SILENCIO: THE SPECTRAL VOICE AND 9/11

Lloyd Isaac Vayo

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2010

Committee:

Ellen Berry, Advisor

Eileen C. Cherry Chandler
Graduate Faculty Representative

Cynthia Baron

Don McQuarie

ABSTRACT

Ellen Berry, Advisor

"Silencio: The Spectral Voice and 9/11" intervenes in predominantly visual discourses of 9/11 to assert the essential nature of sound, particularly the recorded voices of the hijackers, to narratives of the event. The dissertation traces a personal journey through a selection of objects in an effort to seek a truth of the event. This truth challenges accepted narrativity, in which the U.S. is an innocent victim and the hijackers are pure evil, with extra-accepted narrativity, where the additional import of the hijacker's voices expand and complicate existing accounts.

In the first section, a trajectory is drawn from the visual to the aural, from the whole to the fragmentary, and from the professional to the amateur. The section starts with films focused on United Airlines Flight 93, *The Flight That Fought Back*, *Flight 93*, and *United 93*, continuing to a broader documentary about 9/11 and its context, *National Geographic: Inside 9/11*, and concluding with a look at two YouTube shorts portraying carjackings, "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride." Though the films and the documentary attempt to reattach the acousmatic hijacker voice to a visual referent as a means of stabilizing its meaning, that voice is not so easily fixed, and instead gains force with each iteration, exceeding the event and coming from the past to inhabit everyday scenarios like the carjackings.

In the second section, the move from visual to aural continues, with the focus being placed on sound art and music. As the sound art series, William Basinski's *The*

Disintegration Loops I-IV, results from decaying magnetic tape to create a presence in absence, so too does the repetition of the hijacker voice, intended to silence it, allow it to speak volumes. The song "Fly Me to New York," by Cassetteboy, functions referentially, using Frank Sinatra samples to narrate 9/11 from the pilot-hijackers' perspective, acting as a rubble music and providing a critique of narrative omission and U.S. culpability.

By virtue of the use of the hijacker voice in these contexts, that voice is able to inhabit the U.S. psyche, remaining a spectral presence that haunts 9/11 and the nation.

To the slovenly Slovene, a paragon of screwball scholarship and beardiness.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks for this project go to Ellen Berry, Cynthia Baron, Don McQuarie, Eileen Cherry Chandler, Rob Sloane, and Erin Labbie for their committee service and advising; again to Don McQuarie, for his wise counsel and assistance in navigating the logistics of the process; and to Lauren, for her unflagging support and sympathetic ear. This dissertation would not be what it is without them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE: A FIELD OF (HONOR) FOREVER[1]

Something is happening in this field, I think to myself, as the grass sways listlessly in the late summer breeze. The gravel beneath my feet crunches with every shift of my body, but my ears do not hear it or, if they do, are remiss in their reporting. Instead, there is an overwhelming shiver between my shoulder blades, an uncanny feeling that I do not want this, whatever it is, but nonetheless, it happens, is happening, and might never stop.

There are ghosts here, behind me, the wrong ghosts, unseen but commiserating, plotting, four, it seems, deciding what to do next when faced with an unexpected arrival. I know that if I turn there will be nothing, just a handful of tourists clustered in respectful silence, sweaty in the afternoon heat, clutching their cameras and longing for the air conditioning of overpriced hotel rooms back in town, and that whatever this is will be forever back there.

Turning my head from the distant flag planted among the blades, marking where my eyes should be, the pieces begin to assemble, the benches marked with absent names, the length of chain link fence overstuffed with the detritus of past visitors, the anonymous shack in the middle of the parking lot housing pamphlets and transcripts of what I am now hearing. It is July 2006, this is Shanksville, Pennsylvania, and I am more scared than I have ever been in my life.

I should be concerned with the forty, the passengers and crew of United Airlines Flight 93, especially at this, their final resting place, or at least as close as the park volunteers will let us get to the nearly invisible scar by the tree line, but all I hear is Ziad Jarrah, the most human of the hijackers by all accounts. He is not so very different from me, or was not before he turned, not back to Washington D.C., but from his privileged past in Lebanon to the darker future ahead,

---

[1] This title borrows on the motto of the Flight 93 National Memorial project, "A Common Field One Day, A Field of Honor Forever" ("Flight 93…").

and so I am full not of grief for the dead, but of a sort of mutual empathy, projecting myself into

his position as he projects his voice into mine, elected from the four to seize control.

I wonder what brought him here as I question my own motivation, and in that moment,

something clicks, the tape, all we have left of young Ziad, forever 26 as I am nearly 25, the first

day of my life the day after his ended, repeats, my mouth a speaker. I want to scream for this, for

what I have done, but silence is all that remains, a pregnant pause stuck in that moment, and I

cannot talk for an hour, sitting mute next to my mother as we drive home to Ohio. When at last

speech returns, it is not mine, and never will be, until I understand what happened in that field.

<center>***</center>

This is all several years and hundreds of miles from that Tuesday, in the communal

bathroom of my dorm in Ada, Ohio, when a friend told me that a plane had hit the World Trade

Center, and I turned back to putting in my contact lenses, negotiating the unswept stubble on the

countertops, scraped from youthful faces as Ziad and company had shorn themselves in ablution

prior to the day's undertakings. It is worlds from Wellness class that morning, when our

instructor's refusal to let us watch the events unfolding on TV distanced me from the visuality of

the event in favor of word of mouth, of rumored death tolls and missing planes, until my tearful

Sociology instructor's awkward patriotism sent us home for the day, cancelled classes allowing

for an afternoon's worth of rapt viewership. Somehow, the path from that evening's first

contemplation, my ears wreathed in muffling headphones, My Bloody Valentine's interstitial

"Touched" on repeat, forever soundtracking the towers' curdling with its own peals of distortion,

looped drums, and synth washes, in the extrapolated path of Flight 93 had it come a bit further

west from its turnabout in Cleveland airspace, has led me here, to a field in rural Pennsylvania,

within shouting distance of Somerset, where my family would always stop at a local diner on the

way to my grandparents' house, a diner that now sells postcards of this spot, like the one in my pocket.

I have lived with 9/11 for almost nine years now, and we have grown close, grown together in the interim, almost consonant in my at times exhaustive (and certainly exhausting) knowledge of the event. 9/11 came to me (or I came to it, or we met somewhere in between) at a formative scholarly time in my life, at the beginning of my sophomore year of college, as I moved from general education courses and delved into the theoretical foundations of my literature program. The event functioned as a ready object of analysis, so much so that my relation to theory, expanding over the years through my graduate coursework, is inextricably tied to it; there is no 9/11 without theory, and no theory without 9/11. In that first flush of fall 2001, I wanted to understand 9/11, to somehow gain a grasp on what seemed to be an unthinkable event, though the further I looked, the more it seemed that only I had not thought about it, and would do so from there on. This looking faltered, the predominant visual renderings already insufficient when read against MBV's keening sonics, far more evocative of the event's significance than anything I had yet seen on CNN, and so I turned to the aural to find my answers, clinging to the newly released audio recordings of Jarrah and American Airlines Flight 11 pilot-hijacker Mohamed Atta, culled from air traffic control tapes, as well as those placed by passengers and crew aboard the planes and those trapped inside the wounded towers. In particular, Jarrah and Atta captured my attention, expanding their captive audience beyond their respective cabins, agentic, in control, yet forbidden as well, tabooed, and would haunt all of my work to come.

Following on its theoretical centrality, 9/11 became the focus of all of my larger projects from that day forward, beginning with my undergraduate senior essay project, extending to my master's thesis, continuing into course and conference projects thereafter, and temporarily

culminating in this dissertation. My senior essay, entitled "Mediating the Collateral Image: Vision and 9/11," posited a visual representation of the event residing outside of accepted narrativity, an image thrown off by the planes' impacts, then reassembled from peripheral fragments to provide an alternate narrative. The prime example of this image is Kathy Cacicedo's image of United Airlines Flight 175's approach to the South Tower, shot from behind as the plane crosses the Hudson River, the day on the cusp of becoming "9/11," an image seldom reproduced due to its positioning of the viewer nearly within the pilot-hijacker's perspective, yet with much to offer to narratives of the event. From there, it at first seemed that I would be burned out on 9/11, until a bit of happenstance led me back to that which I had never left: a member of my cohort had gone to school with Nicole Miller, a passenger aboard Flight 93, and with that, I was off and running again.

This work led me to my master's thesis, entitled "Fathers and Sons: The Generations of 9/11" which, though primarily concerned with the Oedipal complex in relation to three father-son combinations surrounding 9/11 (1993 World Trade Center bombing plotter Ramzi Yousef and Mohamed Atta, Freedom Tower architect Daniel Libeskind and his father Nachman, and the Georges Bush), also gestures towards notions of presence in absence (in Libeskind's architecture) and inhabitation, and also includes early attention to ghostly voices via a citation in Paul Virilio's *Ground Zero*. Finally, course and conference projects throughout my doctoral tenure, I gave attention to notions of the cultural import of "terrorist" actors (focusing on John Brown in the context of the Civil War), of fragmentation in relation to suicide bombing (looking at the film *Day Night Day Night*, as well as the hypothetical ecstasies of Flight 175 pilot-hijacker Marwan al-Shehhi as he approached his target). Additionally, three other projects directly inform the chapters below: an examination of the use of recordings to approximate event veracity

in films, an analysis of those recordings' use in documentaries, and a study of their relation to sound art.

<div align="center">***</div>

What follows is a ghost story, a personal coming to terms with and making sense of 9/11 that is deeply informed by my own experiences noted above, as well as others that I have yet to understand. It is *a* reading, not *the* reading, and indeed works against closed narratives of the event, instead positing an extra-accepted narrativity (more on that in the introduction) that expands and complicates predominant accounts of 9/11. I readily concede that others may and likely do read not only the event, but also the selected objects that serve as the foundation for this analysis, differently; I have chosen each of these objects for very personal reasons, though those reasons do not by any means invalidate their usefulness as a means of supporting the larger theoretical excursion and the move from texts about 9/11 to those made relevant by my reading. The Flight 93 films were one of the first opportunities I had to come to terms with the event; *Inside 9/11* was the first documentary I saw that situated the event in the larger spectrum of geopolitics (and remains the most effective to that end); "The Long Afternoon" was introduced to me by an undergraduate assistant at my office, and became required viewing in the summer of 2008, and "Demon Ride" is the work of a friend that stands as a serendipitous interlocutor; *The Disintegration Loops I-IV* were a speculative purchase based on a handful of reviews and eye-catching cover art; and Cassetteboy's "Fly Me to New York" came to my attention through the music blog Pitchfork. The listener is me (and possibly you, dear reader, as I have no desire to go this alone), taking the brevity of these recorded voices and meditating upon their huge symbolic import, unpacking their paradoxical politeness and speculating as to what they mean to me and, ultimately, the event, and suggesting a possible result, a Foucauldian *parrhesia*, that is in fact

wishful thinking, what could have happened, but what did not, how I would have liked it to play out, the voices instead being foreclosed by national defensiveness. This is a move from the official focus on the death toll and its proclivity towards short circuiting discourse, from the killing of the 3000 to the nineteen, to those whose deaths have been yet unmournable and unlistenable. I feel that loss every day, field the call from Ziad four years back, answering without answer. This dissertation is one more attempt to understand what happened that July, that September, one more chance to speak as I have been spoken to and through.

INTRODUCTION: NO HAY BANDA

Two women, Betty and Rita, enter a darkened nightclub, Club Silencio, pulled there by the whispered phrases "no hay banda" and "silencio" that emerge from the depths of a dream. On the stage is a master of ceremonies, Bondar, whose multilingual introduction calls attention to the fact that everything is a recording: "*No hay banda* – and yet we hear a band"; "It's all recorded"; "*Il n'y a pas d'orchestre*"; and "It is all on tape" (*Mulholland*). A trumpeter takes the stage under the spotlight's glare, seemingly playing his muted instrument with a flourish, until he takes the mouthpiece from his lips and the sound continues, putting the lie to that impression. Then the master of ceremonies reappears to introduce the singer Rebekah Del Rio, who steps into the light and launches into an impassioned rendition of Roy Orbison's "Crying," performed in Spanish as "Llorando," singing with such vigor that she collapses, the song playing on, revealed to be a recording all along. Betty looks into her purse to find a blue box, the companion piece to the blue key that she had found earlier. Rita uses the key to open the box, and all is plunged into darkness.

This crucial scene from *Mulholland Dr.* (David Lynch, 2001) exemplifies the often unstable and tenuous relation between image and sound in media, the visual and the aural, where all is not what it seems. The apparent actions in this scene, the trumpeter's song and Del Rio's performance, demonstrate the absence-as-presence facilitated by recorded sound, as well as how the realignment of that sound with a visual producing body is at best an imperfect gesture, its artifice subject to jarring revelation, leaving the audience in the dark. This is far from Lynch's first foray into the surreal, the director being known for distinctive treatments of reality dating back to *Eraserhead* (1977), and in the course of his work, Lynch has also maintained an emphasis on the power of the aural.

Lynch's use of sound in this scene and in *Mulholland Dr.* more generally is representative of his approach to it throughout his films, where sound is subject to repetition and takes a superior, almost excessive, relation to the visual. His sound "is animated from the inside by a perpetual pulsation" (Chion 42), as contended by Michel Chion, a throbbing sonics that repeats, a pattern that iterates, each repetition contributing to its perpetuity. Chion elsewhere maintains that "[f]or Lynch, sound is the very origin of certain images" (159), the aural holding the advantage over the visual and, in some cases, existing as its originary locus, in much the same way that the recorded trumpet and "Llorando" dictate the nature of the visual performances. More specifically, Martha Nochimson endows "'the voice'… [with] Lynchian force" (Nochimson [a] 134), placing it centrally within his work, and also specifying the particular power of the voice within Lynchian aurality; the trumpet establishes the visual/aural disconnect, but it is Del Rio who truly makes it known.

For Lynch, "sound deepens the visual depiction of the miracle that narrative representation can contain so much outside of bounded image and narrative" (Nochimson [b] 36), the aural creating a space for excessive narrativity, for an extra-accepted narrativity that transgresses the bounds of image and accepted narrativity to offer its own accounting. As in the dream, where "repetition of the word *silencio* rises in volume from a whisper to a cry" (Miklitsch 240), in the words of Robert Miklitsch, each repetition of the voice exceeds the one prior, gaining volume and the edge over the visual. This voice can be seen as akin to that captured in 9/11's black box,[2] a voice that repeats through its inclusion in accepted narratives of the event,

---

[2] The black box refers (in the abstract) to the voices captured by cockpit voice recorders (part of the black box apparatus, along with the flight data recorder) on 9/11, as the actual recordings have not been released (save for a playback of the United Airlines Flight 93 recordings to family members in a closed session), extant recordings being culled from air traffic control tapes, and only two of the four black boxes were reportedly recovered (those of Flight 93 and American Airlines Flight 77).

though it is able to transcend attempted reattachment to a visual referent and to exceed the bounds of accepted narrativity, getting louder with each pass.

Lynch's treatment of sound is atypical within the sphere of Hollywood film (as is his work in general), with his attention to, if not outright privileging of, sound being met with an opposing elevation of the visual in the vast majority of films. In these more prevalent instances, the aural is taken as an ornament to the visual, the latter maintaining the primary position throughout, and sound supplementing the meaning and interpretation of the image rather than the converse. This favor for the visual is not exclusively contemporary, instead drawing on a long history of ocularcentric discourse dating back to the time of Plato, in which the aural has been systematically deprivileged at the hands of the visual, a deprivileging that has been met with an increasing chorus of anti-ocularcentric theorizing. A brief survey of the debate surrounding ocularcentrism will serve to ground this study and its focus on aural narrativity within the larger flux of visual-aural discursivity, while also highlighting the instability and inadequacy of the purely visual.

<center>THE EYES HAVE IT: OCULARCENTRISM AND ITS DISCONTENTS</center>

Martin Jay's *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought* offers an excellent analysis of the tension between ocularcentric and anti-ocularcentric approaches and, though directed more specifically to French thought, will serve as a footing from which this study's own problematization of ocularcentrism in relation to 9/11 may spring. Following on the chapter divisions used in that text, a survey of the discourse surrounding ocularcentric and anti-ocularcentric approaches will be provided in advance of this study's intervention therein, and will establish a number of sounding points in which the extant discourse may resonate with this study. From Plato to René Descartes, the visual took a dominant position

within Greek (and then French) thought, with sight being linked to notions of intelligence and the

soul, and the other senses being pinned to more material concerns. Within this linkage, sight was

at once a means of spectatorial distancing and self-reflective mirroring, a purity of form or an

uncertain shadow, with vision being seen as a better path to truth than language. Additionally, a

distinction was drawn between the higher light of God (*lumen*) and the lower light (*lux*).[3] In the

medieval church, the emphasis on seers and iconic idolatry positioned vision as the noblest

sense, though an awareness of the representation/fetishism distinction relieved vision of its

sacred function. Baroque vision then celebrated the interaction between form and chaos, surface

and depth, and transparency and obscurity in the face of notions of essential form. However, that

relatively chaotic understanding of vision was soon subject to the ordering function of

perspective, with varied vantage points condensed into a single eye and the visual field replacing

the visual world. Following on the perception of the printed word as a visual and aural event,

Descartes, in his texts *Optics*, *Meteorology*, and *Discourse on Method*,[4] posited that one "sees"

ideas in the mind, suggesting that rays of light are responsible for the mind's visual sensations,

and identifying two dimensions of vision, location/distance/size/shape and light/color.[5] In this

period, vision, initially elevated to heights both sacred and secular, is prone to sporadic

destabilization, indicating the possibility and propensity for problematization that persists to the

present day and that will be exemplified in the present study.

Enlightenment thinkers Voltaire, Francis Bacon, John Locke, and Isaac Newton (among

others) proposed the idea that external objects are the sole source of our ideas, in opposition to

---

[3] *Lumen* is "perfect linear form… the essence of illumination, and it existed whether perceived by the human eye or not," while *lux* "emphasized instead the actual experience of human sight… [with] color, shadow and movement…. accounted as important as form and outline, if not more so" (Jay 29).

[4] Descartes, René. *Discourse on Method, Optics, Geometry, and Meteorology*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2001.

[5] Descartes here suggests that, rather than these qualities residing in the object itself (as posited by Johannes Kepler and others), color and light are functions of the eye itself (77).

the Cartesian internal location. Similarly, the period was marked by the visuality of Louis XIV,

whose reign included an attention to costuming, a predilection for mirrors, a keen understanding

of the power of visual spectacle, and a likeminded exertion of control over the populace through

visual surveillance. A desire for a vulnerability to vision was expressed by Jean-Jacques

Rousseau, who called for a reversal of the camera obscura in which everyone is open to everyone

else's gaze.[6] Even following the tumult of the French Revolution, a privileging of visuality

remained in the importance of the both the flag and dress conventions to the revolutionary effort.

Yet, anti-ocularcentrism began to creep into discourse in this moment, in the work of Diderot

and Jean Starobinski, who suggested the interdependence of senses in the context of a call for

iconoclasm,[7] and who located in the desire for a return to Platonic ideal beauty a move from the

trust in sight,[8] respectively. Additionally, a number of technological changes altered the

relationship to vision, including the visuality of urban Paris and its reconstruction, manifesting in

window displays, advertising, and artificial illumination and representing a democratization of

visual experience. Further, the birth of photography helped to appropriate the other while

destabilizing both painting and the truth of the visual (as undermined by the phenomenon of

retouching). The Enlightenment thus sees perhaps the final wax and ongoing wane of

ocularcentrism, while also injecting technological considerations into the discussion, an element

which will figure into the analysis of 9/11 visuality and, more importantly, aurality, to follow.

---

[6] Rousseau's stance is rooted in an extension of his own desire to appear transparent to God which, when taken to its logical conclusion, requires a similar transparency between and within individuals (91). This desire may have been itself generated by "the Genevan Calvinist tradition of 'holy watching'" (91), and faced a number of obstacles, with assistance being located in primitive language and music.

[7] Diderot valued touch perhaps the most highly among the other senses in the course of his resituation of vision within the larger sensory field, a rehabilitation that anticipated later arguments against Cartesian ocularcentrism (100-1).

[8] For Starobinski, the failure of normal eyes to perceive neo-Platonic ideal beauty, along with "a new valorization of darkness, as the necessary complement, even the source of light" (106-7), undermined the Enlightenment's trust in sight, a move further facilitated by the French Revolution and the changes in Paris noted above.

In the period from the Impressionists to the work of Henri Bergson, the human eye was decentered in favor of the mechanical eye, though the initial excitement over new technologies soon turned to a disillusionment with the visual. Within Impressionism, there was a violent decentering of the dominant scopics,[9] with the *how* of depiction being privileged over the *what*,[10] with priority being given to the body and the sensual visual experience of the beholder, and with the desired result being a captured immediacy of the image. The intention of restating the visual within Modernism, ostensibly a purely ocular exercise, was proven instead to be anti-visual in its bodily focus, an antivisuality echoed in Marcel Duchamp's readymades and their undermining of the visual through a premising on exhibition context.[11] A similar challenge to ocularcentrism existed in philosophy as well, where the detranscendentalization of perspective, recorporealization of the subject, and revalorization of space over time combined to problematize ocularity. In particular, Henri Bergson took the body as the ground of all experience, considered all senses equal, linked the domination of the eye to death (in its tendency towards fixity), and characterized the heard as nonspatial perception, calling on the visual occasionally, but predominantly metaphorically.[12] Vision is here further destabilized, and the aural makes its first significant entrance as a substitute less prone to the failings of the eye, a facility that will be elaborated upon in this study.

---

[9] Prior to the Impressionists' emergence, the dominant scopics entailed color's subservience to line, a relative inattention to movement and atmosphere, and a geometrical approach consistent with perspectivalism, with the living body itself deemphasized in favor of abstraction (153-4).

[10] In Jay's words, "in the celebrated case of Monet's multiple versions of haystacks or the façade of the Rouen cathedral, the external model became little more than an occasion for the stimulus of their retinas" (154-5), the *what* being mere raw material for actualization via the *how*.

[11] Duchamp's readymades, in drawing attention from the object itself to "its nonvisual contextual frame" (162), decenter the visual object , both in the visual indifference of object selection, as well as the insufficiency of the visual itself to unfold the shift in contextualization that gives the readymades their power.

[12] Bergson is the chief agent in "the initial frontal attack on ocularcentrism in French philosophy" (186), resituating the body from being purely an object of analysis to the locus of all perceptions (192) and, in his emphasis on the irreducibility of time by vision, turns to the aural.

For Georges Bataille and the Surrealists, perspectivalism was subject to a breakdown in the wake of World War I and its visual particulars, including the use of camouflage, the identicality and repetition of uniforms, the invisibility of the enemy by virtue of the use of trenches, and the aerial perspective offered by the use of airplanes. Bataille, drawing on his own war experience (as well as his father's blindness), carried this breakdown to its logical conclusion, his *Story of the Eye*[13] challenging the eye's primacy, positing the sun as more violent aggression than benign illumination (versus Louis XIV's solar regency) and acephalic man (having escaped from the head) as an ideal.[14] The Surrealists maintained a closer relation to the visual, aligning themselves with seers and expressing a fascination with the interaction of eye and text. Favoring sensual derangement and the suppression of the rational ego in such forms as automatic writing, the Surrealists worked to defy visual conventions as a means of restoring the purity of the "innocent eye," using photo-collage and film to challenge the temporal instantaneity of the traditional image. In this period, the propensity of acts of war to challenge the primacy of the visual is forwarded, a challenge apparent within 9/11 and furthered by this study.

Jean-Paul Sartre and Maurice Merleau-Ponty developed a new ontology that took much from German philosophy, specifically Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger's phenomenologies and their undermining of the distance between subject and object, move from the ego to the lived body, and restoration of the aural.[15] Sartre expressed an overwhelming

---

[13] Bataille, Georges. *Story of the Eye*. Trans. Dovid Bergelson. San Francisco: City Lights Publishers, 2001.

[14] Bataille here counterposes his own identification with the sun, as noted in the short piece "The Solar Anus," as "violent aggression rather than benign illumination" (223), conflating it with the anus in the process, with Louis XIV's overt solarphilia, and likewise posits the acephalic man, liberated from the hegemony of the eyes and their location in the head, as a desirable model.

[15] Husserl challenges ocularcentrism somewhat obliquely, with his work remaining riddled with ocularcentric ideas, though within that discourse, he suggests that the remove between eye and object does not support full trust in the physiological experience of sight, as well as that a replacement of the transcendental ego deemphasizes the search for pure essences, allowing the impure, that which resists reduction by the gaze, to gain purchase (267-8).

hostility toward the visual, opposing good vision (that which enables one to see through things)
to bad vision (opacity). For Sartre, images were unreal, imagination transcending and
annihilating the real, with hands revealing what the eyes cannot given that the eyes fail to reveal
the whole. Merleau-Ponty attempted to defend an alternate visuality in the face of the collapse
of the scopic in his *Phenomenology of Perception* and *The Visible and Invisible*,[16] positioning
empiricist (vision as external/sensory) and intellectualist (vision as interiority) visual camps
against each other and advocating an ecstatic decentering of the subject and a sense of wonder at
contact with the visual world.[17] Throughout, Merleau-Ponty dethrones the observing subject,
problematizing the link between vision and mind/lived body. Sartre and Merleau-Ponty posit the
irreality of the visual, then compound it by the uncertain linkage between vision and lived
experience, undermining the evidentiary value of and creating an aporia within the visual that
may be attended by the aural, as is the case with this study in relation to 9/11.

Both Jacques Lacan and Louis Althusser contributed much to the discourses surrounding
(anti-)ocularcentrism in relation to their articulation of a spectral subject of ideology. Lacan
furthered Sigmund Freud's own antivisuality (rooted in his attention to Jean-Martin Charcot's
neurological work at Salpêtrière Hospital,[18] the symbolic import of the eye and its triumph over
the nose,[19] and Judaism's taboo on graven images) in his own fascination with the linkages

Heidegger's recovery of "the Hebraic emphasis on hearing God's word rather than seeing his manifestations" places his lot with the aural, thereby problematizing the visual and its primacy (269).

[16] Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
   Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *The Visible and Invisible*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969.

[17] Merleau-Ponty's primary concern with the empiricist/intellectualist binary is that both "failed to register the primary layer of intersensory experience in the body anterior to the differentiation of the senses and their resynthesis on the level of reflected thought" (310), and he advocates an understanding of the unification of that binary as a preceding of the mind by the body.

[18] Charcot himself practices a decidedly ocularcentric method of clinical observation, utilizing photography as a means of locating order within the chaos of the hospital, though Freud's eventual linkage of the desire to see to sexual origins led him away from Charcot's methodology (331-2).

[19] Freud here suggests that, in the move to erect walking, the olfactory is devalued as a function of its lessened proximity to the ground (333).

between vision and aggression. In his articulation of the mirror stage and its related self-formation, Lacan considered the ego as an illusion of wholeness based on that mirror image, preferring the Symbolic over the Imaginary and identifying a split between the eye and the gaze that motivated a scopic drive satisfied by the *objet a*. Althusser, a proponent of Lacan's thought concerning the visual, implemented the Lacanian Imaginary to identify a proletariat that was no longer the Subject-Object of history,[20] noting that any reliance on sight was prone to ideology and offering no escape from ideological misrecognitions and no resolution of his appraisal of such a dire state and his own redemptive impulses. Lacan and Althusser therefore allow the spectral as a discussant, describing the spectral subject and placing it within an ideological sightedness that suggests an alternative (or alternative to) ideology within the aural, as will be suggested in this study.

Michel Foucault and Guy Debord were also participants in the ongoing negotiation of (anti-)ocularcentrism, Foucault in terms of genealogy and Debord in terms of the spectacle. Foucault, at once fascinated by and wary of the visual (as well as indifferent to the aural), demonstrated an interest in the panopticon, surveillance, and imprinted punishment across books including *Madness and Civilization*, *The Birth of the Clinic*, and *Discipline and Punish*.[21] As part of this interest, Foucault asserted that visual regimes constituted cultural categories, configured the medical gaze as rooted in the penetration of the dead body, suggested that vision is epistemic and is constructed linguistically, noted the preservation of the classical observing eye in the human sciences, and established the link between sovereign power and visuality as

---

[20] Althusser invalidates Hegel's positioning of the proletariat as this Subject-Object, considering it "no less a *méconnaissance* than the ego psychologists' centered ego" (373), aligning Hegel with traditional ocularcentrism.

[21] Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. New York: Vintage, 1988.
 Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. New York: Vintage, 1994.
 Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage, 1995.

manifested in the gaze/surveillance/rehabilitation dynamic. Debord meditated upon the dangers

of being subject to the gaze, identifying the visual as the battlefield of revolution due to the

relation between fetishism and idolatry (reflecting his Marxist, Surrealist, and Lettrist

influences), and posited *détournement* as a means of combating the hegemony of the spectacle.[22]

In *Society of the Spectacle*,[23] Debord contended that all was representation, that the spectacle was

rooted in the privileging of the eye, and that society as a whole was spectacle, demonstrating the

dangers of ocularcentrism in the contemporary moment. Foucault and Debord's notions of

vision as a cultural category open the possibility for an analysis of the (anti-)visual that may

reveal much about a given culture, while simultaneously positing that visual as a spectacular

battlefield, and the use of the visual in relation to 9/11 is equally revelatory in terms of its

spectacular manifestation and its generating culture, as will be discussed below.

Likewise, Roland Barthes and Christian Metz took part in the dialogue, Barthes in terms

of semiology and Metz in terms of the formation of a certain strain of film criticism. Barthes

sought the reduction of visual experience to a readable code, taking photography as his primary

object of analysis and drawing a distinction between denotation (analogy) and connotation

(social constitution). He also made a division between photography and cinema, the former

existing as a "having been there" and the latter as an ongoing "being there." In *Camera

Lucida*,[24] Barthes additionally formulated the twinned notions of the *studium* (public message)

and the *punctum* (disturbed intelligibility) in relation to photography, suggesting that

photographs ratify the existence of what was. Metz, as part of the emergent *Cahiers du Cinéma*

---

[22] By *détournement*, Debord refers to a technique or practice in which a media work is altered such that its present meaning is antagonistic to its original meaning. This concept differs from straight parody insomuch as its reuse of the original media work is more direct, and can take on minor (trivial) and deceptive (taking on larger political and philosophical ideas and texts) forms.

[23] Debord, Guy. *Society of the Spectacle*. Trans. Ken Knabb. Oakland: AKPress, 2006.

[24] Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1981.

school of film criticism, observed the accumulative denotation of film versus the instantaneous

denotation of photography, the spectator's identification with the camera eye, the screen's

relation to the mirror, and the manner in which scopophilia and voyeurism bridge the gap

between the subject of desire and its object.[25] Barthes and Metz offer an understanding of vision,

particularly the photographic and cinematic, as subject to public and deeper readings, and such a

critical depth is evident in the case of 9/11 as well, the public visual giving way to a privatized

aural, as will be discussed below.

Both Jacques Derrida and Luce Irigaray enacted a move from the visual, Derrida via

attention to the aural and Irigaray via a feminist problematic. Derrida, taken with the primacy of

the aural over the visual in relation to writing, noted also the nonphonetic visual dimension of

writing, though the latter failed to provide a full accounting of the subtleties at play.[26] He

identified the trace and its inability to yield full visibility, instead subjecting one to interminable

delay, as well as the undisplaceability of black/white and light/dark metaphors, expressing an

interest in touch and hearing in the course of a qualified iconoclasm in which one cannot fix an

image's meaning. Irigaray centered her work around the agency of the gaze and the role of

vision in patriarchal domination, linking phallocentrism and ocularcentrism. She challenged

notions of the woman-as-mirror,[27] as a prisoner of the male specular economy, and as an inferior

version of the male subject, rehabilitating the speculum from a tool of male exploration to a

---

[25] Metz's take on the screen-as-mirror is in actuality a response to/elaboration upon the ideas of fellow film theorist Jean-Louis Baudry, where Metz notes that film spectatorship occurs without the spectator's body on screen (480).
[26] Derrida's concern in this area pertains to his articulation of the concept of *différance*, in which he "enacts…. [a] 'grammatological' resistance to the putative primacy of speech over the written word" in media culture (504), emphasizing the importance of that which lies behind language (in this case problematizing the aural, though not discarding it by any measure).
[27] Irigaray challenges Lacan in this instance, articulating a blind spot within the Freudian/Lacanian conceptualization of symmetry between the sexes, and simultaneously questioning the visual as the sole basis for the Imaginary (531). In the Lacanian mirror stage, the woman is characterized as lack, as imprisoned in male specular economy, though two opportunities for rectifying this situation are suggested by Irigaray: breaking through the mirror, and replacing the Lacanian mirror with the concave speculum (533-4).

means of refuting lack anamorphotically in both *Speculum of the Other Woman* and *This Sex Which is not One*.[28] Irigaray engaged in a lengthy analysis of Plato's allegory of the cave also, the cave being both womb and eye and the mother elided in favor of the father, and concluded that only the Buddha's gaze escapes phallogocularcentric economy.[29] Derrida's attention to the aural and Irigaray's thoroughgoing problematization of the gaze as a tool of phallogocularcentric ideology serve to support the potential of aurality in the face of eroding visuality, both the aural and erosion featuring prominently in the study to follow.

Emmanuel Levinas and Jean-Francois Lyotard contributed understandings of (anti-)ocularcentrism consistent with postmodernist discourse, Levinas in terms of a religious ethics and Lyotard in terms of disruption and complexity. Levinas' religious training influenced his take on the visual and his analysis of the visual in a literary context (along with Maurice Blanchot), where he posited the community as anti-visual and continued the Jewish stress on the voice and the ear.[30] For Levinas, there was an autoethicality of "regard" that thwarted the gaze and resisted formal reciprocity.[31] Lyotard celebrated Levinas' work in his own, though he privileged dissensus and struggle where Levinas favored adjudication. He rejected much of Lacan, including the Symbolic, noting Lacan's failure to acknowledge the embodiment of signifiers and its effect on meaning, following Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's problematization of the Oedipus complex while also drawing a distinction between discourse and

---

[28] Irigaray, Luce. *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Trans. Gillian C. Gill. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.
  Irigaray, Luce. *This Sex Which is not One*. Trans. Gillian C. Gill. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

[29] The cave, in this case, is rehabilitated from its sublimation to the Platonic form of the Idea (its lofty manifestation being linked to the sun) and the father, instead suggesting the cave as womb, locus of disjointed time and of the mother, privileging the cavity of the eye over its pupil (537).

[30] Levinas' work is inflected by the Jewish taboo on graven images, leading to a sense of community based not on mutual regard, but another understanding of "regard" as autoethical.

[31] Levinas suggests that this "regard" includes a refusal "to turn him or her [the Other] into an object of visual knowledge… [r]egard in the sense of caring thus meant keeping the eyes shut" (556), stymieing the gaze in the process.

figure and defending the eye as a source of disruptive energy.[32] Both Levinas and Lyotard

reflected the Jewish anti-ocularcentric perspective, in which truth "works" rather than speaking,

as in the Greek representation of truth in language, and in which taboos on specularity and

visuality are echoed in psychoanalysis' problematization of the same. Levinas and Lyotard both

favor the disruption of the eye, the former through an ethical relation, the latter through a

linguistic preference, favorable conditions for the disruption of the visual in the turn to the aural

and the importance of language to that effort to come in the ensuing chapters of this study. This

history demonstrates the lengthy precedent for discourses of both ocularcentrism and anti-

ocularcentrism. This study will give attention to the latter as an answer to the former in relation

to 9/11.

AND NOTHING, AND NOTHING, AND NOTHING: ON TERMINOLOGY

Before unfolding this study's intervention in the discourse of (anti-)ocularcentrism in

relation to 9/11, there are eight terms that merit definition due to their importance to the

argument: spectral, the hijacker voice, the spectral voice, the listener, the accepted narrative, the

U.S. genome, the U.S. psyche, and the purely aural hijacking.

As the notion of the spectral is central to all that comes after, it must be defined first, and

that effort is multifarious, encompassing the visual, the aural, and much in between. This

spectral bears a relation to the visual insomuch as the word arises from a visual etymology, the

French *spectre* following from the Latin *spectrum*, as in appearance, vision, or apparition, in this

sense suggesting an inadequacy of vision, the decay of vision in favor of an alternate

representation that is at once marginally visual and more substantially aural. Taking the Latin

---

[32] Where discourse privileges textuality over perception, existing as the locus of "normal" communication (i.e. that in which no attention is paid to the materiality of signifiers), figurality transgresses the limits of the knowable, yielding an excess that prevents the coalescence of order in general (564).

origin into account, this spectral represents a gradation of experience, a continuum in which additional perspectives may be added to the singular perspective of a given narrative, permitting a polyvalent rendering that at once preserves the continuity between perspectives while also suggesting a fragmentation or partition, a boundary at which the visual gives way to the aural. This spectral also recalls Jacques Derrida's *Specters of Marx: The State of Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International* and its focus on the specter and its hauntological capacity, its own paradoxical state of being and non-being, and the relation between the ghostly past and the haunted present, a similar (non-)being and pasted present existing within the voice and 9/11. Finally, in relation to the aural in a more technical sense, this spectral additionally refers to spectral voice conversion, a process whereby algorithms are used to modify a source speaker's voice to seem as if spoken by another, a manipulation of aurality that will be recurrently identified throughout this study.

The second term, the hijacker voice, refers to not only the literal voices of the hijackers captured on 9/11, to Mohamed Atta and Ziad Jarrah's transmissions from the cockpit (thus motivating the use of the masculine form [he/his]), but also that voice rendered more abstractly. In abstract form, the hijacker voice refers to the citational and iterative use of the original voice, the hijacker's speech pulled out of his particular context within the actual event and recontextualized into film, sound art, and music. This voice is able to signify more broadly due to his inclusion in accepted narrativity, exceeding the actualities of the original voice, yet maintaining a referentiality to that voice such that the literal and abstract voices remain consonant, though iteratively so, close enough to pass muster but different enough under closer examination. The hijacker voice is negotiated between the hijacker and the listener, a negotiation in which neither the hijacker nor the listener is not fully agentic, the former insomuch

as he cannot dictate nor wholly anticipate how his recordings may be used (though some

foreknowledge is possible) likewise, the latter given that her/his active solicitation of the

recordings is made with the intent of concretizing evil, though that imbibing results in an

unintended inhabitation and ventriloquy. As such, the hijacker voice operates liminally, outside

of the full control of either the hijacker or the listener, always already inhabitational, though

not wholly anticipated by either the hijacker or listener.

The third term, the spectral voice, follows on the spectrality identified above, formalizing

the visual's decay and the aural's preeminence, a lingering presence in absence that actualizes its

own meaning. This voice may be defined in brief as a ghostly voice, an eroded visuality that

registers more aptly in the aural, a voice separated from its producer either through technological

abstraction in the form of recording apparatuses, through death, or some combination of the two.

Once detached from its producing body and its association with the visceral, the spectral voice

may take on a hauntological bent, at the same time becoming available for citation, iteration, and

sampling that withdraws it from one context and inserts it into another, though the trace of the

originary context remains. The voice is uncanny, ethereal, its very detachment lending it an

ability to attach quite vigorously to other contexts, to signify beyond its original sounding and to

resonate, to resound and re(vise/frame)sound, to be heard again, repeatedly. Though the hijacker

voice is not the only one privy to spectralization, the voices of crew, passengers, and World

Trade Center occupants also being preserved for posterity and included in accepted narrativity, it

is the hijacker voice which benefits most from that spectralization, gaining a greater voice

through his attempted silencing.[33]

---

[33] Though all equally available to spectralization, the hijacker voice is the primary beneficiary for one simple reason: the other voices are more readily and willingly included as evidence of the profound and incommensurable victimhood experienced by the U.S. in the course of the event, each recording amplifying the depth and breadth of

The fourth term, the listener, refers to the auditor of the spectral voice, the individual frustrated in its attempts to locate a satisfactory narrative of 9/11 that approaches the harsh reality of the event, and which, in seeking out that narrative, welcomes the hijacker voice and the victimized crew and passenger/World Trade Center occupants' voices to approximate that reality through a greater, more inclusive veracity. This listener is not necessarily from the U.S., though it is predominantly so; the listener is also not necessarily younger, but is predominantly so. The listener holds a position consistent with accepted narrativity of the event; yet, the listener finds an inadequacy within that accepted narrative, not so much so as to motivate an extra-accepted narrativity, but enough to call for a few token additions to the narrative as it has been rendered, a call answered gladly by the hijacker voice upon his conclusion. To this listener, 9/11 is of great importance, is perhaps *the* event of her/his lifetime, suggesting either a younger listener (who has experienced fewer events that might vie for that title), or an older listener who perceives the sea change promised by 9/11. This listener is not only this study's author, the first hearer from whom this anti-ocularcentric (or, more aptly, pro-auralcentric) reading arises but, based on the characteristics described above, a younger American who is in accord with the bulk of the accepted narrative (with the caveat of additional aural inclusion) as a means of describing 9/11 as a central event.

The fifth term, accepted narrativity, refers to the predominant understanding of 9/11 as dictated by Bush administration ideology and parroted in media outlets, where the hijacker is pure evil, the U.S. pure victim, and nothing else open to discussion. The binary opposition central to this accepted narrative does not allow for shades of gray within analyses of the event, codifying the initial knee-jerk reaction to being attacked and extending it well beyond its sell-by

---

that validating pain, whereas the hijacker voice is included as an evil foil to that victimhood. Therefore, spectralization enables the hijacker voice a greater presence, as the desirous listener grants it a second life.

date, precluding and eliding all that might complicate its story. This narrative is profoundly linear, tracing what it perceives as a best fit line between the nodal sub-events within the larger event, though that line best fits its own preconceived notions of the nature of the event, with little concern for its actualities. The accepted narrative is tacitly approved by the listener too unmotivated or afraid to seek out additional perspectives, as it is that seeking that reveals the hijacker voice and desires its inclusion. Once included, the hijacker voice counterposes the accepted narrative with his own extra-accepted narrativity, which moves beyond the exclusionary linearity to conclude that, in the end, the nodes know.

The sixth and seventh terms, the U.S. genome and the U.S. psyche, may be discussed together due to their close relation. The sixth term, the U.S. genome, refers to the very building blocks of national identity in the U.S., the liberty, freedom, and justice for all upon which this country was purportedly founded, and for which it (equally purportedly) stands today. The genome analogy proves instructive here, reflecting the degree to which these notions are hard-wired into national identity, and cannot be ignored in the same way that one cannot ignore one's genetic predispositions. Much like the genome, U.S. national identity is composed of a myriad of tiny elements that, when operating together correctly, produce a fully functional organism, a nation more melting pot than salad bowl. However, when genes are altered, a pairing deleted or augmented with an additional gene, that genome may mutate, its functionality being accordingly problematized. In such an event, national identity is rendered vulnerable down to the very core of its being, the deleted or extra gene inhabiting that identity in its sparseness or excess. The seventh term, the U.S. psyche, arises from this genetic foundation, being ideologically determined by the genes therein, psychologically manifesting the physiological hardwiring to which liberty, freedom and justice are subject. This psyche is a fragile one, full of sound and

fury, though it is the fullness of this sound that renders it most susceptible to aural inhabitation by the hijacker voice. Rather than signifying nothing, the sound signifies furiously, exceeding the bounds of accepted narrativity and leaving the U.S. psyche prone to instability.

Finally, the eighth term, the purely aural hijacking, is both the end result of 9/11 as enacted by the hijackers and a prospective future means of attack, an event from which vision has been removed and a way of removing a vision that no longer moves, a static methodology discarded in favor of an aural kinesis. 9/11 itself is an aural hijacking insomuch as, due to the absence of video footage within the planes themselves, the hijacking action is invisible, spectral, uncorrupted by visual referentiality, known only through the aural dispatches sent out over air traffic control frequencies and cell phone connections. Within this understanding, visual elements such as the footage of the planes' impacts are always already external to the event, allowing little insight in their lack of sight, rendering the locus of lacked sight, the aural, as a more fitting site for event narrativity. Taken more broadly as a model for future undertakings, the purely aural hijacking is 9/11 without the impacts, the impact having already occurred in the plane's aural commandeering, the damage done once Atta has spoken his "we have some planes," the literalization of that possession in the planes' later demises being but icing on an already baked cake. The visual is not only not necessary for the enactment of this purely aural hijacking, it is detrimental, pinning the event to the pineal gland, a third eye concerned more with the I of U.S. victimhood constructs than accurate event narrativity, where the more broadly receptive aural has much more to say and hear.

With these terms in place, and subject to further elaboration throughout the chapters that follow, one may gain an advance understanding of the argument and its supporting language, the words that will be called upon to answer the questions outlined below.

WE DO (WHY DO): ON NECESSITY

This study will frame the importance of analyzing the use of sound in relation to 9/11 in contrast to the overwhelming prevalence of visual studies of the event. The glut of visual analyses points to a critical oversight within scholarship surrounding the event, and one that represents an erroneous devaluation of the aural at the hands of the visual consistent with the ocularcentrist perspective chronicled above. In these visual studies, attention is paid to the spectacular imagery of the event, including the planes' impacts (primarily into the World Trade Center towers, with the impact of American Airlines Flight 77 into the Pentagon being captured only indirectly by surrounding surveillance cameras) and the fires in and eventual collapse of the World Trade Center towers, with a mind to the symbolic import of their demonstrations of the vulnerability of the U.S. homeland and its financial and governmental edifices. Instead of approaching 9/11 as a purely or primarily visual spectacle whose imagery resonates after the fact, as is evident in the background provided above, this study will take 9/11 as an aural spectacle whose resonance lies in the persistent use of recordings captured on that day, as well as the manner in which those recordings problematize victimhood narratives and point to U.S. complicity in the event.

The deliberate and unrelenting focus on the visual is consistent with the aims of accepted narrativity, defined above and here subject to further explication as not only a central part of this project but, in its mutation into extra-accepted narrativity, *the* central part of this project. As noted earlier, accepted narrativity is Manichean in its allegory of victimhood, positioning the U.S. as a pristine, guiltless sufferer, the undeserving target of fanatical, backward murderers emerging from some Third World Muslim wasteland of their own devising, filled with a bilious hatred of the freedoms on offer in the home of the brave, cowards in their suicidal actions. This

narrativity is the sole version on offer in the wake of the event, or at least the sole *approved* narrativity, all others being patently unpatriotic at the least, treasonous at worst.

When rare exceptions do in fact appear, they are foreclosed with extreme prejudice, as is evident in the case of Bill Maher. On the 17 September 2001 episode of his talk show *Politically Incorrect*, Maher responded to panelist Dinesh D'Souza's contention that the hijackers were not cowards, as George W. Bush and his accepted narrativists had asserted, saying "[w]e have been the cowards. Lobbing cruise missiles from two thousand miles away. That's cowardly. Staying in the airplane when it hits the building. Say what you want about it. Not cowardly" (quoted in Raphael). Raphael goes on to cite Robert Thompson, director of Syracuse University's Center for the Study of Popular Television, who states that "[h]e [Maher] was the only dissenting voice out there that week" (Raphael), and for some time after, at least in major media channels, and the subsequent cancellation of Maher's show stands as an example of the cost of alternate narrativity offered in the face of the accepted line.

Accepted narrativity excludes all other voices from the discussion, producing a cycloptic, monovisual rendering that is fatally flawed, that sacrifices the periphery for the center, that forgoes depth of field for the shallow grave, newly turned earth being maintained as the wounds of the event are prodded in the constant evocation of 9/11 by the Bush administration. It is my goal, and that of this study, to complicate accepted narrativity with the notion of extra-accepted narrativity, that which moves beyond the party line, as motivated by the exclusionary shortcomings of that account, seeking additional information so as to gain a deeper understanding of the event and, in that seeking, to begin to come to terms with it and to unpack its implications for myself and for the world at large.

This extra-accepted narrativity is not simple counternarrativity; instead, it is the product of a complicated relation, a creative moment involving questions of agency, intent, and inherent meaning. First, in its generative moment, extra-accepted narrativity is produced by the hijackers themselves, by Mohamed Atta and Ziad Jarrah speaking to the passengers and to air traffic controllers, their words automatically forming another narrative layer, the supplement to accepted narrativity, a throbbing appendix that is either excised or exercises its will. Though, as discussed above in relation to the hijacker voice, the pilot-hijackers may not be able to fully anticipate how their voices will be used after the fact, the act of casting them into the ether is not without some agency, not only in the course of the assault itself, but in the knowledge that, whatever its form, the deed will endure.

Second, following the event itself, extra-accepted narrativity is further produced by texts about 9/11 which, in a similar agentic bind, are intended to lend further credence to the cult of U.S. victimhood, but which simultaneously fall prey to the machinations of the hijacker voice through inclusion of the pilot-hijackers' recorded voices. The extra-accepted in this case is what slips through and beyond the intent of the texts, the repetition of the recordings serving not to drum their evil into the listener, but only to drum the voice as a raw, inhabitational datum, a martial beat that keeps time with the pulse of the listener and the nation. It is also that which is read into the texts not only by myself, but by others similarly saturated in the hijacker voice, sites of seeming tangential relevance becoming highly relevant indeed once invested with a 9/11-oriented reading.

Third, the artists themselves, those behind the creation of 9/11 texts, actively participate in extra-accepted narrativity, at times passively (in the case of William Basinski, to be discussed below) and at times actively (in the case of Cassetteboy, also to be discussed below) producing a

more complicated, polyvocal narrativity that moves from the hyperfocal, singular vision of accepted narrativity to a broader, synaesthetic narrativity that gives increased, indeed primary attention to the aural. Finally, anti-empire texts, those objects critical of superpowers like the pre-, and certainly post-, event U.S., are an active part of extra-accepted narrativity, that extra-being inherent to such texts as a crucial element in their complication of singular narratives of empirical good.

Collectively, this complicated relation, or rather interrelation of genetic factors, is not so much a wholesale rupture of accepted narrativity as its logical complication, an expansion of the seams left by its haphazard assembly, the rough edges reflecting its coarse, unrepresentative and selective excerpting. The pilot-hijackers indeed throw down the gauntlet in their initial aural contribution, a verbal exorcism of their own trauma at the hands of U.S. neo-imperial might, the mantle then being taken up by 9/11 and anti-empire texts and their authors thereafter, the extra-growing in force as it itself springs, seedling-like, from the cracks within accepted narrativity to a flourishing beyond.

Given the relative lack of extant aural source material recorded during the event (consisting of three recordings from American Airlines Flight 11 [spoken by pilot-hijacker Mohamed Atta] and two recordings from United Airlines Flight 93 [spoken by pilot-hijacker Ziad Jarrah], as well as a handful of cell phone calls from aboard the hijacked planes and within the World Trade Center), these recordings are subject to repeated use, where the plethora of available images makes each individual image less central to the visual narrative. Though the paucity of aural source material is in part a function of the journalistic distance from the event, the very carnage unleashed upon the World Trade Center and Pentagon precluding a more proximal gathering, and some other related material exists attesting to the mis/communication

taking place within the event (with erratic radio contact between first responders being a prime example, along with a similar confusion evinced in exchanges between military command and the FAA), it is the recordings identified above that serve as the chief data of the event in their situation within the planes themselves.

Through this repetition, wherein aural evidence of the event is included to magnify (and indeed exceed) the impact of the visual evidence, the recordings come to inhabit the psyche of the listener who seeks out a discourse in which the hijackers are evil and the U.S. is a well-intentioned victim. The intended message of hijacker evil erodes with each repetition, while the spectral, inhabitational hijacker voice comes to haunt and ventriloquize the listener, manifesting the U.S.' involvement in its own pseudo-victimization. One may trace this erosion throughout the various media in which the hijacker voice is included directly, such as semi-fictionalized accounts of Flight 93 and documentaries about 9/11 writ large (many of which trace the event back to its origins in the Afghan war of the 1980s), as well as those in which the voice is referenced as an artistic touchstone, such as YouTube videos, sound art, and music pieces. What results from this analysis is a clearer picture of the centrality of the use of the aural to 9/11 and the possibility of purely aural hijackings in the future, a perspective sorely lacking in existing scholarship.

In surveying existing literature surrounding 9/11 more generally and the visual/aural more specifically, two primary divisions become apparent: within 9/11 texts, the visually centered influence of the three-book 2002 Verso series including texts by Jean Baudrillard, Paul Virilio, and Slavoj Žižek, as well as political science and popular texts; and within aural texts, a focus on sound design in film and the phenomenology of voice as constructed within the philosophical field. Taking first the 2002 Verso series, which includes Baudrillard's *The Spirit*

of Terrorism, Virilio's *Ground Zero*, and Žižek's *Welcome to the Desert of the Real: Five Essays on September 11 and Related Dates*, the three texts reflect an attention to the visual that is consistent with each author's previous privileging of the visual at the expense of the aural, a privileging that undermines the scope and impact of their discussions of 9/11. Baudrillard characteristically devotes his analysis to the visual symbolism of the event while couching that symbolism within the simulacral field, and though his text does a service in taking attention away from the literal, visceral destruction of the event to its symbolic import, he does not follow the aural dimension of that import. Virilio too foregrounds the visual, drawing on his previous cinema scholarship to offer a pessimistic reading of the post-9/11 cultural sphere and the implications of technological progress, and while he makes a useful point concerning the destructive potential of technology, he fails to pursue that potential's actualization in the inclusion of the hijacker voice within recording technologies. Finally, Žižek forwards a meditation on the discursive relation between the real and Real as it pertains to 9/11 as a spectacle, noting the filmic referents of the event in the process, and though his text draws the apt parallel between global capitalist fundamentalism and radical Islamic fundamentalism, he does not extrapolate that problematized victimhood into the realm of the aural. Other likeminded theoretical-philosophical texts, including Giovanni Borradori's *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, take the same approach, seeing the visual as a worthy foothold for constructing theories of the event that, while valuable in many respects, do a disservice to their object of analysis by not fully addressing both the visual *and* aural dimensions.

A similar inattention to the use of the aural plagues political science and popular texts that seek to address 9/11, though that deficiency is more prevalent in the former than the latter.

Within political science, texts such as Noam Chomsky's *9/11*, Steve Coll's *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and bin Laden from the Soviet Invasion to September 10, 2001*, Lawrence Wright's *The Looming Tower: Al Qaeda and 9/11*, and numerous others do an able job of establishing the historical outline of the event and, in Wright's case, the particulars of its occurrence. However, where these texts gesture towards or openly discuss the aural, it is only in a historical-factual sense (transcribing the hijackers' or passengers' words as evidence), with little analysis of the implications of the use of the recordings and their persistence after the event. Likewise, the profusion of popular texts surrounding 9/11, the best of which include Terry McDermott's *Perfect Soldiers: The 9/11 Hijackers – Who They Were, Why They Did It*, Jere Longman's *Among the Heroes: United Flight 93 and the Passengers and Crew Who Fought Back*, John J. Miller, Michael Stone, and Chris Mitchell's *The Cell: Inside the 9/11 Plot, and Why the CIA and FBI Failed to Stop It*, and Jim Dwyer and Kevin Flynn's *102 Minutes: The Untold Story of the Fight to Survive Inside the Twin Towers*, include transcripts of the words spoken by both the hijackers and those aboard the planes and in the World Trade Center towers, though their contextualization of those words within personal experience serves to imply the profound impact of the aural during the event and its use thereafter. Yet, in both the political science and popular texts, the significance of the use of the aural is at best implied, necessitating further analysis, which this study will provide.

Turning to sound, there are no extant studies of the importance of the use of sound in relation to 9/11, and so one must look further afield to locate relevant discussions of sound, which may be found within analyses of sound design in film, of the phenomenology of voice within philosophy, and the emergent field of auditory culture. Beginning with sound design in film, there are two main scholars who have produced theory in this as yet underexamined aspect

of film, Gianluca Sergi and Michel Chion. Sergi's *The Dolby Era: Film Sound in Contemporary Hollywood* and Chion's *Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen* and *The Voice in Cinema*, along with Rick Altman's edited volume *Sound Theory, Sound Practice*, Vincent LoBrutto's *Sound-On-Film: Interviews with the Creators of Film Sound*, David Sonnenschein's *Sound Design: The Expressive Power of Music, Voice, and Sound Effects in Cinema*, Elisabeth Weis and John Welton's edited volume *Film Sound: Theory and Practice*, and Simon Frith's chapter on film music in *Performing Rites: On the Value of Popular Music* constitute a small but burgeoning body of scholarship focused on the impact of the aural within the filmic realm, a focus that will prove useful to the study's analysis of the use of recordings in the semi-fictionalized and documentary realms. Still, this field is undertheorized at best, necessitating additional theorization if a sound design approach is to be brought to bear on the use of the 9/11 aural.

The phenomenology of voice proves a more fruitful area of scholarship, with the work of Allen S. Weiss, Steven Connor, Mladen Dolar, Douglas Kahn, Gregory Whitehead, and Jonathan Sterne proving of particular value. Weiss' texts, including *Breathless: Sound Recording, Disembodiment, and The Transformation of Lyrical Nostalgia*, *Phantasmatic Radio*, *Shattered Forms: Art Brut, Phantasms, Modernism*, and the edited volume *Experimental Sound and Radio*, demonstrate the power of the voice within recorded media, and though Weiss' chief focus is on radio-as-medium, his theories are extrapolable beyond their location in early sonic objects like Antonin Artaud's *To Have Done With the Judgment of God* to contemporary, underexamined events like 9/11. Similarly, Connor's *Dumbstruck: A Cultural History of Ventriloquism*, Dolar's *A Voice and Nothing More*, Kahn and Whitehead's edited volume *Wireless Imagination: Sound, Radio, and the Avant-Garde*, and Sterne's *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction* each privilege the voice and the aural before the visual,

additionally giving attention to the ventriloquial, inhabitational aspects of the voice, which are crucial to this study. Auditory culture is of a similar import, its novelty as a scholarly field granting it a freshness of perspective essential to the refocusing on the aural rather than the visual. The field is concerned with cultural uses of sound and the ways in which sound is integral to the construction and maintenance of a culture, and finds its home with Berg Publishers, who are responsible for the foundational Michael Bull and Les Back edited volume *The Auditory Culture Reader* and the Veit Erlmann edited volume *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening and Modernity*. Auditory culture will be of particular use to the discussion surrounding the inhabitational capacity of the hijacker voice and the way in which the voice comes to infiltrate U.S. culture to such a degree that he is able to gain access to the U.S. psyche. This survey of extant literature points to the notable shortcomings within and potential utility of scholarship in 9/11 studies and sound/voice, and identifies a crucial lack at the center of that scholarship that will be addressed by this study.

<div align="center">ALL WE ASK: ON INQUIRY</div>

Given the aforementioned gaps within existing scholarship, there are a number of unanswered (and in some cases unasked) questions surrounding 9/11 and the use of sound. In the course of its argument, this study will address a number of these questions: Why has the aural been underexamined in relation to 9/11 (as well as more broadly)? What is the potential impact of the aural dimension of the hijackings? How does that impact compare to that of the visual dimension? What can the aural provide that the visual cannot? How can the aural function separately from the visual? What does the inclusion of the aural dimension in other artistic media discourse surrounding the event have to say about its import? How does this inclusion demonstrate the manner in which the hijacker voice comes to inhabit the U.S. psyche?

What is it about the hijacker voice and its use that makes it so haunting? How does that voice shift from its visceral production by the hijacker to its spectral existence after the event? How might the aural figure into future hijacking scenarios? Each question will receive considerable attention throughout the study.

Since this study is venturing into uncharted waters, it cannot hope to address *all* of the questions surrounding 9/11 and the use of sound, and accordingly certain limitations will define the field of analysis. The limitations of this study, if not already apparent from the above, are as follows: though the project may gesture towards discussions of the use of sound and theoretical constructs predating the events of 9/11, the historical periodization of the project will be primarily limited to 9/11 and the years thereafter; though the project may include references to additional cultural artifacts, including counterexamples, the objects of analysis will be primarily limited to four professional films, two amateur films, one sound art series, and one song (to be discussed below); though a discussion of the visual aspects of 9/11 will be essential to setting up the argument of the project, its focus will be on the aural dimension of the event. A glance at the visual is an inevitable function of the structure of the argument, though the project will not fall victim to the typical fetishization of the visual that renders other studies incomplete at best, and misguided at worst, instead giving a much needed hearing to the aural.

The similar profusion of cultural artifacts directly or indirectly related to 9/11 requires a degree of selectiveness if a thoroughgoing analysis is to be pursued, and with this necessary limitation in mind, the study seeks to locate objects that are at once indicative of larger trends within the artifactual field, while also retaining unique elements that make those particular objects valuable to a study of the use of the aural in relation to 9/11. To discuss all, or even a significant portion of the artifacts available would not only exceed the scope of this study, but

also the realm of possibility for anything short of a sizeable team of scholars concerned with little else than cataloging those objects. Rather, the study will do much with the selected handful of objects, unpacking their significance and reaching insights applicable to the broader artifactual field. Counterexamples will be included where relevant as a means of situating the chosen objects within the broader field of artifacts and clarifying the chosen objects' intervention in the discursive field. Finally, though certain aspects of the theoretical bases in sound and the spectral do indeed precede the event, those theories will be brought to bear on the period after 9/11 almost exclusively, earlier manifestations being consulted sparingly and with a mind to providing occasional context for phenomena in evidence after the event. The events of and following 9/11 do not exist in isolation, but the period preceding 9/11 will be addressed only insomuch as the events of and following 9/11 echo back beyond their origins.

THE BOOK I READ: ON THEORY

This focused field of study will be informed by a number of theoretical concepts. Jacques Derrida's articulation of the related concepts of citationality and iterativity, drawn from his 1988 text *Limited Inc*, will appear throughout the text, the ideas providing a constant refrain in each chapter. Given that the 9/11 recordings are subject to profligate repetition as a function of their persistence through inclusion in various forms of media after the event, Derrida's notions of citationality and iterativity combine to provide a partial description of the performative nature of sound on 9/11 and in its continued relevance thereafter. Citationality, wherein differential repetition operates via the action of quotation to create alternate contexts for the speech act, allows that act to signify beyond its original import. Iterativity, where the speech act is subject to a repetition that exceeds mere repeatability, instead maintains the spirit of the initial utterance while allowing for unique variations engendered by contextual alterations. Together, the two

may be brought to bear on the recorded voices of 9/11 and their imbrication within repetitious use patterns in which their language is cited, either directly or indirectly, ostensibly as a means of making real the horror of the event, but ultimately as a vector for a perpetual inhabitation of the U.S. psyche.

In addition to the Derridean concepts of citation and iterativity, a number of theoretical constructs will be drawn from within the broader field of cultural studies, primarily around ideas of sound/voice and contemporary music studies, new media, and repetition and return. Beginning with sound/voice and contemporary music studies, Jacques Attali's foundational work *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*, Mladen Dolar's equally essential text *A Voice and Nothing More*, and Paul D. Miller (aka DJ Spooky That Subliminal Kid)'s *Rhythm Science* and his edited volume *Sound Unbound: Sampling Digital Music and Culture* will provide crucial theoretical background concerning the political signification of the distinction between music and noise, the relation of the voice to and its separability from the body, and the unmooring and recontextualization of sonic materials through the act of sampling (as facilitated by emerging information technologies), respectively.

For new media, Brian Massumi's *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* and Henry Jenkins' *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide* will provide the platform for a discussion of the presence of the hijacker voice in new media and the inhabitational capacity that such a placement enables, offering discussions of kinetic repetition and its sensory referentiality, as well as the increased involvement of the audience and the swiftly eroding division between the audience and performer, respectively. Finally, in terms of repetition and return, Diana Taylor's *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* and David Wills' *Dorsality: Thinking Back Through Technology and*

Politics will function as jumping off points for an analysis of the manner in which repetition, as enabled by technologies which serve to constantly turn the present to the past as a means of conceptualizing the future, creates unique iterations of the repeated recording such that the voice is not banished as intended, but rather welcomed back with open arms (and ears).

HOW DID I GET HEAR?: ON METHODOLOGY

Of the aforementioned theories and theorists, three in particular will also provide methodological support for the study. First, Derrida's methodological predilection for sampling will serve as a precedent for the implementation of his ideas of citationality and iterativity in a manner that both cites and iterates its theoretical touchstones and critical objects. Given that Derrida appears often in the following chapters, exercising his hauntological imperative by gracing each section with a few choice passages drawn primarily from *Limited Inc* and *Specters of Marx: The State of Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*, and that citationality and iterativity have received attention above, this brief description will suffice in advance of a more thoroughgoing use of his theory. Second, the work of Paul D. Miller (aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid) around notions of sampling will prove instructive here, particularly the recombinant approach he takes to borrowings from different source materials. Given too that Miller appears frequently in the following chapters, primarily in the final chapter of the aural section, which calls on his *Rhythm Science* and the edited volume *Sound Unbound: Sampling Digital Music and Culture*, a brief discussion here precedes a lengthier one later on. In light of the partial, diffuse existence of discussions of sound (the related fields being relatively new, and related scholarship surrounding 9/11 being all but nonexistent), a similar re/assembly is necessary for this project, making not only Derridean citationality (with its focus on de- and recontextualization and their effects of signification) and iterativity (with differential inclusions

of similar source materials bearing out significantly different end results) utterly appropriate methodological decisions, but also the likeminded attention to citationality and iterativity present in Miller's approach to sonic *bricolage*/collage.

William S. Burroughs' cut-up method will serve as a methodological touchstone as well, though in a more figurative sense than suggested by the literal technique of that method, Burroughs participating in spirit in the spectral discussion to follow (as well as in Miller's work, his DJ name [DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid] being drawn from Burroughs' cut-up novel *Nova Express*), and so that method will be discussed at greater length here. It is Burroughs' approach to the source text and what it may reveal when manipulated that is essential here, beginning with its relation to narrativity. Within the cut-ups, specifically the cut-up trilogy of the novels *The Soft Machine* (1961), *The Ticket That Exploded* (1962), and *Nova Express* (1963), Robin Lydenberg notes that "Burroughs' experiments with narrative deny the reader all continuity, even that of a narrative persona" (Lydenberg 48), revoking the potential for an accepted narrative produced by an authority, while also suggesting a discontinuity with any such narratives that preceded the intervention of the cut. In *The Job: Interviews with William S. Burroughs*, Burroughs hypothesizes about a potential response to the discontinuity rendered by the cut: "Suppose I make a recording of the conversation, alter and falsify the recording, and play the altered recording back to the two actors. If my alterations have been skillfully and plausibly applied… the two actors *will remember* the altered recording" (Odier 21), the sort of elisive renarrativization practiced by the inclusion of the hijacker voice within accepted narrativity, though the application is less than skillful and plausible.

This renarrativization, this silencing response to the hijacker voice, indicates a discomfort with that silence, with the voice that does not register in extant rubrics of intelligibility, though,

as Burroughs contends in a different context, "[s]ilence is only frightening to people who are compulsively verbalizing" (23), those who know that they lack the skill to acceptably manipulate narrative materials. The narrative cut, foundational to Burroughs' methodology and representative of the hijackers' intervention, is positioned against what Oliver Harris identifies as "the 'continuity editing' of classical Hollywood film, a system designed to create the illusion of transparency and consistency for the audience's comfort" (Harris 8), the very continuity practiced by filmic renderings of the event. The cut complicates accepted narrativity, repositioning it as a vehicle that may be used to the cutter's own ends, be it Burroughs or the hijackers.

The Burroughsian reader, aligned with the hijacker voice's listener, bears a distinct relation to the text, an active relation where the reader/listener's desire to construct meaning from seeming fragments endows that reader with a degree of complicity with the results. As Timothy S. Murphy observes, "Burroughs could no longer be treated as an author… his writings were no longer *his* but belonged entirely to his readers" (Murphy 103), putting the onus on the reader/listener for whatever the text may yield. Yet, the same author deadened by fixation within the text is subject to revivification at the blade of the cut, where "a cut-up of even the most familiar text will literally reincarnate the voice and creative imagination of the writer" (Lydenberg 49), the blade serving to bring about 9/11 and to bring it back from attempted fixation within accepted narrativity. In opposition to the clampdown of accepted narrativity, "literary use of cut-ups and tapes is quite another matter. It's a question of survival" (Lotringer 155), in Burroughs' words, the cut permitting the author to survive and sever narrativity, and permitting the hijacker voice to do likewise. Confronted with criticism concerning his method, Burroughs states that "[a]nyone can use scissors… but some can use them better than others"

(quoted in Morgan 425), and it is the skilled wielders who dictate the terms of the narrative, inverting accepted narrativity in the process.

Cutting into a text, breaking its connections, serves too to break the narrative linearity and continuity of that text, phrases turning against each other once the spell is broken, pointing to a dark future. Speaking of the potential for uncovering subliminal meanings via the cut, Burroughs suggests that "[y]ou'll find this especially when you cut-up political speeches. Here, quite often, you'll find that some of the real meanings will emerge. And you'll also find that the politician usually means the exact opposite of what he's saying" (Lotringer 262), creating the possibility for an inverted political speech whose real meaning only emerges with the help of the cut. Once loosed, the cut phrase produces "certain formulae, word-locks, which will lock up a whole civilization for thousands of years" (Hertz 148), and the hijacker voice, specifically Mohamed Atta's immortal "we have some planes," similarly entrances the American public to date and beyond. As such, Atta's phrase, which results from the cut, is fed back into narrative machinery by the authority that desires to rehabilitate the accepted narrative, and, in its use of cockpit communication protocol, manages to gum up the works: "[O]ne must give the machine scrambled, cut-up recordings of its own memory/control words and let it fall into a self-destructive feedback loop" (Murphy 135). The machine immobilized, the cut may formalize its intervention, transcending its moment; in Burroughs' words, "[i]f you cut into the present, the future leaks out" (quoted in Murphy 105). It is this future that the hijacker produces, less the one envisioned by accepted narrativity than the one enlistened by extra-accepted narrativity. This study will similarly take the blade to 9/11 films, sound art, and music, loosing the hijacker voice and identifying its extra-accepted narrativizing.

That the 9/11 aural is fragmentary (being spread over a small clutch of recordings across the breadth of the event) necessitates a similarly fragmentary response, one devoted to assembling the fragments and, in the course of that re/assembly, creating juxtapositions that will grant particular insight into the event itself. Through these methodologies, the different voices (both literal [Atta, Jarrah, passenger/building victims] and theoretical [9/11 studies, sound/voice]) may be brought into concert with one another, creating an additional sonority and/or music to complement that already present in the project's chosen objects of analysis. What results is not the prevalent visualizing of problems and solutions, but rather an auralizing of the same, a methodological cacophony of voices that alone, or partially, ring discordantly, but which interact in a more melodic way when critically arranged. Each chapter will take a small number of objects (three films, one documentary, two YouTube shorts, a sound art CD series, and a song, respectively) and, through a consultation of and juxtaposition of the overarching attention to Derridean citationality and iterativity with specific foci on sound/voice and contemporary music studies, new media, and repetition and return, craft an analysis of those particular objects that accords with the overall project of tracing the transition from the use of the visual to the use of the aural in relation to 9/11. Through these methodologies, in combination with the theoretical approaches identified above, the study will produce new knowledges about 9/11 and answer some of the most vexing questions yet unanswered.

PAGES UNDER PAGE: ON CHAPTERS

A brief summary of each chapter will make clear the trajectory of the argument, while also situating the theories and methodologies discussed above in relation to their research objects. The first chapter of the visual section, entitled "The Empire, Miked Back: The Spectral Voice and Flight 93" takes as its objects three accounts of the events aboard United Airlines

Flight 93: *The Flight That Fought Back* (Bruce Goodison, 2005), produced for the Discovery

Channel; *Flight 93* (Peter Markle, 2006), produced for A&E; and *United 93* (Paul Greengrass,

2006), released to theaters. The three films' use of recordings gathered from air traffic control,

the cockpit voice recorder, and cell phone calls from passengers on the plane, meant to

emphasize the pure evil of the hijacker and the pure victimhood of the passenger, serves instead

to deemphasize the visual account of the event and its accepted narrativity in favor of an aural

extra-accepted narrative directed by the now spectral hijacker voice. The chapter examines the

failed efforts made to anchor the acousmatic hijacker voice (spoken without a visual referent) to

his producer, where the voice, which initially registers only as noise to the uncalibrated ear,

instead remains free to roam and to narrativize alternately. This ear, unable to close and thus

unable to defend itself, cannot help but heed the hijacker voice, giving audience to the spectral

hijacker voice. That voice is spectral, exemplifying Derridean hauntology in his presence before,

during, and after the event, and he is always welcomed by the listener who solicits it.

      The second chapter of the visual section, entitled "I See What You're Saying: The

Spectral Voice and the Listening Look," takes as its object a representative selection from the

numerous documentaries about 9/11, *National Geographic: Inside 9/11*. This chapter continues

the analysis of the accepted narrative's failure to reattach the spectral hijacker voice to his

producing body, tracing a progression from the smoother, dramatized narrativity of the Flight 93

films to the more fragmentary narrativity of the 9/11 documentary, whose fractures act as

openings into which the hijacker voice may intervene with his extra-accepted narrative of the

event. Following on the previous chapter's attention to the acousmatic nature of the hijacker

voice, the chapter looks at the properties of the acousmatic hijacker voice that *Inside 9/11*

attempts to reattach to his producing body. The hijacker voice is discussed in terms of relation to

his producing body, a relation that necessitates the inhabitation of another body, that of the listener, if he is to continue to signify. After this inhabitation, the voice is able to ventriloquize the listener, channeling his words through the listener's mouth and drawing attention to the listener's investment in the event.

The third chapter of the visual section, entitled "Step Back (In the Cu[n]t): The Spectral Voice and Oral/Aural Hijackings" takes as its objects two amateur film productions: Hodge-Stansson's "The Long Afternoon" (2007) and Omega Wolf Productions' "Demon Ride" (2008). Both are short pieces made available via YouTube that chronicle carjacking scenarios enacted by a hyperbolic African American thug against a young white SUV driver and a shoddily costumed demon against a young white woman, respectively. This chapter uses David Wills' *Dorsality: Thinking Back Through Technology and Politics* and its formulation of the dorsal as that which comes from behind in the present to dictate the future to articulate a reading of the films in relation to the 9/11 hijackings that they echo, where the films' deemphasizing of the visual in favor of an almost purely aural hijacking suggests the primacy of the aural (in this instance the racialized voice) to an understanding of 9/11. The chapter posits these films as a response to the overtly (yet unsuccessfully) visual renderings of the event present in the Flight 93 films and *Inside 9/11*, a speaking back from the back that indicates a bright future for the aural and a dark day for the visual.

A brief interlude section entitled "Inter/mission" acts as a transition between the visual and aural sections, finalizing the professional to amateur, unitary to fragmentary, and primarily visual to primarily aural progression within the first section as a prelude to the purely aural objects of the aural section. This interlude observes how the hijacker voice, brought back from the dead through the spectral renewal performed by his inclusion in the semi-fictionalized,

documentary, and amateur films, goes forth on his mission of inhabitation, extending himself

outside of his visual birthplace and rendering that visuality irrelevant to event narrativity.

      The first chapter of the aural section, entitled "'Keep Remaining Sitting': The Spectral

Voice and the Repertoire," takes as its object a four volume sound art project by William

Basinski entitled *The Disintegration Loops I-IV*, which consists of a collection of recordings

derived from the repeated playing of decaying orchestral loops committed to aging magnetic

tape, with each repetition causing further fragments of the tape to flake off, eventually

eliminating the sound of the loops. This chapter uses Diana Taylor's *The Archive and the*

Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas and its conceptualization of the

archive, the fixed locus of static memory, and the repertoire, the performed locus of kinetic

memory, as a framework for understanding Basinski's project. In much the same way as the

hijacker voice is included in the accepted narrative and its fixed archivalism as a means of

emphasizing his purported evil and silencing all other views, it seems that Basinski's decaying

loops similarly silence the record of the event. However, as the hijacker voice manages to

transcend his attempted silencing by functioning as an absence-as-presence in the filmic realm,

so too does he transcend in the realm of sound art, the encroaching silence left as the loop decays

representing the extra-accepted narrativity of the hijacker voice, a repertoire where each iteration

of the loop is different, the hijacker voice's silence coming through louder and clearer with every

turn.

      The second chapter of the aural section, entitled "On a Maddening Loop: The Spectral

Voice and its Dis/Integration," takes as its object the song "Fly Me to New York" by aural

collage artists Cassetteboy, which assembles a selection of samples drawn from contemporary

hip hop and Frank Sinatra songs, creating a narrative of 9/11 told from the perspective of one of

the pilot-hijackers and pointing to U.S. culpability for the event. The chapter examines how the decision to base "Fly Me to New York" around samples drawn from Sinatra, a figure of great import to notions of American identity (especially in relation to New York), and the arrangement of those samples into a narrative spoken from the hijacker positionality indicates that the hijacker voice central to the event is also central to U.S. identity after the event. Additionally, the chapter analyzes the act of sampling itself, concluding that its capacity for de- and recontextualization of cited passages from songs allows the sampling individual to create extra-accepted narratives from the assorted rubble of disassembled songs that, in their intervention in the sampled pieces, demonstrate what has been dormant in those pieces all along.

The project ends with the conclusion, entitled "Vox Aeterna," which poses the possibility that hijacker speech represents (or could have represented, in more ideal conditions) a combination of the *parrhesia* discussed in Michel Foucault's *Fearless Speech*, a protected talking back to power, the dead and dying languages of Daniel Heller-Roazen's *Echolalias: On the Forgetting of Language*, and the auditory hallucinations of Ivan Leudar and Philip Thomas' *Voices of Reason, Voices of Insanity: Studies of Verbal Hallucinations*. The hijacker voice is thus a deadening language that remains unaddressed, silenced by the stigma surrounding the heard voice and sanctioned in his advisory capacity, the native speakers disappearing but the traces remaining in the listener.

Though the identified objects of analysis will be given primary attention in this study, counterexamples will be included to provide an understanding of the broader context in which those artifacts are situated. Where the chosen examples offer a particular critical reading of the event, in which narratives of U.S. victimhood are problematized, many of the counterexamples take a different approach to the use of the aural, suggesting hauntings not of potential complicity,

but of an uncanny incommensurability, or perhaps using the hijacker voice to more simplistically

emphasize the severity of the evil at play in place of a more complex reading. Rather than

constituting a deliberately selected and unrepresentative sampling of 9/11 objects, the chosen

items are indicative of trends within the larger field that apply not only within the relatively

circumscribed purview of this study, but also within the overall scope of 9/11 artifacts. As is

apparent in the interactions noted above, the chosen examples and the counterexamples do not

exist in isolation; instead, the chosen examples' use of sound produces an extra-accepted

narrativity in dialogue with the counterexamples. With this necessary interrelation in mind,

counterexamples will be included in each chapter to clarify the dialogue at work and to

demonstrate that the chosen examples would not be operative in isolation.

THE END HAS NO END: ON CONCLUSIONS

The stakes of this study are twofold, encompassing both the fact of the gap produced by

an underexamination of the use of the aural in relation to 9/11, as well as the potentialities within

that use capitalized upon by al Qaeda in this instance and, perhaps, other likeminded actors in the

future. Accounts of 9/11 offered to date contain an overabundance of visual analysis; as

mentioned above, the visual-as-spectacle is by now well-trodden ground and, though a fertile

area for study, is far from the only or even the most informative aspect of 9/11 subject to critical

attention. The accompanying inattention to the aural, an element that evidences the horror of the

event in a more deeply personal manner than any of the extant visual objects (save perhaps for

footage of individuals jumping from the upper floors of the World Trade Center) by making

present the absent hijackers and victims through the recordings and their repetition, ignores the

ways in which that aural is consulted as a means of validating accepted narratives of the event,

and the ways in which those narratives are themselves problematized by the de- and recontextualization of the hijacker voice.

A similar inattention is paid to the potentialities within the aural capitalized upon by al Qaeda, where that aural is able to persist while the visual falls away. Due to its framing within the spectacular, the 9/11 visual (video footage of the planes' impacts, the burning and collapsing towers, and the terrified onlookers, also captured in photographic images) is legion, constituting such an overwhelming body of images that those images eventually fail to signify, to resonate, and collapse into a single "9/11" which is overly familiar and is no longer noticed. However, the 9/11 aural, subject to a more profound scarcity, must be repeated to register and, in the course of that repetition within the context of the semi-fictionalized and documentary, comes to be emblematic of the event (at least a specific narrative of it), though it signifies outside of the intended narrative space. The aural comes to inhabit the U.S. psyche that craves these pseudo-documentary validations of victimhood, exceeding the visual in import and impact. For al Qaeda, and for other potential likeminded actors, the spectacular visual serves only to distract the onlooker/onlistener from the man behind the curtain, speaking softly into the microphone but registering at a much greater volume. This study accounts for the nearly limitless capacity of the use of the aural, tracing its detachment from the visual and cohabitation with/inhabitation of the U.S. psyche, and underlining the power of and potential future for the purely aural hijacking.

For Lynch's Bondar, *no hay banda*, there is no band; for 9/11's hijacker voice, there is no banned, the voice's extraction from the darkness of the box and inclusion in narrative domains seemingly opposed to his signification demonstrating the listener's openness to extra-accepted narrativity in violation of accepted narrativity. Once included in the narrativizing process, there is no telling what the hijacker voice will do, what and who he will tell within accepted

narrativity, necessitating the extra-accepted narrative space and the inhabited listener that the

voice occupies so well.

PART ONE

THE SEEN OF THE CRIME: VISUALIZING THE SPECTRAL VOICE

THE EMPIRE, MIKED BACK: THE SPECTRAL VOICE AND FLIGHT 93

To begin the journey from the visual to the aural, from the picture to the thousand words, from the professional to the amateur, one would do well to start at the origin, unearthing the root of 9/11's portrayal in that most stereotypical of discursive locales, the theatrical or televisual film. The standard trajectory is this: event, reaction, syndication, both in the sense of passing judgment, creating the narrative precedent for an event, as well as the more commercial packaging of that narrative within a filmic space delimited by advertising and oriented toward profit-making. 9/11 is of course not immune to this path, and though its particular gravity perhaps slows the progression from reaction to syndication, all must inevitably be swept aside in the name of "progress." With this in mind, the production and release of a clutch of films in late 2005 and early 2006 serves to put the stamp of official, accepted narrativity upon the event, closing the dialogue opened by the hijackers and putting their unique specter to rest once and for all through a less than appealing characterization. Or so it would seem. Instead, the desire to attain a veracity in the included portrayals leads each of the films to highlight actual communications from the event, both the speech of the hijackers themselves, as captured on air traffic control and cockpit voice recordings, as well as the passengers within United Airlines Flight 93, the sole semi-success story in a day filled with failure upon failure. By including these recordings as a means of pronouncing a final reading of their content, one in which the hijacker is purely evil and the passenger purely victim, the films only serve to render both the hijackers' presence and the passengers' victimhood perpetual, shifting the spectacle to the spectral through a double ventriloquism in which both the victimizing hijacker and the victimized passenger speak through the listener.

Before analyzing the manner in which these voices become spectral, one must first gain a familiarity with the films in question so as to understand their intended use and its unintended ramifications. The first Flight 93 film to appear is *The Flight That Fought Back* (Bruce Goodison, 2005), produced for the Discovery Channel and first aired on 8 September 2005. Using no recognizable actors, the film functions more as a character study, introducing each hijacker and passenger briefly, then focusing on a small selection of those hijackers and passengers based on availability of information and willingness of family members to participate in the project. Each individual portrayal falls into a familiar structural pattern: first, a dramatized passage establishes the individual in context, either in the course of boarding the plane or during flight; second, a voiceover introduces the individual, sharing minor biographical details; third, a testimonial is included from either someone who had an extended encounter with the individual (in the case of pilot-hijacker Ziad Jarrah, the only hijacker to receive such attention [possibly as a function of the limited availability of information on muscle hijackers Saeed al Ghamdi, Ahmed al Nami, and Ahmed al Haznawi]) or, in the case of the passengers, a family member or close friend, especially if that individual received a call from that passenger during the hijacking. Producer Phil Craig notes the striking quality of the recordings, including transmissions from American Airlines Flight 11 pilot-hijacker Mohamed Atta, Jarrah, and a number of crew and passengers (as well as their families), drawn from "interviews with family members, some of whom describe what they heard in actual conversations with people on board the flight… [and] unprecedented access to recordings that have never before been aired on television" (Craig 1). This exclusivity purports to endow the film with a reality that trumps news accounts and the imaginings of potential listeners, while at once foreclosing the potential with the actual.

The Flight That Fought Back's particular account of the hijacking, as the first filmic

screening of the accepted narrative, sets the precedent for narratives to follow, one based in a

deemphasis of the visual not only due to the lack of actual visual recordings of the event (save

for the World Trade Center and, to a lesser degree, the Pentagon impacts[34]), but also due to the

properties of the spectral voice itself (to be discussed below). In the hijacking scenes (the

hijackings of Flight 11, United Airlines Flight 175, and American Airlines Flight 77 included as

context), stock footage of airline-appropriate planes is accompanied by anonymous plane noises

(acceleration/deceleration, altitude changes consistent with those made by the pilot-hijackers),

with no actual portrayal of the hijackings themselves save for that of Flight 93, which is itself

only tangentially portrayed. Rather, the aural is privileged, Captain Jason Dahl's frantic "get out

of here!" captured on air traffic control recordings serving as the primary notice that the

hijacking is underway. This move from the visual is accompanied by a shift from external stock

footage to computer generated imagery of Flight 93's subsequent flight path, the visual no longer

proving adequate to portray the event. Finally, at the conclusion of the film, as the passenger

revolt threatens the sanitary cockpit established by the hijackers, the discussion between Jarrah

and another hijacker, as heard on the cockpit voice recorder,[35] is included, though its very

possibility is immediately qualified by Arne Kruithof, owner of the Florida Flight Training

Center attended by Jarrah, who does not believe Jarrah to have been capable of such a matter of

fact discussion (*The Flight*), rendering the visualization of that speech problematic at best. *The*

---

[34] To date, only a handful of still images have been released capturing American Airlines Flight 77's impact into the Pentagon from the perspective of a surveillance camera placed in a security booth near the perimeter of the building. Though rumors exist of another surveillance tape from a camera on a nearby gas station, no footage has been made public as of this writing, fueling conspiracy theorists to posit either an alternate flight path or, more abstractly, a missile in place of the presumed plane.

[35] These recordings have been withheld from public hearing under the pretense that they might serve as evidence in the trial of potential pilot-hijacker Zacarias Moussaoui, but have been listened to by investigators and family members, with transcripts available to the public ("Flight 93" 1). Though Moussaoui was sentenced in 2006, the recordings have yet to be made available.

Flight That Fought Back sets the tone, appropriately, for an aural reading of the event in its portrayal.

The second Flight 93 film to appear is *Flight 93* (Peter Markle, 2006), produced for A&E and first aired on 30 January 2006. Using more recognizable actors, including Jeffrey Nordling as Tom Burnett, Brennan Elliott as Todd Beamer, Ty Olsson as Mark Bingham, Colin Glazer as Jeremy Glick, and Kendall Cross as Deena Burnett, the film portrays events in the air and on the ground, especially calls between passengers and family members. Where *The Flight That Fought Back* offers a more democratic reading of events, giving at least a modicum of attention to each of the hijackers and passengers, *Flight 93* is more closely focused on the purportedly male-led revolt effort centered around Burnett, Beamer, Bingham, and Glick, a patriarchal hero narrative that underlines many of the questionable gender and sexuality characterizations present in the film.[36] These portrayals are less structural than those in *The Flight That Fought Back*, perhaps as a function of the structure of the film itself: rather than including documentary footage of family member interviews, the family members are portrayed by actors in *Flight 93*, with no accompanying oscillation between real world/present and dramatization, and the recordings are not overtly identified in their use (where *TFTFB* captions them with the words "actual recording" to call attention to them), in many cases seemingly rerecorded or cleaned up to suit the overall sound design of the film. An "About the Movie" section appearing on the film's website maintains the film's basis in "fully annotated facts from the public record… [asserting that] this heart-pounding movie includes the extraordinary communications that took

---

[36] Contrary to the best available accounts, as collected from various communications between family members and passengers, as well as crew and airline authorities, Mark Bingham, a key participant in the official version of the revolt, is effeminized in accordance with his status as an out homosexual, and the female flight attendants are depicted as being overcome by panic to the point that they must be calmed by (male) passengers, rather than being the integral and resourceful (repurposing available materials like the coffee pots to hurl boiling water at the hijackers) part of the revolt that all evidence would dictate.

place between the doomed passengers and their loved ones on the ground" ("*Flight 93*: About" 1), though the nature of that inclusion is less than certain.

      Flight 93's account of the hijacking, following on the precedent set out by *The Flight That Fought Back*, similarly deemphasizes the visual, offering a strangely subdued reading that switches out chaos for quiet. In the hijacking scenes, or rather scene, only Atta's hijacking of Flight 11 receiving any attention beyond the portrayal of Flight 93's hijacking, and in that case only through a rerecording of his initial "we have some planes" missive, the goings on are oddly sedate, the hijackers not rising from their seats with a resounding "Allahu akbar" as in most accounts, sporting red headbands in the process, but rather allowing pilot-hijacker Jarrah to take the lead.[37] The associated violence is downplayed, cockpit entry being gained not by force or overt intimidation, but rather by Jarrah's almost polite directive to a flight attendant to "take us in the cockpit" (*Flight 93*). Again, Dahl's "mayday!" transmission is included, once more serving as first notice that the hijacking is underway, though it will not be fully interpreted as such until Jarrah steps to the mic. The conclusion of the hijacking in the face of the ongoing passenger revolt displays a similar agentifying of Jarrah consistent with the prior inconsistency, with Jarrah asserting that "I need Ahmed and Saeed in here with me" (*Flight 93*), responding to a muscle hijacker's semi-critical question as to what to do next by dispatching him to face the onslaught alone, while Jarrah remains relatively protected in the cockpit. *Flight 93* is therefore doubly aural, the non-identification and potential rerecording of hijacker and passenger communications reformatting the event's aurality for the singular aural experience of the film,

---

[37] That Jarrah should initiate the hijacking is contrary to all other accounts, which focus on his lack of commitment to the plot and his reticence to perform the hijacking itself, choosing to delay the action and perhaps sabotaging its success by waiting until the plane is over forty minutes into its flight, rather than the curt twenty minute interval on Atta's Flight 11.

and the pronouncements of Jarrah formalizing the hijacking, issuing a dual death sentence to the passengers and to the other Ahmed.

The final Flight 93 film to appear is *United 93* (Paul Greengrass, 2006), produced for theatrical release by Universal Studios and opening on 28 April 2006. Using recognizable actors (though not billing them on promotional materials or on eventual DVD release packaging, preferring to highlight the ensemble cast/ "we're all in this together" mentality of the unified revolt), including Christian Clemenson as Tom Burnett, Peter Hermann as Jeremy Glick, and a nearly unrecognizable Olivia Thirlby as Nicole Miller, the film portrays events in the air and on the ground, though events external to the plane are primarily focused on FAA and military response, with communications between passengers and their families being limited to the plane itself. *United 93* offers a similar, if less hyperbolic, reading of the revolt to that appearing in *Flight 93*, with the majority of the attention being paid to purported leaders Jeremy Glick, Todd Beamer and, especially, Tom Burnett, with Mark Bingham being more notable for his late arrival to the boarding gate than anything that happens thereafter. Individual portrayals are more indirect, leaving the viewer (or rather listener) to assemble biographical detail from conversations between passengers and from overheard calls to family members, the aural moving beyond mere supplement to visual detail to take on a role as primary characterizing agent. Director Paul Greengrass points to the significance of the recordings and their use in the film (though only Atta's "we have some planes" appears in the original, the rest being reenacted in the course of the dramatization), saying that "[a]lthough we can only dimly understand what must have happened on that ninety minute flight, we can know from two dozen phone calls and from the 30 minutes of Cockpit Voice recordings that it dramatizes and symbolizes everything

we face today" (Greengrass "Director's" 1), investing the aural with a significance that exceeds the visual.

United 93's account of the hijacking reverses the subdued tack taken by Flight 93 to offer a decidedly louder, more purely aural reading, while simultaneously making the transition from language to pure sound.[38] The hijacking itself is initiated by the hijackers screaming "Allahu akbar!" upon holding one flight attendant and stabbing one passenger, though the screams precede those actions, rendering the aural element prior to and thus the initiator of what follows, with the holding and hewing merely confirming what the shouts suggest. Dahl's "get out of here!" or "mayday!" heard in the first two films is absent here; though the captain and his First Officer Leroy Homer Jr. do lodge their protest at the hijackers' cockpit entry, it falls on the deaf ears of not only the entrants, but also those who pay an entrance fee, with little intelligible speech emerging from the meeting of pilot and pilot-hijacker. Jarrah is significantly less agentic than in Flight 93, delaying the hijacking against the protestations of his fellow hijackers, then remaining in his seat as the hijacking commences, rising only to coerce the flight attendant into issuing the secret knock that will secure cockpit entry and to take his seat after the bloody work is finished. Indeed, as the passenger revolt gathers steam, Jarrah keeps only one of the muscle hijackers in the cockpit with him, leaving two to meet the revolt, one each in the coach and first class cabins. When the passengers arrive at the cockpit door, the consultation between Jarrah and the other hijacker is untranslated, with only the previously heard "Allahu akbar!"

---

[38] Though the scene is almost entirely speculative, and outside of this analysis' direct attention to the aural moments recorded in the hijacked planes' cockpits, it is worth noting that United 93 privileges the aural from the outset. The film opens with hushed, tense Arabic over a black screen, the prayers of the hijackers in their hotel rooms, translated yet only fleetingly attached to its visual referent in the mouths of Ziad Jarrah and his associates. As the prayers continue, the images shift from a hijacker shaving his body hair in ablution to an overhead shot of a city (presumably New York) in the early dawn hours, only returning to Jarrah as the prayers conclude and a fellow hijacker tells him "it's time" (United 93). Despite Greengrass' assertions as to the importance of the visual to his account, it is this aurality, this unsteady referentiality and translation, that characterizes the film.

reappearing to bookend the hijacking action. This lack of translation allows the hijackers' discussions to signify as they did to the passengers, as an incomprehensible language that, at base, comes across as pure sound, the aural being able to commandeer the controls in the enunciative hijacking and, in the clamor that meets it, to counteract that control. *United 93*'s passengers thus take up the aural gauntlet thrown down by the projected speech of the hijackers, an engagement similar to that performed by the listener in the wake of the event.

These three films, as the first to appear following the event (and to date the only three to address Flight 93 exclusively and in a not purely documentary setting), act to concretize the accepted narrative of 9/11 by investing themselves in the reliability and, ultimately, the truth of the Word, symbiotically asserting the importance of the both the event and its speech, though that attempted concretization is far from final. In his *United 93: The Shooting Script*, Greengrass contends that "if you look clearly and unflinchingly at a single event, you can find in its shape something precious, something much larger than the event itself… the DNA of our times. Hence a film about Flight 93" (Greengrass vi), suggesting 9/11's place within the listener's genome, within that national (and perhaps international, Greengrass being himself British) fabric rent by the event. That Greengrass should address the visual, as well as the temporal, is important to note: in calling attention to the former, he asserts the supposed primacy of the visual in the realm of the filmic, overlooking the impactful aurality of his own work; in calling attention to the latter, he attempts to root the event in time, in a times, our times, set in New Roman or stone, codified, done. Instead, as Brian Massumi observes in his *Parables For the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*, one might more aptly "[c]all that substanceless and durationless moment the pure *event*" (Massumi 58), one that does not pass into (and eventually out of) memory, but one which comes to pass, eternally, always already come and never to go, perpetually present in the

movement from visual to aural made by the decision to feature the recordings. The half heard yet overheard event becomes the "haven't you heard?", and yes, you have, and will.

Concern over the exclusivity of these three films, of their potential isolation from a broader field of available Flight 93 filmic depictions, of a disingenuous selectivity that omits valuable counterexamples, is moot given the fact that *The Flight That Fought Back*, *Flight 93*, and *United 93* are the only single subject films concerned with the events of Flight 93. In the search for counterexamples, for alternate readings beyond the one to be offered below, one need only look to the films themselves. What follows is perhaps more aptly placed in the counterexample positionality, given that it constitutes a reading of the films against the established grain of their accepted narrativity. The purpose of the films is to commemorate the sacrifice offered by the one marginal success story of 9/11, chronicling the heroism of the passengers and crew in stopping the hijackers when no other measure of national defense could, while painting the events' perpetrators, the hijackers, in a less than flattering light, and each accomplishes this task to a varying degree upon a superficial viewing. Yet, when one explores the nuances of each film, reading below the surface and against the accepted narrative flow, one uncovers a more ambiguous extra-accepted narrativity of hijacker humanity and aural centrality. With this less superficial/sacrificial accepted narrative displaced by the subficial, unofficial/sacrilegious extra accepted narrativity of the spectral voice, the analysis may begin without qualification.

BLUE, BLUE, ELECTRIC BLUE: FROM H(EYE)JACKING TO HEARJACKING

The move from the visual to the aural does not happen overnight, but rather in-flight, producing at first a synaesthesia in the transitional stage, and then finally a purely aural that, in its resistance of any anchorage, yields terror. Vision is not initially out of the picture, but merely

out of focus, its lines blurred but still somewhat discernable, though rendered so intentionally, as noted by Don Ihde in his foundational study *Listening and Voice: Phenomenologies of Sound*: "A turn to the *auditory dimension* is thus potentially more than a simple changing of variables. It begins as a deliberate decentering of a dominant tradition in order to discover what may be missing as a result of the traditional double reduction of vision as the main variable and metaphor" (Ihde 13). Moving to the auditory acts to fill in the gaps, to unplug the ears while shutting the eyes, taking the filmic emulsion and reflexively emulsifying it to produce a fluid of a different source, the slippery voice whose intentional use often fails to align with reality. While in this transitional stage, the liminal space between eye and ear, somewhere around the temple there emerges a synaesthesia, a coterminous end shared by the sight and sound that ends the former in tending to and towards the latter. Ihde elsewhere asserts that "I do not merely hear with my *ears*, *I hear* with my whole body. My ears are at best the *focal* organs of hearing" (44), suggesting that, in the synaesthetic sense, sight-as-sense makes sense as hearing: one hears with one's eyes just as one sees with one's ears.

This liminality does not persist for long, the visual soon giving way to the aural, but before it goes, before the sighted becomes the cited, visions of a new world appear, though less visions than omens or aumens, an aural auguring that cleans out the wax to welcome the waxing of the Word. In his commentary track for *United 93*, Greengrass expresses his desire to "create a film that would allow our audience to walk through 9/11 at eye level" (*United 93*), seemingly privileging the eye and its associated viewer as the intentional audience for the film. Yet, Greengrass' hypothetical eye is more aptly characterized as synaesthetic given the prevalence and importance of the aural to the film, leveling the eye and the ear at the bidding of Atta's words and their leveling of the North Tower of the World Trade Center, with Greengrass' own

inclusion of the word "audience" underlining the importance of audition to the event and the film. Greengrass' 9/11, the result of his efforts to address the event as a genetic contribution, functions therefore as address, an appeal to the world in the event and of its creation that "makes audible the new world that will gradually become visible" (Attali 11), as posited by Jacques Attali in his notable contribution to the field of sound studies *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*. As the eye hears, so too does the ear hie, moving quickly into the aural future and leaving the visual past behind.

Greengrass' eyewitness, the audience member-as-viewer who makes his mono-leveled walk with no mind to leveling, cedes the floor to a different sort of witnessing, one freed from eye level and resistant to attempts to tie it back down. Avital Ronell's thorough study of a particular version of the aural in *The Telephone Book: Technology – Schizophrenia – Electric Speech* positions the telephone "as a narrator [and] earwitness" (Ronell 132), and it is this mediated aurality (as rendered through the air traffic control, cockpit voice, and cell phone recordings captured in the course of the event), this earwitnessing, that results from the shift from the visual to the aural. It is thus the ear that registers, noting the notes in the aural register and withdrawing the evidentiary visual in favor of more pleasing quarters in the aural, thereby mobilizing event narrativity from the accepted realm and letting that mobility roll.[39] Rather than clinging to their objects, their producing bodies and the images thereof captured in the film, the voices present in the event, be they those of the hijackers or the passengers, are mobile, recombinant, capable of producing new narrativities in new arrangements and contexts. In his discussion of sonic spatiality in "On Sound Atmospheres," Gabor Csepregi contends that

---

[39] That the aural should roll on in this manner is fitting, given that the primary aural relic held in the aftermath of the event, other than Atta's "we have some planes," is Todd Beamer's "let's roll," spoken to GTE customer service supervisor Lisa Jefferson just prior to the beginning of the passenger revolt (Longman 203-4).

"[s]ounds… detach themselves from their source and pursue us. We are able to turn away from visible objects, but unable to preserve a distance between ourselves and the sounds" (Csepregi 172), noting both the mobility of the aural as well as its inhabitational tendencies (to be discussed below). Instead of clinging, the aural clangs, making itself known separate from the visual, despite thoroughgoing attempts to reattach the two.

The insistence on the visual present in Greengrass and beyond as a means of grounding the aural, confining it to its place without any particular logic (other than the "because I said so," itself an aural performative of the sort enacted by Atta [to be discussed below as well]), motivates efforts towards anchorage, a freezing of aural mobility in favor of visual stability, though that visuality is less stable than expected. Stabilizing the aural within the filmic, especially the hijacker and passenger voices within the screened 9/11, is a problematic venture, as concluded more generally by Michel Chion in his *Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen*, one of a handful of essential texts in a strangely underexamined area of filmic sound design. Chion identifies the phenomenon of "[s]*ynchresis*… the spontaneous and irresistible weld produced between a particular auditory phenomenon and visual phenomenon when they occur at the same time" (Chion 63), the very sort of weld that the Flight 93 films attempt to create between the aural referent and its visual accompaniment. By juxtaposing the visual and the aural in this manner, the films hope to root the voice in the visual, preventing its further dissemination in other venues; however, their own use of the aural is unstable at best, linkages between Attan speech and the visual being nigh upon non-existent, and those between Jarrahan speech and passenger speech and the visual being similarly incomplete and unconvincing. At this point the anchor scrapes, catching bottom occasionally, with the visual later to impact among the rocks thereabouts.

Such a linkage between the visual and the aural suggests a particular dynamic between the two, where the visual is not only the privileged partner, but is merely ornamented by sound; instead, the visual is alienated by sound, the aural becoming multiple and, in its multiplicity, terrifying. Alongside his identification of synchresis, Chion also creates the notion of "added value… the expressive and informative value with which a sound enriches a given image so as to create the definite impression, in the immediate or remembered experience one has of it, that this information or expression 'naturally' come from what is seen, and is already contained in the image itself" (5). Within this added value, the aural is but a compliment to the visual, words of flattery cooed in the visual's synaesthetic ear, less a co-dependent relationship than a full-on dependency, a naturalization of the visual-aural link that seems to render the two inseparable, neither divorce nor annulment interceding. Further on, Chion complicates this relation, discussing "audiovisual counterpoint… [which] implies an 'auditory voice' perceived horizontally in tandem with the visual track, a voice that possesses its own formal individuality" (36), an understanding of the aural-visual dynamic much closer to that present in the Flight 93 films. The aural is indeed individual, the product of the singular event and the singular hijacker (Atta or Jarrah) or the singulated passenger, those singularities combining into unitary multiples that demonstrate the terror inherent to aurality.

Though a product of the singular actor, the speaker/actor of the filmic realm, the aural of the Flight 93 films is multiple, legion, foreign in its intended terror. Greengrass remarks upon the aural design aspects of his film, where much attention is given to "texture of sound so you can hear many conversations" (*United 93*), referring to the conversations between hijackers, between passengers and family members, between air traffic control, the FAA, and the military, and between passengers in the course of planning the revolt, an overlapping confluence of

singular narrativities that combine to fragment accepted narrativity into a number of micronarratives, each catching a piece of the event in its throat. It is the hijacker that initiates this din, and it is the hijacker that dictates its direction, each aural action constituting a reaction to the constitutive enactment of Atta's "we have some planes." That these are the terms on which the event will be negotiated is apparent to one passenger in *The Flight That Fought Back*, Honor Elizabeth Wainio (played by Suzanna Sanchez) who, while talking to her stepmother, thinks "I should be talking… I'm sitting here quiet. I should be talking" (*The Flight*), demonstrating that if it is the aural which landed the passengers in this predicament, it is again the aural that may allow them to land safely. To be freed from subjection to the aural, the passengers must engage the aural, though such an engagement requires bearing up to the inherent terror, as identified by Marshall McLuhan: "Terror is the normal state of any oral society for in it everything affects everything all the time" (quoted in Schaefer 9). In the wake of the shift from the visual to the aural, the passengers necessarily tackle this all-encompassing terror that delimits their world more so than the walls of the plane's cabin, though the films' likeminded attention is less successful, treating as noise that which signifies beyond its wildest nightmares.

Engagement with the aural, whether it be the specifically comprehensible voice of the passenger (as couched within accepted narrativity and its victimhood orientation) or the pure sonics of the purportedly incomprehensible hijacker voice-as-sound,[40] is not so much voluntary as automatic, the seeming noise of the hijacker voice-as-sound dissipating into the voice itself, which emerges from the surrounding dissonance to relate his own narrative of change. Relating the filmic narrative without its visual aspect is not a possibility within that realm, the film

---

[40] Even in its pure sonics, the hijacker voice refers, enacting a Malkovichian linguistics (recalling *Being John Malkovich* [Spike Jonze, 1999] and its inclusion of a scene featuring an entire conversation consisting of the word/name "Malkovich") in which the unfamiliar grammar of Arabic, seemingly sound only to the non-speaker/listener, translates, an endless string of "Terror terror terror. Terror terror?"

without vision being more akin to a radio play; instead, audio-visual counterpoint includes the

visual so as to fulfill the criteria of the filmic, while simultaneously allowing the hijacker to play

the cockpit communication apparatus, with the latter coming into stark relief when the listener

closes her/his eyes. While the eyes can indeed be closed, the ears cannot, and Ihde rightly notes

"this lack of control over auditory presence and the invasion of my very self" (Ihde 212),

emphasizing the significance of the aural as an inhabitational entity. Still, at this point, the

hijacker voice is pure sound, untranslated, his linguistics and particular meaning irrelevant to

accepted narrativity save for the "terrorterrorterror" refrain, only noise.

  With the always already open ear comes the always already open mind, or the mind

prised open, initially against its will, inhabited, its attention grabbed through the presence of

seeming noise, though that noise speaks less to a present bother than to one omnipresent,

eternally present and with a gift to give to the (un)willing receiver. Ronell speaks to this

initiatory noise, offering a highly relevant quote from Friedrich Nietzsche that reflects the

pedagogical extra-accepted narrativizing of the hijacker voice: "Even so, a man who teaches

must at times grow noisy. In fact, he may have to scream and scream" (quoted in Ronell 27).

The hijacker voice is thereby a teacher, doling out a lesson to the dilated pupil, broadening his

audience through his inclusion in pablum like the Flight 93 films, sounding his pseudo-barbaric

yawp across the airwaves, provoking the counter-pedagogical efforts of the revolting passengers

who are yet dunces, stooled in the corner while the teacher continues his lecture. Passengers

scream and, as proxy passengers, just along for the ride, the listener screams too, speaking either

the hijacker's noise or the passenger's responsive noise. This noise, this hijacker voice is less

static that may be tuned out to allow the signal of accepted narrativity to ring with greater clarity

than a fanfare, "a herald, for change is inscribed in noise faster than it transforms society" (Attali

5), a washed out horn[41] rinsing the ears of the listener, caressing the canal as he canalizes a new, more fluid narrativity.

That the hijacker voice should first register as noise or, more aptly, be characterized as such suggests only that the event does not check with existing grammars, punctuates incorrectly, though that noise is not noise but voice, or rather voices, at once multifunctional, multidirectional, and commercial. In his "Breaking the Sound Barrier," Peter Bailey discusses noise as that which resides outside of generally understood sound, identifying "three socially defined types of noise: noise as merriment; noise as embarrassment; noise as terror" (Bailey 24), all of which pertain to the hijacker voice-as-noise. First, the voice, as included in the event and its rehearsal in the Flight 93 films (each being a return of the hearse, a post mortem that reposts the mortems of the event), is an expression of merriment on the part of the hijackers, an initial joy in the forthcoming martyrdom and a subsequent elation at a similarly forthcoming inhabitation. Second, the voice is an embarrassment to the pseudo-victim of accepted narrativity, initially in his evasion of national security measures, and subsequently in his inhabitation of the national psyche by way of accepted narrative objects. Third, the voice is terror, says terror over and over, though he is himself never over, always under the radar and holding the listener under his spell, both in the initial immobility of the passengers and the national security apparatus, as well as the subsequent iconic status of Atta's "we have some planes."

Attali too arrives at additional functions and directions for the hijacker voice-as-noise, adding an element of commerce to the mix, though he misses the mark in his assertions regarding the effects of repetition. Referring more specifically to music's capacity for social

---

[41] The "washed out horn" recalls Bob Dylan's "I Want You" from 1966's *Blonde on Blonde*, where "the cracked bells and washed-out horns / blow into my face with scorn / but it's not that way / I wasn't born to lose you," with the listener-narrator concluding "I want you, I want you / I want you so bad" (Dylan), suggesting the listener's solicitation of the hijacker voice-as-seeming noise (to be discussed below).

control (though still addressing the broader characteristics of noise), Attali notes "the three dimensions of all human works: joy for the creator, use-value for the listener, and exchange-value for the seller" (Attali 9). Again, the hijacker voice-as-noise fits the bill, existing as the ecstatic speech of the martyr, as reinforcement for both the accepted narrativity and the inhabitation of the (used) listener, and as a selling point for the Flight 93 films that include him as part of their narratives. Within these films, the voice is subject to repetition in the simple fact of mass production and dissemination via television and theater screening and home viewing. Where Attali asserts that "[r]epetition produces information free of noise" (106) as part of "a question of Silencing – through direct, channeled control, through imposed silence instead of persuasion" (122), the Flight 93 films instead serve to free the voice from his contextualization within the field of noise, not so much a silencing as an amplification that grows with each repetition of the hijacker's words and their accompanying extra-accepted narrativity.

This extra-accepted narrativity counteracts the accepted narrativity of the event that is the intent of the Flight 93 films, diverting the intended focus on the visual focal through a punctuative intervention of the aural. Greengrass directly addresses his narrative efforts in his commentary track, asserting his aim as "try[ing] to tell the story as honestly… as we could… [to] erect a believable truth" (*United 93*), at once striving for a credible, acceptable narrative while remarking upon the instability of that narrative, its content being less automatic than constructed. The import of that narrative creation, as provided by the Flight 93 films, is equally apparent to Greengrass, who identifies 9/11 more generally and, by implication, Flight 93 more specifically as "the most important event in our lifetime; everything that's happened stems from it" (*United 93*). By placing the event so centrally, as the apex of the generational life narrative, as the root of all to follow, Greengrass grants 9/11 and Flight 93 an omnipresence, an always already

happening and never not to happen that endows the hijacker voice at its foundation with a similar perpetuity, extending the admittedly provisional accepted narrative and the extra-accepted narrative in one stroke. Therefore, decisions made in the course of setting out the accepted narrative refer to the extra-accepted narrative as well, concretizing narrative intercessions like the Flight 93 films being met by a critical dissection of inhabited referentialities.[42]

Moving away from Greengrass' attempts to lodge the narrative of 9/11 and Flight 93, accepted or otherwise, within the realm of the filmic and as the focal point of the generation, the hijacker voice instead offers a critical intercession that makes use of his positionality outside of the main focus, revealing that to be faux and installing a more aural focus. Chion examines the phenomenon of punctuative sound in film, conceptualizing it as a "means of punctuating scenes without putting a strain on the acting or the editing. The barking of a dog offscreen, a grandfather clock ringing on the set, or a nearby piano are unobtrusive ways to emphasize a word, scan a dialogue, close a scene" (Chion 49). The hijacker voice functions similarly in the Flight 93 films, punctuating the accepted narrative without signifying as anything other than "terrorterrorterror" and unobtrusively ornamenting the image, though in reality puncturing that narrative and creating a caesura within it, an opening for the extra-accepted narrative to intercede. Though the hijacker voice is defocalized in the emphasis on the visual within the accepted narrativity of the Flight 93 filmic, as well as overwhelming attention to the passenger voice (though that voice does not operate independently of the hijacker voice, and would indeed be of little interest if the hijacker voice did not initiate the dialogue, the passenger voice instead

---

[42] A fine example of this critical auto-dissection is the decision to have Kiefer Sutherland narrate *The Flight That Fought Back*. Though ostensibly a move based on his authoritative speaking voice, Sutherland cannot be divorced from his role as counterterrorism Agent Jack Bauer in the hit television series *24* (which begins in late 2001), whose own problematic relation to post-9/11 issues like torture points to the inhabitation by and implementation of tactics ascribed to the hijacker/ "terrorist" enemy.

being inhabited by accepting the terms set out by the hijacker voice), he yet exists as Murray Schaefer's keynote, "the anchor or fundamental tone… although the material may modulate around it, often obscuring its importance, it is in reference to this point that everything else takes on special meaning" (Schaefer 7). The visual may swirl, casting a singular veil over the multiple narrativities at play in the event, but the ear remains tuned to the keynote, the hijacker voice emerging from the primordial noise to take his place at the heart of the accepted narrative object.

The hijacker voice arises from the event, paradoxically rising in volume as his producing body dies out, fragments settling in the ruins yielding unsettling fragments that ruin accepted narrativity and undermine the intent of their inclusion within the Flight 93 films. Sherry Simon's analysis of unexpected recurrence in her "Accidental Voices: The Return of the Countertenor" addresses the origin of the unsettling: "No longer a representation of character but an 'accidental thing,' the voice takes on a life of its own" (Simon 111). This accidental thing, this thing produced by the seeming accident (at least until United 175 arrives[43]), is the hijacker voice, his loosing from the now loosened body leaving him nothing left to lose, intentionally included but with an intent all his own. The voice seems accidental, though he speaks deliberately, a labored speech labored over so as to circumvent the discomfort that might threaten his inclusion-as-threat, bowing to protocol in a manner that responds to a concern present in Ihde: "Shock occurs as an *absence* of familiar words, and talk may be needed afterward as a therapy of recovery" (Ihde 160). By using the somnambulant communication protocols in his addresses to the passengers, assuring them that their demands are being met and that they are returning to the airport, the hijacker voice walks the line between comfort and chaos, his accidental voicing to air

---

[43] Prior to the arrival of United Airlines Flight 175 into the south face of the South Tower at 9:03am, it is still conceivable, if somewhat unbelievable, that Flight 11's impact with the north face of the North Tower is the result of an accident, of a mechanical failure or pilot error, rather than the intentional act of the erroneous, unapproved pilot (-hijacker), Mohamed Atta. Once Flight 175 arrives, those illusions are disabused.

traffic control channels rendering the voice-as-accident as well as the voice-of-accident, a simple misunderstanding to be swiftly rectified, though the accepted narrative's attempts to do so fail utterly.

By positioning the hijacker voice peripherally, at the edge of vision, at the synaesthetic cheek, the cheek of the voice's message is not understood and, through this lack of understanding, the voice's inclusion in the accepted narrative functions in a far different manner than intended. Chion observes this peripheral voice in film, calling it "[e]manation speech… speech which is not necessarily heard and understood fully, and in any case is not intimately tied to the heart of what might be called the narrative action" (Chion 177), and the hijacker voice matches this description, his inclusion being premised upon a mis-audition, the voice missing the audition for "pure evil" and instead being more aptly cast as "inhabitor." Lack of understanding does little to inhibit the inhabitation that follows on the voice's inclusion in the accepted narrative, his position at the edge of the visual coming to edge out the visual. Jacques Derrida similarly notes the differential relation of intended use and inhabited use in *Limited Inc*, suggesting that "it is *possible* for X to function under certain conditions (for instance, a mark in the absence or partial absence of intention)" (Derrida 57), with the user's intent, that of the Flight 93 filmmakers, being either partially or wholly absent once vacated by the inhabitation, allowing for a variable functionality of the variable x (the 9/11 narrative) as extra-accepted. The hijacker voice is therefore included to the accepted narrative's disinclusion, his initial attraction proving repulsive in short order.

What is it about the hijacker voice that makes him so alluring, that necessitates the inclusion of his recordings within accepted narrativity, that grabs the ear of the passenger and the listener so much so as to allow for inhabitation? As the camera gravitates towards certain

individuals, so too does the ear and its prostheses (the microphone and recorder), through what

Chion terms "phonogeny… the rather mysterious propensity of certain voices to sound good

when recorded and played over loudspeakers, to inscribe themselves in the record grooves better

than other voices, in short to make up for the absence of the sound's real source by means of

another kind of presence specific to the medium" (Chion 101). Both Atta's and Jarrah's voices

are phonogenic, possessing the aural genes to match Greengrass' generationality, though these

catchy voices are not rendered without a catch, remaining caught in the throat of the

ventriloquized listener desperately trying to regurgitate the accepted narrative. Chion elsewhere

examines materializing sound indices (MSIs), which "frequently consist of *unevenness* in the

course of a sound that denote[s] a resistance, breach, or hitch in the movement or the mechanical

process producing the sound… [and which] might also consist of the presence of breathing noise,

mouth and throat sounds, but also any changes in timbre" (115). These MSIs are present in the

phonogenic hijacker voice, his breach of accepted narrativity ensuring that that narrative goes off

with a hitch, his particular timbre reflecting the true intent of the speech beneath its veneer of

protocol. The catchy voice, now caught in the throat, loses that throat as he is himself loosed,

though this seeming silence only serves to extend his reach and volume.

First production of the hijacker voice does require an embodied throat, a visceral

apparatus whose own inevitable decay is not matched by a similar decay of the voice itself,

which is instead amplified exponentially through inclusion in the accepted narrative. The glottis

stopped upon impact yields the glottal stop, the interrupted airway that interrupts via the

airwaves, the voice living to fight another day, and another, and another. David Appelbaum

demonstrates this post-throated, disembodied voice in his *Jacques Derrida's Ghost: A*

Conjuration, speaking of "voice without the breath. Without the vowel. A voicing in which

respiration cannot provide for the voice box, the larynx and vocal cords, the tongue and the mouth" (Appelbaum 65), the voice removed and at a remove from its fleshy forbear, glotally stopped but always already started, sounding continuously without a sound. Appelbaum goes on to contend that "[e]very utterance thus avoids saying because it is said in a voice that puts telling the primal encounter on mute. *To be turned up later*" (95), the voice produced in the halting of breath and, seemingly, sound, the moot (by virtue of its status as ornament to the image) and mute voice instead turning up, and being turned up, in the later of the Flight 93 films. The voice's inclusion in the accepted narrative only emphasizes this amplification.

The hijacker voice's inclusion within the accepted narrative is premised upon the ability of the recordings to support a characterization of the hijacker as pure evil, though that desired emphasis is turned back upon the emphasizer, revealing a different truth than that which is intended upon initial inclusion. Attali discusses by way of the pacifying effects of harmony the phenomenon in which a differing aurality is included so as to foreclose its difference, stating that "*the less of one it has, the more it must say it has one*" (Attali 60), suggesting that the filmmakers are aware of the aharmonic discord between accepted narrativity and the extra-accepted narrativity of the hijacker voice and, with a mind to squelching that alternate narrativity, choose to include the hijacker voice as a means of balancing out and suppressing his message. By engaging the hijacker voice, the filmmaker-as-listener is itself engaged, her/his own voice subject to inhabitation; as Georgina Kleege concludes in her analysis of readers of books on tape in her "Voices in My Head," the reader-listener becomes "engaged, engrossed. They want to know what happens, how the story plays out" (Kleege 100), an investment in the hijacker voice that demonstrates the depth of his inhabitation and ventriloquism. The emphasis thus shifts from the initial emphasis, the filmmaker-listener's drawing attention to the hijacker voice as a means

of asserting his evil, to the emphasizer, the filmmaker-listener's involvement in and imbibing of the hijacker voice.

As the emphasis shifts, the ventriloquizing hijacker voice seems unreal to the ventriloquized listener, though failed attempts at harmonizing the dissonant voices serve only to produce an alternate truth, that of extra-accepted narrativity. At first, the new voice inside the listener's head seems schizophrenic, decidedly other, internal but not internal to the listener her/himself, what Ihde identifies as an auditory hallucination, "not a matter of hearing one thing as something else but a matter of a doubled sound, a synthesized *harmonic echo*" (Ihde 132). The hijacker voice and his extra-accepted narrativity is briefly overlaid upon the listener's nascent accepted narrativity, yielding a doubled voice, a provisionally harmonized and harmonizing echo that veils not only the jarring tunelessness of their relation, but also the eventual triumph of the hijacker voice by virtue of his perpetuation within the accepted narrative, which is but a host for the star hijacker. For Greengrass, "the truth is all on tape" (Greengrass 106), and indeed the truth does reside in the recordings and the manner in which they are used, the attempted harmonization of the doubled voice giving way to the out of tune hijacker voice which in turn speaks out of turn, out of himself and into the listener, offscreen and unseen.

SETTING THE UNSEEN: AURATIC, ACOUSMATIC, PHATIC

Through the audio-visual counterpoint of partial hijacking image and hijacker voice used in the Flight 93 films, the relation between the hijacker visual and the hijacker aural becomes tenuous, the voice seeming to come from off-screen as a means of offing the screen, decentering the visual in favor of an otocentric narrativity that again resists anchorage in the accepted

narrativity of the visual. Chion follows on Pierre Schaeffer[44] in his articulation of the acousmatic

"as a situation wherein one hears the sound without seeing its cause… [and which] draws our

attention to sound traits normally hidden from us by the simultaneous sight of the causes –

hidden because this sight reinforces the perception of certain elements of the sound and obscures

others" (Chion 32). The hijacker voice is similarly acousmatic, being invisible in the course of

the actual event[45] and only provisional after the event, as reflected in the incomplete

visualization of that voice in the films.

This acousmatic voice is "neither inside nor outside the image. It is not inside, because

the image of the voice's source – the body, the mouth – is not included. Nor is it outside, since it

is not clearly positioned offscreen in an imaginary 'wing'… and it is implicated in the action,

constantly about to be a part of it" (129), a characterization consistent with the hijacker voice's

nearly complete separation from visual speech (the speechifying mouth rarely being portrayed,

especially in *The Flight That Fought Back* and *Flight 93*) and his position not in the wings, but in

control of the wings, almost part of the filmic visual yet separate from it. Such a voice holds

certain powers as well: "First, the acousmêtre has the power of *seeing all*; second, the power of

omniscience; and third, the *omnipotence* to act on the situation. Let us add that in many cases

there is also a gift of *ubiquity*" (129-30). The hijacker voice is similarly panoptic, or rather

panotic, able to hear all without being heard, omniscient in his foreknowledge of the fate he

shares with the passengers, omnipotent in his control over the situation and, to a lesser degree,

---

[44] Pierre Schaeffer (1910-1995) was a French composer and engineer most frequently associated with the creation of *musique concrète*, an electro-acoustic music composed of non-traditional sonic elements drawn from naturally occurring sounds. Schaeffer had and has a significant influence on Chion's work.
[45] This invisibility results from the fact that the hijackers' identities are not know until after the impacts, precluding the possibility of matching the voice to an ID photo, and no video footage from within the planes exists in the moment of speech (though Atta does appear on surveillance cameras at Portland International Jetport in Maine earlier that morning).

his eventual usage, and ubiquitous in the proliferation facilitated by inclusion in accepted narrativity.

Despite efforts to capture the acousmatic hijacker voice, to replant him within the visuality of the accepted narrative, that voice does not take, instead taking the opportunity to indirectly dictate the terms of the discourse that follows, to narrativize in an extra-accepted manner that signs as it assigns, tasking the listener with inhabitory repetition. Chion notes that the acousmatic voice "can be instantly dispossessed of its mysterious powers… when it is *de-acousmatized*, when the film reveals the face that is the source of the voice" (130), and it is this sort of de-acousmatization that the Flight 93 films attempt, though their efforts towards fixity do little to temper the reproductive capacity of the hijacker voice. *United 93* depicts this process in its first iteration, when the air traffic control tapes are pulled for further audio analysis after Atta's transmissions, with a mind to determining not only what Atta says, but also more specifically whether he speaks in the singular or plural. The tape is played, stopped, hand spun forwards and backwards, the return sounding like a turntablist's scratch, though the tables are turned when the listener concludes, after hearing "plaaannneess" in slow distortion, "it's, uh, planes… PLANES. Plural, yeah" (*United 93*), the redoubled capture on the tape and in the cited passage resulting in the capture of multiple planes beyond Atta's Flight 11. Speaking of the live simulation of phone calls in the FAA and ATC/military scenes, Greengrass identifies "people off camera, sending in messages, driving the action" (*United 93*), and it is the hijacker voice that does the driving, assuming the captain's seat, though the fearful trip is never done.[46]

---

[46] Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* addresses the captain in "O Captain! My Captain!" and, in its attention to a national tragedy of another sort (the death of Abraham Lincoln), the elimination of a national symbol, after which "our fearful trip is done" (Whitman 467), notes that "[m]y captain does not answer, his lips are pale and still" (467), though those of Atta and Jarrah are anything but, their person stilled but their personae more resilient still. This poem also features prominently in *Dead Poets Society* (Peter Weir, 1989), where another instance of perceived

The attempted visualization of the acousmatic hijacker voice continues, with Greengrass' identification of the off-camera speaker-as-action driver being mimicked in an attempted assignation to the speaking individual, though that assignation is unsuccessful in its failure to account for the auratic properties of the hijacker voice. Chion identifies "a point of audition… [that] can have two meanings, not necessarily related: 1. A spatial sense: from where do I hear, from what point in the space represented on the screen or on the soundtrack? 2. A subjective sense: which character, at a given moment of the story, is (apparently) hearing what I hear?" (Chion 90), and the hijacker voice is subjected to an attempted pinning to a point of audition in his potential relocation back into the speaking body and the limited ear of the passenger or air traffic controller. In *The Flight That Fought Back*, Atta's "we have some planes" is played while a head shot of Atta fills the frame in a linkage to the no longer relevant producing body, a relocation in the individual that tries to counteract the relocated, inhabited individual listener. Jarrah's words are overlaid in type on images of the passengers, with only a small portion of his speech being visualized by the dramatized Jarrah, whose visual lips pronounce "please remain quiet" and nothing more, the linkage to the visual voice being discarded in favor of the first inhabited (*The Flight*). This non-visual acousmatics acts as what Chion calls "*spatial magnetization*… [w]hen we perceive a sound as being offscreen or located at screen right this is a psychological phenomenon" (Chion 70), with the filmic listener following the voice offscreen and away from visual accepted narrativity.

Rather, the acousmatic voice is excessive, exceeds the frame, unframed and unclaimed but claiming those he will inhabit, extending his aura beyond the bounds of accepted narrativity into the extra-accepted. Ihde observes "an auditory 'halo' or the *auditory aura*… [where] [t]he

---

ventriloquism, the manipulation of young minds by teacher Mr. Keating (as charged by a grieving parent) leads to a grisly suicide act.

other, when speaking in sonorous speech, presents himself as 'more' than something fixed, 'more' than a outline-body, as a 'presence' who is most strongly present when standing face to face" (Ihde 70), with the hijacker voice possessing a similar aura by virtue of his sonority, his non-fixity within the producing body, his spectral (omni)presence, though the face to face gives way to the mouth to ear. Even in the moments when visual assignation is attempted, be it to Atta or Jarrah, the voice exceeds, permeating the air around the speaker and speaking beyond his initial signification. For Appelbaum, this spectral voice "lacks a narrow broadcast band, acoustically focused and free of interference; it rather has an acoustical aura" (Appelbaum 27), in much the same way as the hijacker voice overloads the bandwidth provided by the cockpit communication apparatus, his speech impossible to contain in the cabin, requiring and acquiring a broader audience (though the audience seeks him out as well) that registers first as interference, static, and thereafter interferes in accepted narrativity.

As the spectral hijacker voice seeks, listening for a host, so too does the listener advertise her/his hosting services, searching out the hijacker voice and including him within accepted narrativity in an effort to reinforce its tenuous characterization of the hijacker as pure evil, listening variously but always reaching the same conclusion in the concluded act and occluded accepted narrative. In his "The Indefensible Ear: A History," Hillel Schwartz asserts that "the human ear is an active agent in its own right, not simply a well-tempered receiver" (Schwartz 487), making the heard less a passive event than a made pass, a solicitation of sound that implicates the listener in the content of that sound. When confronting a partial sound, the ear exercises its agentic status by acting as "what Cubists might have called a *collagiste*, what Dadaists might have called a collector of fragments, doing what it must to welcome simultaneous caterwauling universes of sound" (488), reassembling the hijacker voice from his fragmentation

in various recordings and the fragmentation of his producing body and doing so in a manner consistent with the necessary welcoming endemic to the uncloseable ear. This is true in the case of the specific event as well, where available data are pieced together to provide an understanding of the event in progress, as is the case immediately following the Flight 11 hijacking depicted in the Flight 93 films. *The Flight That Fought Back* states that "those in coach class cannot see what is happening" as the hijacking progresses (*The Flight*), suggesting the failure of vision and the primacy of the aural in discerning the event, and *Flight 93* includes a portion of a call from flight attendant Amy Sweeney, where she relates that "people in coach still think it's an emergency" (*Flight 93*). Within extant rubrics of understanding, such noise from first class can only be a medical emergency, the ear thus participating in a narrativization of the event in progress that is complicit with the hijackers' aim of maintaining a docile passenger.

The active ear suffers for its agency, undergoing damage as it itself soon damages after inhabitation, its listening producing a speech that talks back. Schwartz focuses on tinnitus which, "[a]lthough ancient… was a malady newly and closely associated with a modern world in which each personal engagement was a sonic engagement and in which noise itself, however idiosyncratically defined, was privately as well as publicly inescapable" (Schwartz 493). Atta and Jarrah's hijacker voice functions similarly, existing as a sustained ringing in the ear that results from an initially personal engagement with the crew and the passengers, one first read as noise, and later inescapable through his inclusion in the accepted narrative. This ringing is the meeting of the ancient malady, the grudge held dating back to the Crusades, and the modern, the supposedly backward hijacker voice doubling back in flight and in ear, coming from behind to leave behind a token of its visit. Positing ideas for means of motivating anti-noise legislation, Schwartz argues against the passive ear, turning first to "bad vibrations," and then forwarding

"talk about the ear as an organ that fights back" (499-500), the inhabited ear first highly vulnerable to hearing the hijacker voice due to its non-closure, then vulnerizing[47] in its hold on the bad vibrations,[48] striking back against the listener from within.

Spoken with a relative softness, the hijacker voice is paradoxically mannered in his lack of manners (pushing his way to the front), his intended audience exploding beyond the screen even before his explosion. In his "The Proxemics of the Mediated Voice," Arnt Maasø coins the term "*intended earshot… to describe the primary earshot signaled by the volume of the voice*" (Maasø 41), referring to the potential range of a given voice, and in the case of the hijacker voice, the seeming lack of volume would place him more intimately, a lover's language meant to lull the passengers into a false sense of security, to cocoon them in the familiarity of the standard hijacking. Yet, as Maasø more thoroughly analyzes earshot and the voice to identify proxemic zones and analytical levels, it is the public zone that most aptly suits the hijacker voice, with the voice suggesting "community; self-confidence; authority; attention" in terms of vocal distance, "[r]eflected… slightly 'thin' sound" in terms of microphone perspective, and "[n]ormal earshot for raised conversation and public speech… [with] intimate conversation hardly intelligible, but may be heard" in terms of intended earshot (43). The hijacker voice is thus public, expressing an authoritative articulation of community (a "we're all in this together" for both the hijackers, their *jihadi* brethren, and the passengers), a slightly thin yet reflective, echoing microphone presence, and an initial unintelligibility that is nonetheless heard, and heard well.

---

[47] The reference here is to sound artist Gregory Whitehead's radio play "Display Wounds: Ruminations of a Vulnerologist," which focuses on *vulnerology*, the science of wounds, where the wound is first the object of another's (speech) act, then its own agentic spokesperson (Whitehead).

[48] The Beach Boys' "Good Vibrations" comes to mind here, especially the lyric "close my eyes / she's somehow closer now / softly smile, I know she must be kind" (Beach Boys), which reflects the primacy of the aural as a means of self-solicited inhabitation. The song appears on *Smiley Smile*, released on 11 September 1967.

The pushy voice meets the active ear and moves, transferring that audition to his own turf and couching the listener cast as hijacker via inhabitation through the pass and the past in a sort of passing. Massumi speaks of this motion, wherein "[t]he past and future resonate in the present… as a dopplered will-have-been registering *in* the instant as a unity of movement" (Massumi 200), the present sound or voice being not fully heard until it passes, yet seemingly still in process in that hearing. The voice is therefore always already repeated, his initial speechifying having already passed (the speaking body having passed on as well), though his registration as present as he passes suggests repetitions yet to come but, consistent with the originary sounding, already arrived. While inhabited, the listener passes: listening in passing, the listener is subject to the pass, the courtly hijacker who takes her/him by the ear and, once becoming one with the hijacker voice, may yet appear normal, the visual proving insufficient for a diagnosis of inhabitation (a case of the terror happening in the lower case, not so much the proper name as the impropriety of the premarital aural coitus). Listen as s/he may, the listener still ends up in the same place, reflexively listening to the self inhabited by and ventriloquized by the hijacker voice.

Differing modes of listening are available to the listener, though each sort results in the same inhabitation, the same ventriloquism, the same extra-accepted narrativity. Chion identifies three types of listening: causal listening, semantic listening, and reduced listening. Causal listening "consists of listening to a sound in order to gather information about its cause (or source)" (Chion 25); semantic listening "refers to a code or a language to interpret a message: spoken language, of course, as well as Morse and other codes" (28); and reduced listening "focuses on the traits of the sound itself, independent of its cause and meaning" (29). In the case of the hijacker voice, a causal listening creates an investment in the hijacker, a seeking out of the

voice's content to ascertain the cause of the hijacking itself that integrates the listener into that logic; a semantic listening notes the cockpit communication protocols appealed to by the hijacker voice and the relative distress signals represented by the passenger calls; and a reduced listening takes the voice as pure sound, setting the stage for aural engagement.

Telephony is not solely the domain of semantic listening, though its appeal to codes is consistent with the dynamic of threat recognition, power transference, and the goodbye. Ronell recognizes the phone as "the 'annihilator of space,' the conquest of savage intensities" (quoted in Ronell 94), with this sense of annihilation referring not only to the phone's ability to erase the space between speaker and listener, rendering the former present to the latter in an aural immediacy, but also the annihilating act that dispenses with the buffer zone, inflaming tensions with its (supposedly) savage intensity, which is instead a considered intervention. Aural annihilation follows on unbelief in the accepted narrative, though annihilation is present therein as well (within the accepted narrative, one does not know one is annihilated/annihilating; within the extra-accepted narrative, there is awareness). This telephonic annihilation begins with the collect call and, once the charges are accepted, once the aisle is graced and the cockpit cased, a transfer of power takes place: "Heidegger accepted a call. In Lacan's sense we call this predicament the transfer of power from the subject to the Other" (Ronell 15), as Ronell notes in her discussion of Heidegger's National Socialist associations. By answering the call, the listener concedes the terms set out by the caller, the hijacker voice that solicits as he is himself solicited, and any calls made thereafter to relay the contents of the originary call only compound the transfer of power.

A number of calls from flight attendants, air traffic controllers, crew and passengers are included in the Flight 93 films, and each of these calls adds insult to injury, or rather insults the

injury, pouring salt in the newly opened wound by making many aware of the hijackings who

can (or choose) to do little about them, left only to stay on the line indefinitely. In terms of flight

attendant calls, *Flight 93* features a call from Amy Sweeney placed from Flight 11, and though

United 93 does not directly include the call, mention is made of Betty Ong's call from the same

flight and its description of the hijacking in progress. Sweeney's call in particular speaks to the

sense of helplessness present in the event and the inhabitation of the listener, as Sweeney

narrates the approach of the plane to the North Tower, the call breaking up as the plane does. In

terms of air traffic control calls, *The Flight That Fought Back* includes both the Cleveland ATC's

attempts to raise Flight 93 after it is hijacked, as well as the later discussion with military

personnel about the possibility of scrambling fighter jets to respond to Flight 93 as it approaches

Washington D.C. The indecisiveness of the scramble call reflects the swing in power from the

enormous national security complex to the handful of hijackers aboard each of the planes, an

inverted asymmetry present throughout the event. Finally, two answering machine messages are

also included in that film, one from flight attendant CeeCee Lyles and another from passenger

Lauren Grandcolas. In both cases, the eerie calm of the messages only slightly veils the larger

failure of communication within the event, neither Lyles nor Grandcolas even being able to reach

their family members as their last minutes tick by. In their portrayals, the actors in the Flight 93

films attempt to reassert control over the event's narrativity, paradoxically emphasizing

passenger victimhood and passenger agency, though ultimately their own ventriloquism of the

phone calls simply compounds the failures of the event, one in which the death of forty instead

of a fallen Capitol is a success. The terms are the hijackers', no matter how they are framed, the

visual framing serving only to obscure the aural inhabitation. With each call, power is

transferred from the hijacked to the hijackers, the finality of the former producing the infinity of the latter.

The last call, the final round before closing, the last chance to blur, yields a tension between the finality of the passengers' goodbyes and the infinity of the hijackers' post-mortem coda, the former to ring no more, the latter to ring forever, no matter how many times it is picked up. Ronell asserts that "postponing the suicide mission with the 'light of the last hope,' the telephone operates both sides of the life-and-death switchboard" (Ronell 7), and telephony does postpone the end, allowing the hijacker voice to signify beyond his terminus in the producing body while at once motivating and delaying the passenger revolt as additional details come in and final words are spoken. Greengrass deliberately includes many of these final communications, what he calls "the reaching out, the farewell calls, the private moments" (*United 93*), though the moments are only as private as the public zone hijacker voice, and their reach merely reinscribes the terrorspeak of the hijacker voice. As he includes the calls, Greengrass states that "it was always important to me that you would never see the other side of these telephone calls" (*United 93*), a move which creates "a claustrophobia, an intensity" (*United 93*), preventing the filmic voice of the passenger from reaching off screen and inhabiting further, but also pulling the listener-viewer into the cabin, from which s/he will never return.

Where the passengers' final calls signal an end, those of the hijacker voice signal an unending, the hijacker voice returning to haunt the event as he perpetuates its own extra-accepted narrative. In *United 93*, prior to boarding the plane, Jarrah calls his wife Aysel Senguen back in Germany, demonstrating his trilingual abilities by moving from Arabic to English to German and back, saying "Ich liebe dich" three times over (*United 93*), a tripled "I love you" that outstrips the single opportunity offered to some, but by no means all, of the passengers. Greengrass

pontificates on the gesture, calling it "part of the vanity of Jarrah to take the opportunity to say his goodbyes while depriving the passengers of theirs" (*United 93*), with his efforts to include so many of those passenger goodbyes functioning as a response to Jarrah's attempt.[49] Jarrah is human in this moment, and is indeed the most humanized of the hijackers in the Flight 93 films, demonstrating a polite demeanor and a profound doubt in the mission (save for *Flight 93* where, as noted above, he is atypically agentic), rendering himself first victim, closer to the victimized passengers (so quickly to become victimizers in their ventriloquism) than the pure evil intended by the accepted narrative. Here the telephone works as a prosthesis, as noted in Ronell's attention to P.T. Barnum's particular aversion to the device as a "voiced partial limb" (Ronell 301), extending beyond the body, drawing attention to the extent of the damage wreaked upon the passenger and the extent of the inhabitation enabled by the spectral hijacker voice.

The inclusion of these calls, of these dispatches from the cockpit, is meant to underline the evil of the hijacker, of one who could so coldly take over a plane and take lives, who could exist among us, though the iteration of those voices in the filmic serves only to highlight the constructed nature of the accepted narrative. Marsha Kinder offers a helpful reading of the iterative, or rather the pseudo-iterative, in film in her "The Subversive Potential of the Pseudo-Iterative," citing Gérard Genette's definition: "Nevertheless, he defines the iterative as '*narrating one time* (or rather: *at one time*) *what happened* n *times*'" (quoted in Kinder 127). The iterative thus points to the typical, the everyday, iteration capturing a slightly varying same that suggests the hijacking as an everyday occurrence (of the non-violent sort first expected by the passengers) that could indeed happen any day, anytime, anywhere. This focus on the single

---

[49] Yet, Jarrah's delay in initiating the overtaking of Flight 93's cockpit, whether a function of strategy, trepidation, or some combination thereof, enables a longer goodbye interim than that available to the other, sooner-hijacked flights, allowing for the very farewell opportunity that Greengrass claims is absent.

and singular event isolates that event, quieting that which surrounds it, as noted by Paul

Théberge in his "Almost Silent: The Interplay of Sound and Silence in Contemporary Cinema

and Television": "Often, however, soundtracks can become *almost* silent, that is, sounds are

reduced to simple room ambience or to a single tiny sound… drawing our attention to particular

sonic details or lending a special dramatic impact to the scenes in which they take place"

(Théberge 51). The Flight 93 films enact this pseudo-silence, focusing on the hijacker voice and

therefore rendering those scenes the most essential in the films.

Taking the hijacker voice as iterative, not only through his multiple inclusions, but also

his sense of the everyday (with just a little something different, albeit the rough lot of death), his

foregrounding in the accepted narrative draws attention to the ideology behind his inclusion.

Kinder maintains that "if the iterative implications and the slippage between the two aspects

were ever foregrounded, then they would potentially call attention to the process of naturalizing

ideology through the reading of singulative event of fiction as universal truth, a reading that

reinforces the dominant cultural paradigms and genres" (Kinder 133). Though not dealing with

an overt work of fiction (any approximation of the events aboard Flight 93 being necessarily

rooted in conjecture due to the relative lack of available information), the slippage between

renditions within a film and between films calls attention to the naturalized, accepted narrativity

in which hijacker-as-evil/passenger-as-victim is taken as a universal truth, giving way to an

extra-accepted narrativity. This naturalization is backgrounded in the visual, peripheral, but is

brought into focus once the visual cedes its throne to the aural in the regicide, all hailing the dead

king in the living, interpellative hijacker voice.

The pseudo-silence identified by Théberge changes into a different sort of silence, one

that, in its seeming dissociation of the hijacker voice from the event as a means of creating a

unified narrative, only puts the fictive aspect of that narrative into stark relief. Following on Claudia Gorbman's notion of a "structural silence," Théberge describes it as a silence "when a sound… that has previously accompanied an event or particular sequence in a film is absent when similar events or sequences occur; the absence of sound is thus noticed by the audience and usually signifies some kind of shift in the course of the narrative" (Théberge 60). Within the Flight 93 films, the hubbub that surrounds Atta's initial transmission and the confusion of Flight 11's impact with the North Tower is not present upon the first hearing of Jarrah's voice: by that point, the nature of the event is apparent, Jarrah only confirming what air traffic controllers suspected after screams issue from the cockpit. The listener-viewer is therefore trained by the film, taught what to expect from the first, as concluded by Kinder in her discussion of the maid from *Umberto D* (Vittorio de Sica, 1952):[50] "Yet, perhaps even more important for my argument here, it also trains the spectator in how to read the familiar moves both of the maid and of the camera and editing and to thereby deduce what she is probably thinking" (Kinder 135). Atta's transmission and its treatment prepares the listener for Jarrah's as it likewise prepares the passenger for the revolt (news of Atta's success eventually reaching the passengers and dispelling the micro-accepted narrative of hijacking as usual), with Jarrah's preparing the listener for his own repetition within the accepted narrative.

Genette also conceptualizes another iterative whose unifying tendencies render the event familiar, though that iterative is prone to a discontinuity that reveals its constructed nature. This other iterative is "'the synthesizing iteration,' where the scene is 'synthesized by a sort of

---

[50] *Umberto D* tells the story of the titular Umberto, a government pensioner who falls on difficult times with his finances and health, counting only his dog Flick among his close companions. After being released from the hospital to discover that he has been evicted from his apartment and that his dog has disappeared, Umberto locates him in the local pound, then resolves to kill himself (and the dog), stepping in front of a train in a suicide act (recalling that of 9/11).

paradigmatic classification of the events composing it'" (quoted in Kinder 143), the individual

iterations of hijacker speech coming together into a singular hijacker voice, seemingly identical

and anonymous in that identicality. Yet, as Kinder discusses, narrative rupture into the episode,

each iteration existing as a free-standing manifestation, leads the listener "to realize that such

reappearances are merely another form of structural repetition… [b]y repeatedly seeing the same

banal actions freed from the context of a single continuous story, we are led to observe… how

the subtle differences in their performance communicate meaning" (Kinder 147). When each

hijacking is treated as an individual occurrence, part of a larger event yet still singulative, the

initial banality of the hijacking as usual reveals the subtle differences (the fake bomb, the low

flight, the absence of the actual pilot) and in turn reveals the event as something altogether

different. Therefore, the voice of the all-together, the singular hijacker voice as part of the

accepted narrative, when in the all together, stripped from his greater contextualization to operate

independently, displays the small differences, putting the lie to the fictive unified narrative and

creating a space for the extra-accepted narrative: enter ghost.

PHYSICIAN, HAUNT THYSELF: SPECTER V. DIRECTOR

The specter of the hijacker voice as extra-accepted, as a latchkey, unwatched but heard

about endlessly after the fact through the endless iterations that result from inclusion in accepted

narrativity, yields the spectral hijacker voice, a ghost whose naissance exists atemporally,

haunting the past, present, and future. Chion usefully turns to Maurice Merleau-Ponty and his

description of the spectral, one which is of great relevance to the aurality of the spectral hijacker

voice: "[A] ghost is the kind of perception made by only one sense" (Chion 125). Similarly, the

spectral hijacker voice takes form without the aid of additional sensory input, despite his

arranged marriage to the visual, a tempestuous match that exchanges the matrimonial altar for

the sacrificial one of the suicide event. As such, the voice makes sense, singular, not the

jumbled, dissonant multi-narrative of the accepted rendering where, unbeknownst to those

supposedly in the know, each sense offers its own variant, be it the spectacle, the spectral, the

sour, the sepulchral scent, or the singe. This voice, as tied to the aural and its temporal non-fixity

(as heard in the Doppler effect noted above), is likewise untethered, unwed to his originary

moment and, in that sense, atemporal, as observed by Appelbaum: "The ghost first, and the life it

ghosts, second" (Appelbaum 13). The ghost is therefore prior to, a part of, and beyond the event,

the specter diving briefly back into the body that dives Flight 93 to the earth, always already

present in his bodily absence, on the haunt and after you,[51] wise beyond his years in his years in

the beyond.

Through his familiarity with the past, the spectral hijacker voice enables history to repeat

itself, the 1993 World Trade Center bombing returning in 2001, and also the historical event to

repeat, the voice looping omnipresently, demonstrating his foreknowledge as the voice that

knows long before the ear may comprehend. In Appelbaum's words, "[t]he specter is always

already the next, never the present. Spectral time is other, a deformed, de-structured passage.

As a result, a being like the ghost has prefigurative knowledge of a future that is anterior to the

present present" (37), and it is this non-presentism, this exclusion from the notion of a present

via atemporality, this deformation of passing time via the pass, this knowledge of a future that

falls outside of the bounds of its eternal present, that characterizes the spectral hijacker voice.

The voice has always already been there, residing in his specter, in the perimortem Atta and

Jarrah, speaking his phrases until the opportunity arises to have his praises spoken, his "Allahu

---

[51] Duran Duran's "Hungry Like the Wolf" proves an apt reference here, not only in terms of the dual solicitation of listener and hijacker voice heard in the line "I'm on the hunt I'm after you," but also in the synaesthesia of the "smell like I sound" and "scent and a sound" fragments and the aural centrality of the "mouth is alive with juices like wine" line (Duran Duran).

akbar!" taken from his throat to the listeners', to return to the spectral once more, albeit this time

taking on the form of a noisy poltergeist rather than the morning chill of a clear day in

September.

As a function of speech, and a relatively limited amount of speech at that (the hijacker

voice only uttering a few choice phrases prior to choosing his target), the spectral hijacker voice

is cited, citational, set off from the seeming silence that surrounds him, though he sets an

example that the listener cannot help but follow. The voice is quoted, a soundbite that bites

back, and his toothy-ness does not go unremarked upon, instead being marked, as noted by

Appelbaum: "[s]care quotes already always sign the ghost" (71). This quoting seems to conjure

the ghost, as if the ghost did not always already exist in the speech he brings forth, the " "

perhaps making the ghost visible, legible, signing off on his presence-in-absence with a rubber

stamp, the absent signer putting his imprimatur on what was, is, and will be already known.

Once cited, the spectral hijacker voice may operate freely from his originary context, leaving the

body and accepted narrativity to offer an extra-accepted narrative, a self-notarizing that

formalizes the voice-as-document in the pseudo-documentary space of the Flight 93 films.

Indeed, Greengrass makes mention of this spectrality in his shooting script for *United 93*,

including a gesture towards the hijacker voice-as-inhabitant within the mind of FAA National

Operations Manager Ben Sliney, at the helm on 9/11: "And all the time Sliney can hear that

voice in his head – 'we have some planes'" (Greengrass 57). That Greengrass (via Sliney)

should have that voice reappear (in the filmic screenplay) as a quote, in quotes, reinforces the

scare quoting identified by Appelbaum, making the very act of citationality a seeming terror, an

unexpected de- and recontextualization much like that experienced by and reflected in the

accepted narrative of the event.

The ghost does not just arrive; the spectral hijacker voice does not quote itself. Rather, he requires an audience, a listener, one who brings in the ghost so as to be reeled in by his capture in the reel to reel, postdating captivity while captivating. Vampiric, the spectral hijacker voice goes for jugular, sustaining himself in the ear and throat of the listener (the nose is excluded, the listener hardly being in the know), settling in on the couch, putting his feet on the coffee table, not using a coaster. The listener performs "a double action, hosting the ghost as well as being hostage to it" (83), inviting him in, though once the invite is extended, he will not go away (the ghost), staying well past departure time, his ETA always shifting, his shift a timeless white. Set off in the act of citationality, the spectral hijacker voice cannot be put off; he will not take no for an answer, answering instead his own question ("can you hear me now?" or perhaps "can you hear me know?") in the affirmative ("good").[52] The spectral hijacker voice loves to hear himself speak and will not let anyone else get a word in edgewise, putting words in the mouth of his listener who, as a good host, humors the hijacker, though there is but black humor to be found.

Invitation equals solicitation here, the listener-host/age bringing the spectral hijacker voice on her/himself through his misuse in the Flight 93 films, seeking out the sound that seeps into her/his pores, pouring through any opening and leaving a mess in his absence, committing party fouls[53] left and right to which he is no longer a party. The listener reaches into the amortem, the atemporal zone of the always already spectral hijacker voice, as a means of bringing him to attention, a séance of sorts, as concluded by Schwartz: "[T]he ear is analogous

---

[52] This exchange recalls the 2004 Verizon Wireless campaign in which the phone company's "Test Man" demonstrates the extended reach of its service by appearing in a number of locations and talking to an invisible interlocutor, posing the question "can you hear me know?" and, after presumably hearing an answer to his satisfaction, responding "good" (Howard 1).

[53] Urban Dictionary provides a useful assortment of "party foul" definitions, including "something socially unacceptable done in a social gathering" and, more tellingly, "an incident at a party that disrupts the flow," ("Party" 1), referencing the spectral hijacker voice's disruption of the flow of accepted narrativity.

not with the stationary horn or wire but with the moving needle, the microphone/telephone pick-up, the actively straining medium. I use that word 'medium' intentionally, because the modern understanding of human hearing also derives from the mid-to-late nineteenth century rush to hear voices from Beyond" (Schwartz 489). In picking up the phone, in accepting the call issued by the spectral hijacker voice, the ear functions as medium, summoning the voice from the Beyond of his always already dug grave to signify again (and again and again).[54] The hijacker need not be present for this signification to occur, his producing body a mere visual ornament to his aurality. Derrida discusses this difference between the spectral speaker and his embodied apparatus, stating that "[t]he sender of the shopping list is not the same as the receiver, even if they bear the same name and are endowed with the identity of a single ego" (Derrida 49), and though the embodied Atta and Jarrah may share much with the spectral hijacker voice, it is the latter rather than the former that replies to the solicitation after the producing body is eliminated.

Solicitation begets inclusion, the desired participation of the spectral hijacker voice in accepted narrativity extended with the intention of highlighting the evil of his speaker, though instead it is the listener who is highlighted, underlined, the underlying hijacker voice speaking through and rendering narrativity anything but through. As a product of his inclusion in the Flight 93 films, the spectral hijacker voice is subject to a thoroughgoing repetition, each mention within each film, the multiple films, and the multiple screenings serving to exponentialize the voice well beyond his initial sounding. Attali identifies this repetition as reproduction, calling it "the death of the original, the triumph of the copy, and the forgetting of the represented foundation" (Attali 89), with the copied hijacker voice, now spectral in his pre/post-mortality,

---

[54] Both Schwartz's references to the horn and moving needle, as well as the notion of voices from the Beyond, recall Jonathan Sterne's attention to RCA mascot Nipper and his portrayal in *His Master's Voice* in *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction*, where the dog tilts its head inquisitively at a whirling phonograph while sitting atop a shiny wooden surface that suggests a coffin (Sterne 301-2).

triumphs, the sting of the context of his original voicing waning as the voice puts forth his own extra-accepted narrative. Discredited though he may be within accepted narrativity, the spectral hijacker voice's own reflections of victimhood-as-motive still obtain, as posited by Appelbaum: "[T]he voice of the ghost is neither a belief nor a transcendental event on the event-horizon; it can be heard even in disbelief or empiricism" (Appelbaum 16). Whether he agrees with the intention of accepted narrativity or not (which he does not, complicating the clear cut dichotomies of that narrative), the spectral hijacker voice is yet audible.

In their desire for breadth, their will to include any and all available details so as to further validate the veracity of their depictions, the Flight 93 films overreach, letting in that which is not intended, leading to a ventriloquial inhabitation. Speaking of an attempt to record a lecture, Ihde asserts that "[m]y tape recorder, not having the same intentionality as I, records all these auditory stimuli without distinction, and so when I return to it to hear the speech re-presented I find I cannot even hear the words due to the presence of what for me had been fringe phenomena" (Ihde 75). Likewise, the spectral hijacker voice, as registered by the recording apparatuses within air traffic control (the reel to reel consulted to decipher Atta) and the planes themselves (the cockpit voice recorder that holds Jarrah), contains fringe phenomena, the extra-accepted narrative marginalized by accepted narrativity being inherent to the recordings, which capture data and an associated message beyond that intended by their use in the Flight 93 films. By uttering the order word "we have some planes," the spectral hijacker voice "induce[s] a phenomenon of *possession* verbally manifested in the automaton mouthing of pre-scripted words, that is to say as *ventriloquism*" (Massumi 63), the listener staying on cue and on book. In the conflict of ghost versus host, specter versus director, it is the spectral hijacker voice that

claims the first victory and every victory to follow, his inhabitational capacity making a habit of speaking on behalf of the other half.

Inclusion facilitates internalization, the spectral hijacker voice on offer not remaining off for long, but rather on/in, withdrawing the listener from the field of accepted narrativity to a more individualized and more vulnerable singularity of sound and self. Ihde offers an apt query in his examination of self-audition, asking "[d]o I, whenever I turn to 'hearing myself' speak, objectify my voice as that of a 'quasi-other'?" (Ihde 121). The answer to this question is yes, though not in the way that Ihde thinks. Instead, rather than an intellectual separation of the self's voice intended as a means of allowing that self to gain a distanced perspective on its own production, the turn reveals an inhabitation, a ventriloquism such that, in purportedly hearing oneself speak, the voice that emerges is that of the quasi-other, the spectral hijacker voice, not so distant after all, taking on the self's dialect while enacting the dialectic. This inner speech, this speech from the visceral innards of the eviscerated hijacker, is at first a locus of retreat in the face of a sonic onslaught: "I may retreat into myself and the self-presence of my inner speech whose 'static' closes off some of the call of the other" (178). However, in that retreat, the listener doubles back onto and into the inhabited inner speech, the spectral hijacker voice that arises from the chattering threats preceding the event, read only as noise until the voice emerges, not so much closing off the call of the other, but rather answering it, one line at a time.

The repetition essential to the proliferation of the spectral hijacker voice strips away the accepted narrative trappings that surround him, so much window dressing for the foreclosed vision and the always open ear, singularizing the listener and the voice to which s/he responds. Within his discussion of music and mass production, Attali contends that "[i]n this network, each spectator has a solitary relation with the material object; the consumption of music is

individualized, a simulacrum of ritual sacrifice, a blind spectacle" (Attali 32), the auditor

becoming individualized in the aural-commercial space. Similarly, the Flight 93 film listener is

individualized in either the space of televisual reception (typically a small audience, and often a

singular one) or that of the post-commercial home video viewing, consumption of the accepted

narrative being a singular act. Consistent with the divide and conquer stratagem, the

individualized listener is less able to defend her/himself, and is consequently more prone to

inhabitation and ventriloquism. The spectral hijacker voice itself is similarly singularized by

virtue of his portrayal in the films, where the voice possesses reflected sound but little reverb:

"In a film, when the voice is heard in sound closeup without reverb, it is likely to be at once the

voice the spectator internalizes as his or her own and the voice that takes total possession of the

diegetic space" (Chion 79-80). Along with his sheer inclusion, the nature of the spectral hijacker

voice's inclusion allows him to auto-inhabit the listener, ventriloquizing that inhabited individual

and dictating the terms of response.

As the original speaker, the spectral hijacker voice sets out the discursive terms to be

followed throughout the interaction with the listener; as the ventriloquial secondary speaker, the

spectral hijacker voice both dictates, taking his rightful place at the fore, and terms, renaming the

listener-as-victim as listener-as-victimizer. While discussing the necessity of composition as a

means of preserving communication, Attali warns that "[w]e are all condemned to silence –

unless we create our own relation with the world and try to tie other people into the meaning we

thus create" (Attali 134), outlining the compositional method used by the spectral hijacker voice.

Seemingly condemned to silence in his undesired audition, a lack of desire only overturned by

another desire to include the voice so as to emphasize its evil, the spectral hijacker voice creates

his own relation with the world through his articulation of the extra-accepted narrative, tying

other people into the meaning that he creates through inhabitation and ventriloquism. The ear as *collagiste* helps in this endeavor, assembling the pieces left for it by the event and engaging in a composition of its own, with that piecing being identified in *United 93* specifically: "Rejecting standard front-and-center staging, Greengrass works in half-understood fragments" (Denby 146). To gain a fuller understanding of those fragments, they must be composed into a more coherent whole, the sort of composition attempted by the Flight 93 films and completed by the spectral hijacker voice. In this more perfect composition, the spectral hijacker voice inhabits and, in his inhabitation, renames the inhabited less as victim (as the accepted narrative would have it) than as victimizer, not unlike itself.

The choice of the voice that inhabits, that ventriloquizes, is made with some degree of voluntarism; the constructors of the accepted narrative could have just as easily excluded Atta and Jarrah, this time stopping them at security before they can act, rendering the hijackers a faceless, voiceless, abstract evil. Instead, by electing to include the spectral hijacker voice, the accepted narrative is implicated in his operation, likewise inhabiting and ventriloquizing, committing and submitting to the always already of the suicide act. Continuing in his discussion of composition, Attali describes listening within the realm of composition as rewriting, where "[t]he listener is the operator" (Attali 135), though the rewriting performed by the spectral hijacker voice's listener is less a renarrativization than a parroting, the act of operation reflecting a complicity with the operation itself. The spectral hijacker voice does not just appear, but rather must be conjured via inclusion: "To witness the summoning of the ghost, the haunting and the haunted must both attend" (Appelbaum 25), this witnessing being an aural one, Ronell's earwitnessing, and a indicator of complicity insomuch as the inhabited is in attendance.

Within the Flight 93 films themselves, the hijacking is actualized aurally in advance of its physical actualization, demonstrating a potential proxy belief on the part of the passenger in the hijacker's aims, one that is indicative of the greater investment that results from the decision to include the spectral hijacker voice within the accepted narrative. *Flight 93* offers the most examples of this auditory actualization (itself a microcosm of the larger actualization of the hijackers' inhabitational aims through inclusion and repetition), beginning with the initial notification of the hijacking prior to its broadcast via the spectral hijacker voice. Upon commandeering the first class cabin, and in the act of calming the passengers (though few seem particularly riled save for the man stabbed as a scare tactic meant to subdue further opposition), Jarrah states that "we have bombs and guns" (*Flight 93*) well in advance of the visualization of either. When the bombs and guns are later produced (the guns likely fake, given the difficulty of getting a firearm through admittedly lax airport security), it is as if they are conjured into being by Jarrah's words. Those words are elsewhere devoted to the management of sound itself, reflecting the centrality of aurality to the hijacking, when Jarrah advises the passengers to "sit down and shut up," and responds to a flight attendant's whimpers by imploring a fellow hijacker to "keep her quiet" (*Flight 93*). The enunciative precedent is even followed by family members in their conversations with passengers, Honor Elizabeth Wainio's stepmother verbalizing "my arms around you" in an attempt to comfort her daughter (*Flight 93*), and thereby demonstrating the level of inhabitation present in the event as it occurs, much less in its aftermath.

The plane now theirs, the planing away of inconsistencies within the accepted narrative halted by the intercession of the extra-accepted narrativity, all that is left is for the spectral hijacker voice to formalize his inhabitation by finalizing the event, declaring his arrival through a talking back, miking back the voice of the American empire so that the listener may truly hear

what it sounds like. In *United 93*, after looking at the text communication device in the cockpit and noticing the warning regarding cockpit intrusion that follows the World Trade Center impacts, Jarrah notifies the hijacker in the opposite seat that "the brothers have hit both targets," to which the hijacker asks "shall I go and tell them?" in reference to the two muscle hijackers tending to the passengers (*United 93*). Jarrah's reply is telling: "Tell them our time has come" (*United 93*), the warning resulting from Atta's voice and the shot heard 'round the world of the planes' impacts continuing through Jarrah's aural missive, less a showing than a telling that their time, the untime of the spectral hijacker voice, has (always already) come. It takes two to tango, and the listener proves a willing, if unknowing, partner (in crime), as "[t]he ghost can never give voice unless first addressed" (Appelbaum 69), making the call issued by the spectral hijacker voice's initial speech less the originary call than that of the seeking listener, sounding the event for answers to the mystery of her/his seeming victimization and the individuals who would be capable of such an act. The search is but an act, the listener only hoping to find her/himself, and find her/himself s/he does, as a participant in the event, her/his efforts to evidentialize the spectral hijacker voice as an assertion to the contrary only yielding a flawed document.

I SEE WHAT YOU'RE SAYING: THE HIJACKER VOICE AND THE LISTENING

LOOK

Continuing the journey from the visual to the aural, from the scene to the sound, from the professional to the amateur, the next logical step is to move from the more professionalized space of the dramatized, semi-fictionalized film to the less professionalized, less stylized space of the documentary film. The documentary offers a different sort of narrativity, less the smooth, unitary accepted narrative of the dramatic film than a slightly fragmentary assemblage of interviews, archival footage, and reenactments that, in its relative roughness, creates fissures in which extra-accepted narrativity may intervene. Both the semi-fictionalized and documentary depictions of 9/11 facilitate the ubiquity of the hijacker voice, enabling the creation of and catering to the broadly conceived listener. Though many examples of this phenomenon may be located throughout the numerous documentaries devoted to the event, one particular film offers an exemplary sample of representation drawn from the documentary realm: *National Geographic: Inside 9/11* (Michael Eldridge and Lance Hori, 2005). The *National Geographic* program, an exhaustive chronicle of the genesis of 9/11 featuring numerous interviews with government officials and political analysts, prominently includes both the Mohamed Atta recording from American Airlines Flight 11 and the Ziad Jarrah recording from United Airlines Flight 93, as well as numerous other recordings drawn from passenger and World Trade Center occupant phone calls, FAA, air traffic control, and military communications. Through its use of the various recordings, especially those of the hijackers, *Inside 9/11* situates the relocation of the voice in a realm of truth (while simultaneously investing it with the power of truth through accepted narrativity), suggesting that such a relocation is not only natural, but also necessary.

In the course of analyzing the treatment of the voice within *Inside 9/11*, this chapter will articulate the concept of the "listening look,"[55] in which the listener, having sought out the hijacker voice as a means of approaching the reality of the event and constructing the pure evil of that voice, attempts to visualize that voice by reattaching him to a visual referent in the documentary realm so as to make him more easily comprehensible and manipulable. The mere inclusion of the hijacker voice within documentary materials produced as a means of creating the listener (already primed for such a positionality by ongoing susceptibility to accepted narratives) allows that voice to inhabit the listener through the repeated viewings necessary to imbibe the accepted narrative of national victimhood fully, granting the hijacker voice greater resonance through repetition simultaneous to the weakening of the narrative message. In so doing, the listener derives a complicity from her/his practice of the listening look, in so much as the application of that look facilitates the hijacker voice's inhabitation of the listener, who is then ventriloquized by that voice (to be discussed below). It is this listener who is the counterpart to the hijacker voice, and it is this listener who practices the listening look. Given the near invisibility of the hijacker voice during the event, with presence being limited to the aural dispatches from the cockpits, the voice is always already acousmatic, and a consultation of Mladen Dolar's conceptualization of the acousmatic voice in his *A Voice and Nothing More* will extend Pierre Schaeffer's originary version and add to Michel Chion's use of the concept in the filmic realm. Developing Dolar's elucidation of the acousmatic voice along with further theoretical support, this chapter will articulate the listening look, shedding light on the manner in which the retro-location of the aural in the visual against the power of the visual-auditory shift enables the hijacker voice to inhabit the listener.

---

[55] Kaja Silverman indirectly gestures towards such a look in *The Acoustic Mirror: The Female Voice in Psychoanalysis and Cinema*, Bloomington, 1988

Before articulating the listening look in relation to the use of the hijacker voice and other recordings within *Inside 9/11*, it will be useful to gain a deeper understanding of the particulars of the film, including its treatment of recordings from the FAA, NEADS, air traffic control, the World Trade Center towers, and crew and passengers aboard the hijacked planes, as well as its attempted visualization of the recorded hijacker voice, so as to ascertain the documentary's relation to the aural. *National Geographic: Inside 9/11* was televised in two parts on the National Geographic Channel, and released to DVD on 22 August 2006. Approaching four hours in length, the documentary moves beyond the bounds of the event itself, attempting to offer a contextualized chronicle of 9/11 by starting its narrative with the 1993 World Trade Center bombing and tracing its portents back to the 1990 assassination of radical rabbi Meir Kahane and the presence of representatives from major fundamentalist Muslim organizations within the U.S., as well as the Afghan war of the 1980s. *Inside 9/11* operates in a documentary fashion, featuring a consistent narrative voiceover interspersed with interview segments drawn from relevant experts on the topics in question (including former government officials, political analysts, World Trade Center occupants, victims' family members, and those who had contact with the hijackers), and augmented with brief, blurry pseudo-reenactments and location shots. In the advertising copy available in the store on the National Geographic website, two phrases prove of particular interest: first, the sole question in the film's description asks "[w]hy didn't we see the escalating threat?" ("Inside" 1); second, an included blurb from Ned Martel of *The New York Times* calls the film "a visually compelling sweep of imagery" (1). Both of these statements reflect the documentary's apparent location within the visible, paying little heed to the equally, if not more central, aural, the visual proving little match for the aural within the film.

Inside 9/11 demonstrates an unstable relation to the visual within its filmic depiction of 9/11 and its inception, a tenuous linkage that is most evident in the case of the hijackers, whose visual representations serve to emphasize the importance of their aurality above and beyond any extant imagery. Three motifs define the visual representation of the hijackers: first, a primary image of each, drawn from identification photos, is projected over a rippling white flag; second, that image is assembled in a digital graphic where a number of square fragments of the image coalesce into the whole; and third, within the image itself, the eyes are the primary focus. As an attempt to de-acousmatize the hijacker voice by reassigning him to his visual producing body, each of these motifs proves a failure, and the manner of their collective failure acts to problematize the utility of the visual as a narrative tool in relation to the event.

For the flags, the waving, inconstant projected image destabilizes the visual referent, making the image indistinct and unfixed, despite the visual fixation of its projector, with its whiteness also suggesting the surrender of the visual to the aural. The fragments similarly point to the incompleteness of the visual account, also linking it to apprehensive narrativity in one selection where those initially more committed to the plot, Ramzi bin al Shibh and Marwan al Shehhi, are depicted unflagged and unflagging, while those less committed, Mohamed Atta and Ziad Jarrah, appear in fragments.[56] In the case of the eye focus, the implicit relocation of the hijacker voice to the realm of the visual, along with a consultation of the eye-as-window to the soul, functions only to redouble the primacy of the spectral hijacker voice, with one instance of the eye emphasis occurring in a discussion of the muscle hijackers' "blind loyalty" to Osama bin

---

[56] Bin al Shibh's surety is of little use in this instance, since he is denied an entry visa to the U.S. based on his Yemeni background and the according concern that he might possess an economic need that would lead him to overstay his visa (Grace 1). Atta and Jarrah's unsurety proves of little consequence to the plot, Atta acting as plot leader and Jarrah's own reticence perhaps resulting in a delayed hijacking, but posing no threat to the plot overall. Bin al Shibh instead serves as an intermediary between plot leader Atta and masterminds Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and Osama bin Laden.

Laden (*National*). It is this blindness that plagues the accepted narrative of the event and its

failed attempt to reassert the centrality of the visual emphasis, and it is this blindness that

necessitates an aural focus and an extra-accepted aural narrativity that takes the recordings as its

object.

A wealth of recordings are included in *Inside 9/11*, including those taken from FAA,

NEADS, air traffic control, and World Trade Center occupant communications, a profusion that

evidences the importance of and unusual impact of the aural in event narratives both accepted

and extra-accepted, while also suggesting an at best haphazard reaction to the event and its

surreality, especially within the realm of the aural. Recordings from the FAA (Federal Aviation

Administration) indicate a great degree of confusion as the event unfolds, with the bulk of the

transmissions included concerning the mistaken impression that American Airlines Flight 11 is

still in the air and heading south towards Washington D.C. when in fact it had already impacted

the North Tower of the World Trade Center (resulting from an improper identification), as well

as the concern that fighter jets might be needed to intercept United Airlines Flight 93 before it

reached Washington D.C. Similarly, recordings from NEADS (North East Air Defense Sector,

part of the U.S. Air Force's national security apparatus) featured in the film are clustered almost

exclusively around the decision to scramble fighter jets to intercept Flight 93, though rules of

engagement are unclear and such an intercept might not have reached the flight before it itself

reached its target. Air traffic control recordings offer a likeminded sense of helplessness, best

exemplified by the warning that follows identification of the quick descent of United Airlines

Flight 175 into New York airspace: "Heads up, man, looks like another one coming in"

(*National*). Additionally, a number of frantic calls from and to family members and between

firemen in the World Trade Center towers underline the futility of rescue efforts, existing as the

only remaining documents of those killed in the collapses after their bodies are obliterated. Perhaps the most surreal moment is captured in the plaza between the towers prior to their collapse, where a recording captures the jarring juxtaposition of a Muzak version of Billy Joel's "She's Always a Woman"[57] and the percussive impacts of jumpers falling from the floors above, "the most God awful sound you can imagine" (*National*), where each thump means "someone else just died, someone else just died, someone else just died" (*National*). As the jumpers' impacts repeat, so too do the recordings, each inclusion adding fuel to the fire set by the aural and its agent, the hijacker voice.

The most important recordings in *Inside 9/11* are those of the hijacker voice, included as a specter of pure evil, yet spectralizing that voice by allowing him a life after death by attempting, and failing, to recontextualize him within the realm of the visual, instead widening his scope and import, the voice from abroad broadened. Both Atta and Jarrah's voices are identified performatively, as either "Atta" or "Jarrah" followed by a colon in the manner of a script when their words are given textual form on screen, the scene set by the blurry cockpit interior over which each pilot-hijacker's words are projected, an imprecise relocation that speaks to the diminution of the visual in favor of the aural (try as it might, the visual/textual capture cannot truly hold the hijacker voice). Indeed, despite the visual situation of the hijacker voice within the filmic context, his first appearance (Atta's "we have some planes") is introduced by the narrator as firmly aural: "Mohamed Atta's voice crackles over an air traffic controller's headphones" (*National*). The cockpit visualization having failed, an additional visualization is attempted, with dialogue between Boston air traffic controllers concerning Atta's words being

---

[57] Joel's song in this context contains an interesting tension between the visual and the aural, the lyrics stating "she can wound with her eyes / she can ruin your faith with her casual lies / and she only reveals what she wants you to see" (Joel), pointing to both a visual and aural wounding, as well as the selective narrativity present in the visual.

subject to a similar textualization over a blip-filled radar screen (in which the audience is to

assume that Flight 11 appears), though again it is Attan aurality that dictates the terms of the

discussion: "He seemed to think that the guy said 'we have planes.' Now I don't know if it was

because of the accent or because there's more than one" (*National*). There are in fact four

planes, and five known transmissions (three from Atta, two from Jarrah), though *Inside 9/11*

adds another to the mix, which similarly strikes an imbalance between the lesser visual and the

greater aural. Jarrah is stopped for speeding in Maryland on 9 September, and a surveillance

camera in the police cruiser captures an indistinct image of the back of the vehicle and its

approach by the officer, but a more distinct, albeit brief, dialogue between the officer and Jarrah:

"Still live on Quicksilver Drive?" "Yes." (*National*). *Inside 9/11* thus adds to the profile of the

hijacker voice, giving him a broader audience consonant to broadening the repertoire of the voice

itself by one iteration.

Next to the hijacker voice, the most important recordings are those of its direct

interlocutor, the crew and passengers aboard Flights 11 and 93, recordings that are subject to a

similar attempt at resituation within the visual, an attempt that fails to stanch the flow of the

spectral hijacker voice. Cockpit voicing is treated in much the same way for the initial pilot as it

is for the subsequent pilot-hijacker, Flight 93's Captain Jason Dahl's image appearing over the

blurry cockpit background, his text communication with air traffic control being captured in a

similar textualization and identification as "Dahl," and the narrator's description of Dahl's

mayday transmission being read over that same blurry cockpit. Flight attendants are similarly

contextualized, Flight 11's Betty Ong and Amy Sweeney's words being textualized over a blurry

image of an Airfone on the back of a passenger seat and voiced by the narrator, respectively,

though Ong's voice, still on the line until the moment of impact, is terminated simultaneous to the hijacker voice reaching terminal velocity and exiting the body into the spectral.

Several passenger calls are also featured in the film, though in all cases indirectly, the actual recordings and reenactments used in the Flight 93 films giving way to recountings by the narrator and family members. A reference is made to a call placed by Flight 175 passenger Peter Hansen to his father, though the text of that call is recited by the narrator without on-screen textual accompaniment. Similarly, family member recountings lack the visual-textual element, refocusing the discourse on the aural, as is true in the case of American Airlines Flight 77 passenger Barbara Olson, whose words are included via husband Ted Olson, and in the case of Flight 93 passenger Tom Burnett, included via wife Deena Burnett. Both Olson and Burnett are introduced via still photos projected over blurry passenger cabin images, though the non-textualization of the voice draws the listener into that voice and away from visual referentiality, with Deena Burnett herself returning attention to the aural when she asks "who do I call for a hijacking?" after Tom urges her to contact the authorities (*National*). There is only one answer to that question, to the dialogue opened between the hijacker voice and the passenger, the hijacker voice and the listener, the deadening voice and the dead voice: Ghostbusters, those concerned with neutralizing the spectral, for it is the spectral that is home to the hijacker voice, and try as it may, the listening look may not restore that aural to the visual.[58]

At this point in the proceedings, in light of the preceding claim that *Inside 9/11* is indeed representative of the numerous documentaries springing from the rubble of the event, thrown off

---

[58] The call and response lyric to Ray Parker Jr.'s "Ghostbusters" from the film of the same name (Ivan Reitman, 1984), where a scenario is posited, "if there's something weird and it don't look good," a query posed "who you gonna call?" and a reply given, "Ghostbusters!" (Parker), suggests first a visual framing, then an aural solution to the spectral, a meeting of the ghost on its own terms, the very consultation of the spectral enacted by the listener, the same that allows inhabitation to take place.

like so many shattered beams to be transmitted near and far televisually and theatrically, one might, with some justification, offer a few queries: first, is *Inside 9/11* representative rather than electoral, directly related rather than amorphously linked?; second, into what categories do 9/11 documentaries fall, and what characterizes these categories?; third, how do each of these categories relate to the notion of aurality so central to this analysis?; and fourth, how might these categories and their contents function as counterexamples against the perspective provided by *Inside 9/11* (if such an opposition is indeed present)? From the outset, it will be useful to set out three categories that become apparent upon closer examination of the broad spectrum of documentaries on offer, in this instance adjectivally designated: documentaries malefic, committed to at times slender, at times slanderous renderings of the event; documentaries honorific, dedicated to fawning, doe-eyed devotionals of heroism and patriotism; and documentaries terrific, premised upon erratic, if upon occasion brilliant, conspiracy-oriented event narrativities. Taking a signal example from each category as an entry point, the following descriptions will unfold the characteristics and contributions of each category, while also demonstrating the manner in which *Inside 9/11* incorporates the best of each offering while excising the excesses of each, countering the counterexemplary into an accepted narrativity that, while at some distance from flawlessness, is nothing if not representative.

Starting with the maleficent, there is perhaps no better example to be found than *The Path to 9/11* (David L. Cunningham, 2006), televised 10-11 September 2006 on ABC. Starring Harvey Keitel as the stereotypically rogue, devil-may-care FBI Special Agent John O'Neill, and featuring appearances by lesser Wahlberg Donnie as composite CIA agent "Kirk" and Patricia Heaton as a cartoonishly depicted Barbara Bodine, U.S. Ambassador to Yemen, *Path* can be called, at best and with considerable politeness, problematic in its desire to point fingers of

blame. Though it attempts to distance itself from direct narrative accountability by declaring itself "not a documentary" (*The Path*), that claim follows a foregrounding of its basis on *The 9/11 Commission Report*, purportedly *the* document of 9/11, suggesting that, if it looks like a documentary and quacks like a documentary, it may yet be (chicken)shit, at times lapsing into stretches where it more closely resembles a John Miller biopic, the film also being rooted in Miller's book *The Cell: Inside the 9/11 Plot, and Why the FBI and CIA Failed to Stop It*, jointly authored with Michael Stone and Chris Mitchell.

     The Path to 9/11 may be better approached as a bridge piece, a docudrama that splits the difference between the Flight 93 films and *Inside 9/11*, not so much splitting hairs as offering a harebrained narrativity in which the event is the result of failures more testicular (the refusal to support various covert operations targeting bin Laden, the glacial pace of information sharing between agencies, O'Neill's emasculation at the hands of a politically correct Bodine in the course of the *U.S.S. Cole* investigation, among others) than tactical. Aurality is limited here to the sporadic telephonic, brief clutches of the hijacker voice via Atta's cockpit transmissions, American Airlines Flight 11 flight attendants Betty Ong and Amy Sweeney's distress calls, and the exchange between United Airlines Flight 93 passenger Tom Burnett and his wife Deena, serving mainly to relocate the aural into the visual, as well as to distract from the poorly cast (an Arab is an Arab is an Arab), historically inaccurate and ideologically dogmatic effort premised more upon character assassination of the sort advocated against bin Laden by O'Neill than anything resembling evenhandedness. Among others of the malefic school, though none are as awe-(non-)inspiring as *The Path to 9/11*, the execrable *DC 9/11: Time of Crisis* (Brian Trenchard-Smith, 2003) and its charitable reappraisal of George W. Bush comes in a close second.

Continuing with the honorific, a perfect example of the category may be found in *9/11* (Gédéon and Jules Naudet, 2002), at first conceived as a documentary chronicling the probationary period of young FDNY firefighter Tony Benatatos, then transformed into something else altogether by its inadvertent capture of the impact of Flight 11 into the North Tower (one of only two film versions of the impact). While not a full-on stroke piece in the vein of *DC 9/11*, *9/11* falls decidedly within the jingoist camp, its appraisal of the conduct of the FDNY favoring the precious over the precarious, omitting attention to accusations of theft from the mall concourse beneath the World Trade Center towers, to concerns over the ill-advised nature of the firefighting operation undertaken and the faulty communication devices used to facilitate it, as well as the racial and gender uniformity of the firefighters in question (the documentary's concluding honor roll of the dead being overwhelming white and uniformly male). The emphasis is placed firmly on notions of sacrifice and loss, with little concern for the object of that sacrifice (freedom? pseudo-benificent global stewardship?) or its subjects and their thoughts (family members left behind to pick up the pieces, fellow firefighters left to sift through the rubble). Aurality in *9/11* is somewhat more substantial than in *The Path to 9/11*, with two important manifestations evident in the aforementioned footage of Flight 11's arrival, made apparent by a roar that precedes the camera pan to the impact itself (the brief pure aurality being necessary returned to the visual), as well as the chilling thump of the jumpers' impacts[59] and the ominous rumble of the collapsing South Tower as heard from within the North (itself reattached to the external visuals of the South Tower's collapse). Others of the honorific school include *Saint of 9/11* (Glenn Holsten, 2006), concerning FDNY chaplain Father Mychal Judge, and *New*

---

[59] Though the jumpers are present only in aural form in *9/11*, their visual referents were in fact present in the original cut, with "[i]mages of the bodies hitting the pavement… edited out of the broadcast" when the documentary is first aired on network television, and subsequently omitted from the commercial video release of the film as well (Vågnes 73).

York Firefighters: The Brotherhood of 9/11 (Peter Schnall, 2002), concerned with the eponymous über-heroes.

Concluding with the terrific, a fine example of the conspiratorial category can be located in *Zero: An Investigation into 9/11* (Franco Fracassi, Francesco Tre, and Francesco Trento, 2008), which calls into question a number of the salient details of the event in the course of a ramshackle renarrativization. *Zero* contains all of the hallmarks of the conspiratorial category: an outsider's perspective (endowed by its status as an Italian production), familiar points of order (suspicions about controlled demolition of the World Trade Center towers, about a missile impacting the Pentagon rather than a plane, about the incompetence of the planes' intercepts by military fighter jets, about the identity of the hijackers, and about the event as a "surprise" to the Bush administration), suspect "experts" (better known names like David Ray Griffin [author of *The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11* and *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*], and Daniel Hopsicker [author of *Welcome to Terrorland: Mohamed Atta and the 9/11 Cover-up in Florida*], as well as Italian actors Lella Costa and Moni Ovadia [apparent authorities on Pearl Harbor and 9/11 response and the hijackers, respectively]), and unpredictable insight (highlighting the impossibility of an amateur pilot executing the flight path of American Airlines 77 into the Pentagon, the potential for hijacker misidentification, and inconsistencies within bin Laden's appearance in video dispatches over time). Aurality in *Zero* is centered on two instances present in and around the World Trade Center itself: first, the film opens with a woman's panicked 911 call from above the impact zone of one of the towers, accompanied by a black screen, amplifying the hopelessness of her situation in a way that the external view of the burning tower cannot (though that view is also included to resituate the aural visually); and second, reports of explosions heard throughout the

towers prior to either plane's impact, lending credence to the controlled demolition theory (and

also documented with inconclusive visual evidence). The terrific category is legion, with *Loose*

Change 9/11: An American Coup (Dylan Avery, 2009), the latest iteration of the influential

Loose Change series, *Aftermath: Unanswered Questions from 9/11* (Stephen Marshall, 2003),

and *9/11: The Myth and the Reality* (Ken Jenkins, 2007), a compilation of two David Ray Griffin

lectures, being just three among many entries.

Having answered the second and third questions concerning categories and their related

auralities by anatomizing the malefic, honorific, and terrific, what remains to be established is

Inside 9/11's representative status and the position of the other documentaries as potential

counterexamples. In its inclusion of a broad spectrum approach to the event, dating back to the

Afghan war of the 1980s and winding its way through the 1993 World Trade Center bombing,

the 1998 embassy bombings in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, the 2000 attack on the *U.S.S. Cole*,

and the run-up to 9/11 itself, *Inside 9/11* matches and exceeds the scope of *The Path to 9/11*,

offering a much more detailed rendering of the event itself, also including expanded attention to

the assassination of radical rabbi Meir Kahane in 1990, while at once dispensing with the bulk of

Path's Clintonian blame game. In its notation of heroic actions in the course of the event,

including World Trade Center employee Pablo Ortiz's considerable efforts to aid evacuation,

FDNY firefighter Orio Palmer's swift ascent to and appraisal of the impact zone of the South

Tower, and office worker Brian Clark's rescue of fellow worker Stanley Praimnath from the

rubble engendered by United Airlines 175's arrival, *Inside 9/11* nods to the honorific without

succumbing to the treacle of *9/11*. In its incorporation of many of the primary concerns of the

9/11 truth movement, including an extended analysis of the collapse of the towers and the tardy

military response (in both instances, the film hews more closely to the non-conspiratorial bent,

though it does not foreclose the option of shadier dealings), *Inside 9/11* encapsulates the terrific, tying some of its loose ends while refusing to end the discussion, balancing the flights of fancy within the conspiratorial with a rooting in the actual flights themselves.

Insomuch as *Inside 9/11* excerpts the best of each category while avoiding their respective excesses, it is more than a worthy representative of the 9/11 documentary, also functioning not as the exemplary to which all others are counterexamples, but rather as the counterexample itself. Eschewing the prevailing monologistics of each category in favor of a more thoroughgoing, overarching approach to the event, *Inside 9/11* instead expands the scope of each category by the inclusion of the others, offering itself as a counterexample to the singlemindedness of the categorical, containing each while maintaining the critical energies on offer in each instance. Rather than the malefic, the honorific, or the terrific acting as counterexamples, complicating the simplified version that is *Inside 9/11*, it is the malefic, the honorific, and the terrific that expound upon *Inside 9/11*'s completeness, expanding, but not exceeding, the complexity and scope of the ur-text (in terms of content if not chronology, *Inside 9/11*'s 2006 release postdating it in arrears, though it is the categories that are in debt to *Inside 9/11* as a fourth, larger category, the prolific).

CITING SIGHT: FRAMING THE AURAL IMAGE

Turning from the specifics of *Inside 9/11* to a more general discussion of the properties of the hijacker voice and the role of the aural in the documentary realm, one may note how the listening look, as a foundational concept within the 9/11 documentary, fails in its efforts to reattach the aural to the visual, only facilitating the hijacker voice's inhabitation of the listener. Allen S. Weiss' positing of radiophony offers a useful theoretical frame through which the listening look may be formulated, narrowing the broader field of recording paradigms to a more

heterogeneous and less paradigmatic understanding. Weiss first gestures towards the spectrum

of recording paradigms via a paraphrase drawn from Evan Eisenberg's *The Recording Angel*.[60]

Here Weiss offers a concise elucidation of "the three major paradigms: (1) take a 'sound

photograph,' that is, merely attempting to reproduce a given performance; (2) extract 'an

impossibly perfect performance'; (3) create an entirely new entity" (Weiss [b] 40). Beyond the

foundation for the formulation of the listening look provided by this rendering of paradigms,

Weiss also indirectly notes the potential for aural and visual unity in the sound photograph, an

automatic, documentary reproduction that bears some relevance to the hijacker voice, though that

voice also merges the other two paradigms into his speech (impossibly perfect due to the way in

which the event exceeds expectations, and new in the sense that the resonant hijacker voice does

not exist prior to the event).

Continuing with his unintentional elucidation of the hijacker voice, Weiss speaks to the

danger inherent in "the terrifying exterior expanses of radio. Spaces obscene, because haunted

by death; sites fascinating, because ruled by pure metamorphosis, juxtaposition and combination;

scenes of excess, because they necessarily extend beyond the limits of any single imagination"

(Weiss [a] 84), suggesting the haunting pervasion of the hijacker voice as a function of

paradigmatic elision. The potential of this voice, this noise, is captured by Brandon LaBelle in

his "Music to the 'nth' Degree"[61]: "Noise prolongs disquietude by opening up the divide between

crisis and restoration, certainty and uncertainty" (LaBelle 167). It is this liminality that

characterizes the hijacker voice, an in-betweenness placed in stark relief by Weiss' notion of

---

[60] Eisenberg's well-regarded text is a foundational study in the cultural use of music, analyzing (and perhaps celebrating) records and chronicling the ways in which others relate to the recorded medium.

[61] LaBelle's short chapter examines noise from the perspective outlined by Jacques Attali, where noise is simply sound that falls outside of the purview of what is commonly recognized as music, engaging in an analysis of postwar noise music.

radiophony. Such liminality enables the hijacker voice to problematize, if not preempt, the

certainty of restorative closure in a manner which exceeds the comprehension of the individual,

bringing an omnipresent, lingering air of death to the desperately life-affirming discourses that

follow on the event.

Much like the capacity for elision demonstrated by the hijacker voice, Weiss' radiophony

possesses a similar pervasiveness, existing as "a heterogeneous domain, on the levels of its

apparatus, its practice, its forms, and its utopias… [including] Bertolt Brecht: interactive radio

and public communication; Rudolf Arnheim: radiophonic specificity and the critique of visual

imagination… [and] William Burroughs: cut-ups and the destruction of communication [among

others]" (Weiss [b] 2). The examples provided accord with aspects of the hijacker voice:

Brecht's interactivity references the democratic use of the airwaves by the hijacker voice;

Arnheim's visual critique references the invisibility of the hijackers in the course of an act

predicated on visibilities aural and otherwise; and Burroughs' destruction of communication

presages the destructive communication of the hijacker voice,[62] himself a destroyer that is

destroyed and yet perpetuated in recording technologies. Though differing from each other as

per the heterogeneity of radiophony, these forms of acoustics share common ground in their

relation to the accessibility and critical function of the acoustic realm, and prove of value to the

articulation of the listening look due to their suggestion of listener interactivity, visual

referentiality, and the (im)possibility of destroyed communication. For Weiss, this

heterogeneous acoustics synthesizes as radiophony, serving as an effective framework through

which the hijacker voice and the "listening look" may be understood. The three various voices

---

[62] The Burroughsian complication of language via the cut and the revelatory capacity of its manipulation, both set out in the methodological section of the introduction, are subject to a theoretical reprisal here, which functions alongside the overarching incision performed by the cutting edge of this analysis.

that participate in the development of radiophony also point to a particular manner in which the disembodied voice becomes reembodied after its destruction by way of its placement within recording technologies, to which the voice is given access as a precursor to visual and, by association, physical reassignment.

BETTER OFF THAN DEAD: THE ONCE AND FUTURE VOICE

For the listening look to function, it must seek an object, find a voice, and the look finds such a voice within the field of technologized perpetuity: that of the 9/11 hijacker. Dolar locates the essentiality of technology to the perpetuation of the voice, which "fades away the moment it is produced… it is born and… it dies at the same moment – at least until the emergence of the good-hundred-year-old technology of sound reproduction, which blurred many lines" (Dolar 59). The simultaneity of the voice's birth and death moment points to either a temporal instantaneity or a collapse of temporality, the voice as never really or always already. Steven Connor looks to Thomas Edison and the idea that "sound never completely disappeared once it had been formed, but rather continued diminishing for ever… [t]he past was not dead: it was just very, very quiet" (Connor 359), relying on sensitive equipment to capture the revenant of the ebbing voice. It is telling that Connor uses the notion of appearance to describe this diminishing sound, implying the interconnectivity of the visual and aural inherent to the listening look and enacted in *Inside 9/11*. With voices never truly disappearing, all are in what Edith Lecourt identifies as "omnipresent simultaneity" (Lecourt 211), where the technological capture and repetition of a voice serves to redouble its perpetuity, albeit at a higher volume. This simultaneity accords with Dolar's collapsed temporality, the never really and the always already existing as a function of that collapse, as well as that of the World Trade Center. Yet, despite the doubling, "[t]here is a voice which constitutes an enigma and a trauma because it persists without being understood…

[t]he voice is always understood *nachträglich*, subsequently, retroactively, and the time-loop of

the primal fantasy is precisely the gap between hearing and making sense of what we hear,

accounting for it" (Dolar 136), with persistence being only the first step in the vocal analysis.

Due to this necessary delay, the voice requires repetition to gain a just hearing (so to speak).

Rather than decaying into near silence, technology revivifies the voice from its near-death state

and amplifies it into the analytic space of fantasy.

 In keeping with the fantastic nature of the voice subject to delayed understanding is a

voice which implies an immediate, unquestioning understanding: the divine voice as heard and

enacted. Dolar includes "the widespread experience of psychosis based on 'hearing voices,' the

vast field of auditory hallucinations which impose themselves as more real than any other

voices" in an anatomization of uncontrolled voices (Dolar 40), and his understanding of the

(hyper)reality of that voice creates a possibility for the (purportedly) divinely inspired hijacker

voice to function as a similarly (hyper)real voice for the listener. Relocating this voice into the

realm of the seer, Connor contends that "[t]he voice of the god, as transmitted through his seer,

must be stored, as a disposable resource, fixed at a ceremonial distance from everyday life, and

subject to rituals of consultation" (Connor 61), recalling the storage of the hijacker voice on air

traffic control and cockpit voice recorder tapes and his use in commemorative documentary

footage (like *Inside 9/11*) and criminal testimony (in the case of Zacarias Moussaoui, whose trial

has prevented the public release of the cockpit voice recorder tape from United Airlines 93).

With the divine voice often operating at a wordless level, "it is only the pure voice beyond words

that matches the ineffability of God" (Dolar 49), the unintelligibility of "speaking voices"

meeting its counterpart in the broken English and ecstatic "Allahu akbar" of the hijacker voice, a

sublinguistic Godspeech. Taking the notion of divinity one step further, Hildegard of Bingen

posits "the articulated word, in its three aspects of sound, power, and breath… as a model for the three persons of the Trinity" (Connor 108), sound producing, power manifesting, and breath ghosting. The hijacker voice functions as this fantastic, divine voice which cannot be resisted, and which requires a lag period to achieve true understanding, a lag compounded by difficulties of dialect and nationalism.

Though perpetuated through technologization and invested with force through its proxy divinity, the hijacker voice faces difficulty due to his use of broken English, a fracturing which ultimately produces fissures in the U.S. psyche that embraces him. Robin Lydenberg offers a canny indirect perspective on the multilingual hijacker voice in the assertion that, within the jarring juxtapositions of William S. Burroughs' cut-ups, "[he] never fully enters or establishes any character, he never 'soars' on another writer's words or even on his own" (Lydenberg 422). However, in the case of Atta and Jarrah, the hijacker voice both enters and does not enter the stereotypical evil Arab "terrorist" positionality (at once typical and unique) by soaring on the borrowed English of the target, winging on another writer's words (standard cockpit communication protocol) as well as his own. Along with the broken English of the hijacker voice is this break from English, a use of the language which at once separates its adoptive speaker from mischaracterization in its cultural-linguistic paradigm.

Konstantin Raudive's experiments in capturing the voices of the dead via recording technologies address this appropriation via dialect, where "the new voices from the ether were sometimes characterized by striking linguistic disturbance, speaking, not in the language they used in their lives, but in an unstable compound of different languages" (Connor 375), and the hijacker voice demonstrates a similar disturbance that differentiates his speech from the more common Arabic while also troubling the English that is used. Where broken English typically

implies an inability to participate, a cultural outsiderdom, the hijacker voice's use of the language breaks English, rendering the language useless due to his inhabitation. Being linked to the U.S. through his particular inflections and framing within cockpit protocol, the hijacker voice thus intercedes in the "'vocalic imaginary' in American culture, a repertoire of ideals, beliefs, and anxieties which centres on the powers of the voice" (230), embedding himself within that imaginary such that the hijacker, seen as the very antithesis of "American" ideals after 9/11, is in fact squarely within the realm of those ideals, undermining national narratives of the event through self-inclusion. In control of the national language, the hijacker voice is also in control of the U.S. psyche constructed through it. This self-inclusion points to a self-constitutive capacity within the hijacker voice, an ability to create and dictate.

Once invested with the ability to self-create, the hijacker voice benefits from an accompanying investiture of agency and, by proxy, power, a power that allows for an aural exceptionalism that aids in group formation and exclusion in the act of war. Connor finds "the procreative power of the voice… in the voice's power to create imaginary persons at a distance from the speaker" (346), and in this instance the hijacker voice participates in the creation of an imaginarily implicated listener engulfed by the hijackers' inhabitation of the national imaginary. The hijacker voice's intervention reinscribes the distance of that voice from the listener, though paradoxically so, establishing proximity via inhabitation and therefore either counteracting that distance momentarily (albeit Dolar's eternal moment [or perhaps the student visa of the matriculating hijacker pilot, subject to renewal]) or returning the inhabited listener to the voice's origin, the Muslim fundamentalist hotbed (seen [and created] in Iraq, among other locations).

Dolar forwards Giorgio Agamben's idea[63] that, via its enunciation of the letter of the law, "the voice is structurally in the same position as sovereignty, which means that it can suspend the validity of the law and inaugurate the state of emergency" (120); essentially, the voice that speaks the law writes/rights it, and the hijacker follows suit, calling forth the USA PATRIOT Act and its emergency. French playwright Valère Novarina articulates this point abstractly, suggesting the agentic speech act as an act of collective actualization: "When he spoke, he touched another mouth who spoke a language that designated nothing" (Novarina 93), the constitutive voice allowing that other mouth to designate, to benefit from the already existing inhabitation. The inhabited listener serves as a megaphone, giving the hijacker voice a greater volume that similarly gives his message a larger audience. With the group now formed, it may enact the war implied by the emergency state.

The act of listening implied by the existence of the voice is present in the case of the hijacker voice as well, with that voice entailing a prescriptive listening that takes on a declarative form, yielding catastrophe. Speaking of Nipper, canine star of the "His Master's Voice" advertisements, Dolar asserts that "[l]istening entails obeying; there is a strong etymological link between the two in many languages… [e]tymology offers a hint of an inherent tie: listening is 'always-already' incipient obedience; the moment one listens one has already started to obey, in an embryonic way one always listens to one's master's voice, no matter how much one opposes it afterward" (Dolar 75-6). The hijacker voice accordingly acts as an agent of instruction in concert with the always already obedient listener, with the recording serving as a means of continuing instruction after the fact, notes taken and poured over in private. Two always

---

[63] Agamben's most thorough articulation of sovereignty occurs in his *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, in which he gives attention to the paradoxical basis of sovereignty in law, where it is not the rule that frames the exception, but rather the exception that frames and constitutes the rule.

alreadys collide in this instance, the chance meeting of obedience and temporality in the space of

aurality. With the listener at rapt attention, declarations may be made; if, as Dolar states,

"[c]ivilization announces its progress by a lot of noise, and the more it progresses the noisier it

gets" (13), then the technologized amplification of the hijacker voice, as produced prior to the

noisy impacts and their impact, the "War on Terror," moves swiftly down the path to the very

civilization that he is denied in most accounts. The noise of the hijacker voice prior to impact,

both as "chatter" (in intelligence speak) leading up to the event and in the cockpit en route, is

compounded upon his arrival, creating a civilizing event that is paradoxical given its usually

savage rendering. Perhaps Novarina puts it best: "To speak is truly catastrophic" (Novarina

134), the catastrophe here being not the event itself (though it is certainly catastrophic in some

sense), but rather the manner in which the hijacker voice is able to inhabit the U.S. psyche while

coalescing related voices into an oppositional force and implicating the listener through

obedience. This hijacker voice may be unseen, but he is certainly heard.

The heard but unseen voice (the seen voice being immediately visually linked to its

origin) returns the discussion to the acousmatic voice, mentioned in passing in the introduction,

more thoroughly in relation to Chion in the preceding chapter, and unpacked by Dolar in a

manner which establishes a symbiotic relation between the aural and the in/visible, the very

voice that *Inside 9/11* tries (and fails) to deacousmatize. Dolar traces the genesis of the

acousmatic to Pierre Schaeffer, where "'acousmatic' describes 'the noise which we hear without

seeing what is causing it'… [t]he advantage of this mechanism was obvious: the students… were

confined to 'their Master's voice,' not distracted by his looks or quirks of behavior, by visual

forms, the spectacle of presentation… they had to concentrate merely on the voice and the

meaning emanating from it" (quoted in Dolar 61), a definition which aligns with the invisibility

of the recorded hijacker voice. As teacher, the hijacker voice instructs the listener regarding the existence of viable opposition in the extra-accepted narrative space, and his invisibility necessitates a focus that amplifies his efficacy. The relative stability of the seen is contrasted to the less rooted voice, such that "[t]he acousmatic voice is so powerful because it cannot be neutralized with the framework of the visible, and it makes the visible itself redoubled and enigmatic" (Dolar 79), the lack of a visual referent for the hijacker voice endowing him with greater force. The listening look attempts to return the hijacker voice to the stability of the seen by locating his visual origin and, in its failure to do so, functions as a testament to the power of obedience noted by Schaeffer and Dolar's formulation of the acousmatic. Yet, the same is true of the inverse, "a source of voice for which no voice can be assigned, but which for that very reason represents the voice all the more" (69); Dolar is writing about Edward Munch's *The Scream*, but a similar case may be made for laudatory images of the "Magnificent 19" hijackers,[64] whose pursed lips and stoic expressions speak volumes (and at some volume) without assignation. This inversion points to an excessiveness within the voice, his presence and absence proving equally overwhelming.

The hijacker voice proves excessive in his very presence, the technological redoubling of the quiet yet persistent vocal trace allowing a pervasion that saturates the U.S. psyche. Straining the very limits of the circuits that he occupies, the hijacker voice may snap into silence briefly, but his invisibility remains. Connor contends that "[t]he experience of a voice without an obvious origin… is an experience of the overload of sound… [i]t seems impossible for such unlocated or sourceless voices not to be experienced as a subjection to overmastering power"

---

[64] The British fundamentalist Islamic organization al Muhajiroun promoted a conference scheduled for 11 September 2003 with a poster of the "Magnificent 19 That Divided the World on September 11th," depicting each of the 9/11 hijackers along with a quote from the Qur'an: "… they were youth who believed in their Lord and We increased them in guidance" (Slack 1).

(Connor 24), recalling the sovereign power accorded to the hijacker voice as facilitated by his invisibility. In principle, the listening look attempts to corral this overload of sound into a more manageable, visually linked aural entity, though in doing so, the look perhaps errs on the side of reductive excess, producing a silence that functions in the same manner as the overload itself. The product of this overload is "an acousmatic silence, a silence whose source cannot be seen but which has to be supported by the presence of the analyst" (161), with the silence evoking the analysis of *The Scream* and the "Magnificent 19" images above, and the analyst existing as the obedient listener. Whether he is heard as a scream or a whisper, a sound or a silence, the hijacker voice is constantly present and always capable of making his presence known. Connor notes this persistence and its implications: "There seems no limit to the extremity of the violence that can be conjured up by the invisible voice, once freed from appearance or embodiment" (405), and it is this excessive capacity, at the levels of volume and meaning, that renders the hijacker voice such a frightening prospect.

Prone to excess and related to the divine voice of spoken tongues, the hijacker voice may be rendered as pure sound, at once exempt from meaning but still signifying terrifyingly. Dolar astutely concludes, via an example of soldiers mishearing an order, that "usually one hears the meaning and overhears the voice, one 'doesn't hear [the voice] well' because it is covered by meaning… the soldiers also bungled the voice the moment they isolated it; they immediately turned it into an object of aesthetic pleasure, an object of veneration and worship, the bearer of meaning beyond any ordinary meanings" (Dolar 4). Similarly, the superficial import of the hijacker voice (the cockpit communication protocol) is heard at first (prior to the revolt) before the broken English grain of that voice; at the same time, the voice is heard, his clipped tones implying a seriousness beyond his innocuous content. Roland Barthes offers a portrayal of the

terror of this liminal voice, whose calmness belies the tension between voice and message noted above: "there is no neutral voice – and if occasionally this neutrality or blankness of the voice occurs, it constitutes a great terror, as if we were to fearfully discover a petrified world, where desire would be dead" (Barthes 247). The ability to maintain calm, to offer voice and meaning simultaneously, makes the hijacker voice less a voice than a sound, as noted by Joan Didion in relation to William S. Burroughs: "Burroughs is less a writer than a 'sound'" (Didion 2). Additionally, the profound disjunction between tone and intent, literal language and linguistic inhabitation, reinforces the notion of the hijacker voice as sound, at once meaningless (intent not matching cockpit communication protocol) and profoundly meaningful. Once rendered pure sound, the hijacker voice is free to operate beyond the limits of traditional signification, adding yet more terror to the situation.

As pure sound, the hijacker voice cannot be expected to signify in any conventional manner, and indeed he does not. Yet, perhaps due to this extra-structural signification, the hijacker voice proves more perplexing still in his excessive meaning. With meaning as the intended goal of speech in most cases, "[i]f we speak in order to 'make sense,' to signify, to convey something, then the voice is the material support of bringing about meaning, yet it does not contribute to it itself" (Dolar 15), which suggests the voice as a medium, and its iteration as pure sound as a compromising of that medium function. The voice is in fact both medium and material, existing as a moderate invocation of the act to come, in addition to its provision of fodder for the repetition enabled by the technologized recording apparatus. In the case of the "unintelligible voice… one can only propose the formula: *it means that it means*" (25); simply in being able to speak, the hijacker voice forwards his meaning (you are not safe, you are not sound [but we are], we are a part of you).

Forcing pure sound into a linguistic matrix of meaning necessarily leaves "a remainder which cannot be made a signifier or disappear in meaning; the remainder that doesn't make sense, a leftover, a cast-off – shall we say an excrement of the signifier? The matrix silences the voice, but not quite" (20). It is from this remainder that the hijacker voice draws his exceptional force, the non-signifying, non-visible leftover left to fly over U.S. defenses and left as a specter over the event and its aftermath. One example of this remainder voice (remaindered to the periphery by U.S. systems of meaning, and which produces remains) is the scream, "unaffected as it is by phonological constraints… speech in its minimal function: an address and an enunciation. It is the bearer of an enunciation to which no discernable statement can be ascribed, it represents the pure process of enunciation before the infant is capable of any statement" (28). Rather than a pre-statement enunciation, the hijacker voice is a pre-enunciative *art*iculation/declaration demonstrating a distinct capacity for making statements, a capacity premised on a nuanced understanding of his place in the discursive realm that serves to problematize the interior monologue of the listener through the act of inhabitation.

The hijacker voice renders himself internal to the listener's positionality through his inhabitation of technologized channels (via inclusion in the documentary programming like *Inside 9/11*), so much so that the listener's listening act closely resembles her/his inner monologue, leading to pathogenic self-demonization. Connor asserts that "[t]o speak is always to hear myself speaking" (Connor 5), and this conceptualization of the inner monologue lays the groundwork for the inhabitation performed by the hijacker voice. The very pervasiveness of the hijacker voice as facilitated through inclusion in documentaries like *Inside 9/11* grants him provisional status as part of the mourning apparatus of the event to such a degree that, through the obedience necessitated by the listening positionality, the listener gravitates toward the

position of the speaking hijacker, creating a tension between nationalist outrage and proxy participation. The listening look, as embodied in *Inside 9/11*, engages in this process of pseudo-mourning, relocating the hijacker voice into the documentary filmic visual and establishing a proxy correlation there (no one-to-one correspondence may be established in the absence of internal footage from the planes), though one which serves only to facilitate an alignment with the speaking hijacker.

This approximation of self-listening "can be seen as an elementary formula of narcissism that is needed to produce the minimal form of a self" (Dolar 39), in this case the listener that congeals around and through the technologically omnipresent hijacker voice. What results is a possession, where "[t]he voice is the form of a malady's self-consciousness" (Connor 114), the hijacker voice enacting the outrage/guilt dichotomy and producing in the listener a reflexive sense of involvement in the plot, an infection by the "terrorist" pathogen that manifests in a talking cure. Reflexive involvement carries with it an implication of responsibility for the event, (un)intentionally meshing with Bush administration divestment of responsibility for the event (the perpetuation of the hijacker voice being a deliberate means of transferring guilt from higher ups to the masses). Still, the hijacker voice is not identical to the body of the listener (nor that of the hijacker from which he is separated): "The voice may perhaps be thought of as one such benign monster. Always standing apart from or non-identical with the body from which it issues, the voice is by definition irreducible to or incompatible with that body. And yet the voice is always in and of the body" (208). As the hijacker voice exceeds the bounds of language, so too does he exceed the bounds of his producing body, though not without maintaining a linkage to that body. Though no longer within the hijacker body (as per the suicide act), the hijacker

voice remains in and of the listener body and, more generally, the U.S. body (politic) as well, speaking through it in a kind of ventriloquy.

Ventriloquy aptly describes the operation of the hijacker voice within recording technology, where the voice manages to speak through the very documentaries, like *Inside 9/11*, which attempt to hyperbolicize "terrorist" evil while shoring up American exceptionalist ideology, doing violence to the entity through which he is speaking in the process. For Burroughs, as noted by Lydenberg, Western culture is "ruled by a system of mass ventriloquy in which disembodied voices invade and occupy each individual" (Lydenberg 411), in much the same way as the hijacker voice inhabits the listener more generally and individual listeners more specifically. The civilization is therefore inhabited by the noise-as-marker of civilization, the hijacker voice. Through inhabitation, the hijacker-as-ventriloquist is able to elide his identity: "More or less all we know about him, and all he seems to know about himself, is that he has the power not to be himself" (Connor 320), allowing for an invisibility that mimics that of the acousmatic voice in its acousmatic body, speaking through the dummy when its own body is through. This capacity to be other than oneself, to be other than the stereotypical "terrorist" Other, permits the hijacker to be instead the self-same through inhabitation, coming to resemble (or dissemble) the listener as that listener comes to sound like the hijacker.

In keeping with the dualistic nature of the hijacker voice construct, his ventriloquism is doubled as well, drawing on Connor's understanding of an early history of ventriloquism produced by Abbé Jean-Baptiste de la Chapelle from 1772: "There is first the power of the 'inner voice,' or voice from the belly… [s]econdly, there is the power that began to be thought of from the eighteenth century onwards as a throwing of the voice" (214). Doubled so, the inner voice takes on the role of the inhabited listener, whose body is spoken through by the pathogenic,

monstrous hijacker, an airsickness brought on by aberrant flight, and the thrown voice takes on the role of the hijacker voice, thrown into perpetuity through his technologization as his agents are thrown through the buildings and ground through their own exploits. The ventriloquy of the listener is clear from this analysis; the way in which violence is done to that listener-as-dummy (both –as-mannequin and –as-unknowing victim) is less so, and will be clarified below.

Speaking through constitutes a violence that is perhaps more profound than any physical violence that could be done to the listener, and the hijacker is not immune to this ventriloquism as well, though in the latter case, the ventriloquial act produces a salutary, multiple voice enacting the same message as the pre-spoken hijacker. Connor helpfully points to the Romantic/post-Romantic period as that in which "the words 'ventriloquism' and 'ventriloquise' first begin to be represented not as a dangerous or malicious act, but as violence towards the one that is ventriloquized, or reduced to the condition of a dummy" (297), though in the case of 9/11, one may aptly restore the danger and malice to the equation, albeit more as a collateral necessity so as to facilitate the placement of the hijacker voice within the U.S. psyche.

The singular ventriloquist comes to the fore, an "association of ventriloquism with the lone individual [which] helped to give it its newly disruptive political implications" (227), though this disruption is problematized by the compatibility of the singular hijacker-ventriloquist with the oft-used "lone gunman" conspiracy approach. For 9/11, either Atta, Osama bin Laden, or perhaps Khalid Sheikh Mohammed[65] might be that singular actor, though the cell formation required to enact the event undermines the possibility of individual credit. Instead of the singular hijacker-ventriloquist, there is La Chapelle's history "inundated by other voices, which he cannot but render to his reader" (220); the ventriloquial act may not be performed singly (a dyad being

---

[65] Khalid Sheikh Mohammed is the self-confessed mastermind of the 9/11 plot and uncle to 1993 World Trade Center bomber Ramzi Yousef.

necessarily implied in the dual voice and body), and neither may its narrativization, the dyad

implying an unchecked expansion of the voice into multiplicity. Even as Atta and Jarrah are

spoken through as agents of their ideological forbears, so too are those forbears spoken through

by fundamentalist precedent; even as Atta and Jarrah are ventriloquized, so too do they

ventriloquize the listener, the multiple voices only serving to broaden the affected area.

This sort of ventriloquism is evident in the treatment of recordings in *Inside 9/11*, where

both the absent and present are spoken through by the absence-as-presence, decentering the

visual and suggesting an inhabitational ventriloquialism at the heart of language itself. In the

case of the hijackers, both the interviewed and the narrator speak in the hijacker voice ostensibly

as a means of speaking through or around him, narrativizing him in an accepted fashion, though

each exists as an instance of ventriloquism. Portland International Jetport[66] employee Michael

Toohey reenacts his encounter with Mohamed Atta on the morning of 9/11 in an interview,

though his reconstruction includes only his side of the dialogue, framing Atta's voice as an

absence-as-presence, the hijacker voice speaking despite his apparent silence, ventriloquizing

Toohey silently but volubly. The narrator too attempts to ventriloquize Atta and Jarrah, but is

himself similarly ventriloquized in the course of recounting Atta's rendering of the selected date

for the attack, "two sticks, a dash, and a cake with a stick down," (*National*), and Jarrah's

decision to crash Flight 93: "[s]hall we finish it off?" (*National*). In both instances, the

interviewee-narrator assumes the positionality of the hijacker voice, enabling that voice to

inhabit the listener through a repetitive, agentic imbibing.

---

[66] Hijackers Mohamed Atta and Abdulaziz al Omari traveled together to Portland, Maine on 10 September, flying from the Portland International Jetport to Logan Airport in Boston on the morning of 9/11, with a connecting flight aboard American Airlines Flight 11 to Los Angeles. The reason for the trip to Portland is unknown, though it is speculated that Atta wished to avoid unnecessary visibility for the ten hijackers assembled at Logan, as well as possibly circumventing security at Logan by coming in on a continuing ticket (Goo 1).

Passengers are likewise ventriloquized and ventriloquize, Barbara Olson and Flight 93 passengers Tom Burnett and Jeremy Glick all having their words spoken by family members. As opposed to the hijacker voice, none of these voices are presumed capable of pronouncement by the narrator; as opposed to the Flight 93 films, none of these voices are reenacted, and available recordings of passenger calls from that flight are passed over in favor of the more easily and sympathetically narrated Olson, Burnett, and Glick. Accepted narrativity necessitates these decisions, as the appropriate framing and placement of the hijacker voice is essential to his characterization as pure evil. Narrative trickery extends to the World Trade Center as well, where the story of occupant Pasquale Buzzelli is told via his wife Louise, giving the impression that he perished in the collapse of the North Tower, only to have Buzzelli himself appear, as if back from the dead, an ineffectual spectral response to the spectral hijacker voice. As Jacques Derrida notes in *Limited Inc*, "the parasite *is part* of so-called ordinary language, and it is part of it as parasite" (Derrida 97), the seemingly ventriloquized but actually ventriloquizing hijacker voice being integral to the process of event narrativization, a return to the visceral in the documentary via the interviewee and narrator.

IN TONGUES: FLESHING LANGUAGE

Discussions of the hijacker voice in terms of divinity, dialect, status as pure sound, and product of ventriloquy, among other aspects, necessitate an examination of the particular functioning of language in relation to that voice, a function which is at once uncanny and visceral. Speaking of how he selects titles for his works, Novarina posits that "[s]ometimes there are sentences like that [a phrase from Pascal] that you love so much that you want to inscribe them on pebbles, tattoo them on your arms, choose them for your tomb" (Novarina 113), setting out the phrase (in this instance, Atta's well-known "we have some planes" declaration) as a

fetish object of sorts, though one that ultimately yields entombment. The sentence is an epigraph, epi- in its placement at the beginning of the event, graphic in its content and location on the tomb, and representative of the tenor of the event as a whole. In another piece, Novarina speaks to the problem of dialect, pointing to the implicit subversion in its usage in his portrayal of an individual bristling under the limitations of a language: "He didn't try to master French, to possess it, but quite to the contrary to worsen it, to lead it to its end" (90). This mind to usage as a terminal act is reflected not only in the self-termination of the suicide act of 9/11, but also in the inhabitation of language undertaken by the hijacker voice, where his use of English worsens the language, turning it against itself as the listener is turned against the U.S. Hijacker language, as appropriated to detrimental ends, approximates "[Swiss writer and art historian] Michel Thévoz's notion of 'sphinx-words,' which simultaneously stress a certain mystery, uninterpretability, and hermeticism" (34), thereby bearing a distinct sense of the uncanny in their use of familiar language (English) and familiar phrases (cockpit communication protocol), yet making them strange enough to recall the repressed. That which makes the hijacker voice uncanny, his approximate familiarity, also serves to visceralize him, returning him to the flesh repressed by the suicide act.

In many respects, the hijacker voice does not compute (despite his enclosure in the realm of the technological), he does not scan, he is not understood in its own terms, at least pre-inhabitation, implying a transcendence of the lexical that requires a re-rooting in the physical. Recalling the notion of the remainder mentioned above, the excessive aural that exists beyond the linguistic, linguist and literary theorist Jean-Jacques Lecercle offers a useful articulation of the term, where "words are always threatening to revert to screams, because they carry the violent affect of the speaker's body, can be inscribed by it, and generally mingle with it"

(Lecercle 60). For the hijacker voice, the remainder necessarily contains a notion of violence, a sense of linguistic boundaries breached by force, the scream arising from both the ruptured border and its rupturer. The relation to the body links the scream, a sub-/post-linguistic manifestation seemingly beyond the beyond-physical, to the body, rendering it as a guttural, and therefore deeply visceral, utterance.

Burroughs further anchors the hijacker voice in the physical via his understanding of the "function of the word virus as a conveyor of predetermined aspects of human life through the metaphor of electronic transmissions on magnetic tape – an invisible writing that imposes absolute control" (Lydenberg 412), reinscribing the obedience quotient of the listening act in the inscription of the voice upon the tape. Kaja Silverman makes a similar connection to the notion of inscription through consultation of Barthes, focusing on "'writing aloud' or 'vocal writing'… [which] conjures up the vision not only of writing-as-voice but of the word made flesh" (Silverman 190), language here being fleshed by an inscription in the recording apparatus much like that seen in Burroughs, the voice given grain through magnetic dust. The hijacker voice is produced from a body invested with certain temporal-spatial particulars, uncanny in his resemblance to his victims, departs from that body into the technologized realm and, due to his inability to be understood as is, must be returned to the physical, to the body, to attain legibility, though even that return is only moderately successful. This physical return is facilitated by the attempted deacousmatization of the hijacker voice through reattachment to a visual referent undertaken in *Inside 9/11*, though it is that filmic reembodiment that enables the hijacker voice to reembody himself in the listener through inhabitation.

DIS/ARTICULATION: THE BODY AND VOICE, OUT OF JOINT

The relation of the hijacker voice to the body which produces him and the visceral to

which he is returned demonstrates a tension in which that viscerality both grants power to and

drains power from the voice. Weiss asserts that "[i]t is only in leaving the poet that the word can

call out to the other and attain its own destiny" (Weiss [b] 27), neatly encapsulating the initial

power invested in the hijacker voice as he departs from his producing body. Without his

physical rooting, the voice is free to float in the ether and, once there, to be taken up by

technology in such a way as to amplify his fading sound indefinitely, though the lack of visceral

protection seems to render the voice vulnerable at the same time. Silverman's discussion of

Peeping Tom (Michael Powell, 1960)[67] reaches a similar conclusion, suggesting that "the voice

is capable of manifesting an even greater vulnerability than the body" (Silverman 40), both being

under peril, but the former more so without its material casing. Once freed from the body, the

voice is privy to certain advantages not available in his visceralized state.

Later in the same text, Silverman reestablishes the benefits of vocal disembodiment,

where "since the voice is capable of being internalized at the same time as it is externalized, it

can spill over from subject to object and object to subject, violating the bodily limits upon which

classic subjectivity depends, and so smoothing the way for projection and introjection" (80),

bringing the liminality of the hijacker voice back into focus in the process. A salutary mobility

results, permitting the hijacker voice to maintain a jarring, oscillating quality in the course of his

inhabitation, being at once antithetical to the listener's preexisting ideology, yet simultaneously

internal to that ideology. Weiss provides a model for measuring the toll incurred by the

---

[67] Powell's film chronicles a film studio employee, Mark Lewis, who also sidelines as a pornography photographer, and who uses a knife concealed in one of the legs of his tripod to engage in a number of serial murders, which he films and rewatches in the privacy of his own home. Lewis also records the screams of his victims, which Silverman suggests as being more frightening that the filmed murders.

separation of the hijacker voice from its producing body: "Immortality would be achieved at the cost of disassociation, decomposition, and decorporealization, obviating any possible resurrection of the body" (Weiss [a] 71-2). Yet, Weiss' conclusion ignores the way in which, due to its relative incomprehensibility to the listener, the hijacker voice is necessarily re-rooted in the physical through the correlating act of the listening look; initial disembodiment is a must, but once disembodied, the hijacker voice possesses the right of return from repression and to the body. *The* body may not resurrect, having destroyed itself in the suicide act; *a* body may, and the revisceralization of the hijacker voice requires only that, first the filmic body of *Inside 9/11*, then the visceral body of the listener.

To properly articulate, the hijacker voice must disarticulate from his producing body, that separation constituting a speech act in and of itself, the sub-/post-linguistic "BOOM" inherent in the extra-linguistic remainder present in the excess of the voice. Disarticulated, the hijacker voice is the product of a rupture, a break, recalling schizophrenia in Weiss: "The 'schizophonic' condition of the recorded and broadcast voice is that of the separation of the acoustic event from the lived, eroticized, speaking body" (Weiss [b] 79). The schizophonia described here suggests a hijacker voice divested of his producing body which yet contains the implication of a larger body (massed fundamentalist *jihadis*), not so much lived, eroticized, speaking bodies, but bodies with their lives placed on hold, stricturally de-eroticized, silenced bodies craving the opportunity to speak themselves out of their viscera. Schizophonia uses the technologized recording apparatus and implies no necessary physical relocation, while ventriloquism uses the visceral apparatus to facilitate separation, detaching the voice from the visceral as a means of endowing the inanimate with viscerality (typically a dummy). Yet, schizophonia's delinking of the acoustic event and the speaking body exists as the first stage of the ventriloquial functioning of the hijacker voice, its

rupture and placement of the voice in the technologized recording apparatus starting that voice

on the path to inhabitation.

When devisualized through the erasure of the body, the hijacker voice and his acousmatic

nature draw attention to the visual-aural difficulty identified by Connor: "Both the eye and ear

operate in, and require space; but the synesthesic relations of eye and ear are asymmetric, in that

the eye and ear have different kinds or qualities of space" (Connor 15). Discarding the occupied

physical space (registered by the eye), the disembodied voice takes up the resonant space

(registered by the ear), becoming articulate in his disarticulation. The listening look endeavors to

reinstitute this spatial physicality through its linking of the hijacker voice to a producing visual

entity (and, by proxy, a body), the filmic hijacker body of *Inside 9/11*, de-articulating the

articulate disembodied voice not in the manner of bodily separation, but rather of bodily

reparation (a new body being offered as compensation for the previously strictured, suiciding

one). Once disarticulated, the voice is free to ventriloquize, an act which troublingly

problematizes the relation of body and voice: "For those who assume the inseparability of voice

and body, ventriloquism means the multiplicity of the body: those who insist on the separability

of voice and body are forced to acknowledge the insecurity of the body's tenure of the voice, and

the voice's capacity to come deceitfully apart from the body" (147). With this dual

problematization in mind, the primacy of the body and voice comes into question, the relation

between the two being symbiotic, but not necessarily dependent, the body existing as "not the

source of the voice, but rather its tenuous and transient relic" (281), an organ separate from its

body. Rather than the ossifying relic creation suggested by placement within the technologized

recording apparatus, this relic is unverifiable, relying on a malleable provenance for its import, a

provenance that shifts from the hijacker voice to the inhabited listener.

The removal of the hijacker voice from his producing body suggests the separation of the vocal organ from that body, given the continuing signification of that voice after his departure, making the hijacker voice an organ without a body drawn from a body without organs.[68] Looking to writer and audio artist Gregory Whitehead's "new body politic supported by the prosthetic language of the disembody, the antibody, the nobody, the radiobody" for reinforcement (Weiss [b] 81), Weiss invokes Whitehead's "organs without bodies" in relation to the disembodied voice and its place in the technologized realm (81), positing the hijacker voice as an organ without a body. The voice is at once the disembody in his separation from the producing body, the antibody in his pathogenic characterization, the nobody in his post-mortem anonymity, and the radiobody in his inclusion in the technologized recording apparatus. Ventriloquy provides the linkage between this organ without body and the body without organs, fracturing the vocal organ and inverting the organ-body relation through an example of Anglican commitment to the faith at the cost of their tongues, after which speech persists, "[t]his miraculous 'speaking without tongues'" (Connor 180). This speaking without tongues also references the linguistic excessiveness of the hijacker voice, his ability to signify beyond the bounds of language, beyond the borrowed (English) and the blue (vulgar Arabic, a tongue bruised by stigmatization). If the organ without the body may continue to signify, so too may the body without the vocal organ, as demonstrated by this example.

The tension within the body-organ relation persists in the dialogue between miraculists and anti-miraculists in the realm of faith, where "[f]or the miraculists, the miracle was evidence of the autoloquial power of the Word, as a power of utterance and testimony which persisted

---

[68] This phrase references Antonin Artaud's articulation of the "body without organs" in his radio play "To Have Done With the Judgment of God," a concept subsequently discussed at some length by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari in works such as *Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus*.

unchanged through the mute or mutilated flesh; for the anti-miraculists, the fallible, historical flesh inevitably mutilated the Word" (185). Due to his improved communicative ability after the divestment of the flesh, the hijacker voice is soundly within the former, miraculist grouping, the event standing as a miraculous manifestation of the Word of fundamentalist Islam. Oppositely, the inhabitated listener is decidedly anti-miraculist, her/his attempts to historicize the hijacker voice by relocating him in the visceral serving only to mutilate his Word, twisting the humble speech into something altogether different, altogether more powerful than it would have been in and of itself. By "giving his [the hijackers'] body up to electromagnetic waves, [the hijacker] became a body without organs" (Militus 58), making way for the relocation of the disembodied hijacker voice within the bodily realm.

Though the hijacker voice is able to free himself from his producing body in the course of the suicide act, his very freedom implies an original bodily referent, necessitating an acquisition of and rooting in the body to achieve intelligibility, as offered by the listening look. Connor contends that "it is we who assign voices to objects; phenomenologically, the fact that an unassigned voice must always imply a body means that it will always partly supply it as well" (Connor 36), problematizing the body-voice linkage to a degree while demonstrating the necessity of assignation as a means of creating legibility within the listening look approach. Referring to Lodowick Muggleton's *True Interpretation of the Witch of Endor* from 1669[69], Connor speaks of the "'motional voice'… nothing other than the power to create… beings without a body… [which] corresponds in essence to what I [Connor] have called the 'vocalic body': it is a bodiless voice that procures its own body" (99). Through inhabitation of the

---

[69] A London tailor, Muggleton was the primary leader of a group that coalesced around himself and John Reeve (soon deceased), to whom the Lord revealed that they would be the Two Last Witnesses mentioned in Revelations. The group's faith, Muggletonianism, was profoundly anti-rational, believing in God in human form, predestination, and the end of the world (Connor 97-8).

listener positionality, the hijacker voice is such a motional voice/vocalic body, procuring a new body after discarding his previous one as assisted by the filmic body of *Inside 9/11*, though not the provisional one given by the listening look. The hijacker voice is not the agent of this bodily procurement; instead, the listener actively takes the voice into her/himself, soliciting her/his own possession. Somewhat similarly, exorcism performs a bodily creation, with the assembled at the exorcizing act "hav[ing] woven a kind of collective body out of the very act of pious utterance" (163), the divine speech of the hijacker voice creating a post-event community through his galvanizing action. In and of itself, the hijacker voice requires no reembodiment; however, if he is to be understood on his own terms by the listener practicing the listening look, such a reembodiment is necessary, and the reinvestiture of the hijacker voice with a producing body (though of a different sort than its originary one, yet which still performs the speechifying function interminably after the separation from the original) is so extensive as to render that body as a renewed locus of death.

Relocating speech and, more specifically, the hijacker voice, in a body returns the moment of initial death to that voice, redoubling the initial bodily divestment by implying the possibility of further such divestment from the reembodied body. Novarina succinctly notes that "[m]an alone succeeded in leaving by means of the sounds made" (Novarina 22), reattaching the voice to its left body simultaneous to its attachment to another body. Leaving implies both a body left and a possible return to a body (though perhaps not *the* body), paving the way for a renewed visceralization. This revisceralization renders the voice vulnerable in a manner that it is not when detached from the body: "The breathing circuit, the passage between inside and outside, is where the individual is most vulnerable and where the word insinuates itself most effectively" (Lydenberg 425). Where the liminality of the hijacker voice in his extra-corporeal

form grants him a beneficial mobility, the liminality of the visceralized breathing circuit

withdraws that mobility to re-root the voice in his fleshy apparatus.

Alexandra L.M. Keller describes this vulnerability: "Speech: a rate of expiration with a

date of expiration" (Keller 23), linking the expiring of breath to the expiring of death, which is in

this case a respiration as per the secondary body. The rate and date language suggests a doubled

temporality, the never really of a speech that is always already dead that collapses the life of

speech into its instantaneous death, but also its instantaneous life (the two coexisting in an

uneasily shared eternal moment). Yet, the hijacker voice, as contained in the technologized

realm, is, in Christof Migone's words, "dead on arrival" (Migone 42), always already dead (and

therefore never/always alive) before his reembodiment due to the death of the producing body

upon impact, as well as being dead in his first iteration (as functional speech aboard the plane) as

soon as he is taken into the technologized realm (as an inhabitant of the listener positionality).

With the revisceralizing function understood as a means of rendering the hijacker voice legible to

those unwilling or unable to meet him on his own terms, one must turn to the hijacker voice on

just those terms so as to grasp the hijacker voice in his natural habitat, the technologized realm of

recording and the placement of those recordings within *Inside 9/11*.

SPOOOOL![70]: THE WONDER OF RECORDING TECHNOLOGY

Placement of the hijacker voice as spoken by the producing body within the realm of

recording technology and, subsequently, within *Inside 9/11* renders that voice perpetual and

omnipresent by facilitating his inhabitation of the listener, revivifying the dead hijacker into the

living hijacker voice. Gregory Whitehead's *Shake, Rattle, Roll* attests to this point, where "the

---

[70] This effusive enjoyment of recording technology appears in Samuel Beckett's "Krapp's Last Tape," where the
titular character demonstrates a nostalgic affection for a series of reel to reel recordings that capture various
recountings of crucial events from his life.

living only speak through the articulated corpses of technology. They mediate the living, and so the more dead the transmission, the more alive the sensation. The more dead, the more alive" (Whitehead). By this schema, the further removed the initial hijacker utterance is from his producing body, the more alive he becomes through its repetition before and inhabitation of the listener. Weiss notes that "[w]here once total silence was only possible in death, now the dead continue to speak, sing, make noise, and pollute the body politic, leading to an eerie epistemological rupture" (Weiss [b] 78), recalling the impossibility of silencing the hijacker voice and pointing to his uncanny inhabitation of the listener. The dead voice, always already deceased, is simultaneously alive, the moments of life and death eliding into one perpetual moment, a delicate balance on the threshold of existence. Instead, as Weiss suggests, "[s]ound, which had previously been deemed ephemeral and unstructured, is now the gateway to eternity" through its relation to recording technology (Weiss [a] 19). Threshold and gateway meet in the merger of the never really and the always already, making death temporary at best, illusory more realistically.

While the hijacker is ever so briefly dead in the course of the suicide act, that death is only temporary, giving way to a ghosting that brings the hijacker back in the hijacker voice, a return of the sort noted by Rev. Dwight Frizzell and Jay Mandeville: "The ghost in radio's machinations is perpetually bifurcating and attempting to square itself. The modern gustatory devouring of voice or music by tape or digital optics and its subsequent regurgitation over the airwaves allows us to continually reinitiate the flow of the audible body and exteriorize consciousness" (Frizzell and Mandeville 86). Placing the hijacker voice in the context of digestion links him neatly to ventriloquism (etymologically linked to the French *ventre*, stomach), while also reflecting the perpetual presence of the voice as provided by the devoured

recording technology and filmic accompaniment. Additionally, the notion of the audible body accords with the listening look's provisional body, in which the hijacker voice is located, a body closer to the aural than the physical due to its provisionality, but still embodied nonetheless (albeit in the person of the listener). Gregory Whitehead distills the notion of the ghost to its purest essence, posing "the ghost question: Who's there? Is anybody out there on the other side of this broadcast?" (Whitehead 89). In its sheer existence, the spectral hijacker voice creates an implicit listener, the listener that he inhabits through the medium of recording technology and his use in the documentary film.

Recording technology makes itself evident by reiterating the hijacker voice as a function of the vagaries of the recording media themselves, be it the hisses and pops of magnetic tape, the crackle of cell phone reception, or something else in the ether. Burroughs gestures towards this self-evidence in the notion of "the audible *click* of the machine as a cut-in segment interrupts the underlying sequence" (Lydenberg 427), an intervention that recalls Atta and Jarrah's use of the talk-back button to contact the cabin and air traffic control, revealing the discontinuity and fragmentation contained in the continuous, whole hijacker voice. Such a click points to the duplicity of the hijacker voice and the disjunction between his literal signification (via English and cockpit communication protocol) and his remainder (pure sound and the implication of violence to come). This click may be read against French Symbolist writer Villiers de l'Isle-Adam's "*claque*, a group of hired clappers… a deception necessary to the success, indeed to the very existence, of the production"(Weiss [a] 68), as described by Weiss. The *claque* in this case is the pre-inhabitation listener, whose parroting of the accepted narrative of national victimhood is necessary to sustain that account of the event, but whose very listening obedience leads to a repetition of the hijacker voice that facilitates inhabitation.

In addition to the *claque*, there is also Gregory Whitehead's cut, "an extreme, yet highly mediated, linguistic and acoustic violence" identified as somewhat similar to the click (Weiss [b] 75), an evident editing entry of the hijacker voice which is antagonistic to English and which offers an aural agonistic. The fact that the cut is highly mediated references the placement of the hijacker voice in the technologized recording apparatus and the documentary film, a location which enables his linguistic violence (done to English) and acoustic violence (beyond the bounds of language). Finally, there is a return to Burroughs in the *schlupp* in Douglas Kahn, "an appropriate sound for the unhewn hungers of junk or sex, for it is the body's interior making its needs conspicuously known within the world" (Kahn 76), and one which links back to the need expressed by the disembodied vocal organ, the ghost question which inhabits its respondent, achieving a voice beyond its means.

Through his inclusion in the technologized realm of recording and the reembodiment of deacousmatizing documentary film like *Inside 9/11*, the hijacker voice is granted an ability to project beyond the capacity of his producing body, permitting a resonance for that voice which amplifies him across time and space. Kaye Mortley describes the microphone's position as an enabling intermediary: "A microphone is not just a spy, or a thief. A microphone is also an interlocutor. There can be a two-way exchange even if you (the mike-stand, as it were) never open your mouth" (Mortley 160). The microphone intercedes in the initial speech act, spying on the hijacker-spy and stealing voice from the life-stealing hijacker (with his permission), implying an exchange in the ventriloquial act of inhabitation. At the same level of technology, Mary Louise Hill makes a useful media distinction: "[W]hen television went public in the 1940s, it was spoken of as 'radio with added vision,' suggesting that radio was, at that time, considered a complete entertainment system" (Hill 108), and though that consideration is later altered, in the

case of the acousmatic hijacker voice, the radio is complete, with visual attachments serving only to add a layer of hyperreality to the event. It is this hyperreality in which the listening look is engaged, a superfluous relocation of the aural hijacker voice in the physical which pays little heed to the collaterality of the producing body from the start, a mere trifle to be cast aside in the course of the suicide act, an encumbrance on the path to paradise.

Material apparatuses also root the hijacker voice in the physical (as per the above discussion of reembodiment) and extend him beyond the capacities of the physical. In the case of Burroughs' cut-ups, "[w]ith the voice 'inscribed' on magnetic tape – visible, reproducible, and independent of the speaker – the distinction between speech and writing and the privileging of the former over the latter is undermined" (Lydenberg 414), though this materialization of the hijacker voice does little to pry him from the grasp of the hijacking ideology (itself reinscribed in the listener) or elide the speech-writing tension (one may write the hijacker voice in audio transcripts, but one may never right it). Speaking of the difficulties posed to ventriloquy by early audio technology, Charles Olin asserts that "'the ventriloquist comes into the world with… a 'double throat' by which he is enabled to project his voice into space and have it explode anywhere at will, much as a dynamite bomb explodes away from the source from which it is hurled'" (Olin 11). The hijacker voice, though perhaps not born with an internal ventriloquial capacity like the traditional ventriloquist, accesses a double throat through recording technology, then redoubled via the inclusion of those recordings in the documentary film, projecting the voice explosively into the world at large. In the shift from ventriloquy as possession to ventriloquy as voice projection, there is "a move from a voice that enters to a voice that is thrown or projected" (Connor 197), though the hijacker voice performs both functions, albeit externally in the case of the former (inhabiting rather than being inhabited), an excessive

manifestation of the ventriloquial that finds a counterpart in the excessive remainder as it relates to audition.

If the listener is implied in the act of speech, then excessive speech necessitates the presence of an excessive listening, an ability to listen where no listening is expected or anticipated, though the hijacker voice artfully manages this excessive audition to his own ends. Silverman defines the relation between excessive speech and excessive hearing, noting that "[a]uthoritative speech, for instance, often implies or is implied by a heightened faculty of audition – the capacity, as it were, to 'over-hear'" (Silverman 54), linking the declarative pronouncements of the hijacker voice to an over-hearing. Such an over-hearing recalls the perhaps accidental use of the talk-back button (transmitting communications intended for the passengers over a broader air traffic control signal), as well as, to shift to the visual briefly, the oversight of the pilot (either as hijacker or as original pilot kept alive to facilitate target return) and the over-sight (paradoxically lapsing back into blindness) of the intelligence apparatus prior to the event. This shift to the visual aligns with the listening look's move to correlate the aural to a provisional body, oversight implying a bodily altitude and over-sight implying a bodily permeability while still retaining links to audition. In her analysis of *The Conversation* (Francis Ford Coppola, 1974),[71] Silverman offers a description of the fear provoked by superior audition: "The intrusion is the secular realization of his [protagonist Harry Caul's] theological anxieties about being overheard by someone whose powers of audition exceed his own. His initial reaction to the apparatus has been completely reversed: instead of exercising control over the sounds emitted by others, the sounds he himself makes now fall within the reach of a superior

---

[71] That Silverman should turn to *The Conversation* as an example is instructive in this context, given the film's devotion to a narrative of audio surveillance in which protagonist Henry Caul (Gene Hackman) is both the listener and the listened, his own surveillance tools being used against him in much the same manner as the hijacker voice turns *Inside 9/11*'s own accepted renarrativization against it by enacting an inhabitation of the listener.

ear" (97). For the listener, the previous ability to surveil at will is countered by the hijacker voice, which speaks from a surveillance positionality, controlling the sounds emitted by others through inhabitation and thus hearing only himself. At this point, Migone's observation that "Nietzsche dubbed the ear as the organ of fear" is apt (Migone 50), the aural functioning as the locus of "terror" through the specter of superior audition that redoubles the inhabitational control of speech by controlling hearing as well.

With the necessary existence of a listener as counterpart to the speaker, a mutual constitution of the voice/audition relation is implied, the listener creating the speech act simultaneous to the speaker's creation of the listener through the utterance. René Farabet provides apt terminology, coining the concept of the "au(di)teur" (Farabet 56), which implies that the listener places her/his own imprint on the listened speech in the manner of the filmic auteur, participating in and creating the listening act (and listening look) and not simply being ventriloquized by the hijacker voice, but rather participating in her/his own puppetry. The speech act is framed in relation to a canon of similar speech acts as a prerequisite for membership in the au(di)teur's body of work, a relation often problematically established by oversimplification and elision. Silverman attempts to locate the ghost in the machinery of recording technology in relation to the filmic, suggesting that "the camera most often supplies that harmonizing representation [between machine and director], although… the tape recorder can perform a similar function by virtue of its association with human hearing" (Silverman 11), finding the ghost of the hijacker voice in the listening apparatus, which implies an active recorder on the other end of his transmission.

Such harmonization is the case in documentary usages of the hijacker voice, where "[a] director may turn the camera on his or her face, or the tape recorder on his or her voice, and

incorporate the results into a film in the guise of a visual representation, a voice-over, a voice-off, or a synchronized sound and image 'totality'" (213), as exemplified by *Inside 9/11*. The hijacker, as director of the event, actively turns recording technology and the filmic on himself in the course of the event, providing a voice-over to that event, a voice looming over the listener, a voice over via the suicide act, a voice off in the distance of the geopolitical periphery, yet a voice that attaches his sound to images of the event, producing an irrevocable totality that allows his continued presence post-mortem, facilitating inhabitation. For this inhabitation to gain full force, its speech act and its speaker, the hijacker voice, must be repeated ad nauseum, only without the nausea.

The hijacker voice resonates in and of himself, the sound never truly dying, only ebbing into near silence; however, his placement within recording technology and the documentary film allows the voice to persist, though he must be repeated to gain his full force. Connor summarizes the necessity constructively: "From being a source of powerfully mingled pleasure and menace, the technologically autonomized voice becomes a source simply of repeatable pleasure, or of the pleasure of repeatability itself" (Connor 40). Repeated through inclusion, the pleasure of the hijacker voice (for the hijacker and associates) is repeated, redoubling the basic pleasure found in repetition itself. Artaud states that "by repeating I annul" (Artaud 16), though the only thing being annulled in this scenario is the agentic resistance of the listener, who is drawn into complicity after being worn down by repetition of the hijacker voice, and perhaps also the overall accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood.

The voice, as a sonic, aural undertaking, resembles Novarina's "suicide by waves: a man who disappears while speaking" (Novarina 112), with the multiple attacks serving as (radio) waves, permitting the hijacker not to disappear, but to dis-appear, establishing a non-visual

presence in the aural. Approaching Althusser, the suicide also waves, hailing the listener and interpellating that listener as a ventriloquial subject. French fable writer Francois Rabelias' *Pantagruel*[72] indirectly points to the repetitive power of the hijacker voice: "we could see sharp words, bloody words (which, according to the pilot, sometimes went back to the place where they'd been spoken, only to find the throat that uttered them had been slit open)" (Rabelais 497). Recalling the slit throat of the flight attendant and pilot, the pilot-hijacker's own sharp, bloody words return to the place where they had been spoken, attaching themselves to the event and its documentary repetition. Additionally, the location of the bloody words in their slit throat recalls the attempted revisceralization of the devisceralized hijacker voice undertaken by the listening look, a return to the body as the place of speech. In its correlative effort, the listening look tries to allow the hijacker voice to be seen, his bloody words to be visible, and thus legible to the listener. The documentary attempts to enact Novarina's declarative erasure: "Let the world not exist. This is your strength, your deepest conviction. Must repeat this every morning. I came there to say that the world does not exist. I had been sent for this" (Novarina 81), though this repetitive desire to wipe the world in which 9/11 is possible, where U.S. complicity is possible, from the face of the earth only relies on the selfsame repetition that makes that world increasingly apparent through the inhabitation of the hijacker voice. A repulsive voice is compulsively repeated, competing with national narratives and repeating the success of the event in the after-event.

<p style="text-align:center">NOW/HERE'S ALRIGHT: THE LISTENING LOOK</p>

Much has been said (so to speak) about listening and not much about looking; or, to put it differently, much has been heard about hearing without seeing much about seeing. With this in

---

[72] *Pantagruel* is the first in a series of five novels written in the 16th century by François Rabelais, all of which are centered around the adventures of father and son giants Gargantua (father) and Pantagruel (son).

mind, a more direct discussion of the listening look is in order, one that draws together all of the aspects mentioned above into a coherent vision of vision. The listening look approaches the sonic overload posed by the din of the event itself and the hijacker voice offered by his suiciding, producing body with a mind to reducing it to a manageable, comprehensible level, though in doing so, the look may hyperbolically reduce that cacophony to silence, an overwhelming counterpart that allows the hijacker voice to resonate with the same force. By locating the hijacker voice within the realm of the visible through a tentative attempt at a correlative link, the look calls on the stability of the seen to provide a legibility to that previously illegible and foreign (literally and figuratively) voice, solidifying the fluidity of the aural into a static, knowable visual. This visible location constitutes a re-rooting in the physical which does not stop at the visible writ large, but continues on to a relocation of the hijacker voice back into his producing body, or at least an attempt at such a placement. The linkage of the hijacker voice to his producing body disarticulates the articulate hijacker voice (rendered particularly well-spoken after being freed from its producer) not in the sense of separating him from his body, which is the desired disarticulation sought by the suicide act, but rather in the sense of pulling that voice back into the physical, a reparation of the preceding separation.

Yet, the look's efforts to reattach the hijacker voice to his producing body are of only limited success, that body being invisible in the course of the suicide act and inaccessible thereafter. As such, the site of reembodiment is a provisional body which, in its indirect relation to the producing body, is at some remove from that body, existing in a liminal state between the aural hijacker voice and the physical producing body. Even this body fails in the context of the look, which assumes that the provisional body will suffice as a temporary locus for the hijacker voice which will enable his legibility. Instead, the listener itself becomes the physical site of the

hijacker voice through the act of inhabitation, the listener absorbing the voice through repetition of the documentary programming and ventriloquizing him in a manner that produces a sense of self-implication and guilt. The attempt at relocation into the producing body would have been ultimately unsuccessful regardless of the failings of the listening look, as that body is always already superfluous, a mere collateral entity to be shed in the suicide act as a means of inserting the hijacker voice into the machinery of pseudo-mourning, as provided by recording technology and the filmic, be it the Flight 93 films or *Inside 9/11*. Though perhaps well intentioned in its desire for understanding, the listening look is ultimately doomed from the start. The always already of the look's failure reflects the always already of the temporally dislocated hijacker voice, resonating eternally through his inclusion in the technologized recording apparatus and the filmic. At the same time, this compounded perpetual instantaneity or collapsed temporality allows the ongoing act of hijacker speech to become an ongoing speaking through.

Situating the listening look within the fractured discourse surrounding the movement from ocularcentrism to voice will reflect the dynamism of the aural, a dynamism which exceeds that of the visual and which is deliberately obscured in the listening look's efforts to reattach the aural to the visual and physical. Martin Jay provides a typically linear yet still informative understanding of the shift away from ocularcentrism within French thought in his *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought*, a shift which privileges the auditory. As a function of the First World War, Eric J. Leed notes that "[t]he invisibility of the enemy put a premium upon auditory signals and seemed to make the war experience particularly subjective and intangible" (Leed 19), a contextualization of the auditory that proves relevant to the hijacker voice. Where the hijacker itself is invisible, the voice is the only means of access, though such access necessarily places the listener in a subjective position, qualifying

the validity of the victimhood narrative and allowing that listener to become inhabited. The shift away from ocularcentrism is evident in *Inside 9/11*'s focus on the aural, where the event arrives as sound, is plunged into silence, and emerges once more against the visual, the crisis of the ocular meeting the cresting of the aural. In terms of the event's initial recognition, two scenes support the notion of an aural arrival: first, in footage captured by French filmmaker Jules Naudet and representing one of only two known video captures of Flight 11's impact with the North Tower, the firemen in the foreground (the subjects of a documentary by Naudet that later appears as *9/11*), as well as the camera trained on them, register the plane's approach first as sound, then turn/pan to see the plane impact the tower; second, U.S. Army accountant Sheila Moody, whose office was in the E-Ring of the Pentagon, notes Flight 77's approach aurally as well: "I remember hearing the sound of an airplane engine, that whistling sound when they're descending" (*National*). Both scenes demonstrate the non-necessity of the visual to the event's arrival, the aural proving the first, and truest, rendering of 9/11, so much so that it is in some cases absented in an effort to facilitate accepted narrativity.

Much like the case of Michael Toohey discussed above, a monological understanding of dialogue is practiced by accepted narrators as they sculpt an account of the event in *Inside 9/11*, though the intentional silencing of the event and its spectral hijacker voice simply allows that voice to signify via the absence-as-presence. The film makes reference to the unreleased cockpit voice recordings from Flight 93, held back as potential evidence in the long completed Zacarias Moussaoui trial, suggesting a deliberate withholding of recordings that may prove contrary to accepted narrativity, in this case those featuring the voice of Ziad Jarrah. Likewise, surveillance footage of Flight 77 hijackers Nawaf and Salem al Hazmi passing through security is presented without audio, though the graininess of the video speaks to the insufficiency of the visual,

permitting the absent audio to speak. After the collapse of the South Tower, fireman Richard

Picciotto notes that "from this tremendous noise… silence" (*National*), a silencing of the event

by the accepted narrative rendering of it, a moving away from the cacophonous hijacker voice to

its absence. In the post-collapse landscape, "the whole city became very soft. All you could

hear was your voice" (*National*), in the words of WNYW-TV reporter Mike Sheehan, the

silenced hijacker voice being met with the agenticized victim voice, albeit in an environment of

the hijacker voice's design. Yet, the agenticized victim, or pre-victim in the case of the Flight 93

passengers, is similarly unvoiced, as represented by the silence following Jeremy Glick's

assurance to his wife: "[s]tay on the line, I'll be right back" (*National*), though Glick never

returns, his voice absent from the film and the absented hijacker voice speaking in its place.

Derrida contends that "iterability is differential… that the remainder… is never that of a full or

fulfilling presence: it is a differential structure escaping the logic of presence or the (simple or

dialectical) opposition of presence and absence, upon which opposition the idea of permanence

depends" (Derrida 53), and the iterations of the hijacker voice as presence, absence, and absence-

as-presence serve to enact an impermanent permanence, a voice always leaving but never gone,

never here but always heard, imperfectly silent and a silence that reveals the imperfections

within accepted narrativity.

     Inside 9/11 clings to the visual, though in the end, it is the aural that trumps, the

listening look failing in its blind efforts to deacousmatize the hijacker voice, leaving the aural as

the best and only option. Recounting his efforts in rescuing individuals from the Pentagon after

the impact of Flight 77, Lt. Col. Ted Anderson tells of a burning man who crosses a corridor in

front of him; after Anderson and a fellow rescuer extinguish the man, Anderson realizes the

extent of the burns: "[M]y God, he doesn't have any eyes" (*National*). Anderson's blinded

victim is akin to the blinded viewer of *Inside 9/11* and other visual accounts of 9/11 which, in their attempts to reattach the hijacker voice to a visual referent, are likely to get burned. Instead, as the visual fails, as other options seem scarce if not completely absent, as all seems lost, one may do well to follow the words spoken by Tom Burnett to wife Deena after she asks "what else could I do, and he said 'Pray, Deena. Just pray'" (*National*), not so much a turn to divinity as a turn to aurality. When all else fails, there is always the aural.

Having developed Dolar's elucidation of the acousmatic voice along with further theoretical support, this analysis articulates the listening look, shedding light on the manner in which the retro-location of the aural in the visual against the power of the visual-auditory shift enables the hijacker voice to inhabit the listener. Within this look, the visual is consulted as a means of locating the speaker, combating the invisibility of the hijacker by likewise combating the illegibility of the hijacker voice, rendering him readable through repetition. In the moment in which the voice is dispatched through the electronic prostheses of the air traffic control transmission and the cockpit voice recorder, its receiver strives to match the voice to its producer, enacting a simultaneity of the visual and the aural that may be dubbed the listening look. The listening look is directed outward from the first, presuming that the sound it hears and attempts to locate is external to itself. However, as demonstrated by the phenomenon of inhabitation enacted by the hijacker voice, the sound is internal, both to the nation at large (having traversed the borders with relative ease, speaking to a preceding complicity) and to the listener individually, the absorption of accepted narratives of national victimhood carrying with it an extra passenger not listed on the manifest, but who manifests just the same. This listening look is flawed from the start in so much as it is predicated on external location, projecting the speaker implied by the act of listening outside of itself, not recalling that listening also evidences

self-speech, even if it is not the self (but rather the inhabiting hijacker voice) that is speaking. The critical listener is already aware of this fact, having always understood that the listener is always already imbricated in the act of the speaker, and understanding that ventriloquy can only occur to such a degree as the listener-dummy allows it. Instead, the listener remains blissfully ignorant to her/his own self-puppetry, the manner in which s/he not only allows her/himself to be spoken through, but in which s/he actively speaks through her/himself, extending her/himself to encompass the hijacker voice, then detaching and speaking through the self-as-vessel. One may look, one may listen, but in attempting to wed the former to the latter, one locates nothing, save for the self as the locus of the apprehended sound, the self apprehended by the inhabiting voice, invisible yet visible in the self, in the mirror, in the event. The documentary must therefore give way to an even more fragmentary, amateur rendering of the event if an accurate account of the aural and its extra-accepted narrative of the event is to be found.

STEP BACK (IN THE CU[N]T): THE SPECTRAL VOICE AND ORAL/AURAL HIJACKINGS

After tracing the progression from professional to amateur through the semi-fictionalized and documentary productions of the first two chapters of the visual section, one may finalize that transition from the practiced to the provisional, the unitary to the fragmentary through an analysis of two short pieces posted to YouTube and their envisioning of an almost purely aural hijacking. Prior to this moment, the hijacking has always contained a visual element, whether it be dramatic (as endowed by the reenactments present in the semi-fictionalized productions, themselves enactments of a certain narrativity that is temporarily concretized within those productions) or acousmatic (the rootless voice being far too ruthless to exist for long, at least without tenuous assignment to a producing locus). With the shift to the aural, which begins in this chapter and continues throughout the aural section to follow, the visual is accordingly deemphasized, revealed for the screen that it is, a flat projection of accepted narrativity that at once codifies that which is projected upon it, while also screening, selecting the raw narrative materials that appeal to its particular sensibilities and allowing the favored data to sluice through, producing a narrative of renewed U.S. greatness while the balance is grated out.

Before engaging in a direct analysis of this turn to the aural and the possibility for a purely aural hijacking that it suggests, this chapter will begin by taking a closer look at the two pieces in question, Hodge-Stansson's "The Long Afternoon" (Randall Haworth, 2006) and Omega Wolf Productions' "Demon Ride" (Matty Tucker, 2008), to ascertain their overall referentiality to 9/11 itself. Then, the chapter will discuss the narrative power of voice in relation to the intercessive, seemingly recessive participation of the extra-accepted narrative speaker as a talking back to precursive narrativizers, formulating a notion of the daursal that extends David

Wills' conceptualization of that which comes from behind to address the amateur narrativizations of 9/11. Finally, the chapter will conclude with an analysis of new media's specific facility for accommodating such extra-accepted narratives, where a participatory interrelation in response to a hailing of sorts yields a gendered, sexualized hijacker and hijacked that renders neo-narrativity a far more fluid enterprise than the accepted narrativity that precedes, but does not exceed (its excising limitation acting as a lesser counterpart to the exercise of voice, a loosening of the chords that counteracts the cordoning off with an according in), the new narratives.

Beginning with Hodge-Stansson's "The Long Afternoon," each of the shorts contains a number of references to 9/11 that render their narratives of suburban carjacking exceedingly relevant to discussions of aural narrativity and the prospect of a purely aural hijacking. Filmed by Hodge-Stansson Productions (though credited to Tabula Rasa Films, a slate wiping that erases names as it makes them through the relative fame of the filmmakers and actors garnered by the short's popularity online[73]) in 2006, "The Long Afternoon" is a two part narrative (along with a reel of outtakes) that captures the adventures of Robert Lamastus (Logan Hodge), a young Caucasian driving a 2002 Chevy Tahoe, after he is carjacked by a hyperbolic African American thug named Ricky (Gunnar Fritz Stansson). Their adventures include a stop at a local restaurant and another at a local drug house before Ricky ejects Robert from the SUV and drives away, with the intent of taking the vehicle to a friend's house, where it will be disassembled and the parts fenced. Ricky is himself a fixture in previous Hodge-Stansson projects, being the main character in the infamous "Unforgivable" series,[74] and though that series is highly regarded

---

[73] At the time of writing, "The Long Afternoon (Part One)" has garnered nearly 500,000 views, "The Long Afternoon (Part Two)" nearly 300,000, and "Outtakes from 'The Long Afternoon'" nearly 200,000, attesting to their popularity on YouTube, with countless additional embeds and mentions in blogs.
[74] The "Unforgivable" series consists of eight short films ("Unforgivable 1-6," "Unforgivable A, C") which feature rambling, hyper-misogynistic and violent monologues from "Ricky," narrating his experiences as a thug in the

among connoisseurs of the online short genre, "The Long Afternoon" may be rightly described as his star turn.

Throughout the course of the carjacking experience, parallels to 9/11 abound: from the first, Ricky's cheerful greeting to Lamastus upon approaching the car, "[h]ey, nigger, what's up?" ("The Long… [Part One]"), swiftly shifts to a less welcoming "I'll slit your throat" ("The Long… [Part One]") as the carjacking begins, recalling the gentleman hijacker's initially pleasant disposition (also seen in Ricky's preppy attire of a polo shirt, cargo shorts, and sandals) prior to the use of its knife on the nape of the flight attendant. Ricky makes his intentions apparent early on, asserting that "this is a hijack, nigger" ("Outtakes"), extending the apparent carjacking to a less specific hijacking, a broader category that then encompasses 9/11's skyjacking.[75] Further, the use of a cell phone throughout, after Ricky confiscates Robert's phone so as to coordinate the breaking down of the vehicle for parts by an associate, serves to comment on the act in progress, including a moment where Ricky's dealings are interrupted by an incoming call from Lamastus' father, a familial encounter that aligns with calls placed from the hijacked airliners to loved ones, as well as hijacker pilots Mohamed Atta and Marwan al-Shehhi's call to confirm that the plot was on before boarding. Additionally, the carjacking scenario takes place in a cabin setting (in this case that of the SUV rather than the airliner), with

---

contemporary world and set in the woods. Ricky is paradoxically intellectual (referencing the films of David Lean, the plays of August Strindberg, and papal precedent in his rants), yet situates himself as unassailably hard throughout, his unrelenting spiels being punctuated only by the occasional laughter of the camera operator (Logan Hodge, the other member of the Hodge-Stansson duo). The series was motivated by a unique advertising contest, as noted by *Eng C&R* blogger Brett: "It turns out, Sean 'P. Diddy' Combs was sponsoring a commercial-making contest for his new cologne fragrance, 'Unforgivable.' [Gunnar Fritz] Stansson… decided he could do a good job at making a video in keeping with the 'Unforgivable' theme" (Brett 2).

[75] L.W. (Logan) Hodge describes the scenario depicted in "The Long Afternoon" as one in which "[a] character 'Ricky' hijacks the vehicle of another character 'Robert Lamastus'" (Hodge). When questioned concerning the use of the term "hijack" in place of what is ostensibly a carjacking, Hodge contends that "carjacking or hijacking are interchangeable for me in this case" (Hodge), though the language choice is certainly evocative in its more overt linkage of the scenario to 9/11.

the driver/pilot being allowed to persist until his usefulness has expired, with the implication that his person may then follow the same route, as hypothesized in relation to American Airlines Flight 11 and the potential retaining of pilot John Ogonowski for all but the final approach into the North Tower of the World Trade Center.[76]

The references continue throughout the short, with Ricky's insistence on adjusting the radio resonating with the hijacker's own keying of the airliners' communication technologies, as well as their efforts to turn off the planes' transponders to inhibit tracking.[77] Further, Ricky implores Robert to "tell me what you're thinking, ho" ("The Long… [Part One])" as Lamastus attempts to offer possibilities for how the carjacking will proceed, referencing the hijackers' mistaken use of the talkback button and its wider broadcast of their words beyond the cabin into air traffic control channels.[78] Lamastus' shirt, depicting the cover art for an album by English Marxist post-punk band Gang of Four, references both the four planes commandeered on 9/11, as well as the four hijackers aboard United Airlines Flight 93. Two statements by Ricky likewise recall 9/11: first, he asserts that "I don't make deals with white boys, I just break they necks" ("Outtakes"), gesturing towards standing policy against negotiating with "terrorists;" second, he reminds Lamastus that "nigger, I'm royalty" ("Outtakes"), a position that Atta takes in masquerading as a Saudi prince while engaged in flight training in Florida as a means of

---

[76] Though this contention is unconfirmable, it is believed by some that the continued activation of the talkback button in the cockpit, which enables what is happening in the cockpit to be heard over air traffic control channels, "indicates that he [Ogonowski] [is] in the driver's seat much of the way" (Clayton 1).

[77] Transponders emit a coded signal that allows air traffic controllers to accurately track a flight's location, including speed and altitude. Once a transponder is turned off, altitude is difficult to discern, and a plane may only be located via radar, with coverage being fairly sparse in many areas and impossible at low altitudes. In a hijacking, the pilot or first officer is to transmit a four digit code which appears as "HJCK" on air traffic control monitors. This code takes only a few seconds to transmit, but none of the planes hijacked on 9/11 do so (Thompson).

[78] The talkback button allows for simultaneous broadcast of a message to both the passenger cabin and to air traffic control. It is likely that Atta's messages, as well as those of United Airlines Flight 93 pilot hijacker Ziad Jarrah, were intended only for broadcast to the cabin, their wider audience being an accidental one.

155

explaining his uncommon financial standing.[79] Another parallel exists in the stop at the drug

house: after the first blunt stop (Ricky breaking from his carjacking pursuits to get high),

mimicking the abrupt meeting of American Airlines Flight 11 and the North Tower, the event

proceeds unnoticed, both the carjacking and hijacking continuing until just prior to the second

blunting, the equally immediate eviction of Lamastus from his vehicle and its mimicry of the

arrival of United Airlines Flight 175 at the South Tower. Ricky's rather crude behavior casts

him as both a revolting and a revolting passenger, much like those aboard United 93 who take

matters into their own hands, Ricky-as-unseater (and his analogue, hijacker pilot Ziad Jarrah)

being unseated by the passenger, an untailoring of the neatly sewn plot that retorts a resounding

no to the yea on offer.[80] These plentiful references closely link "The Long Afternoon" to the

events of 9/11, allowing an analysis of the former to hold significant relevance to the particulars

of the latter.

Moving to Omega Wolf Productions'[81] "Demon Ride," the short is a one-part narrative

(so far, at least, the "To be continued…" at the short's conclusion suggesting further dispatches

to follow) featuring an encounter between a shoddily-costumed carjacking demon (referred to

only as "Demon" in the credits, and played by writer Daniel Sword) and driver Rosemary

---

[79] This assertion is also unverifiable, only appearing in Daniel Hopsicker's intriguing yet poorly documented book *Welcome to Terrorland: Mohamed Atta and the 9-11 Cover-Up in Florida* (Mad Cow Press, 2005).
[80] This untailoring recalls Thomas Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*, translated as "the tailor, re-tailored," which posits "The Everlasting No" and "The Everlasting Yea" as part of its Transcendentalist narrative of personal discovery, the pessimism of the former being trumped by the optimism of the latter at the conclusion of Book II.
[81] The genesis of the group's name also parallels its chosen portrayal of a 9/11-like hijacking scenario. On the group's website, the origin of the "omega wolf" image is explained in an extended quote from photographer Carl Cook: "At the bottom of the heap is the lowly omega wolf. She, or he gets it from all sides. Sometimes the individual accepts their station in life, and spends its life within the pack. Sometimes too, the omega wolf is driven away… [f]or those of us who have experienced life at the bottom, we can feel a sort of kinship with the omega" ("About" 1). This subaltern positionality accords with that of the hijackers, beset upon by what they perceive as Western crusaders, only to strike back with a vengeance, while also indirectly resembling the victimhood narrative assumed by the U.S. in the wake of the event.

(Amelia Goodyear).[82] In the course of the carjacking, the demon requests a food stop similar to that demanded by Ricky, in this case settling upon Wendy's when a local Taco Bell is unavailable, briefly exiting the vehicle to protest a mistake in the order, then returning to give directions to a drop-off point, much as Ricky eventually removes the driver after discussing various drop-off points himself. Rather than the roadside encounter that begins "The Long Afternoon," when Ricky approaches Lamastus' Tahoe under the guise of soliciting a ride, the demon is already in Rosemary's car when she returns from a shopping trip in the darkened parking lot, Ricky's auto hijacking being met with an autohijacking, an always already occupied vehicle in which the demon resides.

Parallels to 9/11 are equally frequent in "Demon Ride," beginning with Rosemary's discovery of the demon in her rearview mirror. Though the rearview facilitates her initial knowledge of the demon, it is the menace of the demon's voice that provides subsequent information (in opposition to the limited terror provided by his unconvincing demonic attire), much like Lamastus' occasional glances into his rearview serve only to reinforce what Ricky's aural offerings are telling him. This focus on the aural follows on Ricky's linguistic assault, the demon's sinister "drive!" ("Demon Ride") acting as an equivalent of Atta's "we have some planes," albeit with less information contained in its imprecation, the simple directive doing little to direct the directed's response, instead leaving the driver/pilot to improvise a defense via appeasement. Similarly, the visual provides only initial knowledge of the hijackings on 9/11, and in that case only to those in the first class cabin, many in the rear of the planes knowing that what is occurring is actually a hijacking via the cockpit transmissions, perceiving the disturbance

---

[82] That the driver is named Rosemary is a telling gesture, suggesting a link to Roman Polanski's 1968 film *Rosemary's Baby* and its narrative of demonic insemination. The implication of a sexual encounter between the demon and driver is addressed indirectly in the short (to be discussed below).

as a routine medical emergency prior to that hearing (*National*). The entire encounter with the

demon is marked by an overwhelming mundanity, as indicated by its Halloween-esque

costuming: the very non-specificity of the initial "drive!" bores,[83] pointing to the mundanity of

the stereotypical hijacking, an expected ennui capitalized upon by the 9/11 hijackers, as typical

response protocol suggests giving in to the hijackers' demands with the understanding that if

such submission takes place, no one will get hurt (an understanding compromised by the

unspoken suicide mission). Banality compounds the mundanity, the costume's very shoddiness

rendering the carjacking demon decidedly ordinary, and more terrifying for it, as the everyday

quality of the demon implies a similar demonics at the heart of the average person, an Arendtian

demythification of the epic evil to the every(day/one) evil.[84] That the demon chooses to wear a

seatbelt underlines its banality, with its most daring act being to order a Spicy Chicken Combo at

Wendy's, the subtle heat of the sandwich serving as a stand-in for the scalding flames of its

homeland, the searing sands of the Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Lebanon, and United Arab Emirates that

the hijackers called home, their own banal origins redoubling those of the demon.

Further parallels exist in the immediate left turn taken after the carjacking is executed, a

directional shift that echoes the turns to the southeast executed by hijacker pilots Mohamed Atta,

Marwan al-Shehhi, Hani Hanjour, and Ziad Jarrah as they returned to New York City (Atta and

al-Shehhi) and Washington D.C. (Hanjour and Jarrah). Directionality also plays into the

demon's assertion that "I'm a demon, not a taxi driver" ("Demon Ride") that follows

---

[83] Amelia Goodyear and Matty Tucker expound upon this mundanity, noting that "[t]he initial terror of the hijacking victim evolves into confusion and, finally, something akin to complacency as it becomes clear to the victim that this demon intends no harm towards her and is, in fact, insisting that he buy her a treat" (Goodyear), and describing the scenario as "mostly amount[ing] to the carjacker just wanting a ride somewhere and an overblown magnitude of threats given the demands" (Tucker).

[84] Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* discusses just such an everyday demonics, taking Nazi administrator Adolf Eichmann's trial as an opportunity to discuss the more distressing danger of evil within the everyday and how it exceeds the danger posed by the hyperbolic, elite evil of the true madman.

Rosemary's request for a route to the nearest Taco Bell, the implication of potential directional

knowledge recalling the hijackers' own previous experience with flying the Hudson Corridor in

light training aircraft (which passes by lower Manhattan, site of the World Trade Center towers)

and its usefulness to the eventual execution of the plot (National Commission 242).

Additionally, Rosemary's response to her own effort at small talk in the question "what are you

going to be for Halloween?" ("Demon Ride"), the robot Wall-E from the Pixar film of the same

name (Andrew Standon, 2008),[85] addresses the possibility that the hijacked flights, more

specifically American Airlines Flight 77, which executed a 330 degree turn before hitting the

Pentagon that would have required a very skilled pilot to perform,[86] were operated remotely.

Finally, the Wendy's order, as placed through the drive-through apparatus, functions as talkback,

producing an audio record of the carjacking/hijacking, which is initially garbled and

misinterpreted in the order error, then corrected through the intersession of the demon(ic

hijacker). These references link "Demon Ride" to 9/11 and, along with those found in "The

Long Afternoon," form the foundation for an analysis of the narrative power of voice and the

purely aural hijacking that it makes possible.

As a last step before fully entering into the analysis to follow, it is necessary to situate the

two shorts in question, "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride," within the larger field of

9/11-related shorts available on YouTube as a means of drawing a distinction between their use

of the aural and that evidenced by the numerous other shorts. To that end, a tripartite schema

will prove valuable as a definitional rubric for parsing the sizeable volume of shorts, which may

---

[85] The choice of *Wall-E* in this context is doubly relevant. In addition to the technological referent discussed above, the film is also known for its uncommonly silent main characters, with body language and non-verbal communication serving to convey meaning, thereby allowing that silence to signify in much the same way as it does in William Basinski's *The Disintegration Loops I-IV*, to be discussed below.

[86] This information was determined by a Flight Path Study undertaken by the National Traffic and Safety Bureau (NTSB) in early 2002 (National [a]).

be neatly broken down into three classes: confusion (which literalizes the neo-inclusivity of the event itself), profusion (which saturates the hijacker voice with a disproportionate and inaccurate evil), and infusion (which reflects the inhabitational power of that voice by exemplifying its extension outside of the event). Such a classification will speak to the potential for the counterexemplary in this instance, disabusing that notion by demonstrating the unique nature of the selected shorts, while further complicating the didacticism present in the semi-fictional and documentary films examined above.

In the case of the confusion class, the typical short video from this group incorporates the hijacker voice as a means of enacting a responsive inclusiveness consonant with 9/11's own autoinclusivity of the U.S. in the field of vulnerability (the U.S. being always already vulnerable, but never [or not yet] aware of its status as such). As the event unfolds in a seemingly incommensurable manner, nothing of the sort having taken place before, its in- requires an inclusivity as a response, the largest available field of data being required to render the event anywhere near intelligible for the ear unfamiliar with its broadcasting frequency. The voice in this sense is included as raw datum, as part of the traumatized openness in which the pseudo-victimized listener is both laid and lays her/himself open to the event, enacting a sympathetic unfolding of his own, taken in, taken at face value (if that, the face itself being a problematic designation, as will be discussed below), the voice dictated but not read, ripe for the taking (i.e. still lingering in the air, as well as primed for initiation of its inhabitational venture). Often, the voice is included over an image of the pilot-hijacker, with subtitles clarifying the at times rough English of the cockpit speech. Of the numerous examples of this class, "Mohamed Atta: We Have Some Planes" serves as a representative example, collecting Atta's transmissions from the cockpit of Flight 11 and placing them over top of an image of Atta's Florida driver's license,

doubling the evidentiary presentation and inclusiveness by broadening the field to state motor

vehicle records (an operation of a different hijackable entity that will be focused on in the

selected shorts). Little if any evaluation of the voice is present in this class, its presence existing

at the roll call level, a counting as a means of accounting for the totality of the event, the voice

functioning as a means of underlining the reality of the event at the "can you believe this

happened?" stage of analysis. Indeed the listener can, so long as the aural evidence is in

attendance.

In the case of the profusion class, the typical short video from this incorporates the

hijacker voice as a means of amplifying his profligate evil, proliferating that evil and, in the

process, allowing the hijacker voice a greater resonance than he might have attained on its own

(given that the stigmatically evil approach is implemented more often than the stunned, even

approach). Moving beyond the purely comprehensive inclusion present in the confusion class,

the profusion class has taken in the available data and set its mind, shifting from stun to blast,

with a mind to tarring the hijacker voice, feathered in his airy, post-corporeal lightness, winged

from his origins at altitude, with a smear of evil. The particulars of the event itself being not

wholly sufficient to achieve this goal, the hijacker voice is consulted and included, queried for

his advice, adding the twinned vice of the suicide-murder (the pilot-hijacker likely dying first

upon impact, excepting the lonely office worker glancing at the world below, her/his face

pressed against the cold glass prior to being placed under it [save for demonstration killings in

the cabins of the planes themselves]). This voice may be repeated, literalizing the echo that

renders him always already omnipresent, ringing in the ears of the listener, a tinnitus resulting

from the presence of the foreign object, the objectionable foreign, arriving from the past-as-

foreign country,[87] and is similarly overlaid on a still of the speaking pilot-hijacker, recalling the

documentary discussion above. Of the numerous examples of this class, "Voices of 9/11 (Part 2)

Hijacked" serves as a representative example, assembling available audio of air traffic control,

military, and emergency communications into an aural tapestry of "terror" that crudely attempts

to link the aural and visual with limited success, equally crudely interpreting and levying

judgment on the pilot-hijacker by placing him in dialogue with his purported victims. The

profusive short grapples with the event writ large, issuing the listener a writ of habeas corpus

from her/his detention in the purgatory of confusion, as well as responding to the hijacker voice's

own inflammatory writ,[88] though ultimately ineffectively demonstrating the evil it sets to

highlight, any lighting proving insufficient for the task.

Finally, the infusion class, of which "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride" are card-

carrying members, takes the important step of moving beyond the event, or rather of showcasing

the event's own moving beyond its engendering scenario to function more broadly, to inhabit

outside its ostensible locus in a locust-like manner, gaining access to both the crannies and nooks

of the labyrinths of the inner ear. The infusive depiction of the event is not so much a depiction

as a de-picturing, an aural mobilization of the event beyond its originary particulars that

demonstrates the aural's inhabitational capacity. Here, a similar scenario is required for that

mobilization to take place, both "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride" calling on the jacking

genre (in this case, cars being the subject) as a means of giving the inhabitational voice a stable

medium in which to flourish. This infusion underlines the pervasiveness of event narrativity

---

[87] The reference here is to L.P. Hartley's 1953 novel *The Go-Between*, itself manifesting a class agonistics in which the protagonist, Leo Colston, is central to the transmission and interception of secret messages.
[88] Joanna Newsom's song of the same name, taken from her 2004 album *The Milk-Eyed Mender* (a title which itself suggests the pearly spheres of blindness), offers further exposition on the use of the hijacker voice, remarking that "in spite of all the time that we spent on it: one bedraggled ghost of a sonnet!" (Newsom), suggesting the futility of the profusive gesture in the presence of spectrality.

approximated unsuccessfully by the profusive class, which is concerned with imprecations of evil standing as the final word on the Word of the hijacker voice (though repetition forestalls any finality), moving beyond the elemental shock of the confusion (or, rather, confused) class to demarcate its own sphere of influence. As such, the confusion and profusion classes of short are not so much counterexemplary as protoexemplary, earlier stages in the path to the infusive: moving through denial (confusion class) and anger (profusion class), the listener arrives at an acceptance in the infusion class, taking the hijacker voice as her/his own and imbibing his narrative power.

BACK TO THE FUTURE: THE DAURSAL

With an understanding of the referentiality of "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride" to the events of 9/11, one may now look more abstractly at the power held by the narrative voice present in each short and in the event itself. This voice constitutes a new noisemaking that intercedes in accepted narrative efforts by affecting a cut, an interruption that ruptures the continuity of the story told, a ground stop[89] that halts that narrative until the event unfolds in its entirety, creases ceasing to contain and instead stretching the bounds of the imprinted tale.

In her short piece "The Gender of Sound" from the collected volume *Glass, Irony, and God*, Anne Carson notes "two different aspects of sound production, quality of voice and use of voice" (Carson 119), pointing to a duality of voice that carries much weight in relation to 9/11. The spectral hijacker voice maintains a paradoxical relation to the notion of use, operating at once as a performative (Atta's "we have some planes" conjuring that possession before it is

---

[89] This ground stop is much like that issued by the FAA on 9/11 (National 25), a halting of all arrivals and departures meant to clear the air, to cut the fog of war obscuring the radar lens (itself a soundscape, returning the pings of the planes' radio transponders), and to allow the true attack to be discerned from the benign ephemera surrounding it; likewise, the neo-narrative voice offers an extra-accepted rendering of the event, unfurling the furrows of the condensed accepted narrative to allow a different voice to sound, while paradoxically trimming away the fat larded upon event narrativity by jingoistic victimhood tropes.

apparent to anyone but the hijackers[90]) and a performance, a deliberate use of cockpit communication and hijacking response protocols that offers the conciliatory language of demands met and airports to which the plane will return, while beneath that veneer another signification is in play, the gamesmanship of the duplicitous hijacker, the double agent whose agency is enacted in the event. In the hijacking, the voice is both used, tool-like, as a means of accomplishing an end, less a communicational medium than an instrumental one, a horn playing an all too familiar note, a vessel for the inspired and inspiring breath of the expiring hijacker, and used, subject to a prior gentle utilization by another, the othered pilot now in the other world, bloodied in the aisle, its pulpit seized by another who unceremoniously sermonizes while paying heed to ceremony. A less paradoxical relation exists concerning the notion of quality, the spectral hijacker voice possessing a Barthesian grain,[91] sand-flecked, sandpapery, abrasive, wearing down with each word, diminishing towards its and others' demise, substituting the corn-fed agricultural activism and farming background of Ogonowski[92] for a different sort of sowing, a grainier rendering of the event that reveals flaws within the accepted narrative at the pixel level, a picking which only serves to open the scab.

This sort of storytelling, this neo-narrativity, this extra-accepted exception to the rule of victimhood (in which the ruler is always the victim), this dual voice, a director's commentary levied by the spectral hijacker voice that overlays the neat arc plotted by those plotted against is, for Henry Jenkins in his foundational new media text *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New*

---

[90] Atta himself is never able to truly confirm that possession, as his hijacking is the first executed and his impact the first registered; conversely, Marwan al-Shehhi may see the smoking North Tower on his approach to the South Tower, and Hani Hanjour and Ziad Jarrah are aware of the previous successes en route to their targets via cockpit warnings and passenger cell phone calls).

[91] Barthes discusses this grain, that which voice adds beyond its meaning in language, in both "The Grain of the Voice" from *The Responsibility of Forms* (Hill and Wang, 1985) and the edited volume *The Grain of the Voice: Interviews 1962-1980* (Hill and Wang, 1985).

[92] Ogonowski "raised hay, corn, pumpkins, blueberries, and peaches" ("John" 1) on a farm in Dracut, Massachusetts after having secured that land via the Federal Agriculture Preservation Restriction program.

Media Collide, "the art of world building, as artists create compelling environments that cannot be fully explored or exhausted in a single work or even a single medium" (Jenkins 114). "The Long Afternoon" requires two installments (three if one includes the outtake reel), "Demon Ride" at least two, and both extend the narrative space outside of filmic semi-fictionalized and documentary accounts to the amateur realm of YouTube. Both also extend into the world of music, their soundtrack choices offering a multiple narrativity that further deepens their referentiality. Hodge-Stansson's production variously calls upon Frank Sinatra (using "The Way You Look Tonight" as its introductory song, featuring Ricky's insistence on setting the XM satellite radio to the station "Frank's Place," and including "The Song is Ended" in the outtake reel),[93] Dave Brubeck (whose "Take Five" ushers in part two), and Madonna (whose "This Used to Be My Playground"[94] is on the PA system at the restaurant during the food stop),[95] while Omega Wolf Productions' piece uses Beck's "Hell Yes" over its final credits.[96] In each case, an

---

[93] The Sinatra selections deepen the impact of the extra-accepted narrative offered in "The Long Afternoon" by virtue of their referentiality. "The Way You Look Tonight" features the lines "with each word your tenderness grows / tearing my fear apart" and "lovely… never ever change / keep that breathless charm" (Sinatra b]), pointing to the comforting use of communication protocols and the persistence of the voice after its aspirator expires. "The Song is Ended" features the lines "the song is ended / but the melody lingers on / you and the song are gone / but the melody lingers on" (Sinatra), suggesting the resonance of the voice long after its sounding in the death of the lamented individual.

[94] The Madonna selection similarly deepens the impact of the extra-accepted narrative, containing the lyrics "why did it have to end / and why do they always say," expressing a longing for the event and disappointment at the affecting repetition, and "we would never tire / and that little fire / is still alive in me / it will never go away" (Madonna), referring to the omnipresence of the spectral hijacker voice. The song is also featured in the 1992 Penny Marshall film *A League of Their Own*, whose narrative of female/feminized exclusion and response in the nationally loaded realm of baseball adds additional depth to the reference.

[95] Hodge insists on the serendipity of these selections, stating that "[t]he Frank Sinatra deal was improvised by Gunnar on the spot," and that "there are no intentional linkages. The music is only there as an ironic stylistic counterpoint to Ricky's behavior" (Hodge). Still, as noted in the lyrical analyses included in the above notes, these particular songs reveal a greater referential depth upon closer examination, and as will be shown in the final chapter, Sinatra holds a particular resonance regarding the hijacker voice.

[96] The Beck selection likewise increases the impact of "Demon Ride," its lyrics including the lines "bank notes burn like broken equipment… looking for shelter readjust your position / thought control ghost written confessions… noise response applause and handclaps" (Beck), recalling the financial toll of an attack on the institutions housed in the World Trade Center and on the stock market more generally, the shelter sought in the course of the event, the ventriloquized confession solicited by the spectral hijacker voice, and the Pavlovian concurrence with U.S. victimhood narratives performed by much of the population in the wake of the event. Therefore, Tucker's initial intention of including the song due to the fact that "the subdued vocal style on a hook about dancing contained an

extra-narrative world is built, the excessive narrativity of the extra-accepted being itself

exceeded by the additional referentialities of the artists and songs in question, especially Frank

Sinatra, whose symbolic import will be analyzed extensively in chapters to come.

This new voice, this new narrator, is not, cannot be silent, his incursive inclusion in the

discourse coming in plain script, in a legible font, his knowledge springing forth from the fore in

an affront(al) linguistics that privileges both the oral and the aural, a story less contained in the

text than in the taste, a tell-tale tart n' tangy that leaves a pleasing sting, a bee-stung lip that gives

but does not take. Jenkins observes that, within the realm of new media of which YouTube

videos are a part, "the new consumers are now noisy and public" (Jenkins 19), an Attalian rancor

that rattles the cages of accepted narrativity, an uncontrolled aurality that is at once oral, spilling

forth from the mouth to connect with the pub(l)ic in "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride."

By virtue of its origin in the lingual, the tongue side, the side tongued, "language… is henceforth

presumed to occur within that frontal visual perspective of the knowable" (Wills 9), as posited by

David Wills in his *Dorsality: Thinking Back Through Technology and Politics*, though it is less

the visual that assigns language to this locale than the physiological, the anatomical, which still

orients the body along the visual axis (eyes front) rather than the aural (ears side, hearing all

sides). The new voice is thus afrontal, affrontal, without a front but acting with abundant front,

dishing out a tongue lashing that aims to please and does not miss its mark.

"Unforgivable A," one of the last installments in the "Unforgivable" series from which

the character Ricky is taken, offers a useful bridging of the oral and aural in its references to

cunnilingus, with Ricky-as-cunning linguist transferring that facility to his participation in "The

Long Afternoon" and, by proxy, 9/11, a relation to the oral/aural also present in "Demon Ride."

ambiguity consistent with the end of 'Demon Ride'" (Tucker), in its attention to the terpsichorean chorus, also
benefits greatly from the additional referentialities embedded in the lyrics.

Boasting of his sexual prowess in a coerced encounter with his friend's sister, Ricky states that

he leaves their coitus "with a dustbun hanging up out my mouth" ("Unforgivable A"), a crude

depiction of oral sex that renders that sex aural, the salivary expectoration of Ricky's retelling

rendering the short less about oral sex than about aural sects, the sort of linguistic partnerships

that exist between himself and his cameraperson/audience and, in the case of 9/11, between the

otocentric hijackers and their similarly oriented (or auriented) listeners. The hijacking teams are

in this sense sectular, not so much secular in their temporary adoption of Western mores, but

rather an offshoot of fundamentalist Islam valuing the Qur'an as action rather than text, as Word

and, indeed, deed, rather than object. The aural sect is also present in "Demon Ride," where the

demon expresses a neatly religious distaste for Rosemary's rape fear: "Please don't… I'm

married… you're not going to…" "Oh no! Heavens no!" ("Demon Ride").[97] By omission, this

exchange suggests that the demon would be more comfortable with an equitable exchange of

pleasure, an aurality more in line with its exercise of fear through speech, or its decidedly

salivary devouring of its Spicy Chicken Combo later in the short, which demonstrates an oral gift

expressed aurally. Rosemary and the demon thereby form an aural sect, united in the course of

the plot in a more perfect union, a constitution geared more towards the aural as a function of the

oral, a sectuality that realizes its aims with a slip of the tongue.

Now affrontal and sectual, the aural adherent sticks out, protrudes as intruder from and to

the accepted narrative, its noise existing as chatter, a turning from the prevailing argument that

comes about with no small violence, though solely in the aural realm, leaving the balance

untouched yet profoundly touched by its extra-accepted narrativity. Wills turns to Jacques

---

[97] Goodyear observes that "the demon himself seems disgusted by the suggestion that he might somehow take advantage of his victim" (Goodyear), further reinforcing the notion of the demon as sectular in nature, at once respecting the sacrament of marriage and the holiness of the (body-as-)temple.

Derrida to describe the aural turn provided by the sectular offshoot, specifically his preface to *The Post Card*, where Derrida describes the apostrophe as "a live interpellation (the man of discourse or writing interrupts the continuous development of the sequence, abruptly turns toward someone, that is, something, addresses himself to you)" (quoted in Wills 143). This apostrophe, this aside, turns from the argument to the discussant, addresses it affrontally, with noise, with brio, issuing a call to the discussant that can only be answered, whose response is already known, a tip flick that brings the shudder, the moan, the melt, and an at times unwilling (affrontal) affection in the address from the front. Derrida elsewhere confirms the mobility of the sign implied in the apostrophic offsetting, stating in *Limited Inc* that "the sign possesses the characteristic of being readable even if the moment of its production is irrevocably lost and even if I do not know what its alleged author-scriptor consciously intended to say at the moment he wrote it" (Derrida 9), and allowing for the sectular enclosure of the sign in the exclosive space of the extra-accepted narrative, a unified voice that exceeds the sounding from within accepted narrativity to sound without that narrative('s approval). The spectral hijacker voice is then immortal, affrontal, atemporal, multiple, a chattering populousness that peoples the narrative with the ventriloquized, resonating with the intelligence chatter gathered before the event, a thousand voices producing a mosaic of knowledge that cannot be understood in the accepted narrative space, that necessitates extra-accepted narrativity for a fair accounting or hearing, a dealing with the raw data rather than a raw dealing.

The affrontal aural sect comes into being by virtue of exclusion, excising, the trimmed neatened narrative whose wrinkles are caked over with a bit of the pancake, ash-filled crevices revealing themselves with the slight disturbance that noise provides. "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride," as shorts, are also asides, both brief speeches delivered to the audience only

without the knowledge of other participants (like the accidentally transmitted cabin

communications of the hijackers), inaudible to those present but forever audible and forever

present, as well as more thoroughgoing sidelong listens outside of the lines, to the lines

themselves, obscured within the linearity of the accepted narrative but resignificant in the extra-

accepted narrative space. Wills turns to Derrida once more, this time *Of Grammatology*, to

describe the interruption: "And let's not talk about the parentheses, their violence as much as

their untranslatability" (quoted in Wills 149). The aside, here parenthetical, is a violence, though

an aural violence, as is the bulk of the violence in both "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon

Ride," with only hands to the shoulder breaking the purely aural spell, albeit an untranslatable

sort, illegible within accepted narrativity.

It is enough that the voice should return, that it should ever leave (if indeed it does); the

spectral hijacker voice, in stepping outside of accepted media and accepted narrativity, cannot be

translated with existing grammars, necessitating a turn to the informal, the vernacular, to signify.

To wit, Ricky's instruction to "step back in the cut and take me to Tyrone's house" ("The

Long… [Part Two]"), misheard as "step back in the cunt," references the cunning linguistics of

the aural sect, the pleasing tongue, the "speaking in tongues" that Ricky anticipates will result

from Robert's encounter with "nigger pussy" ("The Long… [Part Two]"), as well as popular

meanings of "the cut" drawn from Urbandictionary.com. In this context, "cut" signifies as "a

hidden place where one can use illegal substances and commit other illegal acts in safety… a

hidden section of a public place… [or] a term used long ago to describe a woman's vagina"

("Cut"), describing both the drug house that Ricky visits and the women that he engages, as well

as the driver's seat-as-cockpit and its status as the site for uninterrupted carjackings/hijackings,

as a cordoned off part of the public space of the plane, and as a pubic site of pleasure, penetration

and (re)birth for the hijacker. The incised cut allows the extra-accepted narrative to come, to cum, the new tongue spoken and spoked, wheeling and turning, rendering the dorsal and the aural one in the comingling that is daursality.

The extra-accepted narrative voice becomes such through its externality, its exturnality, a moving away that shows the back to the front-laden posture taken by accepted narrativity, a half-revolution that is yet fuller in its talking back, its dialogic aural dorsal surface, or rather daursal surface, bringing the past/passed sound into the present as a means of narrating the future. Wills' *Dorsality* proves crucial to the notion of the daursal, and that text will provide support for the articulation of daursality more generally, as well as its relation to foresight (or rather forehearing, a foreswearing of sorts given the perceived profanity of the spectral hijacker voice and its vulnerability-producing and –emphasizing function), auto-ethicality, and the process of othering. Early in the text, Wills notes that "every turn is a type of turning around, movement toward the back, toward what is behind: in turning however gently to the right or to the left, indeed up or down, one is on the way toward the back" (Wills 5). It is this very turning that is evident in the event itself, each hijacker pilot executing an about face (that, as will be shown, is both not about the face and all about it) that brings it back to its target, the first deviational moment enacting the turn prior to the turn itself (the hijackings being followed first by changes in speed and altitude), and it is a similar turn that is present in the extra-accepted narrativity of "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride." The smallest deviation, the portrayal of the carjacker/hijacker as anything other than a figure of profligate, unqualified evil, the event as common, extending beyond its supposed encapsulation in the "never again" of the exceptional 9/11 (with credit given for non-repetition, as if the first [re]petition partitioned the event from its run-up), is a turning, a turning

back, an actualization of the "either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists"[98] that

exchanges the party line for a line apart. Such a turn puts the turner on notice, though unnoticed,

at least initially, the opening missive missed until it gains a broader audience, until more planes

or views are involved, a division in which vision dies, in which alternate approaches are moot, in

which the aurality of the cockpit threat is met with an equally cocky threatening from the

presidential pulpit.

The decay of vision inherent in this turn to the aural, this daursal turn in which the

past/passed speech of the spectral hijacker voice, overlooked in the ocularcentrism of the event,

is consulted in the present (by Bush and others) as a talisman[99] for the future, reflects the

deprioritization of visuality in the daursal space: one may not have eyes in the back of one's head

such that turned vision would be possible (at least without the rearview, which itself privileges

the visual axis), but one may indeed have ears (hearing being a 360 degree affair). Wills asserts

that "[w]hat comes from behind comes from beyond the simple perspective of the human and

hence, from the point of view of perspective and of vision in general, it comes from another

point of view, from outside the field of visual possibility" (7), identifying the extra-human

quality of the voice rendered spectral through the abolition of his producing body in the course of

the event, as well as the invisibility of what comes from behind, the necessary frontal orientation

of vision preventing a behindsight, a 0/20 that remains blind but not deaf. Therefore, the

dorsalocale, the knot in the back is, for the visual, a not in the back, an impossibility of a back

---

[98] This language appears in George W. Bush's 20 September 2001 Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People, known for its uncompromising rhetoric of victimization and stern warning to all who would stand in the way of U.S. aims. In context, the quote reads "[e]very nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime" (Bush 1), suggesting an ultimatum with little room for deviation, an impossibility of turning back for the U.S. or anyone in its path.
[99] The secondary definition of talisman holds here as well, referring to "a Mullah; sometimes to a lower priest of Islam, a religious minister, a muezzin" ("Talisman"), the spectral hijacker voice sounding from its tower and calling to prayer all adherents to its fundamentalist devotional act.

that gives way to the daursal, the enunciated knife of "The Long Afternoon" or the spoken destruction of "Demon Ride"[100] with its related implications of trouble to come.

That which comes from behind, the daursal speech of the spectral hijacker voice, heard in retrospect, already delayed by the vagaries of the communication apparatuses that capture him, captivating and holding captive the audience present in the event's aftermath, is produced and produces with a partial understanding of his post-mortem applications, with some thoughts as to how he might be disseminated, though he is less interested in seeding than the seedy. As Wills contends, a tradition exists that finds "what comes from behind to be, as it were, beyond the *sinister*, farther out than left field, precisely out around back, the darkest version of what is untrusted and unknown, even if it is also recognized as the source of the most stimulating fantasy" (12), characterizing the daursal as nearly demonic, yet a sexual/sectual demonics that captivates in the same manner as the spectral hijacker voice. In both "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride," what comes from behind is indeed beyond the sinister, hyperbolically so, tracing a trajectory that curves around the sinister and arches back to the banal in the arched back of the cunning linguist's application, a fantastic enactment of the event that reveals its unknown pleasures. What comes from behind is thereby sin-ister, a sin of the flesh more precisely, s(in)ister to the more profound sin of suicide, though the self that kills here is not so much the carjacker/hijacker, who in both cases exceeds the timeline of the short, foreshortening the passenger by problematizing safe passage, than the inhabited listener, resulting in a feminized return of the feminized, overly verbal hijacker to the auto-feminized victim-passenger (to be discussed below), in which the tongue plays a starring role.

---

[100] Upon initiating the carjacking and being met with Rosemary's screams, the demon shouts "quiet, or I will destroy you" ("Demon Ride"), emphasizing the importance of the aural to his undertaking and speaking his destructive capacity rather than demonstrating it through visual means.

This daursality, the product of the back spoken from the back to the back, is relatively

undefined, nebulous, a cloudiness over the eye[101] that necessitates the turn to the aural as a turn

from the visual and the envisioned/accepted narrative, rendering the dorsalocale as the always

already unforeseen, an aftseen or foreheard. Wills usefully declares that "[w]hat produces – or

what is behind – sees without foreseeing what it produces, without seeing what face that offers to

the future and to the world; it supports without shaping any final form" (98), and even this

gesture towards vision is problematic, the daursal discarding the visual, utilizing it briefly as an

insertion point, an entry into the discursive space of accepted narrativity, a puncture that allows

the more fluid aural data present in the spectral hijacker voice to eddy away from the visual

mainline, instead coursing through the bloodstream, going viral in the YouTube video but

inhabitational in the aural. The dorsalocale, the backseat, the cockpit jumpseat,[102] the jumped

seat of the first class cabin, is unforeseen, as it can only be seen from the back, a retrovision

which is only possible after the fact, leaving it to the aural to forehear the forebear that will soon

bear down on vision, exceeding its field and fielding all questions with the inhabitational answer,

the response of implication to inquiries of victimhood. Daursality is thus faceless, both in terms

of its atomized producing body, whose face fails to survive a punishing vis a vis with those of

the North and South Towers, the Pentagon, and Shanksville's reclaimed coal strip mine

(formerly possessing a face), as well as in terms of its deemphasis on the visual, Ricky's face

being slightly obscured by a goatee (and rendered as a cipher for the African American thug

---

[101] In medieval usage, nebulous and its root nebula could refer to "a film or membrane over the eye," and later use extends that meaning to "cloudiness of the cornea… a circumscribed area of this… one that is slight or poorly defined" ("Nebula").

[102] As part of their preparatory efforts, some of the hijackers took the opportunity to ride along in the cockpits of transcontinental flights as part of the practice of "jumpseating," where certified pilots may sit in an extra seat in the cockpit if none are available in the cabin. By doing so, the hijackers were able to gain additional familiarity with the cockpit itself, as well as entry timing and practices by the flight attendants, openings that would be well suited to hijacking (Johnson 1).

stereotype) and the demon's by face paint. The face is irrelevant; the only point of interest is its accursed and cursing share,[103] the tongue, made excessive and non-recuperable in its recouping of the aural, the spectral hijacker voice, to inhabitational ends.

The irrelevance of the face in favor of its inhabitational inhabitant, the tongue, points to a divergence from the face as discussed by French philosopher Emmanuel Levinas, suggesting a new relation to the ethical for the face-as-vessel rather than the face-as-vassal(-maker). Rather than the simple visual relation between individuals and, at base, between faces-as-ensouled representatives, the aural relation negotiated by speech lacks the auto-ethicality of the face-to-face, as noted by Wills in discussion with Levinas: "Speech itself, that which the mouth speaks rather than the eyes, 'does not have the total transparence of the gaze directed upon the gaze, the absolute *frankness* of the face to face proffered at the bottom of all speech'" (quoted in Wills 44). Though Wills and Levinas are correct in their dorsalocation of speech within and without the mouth, their understanding of the relative clarity of speech and vision is inverted; instead, it is the gaze-on-gaze which fogs, an ocularcentric obscuring of other sensory data, specifically the aural. Rather than the face to face offering an absolute frankness, that face to face frames absolutely, excluding that which falls outside of the field of vision and establishing a unitary, accepted mononarrative in the process. The aural counteracts that accepted mononarrativity, offering a multiplicity of voices read and (re)enacted/ventriloquized multiply, all on message but off key in an ocularcentric clef. Pretense pervades the visual, problematizing Levinas' auto-ethicality with a similarly problematized auto-ethicality in the aural, where the turned phrase, lathe-spun and tongue-rolled, turns from accepted narrativity into the space of the extra-, both in

---

[103] George Bataille's notion of the "accursed share," articulated in the aptly titled *The Accursed Share*, references this excessive nature of the spectral hijacker voice, an aural overabundance that cannot help but proliferate in its inhabited listener, one oriented towards the non-procreative sexuality of the tongue and the catastrophic sacrificial act.

174

relation to the accepted and the ethical. Existing outside of the ethical parameters of the accepted narrative space, the daursal instead offers a neo-ethicality, a reflexive embodiment and ensouling of the spectral hijacker voice that yields an implicational ethic in the inhabited self's declamation and declaration.

As the spectral hijacker voice functions performatively in Atta's enactment of possession via his articulation in the "we have some planes," so too does he perform the listener he inhabits, a puppetry that allows his own declaration of self to work doubly. Speaking of James Joyce's *Ulysses* and a handful of vexing linguistic enigmas therein, more specifically Leopold Bloom's unfinished statement "I AM A," Wills posits that "whether Bloom intends to write something like 'I AM A naughty boy,' or 'I AM About to…,' he cannot avoid explicitly performing here a first-person narrator" (Wills 83). Such a first-person narration exists in Atta's assertion, an ascension from the victimized positionality to one of an agentic actor, an "I AM not silent," "I AM A speaker," or "I AM AN agent" that is heard far and wide, both from his own mouth, in the recordings and, more profligate still, in the inhabited listener. Atta's declaration of independence becomes the listener's own, his emoting a connecting with and through the inhabited listener, an "I can(not) believe that I am saying this" that sheds its negation with each saying, a daursal coming from behind that renders Atta less enemy than friend, less avenger than attendant, speaking the words that everyone is thinking. It is not the eyes that have it, but the ears.

Atta-as-enemy seems the default setting, the set-up suggested by the accepted narrative, with Atta as a purely evil individual who comes out of nowhere, from behind, who hinds the progress of the flight and nation though, within the dorsal as outlined by Wills and the daursal conceptualized here, the enemy may not come from behind, further inverting Levinas (who posits that the auto-ethicality of the face makes the ventral enemy impossible) and making that

which comes from behind a companion. In dialogue with German political theorist Carl

Schmitt's delineation of the enemy as that posited by the political and actualized in war, Wills

states that "warfare must function explicitly as a con*front*ation… [a] distinct line between

frontally opposed combatants is what serves to figure and to define the opposition between friend

and enemy" (Wills 135). It is this frontal relation that is lacking in "The Long Afternoon" and

"Demon Ride" where, in the course of the carjackings/hijackings, both Robert and Rosemary

remain with their backs to Ricky and the demon, respectively, making what takes place between

them not so much warfare (a status echoed in the use of combatant language and its manipulation

to enable indefinite detention outside of the Geneva Conventions and their predication on

defined war[104]) as companionship or, to follow on Wills' binary, friendship.

Looking at "The Long Afternoon" more specifically, the non-actualized aural violence

maintains the daursal relation, as suggested by Ricky's contention that "I thought we'd become

niggers… kind of" ("The Long… [Part Two]") in response to Robert's attempt to deceive him as

to his mother's whereabouts. Though Ricky's threats create a potential for a reversal of the turn,

especially his threat to "put this [the knife] in your heart and twist" ("The Long… [Part Two]"),

that turn would only yield a face to face that, consistent with Levinas, would make enemyhood

impossible. It is not so much that Levinas' auto-ethicality of the face is flawed in and of itself; it

is that he erects that auto-ethicality at the expense of speech, whereas speech is similarly, in fact

more thoroughly, auto-ethical in its daursality. Ricky's own emphasis on the back as dorsalocale

---

[104] This manipulation is evident in House Resolution 1076, which introduces the Detention of Enemy Combatants
Act. While intended to outline treatment of U.S. citizens falling under that designation, the bill also offers an
articulation of "enemy combatant" that leaves much leeway for interpretation and contextualization outside of a
recognized war: "The term 'enemy combatant' has historically referred to all the citizens of a state with which the
Nation is at war, and who are members of the armed force of that enemy state. Enemy combatants in the present
conflict, however, come from many nations, wear no uniforms, and use unconventional weapons. Enemy
combatants in the war on terrorism are not defined by simple, readily identifiable criteria, such as citizenship or
military uniform. And the power to name a citizen as an 'enemy combatant' is therefore extraordinarily broad"
("Detention").

of speechifying the threat and enacting it underlines his daursality, as evidenced by two

statements from the outtake reel. In the first, Ricky meets Robert's objections by saying "nigger,

keep drivin' before I put this in your back" ("Outtakes"), positioning the back as the space in

which their tenuous friendship resides and where that friendship may be rescinded through an

additional extra-accepted narrative cut (the typical narrative of a carjacking, like that of a

hijacking, involving little actual violence beyond the initial establishment of control). In the

second, Ricky's patience wanes, as he yells "nigger SHUT UP, before I put it through your

back" ("Outtakes"), again focusing on the daursal while drawing additional attention to the aural

as the site of alliance and threat in his attempted silencing of Robert's sass. Robert's turned

back, as well as Rosemary's, "allows the other to come as other to the other, as other other, as

another other" (Wills 159), rendering the seemingly othered Ricky/demon consonant with the

seemingly othering Robert/Rosemary, their auralities commingling in the shared tongue of the

event.

The back turns away, shielding its ventral surface from potential harm, limiting the

vulnerabilities associated with the face; yet, in its own auto-ethicality, the back comes to

resemble the face, comes to stand for the individual, backing it up, giving it backbone. Wills

follows on Levinas' statement that "'the whole body – a hand or a curve of the shoulder – can

express as the face,' suggesting, word for word, that the face beyond the face of the feminine and

of the erotic moves, from the hand, up the arm to the shoulder and over it, to encompass the

whole body and therefore include the back" (quoted in Wills 48). With this broadening in mind,

a movement from the small of the back to its large, considerable presence as discursive and

implicational equal to the face suggests that when one turns to the back, there is no back back,[105]

producing a more extensive auto-ethicality that includes the daursal to the diminishment and/or

disinclusion of the visual. The other is already un-othered through a recursive othering that

renders it other alongside the othered carjacker/hijacker, and that newly othered driver/pilot is

caught in a double bind of sorts: with its back turned, the carjacker/hijacker cannot be an enemy,

as one must be positioned face to face to be recognized as an enemy (as well as the auto-

ethicality entailed by the daursal); turning to face the carjacker/hijacker, the driver/pilot is caught

within Levinasian auto-ethicality. In either case, there is no place to go, nowhere to turn but to

the turn, from the front to the back; one may shut their eyes, but the ears never close, leaving the

narrative space open to a shift from accepted narrativity to exceptional extra-acceptance.

Both Ricky and the demon exist as shadows of Robert and Rosemary, not only for their

racial referentiality (to be discussed below), but for their elemental darkness, their seemingly

obverse positioning in the back, behind, trailing the action while still dictating it in the act of

dictation. Though "Demon Ride" takes place at night, the demon appears darker still in the back

seat, redoubling the shadows there with a dark matter, a darker mattering that carries an

additional significance, akin to Ricky's blackness of character-as-character. For Robert and

Rosemary, their respective darknesses adhere, lurking behind them inexorably, omnipresent

negative presences who will not budge. In the course of the carjacking scenario, both are

presented with a choice, aptly described by Wills from a similar position: "[we can] reject our

shadow as something outside ourselves rather than expand our body to encompass it; to expel it

into a dorsal space" (Wills 240). However, in the case of Ricky and the demon, that shadow

---

[105] Gertrude Stein's assertion that "there is no there there" (Stein 298), made upon discovering that she could not locate her childhood home in Oakland, California and drawn from her *Everybody's Autobiography*, suggests also the uncanny home and its sense of originary exile, to be discussed below.

always already exists in the daursal space, waiting only for its potential to be realized in the

literalization of the shadow via the shadowy figure. Since expulsion is not an option, the only

choice available to Robert and Rosemary is to expand their respective bodies to encompass the

shadow, to take it upon themselves and into themselves through the daursal, a piggybacking that

advances the simple adherence of the shadow to the carjacked-as-adherent, following the lead

outlined by the shadow in its overtaking of the vehicle, an over the back that embraces through

the bracing threat of the knife. The seemingly immune listener is thus made Other via self-

othering, the darker dimension dimming the whiteness of the pseudo-victim into a more elusive

shade of gray, a self-invasion of privacy that airs its errs.

The focus on the voice that exists within daursality's anti-ocular turned phraseology

reflects this very privacy, this personal relation between the self-other and the other, a me and

my shadow[106] that renders the voice introspective, retrospective, and retrospecular, probing the

listener's private, unpublished/unpublic/amateur memory productions so as to enable

inhabitation of her/his residence. Carson notes the inherent privacy contained within the voice,

specifically in the case of women (a reference which proves equally applicable to the feminized

hijacker [rendered as such through previous victimization and non-masculine bearing and attire]

and the feminized driver [in the shorts] or passenger [in the planes], rendered as such in the act

of victimization), observing that "Plutarch's woman has a voice that acts like a sign language,

exposing her inside facts. Ancient physiologists from Aristotle through the early Roman empire

tell us that a man can know from the sound of a woman's voice private data" (Carson 129). This

---

[106] This song ("Me and My Shadow") is also well known for its problematic performance as part of Rat Pack shows, where Frank Sinatra ("me") would duet with Sammy Davis, Jr. ("my shadow"), and contains the lines "not a soul can bust this team in two / we stick together like glue" and "before we get finished we'll make the town roar" (Sinatra and Davis), referencing the post-mortem connection between the spectral hijacker voice and its inhabited listener, as well as the chaos following the event.

private data serves as an unveiling of the individual, the veiled feminine revealing an

introspection, an amateur turn reflected in amateur productions such as "The Long Afternoon"

and "Demon Ride." Such introspection is not unprofessional, but rather aprofessional,

professing instead its rawness outside of the mediating tendencies of accepted narrativity and, in

the extra-accepted space, articulating a private data elided in the overly clean linearity of the

accepted, omitting the digression and its accompanying digging/unearthing dynamic in favor of

the professional progression.

Private data, as presented in the unpolished digression of the amateur production, lets that

production paradoxically exist less as a biographical depiction (as would be suggested by

biography's necessarily external relation to its subject and the extra-/external postionality of the

extra-accepted narrator) than an autobiographical depiction, a glimpse into that domain that can

only take place after a turn from the public/visual to the private/daursal. Further on in her

discussion of the voice, Carson asserts that "[e]very sound we make is a bit of autobiography. It

has a totally private interior yet its trajectory is public. A piece of inside projected to the

outside" (130), pointing to the autobiographical quality of the voice, as well as the potential for

its double exteriorization into the public realm (after its initial exteriorization in the act of speech

as enacted in the extra-accepted narrative space). Both Ricky and the demon recount their

histories tangentially through offhand comments, including Ricky's statement that "I ain't got it

that bad, but I grind HARD" ("The Long… [Part Two]") and the demon's repugnance at

Rosemary's food suggestion, "no McDonald's! Wendy's, drive!" ("Demon Ride"), each of

which reflect personal histories (Ricky's budding thug life and the demon's prior encounters

with Ronald). Similarly, the spectral hijacker voice recounts his history both in his own

speechifying (the grain of the voice discussed above referring to national origin, the command of

English indicating a certain association with the West, the ability to board the plane pointing to conventions of behavior and dress) and in his inhabited listener (her/himself resonating with that grain with one of her/his own [like that of Ogonowski], the ease with which the words pour from her/his mouth reflecting the listener's comfort with their form and intent), an amateurish rendering that exceeds the bounds and capabilities of the professional.

Jenkins does a superb job of chronicling this sort of amateur production within the realm of new media, and his particular attention to the amateur within the filmic will serve to ground an analysis of amateurism in relation to "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride," where that turn to the private furthers the private/aural linkage identified by Carson. In his discussion of fan films based upon George Lucas' *Star Wars* films, specifically the work of Evan Mather,[107] Jenkins posits a tension between "the auteur as amateur… [and] the amateur as an emergent auteur" (Jenkins 140), where Lucas is portrayed as being relatively down to earth and Mather as unusually talented, allowing the two to meet in the liminal space between amateur and auteur. Within the event, it is the accepted narrator who is revealed as an amateur, the myth of U.S. invulnerability deprofessionalized and depressed by the amateur, Atta-as-auteur, crafting a singular narrative that bears the unmistakable mark of its director, a beastly brand.

In "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride," both Hodge-Stansson Productions and Omega Wolf Productions are revealed to be auteur-level outfits, their productions bearing the voiceprints of their directors while still maintaining the stamp of the private, the shorts being

---

[107] Mather's work is brought up in Jenkins' argument by virtue of his *Les Pantless Menace* (1999), a fan film created using *Star Wars* action figures. Mather's website (evanmather.com) positions him as an auteur, listing his write-ups in prestigious publications like *The New York Times* and *Le Monde*, though his work would be more likely cast as amateur against traditional understandings of the amateur/professional divide (Jenkins 140-1).

made for the directors' own amusement,[108] a private which yet addresses the public through its posting to a public forum. The shorts are home movies of a sort, as articulated by Jenkins: "[T]he amateur film has remained… the 'home movie' in several senses of the term: first, amateur films were exhibited primarily in private (and most often, domestic) spaces lacking any viable channel of public distribution; second, amateur films were most often documentaries of domestic and family life; and third, amateur films were perceived to be technically flawed and of marginal interest beyond the immediate family" (142). Indeed, the shorts do capture the domestic ("terrorism" in the U.S. homeland), exhibited in and exhibiting the private space (of the auto cabin, at once private and visible, as well as the private commons of YouTube), document domestic (again, homeland "terrorist") life, and are perceived of limited interest beyond the immediacy of the event (the unintentional broadcast of the hijacker voice suggesting an initial privacy made public). Theirs is a public private, an auteurish amateurism, an aural suggestion that offers a purely aural narrativity that need not venture into the physical to accomplish its aims.

Both "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride" demonstrate a private, amateur, purely aural hijacking scenario in which the enunciation suffices, the weapon being spoken, but softly, a big stick carried but not used, a daursal articulation that comes from behind without actually having to actualize its coming in literal violence. Ricky's paradoxical response to Robert's interjection "look…" ("The Long… [Part One]"), intended as an entry point to a counteroffer, is to say "no, you look! Knife!" ("The Long… [Part One]"), the aural pronouncement of the knife

---

[108] In the case of "The Long Afternoon," Hodge states that "[t]here is no intended message or meaning behind the film" (Hodge), abdicating any responsibility for its contents; in the case of "Demon Ride," Tucker and Goodyear are perhaps less disingenuous, conceding that, while "intended to be humorous" (Tucker) and "to instigate laughter" (Goodyear), the film also "put a twist on a threatening situation" (Tucker) and "violat[ed] expectations about the nature of evil and the intentions of a supposedly evil party" (Goodyear), the film subjecting accepted narrativity to a certain torsion more in line with extra-accepted narrativity.

taking the place of its visual registering by Robert. The knife is additionally situated within the realm of the purely aural in a statement drawn from the outtakes reel, where Ricky responds to another suggestion from Robert by saying "that sounds good to me except for this right here" ("Outtakes"), the aural knife interfering in the aural registration of Robert's suggestion, preventing its enactment by calling "cut" (aurally, of course). The same proves true in the case of "Demon Ride," where the demon's threat to destroy Rosemary is registered aurally when it says "quiet now, or I will destroy you" ("Demon Ride"), with no accompanying visual aid and only a brief brush of the shoulder as reinforcement. Yet, the demon is uncommonly explicit in its demands, at least in relation to 9/11, where Jarrah only notes that he intends to return to the airport, and that "we have our demands," without actually listing those demands; in "Demon Ride," the demon states "I will tell you what I want" ("Demon Ride"), albeit in the context of the Wendy's drive-through, exchanging orders for the order. The privacy, the comfort, the intimacy of these statements suggests a welcoming environment for the carjacker/hijacker, a home that may yet be uncanny for the carjacked/hijacked so recently in control of the space in question.

The carjacked/hijacked home, so recently the sole domain of its owner-operator (Robert's car being referred to throughout as "my car" by both Robert and Ricky [though perhaps belonging to his parents' or a gift based on its existence outside of a teenager's price range], Rosemary's being of indeterminate ownership, and the plane being owned by the airline [but transferred from pilot to first officer through the phrase "the plane is mine"[109]]), becomes uncanny, a foreignness to the resident that also extends to notions of race within "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride." Looking first at the physical home represented by the car/plane

---

[109] This transfer is captured in Paul Greengrass' *United 93* (2006), where pilot Jason Dahl and first officer Leroy Homer, Jr. alternate control of the aircraft several times to allow for bathroom breaks and meal service prior to the hijacking, using ownership language throughout.

and its passenger cabin and cockpit, the private space is rendered less so by the forced inclusion of the carjacker/hijacker, an alienation from the private space that places its initial homeliness into question. Wills examines the uncanny home at length in reference to Odysseus' impossible return in the *Odyssey*, asserting that "we have to imagine a desire to return to a first home that was never natural and always already invaded by foreignness" (Wills 72), though his always already invaded nullifies the prospect of invasion, suggesting that the invading entity has been there all along, is original to the situation, much like the omnipresent shadow, appearing, disappearing, but maintaining a constant possibility.

In this sense, the car or cockpit is never home, is perhaps open but never welcoming, is far less discrete/discreet than one would have thought, and is subject to the whims of the unhomely, who homes in on the cabin-as-target, logging onto its compromise in "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride" and, in the process, opening its own cabin, the viewing space in which the computer resides. The cabin exists in what Wills describes as a sense of "originary exile, as if the heightened sentiment of separation that is felt the closer one approaches home were understood to mean that there is no home from which the sense of exile can be completely banished" (78), pointing to the impossibility of returning the cabin to a pristine prior state which in fact never existed, as well as the impossibility of returning to a home (Robert's, Rosemary's, the pilots' and passengers') that only becomes more alien the closer one gets.[110] Wills captures this sense of the impossible home, "of a displacement that necessarily mean[s] a movement into exile, and a wandering without hope of any final return" (82), an impossibility that resonates with the event as well, the hijacker's endeavor (and that of the revolting passengers aboard

---

[110] Tucker follows on the dual sense of im/possibility generated by the uncanny home, asserting that "it's almost like a person's car is a fairly sacred place and the act of trespassing there implies a lack of boundaries that could lead to anything" (Tucker), the impossible origin/return meeting with the infinite possibility of the compromised cabin.

United 93) necessarily requiring exile from Middle Eastern or Midwestern homelands and a

finality that precedes the return, a never-ending mission whose aural element is similarly

unending. Home is a performance, an assumed comfort that is but a cold one, the rising pulse of

fear doing little to address a body temperature that is way, way too low.[111]

Race is similarly performed in both "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride," an

uncanny identity residence that is unstable at best, unable at worst, inaccurate in its capture of the

nature of the individual and rendered to hyperbolic ends as a means of underlining that

instability. Both Ricky and Robert perform their racial polarities, Ricky embodying the

excessive African American thug,[112] overfull with aggressive speech, impending violence, and

physical dispersion (as represented by his frequent splaying across the back seat, ostensibly for

comfort, but also as a territorial gesture, a cordoning off of occupied space), and offset with

typically preppy dress (a polo shirt, cargo shorts, and sandals), referencing dandy stylistics and a

whitewashing ascendancy,[113] and Robert hyperbolically embodying the white-as-outsider, at

once in possession of the desired object (the car), yet not cool enough by half, attempting to fit in

---

[111] These words are spoken by Flight Attendant Amy Sweeney as American Airlines Flight 11 makes its final approach to the North Tower of the World Trade Center as part of a call placed to the airline during the hijacking. The full quote reads "I see water. I see buildings. I see the buildings. We are flying low. We are flying very, very low. We are flying way too low. Oh my God, OH MY GOD!" (*National*).

[112] Hodge describes Ricky as "a domineering character… originally based somewhat on Ice Cube's persona in the late 80's/early 90's" (Hodge). In this period, Ice Cube was a member of Compton rap group N.W.A. ("Niggaz With Attitude"), a gangsta rap staple best known for their 1988 album *Straight Outta Compton*, which featured the controversial single "Fuck Tha Police"; embarked on a solo career after the dissolution of N.W.A., most notably releasing the album *AmeriKKKa's Most Wanted* in 1990 (in both cases authoring controversial rhymes characterized by deeply political and at times sexist and misogynistic content); and appeared in the film *Boyz n the Hood* (John Singleton, 1991), a depiction of the South Central Los Angeles of the period. Additionally, Ice Cube converted to Islam in the early 1990s, making Ricky-as-disciple an additional gesture towards 9/11 and its Muslim hijackers (Leigh 1). Further, the choice of a hyperbolically "black" identity in the run-up to the purportedly post-racial Barack Obama presidency suggests a twinned notion of Obama's questioned "blackness," as well as the performative nature of that "blackness."

[113] Ricky's selection of clothing styles is consistent with a similarly preppy leaning among some in the hip-hop and rap worlds, including Pharell, Diddy, Kanye West and, most notably, Andre 3000, whose Benjamin Bixby line evidences a sharp dandy aesthetic. The use of preppy dress by these artists is at once a gesture of financial ascendancy and a flaunting of achieved status therein (preppy clothes being the typical province of upper class, affluent whites), as well as a complication of the racial binary in which African Americans are assumed to be poor by default.

with Ricky by using the companionate appellation "nigger," but failing miserably to meet Ricky's lofty criteria. The demon performs race similarly, as does Rosemary: though not subject to direct human racialization, the demon is a dark, evil, potentially violent figure, and accordingly occupies the "black" end of the pole, as set against Rosemary's "white," her pantsuited hip young appearance reinforced by the choice of Wall-E as a Halloween costume. Rosemary similarly fails to satisfy the demon's criteria for cool, eschewing the slutty costume (in response to the demon's statement that since she is "young and hip," she is probably going as a "slutty something or other" ["Demon Ride"]) and being told to shut up after registering her appreciation for the demon's choice of restaurant. The few cracks that appear in the carjacker/hijacker's racial facades serve to highlight their performance: Ricky's momentary friendship with Robert reveals a potential beneath his hard exterior, while the demon's repugnance at the idea of rape reveals a similar decency not readily apparent at the commencement of the carjacking. This paradoxical performance mimics that of the hijackers, who appear gentlemanly in shirts and ties, and whose politeness masks the violence to come, a fluid identity manipulated to suit conditions, the suited's pressed charge allowing entry into cockpit, and one mimicked by the audience within the planes/shorts and without (as evidenced by the seemingly timid passengers' potential for revolt and the extra-accepted narrativity of the directors and their audience).

DISAPPEAR HERE: ON THE (CON)VERGE

The fluidity of identity and narrativity seen above is facilitated by the particulars of new media such as YouTube (the uncanny home of both "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride"), whose ability to provide a space for additional voices and extra-accepted narrativities creates the possibility of multiple, interactive audiences, though that interactivity also carries with it

implications of complicity with the depicted acts. Jenkins identifies the new media as a function

of media convergence and its associated convergence culture, characterized by "the flow of

content across multiple media platforms, the cooperation between multiple media industries, and

the migratory behavior of media audiences who will go almost anywhere in search of the kinds

of entertainment experiences they want" (Jenkins 2). It is the migratory audience that is of most

interest here, though the use of multiple platforms (the aural being included in and thus

transmitted through the pseudo-documentary and documentary filmic, as well as being available

on websites including Wikipedia[114]) and cooperation between industries (indicating a more

thoroughgoing inhabitation with each new participant) are also of some relevance. This

migratory audience is fickle in its favor, jetting from one media object to the next, with little

apparent loyalty and with an understanding that if such an audience is present, it is because the

media object in question is filling a need, providing a much required service, responding to a

narrative omission or gap with an extra-accepted narrativity. Such is the case with "The Long

Afternoon" and "Demon Ride," where the inhabitation of the listener by the spectral hijacker

voice is literalized in the enactment of that voice's implications outside of the immediate realm

of the event, a mimicry that underlines the transmissibility of the hijackers' linguistics.

   Within this amateur space, where the non-professional may attain a status similar to that

of the professional, a patent impossibility prior to new media's emergence, the audience may not

only be migratory but, in that mobility, individual, the audience fragmenting to the singular. In

turn, within the singularity, the individual may assume a status as expert, deeply investing

her/himself in the media object and establishing a familiarity with that object that approaches an

agentic participation in its aims. Speaking in the context of a discussion of fandom and

---

[114] Sound recordings from the hijackers are readily available on Wikipedia, with the "American Airlines Flight 11"
and "United Airlines Flight 93" entries featuring transmissions from Mohamed Atta and Ziad Jarrah, respectively.

individual knowledge as expressed through discussion boards, Jenkins turns to Peter Walsh's notion of "the expert paradigm… [where] Walsh argues that our traditional assumptions about expertise are breaking down or at least being transformed by the more open-ended processes of communication in cyberspace"[115] (52), creating a situation in which the individual may become an expert in a manner not allowed by accepted narrativity, having greater access to and greater forums for the relation of information. The individualized audience operates doubly: as a listener to the event and its accepted narrativization, the expert discerns the silences within that narrative and seeks the voice to fill those silences; as a listener to the extra-accepted narrative, the expert locates the resonances between that narrative and the voice that inhabits the expert her/himself; Hodge-Stansson and Omega Wolf Productions are this first expert, their audiences the second.

Amateur spaces and fragmentary, potentially individualized audiences and producers suggest the multi-platform, multi-user approach present in new media to be a democratic one, a shared participation in the venture that decentralizes production, rendering it cellular. Jenkins notes new media theorist Pierre Lévy's contention that "such knowledge communities [as those present in the act of creating extra-accepted narrativities are] central to the task of restoring democratic citizenship" (29), identifying that citizenship as an ideal in which each individual may have a voice and an opportunity to participate in defining her/his culture. This democratic citizenry also implies a sharing of content, an availability of the means of production as well as the distribution of the product, and therefore a fluid relation between individual producers and producing groups like the Hodge-Stansson and Omega Wolf groups. In their cases, produced

---

[115] Within the expert paradigm, knowledge must be bounded, allowing for individual mastery; assumptions broken down by collective intelligence, a shared knowledge mastered by a number of individuals, yield an open ended, interdisciplinary field of knowledge (Jenkins 52).

content is enabled by the ready availability of digital recording technologies, and its subsequent

distribution is likewise enabled by the availability of broad-reaching platforms like YouTube,

which allows anyone with a computer and a relatively fast connection to view their videos

whenever they so choose. The production group may then function as a cell, a small

organization of actors devoted to a given project, operating in relative anonymity until the

moment their offering goes public, then achieving a broader profile thereafter, allowing future

offerings to trade on the cachet of their name (much like al Qaeda).

This notion of cellularity, of the small unit operating independently and exploiting the

possibilities of its operational medium (in this case, new media more broadly and YouTube more

specifically), entails a reorganization of media production, a decentralization of the monolithic

producer in favor of smaller, more diverse, more numerous producers. In the face of the unitary

accepted narrative proffered by mainstream media channels, themselves enacting a hierarchy of

who may and may not participate in the narrativizing process (thereby defining acceptability),

the cellular new media producer problematizes acceptability by offering a multiplicity of

potential narrativities, allowing voices not already included a chance to speak and

recontextualizing and reapproaching extant voices (like that of the spectral hijacker). Jenkins

dubs the cellular space an "adhocracy… an organization characterized by a lack of hierarchy. In

it, each person contributes to confronting a particular problem as needed based on his or her

knowledge and abilities, and leadership roles shift as tasks change. An adhocracy, thus, is a

knowledge culture that turns information into action" (Jenkins 251). Adhocracy enables a

contingent organization to meet specific needs, much like the cell coalesces in response to a

given objective, then disperses once that objective has been achieved (as is the case with Hodge-

Stansson Productions, the partnership dissolving into Gunnar Fritz Stansson's continued use of

the Hodge-Stansson banner and Logan Hodge's formation of North American Kino-Eye Motion

Picture Corporation, though collaborative projects continue [Hodge 1]).

Cellular production meets with cellular circulation in the sharing of new media offerings

through non-traditional channels, including word of mouth, blogging, and e-mail and social

network site linking, a coterminous cellularity that extends its mimicry beyond the point of

creation/transmission to an ideological, participative commonality. As Wills notes in his

discussion of Virgil's *Aeneid*, specifically the discussion between Caesar and Virgil where the

latter maintains that the text was written only for himself, with no larger intended audience,

"Caesar retorts that the poem amounts to a collaborative effort, that the people of Rome are

glorified in it, and that as portions of it have been circulated and admired, Virgil has received at

least the feedback represented by such admiration: 'It is no longer your work, it is the work of all

of us, indeed in one sense we have all labored at it'" (quoted in Wills 95). Likewise, though

perhaps authored within the moment with no intended audience beyond the event (especially in

the case of the cockpit transmissions, which were only mistakenly sent out over air traffic control

channels), the glorification of sorts included in the victimizing extra-accepted narrative

pronouncements of the spectral hijacker voice, along with the circulation of that voice in pseudo-

documentary, documentary, and amateur films, renders the act public, the labor of all. Through

this linkage, the audience comes to be invested in and indirectly culpable for that which it hears,

listening as licensing, going with the flow of new media transmission as going with the flown.

By listening to the spectral hijacker voice in his original (dis)incarnation or his

remediation in "The Long Afternoon" or "Demon Ride," new media consumers such as those

turning to YouTube for additional aural matter to address the gaps present in the accepted

narrative become unintentional proxy agents in the spoken (and yet seemingly unspeakable) acts.

Jenkins states that "[t]he circulation of media content… depends heavily on consumers' active

participation... consumers are encouraged to seek out new information and make new

connections among dispersed media content" (Jenkins 3), and it is just this sort of active

participation, this sort of seeking that is present in the listener searching out an extra-accepted

narrative rendering of the spectral hijacker voice, one that accords with its own inhabitation. As

the listener seeks and finds, it in turn defines the bounds of its own inhabitation, the banal

victimizing and victimhood present in both "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride"

demystifying the event beyond grand accepted narratives of evil and victimhood and relativizing

the event while at once emphasizing its potential repetition and the individuals' potential

participation in likeminded actions.

      The cell-as-producer creates the new media object that bends the ear of the seeking

listener, and that listener, along with likeminded seekers, forms a cell of her/his own, a faction

whose affection for the spectral hijacker voice creates a collective knowledge within its broad

participatory base, yielding a vernacular understanding of the event and the listener's role within

it. In the act of seeking, the listener functions as an intelligence gatherer, sifting through an

untold amount of data to locate the useful bits, then assembling those fragments into a collage

that yields an associated meaning, preferably an actionable one, using her/his smarts along the

way. Through grouping knowledge, the listener produces a group knowledge in concert with

other listeners, a hearing out that hears, then outs the aural particulars, in this case the spectral

hijacker voice. The distinction here is between "shared knowledge, information that is believed

to be true and held in common by the entire group, and collective intelligence, the sum total of

information held individually by members of the group that can be accessed in response to a

specific question" (27), with the former representing accepted narrativity, that believed to be true

by the totalizing totality, and the latter representing the seeking listener. Since the individual

listener is in possession of but a piece of the puzzle, the totality residing in the collective hive

mind, that listener is perpetually seeking, turning again and again to the equally perpetual

spectral hijacker voice.

Rather than the cultural offerings produced by accepted narrativity, unified messages that

allow little space for interactive participation and less space still for alternate readings of already

included voices, the cellular new media favored by the seeking listener exists more broadly,

exchanging the approved discourse and language of the accepted for a more informal linguistics

of the multiply produced. What results is a "new vernacular culture [that] encourages broad

participation, grassroots creativity, and a bartering or gift economy" (Jenkins 132), a less

formalized language that welcomes the general audience, allows for creativity on the part of the

amateur producer, and circulates within an exchange economy outside of the commercial realm.

Linguistically, the vernacular culture is met with the vernacular, Ricky's hyperbolic slang and

Robert's approximations thereof, the cockpit communication protocols capitalized upon by the

hijackers and the soothing words utilized therein, a language better suited to the space of new

media than that of the ossified realm of accepted narrativity. In terms of creativity, the

vernacular favors the amateur producer, Hodge-Stansson or Omega Wolf Productions, the group

with an understanding of the conventions of such products as they appear in the accepted

narrative space and the deviations necessary to alter that perspective. Finally, the bartering or

gift economy exists within the exchange avenues previously discussed (word of mouth, blogs, e-

mail, and social networking sites), informal sites where information passes as a non-reciprocal

gift, a desire to share the unique extra-accepted narrative rendering with an audience of

likeminded seekers, a response to the coexisting calls issued by gaps in accepted narrativity and the spectral voice of the hijackers, a response that is as inevitable as it is predictable.

Unsurprisingly, given its relation to the duarsal as the site of aural emanations in the context of the event, as heard on 9/11 and echoing thereafter, the response, like the voice that solicits it, comes from behind, a hailing that calls back, that stands as blowback, turning and returning the ear as it (re)tunes the ear. The listener is thereby interpellated, called from the back in a call issued to the back-as-face, consulted as a friend, her/his back gotten by the supportive hijacker who wishes to in turn, in provoking a turn, draw support from that friend. Wills notes that "the individual is hailed not by something or someone visible, identifiable, or familiar, approaching from in front, but by an impersonal unseen, and threatening voice calling from behind" (Wills 36), the hijacker unseen in his initial incarnation and more invisible still in his spectral reincarnation (though the voice is never in fact incarnate, persisting through the moment of separation and interminably thereafter), who is yet more personal and less threatening than Wills would have him to be. Instead of the impersonal dorsal threat, there is the personal daursal, less threatening than threat-themed, using this language of violence with little of its actuality, emerging from behind in its initial voicing (prior to the discovery/commission of what is recognized as the event) and remaining behind in its originary locus and adherent trace back to that moment, imminently identifiable as an offshoot of the self shooting off at the mouth. Once hailed, once called from the back to the back so as to go back, and back, and back again, the listener can only respond, her/his involvement in the interpellation already serving as an auto-response (like that of Robert and Rosemary's respective vehicles).

The hailed response comes on the heels of the original surprise, the shock at the primary communication, the listener initially taken aback, then taken by the back, of all entities,

back, of all places, the stun and the pun positioning the response as blowback, a blow to and

from the back. Wills notes the imbalance of the opening communiqué, asserting that "the friend,

the lover, and the ethical subject are produced out of such an asymmetrical surprise; they

mobilize the tropological dorsal force of such a surprise to have language function as rhetoric – a

dramatic flourish in excess of the message, designed to catch off guard and off balance – as it

were *before* it functions as communication" (18). The hijacker and its spectral voice, as argued

above, is just such a friend in its daursal positioning, just such a lover in its lingual affections,

just such an ethical subject in its post-Levinasian auto-/auto, appearing and hearing

asymmetrically (until the response of the listener, at which point the asymmetry oscillates, the

resonating singular voice being counter[off]balanced by the resounding chorus of the

ventriloquized), and signifying beyond the bounds of accepted narrativity. A similar sense of

asymmetrical response is heard in "The Long Afternoon" when, in the course of verbally

harassing Robert during the food stop, Ricky mentions the history of "300 years of slavery," and

warns Robert "I'm about to get you back, nigger. You're my first one I'm getting back" ("The

Long… [Part One]"), referencing the possibility of reparations, themselves to be levied well after

the fact and in no proportion to the offense that warrants them. Ricky's carjacking is thus a sort

of blowback, the blow to the back promised by his various knife plays, the same blowback

present in the event as produced by numerous prior offenses (including the desertion of

mujahideen forces after the Afghan war, continued support for Israel, and the presence of troops

near the holy sites of Mecca and Medina in Saudi Arabia), though the blow from the back need

not always be vengeful.

It is important to recall that it is the friend, the ethical actor, and the lover who comes

from behind, not only the enemy (it in fact being impossible for the enemy to come from behind,

as discussed above by Wills [via Schmitt]), and it is in this coming, this cumming, this lingual

arrival that the hijacker's kiss, the lips to the headset that set the head astir, leaves its mark.

Wills reminds that "what comes from behind… could as easily be a carress" (Wills 11), the

dorsal/daursal containing a potential for the gentle, a lilting, lisping lipping that issues butterfly

kisses while engendering butterflies in the stomach.[116] This affection is present in Ricky's

halting friendship with Robert, as exemplified in his momentary, indirect sympathy for the plight

of Robert's dying mother (later revealed as a hoax meant to divert Ricky from his intended aim),

as well as the demon's treating of Rosemary to dinner at Wendy's, a token of gratitude (in fact,

one detects a slight blushing beneath the demon's already ruddy countenance).[117] In both cases,

contact is limited to the shoulder, the hand dealing either a love tap (in Ricky's case), a blow to

the back that is closer to a blown kiss than a blown fuse, or a gentle, reassuring pat (in the

demon's case). Along with the aural hailing, the "verbal call or whistle [*coup de sifflet*]" (quoted

in Wills 40) used as an example of interpellation by Althusser, there is the *coup de foudre*,

literally a lightning strike, figuratively love at first sight, though the interpellative shock may be

more rightly termed love at first cite, at the first hearing of the cited hijacker. The hailing is a

---

[116] To this point, given the focus on coming/cumming from behind, one might wonder why sodomy has not yet made an appearance, as it seems to fit the overall description of daursality. Yet, this analysis' focus on aurality/orality above, as well as the example drawn from "Unforgivable A," in combination with notations of feminization to follow, render cunnilingus the more appropriate reference. This is not to foreclose the referentiality of sodomy, perhaps implied in the male on male encounter of "The Long Afternoon" or the male on female encounter of "Demon Ride" (as per the demon's abject origins), and of some interest in light of speculation concerning the hijackers' own sexual orientation (a subject for another study), only to place it outside of the scope of this analysis.

[117] Indeed, Goodyear herself suggests that "the relationship between the two [is] somewhat symbiotic," and that Rosemary "seem[s] to experience some fluctuating level of camaraderie" with the demon (Goodyear). Whether the demon ever acts on this crush is uncertain, though there is no evidence of such action in the extant "Demon Ride" segment; perhaps the two follow their impromptu dinner with a movie in the next segment?

love song, rising and falling in a hail of emotions, lightning striking again and again and again and again,[118] searing its brand into the lover in the process.

Stung by the electricity of its relation with the spectral hijacker voice, the listener cannot help but bear some reminder of the encounter, of the affection exchanged and the self changed, and the impact is accordingly noted both in person and on its person. Speaking of Coca-Cola marketing campaigns and the desire to move beyond traditional product identity into the synergistic possibilities opened by new media, Jenkins raises the concept of "'lovemarks' that are more powerful than traditional 'brands' because they command the 'love' as well as the 'respect' of consumers" (Jenkins 70). The spectral hijacker voice leaves just such a lovemark, a hickey produced by the pressure of his application, by the force of his lips upon the listener's throat, an affectionate, well-intended welt that marks the listener as the object of the spectral hijacker voice's affection, redoubling the impact of plane-on-tower face with the plainspoken, equally impactful "I love you" of the hijacker; whether one feels the same or not, that bold of an expression cannot be left unanswered, the lover cannot be left hanging. Instead, a response is merited, required, mandatory, though it is less the man, the masculinized, fury-filled hyperbolically evil hijacker (satirized to much effect by Ricky/Stansson) that does so than the feminized hijacker/listener, on the receiving end of the tongue.

This feminization broadens its scope to include the hijacker and the hijacked, the speaker and the listener, both formers feminized through previous victimhood and a diminutive physicality (the bulk of the muscle hijackers possessing little and doing little to merit the appellation), and both latters feminized through a similar victimization and a positioning at the

---

[118] Lou Christie's "Lightnin' Strikes" captures this tumult, wondering "am I asking too much for you to stick around?", and stating that "believe it or not, you're in my heart all the time… lightning is striking again / and again and again and again" (Christie), referring to the shocking omnipresence of the spectral hijacker voice and its lovestruck listener.

feminine end of the aural dialectic (man speaks, woman listens; when woman speaks [prattling

endlessly, gossiping], the man tunes out). Carson reflects on the "ideological association of

female sound with monstrosity, disorder, and death" (Carson 121), a traditional understanding

that makes the linkage between female sound and the spectral hijacker voice apt, with both

falling under the purview of monstrosity via the disorder and death brought about by the event.

Yet, the spectral hijacker voice's femininity is less monstrous than motherly, a caretaking that in

the end takes care of the hijacked,[119] less disorderly than concerned with linguistic protocol, less

deadly than perpetually alive. Indeed, in the only moment when the hijacker voice moves

beyond his overall soothing, if occasionally impatient tone is in the final "Allahu akbar" just

prior to impact, a shout akin to another attributed specifically to women: "[T]he women are

uttering a particular kind of shriek, the *ololyga*. This is a ritual shout peculiar to women. It is a

high-pitched piercing cry uttered at certain climactic moments in ritual practice (e.g., at the

moment when a victim's throat is slashed during sacrifice) or at climactic moments in real life

(e.g., at the birth of a child)" (125). The ritual undertaking that is the event contains just this sort

of high pitched scream, spoken also by the muscle hijackers as the hijacking begins (shock being

the best weapon at their disposal, knives acting as a necessary, but not central, accompaniment),

the muscle in the back remaining silent and unrecorded while the more feminized pilot offers a

throaty riposte.

A similar feminization occurs in both "Demon Ride" and "The Long Afternoon,"

though that feminization is perhaps less stable, in keeping with the overall fluidity of the event in

---

[119] United Airlines Flight 175 passenger Peter Hanson refers to this taken care in a call placed to his father Lee. After relaying his suspicions that "I think they intend to go to Chicago or someplace and fly into a building," Hanson comforts his father, saying "[d]on't worry, Dad. If it happens, it'll be very fast… Oh My God… oh my God, oh my God," the hijackers taking care to make the passengers' deaths swift, and even sharing the pre-impact religious appeal (*National*).

terms of identity. In "Demon Ride," the driver/pilot is provisionally auto-feminized as a woman, an additional layer being added by her concern over the threat of rape (usually enacted by the male against the female),[120] thereby inverting the initial dynamic between male pilot and female flight attendant evident in all 9/11 flights, with the provisionally masculine demon attending to the feminine driver's hunger. Additionally, the demon is not as violent or as masculine as one might expect, casting a relatively unimposing physical presence in the back seat, speaking deeply but rarely at great volume, and establishing himself as a subordinate to the Grim Reaper, who he plans to dress as for Halloween, suggesting a subaltern positionality. The short creates a more direct linkage between the demonized feminine and the feminized demon, both falling under the purview of a liminal devaluation. In "The Long Afternoon," the driver/pilot is autofeminized as a thin, young white male, his youth emphasized in Ricky's assertion that "you better change yo age, nigger!" ("The Long… [Part One]") when Robert notes that he is only nineteen rather than the apparently more acceptable twenty,[121] and his lesser status connoted by his frequent address as "bitch," a term that, while relatively divorced from its preexisting gender referentiality, retains more than a trace of the associated feminization. Further, Ricky is not as violent or as masculine as one would expect, constantly threatening but doing little, equally unimposing with his small frame and diminutive stature (significantly shorter than Robert, as is evident during the food stop), and whose hunger is also attended to by Robert. Ricky cautions Robert that "you act like bitch, man, I'm gonna put you down like one" ("Outtakes"), though the bitch-man conjunction

---

[120] Goodyear describes Rosemary as "a rather unsuspecting everywoman… connecting with her attacker as best she can while maintaining some composure in the face of her fears" (Goodyear), with Tucker additionally characterizing her as "the straightperson in the piece" (Tucker). Therefore, Rosemary is taken to represent a broader feminine perspective and experience, among her fears being the concern over rape expressed in the film. Further, her sexual orientation is clearly asserted, marriage (unfortunately) yet implying a heterosexual union, though space is left for the demon to take on a queer positionality (given Rosemary's fulfillment of the straightperson quota).

[121] Hodge characterizes Robert as "just a punk kid" (Hodge), further feminizing Lamastus by linking him to the subservient partner positionality in a homosexual jailhouse relationship. Robert is also implied as something of a mama's boy in his use of his mother's supposed illness as a means of escaping Ricky's control.

seems less oriented towards the hetero- and more towards the reflexive femininity of the enacted tongue.

The turn to the feminine, a fluid designation, exemplifies the shifting identities at play in the daursal, the unfixed account of the unaccounted extra-accepted narrative that comes from behind, dictating the path of the future. Accepted narrativity attempts to draw a line, a clear progression from event to event, a causality that may be clearly determined and clearly depicted, though the line in the sand is subject to the lapping of the waves: "They are exposed to the billows of political change and military force, are difficult to defend, changeable, undecidable, always threatened with disappearance or reimposition, subject to waves of conquest or flight, the stampede of armies or the panic of refugees. They are lines drawn in the ocean" (Wills 117). The spectral hijacker voice is a wave, disappearing accepted narrativity through his flight from the throat of the hijacker to the throat of the listener, emerging from an ocean, the likeminded waves of other events and of the event's own repetition, both ocean and of the ocean. As Derrida notes in *Limited Inc*, "[c]ontext is always, and always has been, at work *within* the place, and not only *around* it" (Derrida 60), and the wave performs its erasure prior to, as a lonely tide following the tied hands of the flight attendant into the cockpit, voice box meeting black box, as well as along with the other waves, the rippling voices of the ventriloquized. The fluidity of new media facilitates this flow, bringing the extra-accepted narrative to new shores and allowing its waves to lap against new beaches, "bitch"es spoken and bitches made at tonguepoint.

"The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride" thus set out the possibility of not only a primarily aural hijacking, one whose main impact is based in its use of the aural, but also a *purely* aural hijacking. In the case of 9/11 and its spectral hijacker voice, as initially produced by Mohamed Atta and Ziad Jarrah and reproduced endlessly thereafter through inclusion in the

professional and amateur filmic of the pseudo-documentary, documentary, and online short, it is

the aural that first signifies the hijackings, that commences the event and that ultimately

exemplifies the event. Though the visual later registers the impact of the event in the literal

arrival of the planes at their respective targets (or non-arrival in the case of United 93, an

unterminated terminus in Shanksville that leaves the ETA open ended, the event remaining

always already in progress, always already unended and unending), it is by that point irrelevant,

knowledge of the hijackings having been made apparent aurally as early as 8:23 AM,[122] more

than twenty minutes prior to the plane's impact with the North Tower and approximately forty

minutes prior to the impact of United 175, whose arrival signals the visual registration of the

event as intentional. What matters is the Word; the deed is at best secondary, and more

appropriately tertiary. That the hijacker voice leaves the hijacker is sufficient, his transmission

to the cabin allowing for a relay to the airline and beyond via flight attendant Betty Ong's phone

call (Sullivan 1); that he is recorded inadvertently by air traffic control is beneficent, creating a

greater and more permanent audience still; that Atta eventually arrives at the World Trade Center

is a foregone conclusion, the denouement of his performative. Accordingly, the hijacker need

only speak for the event to come to pass, the past passing from back to front, the invocation

rendering the vocation complete, with everything else simple window-dressing. This is the

purely aural hijacking, the specter sidling up behind the listener, rasping his "BOO!" and

registering the fright without sight.

---

[122] Atta's first transmission comes at 8:24:38, with two additional transmissions occurring at 8:24:56 and 8:33:59, prior to the plane's impact with the North Tower at 8:46:40 (National [b]).

INTER/MISSION

Relax, take a deep breath, pull air into the lungs, but know that with every pull there is a push, for every action an equal and opposite reaction, for every bit of oxygen taken in a monoxidal expulsion, a well-intentioned inhalation that yet inhabits, coursing through the bloodstream, and yielding an undesired but all too present byproduct that emerges from the mouth. Keep your seat, but know that the film is over, visuality having proven inadequate to the demands of the voice. What has come before, the seemingly successful deacousmatization of the hijacker voice through its inclusion in visual accepted narrativity, is gone, removal from the immediate referentiality of the event serving to hasten the divorce between the visual and the aural.

This is an inter/mission, concerned with interring the visual, locating a neat little plot within its equally impeccable accepted narrativizing, putting it to rest in the rest, the silence between sounds, the ruptures left open within that narrative that allow the solicited hijacker voice a place in which it may counteroffer its extra-accepted narrative. At once a mission, a hard day's journey from sight, this taken pause also gives it, the unsettling of the first section foretelling further discomfort to come, the discomfiting of the visual giving way to the now comfortable aural, which settles in as narrator, taking the soundtrack from the film's edge and edging the film out of the picture. It is a flight to the death, and only one can emerge victorious.

A film in reverse, the taken credit running first, the assumed victimhood existing as the premise upon which accepted narrativity is founded, the reel furls itself, returning to the trailer and previews. Portents of the future emerge, the previews too giving way to music and darkness, the purely aural controlling the floor and flooring the controller. Envision an unvision. Swallow, yawn, do whatever it takes to pop the ears, as they are in for a workout. Hear ye, hear ye, for ye shall hear, and well.

PART TWO

HEARD MENTALITY: LISTENING TO THE SPECTRAL VOICE

"Keep Remaining Sitting": The Spectral Voice and the Repertoire

Following on the traced progression from professional to amateur, predominately visual to purely aural, optic to sonic evident in the Flight 93 films, the 9/11 documentary, and the YouTube shorts, one may extend that move away from the visual and towards the aural by examining sound art and music, locating a similar progression from the professional to the amateur starting with the work of William Basinski. Where the hijacker voice is included in the Flight 93 films and 9/11 documentary as a means of solidifying his signification as pure evil, that evil is problematized by the voice's iterative citationality, by virtue of which he is able to inhabit the listener by becoming spectral, haunting, present in his very absence. It is this absence that Basinski's work addresses, specifically the sound art series *The Disintegration Loops I-IV*, which carries a particular resonance for 9/11, the voids and seeming silences of the decaying recording paralleling the filmic pseudo-silencing of the hijacker voice, though, much like the filmic rendering, the spectral hijacker voice manages to speak his way through.

Prior to engaging in a direct analysis of the series, this chapter will implement an understanding of performance studies to parse the hijacking-as-performance, taking as its more specific object the voice of the hijacker, as captured by the cockpit voice recorder and air traffic control recordings, and the way in which that voice is perpetuated by his situation in the realm of technology. As noted above, with each repetition, the narrative of U.S. victimhood forwarded by the documentary and semi-fictionalized versions loses its impact, and with each repetition, the message of the hijacker voice resounds more profoundly through his inhabitation of the listener. To arrive at this understanding, the chapter will include a close reading of Diana Taylor's 2003 book *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*, with specific attention to her elucidation of the scenario, the archive, and the repertoire through a

number of case studies spanning the Americas (and including 9/11). Taylor's concepts will facilitate an examination of the hijacker voice, situating that voice firmly within the realm of the repertoire, the active space of embodied cultural memory, rather than the archive, the more static linear historical space suggested by his couching within recording apparatuses. Then, the hijacker voice will be aligned with some of the culturally specific examples provided by Taylor, enacting a linguistic performance of reflexive alterity that implicates the listener in his message, haunting the U.S. national imaginary. Finally, using William Basinski's *The Disintegration Loops I-IV* as a case study, this essay will explore both the 9/11 scenario and the hijacker voice's place in the repertoire, demonstrating how the failure of the victimhood narrative gives way to a self-victimizing through inhabitation. Basinski's series will be discussed in terms of its negotiation of the voids produced by the machinic glitches endemic to an older, residual medium, where the incrementally increasing space within the recordings functions less as absence than presence in absence, redoubling the inhabitational capacity of the hijacker voice by paralleling his attempted silencing at the methodological level. Taylor notes that "[i]f performance did not transmit knowledge, only the literate and powerful could claim social memory and identity" (Taylor xvii), and wonders "[w]hose stories, memories, and struggles might become visible?" through a look at embodied performance (xviii); this chapter will support the claims regarding performance in the former while giving answer to the latter.

ACTING OUT: SCENARIO, ARCHIVE, REPERTOIRE

Before undertaking the analysis outlined above, it is important to position 9/11 more generally, and the hijacker voice more specifically, within the tripartite schema offered by Taylor: the scenario, the archive and the repertoire. Beginning with the scenario, which Taylor first describes as "a paradigmatic setup that relies on supposedly live participants, structured

around a schematic plot, with an intended (though adaptable) end" (13), 9/11 fits the model to a

T, invoking an accepted narrativity of U.S. victimhood (recalling Pearl Harbor, among other

precedents) with live participants, to the end of restoring U.S. dignity and international profile.

Scenarios are "meaning-making paradigms that structure social environments, behaviors, and

potential outcomes" (28), much as the U.S. victimhood scenario, as manifested on 9/11,

structures international relations, military postures, and the inevitable resort to war as a means of

preemptive deterrence. Taylor provides a comprehensive listing of "the ways that using *scenario*

as a paradigm for understanding social structures and behaviors might allow us to draw from the

repertoire as well as the archive… [including attention to] the physical location… the

embodiment of the social actors… [scenarios as] formulaic structures… multifaceted systems at

work in the scenario itself… situat[ing] ourselves in relationship to it… [and scenarios as] not

necessarily, or even primarily, mimetic" (29-32). Similarly, the 9/11 scenario meets these

paradigmatic demands, its sites (the World Trade Center towers, the Pentagon, Shanksville)

being of crucial importance, its actors (hijackers, victims, rescue personnel, administration

figures) assuming a certain viscerality, its structure being wholly formulaic, its consultation of

both the archive and the repertoire being thoroughgoing, its largesse and prominence

necessitating situation in relation, and its references to past situations (Pearl Harbor again) being

quite transparent. Thus, the U.S. victimhood scenario, as manifested on 9/11, is "an act of

transfer… a paradigm that is formulaic, portable, repeatable, and often banal because it leaves

out complexity, reduces conflict to its stock elements, and encourages fantasies of participation"

(54); however, the scenaric function is not so neat in this instance, and will be problematized by

the embodied status of the hijacker.

Embodiment, as provided by the application of theatricality to the scenario, complicates the scenario's banality and its tendency to gloss over the tensions within. This complication allows a clarification of the proceedings that makes the hyperbolic elisions of the scenario highly visible. Taylor contends that "[t]heatricality makes the scenario alive and compelling. In other words, scenarios exist as culturally specific imaginaries – sets of possibilities, ways of conceiving conflict, crisis, or resolution – activated with more or less theatricality" (13), positing a revivifying effect on the part of theatricality, an enlivening by the liveness of the performance, enacted without a net but netting a substantial audience. This revivification is made possible by a methodological shift: "Instead of focusing on patterns of cultural expression in terms of texts and narratives, we might think about them as scenarios that do not reduce gestures and embodied practices to narrative description" (16). This shift in focus provides a critical opening for 9/11 to be viewed outside of or with an awareness of accepted narratives of U.S. victimhood and for the hijacker voice to be heard outside of his positioning within technological apparatuses. Such critical distantiation is definitionally included in the scenario, which "more fully allows us to keep both the social actor and the role in view simultaneously, and thus recognize areas of resistance and tension" (30), allowing a parsing of banalizing scenaric performance and the real actor beneath. This distinction is useful in the case of 9/11, where individuals are often not who they appear to be, instead being multiply roled, gentleman and hijacker, passenger and presager. While parsing, the scenario also links, "bridg[ing] past and future as well as the here and there" (58), also suggesting a temporal collapse that will prove of particular use to the notion of the perpetual and perpetuating hijacker voice.

Yet, despite its relative rehabilitation by theatricality, the inherent nature of the scenario establishes it as a less than ideal critical space, at least in the case of the U.S. victimhood

scenario as it manifests in relation to 9/11. Within this scenario, the initial paucity of

theatricality (prior to the workings of the hijacker voice) renders the event troublingly banal, an

unstriking strike that is in a sense routine in its routing, another in a string of victimizations.

Victor Turner's theorization of the recognizability of non-Western events according to Western

models, for Taylor, "may have less to do with the 'supposedly "spontaneous"' events than with

his analytical lens" (quoted in Taylor 9), speaking to the imposition of the U.S. victimhood

scenario from a distinctly Western (read: U.S. fundamentalist) positionality.[123] Taylor elsewhere

paraphrases Ernest Renan, concluding that "the national imaginary is shaped not only by what it

chooses to remember, but also by what it chooses to forget" (quoted in Taylor 196), once more

drawing attention to the U.S. psyche and its originary creation of accepted narratives of

victimhood, a psyche that will be rendered vulnerable by both the hijacking act and the hijacker

voice.[124] 9/11 itself, in Taylor's words, exists as "[o]ur Hollywood scenarios live – complete

with towering infernos and raging sirens – just down the street" (Taylor 239), a literalization of

the Western perspective that enacts a remembered or premembered (the fictive filmic precedents

[*The Towering Inferno*,[125] etc.] existing as a copy that finds its original after the fact in the event)

imaginary in a distinctly Hollywood-esque fashion, obscuring critical theatricality beneath a

veneer of outright spectacle. The scenario therefore offers a tentatively critical space for analysis

---

[123] Taylor approaches Turner in the course of discussing his understanding of performance as "culture's deepest, truest, and most individual character" (Taylor 4), going on to note his investiture of agency within the visual for their own performance, and also his restrictive framework in which events have a discernible beginning, middle, and end.

[124] Taylor approaches Renan in the context of an analysis of how one stages traumatic memory, using the Peruvian theatre collective Yuyachkani as an example, and discussing the participatory aspects not only of memory, but also of forgetting.

[125] *The Towering Inferno* (John Guillermin/Irwin Allen, 1974) is an apt precedent in this instance, the film chronicling a raging fire within a skyscraping hotel, in which helicopter rescues from the upper floors are rendered impossible, and elevators are immobilized by flames, though, unlike the scenario it foreshadows, the elevators are later partially usable, a helicopter comes to the rescue of several main characters, and the building does not collapse.

of the event, though its ability to draw from the archive and the repertoire will strengthen that critical potential.

The archive is typically perceived as the appropriate locus for the hijacker voice which, though initially performed as a speech act by the hijacker, is nearly immediately taken into the technologized recording apparatus and held there for posterity, in the posterior, at the back, as per the static nature of the archive. Composed of "supposedly enduring materials (i.e., texts, documents, buildings, bones)… [as opposed to] the so-called ephemeral *repertoire* of embodied practice/knowledge (i.e., spoken language, dance, sports, ritual)" (19), the archive is typically characterized as being fixed or canonical, though the interpretations of its holdings may differ over time, articulating a proximate and iterative change above a static foundation. Due to his imbrication in the recording apparatus, the hijacker voice seems closer to the archive, functioning as a text which documents the speech act, more a transcripted script of communicational protocol than a unique performance. Following on Taylor's notion of enduring materials, the coterminous meeting of the voice-as-archive and the building (World Trade Center)-as-archive in the event yields the archival and archived bone (of the shattered body), each standing as one of those materials. Attempting to situate the hijacker voice within the archive puts several myths concerning the archive into stark relief, namely "that it is unmediated… [and that] the archive resists change, corruptibility, and political manipulation" (19), given that the voice is always already mediated through his placement within the technologized apparatus and is prone to corrupting elision in the accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood. Awareness of these myths grants the archive some critical possibility, though it seems that one must skirt the boundaries of the archive to achieve true criticism, as observed by Taylor in the case of the Madres of the Plaza de Mayo in Argentina: "Instead of the body in the

archive associated with surveillance and police strategies, they staged the archive in/on the body, affirming that embodied performance could make visible that which had been purged from the archive" (178).[126] This example of the performed archive, though generally related to the archive, is more closely tied to the repertoire, which is the more accurate locus of the hijacker voice and a more ideal critical space.

In contrast to the archive, the repertoire serves as an embodied space better suited to the particulars of the hijacker voice, which is simultaneously embodied (in his relation to his producing body, the hijacker) and disembodied (in his separation from that obliterated body and perpetuation as a piece of data within the technologized space). The hijacker voice is never static in either case, though he arises from the seeming static of the initially incomprehensible transmission, and is always tied to the producing body. For Taylor, "[t]he repertoire requires presence: people participate in the production and reproduction of knowledge by 'being there,' being a part of the transmission. As opposed to the supposedly stable objects in the archive, the actions that are the repertoire do not remain the same. The repertoire both keeps and transforms choreographies of meaning" (20). It is this very presence that is implied by the hijacker voice, which necessitates the present speaker (spectral though it may be, less a speaker-as-individual than a speaker-as-audio equipment, though another individual is located in the listener) and present listener, subject to permutation in the act of repetition (to be discussed below). The repertoire exists, in relation to the hijacker voice, as the oral pole of the written/oral binary (the archive aligning with the written), and "transmits live, embodied actions… [with] traditions…

---

[126] The Madres of the Plaza de Mayo are a group of mothers of the left wing individuals "disappeared" in Argentina during the late 1970s , individuals who were kidnapped, tortured, and in many cases killed by the military and police with the approval of Isabel Péron. The Madres protested these disappearances as they were happening, at great risk to themselves, carrying placards depicting their missing children and drawing attention to the widely known but amnestically erased actions of the military and police.

stored in the body, through various mnemonic methods, and transmitted 'live' in the here and now to a live audience" (24). This transmission carries on the lineage of subaltern pronouncements and retakes the speech act from transcripting to speaking by the embodied hijacker subject. Rather than the archive's approximate embodiment, the repertoire gives body to the voice, as noted by Taylor: "The embodied experience and transmission of traumatic memory – the interaction between people in the here and now, whether in giving testimony, in psychoanalysis, at a demonstration, or in a trial – make a difference in the way knowledge is transmitted and incorporated" (173). The hijacker voice functions as a testimony of past trauma (reaching to the Crusades and including U.S. military presence in the Middle East, support for Israel, and failure to embrace Islam), his embodiment and his producing body (the hijacker) transmitting that memory via the demonstration effect of the event, managing to circumvent the trial via suiciding. With this more thorough embodiment in mind, the hijacker voice is most closely aligned with the repertoire, though his reading through a clutch of specific examples provided by Taylor will bring this alignment into greater focus.

Of the many specific examples provided by Taylor as case studies within her larger analysis, three models in particular bear a striking resemblance to the actions of the hijackers on 9/11: *relajo*, escraches, and Victor Turner's "social drama." A cursory examination of the connection between the models and the event will ground the hijacking action while also providing a leaping off point for its further theorization in this analysis. Starting with *relajo*, "a blissfully failed performative, an act that breaks the appropriate system of conventional behaviors and turns its actions null and void… [a] liminal mode of action that entails an acting up and an acting out…. an act of spontaneous disruption [which] shatters the given configuration of a group or community" (129), parallels with the hijacking action and its accompanying voice

are clear.[127] Rather than performing his spoken intent (returning to the airport to have its demands), the hijacker and hijacker voice deliberately fail in that performance, instead breaking non-suicide hijacking patterns to nullify themselves in the suicide act (temporarily in both cases, as will be shown below). The suicide act serves to rupture the U.S. psyche while simultaneously rupturing and coalescing disparate Muslim communities.

Moving to escraches, "acts of public shaming… [which are] highly theatrical and well-organized. *Theatrical* because the accusation works only if people take notice" (164), the parallel is similarly evident in the spectacular revelation of U.S. vulnerability and ineffectuality demonstrated in the immaculately plotted hijacking action and the notification of its ongoing commission via the hijacker voice.[128] As part of the escrache in the Argentine context, relatives wear the photo IDs of disappeared family members as they walk the Plaza de Mayo, IDs "[n]ormally categorized, decontextualized, and filed away in official or police archives… [and] [p]hotographed in conditions of absolute sameness – white background, frontal pose, hair back, ears exposed, no jewelry – [where] the individual differences become more easily accessible to scrutiny and 'positive identification'" (176). Somewhat similarly, the hijackers are (self-)reduced to photo IDs (though the self- aspect is complemented by the deacousmatizing efforts of the filmic to rejoin the visual/visceral hijacker to its voice), previously used as means of Foucauldian biopower,[129] now speaking to a collective alterity (the nineteen hijackers forming

---

[127] Taylor deals with the concept of *relajo* in the context of Walter Mercado's performance of Latino psychic space. Mercado, a television personality whose commercial reach includes books, books on tape, and CDs, enacts a cosmetic performance of Latinness, in which hyperbolic performance of Latin American signifiers serves to put the constructed nature of identities both stereotypical and counter-stereotypical into question.

[128] Taylor discusses *escraches* in the context of protests by H.I.J.O.S., the children of the disappeared, in Argentina, specifically in relation to their use of festive guerrilla performances to draw attention to the actions that claimed their parents.

[129] The ID typically functions as a means of state control through the management and possession of data, along with the accompanying certification of that data as part of the ID granting process; however, in this case the ID functions

a distinct "them") and a criminal "positive identification" after the fact within the homogenizing frame of the passport photos displayed following the event. These photos function as a testament to continued presence in absence exemplified by the hijacker voice. Turning finally to Turner's "social drama," Taylor identifies four stages: "(1) the breach, or social rupture and flouting of the norm; (2) crisis, in which the breach widens and escalates; (3) redressive action, which seeks to contain the spread of the crisis; and (4) the reintegration, the reordering of social norms" (137).[130] The U.S. victimhood scenario more generally, and 9/11's hijacking/hijacker voice aspect more specifically, complete the first three stages of this model: the event serves as the (literal and figurative) breach, its aftermath as the crisis, the military response in Afghanistan and Iraq as the redressive action, and the attempted reformation of the U.S. psyche as the reintegration. However, the inclusion of the hijacker voice in the reformative effort (via semi-fictionalized and documentary accounts) renders completion of this stage an impossibility, the linguistic functioning of that voice instead enabling an inhabitation of the provisionally reformed imaginary.

MY KINGDOM FOR A HOARSE: THE HIJACKER VOICE

Due to his unique placement within the technologized recording apparatus and subsequent inclusion in semi-fictionalized and documentary accounts of 9/11, the hijacker voice is able to engage in a number of linguistic gymnastics. His intentional malfunction enables a performative speech that turns the speech of the U.S. psyche against itself, opening a polyphonic discursive space in the process. Particularly quote-worthy segments of hijacker speech (notably,

---

inversely, highlighting the failure of the state in spite of its possession of information on each of the hijackers, classification via the ID now placing the hijackers in a class by themselves as successful agents of alterity.

[130] Taylor approaches Turner's "social drama" as part of her analysis of minority mourning for Princess Diana after her death, identifying the four stages in that instance as her divorce from Prince Charles and estrangement from the Royal family, her death, her funeral, and her ghost as a site of cross-cultural negotiation, respectively (Taylor 137-41).

Mohamed Atta's initial "we have some planes," spoken as pilot-hijacker of American Airlines

Flight 11) function as memes, "stories, songs, habits, skills, inventions, and ways of doing things

that we copy from person to person by imitation" (quoted in Taylor 4), which are eventually

placed within the U.S. psyche through their repetition in semi-fictionalized and documentary

accounts. Hijacker speech on 9/11, which promises a return to the airport pending passenger

cooperation and the meeting of demands, falls under the category of "misfires, acts that do not

take effect and are declared null and void, either because (1) the procedure used is the wrong one

or the person executing it is not the appropriate one ('misinvocation,' 17) or (2) the procedure is

correct but its performance is bungled ('misexecutions,' 17)" (125). This misfire is deliberate,

the wrong/inappropriate pilot-hijacker misinvoking conciliatory speech with correct procedure

not followed by performance, a misexecution of the promise that facilitates execution of the

event. By using the language dictated by cockpit communication protocols, the hijacker voice

functions as James Scott's "'hidden transcript'… a strategy that subordinate groups create 'that

represents a critique of power spoken behind the back of the dominant'… that grants these social

actors the opportunity to rearrange characters in parodic and subversive ways" (quoted in Taylor

30-1).[131] The hijacker voice is an enduring speech that eludes the archive while parodically

invoking conventional speech to unconventional ends, while still courting the performative.

Focusing more narrowly on Atta's "we have some planes," that statement functions as a

performative, at once identifying and creating the multiple hijacking. Taylor quotes British

philosopher of language J.L. Austin's definition of a performative,[132] where "the issuing of an

---

[131] Scott, an anthropologist, is invoked in Taylor as a means of demonstrating the potential for a response to the archival transcript, the official account, by the hidden transcript, a more repertoire-minded rendering that creates a subversive narrative space for the heretofore subverted.

[132] Austin's articulation of performatives occurs most notably in his influential *How to Do Things With Words*, and acts to counter the understanding of sentences as statements of fact, instead positioning those sentences within a

utterance is the performing of an action" (quoted in Taylor 5), and the particulars of Atta's

statement exemplify that definition. Atta's "we" creates a community of hijackers where no

awareness of one preexisted that moment (and, indeed, unity among the hijacking teams was less

than uniform, despite the red headbands sported by each team [as depicted in each of the Flight

93 films] to emphasize their unity), his "have" creates possession where no such possession

preexisted that moment, and his "some planes" creates a four-pronged assault where no

awareness of any other hijackings (or, indeed, Atta's, prior to his speech act) preexisted that

moment. The performative is situated within the linguistic stream of performance studies, which

"stressed the creativity at play in the use of language, as speakers and their audiences worked

together to produce successful verbal performances" (Taylor 7), Atta's speech at once requiring

an audience while creating that audience through his use of the air traffic control frequency. As

shown by the above discussion of misinvocation and misexecution and noted by Taylor in her

attention to Denise Stoklos, "[t]he 'meaning' of the words has so little to do with their

performative utterance" (214).[133] Simply the fact that Atta is speaking, that the hijacker is given

voice (or, rather, seizes it), is sufficient to perform the hijacking action implied and literalized in

his speech, a separation of speech from meaning that mimics the separation of the hijacker voice

from his producing body.

As an inevitable consequence of the suicide act, the hijacker voice divests himself of his

producing body simultaneous to his reception by the technologized recording apparatus. The

voice functions equally well, if not better, in that context, though he always refers to his body

---

constellation of others. Included among these are performatives, which are not evaluable on the basis of truth
(Austin).

[133] Denise Stoklos is a Brazilian performance artist whose work deals with intercultural performance, stressing
linguistic (including performing in the language of the audience), racial (the performer as un/marked), gender (the
constructed aesthetics of beauty), and politics (the legacy of colonialism) aspects in the course of conceptualizing
intercultural spectatorship.

after this separation. Following on Taylor's conclusions regarding Princess Diana's continued relevance after her death, "the signifier has no need of the signified, except as authenticating remains" (154); it is important that the hijacker voice once resided in a human body (giving tangibility to the event), but not that he remain there, the initial utterance proving sufficient verification and the voice no longer requiring his body. For Taylor, "[t]he telling is as important as the writing, the doing as central as the recording" (35), reasserting the importance of the initially embodied speech act as equivalent to (though not more important than) any repetition of the speech act as a function of its recording. Speaking of transmission of genetic or mimetic material across generations, Taylor notes that "[t]hings disappear, both from the archive and the repertoire. Nor can 'copy fidelity' account for transmission; this too proves faulty" (174), pointing towards the inevitability of decay for the voice-as-meme, as well as its intercession and inhabitation at the level of the U.S. genome. However, this decay is forestalled by inclusion in the technologized recording apparatus. Additionally, Taylor's statement implies that, for transmission to persist, the relation of the copy to the original must not be precise, but may in fact manifest the very iterative decay she sees as unavoidable, perhaps even relying on that decay as part and parcel of the message (to be discussed below). The hijacker voice in essence hijacks his own producing body, using it for his own ends, then discarding it, a hijacking also seen in the voice's use of English.

In the course of creating the hijacking action through his function as a performative, the hijacker voice and his production of hijacker speech uses English as a second language (after Arabic), hijacking that language in much the same way that he overtakes cockpit communication protocol, inverting it to different ends. Like Emilio Carballido's Intermediary, the hijacker's use of English "bespeaks the coexistence of another language alive within in, constituting linguistic

and cultural bilingualism" (89), with the implied Arabic of the hijacker's English dialect

resituating the U.S. within a more equitable sphere of global actors.[134] Returning to Taylor's

discussion of Stoklos, where Stoklos "prefers to perform in the language of the audience…

[t]here is always another language coexisting within the language one hears" (217), the hijacker

electing to use English to enable maximum comprehensibility, while still allowing the favored

Arabic to seep through at the level of dialect. The hijacker thereby parodically invokes protocol

language automatically by channeling it through that dialect. Hijacker speech and the hijacker

voice therefore carry a double message, a phenomenon commented on by Taylor within the

Stoklos analysis: "Doubleness, then, is as much strategy as circumstance. Nothing is transparent.

We know each other, if at all, only in translation" (217). Strategic doubleness is a deliberate

function of the hijacker voice, the apparent transparence of his speech (the cockpit

communication protocols believed by most passengers [at least initially, especially in the case of

United Airlines Flight 93]) being muddied only through an understanding of the implications of

the dialect. The dialect itself also requires some translation (as evidenced by the necessary

playbacks of the air traffic control tape before it could be ascertained that Atta's "planes" was

indeed plural [though its initial invocation is always already plural, following on the "we" and its

implication of a coalescent *jihadi* community]). This use of English, a linguistic borrowing,

serves to both facilitate the impact of the hijacker voice and to problematize English more

generally.

---

[134] Playwright Emilio Carballido figures into Taylor's argument as the author of *Yo, también hable de la rosa* (*I, Too, Speak of the Rose*), in which a character known as the Intermediary functions eponymously, "as the site of convergence binding the individual with the collective, the private with the social, the diachronic and the synchronic, memory with knowledge. She becomes the locus and means of communication" (Taylor 80), much as Atta and Jarrah enact a linguistic coexistence in their use of English.

The choice to speak the hijacker voice in English, beyond providing for easy legibility of his speech and easy digestion of his seeming message, also enables a problematization of English more generally. To wit, if the hijacker speaks English, and the listener speaks English, the listener is either aligned with the hijacker positionality, or must distance her/himself from that positionality through an according distantiation from English, as the language is inhabited by the hijacker voice. In relation to Stoklos, Taylor concludes that "if we learn to say the words of another, we will be able to somehow feel what the other feels and understand why others do as they do" (230), and with this relation in mind, the hijacker voice gains an understanding of the listening positionality simultaneous to the listener's understanding of the hijacker positionality, as provided by the voice's use of familiar English. By using the words of another (the listener), the hijacker approximates that stance, allowing an externality to his own action literalized by the separation of the hijacker voice from his producing body; by having her/his words used by the Other (the hijacker), the listener approximates that stance in turn.

Fernando Ortiz's notion of "transculturation"[135] proves useful to this discussion, the term "denot[ing] the transformative process undergone by a society in the acquisition or imposition of foreign material, and the fusion of the indigenous and the foreign to create a new, original cultural product" (94) and consisting of four stages: "loss, selectivity, rediscovery, and incorporation – all of which take place simultaneously" (105), as conceptualized by Angel Rama.[136] The hijacker transculturates English to his speech act, producing a new, hybridized dialect that allows for dualistic, parodic speech, while the listener transculturates the hijacker

---

[135] Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz's "transculturation" is mentioned in the context of Taylor's discussion of the Intermediary, where issues of hybridity in relation to embodiment are central to Taylor's larger attention to Latin American and Latina/o cultural and racial performance.

[136] Rama's *Transculturacion narrative en America Latina* elaborates upon Ortiz's conceptualization of transculturation, addressing a perceived deficiency in Ortiz concerning selectivity and inventiveness, while also characterizing transculturation as distinctly Latin American in its resistance to cultural modification by a foreign entity (Taylor 104).

voice, creating a new, inhabited English. Both the hijacker and the listener operate in a space of

loss (global disenfranchisement/linguistic hegemony), selectivity (choosing cockpit

communication protocol/having the hijacker voice chosen for her/him), rediscovery (the

discovery of speech in general doubled by its secondary meaning/repetition in semi-fictionalized

and documentary accounts), and incorporation (able speech in dialect/inhabitation). Where

Taylor posits 9/11 and its accompanying profusion of imagery as an environment in which "[o]ur

very eyes [were] used against us" (244), the hijacker wields the listener's words and language to

similar effect, meeting the monovocality of U.S. exceptionalism with a polyphonic, inclusive

multivocality that uses the listener's ears against her/him.

Though speaking in a singular language (English) and through a singular paradigm

(cockpit communication protocols and similarly oriented protocols of mourning), the hijacker

voice/listener combination demonstrates a polyvocality that comes along with the presence of

duplicity at the level of dialect and rhetoric. At the moment of his invocation, the hijacker voice

manages to "enter into dialogue with the history of trauma without [itself] being traumatic"

(210). That moment of trauma is delayed by the veneer of normalcy that results from the use of

English and the adherence to communication protocols while the traumatic act is yet being

committed. The implied dialogue with trauma similarly implies multiple voices (dialogue

requiring at least two), a multivocality that, once opened, paves the way for proliferate vocality,

such that "the disaster seems uncontainable" (260), exceeding the bounds of the typical

hegemonic monovocality of the U.S. victimhood scenario within its manifestion on 9/11. Much

like Taylor's citation of Dori Laub's "'witness from inside'" in the context of the Holocaust

(quoted in Taylor 205),[137] the hijacker voice functions as a witness from inside the hijacking itself, another voice added to the witness narratives offered by those in the planes, in the towers, and on the streets surrounding them. In his use of speech protocols, the hijacker voice has the same "odd air of quotations" noted in relation to the Columbian discovery scenario (quoted in Taylor 57),[138] reflecting the multiple voices consulted to produce the hijacker voice and the multiplicity of voices that it exemplifies. Where once there was only the accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood and its linearity, there is instead "a cacophony of voices" (Taylor 276), the hijacker voice being only the first to breach the now open floodgates. His use of language having been unpacked, one must next examine the intended message of the hijacker voice veiled beneath his dialect and decorum.

<p style="text-align:center">YOU ARE ME AND WE ARE ALL TOGETHER: SHARING MESSAGES</p>

It is not enough that the hijacker voice act as a performative, that Atta's "we have some planes" and its use of English and cockpit communication protocols enable an inhabitation of language that broadens the discursive field; there must also be a message within that voice, such that his use in semi-fictionalized and documentary accounts may facilitate an inhabitation of the U.S. psyche. This message necessity is suggested by Taylor's assertion that "[p]erformances function as vital acts of transfer, transmitting social knowledge, memory, and a sense of identity" (2), and given that the hijacker voice, as a performative, constitutes a performance in the course of the event and in repetitions thereafter, he too must transfer his memory and identity to the listener, choosing trauma as his means of conveying his own traumatized past.

---

[137] Holocaust scholar Dori Laub posits the witness from inside as a response to the purported impossibility of witnessing in relation to the Holocaust, where the enormity of the event precludes an outside in which a critical positionality may exist.

[138] In this scenario, exemplified by Christopher Columbus' "discovery" of the "New World," the seeming novelty of the discovery is instead familiar, its individual components (surveying the land, reading a declaration, unfurling flags, and taking possession of the land), having been rehearsed elsewhere and destined for repetitions to come (Taylor 57).

The linkage between performance and trauma merits a five point elucidation in Taylor, where performance "helps survivors cope with individual and collective trauma by using it to animate political denunciation… is characterized by the nature of its 'repeats' [like trauma]… [is] felt affectively and viscerally in the present [like trauma]… [is] always in situ [like trauma]… [and where trauma] relies on live, interactive performance for transmission" (165-7). Regarding the hijacker voice, that voice is put to similar use initially as part of the semi-fictionalized and documentary accounts meant to aid in coping, is prone to repetition in that context, is of the moment (and yet perpetually in its moment while perpetuating that moment), is felt viscerally (despite the divestment of his viscera), and relies on the mediatized live as a means of transmission. The hijacker voice is a message in a bottle, cast into the sea of the technologized recording apparatus: "Sometimes the message arrives, in the face of overwhelming odds, intact in the bottle. Sometimes not" (218). For the message of the hijacker voice to arrive, his bottle, his body, his target, must be broken, ruptured, inhabited.

The manner in which the hijacker voice comes to inhabit the U.S. psyche resembles an infection, a further collapse of the listener positionality into the hijacker positionality such that the two become elided. Taylor astutely posits that "[t]he transmission of traumatic experience more closely resembles 'contagion': one 'catches' and embodies the burden, pain, and responsibility of past behaviors/events" (168). In this vein, the hijacker voice transmits his trauma via trauma, embodying his pain by disembodying his voice, to be reembodied by and in the listener. This reembodiment, this merger of the hijacker and the listener, resembles Taylor's discussion of the Peruvian theatre collective Yuyachkani, where "the term [Yuyachkani]… signals embodied knowledge and memory and blurs the line between thinking subjects and the subjects of thought… 'I' and 'you' are products of each other's experiences and memories, of

historical trauma, of enacted space, of sociopolitical crisis" (191). Similarly, the hijacker voice

and his listener are nearly elided, producing each other's experiences simultaneously, the

hijacker speaking through the listener, and the listener providing the linguistic and protocol

framework for that speech. Within this elision, "[t]he 'I' who remembers is simultaneously

active and passive" (191), much like the listener who, though actively seeking to participate in

the process of mourning as enabled by the semi-fictionalized and documentary accounts,

becomes a passive recipient and adherent of the hijacker voice. As the World Trade Center

towers collapse as a function of the speech act performed by the hijacker voice, so too does the

listener collapse into that hijacker voice. Such a collapse takes place due to the constant

repetition of the U.S. victimhood scenario implicit in 9/11, which weakens the effect of that

narrative while investing the hijacker voice (included as evidence of the profligate evil of the

U.S.' enemies) with an increasing agency. What results is the hijacker-listener, implicated in the

very act from which s/he seeks solace.

It would seem that the listener is in the position of a spectator (or, rather, aurator),

detached from the event (despite any emotional investment therein) to such a degree that any

implication in that event would be an impossibility. However, in receiving the hijacker voice,

the listener is implicated, her/his elision into the hijacker giving her/him an indirectly agentic

responsibility for the spectated/aurated event. Following on the Yuyachkani linkage established

above, that performance group "becomes the belated witness to the ongoing, unacknowledged

drama of atrocity, and asks the audience to do the same" (211); in this case, the listener becomes

the belated witness from inside in approximating the hijacker positionality and, as audience, is

asked to do so by the hijacker voice as part of his performative function. Taking the event as an

intercultural performance given its linguistic merger of Arabic into the English dialect, "a new

kind of spectatorship [is required], a dialectic spectatorship (for Althusser) that demands a break both with the 'identification' model *and* its opposite, the one that places the spectator outside the production" (234). This new spectatorship is that of the indirectly agentic listener, a near one-to-one identification with the hijacker, though not an external positioning. That external positionality is reserved for the deity: "God, viewing the scene from above, is the ultimate spectator" (57), as Allah is the ultimate spectator for the devotional act of fundamentalist Islam enacted by the hijacker voice. Once implicated in the event via its reception of the hijacker voice, the listener may only attempt to make sense of her/his positioning, to derive an answer to the question posed by the hijacker voice (ostensibly, "am I not you?" or perhaps "is the U.S. not part of the world?"), though there is no such answer to be found.

There are many looking for answers in the wake of the event, with the hijacker-listener being merely one among that number; as is true of the other searches, there are no answers, only more questions, and any provisional answers that might be located are always already wrong. Speaking of Howard Stern's harsh comments regarding Selena,[139] Taylor asserts that "[t]he performance of explicit noncaring performs the breach even as it denies the drama. By refusing to acknowledge a loss, it forecloses the possibility of redressive action and reintegration" (147). As an act demonstrating explicit non-concern for its victims, the hijacking act and its associated speech acts (as performed by the hijacker voice) perform the literal/figurative breach (of the towers/of the U.S. psyche), refusing to acknowledge a loss which is none of its concern. Through inhabitation, these acts also eliminate the possibility of redress (via war or other means) and the reintegration of the U.S. psyche. Post-event situation via U.S. victimhood narratives

---

[139] Following the death of the Latino pop music star, shock jock radio host Howard Stern smears her music and her identity by resorting to ethnic slurs based in migrant labor and teenage pregnancy stereotypes, concluding that her death is not worth mourning (Taylor 147).

reinscribes the standard Western gaze as applied to non-Western actors, placing the hijacker

squarely within the sights of a circumscribed gaze.

However, as Taylor notes in relation to Coco Fusco and Guillermo Gómez-Peña's *Two*

Undiscovered Amerindians... ,[140] "performance critiques the West's history of ethnographic

practice" (75), inverting the answer-oriented examination associated with that practice and

rendering previously yielded answers erroneous at best. The Fusco/Gómez-Peña performance,

much like the hijacker voice's performance, possesses a "'testlike' quality… [n]o matter what,

we fail. But we fail for different reasons depending on the mode of transmission" (72). If

attempting to reach an answer via consultation of the archive, the listener fails in attempting to

fix a hijacker voice which is always in the process of becoming; if attempting to reach an answer

via consultation of the repertoire, the listener fails in overlooking her/his own elision into the

hijacker positionality. In each case, the search for answers is fruitless, and the accepted narrative

of U.S. victimhood is accordingly problematized.

In contrast to the smooth narrativity offered by the perception of U.S. victimhood

endemic to 9/11, there is instead the smoother elision of the hijacker and the listener into the

hijacker-listener, which produces fractures within the U.S. victimhood scenario. Rather than the

impeccable guiltlessness of the victimhood stance, there is, in Fusco's words, "a surprise or

'uncanny' encounter, one in which audiences had to undergo their own process of reflection"

(quoted in Taylor 69), the listener meeting the requirement to reflect on her/his own inhabitation

by the hijacker voice. Performance studies theorist Joseph Roach's notion of "surrogation"

---

[140] In this performance, Fusco and Gómez-Peña took on the identities of a lost tribe, the Guatinaui, newly unearthed from the jungle primeval, touring under that guise as a challenge to notions of colonialism, race, gender, and sexuality. The performance particularly targeted historic sites and museums, emphasizing the dehumanization at the heart of national legitimization practices (Taylor 65).

proves instructive in this case,[141] surrogation existing as "the term… developed to think about the ways that transmission occurs through forgetting and erasure" (46), and "stress[ing] seemingly uninterrupted continuity over what might be read as rupture, the recognizable one over the particularities of the many" (174). The hijacker voice –listener elision into the hijacker-listener functions as an erasure, rendering the listening positionality as a shell for use by the hijacker voice. This elision also offers an alternate continuity to that of the accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood, simultaneously producing a rupture while determining its concealment beneath the larger elision. However, that elision serves to undermine the coherence of the U.S. victimhood positionality, fragmenting its linearity into what Taylor calls "the simultaneous, jumbled, episodic practice of accumulation and saturation" (274): essentially, the hijacker voice enacts a simultaneity of himself and the listener positionality, saturating that positionality and the U.S. psyche with his message. Though the producing body of the hijacker voice may be subject to disappearance in the course of the suicide act, the voice himself is not liable to go anywhere anytime soon.

<center>A HAUNTING MELODY: GHOSTING BASINSKI</center>

To preface the case study of William Basinski's *Disintegration Loops I-IV* and its relation to the hijacker voice-as-repertoire, one must first have a cursory grasp of Basinski himself, a context for the *Loops* series' production, and an understanding of the series' structural and methodological parallels to the filmic treatment of the hijacker voice. A biography taken from the 2002 Freewaves Festival website describes Basinski as "a musician, composer, [and] auteur who has worked in experimental media for over twenty years in NYC, expanding the

---

[141] Roach discusses surrogation at length in his *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance*, using the urban sites of London and New Orleans as a means of discussing Paul Gilroy's notion of the "Black Atlantic" and its embodiment through performance (Roach).

boundaries of the aural landscape" ("Artists: William…" 1), characterizing Basinski as a professional both in the duration of his career and the accomplishments achieved therein. The *Loops* series performs such a boundary expansion, resulting from Basinski's realization that, in transferring orchestral loops made in the early 1980s from magnetic tape to digital media, the tape was slowly flaking off, removing more and more of the music with each pass. In a moment of serendipity, Basinski was in the process of mastering those loops on 9/11, and that mastering process served as a soundtrack to the event. This relation is reflected in the sequential cover art for the series, which depicts first the smoking wounded towers, then their post-collapse plume over its four disc breadth. The Freewaves biography notes that, in the period around the loops' initial composition, "[Basinski] began developing his own vocabulary using tape loops and old reel to reel tape decks" (1), a repurposing of the loops beyond their initial intent and through technologized recording apparatuses that recall the hijacker voice's parodic inversion of English and cockpit communication protocols, in which a similarly singular vocabulary is produced.

Turning to the particulars of the series, the ghostly, ethereal recordings are nearly ambient in nature, though close observation reveals the decay of the loops, with the tracks varying from just over ten minutes to more than an hour in length. There are six individual loops used across the four volumes, with one loop being used three times and another twice for a total of nine tracks. The first loop, entitled simply "1.1," "1.2," and "1.3" in each of its respective appearances, consists of a roughly thirty-second horn and string melody layered over a subtle clamor of percussive clanking noises. Already endowed with a fuzziness from the beginning of each repetition, the loop becomes increasingly rougher with each turn of the reel, drifting into the distance as the flakes of its melody drift from the tape. Loop 1 appears three times in the series: as "1.1" on volume I, and as "1.2" and "1.3" on volume IV, persisting for sixty-three minutes at

first, then diminishing to just shy of twenty-two minutes the second time and twelve the last. The loop suggests a fanfare of sorts, gesturing towards the pageantry of the World Trade Center towers' creation and their status as symbols of U.S. commerce, though that pageantry is undergirded with an ominous low end and the insistent clamor of the percussive element.

The second loop, entitled "2.1" and "2.2" in its two appearances, consists of another approximately thirty-second passage composed of a massive, shimmering electronic pulse beneath which a bass drone and slight horn introjections appear. From the first, the electronic pulse is brittle, crackling with the imprecision of analog equipment, a crackle which becomes more profound with the decay of the analog tape medium. Loop 2 appears twice in the series: as "2.1" on volume I, and as "2.2" on volume II, enduring for a mere eleven minutes at first, then for a hardier thirty-three minutes the second time. The loop's pulse suggests a Morse code, tapping out the distress signal of 9/11, the siren-like horns and eerie bass drone underlining the surreal nature of the post-collapse moonscape, as well as the gentle rain of debris over lower Manhattan after the towers' disappearance.

The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth loops, entitled "3," "4," "5," and "6," respectively, each appear once in the series. Loop 3 appears on volume II, is forty-two minutes in length, and consists of an approximately ten second segment composed of swooning, rattling, deep strings beneath a keening horn lead. The edges of the loop are ragged with distortion, suggesting the frazzled resurgence of patriotism in the wake of 9/11, an imperfect reassertion of national identity in a time of great crisis. Loop 4 appears on volume III, is twenty minutes in length, and consists of another ten second passage made up of a jittery high electronic melody line above a supporting synthetic wash, a distant, slightly distorted string accompaniment, and a percussive clatter much like that of Loop 1. The loop is by far the least stable of any of the loops' first

appearances, and its short running time reflects its instability, a fragile fight song riddled with the corrosive effects of doubt. Loop 5 also appears on volume III, is a robust fifty-three minutes in length, and consists of a fifteen second passage based around an interwoven rise-and-fall horn and counterpoint bass melody, again featuring clanking percussion beneath. The loop's intertwined melodic line suggests the possibility of alliance in the wake of 9/11, though its ramshackle feel points to the failure of the U.S. to turn global sympathy post-9/11 into anything more truly collaborative than a "coalition of the willing." Loop 6 appears on volume IV, is just shy of forty-one minutes in length, and is made up of a short original segment of approximately five seconds with a swift, warbling electronic line and interspersed lower horn accompaniment over what sounds like someone's feet scuffling on an echoing stairwell. The loop's brevity, along with the footstep sound, recalls the limited escape time allotted to those descending the stairwells of the towers, as well as the omnipresence of threat after 9/11, always lurking behind the scenes and hunted by intelligence organizations who were themselves one step behind on 9/11.

Though it will be theorized that the accumulating silences yielded by the decaying magnetic tape that is home to the original loops suggests that of the similarly iterated hijacker voice as included in accepted narrative locales, the correspondence is not a use of that voice in and of itself. Rather, this analysis parallels the methodologies of the texts of accepted narrativity and of the *Loops* series, in which a knowing cultivation of silence, in the former produced by a fixation on and of the voice within limited narrativity and its repetition, in the latter by the flaking tape laid waste by a similar repeating, ends up creating a more expansive narrativity that exceeds the bounds designated by the accepted version. Yet, the parallel is more than a simple methodological relation, extending to Basinski's own relation to the event. Given the

progressive cover art for the series, depicting the World Trade Center towers collapse plume in various states of dispersal throughout the afternoon and evening of 9/11, it is clear that the series bears some relation to the event, and that the event has an according significance to Basinski not only as a resident of New York City, but also as an artist. For Basinski, the *Loops* series is the soundtrack to 9/11 in much the same way as the pilot-hijackers' recorded voices constitute the soundtrack within both accepted and extra-accepted narrativity, and so those loops stand as his version of the voice. The attempted silencing of this voice, for Basinski less a deliberate act than a procedural one, a byproduct of the methodology of the particular sound art piece in question, only serves to draw greater attention to that which remains, be it the scarce shreds of magnetic data that remain or the handful of brief recordings that remain from the pilot-hijackers, the very silence itself suggesting the voice that once occupied it and the ghostly remnants that still do. Therefore, the *Loops* series is more than a methodological companion piece to the accepted narrative texts discussed above, standing as a similarly minded, if more passively and ambiguously (perhaps even critically)[142] articulated, silencing of the voice.

Before delving further into *The Disintegration Loops* and their relation to the repertoire, it is necessary to address the possibility of counterexamples within the field of sound art, of which one in particular merits attention: The Sonic Memorial Project. As described on its website (it being a web-only entity), the project "is an open archive and an online audio installation of the history of the World Trade Center… [meant] to collect stories, ambient sounds, voicemails, and archival recordings… [as a means of] tell[ing] the rich history of the twin towers, the neighborhood and the events of 9/11" ("Sonic"), as facilitated by NPR's Lost

---

[142] In this instance, Basinski is likely more concerned with his series as an articulation of a seemingly inarticulable and incommensurable loss than any greater critical act, though such a critical stance may be easily read into his work, suggesting it as a potential undercurrent, either an ambient accompaniment or a silent partner.

and Found Sound radio series. The project trumpets its inclusion of "tapes of weddings atop the World Trade Center, recordings of the buildings' elevators and revolving doors… [and] voicemail messages from people who worked in the World Trade Center" ("About"), positioning itself as "a dramatic, unprecedented audio archive of immediate, first person accounts chronicling a historic event from almost every vantage point" ("About").

Though ostensibly counterexemplary in its attention to rendering the audio present in the agglomeration of audio artifacts as a notation of absence, as well as in its disinclusion of the hijacker voice from the archive (neither the Atta nor the Jarrah recordings making the cut), where *Loops* renders the hijacker present by virtue of his conspicuous absence, The Sonic Memorial Project is in fact at once so counterexemplary as to invalidate any possible problematization it might offer to the *Loops* series, as well as proximal enough to some of the series' qualities to establish it as less counterexemplary as subexemplary. In terms of the counter-, the project's attention to massive presence, to the non-hijacker, places it in opposition to the *Loops* series, almost as if the project serendipitously accounts for all that *Loops* leaves un(ac)counted; yet, there is a shared attention to the essential status of the aural, a negotiation of absence, and a valuation of the telephonic in the case of the voicemail recordings, as well as a concern with ambient sounds (akin to Basinski's potential categorization in that genre) that places the project nearer to, if not within, *Loops'* orbit. As such, The Sonic Memorial Project is less a counterexample than a subexample, a collectivity of response that gathers the secondary voice, that of reaction, where the *Loops* series leaves the primary, initiatory voice, that of the hijacker, ungathered, loose, and inhabitational. The two are parts of a whole in this sense though, as responses generated by the event, it is the *Loops* series that is in the driver's (or rather pilot's) seat.

That *The Disintegration Loops* series should have the loop at its heart, the repeated thrum of the fragmentary segment pulsing over and over, the thump of each return promising a dying sound yet undying, suggests the iterative power of the loop and its ability to first train, then inhabit the listener. In *More Brilliant Than the Sun: Adventures in Sonic Fiction*, Kodwo Eshun asserts that "[l]ooping the break tricks the ear into hearing a continuous beat. Each cycle slips out of memory as if the body refuses to realize that it's hearing the same beat every time. Each loop trains the obstinate body until it recognizes its endpoint. Bodies start to remember the point when the beat loops back on itself" (Eshun 24). Similarly, repetitions of the Basinskian loop are not immediately evident, the iterations forming a seemingly seamless chorus, though each voice is soon apparent as the listening body (and her/his ear, more specifically) is trained to hear the rupture, the break in the martial beat, the crack in the accepted narrativity proffered by the inclusion of the hijacker voice and the constructedness that that crack reveals. Prior to that training, the listener is caught within what Eshun calls, via George Clinton of Parliament/Funkadelic, "doo-loops, the iterative processes that maintain consensual hallucination" (145), an unawareness of one's ongoing manipulation by constructed, fictive accepted narrativity, with the iterative sounding more identical than it actually is, the loop more repeated than replated, more swallowed than digested. When digested, the loop lingers in the throat for a bit longer, its inevitable dissolution serving to give it an acid tongue drawing on the corrosiveness that lies further down the line.

While eroding, the loops, through their situation against the event, take on an according vocality, the growing silence of the decaying tape mimicking the growing prominence of the hijacker voice-as-Other (and thus silenced, resigned to the void while producing a void at the World Trade Center site and within the U.S. psyche). Within this schema, the U.S. victimhood

narrative is the original loop, preserved beyond its usefulness and prone to weakening upon (over)repetition in the context of 9/11, and the hijacker voice is the encroaching silence, a presence as absence that grows ever louder with each iteration. The loop-as-medium attempts to forestall this decay, its magnetic writing "capable of perpetuating those thoughts and of making them *known* to persons who are *absent*" (quoted in Derrida 4), as Jacques Derrida cites from French philosopher Étienne Bonnot de Condillac, and though the magnetic dust may settle as ash, its thought is yet perpetual as rendered via its absence. An interview concerning Basinski's untitled collaboration with Richard Chartier speaks to this potent absence, as Basinski responds to interviewer Nicola Catalano's question "[y]ou're definitely interested in a precise aesthetic concept – space, time, void: Is it a way to face the 'symbolic power of absence' (Baudrillard), which we're usually scared to face, so to speak?" (Catalano 1) by asserting that "with so much chaos and noise in the world… I feel the need to hear a little harmony, a balm… a little silence, anyone?" (1). The *Loops* series does provide that silence, though it simultaneously emphasizes the power of absence by mirroring the inverse relation between the effectuality of the accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood within the scenario and the inhabitational capacity of the hijacker voice within the repertoire.

This silence, this absence, may most aptly be referred to by Basinski's own word, void, an emptied signifier and signified emptiness in which the occasional sound is amplified and expanded further still by its expansive surroundings, an unsupported expanse that ruptures itself and others. The initial loop, the opener, in its completeness, is intact, though its partial iterations, as they unfold in the decaying progression of the loop, are opened, their message out in the open, rendered fractally but tactfully, the sound resonating without sound, the absence both recalling and renewing the call. Derrida maintains in *Limited Inc* that "the structure of possibility of this

utterance includes the capability to be formed and to function as a reference that is empty or cut off from its referent" (Derrida 11), and indeed the post-loop loop, the loop posted, punctured with ever more pinholes, is seemingly empty in its silence, cut off by the thousand cuts of the disintegrating magnetism, yet magnetic still in its ongoing signification. Such absence both voids and is void, clearing out as it itself becomes clearer with each repetition, the falling away turning attention from the away back to the fall, amplifying the presence in the absence by virtue of its very rarity. Luigi Russolo gives much attention to this occasional noise, this noise as an occasion for attention, occasioned by the chance iteration in his foundational sound study *The Art of Noises*: "In this scarcity of *noises*, the first *sounds* that men were able to draw from a pierced reed or a taut string were stupefying, something new and wonderful" (Russolo 23). The stupefaction that comes with the occasional noise, with the fragment of each Basinskian loop that remains after a given iteration, is less stupid than fact, a manifestation of the focusing effect engendered by the silence, an absence that makes present the present that is itself becoming ever absent. Russolo concludes "let us drink in, from beat to beat, these few qualities of obvious tedium, always waiting for that extraordinary sensation that never comes" (25), and it is a fluid imbibing that does take place, the slippery, ever changing iterative loop always going and seemingly never coming, though instead the loop always comes and, despite its decay, never goes, going on infinitely.

As the loop unloops, unspools, spoils, its expiration date drawing nearer with each expired breath, the absence within each iteration broadens, yawns, its mouth opening wider and its message reaching more ears, rupturing drums both aural and martial. Eshun, in reference to dub reggae and its own expansive use of space, contends that "The Song is disinterred until its ghost universes populate the world" (Eshun 63), the seemingly dead (or certainly on its way

there) loop being dug up before the grass can grow, dug by the listener and multiplied by

iteration until it populates the world, assuming narrative prevalence in opposition to accepted

narrativity. Down in the hollow, the loop plays a new game, hiding from the seeker while

appearing in the hearing of the seeker, establishing a new legend for itself in the process.[143] The

spaciousness of dub reggae, as produced by the removal of most of the vocal track and much of

the instrumental tracks in favor of a drum and bass groove, separates the beat, identifying its loci

of repetition: "Space between sound doesn't drop out, it's pulled out from between beats until it

convulses, buckles, folds up into fists of solid air that buffet you with what [legendary reggae

producer Lee] Perry calls the Shocks of the Mighty" (64). This space, this void, resembles

Basinski's, the magnetic pulling and being pulled, the loop trembling, seizing, folding and

unfolding, grabbing hold of the listener as its own hold on the medium decays, his spacing loops

creating space in the accepted narrative for extra-accepted narrativity. The subtraction of dub is

less consignatory in its removals than contributory, what Paul Miller identifies in his *Rhythm*

Science (via American contemporary artist Jasper Johns[144]) as "additive subtraction" (Miller 53),

where less is indeed more, the produced void being itself productive in its crystallization of the

loops' remnants. Though characterized by seeming lack, Basinski's voids have a more stirring

message to offer, as posited by Jacques Attali in his *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*:

"Truly revolutionary music is not music which expresses the revolution in words, but which

---

[143] The reference here is double, not only to Van Morrison's "Brown Eyed Girl" and its lyric "down in the hollow / playing a new game" (Morrison), but also to the television program *Legend of the Seeker*. Morrison's lyric elsewhere includes tales of "going down the old mine / with a transistor radio," a domain of spacious echoes, and asks its subject "do you remember when we used to sing" (Morrison), suggesting a time in which the voice rang more clearly, though its absence serves to renew the song for him (via song). *Legend of the Seeker* features the character Richard Cypher, who is prophesied as the Seeker, the one who may wield his powers to reveal truth in the face of evil, the revelator being both a cipher, an absent stand-in, as well as one protected by a legend, an espionage-motivated cover story, moving through the world to reveal truth in much the same manner as the loop ("Character").

[144] Miller's use of Johns as an example also recalls Johns' *Flag* (1954-55) which, in its use of the American flag-as-subject, functions as a meditation on Cold War identity, a similar attention to the U.S. psyche and genome to that demonstrated via the machinations of the hijacker voice in the midst of another unending conflict.

speaks of it as a lack" (Attali 147). Basinski's revolution is therefore illusory, the product of decay, though it exceeds the mere malfunction of the magnetized medium.

The progressive decay of the Basinskian loop seems inherent to the medium, a failure of the magnetic, a glitch within the machinery that dooms the loop to disappearance in relatively short order; however, this glitch functions less as a death sentence than a life sentence, the loop granted clemency by the listener who perceives the decay as the fault of the medium rather than the message, rather than the medium as the message.[145] This glitch arises from the recording/playback apparatus, and is clearly defined by Torben Sangild in "Glitch – The Beauty of Malfunction": "A glitch is a minor malfunction or spurious signal… [i]t is not a collapse of the machinery. The machinery is still running, but the performance is poor – either annoying, problematic, or downright useless" (Sangild 258). Basinski's loop and its referentiality towards the hijacker voice is seemingly similarly spurious, that voice being collateral to the event's accepted narrativity as produced by the machinery of national ideology, though that machinery runs poorly, revealing itself as problematic at best. The glitch as sound "is far from neutral; it becomes a disturbing sign which reminds us that things are not right" (266), that something is rotten in the state,[146] that the full throated voice of U.S. victimhood is troubled by the tubercles of the inhabiting hijacker voice. Once troubled, the rotten lung, the strepped throat expresses the mediatic wound produced by the glitch, pronounces itself, much like Sangild's understanding of Japanese-American sound artist Yasunao Toné's work with CDs: "In a certain sense, the

---

[145] Marshall McLuhan proves useful here for the argument offered in his 1967 book *The Medium is the Massage: An Inventory of Effects*, in which media are posited as extensions of the human sensorium. Similarly, though the listener may be willing to attribute the failure of Basinski's loops and of the U.S. national defense as byproducts of the medium, resulting from overcomplicated and perhaps outdated structures, this attribution overlooks the active role taken by the listener, both Basinski's magnetic tape and the military-industrial landscape being the province and prostheses of the listener, implying an inhabitational complicity.

[146]Something is indeed "rotten in the state of Denmark" (Shakespeare), or rather the U.S., as William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* suggests, with the arrival of the spectral hijacker voice provoking a similar reaction to the appearance of the apparition, the late returning, and none too soon.

screaming CD is more 'human' than the violent person inflicting the wounds" (261). The

glitching machine thus redoubles the scream of the victim, solidifying the listener's prosthetic

relation to the recording/playback apparatus and revealing the persistence of the scream within

the silence.

Basinski's glitch, the flaking tape and encroaching silence, is an iterative one, each trip

across the reader head existing as another contribution to the repertoire which, though it initially

consults the archive for its source material, is firmly performance-minded thereafter. Due to the

flaking, a digital dandruff rendered through analog technology, subsequent iterations of the loop

differ imperceptibly, then increasingly perceptibly, a more literal version of Eliot Bates'

contention that "because of the inevitable presence of glitches in playback technology, and the

ways in which recordings come to be changed by their sonic listening environments, each

listening experience must be understood as a unique event" (Bates 276), as argued in his

"Glitches, Bugs, and Hisses: The Degeneration of Musical Recordings and the Contemporary

Musical Work." Similarly, the listener cannot hear the loop identically, not only because of its

decay, but also because of a less than favorable listening environment in which accepted

narrativity predominates. In the void-as-glitch, "[w]hat you hear is the sound ending, not its

presence" (Sangild 265), the ended sound corresponding to the end of accepted narrativity, its

seams and construction being revealed by the presence-in-absence of the hijacker voice. The

glitch artist and the hijacker voice are aptly characterized as Rob Young's "decomposers"

(Young 48), whose compositional methodologies are predicated on decay and iterative

repetition, as noted in his "Worship the Glitch: Digital Music, Electronic Disturbance."

Speaking of the use of found sound in glitch pieces, Bates observes that "[b]y looping moments

in the recordings, they [glitch artists] focused attention on aspects of these former historical

archives that had been hitherto overlooked" (Bates 285), a brief turn to the archive that serves only to support the void-as-glitch in its consistent alteration of the loop within the repertoire.

The subtle changes brought about in the loop through glitch-spurred decay are generational, inbred, with each subsequent recombination compounding the flaws of the previous one, a genetic relation that suggests similar flaws within and inhabitation of the U.S. genome by the void and its hijacker voice. Sangild addresses this tendency, stating that "[i]n nature, genetic 'glitches' occur when the copying of genes from one generation to the next is imperfect… [w]e call these *mutations*. They are genetic errors or imperfections, and most of them are unimportant, while some are downright handicaps. Once in a while, though, a mutation turns out to be beneficial… [t]hrough natural selection this mutation becomes dominant" (Sangild 269). The void-as-glitch arises in the imperfect generational transition, mutating the original loop into something else altogether, handicapping the accepted narrative while benefitting the extra-accepted narrativity of the hijacker voice, which then becomes dominant via inhabitation of the genome. Young calls attention to the "atoms of sound" endemic to glitch (Young 47), highlighting the raw genetic materials that slowly disappear from the Basinskian loop, each missing gene contributing to a further mutation of the loop, a further destabilization of the medium from playback to play, from mono- to polyvocality, from accepted narrativity to the extra-accepted. As there is nothing between the listener and its genes, once the genome has been infiltrated, resistance to inhabitation is impossible.

After the void-as-glitch destabilizes the loop, that loop sounds different, speaks differently, its hijacker voice resonating as a function of the recording/playback apparatus and independent of it, creating the possibility for extra-accepted narrativity. As Sangild notes, "[t]he word 'glitch' derives from Yiddish 'glitshn,' to slip, slide, or glide. Something glitchy is

slippery and out of control" (Sangild 258), and the void/hijacker voice-as-glitch is similarly

elusive and fluid, existing outside the control of the listener. The recording/playback apparatus

is in some cases responsible for the genesis of the glitch, as observed by Eshun: "AutoCatalysis

is when sound emerges by itself, when the machine generates a new sound autonomously,

without a human agent" (Eshun 19), though the void/hijacker voice-as-glitch predates the

machine in its own citationality, and the human agent is internal to the input sound and does not

agentically engage with the machine itself. Rather, the "skips, pops, and glitches… express not

the voice of the composer, but rather the voice of the technology itself" (Bates 280), the hijacker

composer already decomposed in the death of the producing body, his spectral voice given voice

by the voice of the recording/playback apparatus as used by Basinski. The glitch is referential in

its neo-narrativity: "[W]hereas previously composers manipulated limited harmonic means to

enact narratives already engrained in history and myth… [t]he glitch is the condensed essence of

this new fundamental shift [to uncoded sound]: an effluenza virus" (Young 52). By stepping

outside of limited referentialities that circumscribe the nature of narrativity, the glitch cracks the

code, offering the potential for extra-accepted narrativity such that, in its thorough

technologization, "the world [is] at the mercy of the glitch" (46), inhabited by its hijacker voice-

as-residue of the event through the recording/playback apparatus' own residuality.

Continuing with the notion of the crack, of the code fissured by the glitch, Caleb Kelly's

notion of "cracked media," as articulated in his *Cracked Media: The Sound of Malfunction*,

suggests the glitch/crack not as failure, or even malfunction, but as a repurposing, a

refunctioning. Within this schema, "'[c]racked media' are the tools of media playback expanded

beyond their original function as a simple playback device… [with] '[t]he crack'[as] a point of

rupture or chance occurrence, where unique events take place that are ripe for exploitation

238

toward new creative possibilities" (Kelly 4). Additionally, the crack "also nods towards

'cracked' software – software that has been modified in order to… enable 'pirate' reproduction"

(9) which, in combination with the chance occurrence, aligns with Basinski's use of (and the

hijackers' creation of a seemingly) chance occurrence to facilitate the reproduction of the pirate

positionality, that of the hijacker voice, coming aboard without permission and with ill intent.

This crack is "no longer connected to the failure of the technology" (100), but is rather an

example of what Kelly terms "extended techniques" (18), a use of a given recording technology

(in this instance magnetic tape) to ends beyond those intended by the manufacturers, in that sense

akin to the hijackers' extended use of the planes and communication apparatus to produce an

extra-accepted narrativity. The repurposed magnetic tape recording is "simply redirected

electronics" (286), less malfunctioned than multifunctioned, the recording-erasing dialectic

engaged alternately to generate signification through silence. What is emphasized in this case, in

the highlighting of silence, is that "extraneous to the message" (71), silence being subtended

beneath sound, as the extra-accepted is placed outside the field of accepted narrativity, with the

playback device being "forced to read its own technological support structure rather than [the

magnetic flakes] for which [it] was designed" (187), that which lies beneath being exposed in the

flaking as that beneath the lies. The tape is then a dual substrate, both beneath the recorded

datum and the catalyst for its decay (such a fate being endemic to the medium).

The hijacker voice-as-residue, that left behind by and indicative of the fluid, washes out

the bridges between sounds within the loop, replacing those bridges with a silent flow, meeting

with the residual medium, the analog reel to reel of the tape, yielding a proliferate genetic

intervention that inhabits spectrally. In its pastmindedness, in its daursal coming from behind,

the residual medium is nostalgic, possessing "an innocent – but aware – view to the world, or

what might be called a knowing unknowingness" (Acland xiv), as suggested in Charles R. Acland's introduction to his edited volume *Residual Media*. The turn is therefore a revelatory look back, a seemingly innocent reversion that consults the hijacker voice to its own ends, while knowing full well what it will find. Speaking of the obvious historicity of the discarded medium in relation to film, Acland states that "[o]ne cannot watch… or attend a screening of amateur home movies without being alerted to the aged and aging qualities of the artifacts presented. The footage and hardware connote their status as 'retrieved'" (xvii), suggesting that the loop cannot be played without referencing the decay of accepted narrativity, a retrieved trope that draws on past articulations. Though seemingly placed within the realm of the past by virtue of its very residuality, the residual medium is not wholly past; instead, as Raymond Williams contends, "[t]he residual, by definition, has been affectively formed in the past, but it is still active in the cultural process, not only and often not at all as an element of the past, but as an effective element of the present" (xxi). The residual tape medium thus calls on the omnipresent hijacker voice, always already in circulation, pulling him through the void-as-glitch and bringing him into action against the retrieved accepted narrativity of the event by allowing him to proliferate.

In drawing on the past through the usage of a past technology that is simultaneously present, the residual medium performs a brief consultation of the archive via the void-as-glitch, taking that pseudo-archival material (the supposedly fixed hijacker voice recording, a fixing that ignores the always already status held by that voice) as a jumping off point for repertoire-oriented iterativity. Will Straw's "Embedded Memories" points to "the reliance of each new media technology on repertory from the past" (Straw 12), and residual media do the same, iterating past technology into the present while simultaneously iterating the purportedly past hijacker voice into an omnipresence, an eternal novelty that permits approximate copies of the

hijacker voice to proliferate in a manner consistent with Taylor's repertoire. Each of these copies functions to preserve the original; in John Davis' words in his "Going Analog: Vinylphiles and the Consumption of the 'Obsolete' Vinyl Record," "[a] surrogate, such as a copy on audiocassette tape, helps maintain the condition of the original record" (Davis 234), the loop and its hijacker voice persisting not in spite of, but because of, the oncoming void. The iterative is founded in a relational newness, and Jonathan Sterne offers a bipartite reading of that newness in his "Out with the Trash: On the Future of New Media": "In short, there are really two models of 'newness' to which scholars of media change need to attend: (1) the 'newness' of a medium with respect to other media, and (2) the so-called state of the art design and function *within* a given medium" (Sterne 18). Along with the very iterativity of the term itself (subject to similar but incremental articulations), this second newness speaks to the iterativity of the loop, the transference of the analog recording to a digital medium producing a decayed iteration of the loop itself, with each subsequent iteration offering an indirect experience of the original. Therefore, the desire for newness motivates a constant consumption of the related variants, facilitating the inhabitation of the U.S. genome through a different sort of mutation, less the subtracted gene than the added one.

Within the U.S. genome, there is an inherent nostalgia, a longing for a simpler time, a time in which certain characteristics reigned supreme, characteristics that are identified as distinctly American, and the rupturing of that American strand by the intervention of the glitch and its home in the residual medium recombines the genetic building blocks into an iterative nationality. Matthew Malsky analyzes the particularly American relation to the recording/playback apparatus in his "Stretched from Manhattan's Back Alley to MOMA: A Social History of Magnetic Tape and Recording," discussing film sound designer Walter

Murch's[147] youthful experimentation with a recorder "as proof of the tenacity of more traditional

American character qualities. It is hard to imagine his experiments as other than play,

independence, and enjoyment, a sort of *jouissance* of direct engagement with the ethereal,

ephemeral, and tactile qualities of sound in a newly tangible form" (Malsky 234). The

void/hijacker voice-as-glitch acts similarly, at play in the aural, independent of accepted

narrativity, and almost real enough to be touched (with grounded linkage attempted through de-

acousmatization). The nostalgia that Malsky identifies in Murch, in his rosy-eyed look back at

his first dalliances with recorded sound, is indicative of a retroformation of national identity

through a fetishization of the past, where "[t]he solidification of these motifs and practices within

a weighty and coherent cultural sensibility takes shape through the dialogue between cultural

artifacts" (Straw 14), the void/hijacker voice-as-glitch being placed in dialogue with past

narratives of U.S. victimhood to produce the selfsame. However, the hijacker voice, in his

adoption and inhabitation of nationalized notions of play, independence, and enjoyment, exists as

a piggyback gene, an extra pairing that mutates the U.S. genome, creating what Straw describes

more generally as "'recombinant culture'… in processes of pastiche and juxtaposition, evidence

of the random and fleeting nature of cultural citation" (11), the accepted narrative's citation of

the hijacker voice allowing the mutation to take place, the piggyback to haunt as its residual

medium similarly stalks the digital.

The residuality of the medium in question, the analog tape, enacts a double haunting: as

the analog tape is itself haunted by its own onrushing obsolescence, coming at an untold rate of

feet per second, the analog capture of the hijacker voice haunts the U.S. genome by virtue of the

---

[147] Murch is perhaps best known for his sound editing work on *The Conversation* (Francis Ford Coppola, 1974), a particularly interesting example given the film's focus on audio surveillance and the power of the aural, as well as *Apocalypse Now* (Francis Ford Coppola, 1979), also valuable in its portrayal of irregular warfare and the psychology of terror.

glitch, inhabiting the individual on a number of sensory fronts. Speaking again of the record,

Davis examines "the ways in which the definition of obsolescence haunts the vinyl format"

(Davis 223), referring to both technological and symbolic incompatibility, and the void/hijacker

voice-as-glitch functions similarly, being at once haunted by its own relation to the residual

medium, while also implying the obsolescence of accepted narrativity. This analog domain in

which the hijacker voice initially resides is not so much "dead media," but instead "might be

better represented as… 'living dead' culture" (Acland xx), a zombified space in which the

producing body may be dead, but its product never is. Young cites sound sculptor Kim

Cascone's "residualism… [which involves] the process of removing a signal until all that's left is

its ghost-signal or the artifacts thrown off by the signal" (quoted in Young 50), and the hijacker

voice accords with that definition, his signal being held at a remove from his signification

through his placement in accepted narrativity, though the ghost signal and the thrown voice of

the ventriloquial problematize that acceptedness with an extra-accepted narrativity. Once

decontextualized into the accepted narrative, cited from the residual into the contemporary, the

citational hijacker voice is recontextualized by the individual in an attempt to foreclose any

extra-accepted narrativity: "Moving the item into one's life space also helps further divest an

artifact of past associations, including its status as a commodity or as something once owned by

others" (Davis 229). Isolated thus, the hijacker voice may do his work upon the individual

genome, capitalizing on the preservational instinct, where "the tape recorder was the audio

equivalent of the photo album… it could be used to preserve and comment upon both special

events and daily living, so that they could be relived, scrutinized, or enjoyed later" (Malsky 248),

synaesthetically taking the visual and aural as entry points for its inhabitational aims.

YOUR BODY IS A WANDERLAND: HOSTING THE HIJACKER VOICE

Returning to Taylor, the notion of disappearance endemic to the *Loops* series (both the disappearance of the recorded media and, in the case of 9/11, the simultaneous disappearance of the accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood and appearance of the inhabiting hijacker voice) is pushed aside by performance, which manages to combat such disappearance through the repertoire where the archive is incapable of doing so. Paraphrasing from Joseph Roach (and in opposition to Peggy Phelan's presentist understanding of performance),[148] Taylor notes that he "extends the understanding of performance by making it coterminous with memory and history… [such that] it participates in the transfer and continuity of knowledge" (Taylor 5). This approach allows the initial moment of performance, the speech act of the hijacker prior to his insertion into the technologized recording apparatus, to resonate beyond its instant. This resonance takes place not in an archival space of repetition, but rather in a space of iterative novelty like that of the *Loops*, where each iteration of the hijacker voice differs from its predecessor, if only slightly. As a counterpoint to Phelan's assertion, Taylor contends that "[e]mbodied memory, because it is live, exceeds the archive's ability to capture it. But that does not mean that performance – as ritualized, formalized, or reiterative behavior – disappears" (20), reinforcing the possibility for location of the hijacker voice external to the archive while still permitting that voice a durational present. In contrast to the imperial recording of native practices, where "'[p]reservation' served as a call to erasure" (41), in the context of the *Loops* series, it is erasure that serves as a call to preservation, the flaking of the tape obscuring the accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood while perpetuating the hijacker voice through presence as

---

[148] Phelan's understanding of performance is limited exclusively to the immediacy of the present and predicated upon the inevitability of disappearance, with no possibility for recording or other documentation, where Roach sees a potential space for the perpetuation of performance through various memory devices (Taylor 5).

absence. For that voice to exist, the body must preexist him, though the embodied moment of

production need not persist into the space of repetition.

As a product of the vocal organ, the hijacker voice necessarily requires a producing body,

whose momentary existence (prior to the suicide act) is balanced against the persistence of the

produced voice. Though not embodied in and of himself, the produced voice always already

refers to his producing body in its sheer existence as voice. This perpetual reference to and

existence in the space of embodiment (the voice taking leave of his producing body, only to take

hold of the hijacker-listener's body thereafter) is essential to the hijacker voice's situation in the

field of performance and embodied practice which, "along with and bound up with other cultural

practices, offers a way of knowing" (3). The knowledge to be performed here is an

understanding of U.S. vulnerability to, and complicity in, "terrorist" action, a knowledge ably

encapsulated in the hijacker voice. With the duration provided by Roach's formulation of

performance in relation to memory and history, the hijacker voice performative bears a distinctly

physical relation to his performance (in much the same way as the *Loops* do to theirs, the

physical medium determining the aural yield): "Memory is embodied and sensual, that is,

conjured through the senses; it links the deeply private with social, even official, practices" (82).

One cannot separate the hijacker voice from the referentiality of his producing body, beyond his

self-separation in the suicide act, rendering the act of audition one of physical perception, an

embodied memory that recalls the body through the call of the voice. The Haunted Ink review of

the *Loops* series asserts that "[w]hat makes these works so memorable is not the fact that the

loops are slowly disintegrating but the fact that we get to hear their deaths" ("William…" 1),

positing an embodied hearing. Within this embodied hearing, there is an alignment of the

physical passing of the loop (over the reader head) with the death of the producing body and the passage of the listener from innocent bystander to inhabited, implicated agent.

Focusing on the producing body for a moment, as a means of understanding his relation to and participation in the perpetuation of the hijacker voice, one notes his simultaneously indistinguishable and undistinguished status, a dialectic of in/significance that characterizes the event as a whole. In line with Taylor's notion of "a cosmetic race, one in which the outward 'look' fails to reveal any ontological stability" (Taylor 122) in her discussion of Walter Mercado, there is the hijacker body which produces the hijacker voice. This body is clad in the clothes of an anonymous businessperson, well-groomed, unassuming, unidentifiable as anything other than a run of the mill middle class Middle Easterner, a lesser prince perhaps, and far from monstrous. The hijacker is therefore indistinguishable from other passengers, raising no alarm until he chooses to raise that alarm through the use of the hijacker voice. This producing body, so seemingly insignificant in its mundanity, functions much like those of the Madres of the Plaza de Mayo who, "[t]urning their bodies into billboards… used them as conduits of memory" (170). In this case, the producing body billboards the *jihadi* ideology in the course of the spectacular event (plastering the walls of the towers with airplane aluminum, flames and falling bodies) and produces an embodied memory in his performance of the hijacker voice.

Taylor's own writing on 9/11, specifically concerning the flyers which serve first as vectors of hope for discovering lost loved ones, then as makeshift memorials, speaks to this bodily insignificance (though the body is at once significant as the locus of embodied performance, the performance soon superseding the body himself, though never losing his referentiality): "In a sudden reversal, the relatively inanimate and flimsy photograph had outlasted its more 'permanent' subject: the living person, the towering buildings" (249).

Similarly, it is the relatively inanimate (though constantly permutating), malleable hijacker voice which outlasts his producing body and the target of his production, the seemingly unassailable U.S. psyche. That an event of such purported significance, as per the accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood's claims of incommensurability, could be undertaken by such insignificant bodies, so insignificant that their literal duration is quite brief, is perhaps the underlying tension of the event. This tension is mimicked in the largesse of the *Loops* series, yielded by a slight clutch of loops, and one which comes to haunt the U.S. psyche in the course of his inhabitation.

Due to his subtle inhabitation of the U.S. psyche, the hijacker voice takes on the semblance of a ghost, an uncanny return of the repressed that seems both strangely familiar (due to his implication of the inhabited listener) and sadly departed (referencing the loss of the producing body as the ur-loss of an event marked by loss). Much like the museum and its treatment of the cultural object as static, fixed, archival, the U.S. victimhood scenario manifesting in 9/11 "enact[s] the knower-known relationship by separating the transient visitor from the fixed object of display" (66). Such a pairing of knowledge and transience privileges the mobile hijacker voice unmoored from (yet still referring to) his producing body over the static listener, rooted to the spot by the enormity of the event. This mobility, this ability to appear in disappearance, constructs the hijacker voice-as-ghost, rendered as such by the performance of the speech and suicide acts: "performance makes visible (for an instant, live, now) that which is always already there: the ghosts, the tropes, the scenarios that structure our individual and collective life… [t]hese specters, made manifest through performance, alter future phantoms, future fantasies" (143). Accordingly, the hijacker voice makes visible the hijacker as U.S. double, ghosting the U.S. psyche and its structuring, scenaric victimhood narratives, manifesting

in the performative and altering future attempts to recreate the U.S. psyche after its rupture by the event.

To become ghost, the hijacker voice must lose his producing body, a loss which serves as the first (save perhaps for flight attendants, pilots, and passengers killed in the course of the hijackings, though perhaps loss by impact is necessary for a loss to have impact in this case) in an event marked by loss. This loss constitutes an ur-loss of personhood that resides in pre-event geopolitical disenfranchisement and results in a loss of the known, the U.S. psyche. Taylor's description of loss accords closely to this notion of originary loss, an alternative incommensurability that meets the singular victimhood of the event with the singular self-victimhood that produces it: "Loss. A ghost is about loss, loss made manifest, the vision of that which is no longer there" (152). Paradoxically, the ghost, signifying the absence of the producing body discarded to yield the hijacker voice and the absence of the accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood in the post-inhabitation landscape, manifests loss, his absence functioning as a presence, a present tense of the past loss that is tense to say the least. In her attention to the post-9/11 sense of loss in New York City, Taylor observes that "[t]he loss of the Towers triggered a phantom limb phenomenon: the more people recognized the lack, the more they felt the presence of the absence" (147). This ghosting resembles the ghosting of the producing body in the hijacker voice, a lack recognized (in the bodily referent) that calls that which produces the lack (the suicide act) back into constant presence through the repetition of the voice, though that repetition relies upon a listener to resonate.

The *Loops* series exists within this ghosting, a ghosting which resembles the "hauntology" of Jacques Derrida and which, through his inhabitation and alteration of the listener positionality, creates a new spectator, the hijacker-listener. Encroachment and becoming

is the order of the day in Basinski: "The melody disintegrates slowly, until, by the end, only portions are audible; the rest is silence and noise" ("William…" 1). As the original loop and its accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood fall to pieces, silence fills the void as void, the nothing of the typically elided hijacker voice (or, if not elided, hyperbolicized) speaking volumes, inhabiting the U.S. psyche and turning that nothing into a distinct something, the furtherance of oppositionality. Ruptures and fragments allow the ghost to peek through the accepted narrative, to inhabit the U.S. psyche as the magnetic tape peels away, as "the music becomes a ghost of itself, tiny gasps of full-bodied chords groaning to life amid pits of near-silence" in the Pitchfork Media review ("William…" 1). The sputtering remains of that psyche intersperse themselves in the overwhelming ghosting.

Derrida's "hauntology," "the flip side of performance's ontology… [where] [t]he ghost is, by definition, a repetition" is the domain of the ghost (Taylor 142), a figment given weight through that repetition of the original speech act as performance, which is continually performed in the persistence of the hijacker voice. Returning to Taylor's examination of post-9/11 imagery in New York City, substitute images, meant to attend to the loss of the Towers, "filled the vacuum" through repetition (247). In the case of the hijacker voice, that vacuum is filled with another vacuum (silence-as-void) and by virtue of the vacuum (the vacuum tube as a type of technologized recording apparatus). The ghost, brought into being by the spectacular suicide act and its divestment of the hijacker voice from the producing body, is an example of the phenomenon that Taylor notes in the case of the spectatorial fury surrounding Princess Diana: "The spectacle of the specter makes the spectator" (157). With this in mind, the ghostly hijacker voice and his spectacular genesis create a new auditor, the inhabited hijacker-listener, relying on repetition as an enabling force.

Basinski's loops are similarly hauntological, with their address to the ghost, their

inclusion of the spectral hijacker voice in the voids-as-glitches produced by the flaking tapes,

serving to underline the solicited nature of their inhabitation. Derrida defines hauntology in his

Specters of Marx: The State of Debt, The Work of Mourning, and the New International as

"[r]epetition *and* first time, but also repetition *and* last time, since the singularity of any *first time*

makes of it also a *last time*. Each time it is the event itself, a first time is a last time. Altogether

other. Staging for the end of history. Let us call it a *hauntology*" (Derrida 10), with the 9/11 plot

similarly being at once first and last as a product of the novelty of its approach, and its spectral

hijacker voice being a first and last articulation in his status as ubiquitous in the always already.

The inclusion of the spectral hijacker voice is less a choice than a matter of course for, to speak

in the name of justice, of a justice not yet present, to narrativize U.S. victimhood, "[i]t is

necessary to speak *of the* ghost, indeed *to the* ghost and *with* it, from the moment that no ethics,

no politics, whether revolutionary or not, seems possible and thinkable" (xix), to solicit the ghost

as a means of understanding and foreclosing the seeming moral morass that follows the event.

Before speaking to the ghost, one must first locate him, where "the technique for having visions,

for *seeing* ghosts is in truth a technique to *make oneself seen* by ghosts" (134), to make oneself

vulnerable to inhabitation by the spectral not at the level of the visual, but rather the aural, to

hear ghosts by being heard by them (though what the spectral hijacker hears is only its own voice

as ventriloquized through the listener). What results is a "[s]pecular circle: one chases after in

order to chase away, one pursues, sets off in pursuit of someone to make him flee, but one makes

him flee, distances him, expulses him so as to go after him again and remain in pursuit" (140),

the chase always already existing and never ending, the listener-as-accepted narrator always

soliciting the spectral hijacker voice that, over and over, tells her/him exactly what s/he does not want to hear.

Where repetition works to the disadvantage of the accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood, which loses impact with each iteration (one can only wave a flag so many times before their arm gets tired), it works to the decided advantage of the hijacker voice. The hijacker voice capitalizes on the fatigue engendered by jingoism as a means of inhabiting the listener positionality and producing the hijacker-listener, a repetition exemplified by Basinski's *Loops* series. Much like the scenario's propensity for "once-againness" (32), the repetition of the hijacker voice inverts that once-againness, dislodging the event from the continuum of U.S. victimhood narratives into one of hijacker presence. This presence is inculcated by a subtle rupture and inhabitation of the victimhood narrative rather than an outright discounting, a bit of Trojan horseplay that breaches the city. Recalling the hijackers' alignment with Yuyachkani discussed above, "performance is not about going back, but about keeping alive. Its mode of transmission is the repeat, the reiteration, the yet again of 'performance'" (208), the very repetition that enables the existence of the hijacker voice at once enabling his perpetuation as a performative, his vivification after separation from his producing body in the performance of the suicide act, not so much a yet again as a still which is anything but static.

The *Loops* series is party to this repetition, the very conceit of the recordings relying on repetition as a means of driving home the point as the pilot-hijacker drives the plane home into its target. In the words of the Haunted Ink review, "[t]his is the sound of entropy; the sound of life as it decays and dies before our ears" ("William…" 2), though the choice of entropy terminology speaks more to either a reflexive thermodynamics (the explosion-as-implosion of the inhabited state) or a similarly reflexive communication (the hijacker voice is the listener's

voice by virtue of inhabitation) and less to the possibility of a death. If any death is indeed present, it is not before the listener's ears, but after, once the sound has been imbibed, and what dies is the U.S. psyche. After performing the initial speech act, the hijacker voice is left to its own devices, or perhaps left to devices (technologized recording apparatuses), with "the recording process playing an inadvertent witness to the destruction of Basinski's old music" ("William…" 1), in the words of the Pitchfork Music review. This inadvertent witness resembles that in which the listener pays inadvertent witness to the destruction of the old U.S. psyche by the inhabiting hijacker voice.

However, the inclusion of the hijacker voice in this ostensibly passive space is a voluntary, deliberate, knowing act on the part of the hijacker, whereas the listener enters actively, seeking the hijacker's contribution to the narrative, though perhaps passively and unknowingly acceding to the hijacker voice's dictation of terms. The mechanics of Basinski's compositional methodology accord with this active passivity, the *Loops* series existing as a product of "a simple set up where the insignator [sic] is no longer in control of the output. All Basinski did was push play and record and the machinery did its magic" ("William…" 1), as described in the Discogs review. Similarly, the hijacker simply pushes play (or the talk back button), issuing the voice for uptake by the technologized recording apparatus. The apparatus then does its magic, rendering the voice spectral and placing him in semi-fictionalized and documentary accounts, in sound art and music, enabling the inhabitation that permits the hijacker voice to fracture the U.S. psyche.

CAN'T A LOOP?: THE POSSIBILITY OF INHABITATION

Having examined the hijacker voice, as captured by the cockpit voice recorder and air traffic control recordings, and the way in which that voice is perpetuated by his situation in the realm of technology, alongside Diana Taylor's elucidation of the scenario, the archive, and the

repertoire in her 2003 book *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*, only one question remains (with related subquestions, of course): Can a few seconds of recordings capturing the inadvertent transmissions of the pilot-hijackers of 9/11 really compromise the U.S. psyche? Must this inhabitation be apparent to the inhabited? Does silence, as in the case of William Basinski's *The Disintegration Loops I-IV*, really speak volumes? The short answer is "yes" in all three cases, though some explanation is necessary.

As a mostly fortuitous occurrence from the hijacker's perspective (save for the fact that broader knowledge of the hijackings-in-progress enabled the partial foiling of the efforts of Ziad Jarrah and his fellow hijackers aboard United Airlines Flight 93), given that proper use of the cockpit communication system should not have allowed the transmissions to be heard by air traffic control, the talk back button serves its purpose on 9/11, permitting the voice of the hijacker-Other to resonate, even after death. That such speech may enter the public arena points to a discursive opening for non-state actors, a problematization of the superpower model of geopolitics that allows a handful of dissatisfied individuals to offset a multi-trillion dollar military-industrial complex with fewer than one hundred people and less than a million dollars. This offsetting capacity democratizes discourse from a monovocal terrain to a polyvocal one. It is not necessary that the inhabited be aware of their inhabitation, only that they act on it, consuming the semi-fictionalized and documentary accounts containing the hijacker voice with such voracity and commitment that the U.S. administration feels some justification for its knee-jerk resort to military intervention (though, as evidenced by recent years, no justification or consensus is required). Such a response is exactly the sort of hyperbolic bullying that rallies the disenfranchised to the oppositional actor, no matter how abhorrent it might be (and al Qaeda's situation in fundamentalist Islam is certainly objectionable in many respects), and so the

hijacker-listener need not mouth the words of the hijackers to ventriloquize their intended ends; one need only "keep remaining sitting," in Ziad Jarrah's words, and let the hijacker voice do his work. This disjunction, this silence between the actual language and its import, the enveloping void of Basinski's eroding loops, does in fact speak volumes, amplifying the "BOOM" of the impact and the similarly impactful "we have some planes" into an altogether larger impact. That impact endures to this day in the "War on Terror" and will endure, in perpetuity, so long as the hijacker voice remains in circulation, be it in the semi-fictionalized or documentary film, the YouTube short, sound art, or music.

ON A MADDENING LOOP: THE SPECTRAL VOICE AND ITS DIS/INTEGRATION

Having explored the more appropriate placement of the type of citationality and iterativity performed by William Basinski's *The Disintegration Loops I-IV* within the realm of the repertoire rather than the archive (as defined by Diana Taylor), one may continue the transition from this more professional, unitary rendering of the purely aural use of the spectral voice to the more amateur, fragmentary version proffered by British plunderphonic collage artists Cassetteboy and their song "Fly Me to New York." As a postlude to the literal fragmentation of the producing body upon the hijacker's impact with his chosen target and the accompanying figurative fragmentation of the voice into the realm of the spectral and his provisional capture in recorded media, those fragments are coalesced into a new sort of music, a rubble music that represents a citational and iterative de- and recontextualization of the spectral voice and that draws the past into the present as a means of determining the future.

Before engaging in a direct analysis of the song in question, this chapter will expand upon the relation between citationality and the inherent selectivity of hearing through an engagement with Paul D. Miller aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid's methodological forwarding of the notion of "rhythm science" and its implications for practices of recontextualization. Then, the chapter will couch "Fly Me to New York" within a broader understanding of the musical technique of sampling and its more specific manifestation within John Oswald's "plunderphonics," where the techniques serve to endow the creative process with an auto-reflexivity via the traces that adhere to sampled materials. Finally, the chapter will conclude with a series of meditations upon the ramifications of Cassetteboy's citational tendencies and the manner in which "Fly Me to New York" enacts a rubble music in its de- and

reassembly of its constituent parts, a constructivity that exposes U.S. culpability in 9/11 in the

chopped and screwed[149] language of national symbol Frank Sinatra.

<center>CUT AND TASTE: CITING SINATRA</center>

One may begin by returning (the return being a beginning as end in the effort of

[re]beginning, a renewed consultation of the finished that helps to place a finish upon the

forthcoming, a coming to the fore of the aft aforeseen) to Derrida's notion of citationality to

establish an understanding of the sort of recontextualization enacted by Cassetteboy within "Fly

Me to New York." This return will indeed spur a "cut/retake" directorial intervention such that

the listener, already nominally passively involved insomuch as s/he hears selectively, may now

interact with the aural in a more directly participative manner. In *Limited Inc*, Derrida offers a

concise articulation of citationality's function, asserting that "[e]very sign, linguistic or

nonlinguistic, spoken or written… in a large or small unit, can be *cited*, put between quotation

marks; in so doing it can break with every given context, engendering an infinity of new contexts

in a manner which is absolutely illimitable" (Derrida 12). What may be extrapolated from

Derrida's understanding of citationality is that the demarcation of quotation via punctuation

serves as an imperfect severing, a disassociation of the cited unit from its context, a de-sociation

or desocialization of the unit from its discursive participation within its context that yet fails to

fully erase the origin of that unit. Rather, a trace of the origin lingers, always already and forever

attached to the unit such that though it is subject to permutative recontextualization in

accordance with Derrida's infinity, each subsequent context refers to the origin, nesting within

---

[149] "Chopped and screwed" refers to hip-hop terminology for a recording which has been altered (by slowing the tempo and incorporating skips, scratches, and other variations to the original), one of the results of which is an increased emphasis on the vocal track.

the originary ur-context and deepening its referentiality rather than obscuring it through fancy flights into neo-contextuality.

It is in this moment that Paul D. Miller aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid's disciplinary elucidation of "rhythm science" may enter the discussion, first in the notion of the unions that proliferate recontextualization permits within the sphere of new media, and subsequently in the manner in which the listener comes to be implicated in various recontextualizations, including that of Cassetteboy, through the active process of listening. In his edited volume *Sound Unbound: Sampling Digital Music and Culture*, Miller includes contributor Ken Jordan's essay "Stop. Hey. What's That Sound?", which contends that "digital media give rise to forms that wed: sound and movement; sound and space; sound and image" (Jordan 245). It is at the level of the wedding, 9/11's "Big Wedding," [150] that citational recontextualization takes place. Once the unit is provisionally detached from his origin, as on 9/11 in the disjunction between the superficial meaning of protocol language used by the hijackers and the actual intent of that speech, he may then be wed to his recontextualized home in the moment of impact, the producing body melding into the impact zone and asserting the primacy of his speech in relation to the act. Attachment to the act and its iterative reappearance in cultural artifacts then enables inhabitation to take place, as facilitated by involvement in engaged listening.

Miller more directly addresses his notion of rhythm science in the volume of the same name (*Rhythm Science*), a concept briefly described as the creation of art from the flow of patterns in culture. An essential component of rhythm science is the awareness of and performance of selective listening within the creative act, a listening that entails an active

---

[150] "The Big Wedding" was the code name for the plot, and was used in communications from stateside hijackers, including Mohamed Atta, to plot facilitators in Europe and Afghanistan (Ramzi bin al-Shibh and Khalid Sheikh Mohammed) (Thompson 2).

participation on the part of the listener. Within a discussion of early cinematographer George

Méliès'[151] application of montage, Miller observes that "[i]n the space of one random error,

Méliès created what we know of today as the 'cut' – words, images, sounds flowing… [f]low,

rupture, and fragmentation – all seamlessly bound to the viewer's perspectival architecture of

film and sound, all utterly malleable" (Miller 81), though the cut existed prior to Méliès'

application. This cut incises the originary unit, acting as a decontexualizing motion that yet

contains a trace of the origin in the referential geometry of its ragged edge and which, within the

realm of the aural (neatly attached to but not exclusive to the filmic within Miller's rendering),

points to a selective listening that excerpts certain sounds from the whole as both a necessary

measure to cope with the glut of raw aural input, as well as a deliberate omission or

commission/committing to a specific piece of aural datum. The cut, as situated within selective

listening, responds to Miller's determination that "it's not so much new ways of hearing that are

needed, but new perceptions of what we can hear" (Miller 17), where raw data are in fact heard

insomuch as they are registered by the auditory apparatus (at least within the limits of human

anatomy), but not always registered due to selective in/exclusion.[152] As a means of

decontexualizing, the cut implies a subsequent recontextualization consonant with its originary

contextualization (in form, if not content, via the inescapable trace), rendering the citationality of

the cut a precursor to additional contextualization, as well as a continued discursor/discussant

within the frame of its originary discourse.

---

[151] Méliès is perhaps best known for his *A Trip to the Moon* (1902), which displays many of his technical and narrative innovations and contributions to early film, and which stands as one of several Méliès films to chronicle a strange journey, making his appearance in a discussion of 9/11 wholly apropos.

[152] Miller's emphasis on perception accords with Steve Goodman's attention to "*unsound*, another name for the *not yet audible*. It describes the peripheries of human audition, of infrasound and ultrasound, both of which modulate the affective sensorium in ways we still do not fully comprehend" (Goodman 191), offered in his *Sonic Warfare: Sound, Affect, and the Ecology of Fear* (to receive further attention below). Though Goodman is gesturing towards alternate forms of sound, the implied notion of selectivity is shared with Miller.

The listener-as-cutter, a self-mutilator who inflicts the aural incision as a means of attaining feeling in the face of aural overabundance and its accompanying numbness, is therefore a participant in her/his own hearing, less a hearing out of the aural totality than a hearing in that, in many cases, remains insular. Yet, when positioned within preapproved discursive tropes (U.S. as victim, etc.), the incision may cut doubly, selecting the seemingly benign aural unit and further slitting it, opening the throat to loose the spectral voice within. Miller describes the listener's participation in the auditory act by turning to the words of artist Marcel Duchamp: "[A]ll in all, the creative act is not performed by the artist alone; the spectator brings the work in contact with the external world by deciphering and interpreting its inner qualifications and thus adds his contribution to the creative act" (quoted in Miller 97). With Duchamp's implicated spectator/listener in mind, the listener is likeminded, mining the raw aural data to select datum consistent with her/his preconceptions but, in the case of the spectral voice, one more insistent against those preconceptions. If this listener does indeed hear the spectral within the typical, within the reinforced enforcement of the accepted narrative, if s/he does hear, s/he also hears back, hears daursally, following the trace to its originary locus within the producing body, seemingly ventriloquizing the hijacker voice into a demonizing narrativity while actually being ventriloquized her/himself as part of a chorus apostrophizing on U.S. culpability. This replication of the originary datum and its context unfolds Miller's useful observation concerning "the premise of replication, which itself derives from the word 'reply'" (Miller 73), where the invocation of the hijacker voice and his transition to spectral climes elicits an answer, a call and response dialectic where the audience registers its approval in an apparent parroting of the spectral voice.

A further look into the particulars of the rhythm science posited by Miller demonstrates the utility of that theoretical approach as a model for the interwoven processes of citationality and recontextualization, a model that enables a wholesale liquidation of received narrativities within the fluid discursive space. Miller elucidates the neo-linguistic aspect of rhythm science while also gesturing towards the inhabitational capacities that that aspect brings into being, asserting that "[r]hythm science is not so much a new language as a new way of pronouncing the ancient syntaxes that we inherit from history and evolution, a new way of enunciating the basic primal languages that slip through the fabric of rational thought and infect our psyche at another, deeper level" (Miller 72). In this passage, the language produced by rhythm science is at once paleo-linguistic (in its extensive consultation of the past as part of its return to the ancient and primal[153]) and neo-linguistic (in its creation of a new communication as performed by an unearthing of older forms and their subsequent recontextualization). The rhythm scientist locates the fragments of past languages, past mediations and, in the course of synthesizing the paleo- and neo-linguistic into a liminal form which borrows on past forms in a presentist manifestation of linguistic hybridity that defines the framework of future speech, unites those fragments, creating an accompanying neo-narrativity in contrast to extant ossified narrativities that are unwilling or unable to engage the fluid linguistics practiced by the scientist.

As it pertains to the citationality posited by Derrida, Miller's rhythm science and its neo-linguistics is consistent with the notion of the perpetual trace outlined above, enacting a daursality that brings together fragments from temporal locales near and far in a listening back that places the back towards the future which is itself informed by the back. Much like Derrida's unnamed citationalist, the rhythm scientist is able to drawn upon source material, pulling quotes

---

[153] Miller's offhand use of those particular descriptors is indirectly fetishistic at best, and is cited here with full knowledge of the problematic nature of "ancient" and (especially) "primal."

without punches and including them in subsequent work, in some cases with attribution, in others

with an understanding that the dated nature of the datum places it within the realm of the public

domain, to be used fairly as the citationalist/scientist sees fit. This pulling is far from woolen,

however; there will always be the well-read or –listened who may backtrack the citation or

sample to its originary placement in the back, in the dusty tomes or mildewed record crates that

lie behind (without ever lying, a past both prologue and epilogue), making the trace tenaciously

adherent. The citation is therefore a shade, pulled behind as shadow, lingering always behind the

quote, withering briefly at the apex of the day, but holding court for the balance. Miller's rhythm

scientist may cite, may recontextualize, but the originary context is omnipresent, omniscient, and

the fragmentary re-coalesced tongue serves only to make the spaces between the cracks doubly

apparent.

Rhythm science thus yields a new language, supremely yielding due to its basis in flows

and its fluid temporality in drawing on the ancient and primal, a language whose very fissures act

to draw attention to the comparatively pristine liminal spaces, and to make pronouncements in

the course of their pro- (or perhaps anti-) and/or e-nunciation (the e- prefix also denoting a basis

in the electronics of new media technologies, including the sampler, to be discussed below).

Taking a cue from Basinski, imagine an aged mirror, dusty from years of use and disuse, riven

by cracks; at first glance, one sees only the seams, the uneven fault lines within the glassy

surface – yet, upon further review, an image pieces itself together, the presence of these fault

lines generating more intense focus on the unfaulted data left between, though that data is far

from immune to faulting of its own. Miller suggests thinking of rhythm science in similar terms:

"Rhythm science is a forensic investigation of sound as a vector of a coded language that goes

from the physical to the informational and back again… [t]hink of it as a mirror held up to a

culture that has learned to fly again, that has released itself from the constraints of the ground to drift through dataspace, continuously morphing its form in response to diverse streams of information" (Miller 5). What emerges from Miller's mirror is a codex of sorts, an unscripted manuscript drawing on the ancient to yield an encoding founded on the decodification of the citation's originary locus, a recontextualization that contests, that draws the mind from the fissure to the 'flection, spurring additional re-s in the form of re-turn.

The held mirror is jagged, a shard to the throat of the subject, encouraging a reflection that is never voluntary, inflecting the deflected rays with which it is supplied as a means of raising the question via recontextualization. It is the subject who actively solicits the mirror's function, though that subject may not always (or even often) be pleased with its reward. Likewise, the language produced by the rhythm scientist's doings appears innocuous at best, ramshackle at worst, its tape-held edits seemingly the province of the amateur, its more technologically inclined home in the sampler (to be discussed below) perhaps more professional, if less original. Yet, its resituation of the citation from its originary site (which simultaneously cites the site in the act of removal [or rather re-moval, the prefix implying an inherent motion within the originary site, passages itching to pass from past to present as per a potential citational fate]) jars, preempting the canned response and forcing a reappraisal of the citation and a reevaluation of its previous use(s). Rhythm science holds up this mirror to society, rendering the cracks not a detriment to the larger perception, but rather essential to its functioning, engendering gaps prone to inhabitation by narrativities contrary to the citations' originary loci.

The neo/paleo-linguistics of rhythm science sieves, its gaps allowing some but not all to pass, sifting out the largest chunks of unitary narrativity and letting the fragments continue their state of flow, the fissures/faults/flaws in this case functioning as a presence in absence. This

sieving slivers, slicing already fragmentary data into smaller fragments still, all ripe for the recontextualizing with the technologized field of the sampler, so integral to rhythm science for its capacity to juxtapose and, by proxy, pose the question. For Miller, this situation of the fragmentary data, memory shards much like the slivered silver of the mirror's pseudo-blades, within the technologized space raises a question: "[W]hat happens when the memories filter through the machines we use to process culture and become software – a constantly updated, always turbulent terrain more powerful than the machine through which it runs?... [a]nd the software that runs the machines is the text that flows through the conduits like a *flaneur* of the unconscious. These are tales told over and over so many times and in so many ways that the texts undergo rigor mortis" (Miller 9-12). The essential elements of this passage, the transition of memory data into software within the technologized space and the function of repetition within that space, are of crucial import to a further understanding of the workings of citationality.

In the course of the transformation/transference of memory data into software, the inherent turbulence of that (re-)context foments a turbidity of meaning: once coded into the language of rhythm science, that data is subject to permutations beyond the control and/or imaginings of its originary site, and beyond the control of the memory holder, creating a space in which de- and renarrativization may take place. The software is then transmissible between varying operating platforms and user interfaces, outlining a broad, inclusive scope from which the de- and renarrativization process may not be escaped, only backgrounded slightly. Additionally, the repetition within that system noted by Miller functions similarly, embarking on its own peregrinations and, through thorough iteration (attaining the status of iterativity through the variation within each telling of the tale, the sheer volume of tellings and tellers yielding sufficient differentials), becoming both the "man about town" whose strollings serve to map

landscapes urban, civic and, ultimately, political, as well as something of a faith healer, laying hands (as code-typing digits typing digits) to reimbibe life (in death) in a rigorous fashion. Much like the phenomena that he identifies in this passage, Miller's own elucidation of rhythm science goes viral, a citation describing patterns of citationality that operates unmoored from its originary site and which, in the course of its bobbing and weaving upon the currents of the fluidity that it brings about, alters received narrativities by sounding the cracks as a means of amplifying the subject(s) they frame. This rhythm science will prove of significant value to the more detailed analysis of Cassetteboy's "Fly Me to New York" that follows and its notable participation in the eddies of cultural flow.

With the utility of Miller's rhythm science as a model for the interwoven processes of citationality and recontextualization and the accompanying liquidation of received narrativities in place, one may begin the analysis of Cassetteboy's "Fly Me to New York" with a mind to first introducing the artist and song, then turning to its engagement with plunderphonics and sampling, and finally unpacking the ramifications of its citational tendencies in relation to an articulation of rubble music. The song was produced by the British plunderphonic tape collage artists Cassetteboy (Steve Warlin and Michael Bollen)[154], featuring DJ Rubbish, and appears on their 2002 debut album *The Parker Tapes*. Based primarily around tightly-edited samples from Frank Sinatra songs, and also featuring excerpts from songs by the Smiths and a number of hip-hop artists, the song narrates the events of 9/11 from the perspective of one of the pilot-hijackers and, in its reconstitution of disparate fragments, is, along with Basinski's aforementioned work, the best example of the rubble music arising from 9/11.

---

[154] While Warlin and Bollen collaborate under the title Cassetteboy, as Bollen notes, "although Cassetteboy are a double act… we generally work on individual tracks alone. I think I'm right in saying that 'Fly Me to New York' was entirely my own work" (Bollen), and it is his input that will be featured in this analysis.

Beginning first with the song itself, prior to an analysis of its primary source and method of assembly, "Fly Me to New York" includes, and is indeed largely composed of, the hijacker voice, allowing that voice a venue from which to be heard, though without advocating that positionality. At the outset is an introductory section composed of hip-hop samples and occasional offerings from DJ Rubbish, which states that "the U.S. is a terrorist" (Cassetteboy [b]), reminds the listener that "one million, five hundred thousand Iraqis died" during the first Gulf War and the embargos thereafter (Cassetteboy [b]), and asserts that the hijackers will "commit suicide like my man from Afghanistan" (Cassetteboy [b]), suggesting a critical stance on the part of the song, though not so far as to draw a direct allegiance to the al Qaeda/hijacker positionality. This section is concerned with the initial motivations for the event, encouraging the listener to "remember Iraq, remember Iran" (Cassetteboy [b]), perhaps in reference to the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980s and the U.S.' opportunistic alliance with Iraq despite Saddam Hussein's use of chemical weapons on Iran and Iraqi Kurds, and also ambiguously calling for someone to "blow up the World Trade Center" (Cassetteboy [b]), recalling the failed 1993 bombing plot led by Ramzi Yousef. Once this background is in place, the stage is set for Sinatra, who strides to the spotlight in the person of a pilot-hijacker, either of the Atta/Jarrah school (his speech registering again as a result of the recorded precedent) or of the al Shehhi/Hanjour school (newly speechifying and seizing the agency opened by Atta and Jarrah).

The Sinatran pilot-hijacker narrator at first gives his attention to those aboard the plane and, once the passengers and crew are adequately subdued, offers a more personal, at times ecstatic narrative of his impending demise, extending that accounting into the perimortality as well. At first, the original pilot is in control, the pilot-hijacker narrator declaring "fly me to New York" (Cassetteboy [b]) as if he is not yet at the yoke (unless he simply talks to the plane, urging

it forth [and further suggesting an operational immaturity such that flying the plane is a mystical operation]). Turning from the cockpit to those gathered in first class, the pilot-hijacker delivers a casual threat, an offhand reminder that "I've got a razor in my pocket" (Cassetteboy [b]), the implied violence more aural than visual, warning the now hostage-held flight attendant that "once I get you up there / I'll be holding my knife deep in the heart of you" (Cassetteboy [b]), slitting the attendant's throat after her usefulness has passed. This section may also be the inner monologue of the pilot-hijacker prior to takeoff, as the lines "you think you've flown before / wait 'til you're locked in my plane" seem to refer to a future action (Cassetteboy [b]). Once in the captain's chair, the pilot-hijacker narrator comments upon his own psychological disposition, pronouncing that "I'm round the bend / I'm mental and I'm flying the plane" (Cassetteboy [b]), providing a complicating counterpoint to the rational causality of the introductory section. The pilot-hijacker narrator becomes nearly ecstatic at its approach to the World Trade Center, with a joyous "let's fly, let's fly into buildings / let's turn to ashes" demonstrating not a fear of, but rather a desire for, a fiery end (Cassetteboy [b]), a nod to the suicide mission echoed in the statement that "I'm dying on a jet plane / I know I won't be back again" (Cassetteboy [b]). Finally, after a series of impact and fire noises, as well as an insert line explaining "that's the way the jet plane crashes into the World Trade Center" (Cassetteboy [b]), Sinatra returns in the moment of death, softly crooning "and now my skin is melting away" (Cassetteboy [b]), concluding the Sinatra portion of the song.

As "Fly Me to New York" begins with an introductory section that meditates on the potential motives for 9/11, the song wraps up with a concluding section that turns back to hip-hop samples to recount the Towers' fate and those to be held accountable for it. One sample contends that "we burned the Twin Towers" (Cassetteboy [b]), either establishing an allegiance

between hip-hop-as-alternative narrative and that posited by the hijackers, or creating a larger

culpability for the U.S. more broadly. The song is then more open in its finger pointing,

answering its own question "who to blame?" by immediately splicing in "America" (Cassetteboy

[b]), and reemphasizing that attribution via the fully intact Smiths line "there's no one but

yourself to blame" (Cassetteboy [b]).[155] DJ Rubbish then draws the discussion back into the

more overtly rational debate of the introductory section, calling for a more open discourse

around the causes of and conflicts to follow the event: "let's talk about the war over oil… let's

talk about the need for the oil on the U.S. soil" (Cassetteboy [b]). Though the hijacker voice is

seemingly ended upon impact, the Sinatran pilot-hijacker narrator saying but one additional line,

there is much to come from that voice, with "Fly Me to New York" acting to enable its further

livelihood after the event.

Having looked at the lyrical particulars of "Fly Me to New York" itself, especially its

inclusion of the hijacker voice via the assembled Sinatra samples, it is necessary to further

analyze that inclusion as a means of determining its implications for the listener and for

Cassetteboy. "Fly Me to New York" includes the hijacker voice as a means of invoking a critical

commentary on the event and, more importantly, its circumscribed depiction within accepted

narrativity, revivifying the hijacker voice by enabling an expansion of the hijacker voice beyond

its recorded referents. This voice, specifically in its Sinatran manifestation, but also in the

assumed positionality of the rationalizing introductory and finger-pointing concluding sections,

complicates accepted narrativity by rendering its speaker more human, something more than a

---

[155] This line is drawn from the song "Accept Yourself," which also contains the intriguing lyric "anything is hard to find / when you will not open your eyes" (The Smiths [a]) suggesting at once a dependence on visuality, as well as a willful evasion of ready narrativity. Further, the song states "oh how do I feel about the past? / others conquered love, but I ran / I sat in my room and I drew up a plan" (The Smiths [a]), an attention to past events as motivation similar to that noted in the introductory section of "Fly Me to New York," and a likeminded turn to plotting.

sound bite generator, more than a caricature of evil, instead offering an at times suave agent whose intent is clearly articulated, foreclosing any specious ideological conjecture on the part of accepted narrativists.

For the listener, "Fly Me to New York" bears a tripartite implication: of intentionality in seeking out the hijacker voice; of relationality in the likeness to the humanized and non-demonized pilot-hijacker narrator; and of culpability in both Cassetteboy's attribution of guilt and the distinctly American Sinatran narrative positionality. In terms of intentionality, the fact that the listener has sought out an additional instance of the hijacker voice, reaching beyond the recorded voice to the more expansive narrative provided by the Sinatran pilot-hijacker narrator, suggests some degree of extended interest in, though not quite alliance with or full sympathy for, the hijacker positionality. This proximal relation in furthered by the notion of relationality, in which the typically broad stroked depiction of the hijackers as specters of pure evil is complicated by the Sinatran pilot-hijacker narrator, who is certainly assertive, but also debonair, in fine aural form and of excellent breeding, more relatable than hyperbolic renderings might suggest. It does not hurt that the hijacker voice is delivered in Sinatra's dulcet tones,[156] making his (the voice's) narrative that much more palatable, though a palatability that also contains culpability insomuch as Sinatra stands as a distinctly American figure. That it is Frank at the yoke is, to put it frankly, a near admission of guilt, the listener being drawn to and into the pilot-hijacker positionality, a proxy pilot in much the same way as Atta, Jarrah, al Shehhi, and Hanjour.

---

[156] The "dulcet tones" invoked here also reference those of Wavy, one of Craig Ferguson's puppets, in this case a crocodile, often used in the opening monologue of *The Late Late Show with Craig Ferguson*. In a rambling segment criticizing Joe Wilson for interrupting President Obama's address concerning health care reform, Wavy refers to his own "dulcet tones" as a means of seduction, characterizing himself as a "fearsome predator… of love" ("Late Late"), striking a similar balance between velvet and violence to that of the Sinatran pilot-hijacker narrator.

For Cassetteboy, "Fly Me to New York" bears a similarly tripartite implication: of shock value in its provision of narrative space and voice, of technology in its use of sampling to assemble that narrative, and of criticism in its inclusion of the hijacker voice. As the first two will receive more extensive attention below, the bulk of the focus here will be on the critical dimension of Cassetteboy's songsmithing. In terms of shock value, the creation of a venue for the hijacker voice is in and of itself a jarring act, one rendered doubly so by the similar manner in which Sinatra's voice is made available as a locus for the hijacker voice's articulation. In terms of technology, Cassetteboy offer a demonstration of the critical possibility of technology, as embodied through the act of sampling, that parallels the pilot-hijacker's own repurposing of a technology, in his case the planes themselves more broadly and the cockpit communication apparatus more specifically, with technology taking a leading role in rendering the hijacker voice present in both instances. In terms of criticism, Cassetteboy do not actively take sides in the discourse surrounding the event, instead complicating event narrativity and adding an extra- to the accepted not by deliberately speaking through or on behalf of the pilot-hijacker narrator positionality, but by allowing that voice the time and space to make its case. Where the voice is rendered absent, is provisionally silenced by the repetition of accepted narrativity (though that repetition instead gives it staying power), Cassetteboy bring it back to life, indeed broadening it through a contextualization in rational causality and rational culpability. The U.S. victimhood positionality, sacrosanct within accepted narrativity, is deeply problematized by "Fly Me to New York," a problematization that is evident not only within the song itself, but also in the samples of which it is composed, particularly those drawn from Sinatra.

A brief glance at a handful of the Frank Sinatra samples demonstrates the way in which "Fly Me to New York" functions as a footnoted, citational text, an amateur recontexualization of

professionally produced recordings that yields greater critical insight when the sources of the samples are traced and analyzed. The latter half of the line "I've got a razor in my pocket" (Cassetteboy [b]) is drawn from the Dean Martin song "Money Burns a Hole in My Pocket" (often sung with Sinatra in Rat Pack performances), which also features the lyrics "money burns a hole in my pocket / how I wish I had oil wells in Texas to keep me supplied / with money while I sit by your side" (Sinatra and Martin), referencing George W. Bush's past and present relations with Big Oil and their influence on the decision to invade Iraq. Similarly, the sampled line "you think you've flown before" (Cassetteboy [b]) is part of "The Best is Yet to Come" and the phrase "you think you've flown before, but you've never left the ground" (Sinatra "The Best"). The song also contains the lyric "I'm gonna teach you to fly" (Sinatra "The Best"), referencing the training of hijacker pilots Mohamed Atta, Marwan al-Shehhi, Ziad Jarrah, and Hani Hanjour (or Nawaf al-Hazmi) at U.S. flight schools.

Further, the first half of the line "I'm mental, and I'm flying the plane" (Cassetteboy [b]) comes from "I Won't Dance," and is part of the verse "when you dance, you're charming and you're gentle / 'specially when you do the Continental / but this feeling isn't purely mental / for, heaven rest us, I am not asbestos" (Sinatra "I Won't"). This verse recalls the seemingly gentlemanly hijackers, the airline-as-point of vulnerability (Continental being another carrier in the U.S.), and the inferno that overwhelmed the fireproofing of the World Trade Center towers, as well as concerns over the potentially harmful collapse plume that lingered over lower Manhattan. Additionally, the second half of the line "let's fly into buildings, let's turn to ashes" (Cassetteboy [b]) is drawn from "What Now, My Love?" and the line "watching my dreams turn to ashes" (Sinatra "What Now"). The song also contains the verse "what now, my love, now that it's over / I feel the world falling all around me / here come the stars, tumbling around me /

there's the sky, where the sea should be" (Sinatra "What Now"), aptly describing the topsy-turvy feelings in the wake of the towers' collapse.

Finally, the middle portion of the line "and now my skin is melting away" (Cassetteboy [b]) comes from "I've Got You Under My Skin," as part of the verse "I've got you under my skin / I've got you deep in the heart of me / so deep in my heart, that you're really a part of me / I've got you under my skin" (Sinatra "I've Got"), referencing the hijackers' presence within the U.S. before the attacks and within the national psyche thereafter. Another verse states "I'd sacrifice anything come what might / for the sake of having you near / in spite of a warning voice that comes in the night / and repeats, repeats in my ear / don't you know you fool, you can never win / use your mentality, wake up to reality" (Sinatra "I've Got"), drawing attention to the hijackers' suicidal devotion, the unheeded warnings before 9/11, and the difficulties of waging a "War on Terror."

Other samples are drawn from "Fly Me to the Moon," "Theme from New York, New York," "Come Fly With Me," "Leaving On a Jet Plane," and "My Way," illustrating Cassetteboy's mining of Sinatra's broad catalogue and use of songs both immediately recognizable and slightly obscure. A closer examination of the song's methodology in relation to the citationality present within Miller's rhythm science will demonstrate the manner in which Casetteboy call upon citationality to facilitate their autoreflexive critique of U.S. culpability for 9/11, with the deliberate choice of Frank Sinatra serving as a foundational masterstroke.

Prior to engaging in a more extensive analysis of "Fly Me to New York," it will be useful to emphasize the song's uniqueness within the field of post-9/11 music as a means of addressing the potential presence of counterexamples. In its assumption, via pilot-hijacker-narrator Frank Sinatra, of the hijacker positionality and the hijacker voice, "Fly Me to New York" is unique (the

closest available approximation being Steve Earle's "John Walker's Blues," which is written from the perspective of John Walker Lindh, an American citizen captured as an enemy combatant in Afghanistan while with the Taliban) in its attention to an underrepresented narrative voice within 9/11 discourse. A seemingly ready counterexample may be found in Neil Young's treacle laden song "Let's Roll," which takes the words of Todd Beamer as the impetus for a recounting of the final assault on the cockpit of United Airlines Flight 93 by its passengers. Though Earle's song operates from a "terrorist" positionality (Lindh being identified as such for his participation in Taliban actions, despite his journeying to Afghanistan in advance of 9/11), and though Young's song functions within the context of an event initiated and characterized by the presence of the hijacker voice, neither engages that positionality in the course of its narrativizing, leaving "Fly Me to New York" as the sole example of its type and therefore without counterexample. Its exclusivity determined, one may now return to an analysis of the song as unique artifact.

Cassetteboy's methodology for constructing "Fly Me to New York" is premised on offense, an offense that jars via its recontextualization of the grave (9/11) into the humorous (a satirical pastiche), the maudlin romantic (Frank Sinatra) into the Muslim ecstatic (the unnamed pilot-hijacker-narrator), a citationality that provokes reflection on the centrality of Sinatra to narratives of U.S. nationalism and, more specifically, metropolitan splendor vis a vis New York City. Chris Dahlen's "The Pop Culture of 9/11" focuses on this methodology in its discussion of the song within the frame of *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States*, with Dahlen asserting that "[w]hether out of bad taste, an attempt at political insight, or because they wanted to take us down a notch, Cassetteboy spliced together a mockery of the disaster at the World Trade Center" (Dahlen[c] 2).

Dahlen provides a shorthand listing of the spectrum of motivations ascribed to Cassetteboy, neatly tracing a trajectory of affect from the rupture of bad taste, the lingering metallic flavor of charred buildings and rung bells, to the trenchant insight (and its implied notch-taking, alongside the bedpost/belt notch of the successfully penetrative hijacker) contained within the song's manipulation of its chosen samples, discarding of the tenets of professionalism and its dictates concerning taste in favor of an amateur, unflinching incisiveness.[157] Elsewhere, in his review of *The Parker Tapes*, Dahlen describes Cassetteboy's methodology in more direct terms: "The guys break things up with dozens of music clips and remixes, from hip-hop to pop, making for a kind of post-modern vaudeville, and they construct each voice track with attention to rhythm and flow" (Dahlen [b] 2). Song and dance men of a sort, Cassetteboy provide the choreography of the plot, following the pilot-hijacker through his daily rounds, bringing an airiness to the narrative that simultaneously lets the air out of the U.S.' bombastic sense of immaculate victimhood. Further, the particular attention to rhythm and flow reflects a kinship with Miller's rhythm science, Cassetteboy themselves engaging in a surgically precise editing of samples that yields a fluid neo-narrativity from the ruins of the accepted narrative of U.S. victimhood.

The decision to base "Fly Me to New York" around Frank Sinatra samples, principally those drawn from the songs "Fly Me to the Moon" and "Theme from *New York*, *New York*," stands as the first and perhaps most affecting transgressive step taken by Cassetteboy, a step that proves particularly jarring to the U.S. psyche. Given his rise to prominence in the run-up to, during, and shortly after World War II, Sinatra is inseparably linked to ideas of American

---

[157] Mike Bollen, creator of "Fly Me to New York," describes his motivation for creating the song in terms of a discursive vacuum: "'Fly Me to New York' was created late in 2001/early 2002. At the time, the mainstream media did not seem particularly interested in asking WHY Islamic terrorists wanted to attack America. The terrorists were painted as crazed fanatics, and America was the innocent victim" (Bollen). With this perspective in mind, Bollen aims to complicate the discourse surrounding the event by literalizing the absent presence of the hijacker voice, which also manifests implications of guilt for the listener (to be discussed below).

nationalism, victory, and postwar affluence, making his fragmentation into sampled lyrics and

reconstitution into a hijacker narrator especially affecting.[158] Dahlen reinforces this point by

stating that "nothing is as profane as when they [Cassetteboy] retell the events of the day from

the hijackers' point of view, by splicing together clips from New York icon Frank Sinatra"

(Dahlen [c] 2), demonstrating the unusual sanctity accorded to Sinatra (especially given his

relatively seedy past with alleged ties to organized crime figures) and his iconic status at both the

New York City and, by proxy, national levels. The description of Cassetteboy's manipulation of

Sinatra, a cracking open of his often hackneyed lyrics (themselves the work of songwriters,

making Sinatra's speech a first ventriloquism ventriloquized by the spectral hijacker voice), as

profanity also ties his import closely to the linguistic level through the common linkages to

profane speech and deviation from sacred/biblical tenets and their rooting in the primacy of the

Word. Sinatra himself is almost secondary in Dahlen's indictment, as the main complaint

pertains to the voice given to the hijacker's point of view, not the voice taken from Sinatra,

pulled from his throat to pull shapes in the choreographed space outlined by Cassetteboy.

Dahlen gives further credence to the profanity of Sinatra's (mis)use by Cassetteboy in an

installment of his recurring column "Get That Out of Your Mouth" on the Pitchfork.com music

website entitled "Negativland and Cassetteboy Steal Music," redoubling Sinatra's untouchable

status as suggested by his potential mob ties, though he is less an Eliot Ness figure than an Al

Capone in this case. Discussing *The Parker Tapes* in relation to the issue of sample clearance

(the act of gaining permission to use a sample from the sampled artist, to be discussed further

below), Dahlen observes that "[t]hey [Cassetteboy] didn't get the rights to any of the material

---

[158] Bollen speaks to the value of Sinatra to the song's critical stance, stating that "Sinatra and 9/11 were a perfect combination. He is synonymous with New York, and America generally. The message of the piece would not have been as strong using a less 'American as Apple Pie' artist" (Bollen).

and in some cases, no amount of money would have worked – like when they mix lines from Frank Sinatra's greatest hits into a mockery of the tragedy at the World Trade Center" (Dahlen [a] 3). Aside from its upholding of intellectual property rights such that all samples must be cleared with the artists in question, a process that greatly limits the potential for citationality and does much to increase the survival rate for accepted narratives, Dahlen's statement reflects the unthinkable disservice done to Sinatra's music and his legacy by "Fly Me to New York," a disrespecting of his elevated ranking by the rank amateurs in Cassetteboy. What Dahlen fails to recognize is the degree to which Sinatra's particular vision, one of a bootstrap America in which the child of Italian immigrants can scale the heights of fame and celebrity through sheer talent and charisma, is premised on the very sort of exclusionary mythology that so infuriates the ideologues behind 9/11. Such opportunities are not available to everyone or accorded to just anyone, be they members of racial, gendered, or economic underclasses in the U.S. or religious (Muslim fundamentalist) or national (non-global North/western European/predominately white) undesirables around the world, and Cassetteboy's de- and reconstruction and de- and recontextualization of the Sinatran fragments points to the crucial flaws at the heart of the American dream mythos.

Subject to the cut in the act of sampling, Sinatra is also subjected to the perils of poor taste in his citational implementation in "Fly Me to New York," a bitter pill swallowed with a chaser of bile as brought about by rhythm science's destabilization of his narrative. In good taste, "Fly Me to the Moon" would have been excluded from airplay in the weeks after 9/11, much like the songs and artists included in the 2001 Clear Channel memorandum issued after the event (of which "Theme from *New York*, *New York*" was one [Wishnia 3]). Instead, those two songs form the backbone of a scathing critique of U.S. culpability for 9/11, an effort indirectly

saluted by Dahlen: "I just have to hand it to Cassetteboy that not only is the piece disturbingly brutal, but their decision to build it around samples from Frank 'New York, New York' Sinatra is the final nail in the coffin of good taste" (Dahlen [b] 2). If "Fly Me to New York" is indeed the final nail in a nation-sized coffin, one wonders what other spikes found their way into the woodwork (perhaps Toby Keith's "Courtesy of the Red, White and Blue [The Angry American]"[159] and its ever so delicate expression of wounded aggression or, perhaps, the "War on Terror").

Rather than a matter of bad taste,[160] the discourse surrounding "Fly Me to New York" is a question of a taste, a bite, a free sample (unpaid and uncleared) given in advance of a larger serving to follow (after all, you can have a taste for free, but you have to pay for the scoop[161]). The event and its related song are therefore but a drop in the bucket from the flood to come, a fluid de- and recontextualization occurring in accordance with rhythm science's citational liquidity, a daursal portent from the past that, in being consulted through a turning back, provides direction for the future to come. This liquid is bitter at first sip, and is an acquired taste; some find that it goes down quite smoothly, while others prefer more sugary renderings best fit for those young of mind and body. The liquid tastes great from the perspective of critique, is less

---

[159] Keith's jingoist masterwork contains such immortal lines as "[a] mighty sucker punch came flying in from somewhere in the back / soon as we could see clearly through our big black eye / Man we lit up your world like the Fourth of July" and, of course, "[y]ou'll be sorry that you messed with the US of A / 'cuz we'll put a boot in your ass / it's the American way" (Keith).

[160] Bollen again recognizes and responds to this critique, describing the song as "a humorous satirical cut and paste audio collage" (Bollen), a statement seemingly exercising a further poverty of taste, but complicating that description by framing the initial impetus for the song against earlier work: "After 9/11 people wanted us to do something similar [to 'Di and Dodi Do Die,' which will be discussed below], but I wasn't interested. After the initial thrill of excitement, the reality of 3000+ deaths was not something that I felt was ripe for satire/comedy. It was only a couple of months later, whilst listening to Frank Sinatra that I found an 'angle' that had a point to make without belittling the personal cost and tragedies of 9/11" (Bollen).

[161] See *The Simpsons* episode "A Star is Born-Again" for a further elaboration of this point, taken from a speech made by religious neighbor Ned Flanders in response to movie star Sara Sloane's entreaties for further relations after a satisfactory one-night stand.

filling[162] through its use of easily digestible bites of different source materials whose originary

loci are preconditioned for ready acceptance and, though apparently frothy as a collage of

ephemeral popular culture songcraft, is ultimately all head, requiring only a bit of settling to

ensure potability.

<div align="center">HOOKED ON (PLUNDER)PHONICS: SAMPLING THE SONIC</div>

Much reference has been made to sampling above, specifically in relation to

Cassetteboy's treatment of the Sinatra catalogue as source material, where that treatment acts as

a methodology through which citationality may be implemented. With this referentiality in

mind, a deeper analysis of the song's use of sampling and the artists' use of the sampler,

consistent with John Oswald's plunderphonics, serves to enable their recontextualizing efforts in

a manner that spurs reflexive memory in the course of a daursal, retrograde renarrativization. To

that end, an initial look at the particulars of sampling and the sampler will illuminate

Cassetteboy's technique beyond Dahlen's impressionistic reading, allowing for a more

thoroughgoing understanding of the ways in which sampling is ideally suited to the sort of

reflexivity that is the goal of "Fly Me to New York."

Within his discussion of rhythm science, Miller turns to an 1875 essay by Ralph Waldo

Emerson entitled "Quotation and Originality," citing many passages from that piece, though

none more relevant to this argument than the following, written as a defense of the necessity of

quoting: "It is as difficult to appropriate the thoughts of others as it is to invent" (quoted in Miller

68). Emerson's assertion is of value for a number of reasons: first, his attention to the necessity

of quotation serves to foreground the background, that which comes from behind, the

---

[162] This line of discourse follows on the immortal debate between Bubba Smith and Dick Butkus concerning whether Miller Lite may be more aptly described by the slogan "Tastes Great!" or "Less Filling!" which receives its first airing in the early 1970s.

inescapable past whose escapades cannot help but inflect the present, whether solicited willingly or not; second, his focus on appropriation works trebly – in terms of the event itself, the hijacker appropriates cockpit communication protocols in an attempt to subdue revolt-minded passengers, reassuring with the all too familiar language as part of a scenario that is anything but (yet which retains some familiarity via filmic precedents) – in terms of its aftermath, the hijacker voice, now rendered spectral by his disembodiment from the producing hijacker and reembodiment into the ventriloquized listener, is recontextualized into a newly iterative locale as part of his inclusion within semi-fictionalized and documentary accounts of the event – and in terms of Cassetteboy's usage, the spectral hijacker voice is indirectly appropriated through a layered appropriation of the sampled materials; and third, Emerson's reassurance validates the difficulty and merit of the creative act undertaken by Cassetteboy, an exacting arrangement of samples that moves beyond disposable parody (as framed within the discourse of bad taste discarded above) into the realm of legitimate and legitimated discourse. Citationality thus functions not as a mere act of un/attributed borrowing, but instead a burrowing into the depths of cultural artifacts, a fracturing of those artifacts into fragments where the act of juxtaposition performs the critical act without interference from the artist, where no explication is necessary, a critique that remains legible at a glance and upon further review.

Its legitimacy in place, sampling may then be discussed in terms of its relation to temporality, with both the act and its actor (the sampler) serving to detach the sample itself from its temporal particulars while still preserving the trace, an unhooking that hooks the sample into past and future temporalities, broadening its referentiality and critical scope. Given its particularity, its rooting in a specific aural artifact whose conditions of production are often evident in the aural datum itself (including recording quality, medium integrity, instrumentation,

and any number of additional factors), it would seem that the sample is inescapably and thoroughly linked to its originary locus, to the point where temporal mobility would be provisional at best, and where such mobility would be smeared with the markers of time. Yet, as Scanner aka Robin Rimbaud maintains in his "The Ghost Outside the Machine," included in Miller's edited volume, such a temporal non-fixity is inevitable: "Using machines that allow us to replicate and duplicate familiar sounds by 'sampling' them we are already experiencing notions of time and memory displaced from their reality" (Scanner 133). It is the machinic element, as exhibited by the sampler, which facilitates this temporal slippage, producing a multiplicity of copies creating a simultaneity that draws the past artifact into the present, while also establishing a productive capacity that links that artifact to future iterations. What results is not a sample emblazoned with its temporal context for all to see, but rather a more easily recontextualizable sample tagged only with an inconspicuous time stamp, apparent upon closer analysis, but largely absent, which is accompanied by a similar displacement of memory. Where the weight of the memory was responsible for previous displacement, fluidity fills the gap, an unmooring that permits more for the sample, less the bulk of its originary locus.

The sampler not only enables a near separation from the temporal dimension of artifactuality, it also yields a different relation to time itself within the sampleable world. Kodwo Eshun addresses this point in his book *More Brilliant Than The Sun: Adventures In Sonic Fiction*, positing that the sampler is "an anachronizer that derealizes time" (Eshun 57) and, in that anachronizability, creates powerful juxtapositions that auto-critique without annotation. Once sampled and reduced to their incidental time stamps, the samples, as contained in the sampler, may be rearranged in the present with no regard to their specific and respective pastnesses, a recombinant atemporality that results in the future track-in-progress. In the case of

"Fly Me to New York," Sinatra samples drawn from songs dating back to the 1950s are placed next to rap and hip-hop samples taken from the 1990s, with no evident chronology in mind, an achronology that is at once anachronistic in its derealization of time, as well as neo-temporal in its realization of de-time, a detonated temporality that fragments into the coalescent omni-present.

Memory in this environment is therefore attempted, atemporally, without the fixity of an obvious time, a timelessness both without and unmistakably with, though a chronicity that requires a bit of backtracking if that behind is to be foregrounded. "Fly Me to New York"'s memory is similarly atemporal, its time out of joint via the joint venture of alternate temporalities at play in its ranks, an unranked mélange of samples, all predating the event itself, which speak the event from an uncaptured perspective (save for the small clutch of audio recordings, which themselves fail to provide anything approaching a coherent narrative) in a first-person present, which yet exists in a future anterior to the event being spoken. Sinatra's voice comes from the past, individual samples bouncing back and forth chronologically as a function of their narrative rearrangement, into a present that describes an event yet to come, the hijacking as it happens, a future posterior that postdates the event to come within the song by its exterior production after the event.

The samples that compose the song then act not as played memory arising from the play of the de- and recontextualized excerpts, but rather replayed memory, exposing the contents of the sampled songs as having contained the event narrative all along, making the event a present that the past gives to the future, an unreturnable gift legible only through return, a potlatch that

gives without receiving, but which ensures its own reception.[163] As Miller notes, "[s]ampling allows people to replay their own memories of the sounds and situations of their lives" (Miller 29), leading one to conclude that the samples are those aspects of the past that we desire to remember above others. "Fly Me to New York" therefore exists as the narrative on everyone's minds, on the tip of the collective tongue (or at least that of Cassetteboy), waiting only for the amateur, the average Joe, to give it voice, its re-assembly of disassembled constituent parts drawn from Sinatra songs and elsewhere plucking the best from each, playing out the string with a playful highlighting of U.S. culpability. This memory is extant, already contained within the originary loci, locked into its poured plastic frame like a model airplane, potential, linked by hidden threads, waiting for the moment where the pieces fall into place through a falling to pieces, Patsy's pretended non-meeting with spoken name and added flame.[164] Sampling and the sampler offer replayed and remade memory, but only after that play and that made have already occurred.

Sampling is not only a compositional methodology that exists atemporally and amemorially, but also, through its juxtapositionality, a tool through which the listener may engage in self-narrativity and an accompanying self-reflection. In Miller's contribution to his edited volume, entitled "In Through the Out Door: Sampling and the Creative Act," he suggests that "[y]ou can think of sampling as a story you are telling yourself – one made of the world as

---

[163] The notion of the gift references Jacques Derrida's articulation of the same in *The Gift of Death*, where he specifically focuses on the giving and receipt of mortality (including suicide among his foci), as well as Georges Bataille's description of the potlatch in *The Accursed Share*, where Bataille analyzes the power engendered in the giver by the act of gifting.

[164] Patsy Cline's "I Fall to Pieces" offers an interesting narrative of relational collapse, in which the pretense of deficient aforeknowledge references the U.S.' disingenuous pre-9/11 obliviousness to the developing plot and elision of previous contact with *jihadi* elements in the Afghan war of the 1980s ("you want me to forget / pretend we've never met"), its fiery enactment ("time only adds to the flame"), and George W. Bush's proclivity for calling on it again and again that only leads to further damage ("but each time I go out with someone new / you walk by and I fall to pieces") (Cline).

you hear it, and the theater of sounds that you invoke with those fragments is all one story made of many" (Miller 12). This auto-narrativity creates a narrative from already-narrative elements, a selective hearing that draws its excerpts from discrete originary loci at the discretion of the sampler, though not without adherent traces remaining. A narrative is then produced, presumably tailored to the express memorial needs of its creator; a little bit from here, another chunk from there, and voila – this is how it happened – except it is not. Selectivity implies a trimming, a deliberate editing of the past in the present as a means of codifying future understandings of a given narrative, be it at the individual level or a more broadly construed narrativity, and a trimming which ignores the inconspicuous and seemingly innocuous date stamp in the corner, the mark of the trace that is unmistakable if one knows the signs. It is only through a (re)assembly of samples undertaken with a mind to past referentiality (at least in passing), an understanding of the juxtaposed samples as constituting a footnoted text laden with other associations, that accurate narrativity may take place.

The sampler is therefore a revelatory apparatus, its use revealing as much about the amateur sampling agent as the juxtapositionality of the samples has to reveal about their originary loci. Eshun observes that "[t]he sampler insists you know what sounds you love… [y]ou're forced to externalize your taste" (Eshun 57), and this report is indeed so, a shot across the bow of accepted narrativity that reveals the sample as barometer, reflecting exactly how the wind blows without the aid of a weatherman.[165] The sample is loved, is treasured, a little nugget of truth adored in one setting and just as cherished once reset, unsettled though its juxtapositionality may be. It is a matter of taste: along with the good/bad taste discussed above,

---

[165] Bob Dylan's "Subterranean Homesick Blues" acts as a proto-sampler of sorts, its Whitman's sampler of imagery and accompanying early music video featuring a rail-thin Dylan rifling through cue cards featuring the song's lyrics, with an overall message of anti-government paranoia that asserts "you don't need a weatherman to know which way the wind blows" (Dylan), itself a reference to the radical leftist organization the Weather Underground.

the free nibble, there is the externalized taste, the unleashing of one's preferences that makes the samples, if not their specific juxtaposition, the people's choice, an expression of collective will, and thus an in/voluntary self-narrativization that unpacks the realities contained within the originary loci in their new abode. Such self-narrativity, as exemplified in sample selection and arrangement, also creates the potential for self-reflexivity, an awareness of why one makes the choices that one makes, a daursal turning back to the aural origin that interrogates that locus, prodding out the reasons for its coalescence into the sort of unsettling narrative offered by "Fly Me to New York." Taste is out in the open, bitter though it may be, its externality returning the turn to the internal, the impression beneath/behind the expressed, revealing the devices of selectivity.

In addition to its ability to include purely musical/instrumental elements such as drum sounds, vinyl crackle and scratching, and particular riffs within sampled segments, the sampler also enables the inclusion of elements which do not fall into that category, namely voice. Steve Reich, avant-garde composer and early proponent of the sampler, notes this capacity in his contribution to Miller's edited volume, entitled "An Introduction, or My (Ambiguous) Life With Technology": "But samplers are another story. They made it possible to bring in noninstrumental, documentary sounds, like speech, on the third beat of the fifth measure" (Reich 2). The precision of the sampler permits a similarly precise editing of the sampled datum, the surgical rhythm scientist's incision into the originary locus and subsequent extraction of the sample, later to be given traction through its juxtaposition with other such samples. Non-instrumentality also creates a space in which the sample is able to signify not only aurally, as sound producer within a field of mechanically defined productivity, but also linguistically, taking the listener back to the paleo-/neo-linguistics of the trace. This non-instrumentality is at once

documentary, bringing into being a new document of the sampled in its placement alongside other samples, also facilitating a recontextualization of the originary aural datum into new loci where that datum may continue to signify beyond the bounds of its origin. Such is the case with the spectral hijacker voice and his inclusion in semi-fictionalized and documentary film, as discussed above, and such is also the case with "Fly Me to New York," albeit inversely. Where the recorded voice is fractured from his originary context in the event as a means of constructing a narrative of U.S. victimhood in the films, that voice is reconstructed from fragments as a means of constructing an extra-accepted narrative, one spoken from the hijacker positionality and one which calls on the past for a jarring response.

Cited texts, once subject to the act of sampling and its associated auto-return to the source as a means of backtracking the process of selectivity, emit a truth, reverse engineer the recipe of the blended juxtapositionality of the sample-laden song through a seeming narrative flow whose sheen calls attention to the rough waters beneath. Miller's co-authored contribution to his own edited volume (written with Ken Jordan), entitled "Freeze Frame: Audio, Aesthetics, Sampling, and Contemporary Multimedia," discusses this blending: "Referred to as 'remixes,' 'mash-ups,' or 'bootlegs,' digital files of a wide range of recorded material are being cut up and manipulated into entirely new works of art – blending distinct and unlikely source materials into singular creations" (Jordan and Miller 101). The sample-driven song is a mixing of the replay/remake dynamic, remembering the dismembered through a dis-memory of the un-membered bodies, flipping the Sinatran bootstrap myth with a leg up on that narrative, an awareness of recombination that makes evident the fissures before they fizzle away in the neo-narrativity of the song. Miller's reference to the mash-up is particularly useful here, as the mash-up is

typically an interrelation between two artists,[166] a pressing together of disparate ideas and approaches to spectacular end, in that sense akin to the hijackers' face to face with the World Trade Center towers. These impacts impact, dent the dentin, hunker down in the jaw, inflame the oral and aural, withhold their wisdom until revealed via the cut, a crude blending that only draws attention to its own crudeness, bubbling beneath the surface.

The seeming seamlessness of the samples can only call into question its own sheen, shown to be nothing but a veneer that functions as a part of sampling's auto-reflexivity. Speaking of the (re)mix, Miller asserts its purpose as "creating seamless interpolations between objects of thought to fabricate a zone of representation in which the interplay of the one and the many, the original and its double all come under question" (Miller 33). This seamlessness is consciously constructed as a false space, its seams all too evident, a hyperbolic smoothness that only draws attention to the sanding that must have been necessary to produce it and the erasures that sanding entails, a seamy proceeding that acts reflexively. It is in the overattempt, the altogether too smooth, that a similar overreaching is emphasized within accepted narrativity; as the narrative of U.S. victimhood elides much to say little, the alternate narrativity engages in a hyperelision, an obvious oversmoothing that roughs the drafting process, letting in some air and airing a bit of dirty laundry at the same time. Cassetteboy manages such an airing with little airplay, "Fly Me to New York" acting as a differential narrativity which, in its proximal smoothness, draws the ear to its cracks, its edits, an editorial comment, the correction appended in the next day's issue.

---

[166] This interrelation is exemplified by the 2004 Danger Mouse project *The Grey Album*, which overlays instrumentals created from samples drawn from the Beatles' 1968 album *The Beatles (The White Album)* and Jay-Z's 2003 album *The Black Album* (Danger Mouse).

285285

Deliberate citationality, a pull quote pulled from the originary locus that yet pulls the listener back to that locus, and hyperbolic seamlessness find common ground in John Oswald's plunderphonics, where extant recordings are taken without permission, or plundered, pirated, hijacked, and then altered to produce new compositions through a uniquely agentic methodological (b)latency. Oswald's foundational piece "Plunderphonics, or Audio Piracy as a Compositional Prerogative" sets out the parameters of plunderphonic methodology by offering an added dimension to the sampler: "A sampler, in essence a recording, transforming instrument, is simultaneously a documenting device and a creative device" (Oswald 1). In its role as recording device, the sampler is passive, impressed upon and utterly unimpressive, subject to the whims of the subject who dictates terms in the act of dictating, reproducing sound without adding production. However, in its role as creative device, the sampler is active, impressing on all counts, capable of subjecting the subject to alteration in accordance with its own desires (or those of its operator), producing produced sound. Given that plunderphonics concerns itself with preexisting pieces, the sampler allows the operator-listener to talk back to the recording, to effect change upon and through it; though not present at the creation, the sampler allows the operator-listener to book a seat for the recreation, a playtime that makes the operator-listener not simply an engineer/tape op, but a producer, with appropriate credits and accompanying agency.

The plunderphonetic sampler, as utilized by the agentic operator-listener, becomes itself agentic through its contributions to the manipulatory enterprise, and is thereby able to exercise control over the recording to such a degree that it has a say in the discourse that is produced by its own operation. Accomplished musician and critic Chris Cutler's "Plunderphonics" offers an analysis of this phenomenon, praising the duality identified by Oswald and noting the participatory dimension inherent to the sampler: "At last here is a musical instrument which is a

recording device and a performing instrument – *whose voice is simply the control and modulation of recordings*" (Cutler 367). Where Cutler seems to suggest that the sampler remains comparatively unvoiced as read against more conventional instrumentation, which possesses a given tone or timbre in accordance with its particular physical properties, admiring its simplicity while oversimplifying its duality, the sampler is instead voiced, a vocal apparatus whose ability to manipulate recordings gives it voice. The sampler plays doubly: unlike the instrument, which is played by its operator and which then emits sounds based on those actions, the sampler is first played, then plays, its operator triggering its functions, then leaving the sampler to play the recording in a manipulatory manner. As such, the sampler is endowed with an agency, an ability to direct the recording that places it alongside its operator (also allowing the operator to retain amateur status, no virtuousity being mandatory for sample manipulation), the two being co-composers of the piece, and the sampler maintaining a joint status as both instrument and instrumentalist. Much like the spectral hijacker voice exerts control over his capture in recordings through its intervention in event citationality, exercising an inhabitational agency, the sampler acts while acted upon, its passivity being something of an act, or perhaps the first act of a longer (re)production.

This plunderphonetic sampler is at once latent in its vocality, its voice being recombinant, relying on ventriloquy of the inhabited tongue that suggests a voiced silence, yet blatant in its use of the selected voice, counteracting the often unapparent citationality within the realm of music. Oswald asserts that "[m]usical language has an extensive repertoire of punctuation devices but nothing equivalent to literature's " " quotation marks" (Oswald 2), and so if the musical citation is to be recognized by anyone other than the musicologist, it must be more immediately apparent, its parent more directly legible, its referentiality more overtly (ir)reverential. Cassetteboy's

decision to use Frank Sinatra samples stands as an exemplification of this necessity, as from the first notes of the opening sample, drawn from "Fly Me to the Moon," Sinatra's voice is unmistakable, with even the armchair listener immediately recognizing Ol' Blue Eyes on the mic. The citation is further literalized by the relative abruptness of the transitions between samples, a featuring of the fissures that revels in the plunder, the brilliant obviousness of the exercise, an aural manifestation of the cut that refers back to the compositional methodology, while also suggesting participatory interstices for critical interventions.

Consonant with the paleo-/neo-linguistics of the rhythm scientist's citationalist approach to the sample, plunderphonetics calls on the terminology of linguistics to describe itself, outlining a citationality less Derridean than deriding, deplaning plainly through a conceptualization of plunderphony. Oswald identifies the constituent parts of a plunderphonic piece as "plunderphones," defining them thusly: "A plunderphone is a recognizable sonic quote, using the actual sound of something familiar which has already been recorded… [t]he plundering has to be blatant though" (quoted in Igma 1). Plunderphonics is therefore a blatancy latently enacted, the sampler active but absent, the sample acted but reactant, alchemically combined as per the rhythm scientific method. In the place of polyphony, the many voiced, there is instead plunderphony, the commandeered voice, an aharmonic meeting of speechifiers in the obvious theft, the hijacked vocality, an extension of Allen Weiss' radiophony moving radially beyond the radio that captures the spectralizing hijacker voice into film, into music, into sound. The tension between the obviousness of the citation and the non-obviousness of the citationality exceeds the bounds of the Derridean, bounding over the barriers of the present to encompass the past and future, expanding its referentiality by iterating the sample.

Plunderphonics, as used by Cassetteboy, iterates the sample differentially, subjecting it to use that desubjectifies its originary intentionality in a manner that is all too fair, an obviousness that enables the sample to defer its presentism via a daursal consultation of pasts and futures. In being sampled, the sample appears again, adds to its originary locus a new locale that paradoxically fattens, broadening differentially through a seeming sameness. Cutler usefully states that "[w]hen 'the same thing' is so different that it constitutes a new thing, it isn't 'the same thing' anymore – even if… it manifestly is the 'same thing' and no other" (Cutler 359). Through referring in this passage to the copyright difficulties that plague plunderphonic pieces, Cutler's understanding applies also to Cassetteboy's iterativity: the differential rearrangement of the Sinatran same thing is such that it constitutes a new (same) thing, a novelty that still refers to its originary locus, which is in fact premised on that referentiality as being central to its critique. The Sinatran sample/same is the same save for the time stamp, which endows it with a differentiality that necessitates a turning back to the originary locus, a daursal consultation of the perfectly aged and ever aging aural. Obviousness of sample in this case fails to produce an accompanying literality of sampling, the same same becoming the different same, the Sinatran originary piece arriving for a post-preliminary hearing where the arrangement may differ, but the song remains the same.

In its obviousness, "Fly Me to New York" refers, makes its citationality known, creates a present narrative, though that narrative presents itself immediately as excessive, not so much against criteria of good taste, but instead against temporal limitations, establishing a duplicity of signification that falls into the category of daursality. Cutler describes this duplicity in relation to plunderphonics, a methodological statement that reinforces the agency of the sampler: "Plundered sound carries, above all, the unique ability not just to *refer* but to *be*; it offers not just

a new means but a new meaning" (Cutler 364). The plunderphonic piece, in this case "Fly Me to New York," operates not only referentially, as suggested by its use of Sinatra samples and the associations that adhere to them, as a piecemeal assemblage of samples notable for its seams and seaminess and little else, but also as an original, as suggested by its unique juxtapositionality and rupturing of accepted narrativities, underlining the difficulty of its composition in a manner consistent with Emerson's thoughts on quotation. Much like the sampler that is simultaneously played and plays, the song is a device, a contraption that replays, an oldies station that is surely stationary, but also a (literary) device, a conceit that plays, an alternative station that is anything but stationary, instead being fluid and divisive. "Fly Me to New York" is therefore daursal, calling attention to the past-as-(arti)fact/fiction through its use of Sinatra samples as a means of narrating the past event, to the present by levying a stinging critique of that event in a first person, present tense narrative, and pointing towards the future by exemplifying the sort of resourceful bricolage practiced by al Qaeda in the commission of the event (which merits a Commission of its own a bit later). By mimicking the Master's narrativizing voice in the person of the Chairman, "Fly Me to New York" demonstrates that Cassetteboy has the rhythm business down to a science, hitting all of the high notes and going out on one to boot.

Both the sampler-as-creative tool and the song-as-device are positioned not only as mechanisms of critique but, in their threat to accepted narrativity, function as weapons of a sort, participants in what Steve Goodman defines as the titular "sonic warfare" in his *Sonic Warfare: Sound, Affect, and the Ecology of Fear*. Goodman defines the term thusly: "*Sonic warfare* then, is the use of force, *both seductive and violent, abstract and physical*, via a range of acoustic machines (biotechnical, social, cultural, artistic, conceptual) to modulate the physical, affective, and libidinal dynamics of populations, of bodies, of crowds" (Goodman 10), and the ongoing

analysis accords with this description, the hijacker voice existing as an at once violently physical

producing body and an alluring, spectral force with the capacity to captivate the listening

audience. Elsewhere, Goodman suggests the sonic boom-as-weapon in a discussion of Israeli air

force flyovers of the Gaza Strip and the aural toll they levy on the listeners below, recalling the

booms of 9/11 as the planes approach their targets at pace, as well as the impactful nature of the

associated auralities aboard those planes (namely, the hijacker voice). This voice is "a weapon

that, at times, dispenses with weapons" (quoted in Goodman 105), as asserted by French

philosopher Michel Serres in a discussion of noise, conventional weaponry being dispensed with

in favor of the sampler and song, weapons more concerned with dispensing the aural. Instead,

this aural weaponry fires "'affectiles' (affect + projectile)" (Goodman 83) which, in their

infectious aurality, alter the listener via inhabition, the al Qaeda-affiliated missives of 9/11 taking

on the status of missiles, returning the volleys of past attempts[167] and beating the U.S. at its own

game.

<center>MASH NOTES: MIMICKING THE RUBBLES</center>

Cassetteboy's plunderphony and its ability to citationally re-narrate the event through a

rhythm scientific recontextualization of an obviously fragmented neo-/paleo-linguistics gives

"Fly Me to New York" a significant critical bite, one which, at an abstract level,

methodologically resembles the machinations of al Qaeda while maintaining sufficient distance

for a renarrativization that gives form to a new rubble music, a daursal production of the future

composed of the present and past. Turning first to the question of methodology, though Miller

equates the mash-up with the remix and the bootleg above, drawing no specific lines between

---

[167] During the Clinton administration, in response to the 1998 embassy bombings in Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania and
Nairobi, Kenya, cruise missiles were fired at al Qaeda bases with the intent of assassinating Osama bin Laden
though, due to a combination of shaky intelligence and possible forewarning by Pakistani officials, bin Laden lived
to fight another day (one in particular, actually).

what are relatively discrete phenomena, Cassetteboy reject the mash-up label as epithetical, a pathetic and/or apathetic tagging of their work as a mere overlaying or minor juxtaposition of two disparate artists, not the more thorough intermixing of a number of artists and a number of samples from each artist heard in "Fly Me to New York." In a May 26, 2009 post to the Cassetteboy Wordpress blog entitled "Gordon Brown/Obama videos" and concerning two recent videos composed by a tight reediting of speeches by British Prime Minister Gordon Brown and U.S. President Barack Obama, Cassetteboy express their displeasure with the label: "According to the accompanying blurb, I'm a 'mash-up artist,' which I'm not sure I'm too keen on… [m]ashing is what you do to potatoes, a simple pummeling process that a caveman could do. I'd like to think that the work that went into these videos was a bit more sophisticated" (Cassetteboy [c] 3). As Emerson maintains above, the act of quotation, of citation, of sampling is far more sophisticated than typically perceived, an amateurism that yet calls for a professional of sorts, the professor of rhythm science, the speaker of the Word, within that amateur discursive space. The cutting and rearranging of a given text is not the province of a rock-wielding Neanderthal and the result of a singular impact, the collision of artist on artist or plane on tower, but rather that of the rhythm scientist, the result of a number of micro-impacts evident at each site where the speech is cut and each site where it is sutured again, at each intervention of the spectral hijacker voice.

In addition to performing a similar decentralization of the literal impact of the event into a number of ongoing micro-impacts that exceed to temporal limitations of the event in itself while remaining individual and individualized events in themselves, Cassetteboy's methodology also resembles that of al Qaeda in terms of their online presence. Jon Nelson discusses Cassetteboy's low profile in an entry to his blog "Some Assembly Required: Tape Manipulations, Digital Deconstructions and Turntable Creations," noting that "[f]or the longest

time, this was a group so underground that although their work had been well received, no one

knew who the heck these guys actually were. That is to say, their online presence has been

shrouded in mystery and misinformation" (Nelson 1). Out of context, de- and then

recontextualized, citationalized into a discussion of al Qaeda, Nelson's statement holds true,

reflecting the commonalities between Cassetteboy's efforts to create anonymously, to act

notoriously, and al Qaeda's likeminded desire to operate under the literal and figurative radar

and to bring glory to the *jihadist* movement, both retaining an anonymity that refers amateurly,

an evasion of celebrity that accordingly evades professionalism.

Beyond the methodological parallels evident in Cassetteboy's tightly managed online

presence, additional similarities to al Qaeda may be located at the level of target selection, where

a desire to confront the seemingly inappropriate in a not so appropriate manner finds precedent

in Cassetteboy's back catalogue, a daursal lineage that manifests itself once more in "Fly Me to

New York." The first appearance of this methodological striking at the symbolic heart of a

nation dates back to fall 1997 and the death of Princess Diana, an event which spurred

Cassetteboy to create the song "Di and Dodi Do Die," composed from edited samples drawn

from televised and radio broadcast tributes to the fallen princess. Rather than taking that tragic

event as cause for a moment of national mourning, Cassetteboy instead decided to act, with little

mind to the relative sanctity of the situation: "Sod her lads, this is great material" (Cassetteboy

[a] 1).[168] In so doing, Cassetteboy set a precedent for swooping in upon moments of national

misery, however misplaced or overblown, to gather raw materials for their productions, taking

---

[168] Bollen describes the song in dialogue with the initial calls for a 9/11 piece, noting that "[w]ithin 24hrs of Princess Diana's death myself and my Cassetteboy colleague had made a track called 'Di and Dodi Do Die.' This was a bad taste collage of news samples about Diana, an antidote to the cloying, hypocritical, insincere tributes to her that dominated the media at the time" (Bollen), positioning the similarly minded "Fly Me to New York" as a medicinal counterpart (albeit one with a longer gestation period).

293

the pulse of the country as a portion of its pulse ebbs, and allowing the blood spilled across

media outlets to pool into a fluid renarrativization at the hands of the sampler. That this pattern

should repeat itself in the case of 9/11, an event of greater magnitude, albeit different national

referentiality, is no surprise.

Much as al Qaeda strikes at soft targets, not so much looking to inflict damage upon the

literal defenses of a country, including military outposts and government officials, but rather the

figurative defenselessness of a country, as underlined by civilian attacks upon symbolic

locations, so too does Cassetteboy in placing Princess Diana and 9/11 within its sights. There are

few softer targets than a nation in mourning, a nation that has placed certain topics off limits

during a period of post-trauma, a nation content to lick its wounds and to lap up narratives of

victimhood and valor, and Cassetteboy do not miss their mark, trimming away the pretense

around each event and exposing what lies (are) beneath. The Middle Eastern meets Western

mash-up present in the death ride of Egyptian department store and hotel heir Dodi Al-Fayed and

Diana Spencer is met with another Occident on Orient pseudo-accident upon 9/11, a similar

targeting of the soft (the besieged celebrity wishing only to fade from the limelight, the pseudo-

innocent superpower doing its best to be an able steward to the world). It is not the harder

targets that are to the liking of al Qaeda and Cassetteboy, but rather the fish in a barrel, the auto-

sacred (whether of wheel or wing) whose offensive re-rendering serves to highlight the offenses

that incur that rendering.

If nothing is indeed sacred, or if nothing remains sacred for all that long, then that

conclusion can only be the result of a probing, a calculated sounding of the event that looks for

its flaws, detects its deficiencies as an efficient way of constructing counternarrativities, a

seemingly offensive act that reveals both the offenses that motivate the pseudo-victimization of

the event and the doubly offensive response that follows. Dahlen identifies Cassetteboy's

particular sonography, a fluid-facilitated ultrasounding of the event that generates scarce

conclusions and more numerous questions: "Cassetteboy found our weak spot – that we consider

9/11 untouchable…[i]n the U.S., 9/11 is sacred. To much of the world, it isn't. Are we ready to

criticize, or even satirize it? If we censor ourselves, how can we even talk about it?" (Dahlen [c]

2). This passage demonstrates the proclivity for accepted narrativity that follows the event, a

national blinkering (or rather deafening) in the wake of the shock, a hearing loss that results in a

ringing, the call to rally round the flag that can only flag over time, as well as drawing attention

to the national distantiation that may enable the Brits in Cassetteboy a different, less

sentimental/romantic/Sinatran perspective than that held in the U.S. (though "Di and Dodi Do

Die" suggests otherwise).[169] Therefore, seeming offense is less offensive to nebulous criterion

like taste than to the according of sacred cow status, calling instead for a knives out scenario

where the aural cut serves to sever the aura around the event, while also speaking its own

language.

That "Fly Me to New York" may be considered offensive is an unavoidable conclusion,

at least if one is willing to accept the terms of discourse essential to typical analyses of taste; that

said, its purported offense is more aptly filed under "offensive, going on the," a card played also

by the U.S. in its actions prior to and in the wake of the event. In a review of *The Parker Tapes*,

Everything2 discussion board participant Hazelnut asserts that "Fly Me to New York" "is

supremely offensive and thus a must have" (Hazelnut 2), placing the offense and the offensive at

---

[169] National identity plays an important role in the compositional process, as suggested by Bollen: "Being British, and therefore not directly involved in the September 11th attacks, I like to think that I can look at the events dispassionately, without letting emotions cloud my judgment. If you see someone being slapped in the face, you will think 'I wonder why he got slapped, maybe he deserved I, or maybe the person doing the slapping is crazy.' If you're the person being slapped, it's hard not to feel aggrieved and angry, no matter what the build up to the slapping" (Bollen). As a national outsider, Bollen is able to avoid the reflexive victimhood claimed by the U.S. and to take a more critical stance.

the heart of Cassetteboy's methodology and the value of its work. Likewise, it is the offensive,

both gone on, taken to, and exercised against the Muslim world[170] that characterizes the U.S. pre-

and post-event. At least when Cassetteboy makes/takes offense, it is only the class of 1997/1998

(Di dying in August of the former, Sinatra in May of the latter) who die, or who are already dead,

if slightly turned in their graves (though the hijacker voice enacts a greater toll); the same is not

true for the U.S. make and take, underlining the centrality of offense to its methodology.

Cassetteboy's choice to resort to offense, to resort the samples it draws from Sinatra and

elsewhere, permits an evasion of accepted narrativity, such that "Fly Me to New York"'s

anthracite[171] humor, a black coal-esence (or coal essence), may be aptly construed as being

something of a postmodern protest song within the new genre of rubble music. In his entry on

the song, included as part of *The Stylus Magazine*'s Non-Definitive Guide to the Pop Protest

Song, Todd Burns states that "[w]ith the aid of sampling technology, Cassetteboy does

something here that nearly no artist has been able to do with a guitar and voice in the past year –

convey the terror, the hurt, the disorientation caused by the September 11th attacks – and

disconnect the jingoistic sentiments that commonly go along with them" (Burns 4). The focus on

sampling technology reinforces the neo-narrative potentiality contained within the sampler,

while also conveying the depth of emotion that may be captured through the seemingly simple

recombinant recontextualization of samples, a depth produced by the daursal temporality present

in the samples' juxtapositionality. Burns finds Cassetteboy to be exceptional, though not for

---

[170] A number of offenses may be noted here: the desertion of Afghan proxy forces after the expulsion of the Soviets from Afghanistan in the 1980s, the exclusion of *mujahid* volunteers and continued stationing of U.S. troops near the holy sites of Mecca and Medina in Saudi Arabia, the perpetual favoring of the Israeli side of the Israel-Palestine conflict, or the invasion of two nations and subsequent problematic detentions in Afghanistan, Iraq, CIA black sites, and Guantanamo Bay.

[171] The choice of anthracite for this comparison reflects the relevance of one of its other names, "blind coal," a deviation from the visual that resonates with the primacy of sound as opposed to the blinkered mono-narrativity of the accepted U.S. victimhood narrative that surrounds 9/11 ("Anthracite").

their supposed offensiveness (exceptionalism being more fittingly assigned to the U.S. pre- and post-event due to its mythic victimhood narrativity); rather, its exceptionality is rooted in the act of disconnection that results from the connection of samples within the plunderphonic construct.

Placing a song like "Fly Me to New York" within the pantheon of protest songs, alongside such venerable institutions as Bob Dylan (whose "Masters of War" and "Blowin' in the Wind" make the *Stylus* list), Bruce Springsteen ("Born in the USA"), and Creedence Clearwater Revival ("Fortunate Son"), seems nearly impossible: how could a song that openly mocks a national tragedy by editing the voice of a national treasure register as anything other than a crass instance of the "too soon" maxim at best, a treasonous act of amateurs only possible in the extra-national space of Britain at worst? This difficulty may be resolved by looking at the narrative positionality of each of the songwriters in question, an exteriority that places the narrator in clear opposition to accepted narrativities, instead offering a distanced perspective much like that found in "Fly Me to New York." As Dylan provides meditations on the turbulence coming from the burgeoning civil rights and anti-war movements prior to and during Vietnam, as CCR casts a critical eye on the prospect of serving there, as Springsteen ventriloquizes an amalgamated vet to portray the actual experience of those who served upon their return, so too does Cassetteboy step outside of the event by stepping into it, claiming the unoccupied shoes of the hijacker pilot, left empty in the course of the devotional act/event, and filling those shoes by narrating a critical reading of the event. Sampling's necessary decontextualization of the citation (though not a complete divorce, with the sample subject to shared custody by its originary progenitor and its recontextualizing projector) creates an auto-externality, an auto-critical positionality that grants a new perspective as a matter of course, though it matters, of course, who renders that new narrative.

The citational act of recontextualization/reassembly/renarrativization is necessarily premised on the presence of fragments, be they the samples extracted from various originary loci or the crumbled remains of the collapsed World Trade Center towers, a rumble that emerges from the rubble into a rubble music, a spectral speech rising from the ashes, redoubling the phoenix of the ignored memo[172] to memorialize the event, though not in accordance with accepted narrativity. A listing for *The Parker Tapes* on retail music website Forced Exposure, one of the few locations that stock the album, references the site of that speech at the World Trade Center site (or "Ground Zero" if you will, which I will not), "under the wreckage of the twin towers" ("Browse…" 1). One can imagine a shattered hijacker, the Sinatran narrator whose desire to "turn to ashes," whose "skin is melting away" (Cassetteboy [b]), is realized in the carnage of his creation where he comes to rest, a carnival of souls with stirring organ (without body) accompaniment,[173] returning via the recording to haunt you down among the rebar and wreckage. In this case, it is the fragments that speak, the reassembled samples and their ventriloquist, the fragmented hijacker, flecks of flesh formatting magnetic flecks on the tape, shifting the Sinatran *bon mot* into his own bon voyage, a leaving never to return that can only return, again and again, in the spectral hijacker voice.

This rubble music critiques reflexively, reconstituting the shattered fragments of a national psyche in the wake of a traumatic event, in this case 9/11. Given his rise to prominence

---

[172] The Phoenix Memo is a memorandum sent by FBI agent Kenneth Williams on July 10, 2001 advising further investigation of students at civil aviation schools in the U.S. after behavior at area schools aroused suspicion. The memo's stated purpose is "to advise the Bureau and New York of the possibility of a coordinated effort by USAMA BIN LADEN (UBL) to send students to the United States to attend civil aviation universities and colleges" (Williams 1). Williams' recommendation was ignored, though the oversight was noted in *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States*, as well as in a whistleblower action by FBI agent Colleen Rowley.

[173] Herk Harvey's 1962 cult classic *Carnival of Souls* tells the story of Mary Henry, who mysteriously survives a drag racing accident only to find herself the subject of repeated spectral encounters in her new position as a church organist, a ghostly return from/to the accident similar to that of 9/11.

in the run-up to, during, and shortly after World War II, Sinatra is inseparably linked to ideas of American nationalism, victory, and postwar affluence (additionally evidenced by his status as recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom from Ronald Reagan in 1985 and a Congressional Gold Medal in 1997), making his fragmentation into sampled lyrics and reconstitution into a hijacker narrator particularly affecting. Such a rubble music establishes a new perspective of self-critique from materials of old that were somewhat deficient on that account, fracturing Sinatran platitudes into their nationally referential components, then recombining them into the narrative of the Sinatran unconscious, everything you always wanted to know about the neo-cons but were afraid to ask Frank.[174] The spectral voice is itself fragmentary, speaking through a tattered voice box, his dispatches patchy at best as they filter through the tons of rubble above, requiring an assembly to signify, an assembled audience to resonate, whether that assembly lies in the reconstituted narrativity of "Fly Me to New York" or the recontextualized narrativity of the pseudo-documentary.

From the blackness of the obscured sky in the depths of the rubble, from the blackout issued against certain non-accepted narrativities in the wake of the event, comes a humor of the blackest sort, Cassetteboy's lingual assault on all matters of taste, less an alkaline saltiness or acidic sourness than a savory umami that saves the spectral hijacker voice from obscurity. As an event of rather colossal import in geopolitical terms, 9/11 can be difficult to swallow whole, requiring a necessary parsing, a parceling into bite-sized chunks that renders the event manageable. The same is found to be true of "Fly Me to New York" by No More Mister Nice Guy blogger Steve M., who maintains that "'Fly Me to New York' really did have the effect (for

---

[174] This neo-narrative is therefore a more relevant version of Slavoj Žižek's *Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Lacan But Were Afraid to Ask Hitchock* (Verso, 1992), a shift from the psychoanalytic/filmic pairing to a more psychotic/phlegmatic one.

me at least) of shrinking the events down to the size of a sick joke" (M. 1). Cassetteboy's song is an illness, a pathogen taken into the body, eliciting an immune response, but a hyperbolic one, a multiply sclerotic attack on the self triggered by the viral song, which is disseminated virally through new media like YouTube (as evidenced by its available video, made by Cartel Communique).[175] In shrinking the event down to a manageable size, the seemingly salutary shrinkage offered by Cassetteboy is instead a misrepresentation, a rerepresentation that presents the present-tense hijacker narrative as a counterpoint to accepted narrativity, a joke that is not funny anymore, too close to home and too near the bone.[176]

The sooty humor of "Fly Me to New York," congealed from the ashes of American flags,[177] blackens the orifices of the listener, a deeper shade of blue comedy that profanes the event through its critical reassembly of the Sinatran fragments and revelation of the potential they have held lo these many years. Fragmentation, the chewable downsizing of the event into something palatable, breaks that event ever downward, into the rubble, the flesh strip, the cell, both the hijacker organization (the Hamburg Cell[178] at the root of the plot) and the bodily constituent, a reduction to the post-mortem mortal that turns, that returns, to the pre- or neo-natal, the spectral hijacker voice birthed from the national loins, a dark co/untinent consonant with that seen and heard in "The Long Afternoon." This fragment is zygotic, changing quickly

---

[175] The video, available on YouTube and on the Cartel Communique MySpace profile, edits clips of Sinatra singing each of the sampled lines, also including images of the World Trade Center towers before, during, and after the event (Cartel).

[176] The Smiths' "That Joke Isn't Funny Anymore" is an apt choice, its assertion that some humor is "too close to home / and it's too near the bone" resonating with the relative novelty of such an even on American soil and its production of and proximity to the victims' bone fragments (The Smiths).

[177] These ashes are portrayed to some effect in Wilco's 2002 song "Ashes of American Flags," from the album *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot*. The album more generally contains several references that prove chilling after 9/11, including attention to tall buildings, death, war, and heartbreak, and "Ashes" follows suit, concluding with the verse "I would like to salute / the ashes of American flags / and all the falling leaves / filling up shopping bags" (Wilco).

[178] Composed of eventual hijacker pilots Mohamed Atta, Marwan Al-Shehhi, and Ziad Jarrah, as well as al Qaeda liaison Ramzi bin al-Shibh and a number of others, this group provided a valuable resource of individuals familiar with the West who could blend in relatively inconspicuously, as chronicled in Antonia Bird's 2004 film *The Hamburg Cell*.

into a blastomere,[179] blasting through the rubble in the days after the event to emerge fully

formed, incubated by the still simmering fires beneath the towers, acquiring speech early with

the first words "we have some planes," the plane-hung mobile giving way to the mobile phone to

the immobilized nation. The joke may be sick, at least in the opinion of those of a certain taste,

but the spectral hijacker voice that creates and is created by it, which perpetrates and perpetuates

it, is hale and hearty, heartened by his successes and hard-wired into narratives of the event, both

accepted and otherwise, haunting happily without a care in the/this world. The past is present is

future, referring as it refurbishes, checking out its new digs before its old ones are dug from the

bathtub at the World Trade Center site, a fluid space for a fluid voice.

Returning to rhythm science, the rhyme and reason, the marshaled beat that beats back

the drums of war, involves a turn to the old, a daursal consultation of the past in the present to

dictate the future, and a turning out of rubble music, loosed onto the streets to inhabit at a

cultural level. Jordan's contribution to Miller's edited volume pays heed to this turning/turned

back in its focus on the scrutiny given to individual performances as a product of recording,

stating that recordings "become landmarks in time, representing more than an aural experience –

they exhibit a lost way of being in the world" (Jordan 253). With this linkage to the lost way in

mind, Cassetteboy's Sinatra samples refer to a different time, a pre-professionalism, the wartime

and post-World War II oscillation from rationing to plenty, a "My Way," a looking back without

anger, but with some regret. This connection also recalls the landmarks attacked on 9/11, the

World Trade Center towers (whose early conceptualizing dated to 1946 ["Dewey" 1]) and the

Pentagon (whose groundbreaking occurred on September 11, 1941 [Goldberg 44], just months

prior to 9/11's fictive analogue, Pearl Harbor), whose targeting exceeds mere aural experience,

---

[179] The blastomere is the cell type that follows the zygote upon further divisions, and is subject to mutation, much like the U.S. genome.

acting instead as a throwback to the pre-blowback period prior to 9/11, when questionable

foreign policy decisions had yet to wing their way back to roost stateside.

That Sinatra's mellifluous croon should be the voice that tugs at the heartstrings, pulling

the listener back to the old ways, is not coincidental; alongside Cassetteboy's more symbolic

selection on the basis of national referentiality, there is the simple observation that Sinatra is

something of a sweet-talker, cancelling out the bitter taste of Cassetteboy with his own swoon-

inducing renditions, surrendering his person and suggesting a saccharine surrender in songs such

as "Fly Me to the Moon" and "The Way You Look Tonight." Eshun finds a similar phenomenon

to be present in the songs of Parliament/Funkadelic, what he terms "phonoseduction," where "[i]t

creeps in under the cover of nonsense, rearranges the furniture of your mind, leaving you feeling

probed and palpitated" (Eshun 144). The sweet nothings of the plunderphonic lover, of the

sinister Sinatra recontextualized into the hijacker narrative, are whispered into the listener's ear,

spectral whisps that carry the listener away as they fall for the felling blow and its agent, the

agentic samplespeech of "Fly Me to New York." Such seduction sucks one in, against her/his

better judgment, reminding that all is fair in love and war, that, as dictated in an al Qaeda

training manual, "necessity permits the forbidden" (Venzke 76), that simply being along for the

ride still makes you an accomplice. The rubble speaking through Sinatra rubs the right way, a

genius of love that calls on past memories in a pulse-pounding present that promises a bright

future in the flaming passion to come, a high-altitude *danse macabre*, a "Dancing on the

Ceiling"[180] that brings Sinatra's lover, the listener, to him in a dream state, spectrally pirouetting

---

[180] Appearing on Sinatra's 1955 album *In the Wee Small Hours*, "Dancing on the Ceiling" narrates the dream appearance of a distant lover above the narrator's bed, his restlessness offset by the lover's dancing: "she dances overhead / on the ceiling near my bed / in my sight / all through the night" (Sinatra "Dancing").

above, a presentism of the past that bodes well for future encounters, for a second date, for a reprise of the aurally ecstatic.

The sampled voice, the Sinatran segment, gains access via its familiarity, seduction facilitating inhabitation, the seemingly deceased aural instead calling for an ineffectual cease-and-desist order to stanch its flow. "Fly Me to New York" therefore exists as what Goodman dubs "the sonic equivalent of déjà-vu (déjà-entendu?)" (Goodman 133), the already heard but never (to be) seen, as "earworms" (129), a subterranean agent of infiltration which locates its habitus within the listener and makes itself right at home. These earworms themselves create additional symptoms, coalescing into "'stuck tune syndrome,' the effect of a seemingly innocuous piece of music lodging itself in the brain and refusing to leave" (146), the well-worn Sinatra of old wearing a new wormhole, linking temporalities between its created past and its creative present, and inserting notions of U.S. guilt into the discourse surrounding the event through an extension of the critical positionality of the hijacker voice's extra-accepted narrativity.

The rubble-induced turn, the disassembly of the preexisting structure and its disassociation into a dissociative state yields an identity disorder, a fracturing of accepted narrativity at the hands of Cassetteboy's citationality, an omnipresence of the past and future in the present such that the aural is daursal, a full spectrum hearing that operates at 360 degrees, encompassing the dorsal, ventral, and lateral. This omnipresent present, presented with past and future in the form of reciprocal gifts, resembles Miller's attention to Adrian Piper's "indexical present," where Piper "attempt[s] to draw the viewer into a direct relationship with the work, to draw the viewer into a kind of self-critical standpoint which encourages reflection on one's own responses to the work" (quoted in Miller 85). Though Piper's conceptualization is rooted in the

realm of visual art, as noted by his focus on the viewer, the same sort of indexicality is present in the aural, where the rumbling rubble and its citational speechifying similarly attempt to draw the listener into a reflexive relation to the spectral hijacker voice. Cassetteboy's Sinatra references are large, they contain multitudes, not only the sizeable audience for Sinatra himself and for the canonical songs excerpted, but also for their extension into the past and future, a neo- and paleo-linguistic atemporality that ventriloquizes as it is itself ventriloquized.[181]

In extending into the past and future via a separation from temporal limitations, citational sampling, as practiced by Cassetteboy in "Fly Me to New York," expands sound as well, broadening the scope of recognized speech more specifically and aural datum more generally, and thereby widening the discursive space to include a music of the spheres, an inaudible audibility present in the rubble and its own music. Speaking of the benefits of certain recording techniques, Eshun reminds that "[c]lose-miking expands the field of hearing. Perception blows up and in the ruins, the listener goes travelling, climbs the desolate rubble of headphone consciousness" (Eshun 112), and this field expansion is present in the case of rubble music as well. 9/11 as aural event shorts the circuits, exceeds the limits of perception in a patent failure of imagination, forcing the listener to seek other locales, other auralities where it may find a suitable narrativity that will enable it to reconcile the event, settling finally on the still-settling fragments of the collapsed World Trade Center towers, in the rubble that gives up the spectral voice after giving up its own structural integrity. Headphone consciousness, the exclusionary

---

[181] This ventriloquism, in which the listener is spoken through by (and therefore speaks) the hijacker voice, leads the listener to revelations concerning its culpability in relation to 9/11, as intended by Bollen, who variously observes that "[t]he fact that America had 'never stopped bombing in Iraq' wasn't really known, or talked about. So although America didn't actually ask 'What have we done to deserve this?' 'Fly Me to New York' tried to answer that question" (Bollen), as well as that "America brought 9/11 on itself through its aggressive foreign policy and cultural imperialism" (Bollen). Though the listener indeed does not pose the question of culpability as such, its yen for a complete understanding of the event contains an implied inquiry into culpability, with the initial outward attribution of guilt soon following the hijacker voice's turn inward.

privileging of the aural above other senses, narrows this search, letting the spectral hijacker voice ring true as he sounds the disintegration, the citationality of plunderphonic sampling manufacturing a structurally sound neo-narrativity whose ribs may be visible in the retained fissures, but who promises to have a longer lifespan than the aluminum cladding of the departed towers. "Fly Me to New York" therefore speaks through the rubble, for the rubble, after its commission but during the mission, making the spectral hijacker voice and his hijacker always already present through the present-tense narrativity.

We have come to the end, an end that has no end,[182] as the citation atemporalizes the quotation and its quotee, a quotidian perpetuation of the perpetrator in the person of the inhabited listener, rendered so by Cassetteboy's "Fly Me to New York." There is repetition in the music, and we are never going to lose it,[183] as the citational iterativity finds its way into culture through inclusion in the discourse surrounding the event, never to return but always to turn to the past to inform and inform on the present. Miller traces this progression: "Loop, repetition, loop. The machinic process of creation generates its own fascination. Sounds unfold, organize, and iterate cultures as abstract machines" (Miller 8). This citational iterativity acts culturally, at once revealing Sinatra for the puppet that he is, pronouncing other people's lyrics as his own as others pronounce his lyrics as their own, and reviling him for that capacity. The abstract machine is less abstract than abstracting, the sampler pulling out the salient bits and leaving the rest,

---

[182] The reference to New York City's own, The Strokes, more specifically the song "The End Has no End" and its narrative of bombings, the underground, and cellular miscommunication, serves as a return to the question of taste, given the controversy over the group's song "New York City Cops," intended for inclusion on the 2001 album *Is This It?*, but pulled in the wake of 9/11 from American editions of the album ("New York City cops / they're not very smart" [The Strokes "New York"]). "The End Has no End" begins with the line "one by one ticking time bombs won / it's not the secret of the government that's keeping you dumb," concluding that "the end has no end" (The Strokes "The End"), referencing the seeming advantage of "terrorist" actors, government deception via the USA PATRIOT Act, and the atemporality of the "War on Terror."

[183] As in British postpunk group The Fall's 1977 song "Repetition," which asserts that "we dig repetition in the music / and we're never gonna lose it" (The Fall), repetition acts as insurance against insanity, a repeating that de-sanitizes event narrativity to produce a saner account of the event.

---

producing a thumbnail of the citation and letting it iterate itself through juxtapositionality. This is a Derridean citationality, a Derridean iterativity, though not of the sort seen in *Limited Inc*.

In the case of "Fly Me to New York," Derridean citationality and iterativity occurs inversely; rather than the recording returning in a different context and becoming revitalized and achieving a perpetuity in the process, alternate recordings with diffuse, seemingly unrelated significations are recontextualized into a hijacker narrative, one that, in giving the hijacker's account from his own perspective (rather than the hijacker's fracturing of the narrative context that seeks to characterize his voice as a specter of evil, as seen above), serves to underline the omnipresence of the hijacker gene within the U.S. psyche's genome well before, during, and after the event. As Derrida notes, "[i]terabilty alters, contaminating parasitically what it identifies and enables to repeat 'itself'; it leaves us no choice but to mean (to say) something that is (already, always, also) other than what we mean (to say), to say something other than what we say *and* would have wanted to say" (Derrida 62), the voice being unmistakably ours, the message less so. What occurs is not so much a recontextualization as an original contextualization; where the hijacker voice's earlier inclusions are premised on his service to simultaneous narratives of heroism and basest evil, the actual voice's exclusion and ventriloquism via the Sinatra samples allows that voice to achieve a greater fidelity than his reality would permit. The inversion prohibits the Sinatran speaking back, the triumphant reiteration of his nationalist pageantry in the wake of a trauma, instead speaking back through Sinatra, differentially iterating, inverting and perverting his words into an advert for the joys of hijacking, self-narrativizing, and the immortalizing capacity of the spectral hijacker voice. This speaking back produces a karaoke Sinatra that flips the script offered visually on the prompter, rerendering it aurally as the scroll unrolls, strolling through the paleo- and neo-linguistic space as a walk on the Wilde side, an

ironic ventriloquism that circumvents a carnivalesque venting via repetition. A pseudo-mash-up

acts as a methodological resemblance between Cassetteboy and al Qaeda, a proposed

intermingling of aural citations that enables "Fly Me to New York" to not so much keep up with

the Joneses' accepted narrativity, a U.S. jonesing for a boot of victimhood (then transferred into

the Keithean boot), as the Rubbles, a Jonesian non-happening[184] that mimics the low rumble of

collapse and its echo in the rubble voice.

---

[184] Dylan again speaks to the particulars of this alternate knowledge, following on his distaste for meteorology by noting "something is happening here / but you don't know what it is / do you, Mister Jones?" in his "Ballad of a Thin Man" from the 1965 album *Highway 61 Revisited*, suggesting the lack of knowledge about the forthcoming plot and the accompanying lack of knowledge concerning its aftereffects held by the listener.

CONCLUSION: VOX AETERNA

A long time coming, this conclusion is less a dénouement, less a deciphering of the twists and turns of the (9/11) plot, than an unwinding, an unraveling of accepted narrativity as the hijacker voice unfurls himself, stripping away the visual referents so clumsily attached to him so that he may float where the wind may take him, rewinding in perpetuity, ad infinitum, ad nauseum, the listener losing its lunch as it loses its voice. Thus far, the filmic ministrations of *The Flight That Fought Back*, of *Flight 93*, of *United 93*, of *National Geographic: Inside 9/11*, have proven unable to hold sway over the hijacker voice, instead lurching to and fro and provoking the unsettled state of the listener noted above. YouTube shorts "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride" come closer in their approximation of the primacy of the voice, concluding the trajectory from visual to aural outlined in the visual section by rendering the visual at best an unconvincing supplement alongside the voice, a necessary evil that itself problematizes the hyperbolic evil attributed to the hijacker within accepted narrativity.

William Basinski's *The Disintegration Loops I-IV* bring the listener closer still to an understanding of the true nature of 9/11 aurality, their silent speaking spaces counteracting the intended absenting presence of inclusion in the filmic with a presencing absence in sound art. Cassetteboy's "Fly Me to New York" is on the threshold at the culmination of the aural section, looming liminally on the cusp of a pure, implicational aurality, in which the listener's indirect culpability, evidenced prior to that analysis, is revealed to have been always already present, long before and long after the event. It is this elemental aurality, this never-ending and never-commencing inhabitation, that characterizes the purely aural hijacking, the logical conclusion of all that has come before, the auto-condoned critical act that is, at base, all in the listener's head. Through an analysis of Ivan Leudar and Philip Thomas' *Voices of Reason, Voices of Insanity:*

Studies of Verbal Hallucinations, Daniel Heller-Roazen's *Echolalias: On the Forgetting of Language*, and Michel Foucault's *Fearless Speech*, one may hear the hijacker voice as it sounds the death knell of the visual, speaking its truth to and through the listener and setting the precedent for purely aural hijackings to come. This is an optimistic rendering of what might have happened after 9/11, of a form that the U.S.' reaction could have taken, in subtler hands than those of the Commander in Chief of that moment; it is, as well, a roadmap for a coming to terms with the hijacker voice, a move from rejection to dejection, an understanding of the critical intervention offered by that voice, no longer spurned, but heard.

<div align="center">STARTING, OFF: BEGINNER'S VOICE</div>

From the first, there is something amiss with the hijacker voice, his erroneous visualization that facilitates his inhabitation of the listener being something of an embarrassment, a taboo subject glossed over by accepted narrativity, a sheen that leaves that listener sheer, transparent, vulnerable, provoking a number of questions that few wish to discuss. Without a visual referent, the voice is internal, all in the listener's head, a chorus of repetitions, variations on a theme, leading Leudar and Thomas to pose two salient questions: first, "how can one hear a voice when nobody in sight speaks?"; and second, "how can the voices which avow feelings alien to me and instigating abhorrent actions be parts of myself?" (Leudar and Thomas 1-2). In the case of the hijacker voice, which is indeed produced without an apparent visual referent, or at best an apparite, spectral one, the feelings he avows in and for the listener are alien, abhorrent, yet of the self, internal to the listener and, though repeated aloud, always resonating in the listener, the voice in the head resisting treatments pharmaceutical and psychological.

This voice, this inner dialogue, the second speaker internal to the first, is something of a bother, due primarily to stigmatization: "In our culture voices represent something that is to be

feared" (129). The listener is therefore silenced by a silence, a voice unapparent to the observer,

infernally internalized, a laughing stock as the hijacker voice has the last laugh, permitting a

hijacking of an altogether different and more impactful sort, the commandeering of the U.S.

psyche. This hijacking dispenses with all of the riffraff, using the cut, the aural intervention, in

place of the physical cut, to insert itself in the discourse, compelling the listener to speak his

mind (the hijacker's) rather than her/his own.

There are varying approaches to this voice, this seeming hallucination, different ways of

handling the unhandlable, that which cannot be touched, which holds no visual-spatial

positionality, though in the end the profusive, effusive hijacker voice demands a hearing, leaving

the listener to seek out a talking cure (a cure additionally motivated by victimhood narratives).

Historically, "[m]ost psychiatrists see the 'voices' as symptoms to be suppressed… and many

users of psychiatric services do indeed want to be rid of voices. Other voice hearers, however,

may want to be able to talk about their exceptional experiences in public" (Leudar and Thomas

53), and it is this desire to go public, against the symptomatic treatment, as an asymptote,[185]

always approaching the hijacker voice but never quite reaching him, that characterizes the

hijacker voice's listener, that motivates the inclusion of the hijacker voice in the discourse of

accepted narrativity, a very public airing of grievances.

Yet, in the manner of the suppression mentioned above, some feel that "[t]he sensible

reaction to hallucinations is to ignore them, not to dwell on them" (67), to avoid the very sort of

repetitive attention upon which the public approach is founded. However, the sensible falls prey

to the sensory, the overloaded auditory circuit burdened by the ever repeating hijacker voice and

---

[185] The asymptote is a fitting reference here in its mathematical relation to the curve, wherein the curve continuously approaches the asymptotic line in perpetuity, much like the listener's inhabitation by and approximation of the hijacker voice.

his internalization in the listener, a breadth and depth of speech that swells the ranks and foreheads of the inhabited, demanding that the voice be let out in an effort at relief, however momentary. It is thus the public option that triumphs, that provokes a venting on behalf of the listener, her/his tongue, lingual and English, proving more or less sufficient for the task, at least insomuch as it has already been problematized by its use in cockpit communication protocol. The hijacker voice, internalized as voice, is also internalized as tongue, in the tongue, gracing every word on the way out, less a killing of the language than a killing with the language.

<div align="center">WHERE IS THY STING?: DEATH LANGUAGE</div>

The talking cure sought by the inhabited listener indeed cures, embalming the tongue and giving it a lifelike quality, a transcendence of the dead letter of the purported language death, the irredeemable corruption of English, by a death language, a tongue relocated into the listener's that similarly relocates the dying. Language itself is predicated on the erasure of the prelinguistic, of the onomatopoeic slurrings of the infant, a deadening noted by Heller-Roazen: "It is as if the acquisition of language were possible only through an act of oblivion" (Heller-Roazen 11), with 9/11 and its physical obliteration of the hijacker voice's producing body proving suitable. Upon the erasure of the producing body, the hijacker voice and its unique, colloquial, grainy English, a sandpaper tongue that wears down the listener's resistance with each application, acquires a new home in the unhome of the spectral, the uncanny specter proving alien to his own body and to that of the inhabited listener, requiring the services of an alienist for proper diagnosis and treatment.

Sent abroad from himself and into the listener, the hijacker voice is a refugee, adrift, a series of stateless statements, though that locale proves something less than unfitting: "Exile, in the end, may be the true homeland of speech" (51). Answering the "exile or death" dilemma

with an impertinent "both," the hijacker voice arises from an initial deadening of its producing body to take up his exile in the taken up space within the listener, not so much an erasure of language as an erasure of prelanguage, of the accepted narrativity that predates the extra-accepted offerings of the hijacker voice. The slate wiped of all of the infantile prattle, all of the schoolyard taunts and dichotomous tarrings, a language is acquired, less the king's English than the hijacker's, a language less killed than killing, which too makes a killing, achieving full saturation of the consumer market without spending so much as dime one of his own on advertising.

Though seemingly arising from oblivion, from the obliviousness of national defense and of an accepted narrativity that would include it in the discussion, the hijacker voice and its English is less an instance of language death than of a death language, a tongue suffused with mortality yet itself immortal. Speaking in disciplinary terms, "[t]here is today an entire field of linguistic studies dedicated to a phenomenon that bears the technical name 'language death'" (Heller-Roazen 57), in which attention is given to the decline and fall of various languages as their native speakers follow the dodo's path. The hijacker voice cannot be placed within the field of language death, as though his initial producing body is indeed subject to a decline in the falling World Trade Center, his resituation in the inhabited listener produces a sizeable body of nativized speakers to carry on his heritage.

There is in fact no language death, with "[w]hat some would liken to a moment of death, in many cases, [being] not an event at all but a threshold, through which every form of speech, in its inevitable 'transition from one linguistic system to another,' must ultimately pass" (68). As such, 9/11 stands as a threshold event, a liminal transfer of the hijacker voice from the hijacker to the listener, a transition from a pre-9/11 prelinguistics to a 9/11 hijacker's English. The king's

English, the dominant vernacular prior to inhabitation, performs its own demise by welcoming the alternate linguistics to the discursive space, enacting "the 'lack of confidence' that some speakers have in their tongue, which can bring them to commit the act bearing the technical name 'language suicide'" (60), the failures of accepted narrativity necessitating a suicidal self-sacrifice at the altar of the hijacker voice. If there is in fact any language death occurring in the context of the event, it is the death of the king's English, the pre-9/11 speech; even that speech persists in the form of cockpit communication protocol, though the words now signify alternately, new definitions added and others moved a bit further down the numerical listing.

Despite the persistence of language, its evasion of the icy grip in favor of an icier grippe, a flu that leaves the throat sore and changes its product, some prematurely mark its passing, though it is the originary tongue that passes, seeming to be of one sort when it could just as easily be heard as the other. In issuing paperwork concerning the language's demise, "it may be that even the most official document of linguistic decease reflects less the tongue to which it is assigned than the convictions of the bureaucrats who produce it" (64), the supposed deadening of the tongue within accepted narrativity saying more about the narrator than the narrated. With this reflexivity in mind, the hijacker voice's placement within accepted narrativity, intended to fix the voice's signification to a pure evil and to finalize its ETA, has more to say about the seeming necessity of such a fixation, which reflects the devisualized, inhabitational mobility of the voice.

The hijacker voice and the accepted narrative are not so different in this respect, each approaching the discursive space with its own particular agenda, each with differing conceptions of truth, more alike than different, perhaps, not so much so as to approach identicality (given the hijacker voice's tendency towards the oppositional and accepted narrativity's tendency towards

the inertial), but enough so to pass, for the hijacker voice to find a home in accepted narrativity and for accepted narrativity to gain the favor of his excluded inclusion. The hijacker voice is therefore an adstrate, "the term coined by [creole specialist] Marius Valkhoff, for those cases in which one language changes on account of the proximity of its speakers to another idiom to which it is related" (79), juxtaposed against accepted narrativity, which is not altogether different from him. In this manner, the hijacker voice and accepted narrative are intimates, the former channeling his message through cockpit communication protocols, and the latter attempting to ventriloquize the hijacker voice to its own stigmatic ends. The hijacker voice is therefore undead, undying, dyed in the pulled wool, his trace endemic to accepted narrativity.

WHAT MAKES ECHOES?: TRACING THE REMNANT

Present in his seeming absence, the hijacker voice and his English resonate long after their supposed deaths, a coterminous ending that yet begins, and an ultimately salutary linguistic ebbing that enables the altered flow of inhabitation. This excessive presence, this existence beyond the circumscribed bounds of the assumed lifespan, positions the hijacker voice as "an echo, of another speech and of something other than speech: an echolalia, which guarded the memory of the indistinct and immemorial babble that, in being lost, allowed all languages to be" (12). The hijacker voice is therefore an echo of itself, of the othered speech only included to perform a characterization contrary to his own ends, and of something other than speech, of the signification beneath the cockpit communication protocol (itself included as a trace of the indistinct and immemorial accepted narrative that, in passing out of hearing, allows other languages [namely the hijacker's English] to be), an echo language that interrupts the narcissism of the listener by rupturing the accepted narrative.

This voice both bears the trace and is himself borne, bringing the declining king's English into himself via cockpit communication protocol, and himself being brought into accepted narrativity, further evidence that "however resolutely one speech may develop, it continues to bear within it elements – traces or announcements – of another" (14), though the announcements dispatched from the cockpits prove more enduring than proclamations of U.S. victimhood. Both tongues, or rather the doubled tongue, the embalmed lingua of the declining king's English that persists beyond apparent death through the spectrality of its hijacker voice, remain as Sigmund Freud's "'speech remnants'… [that] could represent segments of particular conversations, declarations, and exclamations that played a decisive role in the lives of the patients before they fell nearly silent" (138), Atta and Jarrah's offerings being decidedly crucial to the listener's silencing and ventriloquism.

The linkage between fallen silence and phraseological import suggests that the decay of a language, arrested by the taxidermy of liminal change, provides an opportunity in which the remaining phrase may come to gain control over what follows, and this is indeed the case for the hijacker voice. Given the constant flux within languages, always adopting new words and consigning others to anonymity, one cannot keep that language in one's head (unless that language chooses to keep itself there in the form of the hallucinatory voice), with an "analysis of a single moment in the course of a language suffic[ing] to illuminate the sounds its speakers are always already forgetting" (27). That language's course is far from run, the always already forgotten functioning as a decay from use to disuse, a disappearance from the visual to the aural, the memorial, the left for dead leaving instead its traces in the subconscious, to return as the hallucinatory voice.

Rather than dying, the language simply breaks down, still able to compose in its halted depredation, riddled with rot and soft with worms, providing entry points through which what remains may be salvaged, leeches applied to strip the necrotized tissue and revivify the remainder. By "[d]ecomposing the word… [one] could alter one of the atoms… of its sound shape and carry the entire term out of the terrible language of its original utterance and into another" (185), creating a molecular opening for manipulation, one initially seized by the accepted narrative in its attempts to excerpt the hijacker voice to its own victimization-emphasizing ends, but better utilized by the hijacker voice's approach to the king's English, in which protocol phraseology turns the language against itself. That the language can indeed be turned against itself suggests a turning endemic to the language prior to the hijacker voice's intercession, a willing critical faculty geared towards the preservation of truth through a reflexive self-awareness, though that reflexivity soon proves refractory, the criticism being not exactly constructive in the mind of the criticized.

KING (FOUR A DAY): APPRECIATING DEPRECATION

This willing critical faculty, this desire for sanctioned feedback, positions the accepted narrative as self-deprecating, not only through the condoned nature of the critique, auto-arranged by that narrative, but also in relation to the linguistic depredation noted above, the accepted narrative actively soliciting the decay of its own language from within, an action necessary if it is to maintain legitimacy within a democratic system. Michel Foucault provides a thoroughgoing analysis of the auto-approved critical voice in his analysis of *parrhesia*, the Greek notion of protected speech to power, in its first formulation a dynamic of between counselor and king, and later internal to the individual. Speech counts as *parrhesia*, and its speaker as a *parrhesiastes*, "only if there is a risk or danger for him [sic] in telling the truth" (Foucault 16), demonstrating

the inherent danger of speaking truth to power, the sort of danger that might end up getting oneself killed or, in the case of the hijackers, suicided.

For those in positions of authority, allowing *parrhesia* maintains the illusion of public responsibility in accordance with democracy, of a power that is responsive to the needs of its people, that is willing to listen to criticism. Yet, "[s]uch a constitution… is condemned to give equal place to all forms of *parrhesia*, even the worst. Because *parrhesia* is given even to the worst citizens, the overwhelming influence of bad, immoral, or ignorant speakers may lead the citizenry into tyranny, or may otherwise endanger the city" (77), and in light of this problematic broad spectrum endowment of *parrhesia*, certain *parrhesiastes* must be privileged above others, some given free reign, some used limitedly and within specific contexts (like the hijacker voice), and some silenced completely. In this manner, the purported risk of *parrhesia*, at least as it exists prior to the codification of the action, remains, the accepted narrative's vulnerability diminishing as the *parrhesiastes* is, is partially, or is not heard.

The subject of *parrhesia*, the accepted narrativist (the filmmaker/musician and its listener), is itself subject to risk in making itself vulnerable to that *parrhesia*, a vulnerability mitigated by the right of omission, though the deliberate solicitation of linguistic compromise elevates that risk considerably. In taking up the gauntlet thrown down by the thrown voice of the hijacker, the accepted narrativist agrees to the terms of the purely aural (at first calling 9-1-1, then calling the event "9/11"), though its subsequent narrativization, spoken from a position of authority, does not itself qualify as *parrhesia*, despite the victimhood narrative in which it is couched: "It is because the *parrhesiastes* must take a risk in speaking the truth that the king or tyrant generally cannot use *parrhesia*; for *he* [sic] risks nothing" (16).

Non-existent risk makes the accepted narrativist seemingly invulnerable in the course of its narrativizing, able to craft tall tales in single bound, though the inclusion of the hijacker voice within that accepted narrative and the risk that he poses are necessary to establish the wisdom that gives that narrative its authority: "The man who exercises power is wise only insofar as there exists someone who can use *parrhesia* to criticize him [sic], thereby putting some limit to his [sic] power, to his [sic] command" (29). If the accepted narrative is to bear the imprimatur of truth, albeit a truth *of* power rather than the *parrhesiastic* truth *to* power, it must include the *parrhesiastic* hijacker voice in a codified manner, that of the "parrhesiastic contract": "The sovereign, the one who has power but lacks the truth, addresses himself [sic] to the one who has the truth but lacks power, and tells him [sic]: if you tell me the truth, no matter what this truth turns out to be, you won't be punished; and those who are responsible for any injustices will be punished, but not those who speak the truth about such injustices" (32). The accepted narrator extends such a contract to the hijacker voice, to his hallucinatory, internalized aurality, the voice escaping punishment (at least that it does not do to itself) and punishing the unjust, though the narrator's perception that such an act would lead the voice to punish itself is misplaced.

ATTA, PARRHESIASTES: TRUTHJACKING

Positioned as *parrhesiastes*, the hijacker voice, that of Atta and Jarrah, demands and commands an audience, operating outside of but referring to its originary locus and maintaining an at best uneasy relation to the listener, speaking truth automatically and without cease. Arising from the spectral, from the hallucinatory domain of the heard voice internal to the listener and without visual referent, the voice is seemingly absent, though its imbrication within the parrhesiastic contract renders it (omni)present. The inhabiting voice is such that the listener "claims to 'hear' the speech in the absence of the actual speaker" (quoted in Leudar and Thomas

9), audition suggesting a presence where vision registers only an absence, despite desperate attempts at reassignation and deacousmatization. This inhabiting voice operates from a "'footing'… the position from which he [sic] speaks and others listen to him [sic]" (Leudar and Thomas 187), a *parrhesiastic* footing through which the listener, having solicited the hijacker's *parrhesiastic* input, listens while the hijacker speaks, ceding the narrative floor to the hijacker voice and his extra-accepted narrativity.

Once established as *parrhesiastes*, the hijacker voice responds to the individual that solicited him, the seeking listener who desires his inclusion as a means of endowing event narratives with a greater veracity, signifying for a broader audience as well, but more specifically for that individual, given that "hallucinatory voices single out the voice hearer" (206). The audience is therefore fragmented, broken into more easily inhabited individual units, contractually obligated to listen to the hijacker voice and to include that voice in her/his own narrative renderings which, though they may take the voice out of context, cannot take the context out of the voice.

The *parrhesiastic* hijacker voice is an intervention, a cut into the accepted narrativity of the event enabled by the excision of the hijacker voice from his originary context prior to his insertion in the accepted narrative, a removal that grants the hijacker voice a greater mobility while still allowing him to refer to his origin. In his entry into the event, in the unexpected audition of the hijacker voice in the cockpit and over air traffic control frequencies, the hijacker voice ruptures the king's English: "[I]nterjections open one sound system to phonemes that normally lie outside it; and they carry, in this way, a language to a point at which, as [linguist Nikolai Sergeevich] Trubetskoi wrote, 'the usual phonological system no longer holds'" (quoted in Heller-Roazen 17). As such, the hijacker voice opens English to the foreign, to the grain, to

the inhabitational dialect, prising open that English and freeing himself for de- and recontextualization within accepted narrativity.

Within accepted narrativity, the hijacker voice is included citationally, though "to place a term in quotes is to designate a lexical unit that can also be invoked outside of them" (Heller-Roazen 107), the cited hijacker voice, purportedly removed from his context and resituated into a narrative in which he signifies as pure evil, yet retaining a trace of his originary locus in the confusion and polyvocality of the event. Citation and placement within the accepted narrative suggests a deliberate forgetting, an erasure of that which falls outside of the bounds and purview of accepted narrativity, though the hijacker voice may more readily be characterized as Walter Benjamin's "unforgettable," "that which persists undaunted by the vicissitudes of the human faculties of remembrance and forgetting alike" (228). Through his solicitation as *parrhesiastes*, the hijacker voice is removed from the condition of remembrance or forgetting; via inclusion in the accepted narrative, he is remembered (though his inclusion is premised on all but his evil being forgotten), and via partial exclusion through channeling, he is forgotten (though his linguistic intervention renders him always already present). As hallucinatory voice, the hijacker voice is not elective, but rather selective, selected for inclusion and selecting of his inhabitant, furthering the seemingly impossible relation to remembrance and forgetting.

Already marked citationally through his situation within quotation marks, the hijacker voice is further marked by the asterisk, his seeming impossibility as a still signifying phrase within the context of accepted narrativity gaining truth with every repetition. That the hijacker voice could perform such an event as 9/11 is seemingly impossible, a vulnerizing of a powerful state by a handful of supposed fanatics being the remotest of possibilities at best, and yet there it is, the event, the date forever marked, starred as star of national victimhood narratives and as

exception, the rule being freedom, liberty, national defense, blahblahblah. Its phrases are similarly stigmatized, following on Noam Chomsky's use of the asterisk "to mark all such impossible phrases" (115), the hijacker voice bearing the star in each of its hearings.

As impossible utterance, the hijacker voice is radical, not only as a representative of a certain strain of fundamentalist Islam, but also as a "'radically impossible utterance': a statement that, by definition, cannot be strictly true at the time of its perception" (158). Atta's "we have some planes" is such a statement, given that he had no way of knowing if the other hijackings had been performed successfully at that moment, and that awareness of the hijackings was not present until his words had been spoken, and the broader hijacker voice follows suit, not fully signifying until he is included in the accepted narrative following the event. It is not that the hijacker voice is false at the moment of his pronouncement, only that he becomes truer and truer with every repetition, less impossible than imp, extending beyond his positionality to signify more broadly and to offer his truth to the listener who solicited him, a story time missive that bears a specific directionality.

The *parrhesiastic* hijacker voice comes to the listener in a very specific manner, giving his truth to the listener directly and from a subaltern positionality, initially inferior but eventually superior through inhabitation. This voice is both direct in terms of his language use and in terms of his dispensing with mediation: "In *parrhesia*, the speaker is supposed to give a complete and exact account of what he [sic] has in mind so that the audience is able to comprehend exactly what the speaker thinks… the *parrhesiastes* uses the most direct words and forms of expression he [sic] can find" (Foucault 12). Though the account given is perhaps not complete (the hijackers do indeed have their demands met, though returning to the airport is not on the agenda), he is exact and exacting in his use of cockpit communication protocol, easing the listener's

comprehension through the use of that direct language, rather than the 9/11 hijacking scenario, which would not register within extant rubrics of hijacking.

As per the particulars of *parrhesia*, at least the earliest incarnation, "the *parrhesia* comes from 'below,' as it were, and is directed towards 'above'" (18), the hijacker voice speaking from his lesser, marginalized position to U.S. power, though spatially the voice speaks from an altitude to those on the ground. Through his retained trace, the remnant of his originary locus in the event itself, the hijacker voice, though speaking from below, draws the listener back to his abode in the above, at altitude, his voice a knife to the throat, a silencing of the listener's speech in favor of the hijacker's spectral language. This drawing is performed internal to the accepted narrative that gives the *unheimlich*, physically exiled hijacker voice a home in the linguistic exile of extra-accepted narrativity, where a new, more accurate language may be formed to narrate the event. Pulled to his originary locus, the listener is also pulled close to the hijacker voice, an initial proximity that is rendered unnecessary after internalization and its accompanying inhabitation takes hold.

Where the historically older form of *parrhesia*, the more formalized condoned advice of counselor to king, contained an implied distance equivalent to the differing statuses of the participants, the historically newer *parrhesia*, where master/teacher and disciple interact (as exemplified by Socrates and Plato), requires a nearer proximity, though one that is likewise discarded in favor of an even closer relation. As Foucault maintains, "unlike the *parrhesiastes* who addresses the *demos* in the assembly, for example, here we have a parrhesiastic game which requires a personal, face to face relationship" (96), the very intimacy expressed by the hijacker voice in his face to face with crew and passengers and in his residence behind the face of the hallucinatory vocal recipient. If the counselor to king relation represents the initial inclusion of

the hijacker voice within accepted narrativity, his placement in filmic and sonic accounts of the event, then the master/teacher to disciple relation comes closer to the inhabitation practiced by the hijacker voice, being closer, more intimate, face to face yet not within or behind the face (thus far).

However, this proximity does not require the master/teacher and disciple to be on good terms, and in fact suggests that it would be better if they were not: "Indeed, it is much better… that the *parrhesiastes* be someone whom you do not know in order for him to be completely *neutral*" (141). Though the hijacker voice finds himself on good terms with the listener, since he defines the terms of their interaction, the two are indeed not known to each other prior to the event (save for snatches of bumbling intelligence), and are as such strangers. The hijacker voice is then able to offer his extra-accepted narrative from a neutral locale, condoned in his *parrhesiastic* truth speaking and protected from harm as he narrates a more evenhanded rendering of the event, one that complicates the accepted narrative and supplements its omissions. This voice is therefore a model of sorts, a *parrhesiastic* ideal that the listener would do well to heed and follow.

One cannot simply become a *parrhesiastes*; there are greater requirements necessary to that critical positionality, training to be performed such that the *parrehesiastic* individual may exist as an example to all, a model of speaking back to power, like the hijacker voice. In the later version of *parrhesia*, where the counselor to king relation gives way to the master/teacher to disciple relation, as well as in the latest version, where the master/teacher to disciple relation gives way to an internal criticism as actualized by the inner (and possibly hallucinatory) voice, "[t]he *parrhesiastes'* relation to truth can no longer simply be established by pure frankness or sheer courage, for the relation now requires education or, more generally, some sort of personal

training" (73). It is by this criterion that the revolting passengers of Flight 93 are excluded from the *parrhesiastic* realm, the sheer courage of their response lacking the pedagogical basis from which to offer its criticism, as evidenced by their failure at the hands and at the hearing of the professional hijacker.

This training is rigorous and demanding, yielding a disciplined *parrhesiastes* who stands as a model of the *parrhesiac*. Speaking of the Cynics[186] and their desire to exist as *parrhesiastic* models for their listeners, Foucault notes that "[t]hey wanted their own lives to be a *blazon* of essential truths which would then serve as a guideline, or as an example for others to follow" (117), and the hijacker voice functions similarly, its life and speech, emblazoned via the event, underlining the essential truth of criticism and emphasizing the sacrifices necessary to the levying of such a critique. Those who wish to proclaim truth must be prepared to submit to training and to act as a model for those that follow: the accepted narrative and its listener are not appropriately prepared, the untrained ear missing much of importance within the event and excluding much more via narrative elisions; the hijacker voice and his extra-accepted narrative are equal to the task, producing truth not (or not only) because they want to, but because they must.

The *parrhesiastic* hijacker voice cannot do otherwise: he has truth, is truth, and must share that truth with the listener before (and after) he explodes. Possessing an unflagging belief in the veracity of his message, the very veracity lacking from accepted narrativity that necessitates the inclusion of the hijacker voice, "the *parrhesiastes* says what is true because he [sic] *knows* that it *is* true; and he [sic] *knows* that it its true because it is really true" (14). Though

---

[186] The Cynics were a group of influential Greek philosophers, whose school of thought argued against possessions, wealth, health, power, and fame in favor of a life of virtue lived in agreement with nature. Diogenes is perhaps the most familiar of the Cynics.

seemingly tautological on its surface, this statement represents the *parrhesiastes'* exclusive

access to truth, with the listener's exclusion being evidenced by her/his solicitation of the

hijacker voice, after which knowledge and saying follow; truth is, truth is known, truth is said.

Through this relation to truth, the *parrhesiastic* hijacker voice is bound to a telling: "in

parrhesia, telling the truth is regarded as a *duty*. The orator who speaks the truth to those who

cannot accept his [sic] truth, for instance, and who may be exiled, or punished in some way, is

free to keep silent. No one forces him to speak, but he feels that it is his duty to do so" (19).

As a function of his training, the *parrhesiastic* hijacker voice is contractually bound to

tell the truth, as the contract binds the *parrhesiastes* to his truth object. This truth is thus

unstoppable, an inertiatic force that does not stop within the hijacker, continuing on into the

listener as *parrhesia* is internalized in the third and final historical iteration. The hijacker voice's

truth is an instance of *athuroglossos*, "someone… who cannot keep quiet… [who has] 'a mouth

like a running spring'" (63), the fluidity of the destabilized, inhabited king's English pouring

from the visceral and spectral mouths of the hijacker in torrents. Thus, the *parrhesiastic* hijacker

voice speaks his truth to the listener, a truth that the listener seeks out and intentionally includes

within accepted narrativity, indicating a voluntary taking in of the hijacker voice, first into the

externalized narrative space, and finally into the psyche of the individual listener, the outer/other

speech soon becoming internal.

CARE BARES: IMPULSIVE/IMPLOSIVE LISTENING

The move from the initial *parrhesia* of counselor to king to the later internalized

parrhesia is of particular import to the listener, as it is this translation of the critical speaking of

truth to power to the inner monologue, to an extra voice internal to the listener, a seemingly

hallucinatory voice, that facilitates her/his inhabitation by the hijacker voice, an inhabitation that

soon proves less hallucinatory than expected. At first, *parrhesia* remains external to the listener, where "the dialogue through questions and answers is typical" (20), in the manner of the Socratic questioning endemic to the master/teacher and disciple model of *parrhesia*, being predicated on the presence of a second interlocutor external to the listener, much as the hijacker voice's producing body is at first external to the listener. However, the slippage to the internal begins as forms shift to the "*personal* (as opposed to political) *parrhesia*" (56), less a speaking back to a recognized authority figure like the king than to an everyday individual, a diminution of the scope (though not the intent) of the *parrhesiastic* enterprise.

Once more broadly construed as a grandiose critical act, the listener-passenger speaking against the Islamofascist front represented by the hijackers, such grandiosity is impossible given the cellular and fragmentary organization of al Qaeda and likeminded organizations, leaving the listener's best option as individual, personal engagement, though even that seems less about the hijacker than the listener itself. As part of the Socratic questioning identified above, "a practice where the one who is being led by Socrates' discourse must give an autobiographical account of his [sic] life, or a confession of his faults" (96), the listener becomes confessor, her/his listening action and the *parrhesia* in which s/he engages being less about a disclosure of truth to the other than a disclosure of one's own truth, the ventriloquism of the hijacker voice standing as the listener's self-truth. Now begun, the listener's internalization of *parrhesia* can only continue apace.

Following on the Socratic form of *parrhesia*, in which a series of questions leads the more personalized *parrhesiastic* subject to recount its own biography and faults via an airing of internal laundry, that internalization is formalized in the full embrace of the final form of *parrhesia*, in which the listener draws the hijacker voice into her/himself and allows that voice to

speak through her/him. As opposed to the more public initial counselor to king form of *parrhesia*, "*[b]ios* is the focus of Socratic *parrhesia*… [with] [t]he aim of this Socratic parrhesiastic activity… [being] to lead the interlocutor to the choice of that kind of life (*bios*) that will be in Dorian-harmonic accord with *logos*, virtue, courage, and truth" (101), the hijacker voice positioning himself as a model of the appropriate *bios* for the listener, a *bios* founded in the Word and by the truth of the hijacker's *parrhesia*. Though the *parrhesiastic* offering is first external, the hijacker *parrhesiastes* levying his critique outside of the listener's head, that *parrhesia* is quickly internalized as the listener-interlocutor takes the advice to heart, testing the soundness of each of her/his actions to see if they accord with the modeled *bios* outlined by the hijacker voice.

Beyond the initial truth telling to the other, "there is a shift from *that* kind of parrhesiastic game to another truth game which now consists in being courageous enough to disclose the truth about *oneself*" (143), the burden of truth moving from the externalized hijacker voice to his internalization as dialogic participant in the listener's performance of *bios*, the voice holding a seemingly hallucinatory place in the head of the listener, absent yet omnipresent in his superego-like functionality. Rather than the master/teacher to disciple relation, "the use of *parrhesia* is put increasingly upon the disciple as his own duty towards himself" (164), an internalization of the sort of duty that motivates the hijacker to speak, and one that similarly allows the hijacker to speak, albeit through and without the express consent of the listener who, though solicitous of the truth as per the parrhesiastic contract, may not like what s/he hears.

Now internalized as a function of the *parrhesiastic* shift, the hijacker voice is in the listener's head, no longer a dialogue but a monologue, with one real voice (that of the listener) and one seemingly hallucinated one (that of the hijacker), though it is only the hijacker voice that

emerges from the listener's mouth. In the famous case of Daniel Paul Schreber, author of *Memoirs of My Nervous Illness* and subject of analysis in Sigmund Freud's "Psychoanalytic Remarks on an Autobiographically Described Case of Paranoia (Dementia Paranoides)," Schreber's hallucinated internal voice resonates as a "'nerve language' [that] often spoke 'telegraphese,' using grammatically incomplete expressions and 'omitting words unnecessary for sense'" (quoted in Leudar and Thomas 55), in much the same manner as the hijacker voice is relatively terse in his use of cockpit communication protocol, speaking sparingly through mediating technologies (updated versions of the telegraph) and with grammatical imprecision (see Ziad Jarrah's "keep remaining sitting").

This inner speech is not voluntarily received, the once courted hijacker voice operating to his own ends after internalization; Atta and Jarrah's voices "are given an 'impulsive assent' and are allowed to 'triumph'" (Leudar and Thomas 88), the permission slip proffered by the hijacker signed, sealed, and delivered without ceremony. That the listener should respond in this manner reflects the commonly perceived interrogative hallucinatory voice, where "about half of voice hearers reported that voices ask them questions" (199), the hijacker voice establishing a dialectic call and response in which his initial call, a simple "what did I say again?" is met with the listener's regurgitation of the hijacker's phraseology within accepted narrativity. It is impossible for the listener not to answer this question, this Socratic inquiry, as s/he has solicited the questioning and is bound to answer without malice as a part of the parrhesiastic contract, impossibility meeting with an impulsiveness of word as deed.

Though voluntarily seeking out the hijacker's parrhesiastic game as a means of potentially coming to a closer approximation of a truth of the event, the listener is then impulsively drawn into the hijacker voice's own yen for self-expression, which counteracts the

desired marginal inclusion of the hijacker with the marginalization of the listener. Leudar and Thomas identify a number of manners in which the seemingly hallucinated voice may affect his listener, "three modes of influence in interaction – impulsion, compulsion, and reason-mediated influence" (53), the first being of primary interest in this context. Indeed, the hijacker voice also functions compulsively (his placement within repetitive locales as part of his inclusion in accepted narrativity enabling a contrary extra-accepted narrativity) and with reason-mediated influence (his inclusion within accepted narrativity being a relatively thought out endeavor based on a controlled usage), but it is at the level of impulsion, where the hijacker voice pushes the inhabited listener forward, to the narrative fore, as his inclusionary agent, that is most germane to this discussion.

In the case of a female patient and her hallucinations, Leudar and Thomas offer four "criteria of impulsion: They are experienced by her… [t]hey are not under her control and appear spontaneously… [s]he does not understand the origins nor can she explain them… [b]eing impulsions, hallucinations should be repetitive" (76), criteria which apply to the seemingly hallucinated hijacker voice as well. That voice is experienced by the listener through his inclusion in accepted narrativity; he is not under the listener's control, despite the listener's presumption that s/he may manage his use in that accepted narrativity; his origins are not understood, being variously traced back to the Gulf War, the Afghan war, and the Crusades; and he is repetitive, a quality granted by his inclusion in certain forms of media, including film and television. This voice, impulsively internalized, takes in the listener, motivating her/him to a kind of navel-contemplating self-erasure in which the listener collapses in on her/himself.

As a byproduct of the final form of *parrhesia* identified above, where other-focused contemplation as a vector of truth telling morphs into an internally oriented truth speaking, the

329

act of self regard, of self-contemplation, enables the voice to take hold within the listener's head, his interrogation becoming interior to the listener. According to psychologist Louis Sass, "[it is] this inward turn, which [William] James postulated to be essentially involved in spiritual self, that in fact produces schizophrenic delusions as well as verbal hallucinations" (98), suggesting that the hijacker voice, if kept external to the listener and to the accepted narrative in which s/he partakes, might not take hold as a seemingly hallucinatory voice internal to that listener. Instead, the voice produces a schizophrenic break within the listener, not so much a split self as a slit self, the hijacker voice engendering the cut and then entering the listener for a complete inhabitation, such that the listener is not aware of her/his ventriloquizing at the throat of the hijacker voice, the only awareness being a faint notion that the hijacker voice in her/his head cannot be real, when it is in fact the listener's own voice that is no longer real, now the domain of the hijacker voice.

As a social act, an interaction between two individual entities geared towards a communication of sorts, the *parrhesiastic* relation of the listener to the hijacker voice is "characterised… by an element of a reaction to oneself from the point of view of another" (100), a self-positioning within the shoes of the other, dually performed by both the listener and the hijacker voice. For the listener, the reaction to self through the hijacker voice enables the listener a better understanding of her/his relation to that voice and the latent culpability therein; for the hijacker voice, the reaction to self through the listener allows the hijacker voice a foothold within the listener positionality, an entry point through which he may engage its inhabitation. Reasoned thus, the seemingly hallucinatory hijacker voice is less so, more a reason-mediated influence voluntarily joined than a voice from without within, internal to the self but involuntary.

At first perceived as a hallucination, as a voice that could not possibly be where he is, at the heart of the U.S. psyche and in the head of the listener, the hijacker voice is revealed to be a

more rational inclusion, manifesting a self awareness on the part of the listener that perhaps there

is some culpability to be had in this venture, that her/his affinity for the hijacker voice may be

more telling than showing. Contrary to popular belief (popular belief being contradicted in many

cases, including the supplemental extra- added to accepted narrativity), "hallucinations [are] not

in themselves signs of madness any more than are thinking and remembering, even though some

people can have bizarre and false memories and some people think delusional thoughts" (12).

As such, even if he is perceived as arising from a hallucinatory locale, the hijacker voice may not

be rooted in any sort of madness, his own or that of his ventriloquized and inhabited listener,

instead offering a rational reading of the event rationally solicited.

The heard voice of the hijacker is therefore not mistaken, not a mistake, "does not

necessarily involve making psychological or ontological errors" (205), approaching normality in

his psychological and ontological stability, of equal validity to (if not greater validity than) the

accepted narrative and its false memory. That he should be seen as such (through attempted

attachment to the visual in accepted narrativity) and heard as such indicates the power of his

contextualization within the accepted narrative, a placement that comes close to subsuming the

voice to its own narrative ends, where "the responses of those around the voice hearer – her

friends, family and the wider society in which she lives – play a central role in influencing how

she understands and deals with the experience" (130). Therefore, the hijacker voice's situation

within narratives neighborly and nuclear, as well as within the U.S. genome, serves to

momentarily influence his perception by the listener, though in the end the inhabitational pull of

the hijacker voice exceeds the fixative capacity of those narratives, the extra-accepted winning

out.

Two forms of purported hallucination found within the realm of voices prove of particular value to discussions of 9/11 given their relation to the victimhood so central to accepted narrativity: bereavement voices and widow voices. Speaking more generally, the bereavement voice "[is] usually noticed… several weeks after the death of the voice-analogue. Most of our informants, however, could not pin-point the first onset of their voices. Some even said that they had always had voices and only eventually discovered that this was unusual" (176). The hijacker voice is indeed present within the event's duration, though he is not distributed more broadly until after the event's completion (though the omnipresence of event narrativity begs the question of whether the event is or will ever be complete), waiting a bit to register in the ear of the listener, a listener already primed for such a solicited incursion through prior experience with voices hallucinatory and otherwise.

More specifically, the widow voice, though potentially male or female due to the inclusion of widowers within Leudar and Thomas' study, is primarily male due to the prevalence of widows within the surveyed population, and within that study, "[t]here was no evidence that these people were suffering from psychiatric disorders such as depression, which are common following bereavement" (116). Rather, the widow voice is inquisitive, turning to a purported beyond to attempt a renewed contact with the deceased, a feminized listening positionality (in accordance with the victimhood narrative) to which the spectral male voice replies, that of Atta and Jarrah. As an inquisitive action undertaken voluntarily, the widow's discursive engagement with the hijacker voice, internal to that widow, is not hallucinatory, but instead a reason-mediated influence that offers additional narrative fodder for event chronicles, putting the extra-in extra-accepted narrativity. That the bereaved is unaware of the uncommonness of the heard

voice reflects social framing of that voice, suggesting the hijacker voice's encroachment on and interrelation with the U.S. genome.

The now non-hallucinatory voice, or the hallucinated voice without insanity implications, intercedes in the event narrative and, in that intercession, enabled by an inhabitation of the listener who seeks him as an addition to the unsatisfactory accepted narrative, intervenes in the genetic makeup of event memory as delimited by the U.S. genome. German psychiatrist and philosopher Karl Jaspers "argues that psychic events 'emerge' out of each other in a way that can be understood through what he calls *genetic understanding*… [where] [j]udgments of meaning are based in… their location as *tangible facts* through language (their verbal content), culture, way of life, and so on" (110). Each repetition of the hijacker voice within the psyche of the listener stands as one of these psychic events, with each repetition being generationally related to its forebear, iteratively attached and judged within the frame of U.S. culture as configured within the U.S. genome.

The hijacker voice is welcomed into the genetic family through his inclusion in accepted narrativity, given access to the very code which he then alters, subtracting qualities (freedom, liberty, and justice for all, casualties of the "War on Terror") as he adds itself to the mix, an augmentation that proves less than salutary to that genome. Through his inhabitation of the listener, the hijacker voice falls into the category of "voices as 'mutations of self'" (91), the tampered genome changing forms and acting contrary to its coding. Event memory is therefore erroneous, at least in its accepted narrative form, embodying the error impossible within the hallucinatory voice as part of a similarly but more profoundly hallucinatory victimhood narrative, one in which the listener denies all responsibility for the event. More accurately, the listener is responsible, not only insomuch as s/he takes the hijacker voice into her/himself as a

byproduct of his inclusion within accepted narrativity, but also for how well the hijacker voice and his related message suits the listener's vocality, almost as if the listener has spoken those words before, enacted a similar violence, albeit outside the stigmatization of "terrorism."

AS DRIVEN SNOW: THE PURELY AURAL HIJACKING

The discussion above sets out a paradoxical vision of the purely aural hijacking, a devisioning of accepted narrativity in favor of an extra-accepted narrative in which the event itself, the event as it is broadly recognized, the arrival of the hijacked planes at their targets (or, in the case of Flight 93, at *a* target, any target, so long as people are killed), is of little consequence, providing context to emphasize the import of the voice but allowing the voice to do the real damage. Condoned, dying but not dead, perhaps hallucinatory but certainly sane, this purely aural hijacking dispenses with the formalities of the rote filmic narrative exemplified by the Flight 93 films and the 9/11 documentaries, hewing closer to "The Long Afternoon" and "Demon Ride"'s deemphasized visuality by a fuller unemphasizing of the visual, in which it is not even a consideration. Taking up William Basinski's significatory absence and Cassetteboy's citational tendencies, the purely aural hijacking is an excerpt, a few words pulled from the event writ large that write yet larger in the mind of the listener, that rewrite the very genetic basis of the listener's national identity, that float free of their originary locus while still referring to that locus, rendering the raw event omnipresent within accepted narrativity, carrying the very veracity that motivates its solicitation to places that the listener cannot imagine. Untouched by human eyes, the purely aural hijacking touches the ear in a bad touch of sorts, the traumatic encounter from which the listener does not recover, forever haunted by the spectral voice of her/his interlocutor, solicited, even loved, then absent, sent down in the downed plane, down into the depths of the psyche, always already to return, and return, and return. 9/11's spectral voice

inhabits, becoming a habit, predating the event, manifesting within it, and continuing beyond its bounds, biding his non-time until another listener takes it up.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

9/11. Dir. Gédéon Naudet, and Jules Naudet. CBS, 2002.

9/11: The Myth and the Reality. Dir. Ken Jenkins. UFO TV, 2007.

"About the Project." The Sonic Memorial Project home page. 2002. Sonicmemorial.org.

> 1 March 2010 <http://www.sonicmemorial.org/sonic/public/about.html>.

"About Us." Omega Wolf Productions home page. Omegawolfproductions.com. 15 June 2009

> < http://www.omegawolfproductions.com/About%20Us.html>.

Acland, Charles R. "Introduction: Residual Media." *Residual Media*. Ed. Charles R. Acland.

> Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007. xiii-xxvii.

Acland, Charles R., ed. *Residual Media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.

Aftermath: Unanswered Questions from 9/11. Dir. Stephen Marshall. Guerrilla News Network,

> 2003.

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Trans Daniel Heller-Roazen.

> Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

A League of Their Own. Dir. Penny Marshall. Perf. Geena Davis, Rosie O'Donnell, and

> Madonna. Columbia Pictures Corporation, 1992.

Altman, Rick, ed. *Sound Theory, Sound Practice*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

"American Airlines Flight 11." Wikipedia home page. Wikipedia.org. 18 June 2009 < http://en.

> wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Airlines_Flight_11>.

"Anthracite." Oxford English Dictionary home page. Dictionary.oed.com. 10 June 2009

> <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50009392?single=1&query_type=word&queryword

> =anthracite&first=1&max_to_show=10>.

Apocalypse Now. Dir. Francis Ford Coppola. Perf. Martin Sheen, Robert Duvall, and Marlon

        Brando. Zoetrope Studios, 1979.

Appelbaum, David. *Jacques Derrida's Ghost: A Conjuration*. Albany: State University of New

        York Press, 2009.

Arendt, Hannah. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. New York: Penguin,

        2006.

Artaud, Antonin. *Oeuvres Complètes*. Vol. 23. Paris: Gallimard, 1956.

"Artists: William James Basinski." Freewaves Festival home page. 2002. Freewaves.org. 21

        March 2008 <http://www.freewaves.org/festival_2002/artists/basinski_wj.htm>.

A Trip to the Moon. Dir. George Méliès. Perf. George Méliès, Victor André, and Bleuette

        Bernon. Star Film, 1902.

Attali, Jacques. *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis:

        University of Minnesota Press, 1985.

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things With Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Bailey, Peter. "Breaking the Sound Barrier." *Hearing History: A Reader*. Ed. Mark M. Smith.

        Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1994. 23-35.

Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1981.

Barthes, Roland. "La musique, la voix, la langue." *L'obvie et l'obtus*. Paris: Seuil, 1982.

Barthes, Roland. "The Grain of the Voice." *The Responsibility of Forms: Critical Essays on

        Music, Art, and Representation*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1985. 267-77.

Barthes, Roland. *The Grain of the Voice: Interviews 1962-1980*. Trans. Linda Loverdale. New

        York: Hill and Wang, 1985.

Basinski, William. *The Disintegration Loops I-IV*. 2062. 2003.

Bataille, Georges. *Story of the Eye*. Trans. Dovid Bergelson. San Francisco: City Lights
Publishers, 2001.

Bataille, Georges. *The Accursed Share, Vol. 1: Consumption*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York:
Zone Books, 1991.

Bates, Eliot. "Glitches, Bugs, and Hisses: The Degeneration of Musical Recordings and the
Contemporary Musical Work." *Bad Music: The Music We Love to Hate*. Christopher
Washburne and Maiken Derno, eds. New York: Routledge, 2004. 275-93.

Baudrillard, Jean. *The Spirit of Terrorism*. Rev. ed. Trans. Chris Turner. New York: Verso, 2003.

Beck. "Hell Yes." *Guero*. Perf. Beck Hansen. Interscope, 2005.

Beckett, Samuel. "Krapp's Last Tape." *Krapp's Last Tape and Other Dramatic Pieces*. New
York: Grove Press, 1960. 7-28.

Being John Malkovich. Dir. Spike Jonze. Perf. John Malkovich, Catherine Keener, and John
Cusack. Gramercy Pictures, 1999.

Bleuler, Eugen. *Dementia Praecox, or the Group of Schizophrenias*. Trans. Joseph Zinkin. New
York: International Universities Press, 1950.

Bollen, Mike. Personal interview. 2 February 2010.

Borradori, Giovanna. *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and
Jacques Derrida*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Boyz n the Hood. Dir. John Singleton. Perf. Morris Chestnut, Laurence Fishburne, and Ice Cube.
Columbia Pictures Corporation, 1991.

Breton, André [a]. "The Automatic Message." *What is Surrealism? Selected Writings*. Ed.
Franklin Rosemont. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1978.

Breton, André [b]. *Surrealism and Painting*. Trans. Simon Watson Taylor. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Brett. "Unforgivable." Eng C&R blog home page. 21 October 2008. Brettsengcandr.blogspot. com. 15 June 2009 <brettsengcandr.blogspot.com/2008/10/unforgivable.html>.

"Browse by Artist: CASSETTEBOY." Forced Exposure home page. Forcedexposure.com. 1 June 2009 <http://www.forcedexposure.com/artists/cassetteboy.html>.

Bull, Michael and Les Back, eds. *The Auditory Culture Reader*. Berg Publishers, 2004.

Burns, Todd. "Cassetteboy – Fly Me to New York." [excerpt from "The Pop Protest Song: The *Stylus Magazine* Non-Definitive Guide"] *Stylus Magazine* home page. 31 October 2007. Stylusmagazine.com. 1 June 2009 <http://www.stylusmagazine.com/ feature.php?ID=45>.

Burroughs, William S. *Nova Express*. New York: Grove Press, 1994.

Burroughs, William S. *The Soft Machine*. New York: Grove Press, 1994.

Burroughs, William S. *The Ticket That Exploded*. New York: Grove Press, 1994.

Bush, George W. "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People." White House home page. 20 September 2001. Whitehouse.gov. 17 June 2009 < http://george wbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>.

Carlyle, Thomas. *Sartor Resartus*. Kerry McSweeney and Peter Sabor, eds. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Carnival of Souls. Dir. Herk Harvey. Perf. Candace Hilligoss, Frances Feist, and Sidney Berger. Harcourt Productions, 1962.

Carson, Anne. "The Gender of Sound." *Glass, Irony, and God*. New York: New Directions Books, 1995. 119-39.

Cartel Communique. "Fly Me to New York." Cartel Communique MySpace profile. Myspace.

    com/cartelcommunique. 10 June 2009 <http://www.myspace.com/cartelcommunique>.

Cassetteboy [a]. "Di and Dodi Do Die." Cassetteboy MySpace home page. 29 August 2007.

    Myspace.com. 1 June 2009 < http://blogs.myspace.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=blog.

    view&friendId=210433704&blogId=304798619>.

Cassetteboy [b]. "Fly Me to New York." *The Parker Tapes*. Perf. Frank Sinatra, Morrissey,

    Steve Warlin, and Michael Bollen. Barry's Bootlegs, 2002.

Cassetteboy [c]. "Gordon Brown/Obama videos." Cassetteboy Wordpress blog home page.

    26 May 2009. Wordpress.com. 1 June 2009 <http://cassetteboy.wordpress.com>.

Catalano, Nicola. "William Basinski + Richard Chartier Interview." Spekk home page. Spekk.

    net. 21 March 2008 <http://www.spekk.net/catalog/w+r.html>.

"Character Guide." *Legend of the Seeker* home page. Legendoftheseeker.com. 8 July 2009

    < http://www.legendoftheseeker.com/characters.html>.

Chion, Michel. *Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Chion, Michel. *David Lynch*. 2nd ed. Trans. Robert Julian. London: BFI, 2006.

Chion, Michel. *The Voice in Cinema*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Chomsky, Noam. *9-11*. New York: Seven Stories, 2003.

Christie, Lou. "Lightnin' Strikes." *Lightnin' Strikes*. Perf. Lou Christie. MGM, 1966.

Cixous, Hélène. "Appendix: An Exchange with Hélène Cixous." *Hélène Cixous: Writing the*

    Feminine. Ed. Verena Andermatt Conley. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984.

Clayton, Mark. "Controllers' Tale of Flight 11." *Christian Science Monitor*. 13 September 2001.

Cline, Patsy. "I Fall to Pieces." *The Definitive Collection*. Perf. Patsy Cline. MCA Nashville,

    2004.

Coll, Steve. *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and bin Laden, From the Soviet Invasion to September 10, 2001*. New York: Penguin, 2005.

Colston, L.P. *The Go-Between*. New York: Penguin, 2004.

Connor, Steven. *Dumbstruck: A Cultural History of Ventriloquism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Craig, Phil. "About the Show: Q-and-A with Producer Phil Craig." *The Flight That Fought Back* home page. Dsc.discovery.com. 26 June 2009 < http://dsc.discovery.com/convergence/ flight/producer/producer.html>.

Crary, Jonathan. "Modernity and the Problem of Attention." *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1999. 11-79.

Csepregi, Gabor. "On Sound Atmospheres." *Aural Cultures*. Ed. Jim Drobnick. Toronto: YYZ Books, 2004. 169-78.

"Cut." Urban Dictionary home page. Urbandictionary.com. 16 June 2009 < http://www.urban dictionary.com/define.php?term=cut>.

Cutler, Chris. "Plunderphonics." *Classic Essays on Twentieth-Century Music: A Continuing Symposium*. Richard Kostelanetz and Joseph Darby, eds. New York: Schirmer Books, 1996. 354-76.

Dahlen [a], Chris. "Cassetteboy – *The Parker Tapes*." Pitchfork home page. 5 December 2002. Pitchfork.com. 1 June 2009 <http://www.pitchfork.com/reviews/albums/1339-the- parker-tapes/>.

Dahlen [b], Chris. "Get That Out of Your Mouth #15: Negativland and Cassetteboy Steal Music." Pitchfork home page. 23 June 2005. Pitchfork.com. 1 June 2009 <http://www.pitchfork.com/features/get-that-out-of-your-mouth/6075-get-that-out-of-your-mouth-15/>.

Dahlen [c], Chris. "The Pop Culture of 9/11." Pitchfork home page. 28 March 2005. Pitchfork.com.1 June 2009 <http://www.pitchfork.com/features/articles/6001-the-pop-culture-of-911/>.

Danger Mouse. *The Grey Album*. Perf. Jay-Z, the Beatles, and Danger Mouse. Bootleg, 2004.

Davis, John. "Going Analog: Vinylphiles and the Consumption of the 'Obsolete' Vinyl Record." *Residual Media*. Ed. Charles R. Acland. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007. 222-36.

DC 9/11: Time of Crisis. Dir. Brian Trenchard-Smith. Perf. Timothy Bottoms, John Cunningham, and George Takei. Showtime Networks, 2003.

Debord, Guy. *Society of the Spectacle*. Trans. Ken Knabb. Oakland: AKPress, 2006.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Penguin, 2009.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

"Demon Ride." Dir. Matty Tucker. Perf. Amelia Goodyear and Daniel Sword. Omega Wolf Productions, 2008.

Denby, David. "Review." *United 93: The Shooting Script*. New York: Newmarket Press, 2006. 145-7.

Derrida, Jacques. *Limited Inc*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1988.

Derrida, Jacques. *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*. Trans. Peggy Kamuf. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Derrida, Jacques. *The Gift of Death*. Trans. David Wills. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Descartes, René. *Discourse on Method, Optics, Geometry, and Meteorology*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2001.

"Detention of Enemy Combatants Act." Library of Congress home page. 3 March 2005. Thomas.loc.gov. 19 June 2009 < http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c109:H.R. 1076.IH:>.

"Dewey Picks Board for Trade Center." *New York Times*. 6 July 1946.

Didion, Joan "Wired for Shock Treatments." *Book Week*. 27 March 1966. 2.

Dolar, Mladen. *A Voice and Nothing More*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2006.

Drobnick, Jim, ed. *Aural Cultures*. Toronto: YYZ Books, 2004.

Duran Duran. "Hungry Like the Wolf." *Rio*. Perf. Simon Le Bon, Andy Taylor, and Nick Rhodes. Columbia, 1982.

Dwyer, Jim and Kevin Flynn. *102 Minutes: The Untold Story of the Fight to Survive Inside the Twin Towers*. New York: Times Books, 2006.

Dylan, Bob. "I Want You." *Blonde on Blonde*. Perf. Bob Dylan. Columbia, 1966.

Dylan, Bob. "Subterranean Homesick Blues." *Bringing it All Back Home*. Perf. Bob Dylan. Columbia, 1965.

Earle, Steve. "John Walker's Blues." *Jerusalem*. Perf. Steve Earle. Artemis Records, 2002.

Eisenberg, Evan. *The Recording Angel: Music, Records and Culture from Aristotle to Zappa*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Erlmann, Veit, ed. *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening and Modernity*. Berg
      Publishers, 2004.

Eshun, Kodwo. *More Brilliant Than the Sun: Adventures in Sonic Fiction*. London: Quartet
      Books, 1998.

Farabet, René. "From One Head to Another." *Experimental Sound and Radio*. Ed. Allen S.
      Weiss. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001. 55-6.

Flight 93. Dir. Peter Markle. Perf. Jeffrey Nordling, Brennan Elliott, and Ty Olsson. A&E, 2006.

"*Flight 93*: About the Movie." *Flight 93* home page. Aetv.com. 26 June 2009 <http://www.aetv.
      com/flight_93/f93_about.jsp>.

"Flight 93 Hijack Transcript." The Smoking Gun home page. Thesmokinggun.com. 27 June
      2009 < http://www.thesmokinggun.com/archive/0412061hijack1.html>.

"Flight 93 National Memorial." Flight 93 National Memorial home page. Honorflight93.org. 14
      May 2010 <http://www.honorflight93.org/>.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage, 1995.

Foucault, Michel. *Fearless Speech*. Ed. Joseph Pearson. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2001.

Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. New
      York: Vintage, 1988.

Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. New York:
      Vintage, 1994.

Freud, Sigmund. "Psychoanalytic Remarks on an Autobiographically Described Case of
      Paranoia (Dementia Paranoides)." *The Schreber Case*. Trans. Andrew Webber. New
      York: Penguin, 2003.

Frith, Simon. "Where Do Sounds Come From?" *Performing Rites: On the Value of Popular Music*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996. 99-122.

Frizzell, Rev. Dwight and Jay Mandeville. "**IN**AUDIBLE POST*SCRIPT*: A silent coda on the **disembodied** voice and the subsequent **un**writing of history." *Experimental Sound and Radio*. Ed. Allen S. Weiss. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001. 81-8.

Ghostbusters. Dir. Ivan Reitman. Perf. Bill Murray, Dan Aykroyd, and Sigourney Weaver. Black Rhino Productions, 1984.

Goldberg, Alfred. *The Pentagon: The First Fifty Years*. Office of the Secretary of Defense/Government Printing Office, 1992.

Goo, Sara Kehaulani. "Papers Offer New Clues on 9/11 Hijackers' Travel." *The Washington Post* home page. 13 February 2005. Washingtonpost.com. 15 July 2009 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A19784-2005Feb12.html>.

Goodman, Steve. *Sonic Warfare: Sound, Affect, and the Ecology of Fear*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2010.

Goodyear, Amelia. Personal interview. 1 February 2010.

Grace, Francie. "This One, They Didn't Let In: Feds Rejected Visa for Atta's Roommate but Didn't Track His Moves." CBS News home page. 6 June 2002. Cbsnews.com. 14 July 2009 <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/06/06/attack/main511244.shtml>.

Greengrass, Paul. "Director's Statement." *United 93* home page. Flight93.net. 26 June 2009 < http://www.flight93.net/site/index.php?dl=>.

Greengrass, Paul. *United 93: The Shooting Script*. New York: Newmarket Press, 2006.

Griffin, David Ray. *The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11*. Northampton, MA: Interlink Books, 2004.

Griffin, David Ray. *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*. New York: Olive

    Branch Press, 2004.

Harris, Oliver. *William Burroughs and the Secret of Fascination*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois

    University Press, 2006.

Hazelnut. "Cassetteboy." Everything2 home page. 13 May 2006. Everything2.com. 1 June 2009

    <http://everything2.com/title/Cassetteboy>.

Heller-Roazen, Daniel. *Echolalias: On the Forgetting of Language*. New York: Zone Books,

    2005.

Hertz, Uri. "The Electronic Scalpel of William S. Burroughs." *Conversations with William S.

    Burroughs*. Ed. Allen Hibbard. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1999. 147-51.

Hill, Mary Louise. "Developing *A Blind Understanding*: A Feminist Revision of Radio

    Semiotics." *Experimental Sound and Radio*. Ed. Allen S. Weiss. Cambridge: The MIT

    Press, 2001. 107-15.

Hodge, L.W. Personal interview. 27 November 2009, 11 January 2010.

Hodge, L.W. "The Scoop You've Been Waiting For." Hodge-Stansson MySpace home page.

    24 October 2008. Myspace.com. 19 June 2009 < http://blogs.myspace.com/index.

    cfm?fuseaction=blog.view&friendId=157090552&blogId=443153703>.

Hopsicker, Daniel. *Welcome to Terrorland: Mohamed Atta and the 9/11 Cover-up in Florida*.

    Mad Cow Press, 2005.

Howard, Theresa. "'Can you hear me now?' a hit." *USA Today* home page. 22 February 2004.

    Usatoday.com. 30 June 2009 <http://www.usatoday.com/money/advertising/adtrack/

    2004-02-22-track-verizon_x.htm>.

Ice Cube. *AmeriKKKa's Most Wanted*. Perf. Ice Cube. Priority, 1990.

Igma, Norman. "Plunderphonics: An Interview with Transproducer John Oswald."

    Plunderphonics home page. Plunderphonics.com. 1 June 2009 <http://www.plunder

    phonics.com/xhtml/xinterviews.html>.

Ihde, Don. *Listening and Voice: Phenomenologies of Sound*. 2nd ed. Albany: State University of

    New York Press, 2007.

"Inside 9/11 DVD Set." *National Geographic* home page. Nationalgeographic.com. 14 July

    2009 < http://shop.nationalgeographic.com/product/1168/2690/1074.html>.

Irigaray, Luce. *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Trans. Gillian C. Gill. Ithaca: Cornell University

    Press, 1986.

Irigaray, Luce. *This Sex Which is not One*. Trans. Gillian C. Gill. Ithaca: Cornell University

    Press, 1985.

Jay, Martin. *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought*.

    Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New

    York University Press, 2006.

Joel, Billy. "She's Always a Woman." *The Stranger*. Perf. Billy Joel. Columbia, 1977.

"John Ogonowski, of Dracut, Pilot for American Airlines." Remember September 11, 2001

    home page. Legacy.com. 16 June 2009 < http://www.legacy.com/Sept11/Story.

    aspx?Page=Story&PersonID=91729>.

Johnson, Glen. "Probe Reconstructs Horror, Calculated Attacks on Planes. *Boston Globe*. 23

    November 2001.

Jordan, Ken. "Stop. Hey. What's That Sound?" *Sound Unbound: Sampling Digital Music and Culture*. Ed. Paul D. Miller aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2008. 245-64.

Jordan, Ken and Paul D. Miller aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid. "Freeze Frame: Audio, Aesthetics, Sampling, and Contemporary Multimedia." *Sound Unbound: Sampling Digital Music and Culture*. Ed. Paul D. Miller aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2008. 97-108.

Kahn, Douglas. "Three Receivers." *Experimental Sound and Radio*. Ed. Allen S. Weiss. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001. 73-80.

Kahn, Douglas and Gregory Whitehead, eds. *Wireless Imagination: Sound, Radio, and the Avant Garde*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1994.

Keith, Toby. "Courtesy of the Red, White and Blue (The Angry American)." *Unleashed*. Perf. Toby Keith. Dreamworks, 2002.

Keller, Alexandra L.M. "Shards of Voice: Fragments Excavated toward a Radiophonic Archaelogy." *Experimental Sound and Radio*. Ed. Allen S. Weiss. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001. 22-6.

Kelly, Caleb. *Cracked Media: The Sound of Malfunction*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2009.

Kinder, Marsha. "The Subversive Potential of the Pseudo-Iterative." *Film Quarterly: Forty Years – A Selection*. Brian Henderson, Ann Martin, and Lee Amazonas, eds. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999. 126-50.

Kleege, Georgina. "Voices in My Head." *Aural Cultures*. Ed. Jim Drobnick. Toronto: YYZ Books, 2004. 96-109.

Külpe, Oswald . *Outlines of Psychology*. Trans. Edward Bradford Titchener. London: Sonnenschein, 1895.

LaBelle, Brandon. "Music to the 'nth' Degree." *Experimental Sound and Radio*. Ed. Allen S. Weiss. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001.167-74.

"Late Late Show Craig Ferguson – Wavy is Angry." You Tube home page. 14 September 2009. Youtube.com. 18 May 2010 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3hgYb6E4f90&feature =related>.

Lecercle, Jean-Jacques. *The Violence of Language*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Lecourt, Edith. "The Musical Envelope." *Psychic Envelopes*. Trans. Daphne Briggs. Ed. Didier Anzieu. London: Karnac Books, 1990. 211.

Leed, Eric J. *No Man's Land: Combat and Identity in World War I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Leigh, Mike. "Chillin' with Cube." *The Guardian* home page. 25 February 2000. Guardian.co. uk. 12 February 2010 < http://www.guardian.co.uk/film/2000/feb/25/icecube>.

Leudar, Ivan and Philip Thomas. *Voices of Reason, Voices of Insanity: Studies of Verbal Hallucinations*. Philadelphia: Routledge, 2000.

Longman, Jere. *Among the Heroes: United Flight 93 and the Passengers and Crew Who Fought Back*. New York: Harper, 2003.

LoBrutto, Vincent. *Sound-on-Film: Interviews with Creators of Film Sound*. Santa Barbara. Praeger, 1994.

Longman, Jere. *Among the Heroes: United Flight 93 and the Passengers and Crew Who Fought Back*. New York: HarperCollins, 2002.

Loose Change 9/11: An American Coup. Dir. Dylan Avery. Collective Minds Media Company, 2009.

Lotringer, Sylvère, ed. *Burroughs Live: The Collected Interviews of William S. Burroughs 1960-1997*. Cambridge: Semiotext(e), 2001.

Lydenberg, Robin. "Sound Identity Fading Out: William Burroughs' Tape Experiments." Douglas Kahn and Gregory Whitehead, eds. *Wireless Imagination: Sound, Radio, and the Avant-Garde*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1992. 409-37.

Lydenberg, Robin. "The Negative Poetics of the Cut-Up Method." *Word Cultures: Radical Theory and Practice in William S. Burroughs' Fiction*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987. 44-55.

M., Steve. "Untitled." No More Mister Nice Blog home page. 5 September 2006. Nomoremister. blogspot.com/2006/09/this-911-video-is-tasteless-and.html>.

Maasø, Arnt. "The Proxemics of the Mediated Voice." *Lowering the Boom: Critical Studies in Film Sound*. Jay Beck and Tony Grajeda, eds. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008. 36-50.

Madonna. "This Used to Be My Playground." *This Used to Be My Playground* [single]. Perf. Madonna. Warner Brothers, 1992.

Malsky, Matthew. "Stretched from Manhattan's Back Alley to MOMA: A Social History of Magnetic Tape and Recording." *Music and Technoculture*. René T.A. Lysoff and Leslie C. Gay, Jr., eds. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 2003. 233-63.

Massumi, Brian. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

McDermott, Terry. *Perfect Soldiers – The 9/11 Hijackers: Who They Were, Why They Did It*.

New York: Harper, 2006.

McLuhan, Marshall. *The Medium is the Massage: An Inventory of Effects*. New York: Random

House, 1967.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *The Visible and Invisible*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press,

1969.

Migone, Christof. "HeadHole: Malfunctions and Dysfunctions of an FM Exciter." *Experimental

Sound and Radio*. Ed. Allen S. Weiss. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001. 42-52.

Miklitsch, Robert. "Connie Stevens, *Silencio*, and Other Sonic Phenomena in *Mulholland

Drive*." *Lowering the Boom: Critical Studies in Film Sound*. Jay Beck and Tony Grajeda,

eds. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008. 232-47.

Militus, Joe. "Radiophonic Ontologies and the Avantgarde." *Experimental

Sound and Radio*. Ed. Allen S. Weiss. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001. 57-72.

Miller, John J, Michael Stone, and Chris Mitchell. *The Cell: Inside the 9/11 Plot, and Why the

FBI and CIA Failed to Stop It*. New York: Hyperion, 2003.

Miller, Paul D. aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid. *Rhythm Science*. Cambridge: The MIT

Press, 2004.

Miller, Paul D. aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid, ed. *Sound Unbound: Sampling Digital Music

and Culture*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2008.

Miller, Paul D. aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid. "In Through the Out Door: Sampling and

the Creative Act." *Sound Unbound: Sampling Digital Music and Culture*. Ed. Paul D.

Miller aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2008. 5-19.

"Mohamed Atta: We Have Some Planes." YouTube home page. 22 July 2008. Youtube.com.

13 February 2010 < http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uUqXwsbJdbo&feature=related>.

Morgan, Ted. *Literary Outlaw: The Life and Times of William S. Burroughs*. New York: Avon

Books, 1988.

Morrison, Van. "Brown Eyed Girl." *Blowin' Your Mind!* Perf. Van Morrison. Bang, 1967.

Mortley, Kaye. "Around **Naxos**: a radio 'film'…" *Experimental Sound and Radio*. Ed. Allen S.

Weiss. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001. Weiss 151-66.

Mulholland Dr. Dir. David Lynch. Perf. Naomi Watts, Laura Elena Harring, and Justin Theroux.

Les Films Alain Sarde, 2001.

Murphy, Timothy S. "'I Hassan I Sabbah *rub out the word forever*': The Dialectic of Treason

and the Abolition of the Law in the *Nova* Trilogy." *Wising Up the Marks: The Amodern*

William Burroughs. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997. 103-41.

National Commission on Terrorist Attacks. *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the*

National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. New York: Norton,

2004.

National Geographic: Inside 9/11. Dir. Michael Eldridge and Lance Hori. Perf. Steve Coll,

Caspar Weinberger, and Osama bin Laden. National Geographic Video, 2005.

National Transportation and Safety Bureau [a]. "Flight Path Study – American Airlines Flight

11." NTSB home page. 19 February 2002. Ntsb.gov. 19 June 2009 < http://www.ntsb.

gov/ info/Flight_%20Path_%20Study_AA11.pdf>.

National Transportation and Safety Bureau [b]. "Flight Path Study – American Airlines Flight

77." NTSB home page. 19 February 2002. Ntsb.gov. 19 June 2009 < http://www.ntsb.

gov/info/Flight_%20Path_%20Study_AA77.pdf >.

"Nebula." Oxford English Dictionary home page. Oed.com. 19 July 2009 <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/00321970?single=1&query_type=word&queryword=nebula&first=1&max_to_show=10>.

Nelson, John. "Cassetteboy." Some Assembly Required: Tape Manipulations, Digital Deconstructions and Turntable Creations blog. 15 November 2008. Some-assembly-required.net. 1 June 2009 <http://www.some-assembly-required.net/blog/2008/11/cassetteboy.html>.

Newsom, Joanna. "Inflammatory Writ." *The Milk-Eyed Mender*. Perf. Joanna Newsom. Drag City, 2004.

New York Firefighters: The Brotherhood of 9/11. Dir. Peter Schnall. Partisan Pictures, 2002.

Nochimson, Martha P. [a] "'All I Need is the Girl': The Life and Death of Creativity in *Mulholland Drive*." *The Cinema of David Lynch: American Dreams, Nightmare Visions*. Erica Sheen and Annette Davison, eds. New York: Wallflower Press, 2004. 165-81.

Nochimson, Martha P. [b] *The Passion of David Lynch: Wild at Heart in Hollywood*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997.

Novarina, Valère. *The Theatre of the Ears*. Trans. Allen S. Weiss. Los Angeles: Sun and Moon Press, 1996.

N.W.A. *Straight Outta Compton*. Perf. Eazy E, Ice Cube, and MC Ren. Priority, 1988.

Odier, Daniel. *The Job: Interviews with William S. Burroughs*. Rev. ed. New York: Grove Press, 1970.

Olin, Charles. *Ventriloquism*. Philadelphia: Perm Publishing Company, 1908.

"Omega Wolf Productions." Facebook group home page. Facebook.com. 15 June 2009 < http://www.facebook.com/pages/Omega-Wolf-Productions/44675479067>.

Oswald, John. "Plunderphonics, or Audio Piracy as a Compositional Prerogative."

   Plunderphonics home page. 1985. Plunderphonics.com. 30 May 2009 <http://www.

   plunderphonics.com/xhtml/xplunder.html>.

 "Outtakes From 'The Long Afternoon.'" Dir. Randall Haworth. Perf. Fritz Gunnar Stansson and

   Logan Hodge. Tabula Rasa Films, 2006.

Parker Jr., Ray. "Ghostbusters." *Ghostbusters – Original Soundtrack*. Perf. Ray Parker Jr. Arista,

   1984.

"Party Foul." Urban Dictionary home page. Urbandictionary.com. 1 July 2009 <http://www.

   urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=party%20foul>.

Peeping Tom. Dir. Michael Powell. Perf. Karlheinz Böhm and Anna Massey. Michael Powell

   (Theatre), 1960.

Rabelais, François. *Gargantua and Pantagruel*. Book IV. Trans. Burton Raffel. New York:

   Norton, 1993.

Rajchman, John. "Foucault's Art of Seeing." *October* 44. Spring, 1988.

Raphael, Chris. "Politically Incorrect: A Eulogy." The Big Story home page. 3 June 2002.

   Thebigstory.org. 17 May 2010 <http://thebigstory.org/ov/ov-politicallyincorrect.html>.

Reich, Steve. "An Introduction, or My (Ambiguous) Life With Technology." *Sound Unbound:*

   Sampling Digital Music and Culture. Ed. Paul D. Miller aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal

   Kid. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2008. 1-4.

Roach, Joseph. *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance*. New York: Columbia

   University Press, 1996.

Ronell, Avital. *The Telephone Book: Technology – Schizophrenia – Electric Speech*. Lincoln:

   University of Nebraska Press, 1989.

Rosemary's Baby. Dir. Roman Polanski. Perf. Mia Farrow and John Cassavetes. William Castle

Productions, 1968.

Russolo, Luigi. *The Art of Noises*. Trans. Barclay Brown. New York: Pendragon Press, 1986.

Saint of 9/11. Dir. Glenn Holsten. Equality Forum, 2006.

Sangild, Torben. "Glitch – The Beauty of Malfunction." *Bad Music: The Music We Love to

Hate*. Christopher Washburne and Maiken Derno, eds. New York: Routledge, 2004.

257-74.

Scanner aka Robin Rimbaud. "The Ghost Outside the Machine." *Sound Unbound: Sampling

Digital Music and Culture*. Ed. Paul D. Miller aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid.

Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2008. 131-4.

Schafer, R. Murray. "Soundscapes and Earwitnesses." *Hearing History: A Reader*. Ed. Mark M.

Smith. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1994. 3-9.

Schreber, Daniel Paul. *Memoirs of My Nervous Illness*. New York: New York Review of Books

Classics, 2000.

Schwartz, Hillel. "The Indefensible Ear: A History." *The Auditory Culture Reader*. Michael Bull

and Les Back, eds. New York: Berg, 2003. 487-501.

Sergi, Gianluca. *The Dolby Era: Film Sound in Contemporary Hollywood*. Manchester:

Manchester University Press, 2005.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003.

Silverman, Kaja. *The Acoustic Mirror: The Female Voice in Psychoanalysis and Cinema*.

Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Simon, Sherry. "Accidental Voices: The Return of the Countertenor." *Aural Cultures*. Ed. Jim

Drobnick. Toronto: YYZ Books, 2004. 110-9.

Sinatra, Frank. "Dancing on the Ceiling." *In the Wee Small Hours*. Perf. Frank Sinatra. Capitol, 1955.

Sinatra, Frank. "I've Got You Under My Skin." *The Complete Reprise Studio Recordings*. Perf. Frank Sinatra. Warner Brothers, 1995.

Sinatra, Frank. "I Won't Dance." *The Complete Reprise Studio Recordings*. Perf. Frank Sinatra. Warner Brothers, 1995.

Sinatra, Frank. "The Best Is Yet to Come." *The Complete Reprise Studio Recordings*. Perf. Frank Sinatra. Warner Brothers, 1995.

Sinatra, Frank. "The Song is Ended." *The Complete Reprise Recordings*. Perf. Frank Sinatra. Warner Brothers, 1995.

Sinatra, Frank. "The Way You Look Tonight." *The Complete Reprise Recordings*. Perf. Frank Sinatra. Warner Brothers, 1995.

Sinatra, Frank. "What Now, My Love?" *The Complete Reprise Studio Recordings*. Perf. Frank Sinatra. Warner Brothers, 1995.

Sinatra, Frank and Dean Martin. "Money Burns a Hole in My Pocket." *Together: Frank Sinatra and Dean Martin*. Perf. Frank Sinatra and Dean Martin. Horizon, 2006.

Sinatra, Frank and Sammy Davis, Jr. "Me and My Shadow." *Rat Pack: Live and Cool*. Perf. Frank Sinatra and Sammy Davis, Jr. Crimson Productions, 2005.

Slack, James. "Banned Terror Group Al Muhajiroun Exploits Government Loophole to Reform Under New Hate-Filled Guise." *Daily Mail* home page. 17 June 2009. Dailymail.co.uk. 15 July 2009 <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1193706/Banned-terror-group-Al-Muhajiroun-exploits-government-loophole-reform-new-hate-filled-guise.html>.

Smith, Mark M., ed. *Hearing History: A Reader*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1994.

Sonnenschein, David. *Sound Design: The Expressive Power of Music, Voice and Sound Effects in Cinema*. Studio City: Michael Wiese Productions, 2001.

Stein, Gertrude. *Everybody's Autobiography*. Cambridge: Exact Change, 2004.

Sterne, Jonathan. *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Sterne, Jonathan. "Out with the Trash: On the Future of New Media." *Residual Media*. Ed. Charles R. Acland. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007. 16-31.

Straw, Will. "Embedded Memories." *Residual Media*. Ed. Charles R. Acland. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007. 3-15.

Sullivan, Laura. "9/11 Victim Calmly Describes Hijack on Haunting Tape." *The Baltimore Sun*. 28 January 2004.

"Talisman." Oxford English Dictionary home page. Oed.com. 17 June 2009 < http://dictionary. oed.com/cgi/entry/50246417?query_type=word&queryword=talisman&first=1&max_to_ show=10&sort_type=alpha&result_place=1&search_id=HsAw-hhlTh65288&hilite =50246417>.

Taylor, Diana. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Théberge, Paul. "Almost Silent: The Interplay of Sound and Silence in Contemporary Cinema and Television." *Lowering the Boom: Critical Studies in Film Sound*. Jay Beck and Tony Grajeda, eds. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008. 51-67.

The Beach Boys. "Good Vibrations." *Smiley Smile*. Perf. Brian Wilson, Dennis Wilson, and Carl Wilson. Capitol, 1967.

The Conversation. Dir. Francis Ford Coppola. Perf. Gene Hackman, Robert Duvall, and Harrison Ford. American Zoetrope, 1974.

The Fall. "Repetition." *The Early Years: 1977-1979*. Perf. Mark E. Smith, Martin Bramah, and Una Baines. Resurgent, 1981.

The Flight That Fought Back. Dir. Bruce Goodison. Perf. Greg Benson, Jason LeGrande, and Pej Vahdat. Brook Lapping Productions, 2005.

The Hamburg Cell. Dir. Antonia Bird. Perf. Karim Saleh, Maral Kamel, and Agni Scott. Mentorn Television, 2004.

"The Long Afternoon (Part One)." Dir. Randall Haworth. Perf. Fritz Gunnar Stansson and Logan Hodge. Tabula Rasa Films, 2006.

"The Long Afternoon (Part Two)." Dir. Randall Haworth. Perf. Fritz Gunnar Stansson and Logan Hodge. Tabula Rasa Films, 2006.

The Path to 9/11. Dir. David L. Cunningham. Perf. Harvey Keitel, Donnie Wahlberg, and Patricia Heaton. Marc Platt Productions, 2006.

The Smiths. "Accept Yourself." *Hatful of Hollow*. Perf. Morrissey and Johnny Marr. Sire, 1984.

The Smiths. "That Joke Isn't Funny Anymore." *Meat is Murder*. Perf. Morrissey and Johnny Marr. Sire, 1985.

"The Sonic Memorial Project." The Sonic Memorial Project home page. 2002. Sonicmemorial. org. 1 March 2010 <http://www.sonicmemorial.org/sonic/public/index.html>.

The Strokes. "New York City Cops." *Is This It?* Perf. Julian Casablancas, Albert Hammond, Jr., and Fabrizio Moretti. RCA, 2001.

The Strokes. "The End Has No End." *Room on Fire*. Julian Casablancas, Albert Hammond, Jr., and Fabrizio Moretti. RCA, 2003.

The Towering Inferno. Dir. John Guillermin and Irwin Allen. Perf. Steve McQueen, Paul

    Newman, and Faye Dunaway. Irwin Allen Productions, 1974.

Thompson, Paul. "(8:13 a.m. – 9:28 a.m.) September 11, 2001: Pilots of All Four Hijacked

    Planes Fail to Dial Standard Distress Code." Complete 9/11 Timeline home page.

    Historycommons.org. 19 June 2009 <http://www.historycommons.org/timeline.

    jsp?timeline=complete_911_timeline&day_of_9/11=aa11>.

Thompson, Paul. "They Tried to Warn Us: Foreign Intelligence Warnings Before 9/11."

    History Commons home page. Historycommons.org. 11 June 2009 <http://www.history

    commons.org/essay.jsp?article=essaytheytriedtowarnus>.

Tucker, Matty. Personal interview. 31 January 2010.

Umberto D. Dir. Vittorio De Sica. Perf. Carlo Battisti and Maria-Pia Casilio. Amato Film, 1952.

"Unforgivable A." Dir. Logan Hodge. Perf. Fritz Gunnar Stansson. Hodge-Stansson Productions,

    2006.

"United Airlines Flight 93." Wikipedia home page. Wikipedia.org. 18 June 2009 < http://en.

    wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Airlines_Flight_93>.

United 93. Dir. Paul Greengrass. Perf. Peter Hermann, Christian Clemenson, and Khalid

    Abdalla. Sidney Kimmel Entertainment. 2006.

Vågnes, Øyvind. "'Chosen to Be Witness': The Exceptionalism of *9/11*." *The Selling of 9/11:*

    How a National Tragedy Became a Commodity. Ed. Dana Heller. New York: Palgrave

    Macmillan, 2005. 54-74.

Venzke, Ben N., ed. *The al-Qaeda Documents Vol. 1*. Alexandria: Tempest Publishing, 2002.

Virilio, Paul. *Ground Zero*. Trans. Chris Turner. New York: Verso, 2002.

"Voices of 9/11 (Part 2) Hijacked." YouTube home page. 18 August 2007. Youtube.com. 13 February 2010 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wl4RFoT-sJQ>.

Wall-E. Dir. Andrew Stanton. Perf. Ben Burtt and Elissa Knight. Pixar Animation Studios, 2008.

Washburne, Christopher and Maiken Derno, eds. *Bad Music: The Music We Love to Hate*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Weis, Elisabeth and John Belton, eds. *Film Sound: Theory and Practice*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Weiss, Allen S. [a] *Breathless: Sound Recording, Disembodiment, and The Transformation of Lyrical Nostalgia*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 2002.

Weiss, Allen S., ed. *Experimental Sound and Radio*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001.

Weiss, Allen S. [b] *Phantasmatic Radio*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.

Weiss, Allen S. [c] "Radio Icons, Short Circuits, Deep Schisms." Weiss 1-7.

Weiss, Allen S. *Shattered Forms: Art Brut, Phantasms, Modernism*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.

Whitehead, Gregory. "Display Wounds: Ruminations of a Vulnerologist." *When Pain Strikes*. Bill Burns, Cathy Busby, and Kim Sawchuk, eds. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999. 133-9.

Whitehead, Gregory. "Radio Play Is No Place: A Conversation between Jérôme Noetinger and Gregory Whitehead." Weiss 89-94.

Whitehead, Gregory. *Shake, Rattle, and Roll*. Perf. Gregory Whitehead. Netherlands, 1993.

Whitman, Walt. "O Captain! My Captain!" *Whitman: Poetry and Prose*. Ed. Justin Kaplan. New York: Library of America, 1996. 467-8.

Wilco. "Ashes of American Flags." *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot*. Perf. Jeff Tweedy, Glenn Kotchke, and John Stirratt. Nonesuch, 2002.

"William Basinski – *The Disintegration Loops*." Discogs home page. Discogs.com. 21 March 2008 <http://www.discogs.com/release/75994>.

"William Basinski, *The Disintegration Loops I-IV*." *Haunted Ink* home page. 2003. Hauntedink. com. 21 March 2008 <http://www.hauntedink.com/25/basinski-disintegration.html>.

"William Basinski – *The Disintegration Loops I-IV*." Pitchfork Media home page. 9 April 2004. Pitchforkmedia.com. 21 March 2008 <http://www.pitchforkmedia.com/article/record_ review/15321-the-disintegration-loops-i-iv>.

Williams, Kenneth. "The Phoenix Memo." The Memory Hole home page. 25 July 2003. Thememoryhole.org. 10 June 2009 <http://www.thememoryhole.org/911/phoenix-memo/01.htm>.

Wills, David. *Dorsality: Thinking Back Through Technology and Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Wilson, Eric G. "Real Dreams in *Mulholland Drive*." *The Strange World of David Lynch: Transcendental Irony from* Eraserhead *to* Mulholland Drive. New York: Continuum, 2007. 137-62.

Wishnia, Steven. "Bad Transmission: Clear Channel's Hit List." *Lip Magazine* home page. 24 October 2001. Lipmagazine.org. 9 June 2009 <http://www.lipmagazine.org/ articles/featwishnia_142.shtml>.

Wright, Lawrence. *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*. New York: Knopf, 2006.

Young, Neil. "Let's Roll." *Are You Passionate?* Perf. Neil Young. Warner, 2002.

Young, Rob. "Worship the Glitch: Digital Music, Electronic Disturbance." *Undercurrents: The Hidden Wiring of Modern Music*. Ed. Rob Young. New York: Continuum, 2002. 45-55.

Zero: An Investigation into 9/11. Dir. Franco Fracassi, Francesco Tre, and Francesco Trento. TPF Telemaco, 2008.

Žižek, Slavoj. *Welcome to the Desert of the Real: Five Essays on September 11 and Related Dates*. New York: Verso, 2002.