of the Civil War, current state politics, love, death, popular culture, and migrant labor, among many other topics. Setting up an “open mic” for people to express themselves in a legally-protected environment, against a backdrop of coercive censorship and the prosecution of free-speech in Lebanon, is a powerful act. Nevertheless, *Chou Hayda’s* content could lead to some criticism. Claire Bishop expresses concern that participatory art may become devalued through its association with reality television, social media, and any number of communication technologies relying on user-generated content (2012). But while Bishop speaks to a specifically Western context, in Lebanon in 2018, the politics of participation are starkly different. People are being detained and interrogated for the content of their speech on social media. Cases of censorship in Lebanon have drastically increased in recent months. Fortunately, the field of visual arts remains a less monitored field of production. As such, this collaborative form of participation should be encouraged, not least because of its temporary creation of a public sphere.

In the absence of state-led artistic interventions, opening up access to the National Museum of Beirut by inviting people up its stairs and into its space is a symbolic gesture which can play a role in shifting the public’s perception of the institution as a custodian of high culture. Beirut is witnessing a growth in Museum building. The National Museum shares the *museum alley* with two other recently inaugurated institutions, The Mineral Museum and Beit Beirut,

and there are as yet unrealized plans to build two more museums. Within this context, reflecting on museum culture and practices of audience engagement has become more crucial than ever. As Ruth Holt suggested during a recent conference on *Voices in (and around) the Museum* organized by the Institute of Archeology at University College London, the voice of the audience is “becoming pivotal in the intersection between museums and the public and in defining the museum itself” (Holt 2012, 19–22). I tend to think about *Chou Hayda* as an amplifier that transmits the everyday life of what can be heard in the museums: the conversations prompted by the artefacts, discussions by members of the audience among themselves, dialogues between curators and spectators, ambient sounds, and the necessary debate that must occur *with* and *about* the outside world – here, the specific context of the city of Beirut in 2018.

A VOICE IN THE MUSEUM: AN ARTIST'S PERSPECTIVE

Obsessed, bewildered

By the shipwreck

Of the singular

We have chosen the meaning

Of being numerous.

Of Being Numerous, George Oppen (1968)

The murmurs and echoes of the visitor’s voice in the halls of the museum generally form a hushed sound that carries within it a hint of uncertainty: a tentative questioning, as though there are things that cannot be known about the objects that are displayed there. The voice of the institution, on the other hand, as presented via labels and other written texts, or the museum’s official audio-guide, speaks with authority. It is singular and confident. It is a voice that ascribes a fixed reading of the objects on display, and

that very often forecloses the possibility of multiple perspectives.

For the past several years much of my work has included a sound element that is the result of my interactions with the public. I pose questions to strangers on the street, or in other public places, and record their responses. Although the works produced with the recorded audio vary from project to project, the questions have a similarity, in that they are almost never specific to the person I am interviewing. Rather, there is an openness in terms of how each individual responds to the question raised, with some offering a straightforward reply and others leaning towards a more playful or conceptual response. An example of these audio pieces is *Which side are you on?* (2012), a work that was recorded in downtown Manhattan over a period that overlapped with Occupy Wall Street. The resulting work was a video of a confessional screen that included recorded voices of people responding to the question, “which side are you on?”

There are at least two aspects of this type of project that appeal to me in particular. First, I find that even in the most anonymous of public spaces, the crowded city street, for example, a seemingly banal question can allow for a surprisingly meaningful interaction between strangers. Second, by creating an audio work out of the accumulated voices of strangers, the voices of disparate people who have never met are bound together sonically. The political aspect of these works for me has to do with the way in which they model collectivity and amplify the voice of the multitude.

When Amanda presented me with the opportunity to create a work for *Mathaf Mathaf*, I had to account for her ongoing project, which is meant to exist between two institutions: one rooted deeply in the past of the city, the other not yet realized. I approached *Chou Hayda* through a series of questions:

- (a) What does the space of the museum mean to the people who live and work around it?
- (b) How do you infiltrate a space that in some way rejects the present?
- (c) What language do we allow to have authority in a given space?
- (d) What do the voices of the street sound like in the institution?

Driven by such questions, *Chou Hayda* – a transliteration of the Arabic phrase “What is this?” – began to take form. The simple question “chou hayda?” became a way of asking what these antique objects in the museum mean to us in the present, particularly within the context of a society that gives little space for its people to engage with their history. In this sense the question was a prompt for moving beyond institutional silencing acts.

The museum is one of the few public spaces in Beirut and, as noted above, the building and the neighborhood are viewed differently by different strata of Beirut’s society. As such, I wanted my intervention to be something that would bring the public into the museum. I wanted to find a way to capture the interactions that take place in the space and to give the fleeting voices a more permanent resonance. We felt that the format of the audio guide would allow us to infiltrate the space of the museum in a way that is acceptable to the institution without some of the strictures that accompany a traditional exhibition.

Our methods for inviting the public into the museum space took a number of forms. These ranged from visiting NGOs that work with members of the public who would likely not be museum goers to publicizing the project

on social media and on flyers in the neighborhood. One of the most effective strategies we undertook was simply walking down the steps of the museum and asking people on the street if they wanted to come in and participate. By taking small groups of individuals around the Museum – usually those who did not know each other – and presenting them with a number of objects, followed by a series of questions that encouraged them to respond spontaneously, we encouraged a sense of freedom that the institutional space generally discourages. In the context of these workshops, the museum object was no longer a silent, inaccessible fragment of history. It became something that was within our reach, both physically and conceptually. Often my questions were addressed to the object itself, and the visitors would be asked to lend the object their voice. At other times, the objects gave the visitors an opportunity to reflect on aspects of their own lives. As we proceeded through the space, visitors engaged with the objects playfully and imaginatively, but more often they responded honestly and emotionally. One thing that was most striking was how firmly people responded. The insecurity about whether an answer was “right” or “wrong” was very rarely expressed. People understood very quickly that their voices mattered in this context and that they in fact had something to offer to the space and the objects.

We held workshops with over one hundred and fifty participants, recording the voices of people from all walks of life, including teachers, students, taxi drivers, soldiers, cooks, musicians, bartenders, writers, political activists, election monitors, technicians, engineers and gardeners. It soon became apparent how a shared experience of the present socio-political situation in Beirut was a central preoccupation for respondents. For example, when attendees were presented with a series of ancient keys and asked

which doors in the city they would use these keys to open or lock, almost every participant said they would open Parliament, or the public park or other public spaces. Virtually no one spoke about wanting to use the keys for something specifically for themselves.

In choosing the final selection of voices for the work, I began by creating something of a narrative from the myriad responses we had accumulated. In the case of the above-mentioned keys, my sound-collaborator Nadim zeroed in on the repetitive nature of the responses and helped to bring a sense of urgency and shared intention into the piece through his editing. The accumulative effect was initially funny because it seemed to be the only answer. But it was also heartbreaking as it reflected the shared sense of the population’s frustration and desperation with respect to the political stagnation in the country and the lack of adequate governance.

In Lebanon (and Beirut in particular) in the context of art and cultural institutions, Arabic is far less present than French or English. I chose to restrict the language used in the workshops and the final audio work to Arabic. This was first and foremost to allow access and participation to people from all walks of life, since Arabic is the only common tongue across different segments of the population. I also wanted there to be a certain constraint to the sound of the work itself, a rhythm that is unbroken by meaning.

Of course, at present, the bulk of the visitors to the National Museum are foreigners who do not speak Arabic, and the lack of translation of the audio work was frustrating to some. Subtitles are provided on the website and for the accompanying video that is accessible in the audio-visual room at the museum; however, one of my intentions was for the work to be a gesture against accommodating the given structure of an

institution that is comfortable ignoring, if not excluding, a large segment of the local population.

The choice of questions was also intended to brush against institutional norms. The questions did not situate the object in any historical context, but at the same time they did not restrict the possibility of speaking about the objects as having a history. I wanted the questions to shift between referencing the animate and the inanimate, the viewer and the object. Some of the questions included:

Which side are you on? What would you leave behind? Who has authority here? What happened to your face? Do you follow the law? Who are you? Can you hear me? What have you seen? Have you killed anyone? Is there something you'd like to say? Do you feel important? Who would you silence? Can you keep a secret? Are you Lebanese? What can you do with this? What door will you open? Are you telling the truth? What are you worth? Are you ruined? What did they say?

The sound we collected was in response to the questions asked, but in the final audio work, the questions and my voice asking them are removed. The multitude of voices was strung together so as to reflect the rhythms of the responses that each object provoked. The voices are scaffolded by the scripted voices of two actors, Julia Kassar and Georges Khabbaz, who play – but also *play with* – the role of the voice of reason and authority that is generally present in an institutional audio-guide. As a sound work designed to be heard in a public space, *Chou Hayda* allows us to reconsider what and who matters when it comes to the discourses of our shared and varied histories. By letting in the voices of the many, it enables us to hear, in new ways, what the objects of the past have to tell us about our present.

VOICING A COLLECTIVE HISTORY: A COMPOSER'S PERSPECTIVE

Echoing earlier claims, there is something unnerving about the quietness of museums. We could compare this situation to other spaces that also demand that we remain mute: libraries, as spaces of learning; sacred buildings, as spaces of meditation, and so on. But the reticence practiced by the public in museums is more reflective of a political reality; the idea, that one should not speak when being spoken to. The hierarchy created between the public and most institutional space, is one that facilitates a one-way passage of information: the institution transmits and the public receives. What then of the narratives being presented in museum spaces, be they scientific, historical, military, or otherwise? Can these narratives be questioned, doubted, refused, or presented in other ways that may contest the fact-based logic producing these narratives?

There are exceptions of course: the use of multimedia can provide an information soundtrack to visiting audiences, in turn opening up a conversation with the objects on display. The opening up of the museum as a participatory and interactive space for audiences has become a strategy adopted by museums to increase public engagement. With regard to more traditional museum spaces, such as the National Museum of Beirut, the general hush – usually coupled with the expansive reverberation of the space – can seem oppressive: the ruined, inanimate objects, completely detached from their original contexts, gazing back at us silently; the whispers and distant scuffling of other visitors emphasizing the hollowness of the museum's empty shell.

It became apparent during the initial preparations of *Chou Hayda* that the project sought to challenge the intended relationship that the public has to museum culture, and even the

general conventions of engaging with history. This project disrupts the idea that the museum's inanimate objects communicate a single history. It brings the objects into a multi-vocal dialogue that is shared and distributed between participants. Writing about the rhythms of urban space and its relationship with those who inhabit them, Henri Lefebvre argued:

Communication certainly exists, has become fluent, instantaneous, banal and superficial— not touching the everyday, the kernel of banality become product and commodity, an insipid flow flooding the age. Communication devalues dialogue to the point of its being forgotten. . . It is only too true that in modernity, the informational stocks up on itself, trades itself, sells itself; that it destroys dialogue. . . (Lefebvre 1992, 18–19).

With the *Chou Hayda* audio guide the objects have become separated from their merely “informational” value, integrated into a temporary public, in which information is transmitted dialectically, rather than statically. Dialogue of this kind suggests the presence of two things: voice and rhythm. This is to say, the vocal interactions between people, and the structures these interactions create.

The human voice presents a particular, almost contradictory duality. It is internal (my voice from within) and external (the voice of the other): it is immaterial and intimate; it is uttered and silent. This duality reminds us that the voice is the thread connecting the inner to the outer— an internal, intimate, silence with an external, material, utterance. Practices like oral history assert that testimonies and anecdotes can alter the facts presented by institutionalized history. It is probably the power of the human voice to create connections of this kind that inspired its inclusion into the contemporary museum spaces in the form of audio-guides. Whilst the original

intention may have been to help attract the public, and bridge the gap between the objects and the spectators, the conventional audio-guide does not allow us to realize the temporal relationship between past object and present interaction. Traditionally, audio guides vocalize the monologue already sanctioned by the museum, directing the audience where and how to observe and interpret the objects on display. By inviting voices from the public to replace the voice of the audio guide, and allowing the public's interpretations to run in parallel with the facts dictated by the Museum's historical record, Daou's initiative not only opens up a space to consider how we interact with, and how we interpret the museum's collection, it also empowers the public to re-think the parameters of their collective history. In this sense it creates a polyrhythmic arrangement within a soundscape that is usually quite monotone.

My work on *Chou Hayda* effectively began after the initial recordings were made in the museum. Though I was involved in the preparatory process, up until I began editing the content of the public's responses, my input was either technical or speculative. Once the voices were recorded, I had the material to begin shaping what would eventually become the conversations engaging with each museum object. This process began with listening to the recordings, paying specific attention to the selections Daou had already highlighted as relevant. It was necessary to become acquainted with the different modes of expression each voice carried, whilst keeping closely attuned to the relationship between the recorded voices: even if the idea being expressed pertained to the object in question, this was not the only criteria for my selection. Of greater importance was the emotive and intimate relationship between voices that animated the objects on view. Often it was a

chuckle, a sigh, or a cough that gave the voices what was needed to become part of a conversation with others. In fact, most of the final selections were made depending on both the content and the basic sonic nature of the voices.

The impact of the *Chou Hayda* audio-guide, is how it moves the voice beyond being a vessel for the transmission of information, and returns to its innate power of creating linkages. The presence of dialogue automatically triggers rhythm. Much of the knowledge we acquire from other voices while listening to the piece is through what Michel Chion would consider a non-semantic mode of listening (Chion 1994). It is through the nuances, tones, and timbres of the voice, as well as through the disruptions of pauses, breaths, and interjections, that the listener can begin identifying with the subject matter and relating to the narratives the objects carry. That is to say that at some point language and voice are two separate things to be considered.

Once the selections were made, the editing process began by arranging the audio clips into sequences. The audio clips differed in length and content, varying from actual sentences to quick statements, or simply words that spoke to the mood or meaning-making of the object. I did not follow a strict methodology when arranging the sound clips, but worked from a sense of capturing the affective tones of the public's responses. Of course it was important to keep some kind of coherence, considering the final result had to be comprehensible by the Museum's (disconnected) public; but, it was mostly the sonic qualities of the voices that determined how and where the voices should be placed within a given sequence. For example, when editing the piece titled "Dagger," referring to the dagger-like artifact in the museum, Daou and I began by collating the voices

speaking in relation to the object. Once these selections were made, my role was to suggest a specific arrangement that ensured the voices both relayed the necessary information (i.e. the different interpretations of the object), as well as create a composition of voices that the listener could relate to both linguistically and rhythmically. Obviously, it was important that the pieces make sense linguistically, but it was also a concern of ours that the listener be able to engage with the sounds to feel that they are not being spoken to, but rather being invited into a discourse. Most of the time, this arrangement was based on the sonic qualities of the voices, rather than the content. Sometimes a speaker's intonation, or cadence, would make the link of one voice to the other more organic or more intriguing. Through the editing I was trying to emphasize the voices' musicality.

The creation of this pseudo-conversation was mostly a matter of rhythm. To quote Lefebvre once more:

Rhythm reunites quantitative aspects and elements, which mark time and distinguish moments in it – and qualitative aspects and elements, which link them together, found the unities and result from them. Rhythm appears as regulated time, governed by natural laws, but in contact with what is least rational in human being: the lived, the carnal, the body (Lefebvre 1992, 18–19).

Each person moves, speaks, lives to a different rhythm. And when working with the human voice, trying to capture that rhythm often requires one to temporarily suspend the meaning of the words, and focus more directly on the voice. For *Chou Hayda*, it is this mixing of different rhythms that eventually becomes a political gesture. The public sphere and the institutional sphere do not occupy the same rhythmic space or time.

The institution is regimented, controlled, and linked directly to other institutions which are obliged to follow similarly disciplined, rhythmic structures. The public however, though partially or temporarily aligned with institutional structures, is also subject to their personal rhythm: namely, biological rhythms, social rhythms, psychological rhythms, etc. It was thus important for us that these personal rhythms punctuated the piece so as to penetrate the museum space. When listening to the finished piece, the organic or sporadic interactions people had with the objects, came together to alter the way the objects are being perceived. Daou would repeatedly express that she wanted to “give the objects a voice.” In a similar sense, I like to think that we succeeded in animating the inanimate, by introducing new rhythms that interfered with and altered the dominant rhythm of the museum.

IN CLOSING

Our hope is that the visitors who use Chou Hayda as an audio guide in the museum will sense a shift in the dominant rhythms of the institution and feel a sense of liberty to move through the space to their own tune. **END**

NOTE

1. Film and sound theorist Michel Chion, in his book *Audio-Vision* differentiates between three modes of listening. Causal listening, through which we gather information about the cause (source) of a particular sound; Semantic listening, through which we decipher linguistic codes; Reduced listening, through which we analyze the sonic qualities of sounds.

REFERENCES

Holt, R. 2012. “Voices in (and around) the Museum Introduction.” *Journal of Conservation and Museum Studies*. 10(1). Accessed August 31, 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.jcms-journal.com/articles/10.5334/jcms.1011206/>

Bourdieu, P. 1979. *Distinction: A social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Paris: les éditions de minuit.

Ardenne, P. 2004. *A Contextual Art, Artistic Creation in Urban Environment, in Situation, Intervention, Participation*. Paris: Flammarion.

Bishop, C. 2012. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and The Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso.

Bourriaud, N. 2002. *Relational Aesthetics*. Dijon: Les Presses du réel.

Oppen, G. 1968. *Of Being Numerous*. New York: New Directions.

Lefebvre, H. 1992. *Rhythmanalysis*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Chion, M. 1994. *Audio Vision*. New York: Columbia University Press.