Toilet Papering the Cultural Edifice: Jose Maceda’s *Cassettes 100* as Philippine Happening

**[Fig. 1-2]** On the evening of March 8, 1971, following the premier of *Cassettes 100* at the Cultural Center of the Philippines (CCP), clusters of people milled about as they meandered towards the lobby’s front doors. Above the crowd hung large chandeliers dripping with tiny Venetian crystals and expensive capiz seashells. Their costly procurement and presence signaled First Lady Imelda Marcos’ desire to construct a spectacular international center for the arts in Manila, the capital city of the Philippines. On that particular night, however, piles of unrolled toilet paper and crushed tissue littered the CCP’s pristine floor. A stray sheet or two of crinkled paper dangled from the CCP’s second-floor ledge; their height and vertical orientation mocked the strands of crystal in vulgar fashion. Nathanial Gutierrez—then documentary photographer for the CCP—captured a bird’s eye view of the scene from the CCP’s open third floor ledge. His high vantage point flattened the suspended chandelier into the white mess of paper on the ground floor, collapsing not only the space, but also the hierarchical distinction between the two materials. While the typical concert might result in some misplaced bits of rubbish, the generous accumulation of crumpled paper revealed the peculiarity of that particular night’s performance at the state-supported cultural institution.

The strewn paper had once comprised the backdrop of *Cassettes 100*, an avant-garde music concert/sound happening orchestrated in the CCP’s lobby by Jose Maceda. Maceda, who cited Edgard Varese and Iannis Xenakis as important influences, was serving as an esteemed composer and ethnomusicologist on faculty at the University of the Philippines-Diliman.[[1]](#footnote-1) In lieu of trained musicians, *Cassettes 100* called for one hundred volunteers to descend upon the CCP lobby wielding their own cassette players. Each volunteer played a unique cassette that Maceda had recorded from his detailed score to create one cohesive composition. According to notes for the event, Maceda intended these cassettes to replace “several musical instruments emitting composed sounds of gongs, buzzers, harps, shells, leaves, flutes, sticks, zithers, human voices, blocks, tubes, clappers and so forth” to create “one complete music not based on melody, but on densities, permutations, filters, windows, and screens.”[[2]](#footnote-2) Maceda also provided the volunteers with five numerical diagrams that illustrated each performer’s intended placement and activity within the CCP’s circling multi-level corridors and central lobby. These instructions indicated that after completing the diagrams, the performers were to rewind the cassettes and play them again to choreography by Alice Reyes.[[3]](#footnote-3) **[Fig. 3]** Teodoro Hilado, then technical director of the CCP, designed the light projections used for *Cassettes 100* and artists Jose Joya and Ofelia Gelvezon created its unusual set of streamers, toilet paper, and large sheets of paper hung from the ceiling and the ledges of the CCP hallways.[[4]](#footnote-4)

**[Fig. 4]** While flashes of light throbbed onto the fragmented surfaces created by the suspended planes of paper, members of the audience commingled with the volunteer performers as everyone wove through the tangle of people and paper in the CCP. Despite the order implied within Maceda’s methodic diagrams, *The Asia Magazine*, an international magazine published in Hong Kong and circulated in the Sunday edition of major Asian newspapers, described *Cassettes 100* as a “chaotic concert” in which “the brave majority [of the audience] thronged through the lobby… and the jungle of toilet paper streamers hanging from the ceiling.”[[5]](#footnote-5) In another review of *Cassettes 100* in the *Manila Times*, Exequiel S. Molina contrasted the wild ambiance of the evening with the CCP’s dignified décor. He observed, “Psychedelic lighting and streams of paper tacked to the ceiling gave the usually staid Cultural Center an atmosphere not unlike that of a hippy hangout.”[[6]](#footnote-6) He noted, however, that missing from the party “was the distinctive reek of marijuana smoke. And for a good reason: Everyone was cautioned not to smoke because the paper and inflammable decorative materials could easily catch fire.”[[7]](#footnote-7) Yet, even without drugs and impromptu flames, the CCP’s lobby became a chaotic site during the final moments of *Cassettes 100*. Amidst the drone of the cassettes and psychedelic lights, participants tore apart the pieces of *Cassettes 100*’s flimsy paper backdrop, smashing the debris into the ground as they moved throughout the building.

Posters for *Cassettes 100* advertised it as a “A Sound Happening by Jose Maceda.” In notes for the performance, Maceda characterized the performance as “an avant-garde music composition” that was “presented in a sort of ‘happening’ or an ‘event.’” [[8]](#footnote-8) His placement of quotation marks around the words “happening” and “event” indicate that he intended these terms—and their affiliated forms—as citations. *Cassettes 100* included what Maceda himself described in 1966 as John Cage’s penchant for “chance” and his use of “‘events,’ noises, electronic sounds, and all kind of sound material in an indeterminate organization.”[[9]](#footnote-9) Maceda’s decision to place both the terms “happening” and “event” in quotations for *Cassettes 100*’s program notes linked the performance to his earlier reference of an “event” in relation to Cage, who premiered his most iconic oeuvre of *4’33”* in 1952 in New York City, where Maceda was studying composition and musicology.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Kaprow also owed debt to Cage; the former had coined the term “Happening” in 1958 while he was attending a weekly experimental composition course taught by Cage at the New School of Social Research in New York City.[[11]](#footnote-11) Under Cage’s tutelage, Kaprow conceived of Happening, “a form in which a number of events take place together in space and time, never to be repeated in exactly the same manner.”[[12]](#footnote-12) “Happenings” ranged from “the highly scripted to the spare and conceptual.”[[13]](#footnote-13) Like Cage’s events, happenings also implicitly included an element of indeterminacy, which, according to Stephanie Rosenthal, included a level of risk with the introduction of the general public. According to Rosenthal, Kaprow’s *18 Happenings in 6 Parts* (1959) “gave way to a radically free artistic form in which the individual participant is crucially entrusted to take responsibility for his/her own actions/experience.”[[14]](#footnote-14) Both “happenings” and “events” referred to in notes for *Cassettes 100* rely an open-endedness of form that included individual mediation. This key characteristic of happenings permitted the audience members and participants of *Cassettes 100*—similarly “entrusted to take responsibility for his/her own actions/experience”—to act as a faceless crowd that could trash the CCP from within.[[15]](#footnote-15)

This article explores how *Cassettes 100*,as one of the earliest and most significant example of happenings in the Philippines, anticipated refusal as an elastic and indistinct form under the Ferdinand and Imelda Marcoses’ conjugal dictatorship.[[16]](#footnote-16) Through close examination of the performance and its historical circumstances, the paper argues that *Cassettes 100* provided a model of how resistance could operate by challenging sensorial experiences specific to the Marcoses’ technological and socio-political concerns. Inaugurated in 1969, the CCP had a prominent role in the development of experimental art in the Philippines during the 1970s. The multi-functional building comprised exhibition spaces for the visual arts and a technologically advanced theater for local and international performances. While art exhibited and performed at the CCP in the 1970s carried the burden of collusion with Ferdinand and Imelda Marcoses’ regime, visual and historical analysis of the works complicate that assumption.

Conceived as a happening in the lobby of the formidable Cultural Center of the Philippines Theater for Performing Arts, *Cassettes 100* allowed Maceda and its participants to assemble and reconfigure space within a state-controlled cultural institution at the brink of martial law. Maceda’s citation of an established avant-garde practice disguised *Cassettes 100*’s political undertones and permitted its entrance into the CCP under Imelda Marcos—a patron of the arts who wanted to establish the Philippines as a nation relevant to the international art world.[[17]](#footnote-17) By declaring the performance a happening, Maceda and his collaborators could adorn the lobby with vulgar materials antithetical to the CCP’s intentionally ritzy interior—the literal toilet papering of a cultural edifice.[[18]](#footnote-18) During *Cassettes 100*, soft bodies—one hundred of them carrying cassette players—packed together as they circulated within the confines of the CCP’s concrete walls. The sounds emanating from these moving sources created an immersive sonic environment that absorbed the individual into a collective drone. The pretense of performance art and the indeterminacy specific to happenings generated a site for spontaneous action as bodies absorbed into an anonymous crowd emerged and participated in the temporary defacement of the CCP without repercussion.

“Slab of Sanctified Carpeted Concrete”: The CCP and its Critics[[19]](#footnote-19)

*Cassettes 100* took place in the corridors of the University of the Philippines Faculty Center on March 5 and the lobby of the Cultural Center on March 8, 1971. Co-sponsored by the University of the Philippines-Diliman Council on the Arts and the Cultural Center of the Philippines,the Faculty Center iteration was intended for students and faculty members and the second performance at the CCP was open to the public.[[20]](#footnote-20) Maceda circulated a press release that called for volunteers to carry the cassettes during *Cassettes 100* in Manila newspapers two months before the event. The announcement required participants to bring their own battery-operated cassette tape recorders and gave priority to those who registered in person with the secretary of the College of Music at University of the Philippines-Diliman, hereafter referred to as UP.[[21]](#footnote-21) Despite its affiliation as a public university, Ferdinand Marcos, himself a UP graduate, had failed to quash the as a hotbed of activism in the 1970s. Universities such as UP would later be one of the few sites in Metro Manila that people could assemble for political protest during martial law, which Marcos declared one short year after *Cassettes 100*.[[22]](#footnote-22)

While Marcos’ presidency lasted from 1965 to 1986, he imposed martial law in the Philippines from 1972 to 1981 under the guise of suppressing communist takeover and further civil disobedience.[[23]](#footnote-23) Declaration of martial law resulted in the elimination of independent press, the limitation of assembly and movement due to strict curfews, and covert junctures of violence and secret assassinations. Coinciding with the decade of coercion, control and suppression, however, was a flourishing avant-garde or conceptual art scene that developed within the walls of the Cultural Center of the Philippines, a gargantuan concrete structure constructed largely due to First Lady Imelda Marcos’s interest in arts and in cultural diplomacy.[[24]](#footnote-24) Protests against Ferdinand and Imelda Marcos had already surfaced before his declaration of martial law in 1972. Shortly after the beginning of Marcos’ second term, students organized a set of riots and demonstrations that laid Malacañang Palace—the Marcoses’ official presidential residence—under siege.[[25]](#footnote-25) From January to March in 1970, students at UP and nearby Ateneo de Manila University led three months of violent student protests directed at Marcos and the colluding United States government.[[26]](#footnote-26) That same year, students at UP also humiliated Marcos when they usurped the University radio station to broadcast a recording of Ferdinand Marcos engaging in intimate acts with Dovie Beams, an American actress who starred in one of Marcos’ propaganda films. [[27]](#footnote-27) Maceda’s affiliation with UP and the privileging of those who registered in person at the university suggested that *Cassettes 100* drew its performers from a largely leftist, politically conscientious pool of students who rallied against the Marcoses.

*Cassettes 100* assembled these untrained volunteers—mostly from UP—to perform within the recently inaugurated CCP. Publications from 1970s declared the CCP a “display of architectural and structural unity”— a unity demonstrative of the national power of central governance celebrated by the Marcos regime.[[28]](#footnote-28) Designed by Leandro Locsin, the CCP was a conspicuous example of local Brutalist architecture and visual allusion of the Philippines’ bid for an international modernity in the 20th century. According to Geraro Lico, the CCP was built on reclaimed land along Manila Bay as Imelda Marcos had intended the area to resemble something like the French Riviera.[[29]](#footnote-29) Lico argues that the Marcoses’ manipulation of “natural physiology…by reclaiming the land from the sea” was a “symbolic gesture not only of its subversion of nature, but also of the impeding social changes, especially the declaration of martial law in 1972.” [[30]](#footnote-30) In other words, the political and economic power necessary for the reclamation of land to build the CCP complex anticipated Ferdinand Marcos’ declaration martial law. The Marcoses had planned for the edifice to be the Theater of Performing Arts within a complex that would include a separate art museum. This building, however, was never constructed, and the fourth and third floor rooms initially used for temporary exhibition still remain the CCP’s primary visual art spaces. Many well-known artists of the period also contributed their labor to the CCP. Painters Fernando Zobel, Arturo Luz, and Cesar Legaspi designed murals around the Center, while sculptor Vicente Manansala donated the bronze wall sculpture at the entrance of the theater.[[31]](#footnote-31) Imelda Marcos also commissioned H.R. Ocampo to create *Genesis*, a painting that would be used as the template for the drop curtain in the Main Theater.[[32]](#footnote-32)

Critics of the CCP noted that its programming consisted largely of international performances, which appeared at odds with the CCP’s intended purpose as the custodian and incubator of local Philippine culture.[[33]](#footnote-33) Since the Marcoses was particularly interested in forming international alliances during the 1970s, Imelda often entertained foreign dignitaries at the CCP as part of her diplomatic strategy.[[34]](#footnote-34) During the Cultural Center’s opening festivities, which included American representation by then California governor and his wife, Ronald and Nancy Reagan, Imelda mused about the importance of the institution, stating, “A nation must have a place for Art, or it remains a stranger sitting in the shadow, outside the sunlit circle of the human family.”[[35]](#footnote-35) In addition to envisioning the CCP as a receptacle for art, the CCP itself was meant to be an architectural landmark in its own right.

Through its visual reference to international architecture and its mastery of natural physiology through the reclamation of land, the CCP symbolized the Marcoses’ consolidation of state power and commitment to rapid—and internationally legible—modernization. As the grand pet project of the First Lady, the CCP was criticized for using State funds and land to subsidize a building she had claimed would be mostly privately funded. [[36]](#footnote-36) Senator Benigno Aquino—Marcos’ formidable political adversary whose assassination in 1983 provoked the People’s Power Revolution—thought the government could more effectively use the money to serve impoverished populations. During the building’s inaugural years, he questioned the CCP’s legality of using State funds and its potential to truly benefit the people of the Philippines.[[37]](#footnote-37)

The CCP’s entanglement with the Marcoses also created suspicion towards artists exhibiting at the institution. Artists such as Marciano Galang and David Medalla—an avant-garde artist known for his “bubbling machines” and “pervasive influence over young ‘rebels’”[[38]](#footnote-38)—picketed at the opening of the CCP.[[39]](#footnote-39) Medalla also called Locsin “a freak architect for designing the ‘monstrosity,’” and was “very vocal about the Cultural Center not buying his bubbling machine.” [[40]](#footnote-40) In an article criticizing the CCP shortly after its inauguration in 1969, Marra Pl. Lanot also argued that the CCP “breaks the unity of the artists…Only the yes artist and the name artist will make it to the Center, never the young talented rebel on the left of the Center.”[[41]](#footnote-41) After Lanot’s criticism, programs such as Roberto Chabet’s *Thirteen Artist Exhibition* and Raymundo Albano’s *CCP Annual* belied the notion that “rebel” artists were prohibited from the CCP as both programs promoted young and often provocative artists. Medalla’s *Bubble Machine*—listed as an example of kinetic art—was even exhibited in 1971 in the CCP’s *The Fifties, A Tribute to Lyd Arguilla* exhibition.[[42]](#footnote-42)

Scathing criticism of the CCP common during its inaugural years suspiciously subsided as the decade progressed under the Marcoses. Purita Kalaw-Ledesma—the founder of the Art Association of the Philippines—and Amadis Ma. Guerrero suggest in *The Struggle for Philippine Art* that despite early “misgivings” that the CCP would be used as a “political weapon” through the years, this “suspicion seems to have died down.”[[43]](#footnote-43) Perhaps this occurred because Ferdinand Marcos began to suppress freedom of press during martial law, including closing the weekly *Philippine Free Press*—the Philippines’ oldest and most respected publication, one that circulated information on Marcos’ affair with Dovie Beams and much of Senator Aquino’s accusations against the CCP.[[44]](#footnote-44) As the Marcoses’ regime exerted control over the usual outlets utilized for protest within a functioning democracy, people found creative ways to exercise forms of refusal or self-determination right underneath the prying eyes of authority.

**Siting *Cassettes 100* at the CCP**

While *Cassettes 100* benefited from the sponsorship from the controversial CCP, Maceda’s decision to site the happening in the lobby of the CCP instead of the Main Theater casted doubt on the intended function of the state structure. The CCP was not only a visual representation of modernity as a “progressive image of Manila…through distinctive modern architecture” but its Main Theater was also emblematic of modern sound.[[45]](#footnote-45) Hailed as “an acoustical marvel” by the *Business Chronicle*, the CCP Main Theater symbolized the Marcoses’ desire of a sonic modernity in the Philippines in the 1970s.[[46]](#footnote-46) Engineers from Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, a top acoustical consulting firm from the United States, worked to bring “acoustical perfection” to the Main Theater, the centerpiece of the CCP.[[47]](#footnote-47) That the CCP’s Theater was designed to host a range of performances with various sonic concerns meant that acoustical engineering had to account for those differences. Sound engineers incorporated variables such as a sound-absorbing curtain that could be lowered behind an acoustic wire mesh and adjustable sound reflectors hidden from public view to accommodate for the type of reverberation needed for different performances.[[48]](#footnote-48)

These aforementioned accoutrements allowed the Main Theater to control its reverberation, which Emily Thompson describes as “the lingering over time of residual sound in a space” that marks the specificity of place.[[49]](#footnote-49) The technological command over reverberation, Thompson explicates, was “modern because it was perceived to demonstrate man’s technical mastery over his physical environment, and it did so in a way that transformed traditional relationships between sound, space, and time.”[[50]](#footnote-50) In an article in *Business Chronicle* discussing the CCP’s construction in 1970, V.S. Sambo observed that the Main Theater auditorium could carry “sound, clear and unblurred, to the furthest seat so that every member of the audience felt himself the epicenter of soaring sound.”[[51]](#footnote-51) Just as the reclamation of land exhibited their authority over nature, the attention paid to reverberation demonstrated their “mastery over their physical environment” as representative of the regime’s “progressive image.”[[52]](#footnote-52)

Soon after Marcos had taken office in 1965, Imelda Marcos conveyed her desire to create a venue in the Philippines that would rival international concert halls. At her first press conference as the First Lady, Imelda proclaimed, “My dream is to have a theatre—a completely equipped auditorium where artists can find full expression of their talent. Something like Carnegie Hall, perhaps.”[[53]](#footnote-53) The CCP and its superb acoustics fulfilled Imelda’s wishes. That the CCP Main Theater produced sound that fit the standards of a modern performance venue permitted a rotating cast of international performers to circulate through it. The CCP Main Theater functioned much like a Carnegie Hall with a roster of world-renowned performers such as Harvey Lavan “Van” Cliburn, an American pianist who received the International Artist Award in the Philippines in 1974.[[54]](#footnote-54)

Maceda’s decision to situate *Cassettes 100* in the lobby—an open and public area immediately outside the meticulously designed theater of the CCP—taunted the state structure’s capacity to perform its intended function as a sonic marvel.[[55]](#footnote-55) The flattening of reverberation, which had previously been a building’s acoustical signature, had the consequence of producing a “modern sound [that] was easy to understand, but…had little to say about the places it was produced and consumed.”[[56]](#footnote-56) **[Fig. 4]** While acoustical engineering in the Theater controlled the transmission of sound, the expanse of glass doors that faced Roxas Boulevard—a broad and busy street full of city noises—could not. Not only was the noise of the everyday world included in the performance, the transparency of the doors also opened *Cassettes 100* into the surrounding world, transforming the performance space into one that included the expanse outside. Though the Marcoses’ crusade for international modernity created a performance venue that could be anywhere, *Cassettes 100*, sited just outside of the Main Theater, emphasized the specificity of place—Manila.

Notes on *Cassettes 100* also emphasize the importance of siting it in the “corridors” as a way to integrate the “artistic sound world” into public life. According to the notes:

A music played in corridors rather than on the stage brings artistic sound world into the everyday life of men who work in buildings. At the same time the participation of the public in the production of sound exemplifies the role of the masses in today’s life—in industry, consumption of goods, and political participation.[[57]](#footnote-57)

By using mass media announcements to procure performers for *Cassettes 100* within the space of “every life of men,” Maceda positioned *Cassettes 100* as exemplary of the role of the masses in the public realm, including “political participation.”[[58]](#footnote-58) Maceda acknowledged the potential of the mass of sound and bodies in *Cassettes 100* set within the controversial CCP as one that could resemble political participation or protest. Including an untrained public into a musical performance within an unconventional space permitted people to eschew the usual codes of behavior for concerts at the institution.

Placing *Cassettes 100* outside of the prescribed performance space also eliminated the division between performer and viewer. The lack of an elevated stage removed the spotlight from the performers and their visibility as everyone was encouraged to mingle together in the CCP’s lobby during *Cassettes 100*. Volunteer performers and audience members fluctuated in and out of being seen and not seen as lights flashed around them; everyone participated in watching and being watched. Being off the stage generated the potential for anonymity necessary for people to move in and out of affiliations as everyone in the happening oscillated between being an active performer and a passive viewer.

Maceda’s siting of *Cassettes 100* in the corridors and lobby of the CCP rather than its carefully engineered theater permitted people to further contemplate how they could also position themselves in physical and metaphorical structures of power in non-complicit, but not immediately critical ways. He created a participatory space in which the outside world and all its noises—antithetical to the ideals of Marcoses exemplified by the command of reverberation in the CCP Main Theater—might be incorporated into the happening. *Cassettes 100* interfered with the building’s function as an acoustical marvel and a symbol of Philippine modernity. Though *Cassettes 100* made use of the Cultural Center’s infrastructure and space, it did so outside of the place prescribed for musical performances.

**The Cassette and The Drone**

Locating *Cassettes 100* in areas immediately outside of the Main Theater was not Maceda’s only rejection of the CCP as an acoustical feat. His inclusion of one hundred cassettes also spurned the technological advancements intended to bring the vibrant sound of local and foreign live music to the Philippine people. These included performances such as ones by the London Philharmonic, whose members described the Main Theater as “acoustically the best they have performed in.”[[59]](#footnote-59) As an ethnomusicologist, Maceda was also fond of tape recording’s capacity to document and disseminate “a comprehensive connection with the past”—particularly of musical practices that were slowly disappearing in the Philippine provinces.[[60]](#footnote-60) Yet, the practical qualities that permitted the tape recorder—a portable and relatively affordable device—to function well as a tool for the ethnomusicologist also made it possible for it to be used in more nefarious circumstances.

Tape recording was undoubtedly a fraught medium in Manila when *Cassettes 100* premiered at the CCP. In 1970, students commandeered the university radio station to broadcast recordings of Marcos in an intimate moment with American actress Dovie Beams.[[61]](#footnote-61) As his primary mistress during the late sixties, Beams had secretly tape-recorded the couple’s private trysts. The US Embassy had offered her $100,000 cash in exchange for the recordings, but she refused. Instead, Beams held a press conference at the Bay View Hotel across from the Embassy, where she played recordings of her illicit encounters with Marcos to reporters. Unknown to Beams, two of these clever reporters also secretly recorded her tapes in the hotel room during the press conference. One of these bootlegs made its way to the UP’s student radio station, where it was again played for the station’s listeners. [[62]](#footnote-62)

The Dovie Beams scandal demonstrated tape recording’s capacity to bear witness and publicly relay information that could harm Ferdinand Marcos, exposing the fragility of his authority. The tapes became “a major topic of mirth and gossip” and made Marcos look “ridiculous.”[[63]](#footnote-63) The clandestine nature of tape recorders allowed anyone to replicate and propagate a moment that undermined Marcos and his claim of control—both of his personal life and of the people. A minor actress from Tennessee could use sound recording to implicate the President Marcos in a humiliating public predicament. James Hamilton-Paterson even suggests it is not “beyond speculation that the act of declaring martial law contained an element of rebound from the confusions and depression of the affair with Dovie Beams.”[[64]](#footnote-64) That Beams was unable to restrict circulation of her own covert recordings demonstrated the potential of the public to mobilize in unpredictable ways to subvert Marcos. The memory of tape recording’s capacity for unbridled dissemination of information was fresh when Maceda composed *Cassettes 100*—a concert that called for one hundred people brandishing cassette recorders through an edifice meant to symbolize the Marcoses’ cultural power.

The exclusive use of tape recorders over live instrumentation also permitted people with no technical or musical training to volunteer as performers in *Cassettes 100*. Alfredo Roces, a critic for the arts column in the *Manila Times*, stated in his review of *Cassettes 100* that the concert sought “the participation of the public in music-making, the playing of music in public places other than concert halls.”[[65]](#footnote-65) Another review of *Cassettes 100* noted, “This is all part of the new thinking that music not need be limited to the capabilities of human voice or the skills of the instrumentalists.”[[66]](#footnote-66) Since anyone could participate in new music, regardless of skill, it demanded the masses to take part in the development of culture. *The Asia Magazine* reporter observed, “Maceda’s idea was to create a truly contemporary music for the ‘mass age’—massed populations, mass production, mass consumption. His theory is that the masses, even if musically unschooled, can take a conductive role in the creation of music.”[[67]](#footnote-67) Maceda’s decision to use tape recording —an easily accessible form of technology —emboldened mass participation.

Mass participation encouraged disorder. ThoughMaceda intended participants to simultaneously play their cassettes to produce one penultimate performance, he was more than aware of the potential for human error. The volunteers were unlikely to turn on their cassette players at precisely the same moment and move through the CCP lobby into their positions at the same pace. Since each performer brought a personal cassette player, the quality of the sound from the disparate apparatuses would also be variable. Yet, since the sounds of *Cassettes 100* depended on drone rather than melody, the performance permitted for a lack of precision since the drone was readily absorbed in the hum of a crowd. While a line of melody requires individual components to be perfectly, or at least closely, timed, the drone can be imprecise but still “make one complete music”—the bustling noise of a mass of bodies as they move through space.[[68]](#footnote-68)

According to his accounts and graduate school fieldwork, instruments from Asia prominently featured drone—the consistent repetition of a singular note, or set of notes— rather than melody—a linear set of notes that comprised a pleasing, musical harmony. In a paper presented at the *International Conference on the Traditional Drama and Music of Southeast Asia*, Maceda discussed his research on Philippine instrumentation and states, “In bamboo scrapers for example, there is neither a scale nor a melody to speak of.” He later described these instruments as producing single, steady rhythms—the drone—that he uses consistently in *Cassettes 100*’s composition*.*[[69]](#footnote-69) The sounds that he recorded onto the cassettes produce a complete musical composition that, according to his press release, was “based not on melody, but on densities, permutations, filters, windows and screens.”[[70]](#footnote-70) *Cassettes 100*’s score alsodesignates long sections in which one note is played repeatedly over a span of time, including a few pages labeled “Grains,” which lists drums, pebbles, aluminum and leaves as its instrumentation in the margin notes of the score.[[71]](#footnote-71)

The recording of *Cassettes 100* from its original performance at the CCP begins with Maceda counting down from 10 to 0 over a loudspeaker. The recordingssound similar to the shuffle of everyday life mixed with instances of music. Gentle strains of flute, crinkling paper, popping and banging noises, and the sound of raindrops consistently hitting a pavement are among those heard alongside the buzzing murmur of people’s voices in the recording. The bustle of the physical crowd moving about the CCP remains indistinguishable from the sound generated by the pre-recorded cassettes. This crowd was generated not only through the noise produced by the immediate presence of people in the CCP, but was also through the pre-recorded cassettes, extending the crowd’s presence beyond the time and space of *Cassettes 100.*

In *Listening to Noise and Silence*, Salomé Voegelin analyzes the social aspect of noise—the drone in particular— and its capacity to render the dense phenomenological sensation of a crowd through aural perception. Voegelin explains:

As I walk through a busy urban street I try to ignore the incessant hum of thick traffic, the noisy commotion and vocal drone of people around me…Sound renders the crowd massive and pervasive, becoming ever denser and more intimidating, encroaching on my personal space… Switch off the drone of hammering footsteps and the aural hubbub of human activity, the crowd shrinks immediately, the frightful beast is tamed.[[72]](#footnote-72)

In the passage above, Voegelin suggests that the “noisy commotion” and “drone” made by the people significantly enhances the sensation of a crowd that encroaches on “personal space.” While Voegelin describes this encroachment as negative, the aural perception of a crowd could also conceal the individual body. *Cassettes 100* made use of that disembodied sound. The cassette players generated a crowd that extended beyond immediate presence. The crowd in *Cassettes 100* was not only expressed through the presence of bodies, but enhanced through the aural perception of the crowd, cloaking the attendees of the eventin a sense of anonymity. Filled with the perpetual drone, Maceda’s composition sonically obscured individuals within *Cassettes 100* into a faceless crowd that was primed for action without consequence.

**“Or do something”: Performing *Cassettes 100* at the CCP**

*Cassettes 100* not only created a sonic impression of a crowd through the dispersion of one hundred recordings, it also mobilized a physical crowd of bodies at the CCP. Maceda used newspaper announcements and cassette tapes to encourage public participation in the arts. Prior to *Cassettes 100,* untrained volunteer performers received a set of nine instructions and five diagrams detailing where to go and what to do. These instructions included minor points such as what volume to set the cassette players, how hard to press the levers of the players, and how to clean them with “cotton dipped in rubbing alcohol” before the happening.[[73]](#footnote-73) The set of instructions also specified to “be sure your batteries are fresh.”[[74]](#footnote-74) The directions assert comic control over the minutiae of how participants were to treat their cassette players to maintain a consistency of sound. Yet, thepublic announcement for one hundred amateurs to participate in a performance with minimal rehearsal implied that Maceda anticipated chaos within the concert. The instructions given to participants before *Cassettes 100* further acknowledged that some volunteers might have skipped the only rehearsal and noted that, “Those [participants] who did not rehearse, follow the movements of others who rehearsed.”[[75]](#footnote-75)

*Cassettes 100* required the recording to be played twice. After Maceda’s countdown, performers were to follow the formations diagrammed onto papers given to them before the happening. These handouts noted, “Immediately, after the FIRST performance, rewind your tape CAREFULLY, and go back to your position in Formations I.”[[76]](#footnote-76) The participants were further informed, “The change of formations or positions is every 6 minutes. Flood-lights flashing through the chandelier will signal when the change is due.”[[77]](#footnote-77) Handouts noted that they were also required to check in their shoes. This provided a ritual quality to the performance and prevented the volunteer participants from leaving without prior authorization.

Five diagrams included in the handouts annotate the positions assigned to each performer. “Formations I” consists of the numbers one to a hundred scattered across the entire page **[Fig. 6]**. On the left side of the diagram demarcates a lounge area and on the right, a set of crudely drawn stairs. These features map the diagram to the CCP main lobby. “Formations I” is labeled as dispersion—the hundred participants were first expected to “stand motionless” and then “relax” in their assigned place for six minutes. Since the first formation called for a diffusion of participants and sound throughout the CCP’s lobby, it encouraged the audience members to also spread throughout the space, weaving through the cassette wielding performers.

The script seems to foresee moments of negotiation between the participants and its creator. The dearth of physical floor markers, ample rehearsal or legible numerical order suggest that “Formations I” might not be a diagrammatic programming of positions in real space, but an illustration of the random dispersion of bodies intended at the opening of *Cassettes 100*. Its fulfillment seemed to require the hundred performers to space themselves out in negotiation with others to resemble the dispersion expressed on the paper. Like the mistimed cassette player enveloped in the drone, an errant performer—one who might stand in the periphery instead of following their assignment towards the center—can still appear to be a part of the intended mix of bodies. The opening formation also emphasized the lack of a central focal point—an absence of stage—and blurred the distinction between performer and audience member.

Yet, the unmistakable crossed out number “23” left visible towards the bottom left of “Formations I” indicates authorial intention, as Maceda had decided that *that* particular location was unsuitable for “23.” The “23” remains visible beneath the imprinted X, however, signaling not only its erroneous placement, but that forethought had been given to placing each respective number. This marker of intention suggests that participants had options: they could comply, adopt a divergent direction, follow someone else, or even mistakenly assume the incorrect position. In spite of their decision (or mistakes), however, the result was the same: the dispersion of bodies occupying the usually unused areas of the CCP.

“Formations II” divides the participants into three groups. Two smaller groups of twenty-five are drawn at opposite diagonal corners from one another; the diagram instructs one group to simply sit and the other to form a single file line that “makes(s) a continuous spiral.”[[78]](#footnote-78) The large group of fifty people is labeled as the “walking group”, required to “keep moving.”[[79]](#footnote-79) Despite the lack of elevated stage, the two smaller groups are drawn sequestered together in distinct scenes that might encourage audience members to look upon them like pieces of theater. Dividing these two, however, is the “walking group” that mirrors the behavior of the audience members as they traversed the CCP to observe the sitting and the spiraling performers. Although the possession of cassette players and bare feet made the performers distinct from audience members, in darkness it would have been difficult to discern a performer from a member of the audience. The vast majority of people would thus shift between spectator and performer as they navigated through the different groups in “Formations II.”

“Formations III” divides the volunteers into one “big” group and one “small” group **[Fig. 7]**.[[80]](#footnote-80) “Formations II” requires the big group, made of seventy people, to “go near walls; walk and make the audience walk with you.”[[81]](#footnote-81) The remaining thirty are ordered to sit in the center and instructed to “examine your recorder, doodle, pretend to knit or do something.”[[82]](#footnote-82) The “small” group appears labeled as such not only because they are small in number, but also because their intended movements are modest. Though these gestures are humble, the participants are given a distinct instance in *Cassettes 100* to follow the directions, yet choose their own method of doing so. In this formation, the text in the diagram also encourages volunteers to explore the boundaries of the building by pushing right up against its walls. This is also the first time the diagrams address the presence of an audience. They encourage the performer to “make the audience walk with you” as they walked “near walls,” expanding the perimeters of the prescribed performance space to the very edges of the CCP. The audience members once again blend with the performers as they join them against the walls of the institution.

“Formations IV” is labeled as “concentration.” Performers are called to walk in different speeds to the first floor or balcony over the lounge. Then “Formations V” has them disperse again, as they are called to their original position. When the music stopped, the diagrams indicate that the volunteers were to “freeze” and hold their recorders “high.”[[83]](#footnote-83) **[Fig. 8]** In one of Gutierrez’s photographs documenting this moment, most of the participants follow the directions expressed by “Formations V” and hold their recorders high above their heads. In this position, the performers appear as if they were either surrendering to authority or—due to the position of the paper banners above them—holding up posters in protest at the political rally. The photograph captures a moment in which motives seem unclear; the image oscillates between being a representation of surrender or a gesture of dissent. The photograph illustrates how acts of protest or resistance might be veiled as one pose could convey oppositional intentions.

Since the performers were following directions for “Formations V” that demanded they “freeze” and hold their recorders (and thus their hands) “high,” Gutierrez’s photograph might appear to represent an instance of submission than resistance. Not all of the performers, however, followed directions. To the left side of the photograph is a small, blurry figure who, despite holding a cassette player over his head, seems to have been shifting when this photograph was taken. The fuzziness of the figure contrasts with the sharpness of the woman who stands still at the foreground of the photograph. She holds her cassette player high above her head. Though the woman in the foreground followed the directions, the blurriness of the figure behind her implies that he moved despite being ordered to “freeze.” The small size of the blurred body also suggests that it belonged to a child or an adolescent, indicating that everybody and anybody could participate in *Cassettes 100*.

This concluded the first half of the performance as the participants waited to play the cassettes again to Reyes’ choreography.[[84]](#footnote-84) While the instructions include numerical markings as to where the individuals were to stand at any given time, specified movements appeared random, or without purpose, allowing participants to make choices and mistakes—such as moving when one was to freeze—during the happening.[[85]](#footnote-85) The formations give order to a gathering of bodies that assumes an element of chance—or failure— and *Cassettes 100*’s environment also called for disorder. Joya and Gelvezon brought trash into the Cultural Center lobby to use as the backdrop of the happening. These cheap materials shift between signifying screens, decorations, and literal detritus, mirroring the precariousness of *Cassettes 100* as an authorized performance and an unsanctioned, psychedelic party disguised as such. The ephemeral quality of the tissue paper and the soft bodies of the large number of people who gathered also contrasted starkly with the CCP’s solid concrete construction.

Photographs show how audience members and volunteer participants moved through the CCP lobby between fragmented planes of white paper. Projected onto the blank, broken surfaces were various colorful images that were also cast onto the bodies of those present at the performance as they maneuvered between the sheets of paper. The backdrop was created through the projection of light into relative darkness that made some people visible and others imperceptible. Instead of one flat, stable screen, the inclusion of varying surfaces comprised a fragmented backdrop that dissolved into the space of the attendees. Yet, the demands of the structure limited the possibility of the building’s dissolution; the planes of paper still had to drape over wires strung across the ceiling or adhere to the ledges of balconies. Simultaneously boundless and bounded, the layered surfaces caused different occasions of concealment within the open lobby. An audience member or participant could disappear behind a plane or become absorbed into the backdrop through the projection of images onto her body.

The second time the cassettes played, the participants were to perform Reyes’ choreography, which was described as “mass movements akin to Balinese rituals.”[[86]](#footnote-86)Gutierrez seemed to capture people performing various gestures and movements, such as synchronously raising their arms in cheerleader like fashion or gesturing towards the sky with cupped hands. In two particularly poignant, yet ambiguous photographs **[Fig. 9-10]**, participants sit on the floor of the CCP as they flash the peace sign and flip the bird. Were these also a part of Reyes’ choreography or were they a part of Maceda’s call for a small group of participants to “sit” and “do something”? The veneer of performance allowed *Cassettes 100*’s attendees to enact gestures that were common in student protests against the Vietnam War across the United States during that same period, aligning *Cassettes 100* visually with images of dissent around the globe.

As the night progressed, the events shown in Gutierrez’s photographs dissolve into disorder as people tore the paper streamers from the balconies and ledges of the CCP. In the dark, swirls of paper flew through the air like white clouds and wrapped around the clusters of bodies. Yet, unlike images of protest or political rallies, people generally appeared jovial as they smiled, clapped, danced, and waved about their cassette players **[Fig. 11-12]**. Towards the very end—after the lights had already been turned on in the CCP lobby—Maceda also found himself wrapped in mummy-like fashion in the rolls of unraveled toilet paper as an audience gleefully watched **[Fig. 13]**.

Hidden amongst the throng of bodies and the mess of paper, people could create chaos,trashing the lobby of the CCP right under the watchful eyes of symbolic authority. *Cassettes 100* revealed that art could be a model of refusal, ambivalence or indifference in spite of its official siting.[[87]](#footnote-87) It blurred the dichotomy of state-sponsored as compliant and alternative as protest—assumptions that have previously left artists exhibiting at the CCP in the 1970s as elitist and exclusively beholden to state interests. In fact, while the Marcos state-building interests provided spaces for art to thrive, artists and their viewers often had their own agendas.[[88]](#footnote-88) As others began to eschew the rules, destructive impulses were—to some extent—encouraged.

Feckless and playful destruction contradicted the very purposeful intentions of the Marcoses’ to elevate the CCP as a sacred repository of stable culture. People gathered not for the purpose of political rally or protest, but for a performance that appeared to have lots of rules, yet no concrete goals—a performance antithetical to the Marcos’ goal-driven and progressive agenda. While the motivations of Maceda and the participants of *Cassettes 100* were uncertain and ambivalent,the happening left the Cultural Center of the Philippines sonically and physically ravaged as security guards stood by and watched. One reviewer of the performance remarked, “To the security guard, the whole thing was a puzzler. ‘What are they trying to achieve?’ he asked.”[[89]](#footnote-89)

Captions:

Fig. 1. Jose Maceda, *Cassettes 100* aftermath, March 8, 1971, performance, Cultural Center of the Philippines lobby (Photograph by Nathaniel Gutierrez, provided by Cultural Center of the Philippines)
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