

Hearing is never linear, as seeing can often be in mainstream media practices. In previous interviews, I have also expanded on praxes of “silence” and of “resonance” while working spatially with images in film and installation or with concepts in writing. Seeing (or *sounding*) reality primarily as relations and intervals opens wide the field of possibilities. For example, a poem read as a poem does not appeal to me. It is not necessarily through rhyming verses that poetry can be heard. However, what often fascinates me is, let’s say, theory read as poetry or poetry read as philosophy. I love it when poetry comes to me *as* (or *in*) fragments of everyday conversation, when scientific findings address the profoundly poetic dimension of life or of the universe. (I am thinking here of such work as *The Secret Melody*, one of the fabulous books by the astrophysicist Trinh Xuan Thuan.) In other words, when texts, speeches, discourses do not quite fit in preestablished categories and raise questions in relation to genre and classification.

One can enter or exit a film, an installation, an experiment, a dance, a sculpture, or a verbal text by focusing immediately on whether or not it has a voice, as well as on where and how that voice situates itself. For me, the “voice” is a site and an activity by which the work’s social, ethical, and aesthetic positioning is conveyed to the viewer-listener. One can locate it in the intervals between saying and seeing, speaking and hearing, or between language and image, sense and sound. In mainstream productions, image, sound, and verbal interactions are constituted as a homogeneous whole (the many-as-one fiction), but in my praxes, they are conceived so as to challenge the perpetration of relations of subordination between plastic representation and linguistic reference. There’s a widespread tendency to fold the space of the verbal over that of the visual (and vice versa), and hence to reduce them to the functions of illustrating, explaining, and duplicating. But in my work, the relation between the verbal, the musical, and the visual remains one of multiplicity.

In resonance, all objects, all manifestations, all events have a sound component. To remain creative and keep open the field of possibilities, one listens to the intervals of “evidences,” to the becomings of what appears all too obvious to the ear and eye. This has always been part of my creative process, and this is also how happy findings and unplanned encounters find their way into the fabric of the work. Sometimes unwanted resonances become structural devices. They expand meanings in unforeseen directions and enrich the process of their production. Resonances between findings and between encounters account for what many viewers see as the unpredictable character of the unfoldings of my work or of the filmic and literary “reassemblages” I come up with.

One of the most fascinating facets of cinema is the relationship sound has to visual image. The indefinite links emerging from the fabric woven between sense (or meaning), sight, and sound can be mutually expansive and creatively decentering. In working on the sound track of a film, for example, I either work with the local people’s music or, as in the fictional films, with musicians who improvise freely, independently from the images. This makes us all “composers” whose interactions are intensely defined by the art of listening *in relation* rather than of “making sounds” *per se*. Thus two, three, or more musicians are put in conversation, who might not have actually performed together. With solo performances, I create a kind of virtual musical ensemble, and with a single sound or some musical fragments, I create a multiplicity of “voices” *in situ*. The pleasure of surprising oneself and, later, of surprising the musicians involved by extending the possibilities of the music performed is very intense.

Such a practice of multiplicity gives me a lot more room at the editing table to recompose or to “reassemble” the musical fragments, so as to create, with precision, new relations between sight and sound — that are not those of submission and domination and are capable of unsettling the norms, both in meaning production and in filmic impact. I also prefer to treat sound not as sound effects but as music, making full use of the forbidden field of what the classic, musically trained ear calls “noise” or “nonmusical.” My last film, *Night Passage*, offers, among others, an intense example of such a work on the sound track. With today’s digital technology, the possibilities of transforming and composing are infinite.