

HS: No, I think it's probably been with me for a long time, and it goes back to when I was a child. With my teacher there were always certain parts of my lesson that I had things to work on and there were other parts that--I mean sightreading I always got a kick out of. And we'd always fool around a little bit, sort of play off of each other. And I can remember doing this when I was 7, 8 years old, whatever. I always enjoyed that, and he was sort of a frustrated jazz musician in that he was Les Brown's roommate when Les Brown was in school in Ithica College in New York and would have gone on the road with him except that he wasn't really confident that he'd be able to make it. And so decided that he was going to go into teaching full time. And I think he was frustrated for the rest of his life because he never gave himself the chance. And so he still worked casuals and things like that and sort of introduced me to that music, and that was fun. I could really appreciate it and/^{yet}at the same time there was the other thing which was supposedly "serious". And I can't remember where it was in my life that everything really became fun. Now I feel like I'm serious about everything that I do but if it's not fun I don't want to do it.

PO: Well, that's a great attitude. It seems like a really positive thing.

HS: When I went through school, when I was in college--I did my undergraduate work at Ithica College--I played under Walter Beuler, who had an excellent wind ensemble. I was fortunate enough to play in his group, in his wind ensemble, for the 4 years I was there. So I learned all sorts of new disciplines, and I really appreciated those things. There were a few people there at that time starting to get that school involved with new music because it was sort of a traditional approach to everything. Don Wells was the orchestra conductor and then Don Sinta who came in on saxophone. And I guess he was the one who started opening me up a little bit more. I had--when I went there you had to be a clarinet major; there was no such thing as majoring in saxophone, it wasn't

a real instrument, it was a toy--and it wasn't until my senior year that they got a saxophone instructor. I had passed my proficiencies in clarinet and decided I wanted to study with him to learn more about the instrument and some of the literature, and he was involved in a more contemporary idiom. And started getting me involved with altissimo register on the saxophone and some extended techniques. And when I went to graduate school at the University of Illinois--that was a haven for me, I loved it there because the jazz band was so good, which was the first love, and then my second love was composition. I studied with Sal and with Ed London and Ben Johnston and anybody I could get my hands on, could bend their ear sitting over a beer in Teburg's or someplace. So I loved it.

PO: You said in the beginning that you were not entirely happy in jazz or not entirely happy in the other, let's just call it the other (laughter). Can you talk about that a little bit? Or define what it is that's missing?

HS: I think it's because in jazz--I'm going to get into one of my terrible raves because it goes back--I don't even know what historical basis I have but I've developed these prejudices. One of them is against Beethoven. I mean, to get into jazz...

PO: You and John Cage (laughter).

HS: My whole attitude towards that is that the man was so good at what he did. The way I understand the situation, when he took over so much of the responsibility as a composer and started taking the responsibility away from the performer. Because he was so good at what he did, other people wanted to do the same thing, and think in that sense he set music back 150 years. Because it's only been in the last, maybe the last 50 or so, maybe not even that, that we're starting to give some responsibility back to the performer. I really personally feel, both as a composer and a performer, that the most important part of the

composition is the performer. I mean of any composition. Because once you get it down on paper you're finished. That's it. And that's one of the things that I suppose attracted me to jazz. But what's happening is that jazz is starting to become very traditional in the sense that it's gotten itself into educational institutions and they're starting to talk about right and wrong ways of doing things, and--it doesn't work. That's not what the music is about. At the same time when people--you call yourself a jazz musician and, I hate using labels anyway, but people label you and you start to pull in a certain audience. You feel a certain responsibility to the listener--I do. I enjoy playing within very strict disciplines sometimes and other times I enjoy making my own disciplines. And the thing with the jazz performer is that the music itself seems to be imposing more and more disciplines from the outside and allowing fewer and fewer disciplines for the performer. As far as, let's say, the other music, I guess the thing that keeps me from going full tilt in that direction is the limited audience that you reach. At new music concerts you get a very small, very enthusiastic but very small audience. Although I do not have any missionary blood in me at all, I do feel sort of that as my role as a musician and as a composer I can function better in terms of presenting that sort of music to people that never thought they would like it as opposed to those that already like it. So I tend to program concerts and put myself in situations where I enjoy playing traditional sorts of things, and in the middle of a traditional sort of thing I will do something quite untraditional. It may have shock value and yet at the same time I feel that anything I do is valid. And if I can convince the listener of that, they may be more willing to go out and listen to somebody else starting from that point, to go someplace else, instead of starting from the traditional point of view.

PO: How long are--this kind of philosophy that you're talking about. How long have you been aware of it, or how did it evolve?

HS: I don't know. I think it's been gradually evolving. Probably--I've probably felt strongly about it since when I was at Illinois, when I was a graduate student, which meant I would have been about 23, 24 years old. The way that Illinois, the way that the jazz band there programmed material. John Garvey as conductor was totally different from Walter Beuler, the way he approached things, everything about the two people was different with the exception of the fact that they were both striving for excellence in their own way. John's approach to the band--I probably should say that the approach of the band was similar to Ellington's band in that the music grew out of the people in the band. Ellington's whole philosophy was that the band was his instrument. And in a sense that was the instrument that John was playing as a conductor. He wasn't writing the music; we wrote--the music came out of the band. The majority of the music was from the people in the band or music that we wanted to play. Because of the unique situation of the school at that time, it wasn't a normal band. The majority of the people were graduate students or undergraduates that maybe after they got out of high school went^{out} on the road. They were working for 5, 6 years before they finally decided to go to school. Some were graduate students that, after getting/^{an} undergraduate degree, went out and worked and came back to school; some had been in the service and service bands. So the average age of the band--we were always accused of having a bunch of ringers in there--it was all legitimate, we were all students but the average age was about 26. And you had, I'd say probably the youngest one there at that time that was--there were very few undergraduates. And then you had people like Morgan Powell. Different people had different

likes and dislikes and we all became a community where you gave a little bit of yourself away in order to go along with somebody else and found that it was very interesting. That's what we enjoyed doing. A concert with that band ran a whole spectrum from playing Jimmy Lunsford material to something that Morgan may do which didn't even deal with metered time. I suppose that's where I got the idea, because that band to me was a tremendous success.

PO: So that represents a change for you then at that point.

HS: I think so.

PO: What about your emotional states in relation to your music making?

HS: That's difficult because I go somewhere else. When I play I deal in a world that is totally dependent on sound. There are visual aspects to that world. I almost always, if I'm doing jazz material, or once I learn material I work more often than not with my eyes closed, and although I'm aware of audience response and--I hate to get into the thing of talking about vibes, but there really are things that go back and forth between an audience and a performer and that you can feel and you can understand--aware of that and yet at the same time the world I'm in is not this one here. It's someplace else. And with my eyes closed there is a total visual difference, which is hard to explain. The closest I can explain is that--in "2001: Space Odyssey" when he's going towards a planet, towards the end of the picture, and all those lights are flashing by, that's probably the closest that I could explain to anybody because it's a world of bright colors that I live in and they're very transitional, although there may be a time when there's just a solid color with different shapes. These things change, and I've never been able to figure out if concentrating on the color does something to the sound, or if concentrating on the sound does something to the color. To me it makes no difference anyway.

That's the world that I live in when I perform. And there are times when I'll get so involved with that, and I know it's also because I totally involve myself physically when I play, that even when I'm finished playing I have not returned. Part of it I know has to do with when I was involved with the big band and doing a lot of altissimo sorts of playing which places physical demands on you. And from there were times when I would finish/a concert, there were times when I would almost pass out during a concert, more than once somebody's caught because I was that far out, there have been numerous times after concerts where I realized I'm in the same dimension as everyone else almost. Sound comes at me and it's almost as though the sound stops right here and then goes around. It goes over me and around, as though I'm encased in something else. I'm walking here but I'm not really even on the floor or on that level. It's a little bit above that and things go around me. I don't really socialize very well after a concert. I sort of--I'll go out and be sort of sociable but not completely because I'm still someplace else; I can hear, I can communicate, but it's through a mist somehow. It takes me awhile to get back and reorient myself.

PO: Has this been consistent or did it begin at some point in your career as a performer?

HS: I can't really say when it began, but I've been aware of it for probably--I know I was aware of it when I was playing in the band in Illinois, I've been aware of it ever since then.

PO: It's elaborated, become deeper?

HS: No, I think now I've learned to deal with it so that I can get back here quicker once I'm finished. I've learned to reorient myself faster than I used to be able to. I couldn't deal with it whatever it was. Whereas now I can do that. But I want to go there when I play. Now since that's a matter of concentration

and focus of attention. There are sometimes when I'll make it and sometimes when I won't. It's not something that I can turn on and turn off. It's something I try to. If I can go there, and I'll get back to the thing I said earlier about schizophrenia, is that I'm very happy when I'm two people at a concert when there's part of me up there performing and another part of me that's out there listening and is just as much surprised as anyone else at what's happening.

PO: Okay, so actually you're talking about the question which is what I want to ask. Are you aware of your attention states as distinguished from the content of what you're playing?

HS: Yes, I am.

PO: That's what you've been talking about. Maybe you could talk more.

HS: I suppose that first time I started thinking about it, even though I was aware of this being someplace for a number of years, the first time I started trying to figure out what it was, was probably about maybe 8 years ago I guess. I'm trying to think--it would have been about '71, '72. And talking with Gary Burton, he was talking about ideokinetic techniques. And he was very high on this book by Luigi Gompensieri called New Pathways to Piano Technique. I don't know if you're familiar with it or not.

PO: I've heard of it.

HS: I've got a copy of it which is unfortunately missing one of the most important pages of the book, a book of definitions. You can go through and figure everything out but it would make it much easier if I had that one page. Basically it's a piano methods book in two halves. The first half doesn't deal with the piano at all. It deals entirely with the mind, setting up exercises for concentration and trying to get the performer to deal with symbols of his own structure

as opposed to what somebody else might come up with. And then you start reading musical playing you deal totally with symbols as opposed to--I mean we do that anyway, but like it's all become subconscious. Gary was talking about the first time when he experienced something like that when he was in the middle of playing a solo and all of a sudden was amazed by the fact that he had just done whatever it was he did. It's the feeling like I didn't even know I could do that before, that you haven't been in control, and as soon as you try and focus your attention on that it disappears. We were talking about this and I had been aware of that myself, never focussed on it before and started to after that. It happens--you're playing and all of sudden you are out of control and one of two things happens. Either you panic and immediately grasp for the control again or you sort of sit back and let whatever it is take over. It's the sort of thing that if you try and concentrate and watch what it is that's taking over you lose it anyway. So what I try to do is consciously get myself someplace else where I can back off and let whatever it is take over. That's the easiest way to sit is I try and program myself before I go out. I know it's probably very foolish of me not to ever have gotten into meditation because it seems like that would be very helpful. I never have. It seems like it would be sort of the same thing. But mostly what I do is, before I go out sort of have a little talk with myself and say it would be really nice if you did this, really nice if you did that, and then do it. Let's take for example your piece. That was easy for me to do in that I didn't have to have a long conversation with myself at all. Because the whole environment was set up for me, I didn't have to create the environment, I just had to become a part of it. And it was very easy for me to get lost in the jungle and be, as I mentioned to you one time before, instead of imitating an animal to become an animal. And that

was almost something I could do just (finger snap) like that. The switch could be made immediately. The biggest difficulty I had in your piece was remembering to keep my eyes open for Carol's cues (laughter), during the first section, and other than that it was easy because I could deal with that world of sound. Everything else was done on a sound cue, all the evocations, either going into them or coming out of them was all done with sound and even in the very last section which does give a cue for the free section you could hear because of things that are happening in the rest of the group. So it was only those first few visual things.

PO: Now, I think that you could probably keep your eyes closed for the whole piece if the piece was learned in the way it was intended to be learned, which deals with a longer period of time. But also because you feel it, you feel the silence and it wouldn't be necessary to see it visually. I debated about visual cues in the piece for that very reason. I wanted you to be able to simply know where you were in the auditory because I believe-- Well, it's interesting the difficulties musicians have because of being riveted to visual notation if...

HS: I thank my teacher, the first one I had, so often, I've told the story so many times about how he started me with notation. The very first lesson I had was the obligatory thing of playing on the mouthpiece, you know, make sure you get the sound and you put the thing on the horn, and I had a little curved B^b soprano and he had an alto sax, so there wasn't anything about watching his fingers. It was rote teaching is what it was in that he said put down this finger and then this one and you move them back and forth and you listen to the sound. He got out his horn and he composed a tune for me without any music at all. It was just an 8-bar thing, and he said, "okay now you play that". It was within the notes that I had just learned, it was nothing to deal with notation at all, it

was pitches that I heard. And after I learned it then he got out some manuscript paper and that's when he introduced notation. And for me I learned those things on the page had to do with sound, they didn't have anything to do with a mechanical action, they didn't have anything to do with "hold that for so many beats" or whatever. It had to do with sound. So I've always-- those things have to do with sound, the music is totally sound. I can't get wrapped up in the visual thing. I think too many people, again coming through the--because music is in the public schools, they end up with these methods books, they go for the lowest common denominator and you get your Belwin Band Builders that's--you know, you look at that note like that and you count that for 4 beats and you press down ^{these} fingers, and that's how they deal with it. And they get to high school and they've never learned anything else.

PO: Let me ask you this. If you were learning a new piece, say, and all you have is the notation, what process do you go through?

HS: If all I have is the notation, first of all I hear what I see. And I really don't get into figuring out fingerings or beats or anything like that. When I see a thing instead of looking at individual notes or instructions or whatever I really try and grasp the thing as a unit and go into blocks of time or blocks of pitches or whatever. And I can hear those things even though I may not be able to sing them because of some of the elements or whatever. I can hear what it is that I see, and if I'm just looking at it I can go through that without even having an instrument and I start dealing with fingering. I practise a lot anymore without the saxophone because I get so little time to practise with the horn. I do a lot of practising like this. And that's what I do with a piece. And after, I suppose I would try and analyze it and figure what is going where, what the idea of the composer may be, see if I can get anything out of my part, but usually you can't get that until the whole thing is coming together.

- PO: Is that ensemble playing?
- HS: Ensemble playing. And then just try and fit into whatever that piece is.
- PO: What's the difference between a rehearsal and performance for you?
- HS: For me, none. The only difference being let's say at an initial rehearsal I may be trying to find out, not knowing what the other parts are, how I relate to the other people in the ensemble. Once I find out what my place is there, then to me every rehearsal is a performance. I don't really care for the attitude of--obviously you have to break things down, do them in sections, to go over it a few times and try and get the feeling that's supposed to be there. But I get very bored dealing with pitches and rhythms. With me that's something I can do on my own. If I'm having trouble with that I should be taking it home and come into a rehearsal ready to play music.
- PO: In a performance...let's see, I want to use the word "creative", which we have to modify in various ways because it gets kicked around so much. Creative I use in the sense of things coming together in a new way, so that if I'm dealing with a new situation in a way, so as a performer what is the creative event, or the creative process for you?
- HS: I'm not sure. Could you explain a little bit more?
- PO: Well, say you've played a piece before, played it many, many times. But on a particular occasion it comes out differently. I mean what happens in the piece, what is that you feel?
- HS: Excited (laughter). Maybe it goes back to this trying to deal with letting the subconscious take over. Because the subconscious part of what I do is probably more of other possibilities than the conscious part of it is. I don't know if that's a copout or not, but I believe that. I don't really feel that conscious can deal with everything that it's supposed to or should be able to, where the subconscious can, it doesn't have any trouble whatsoever, it's... So that if I'm

able to tap into that subconscious and get my conscious mind away from doing some sort of programmed thing, like I said, I can be surprised at what comes and that's what I'm trying to have happen anyway. Every time that I play, even if it's a rehearsal I don't want to go through the motions of playing a piece at rehearsal. To me music is something that is very important. I want to have fun with it, but it's not something to waste time with.

PO: In this process you describe, of your going away into a different state that's very ethereal in your music, this attention state or whatever it is, are you able to transfer it to other parts of your life?

HS: Unfortunately, yes (laughter). Because I find people talking to me, and I'll even answer them and I'm not there. It's--I guess sometimes I'm not good at staying here. It does transfer.

PO: Well, does it transfer to your benefit?

HS: I'm not sure because most of the time that it's--I don't know. I've become so involved with it musically it's only that I notice it happening as a byproduct of other things and haven't really tried to make it happen in other areas. Which again is probably very foolish. You know, I mean not using it if it's there.

PO: Yes, it's a mode of operation with intention.

HS: It's not something I've tried to make happen. Except with composers sometimes. And composition, I don't know where I came across this idea. I've since started trying to work backwards in a piece. Maybe it's not really really backwards, maybe it's just the way a lot of people do it. I've never had it explained this way before. But I start with the whole piece and work back to finding out what's in it. And I've used this in talking to a composition class already where I sort of have them blink in reverse, everybody close their eyes, and I say, "okay, now when I snap my fingers open them, and when I snap

have them
 my fingers close them,' and/focus in a certain direction of the room, whatever,
 and so it's like (snaps fingers twice), and have them sit there and think about
 everything they just saw. Everything. And then I'll have them do it again
 and their open space is a little bit longer, and gradually get to the point
 where they have their eyes open for maybe 5 seconds. And at that point they
 are obviously able to focus more on detail than they did the first time. And
 yet everything they saw that first second was there. Everything was in that
 split second. And if they could have kept their eyes closed long enough
 and concentrated hard enough they would have seen the same thing anyway.
 And even if they keep their eyes open for the next three years, focusing on that
 same space, they'll still see different things at the end of the three years
 than they saw. However, they're all there. When I work with a piece I suppose
 I do try and get myself into this subconscious state or wherever it is. And
 I want to hear a whole piece like that (snaps fingers twice). The whole thing.
 And from there on, as soon as I get there, I'll write myself a couple of notes
 to remind myself of what it was generally that I heard, and start with the largest
 possible thing and start working backwards. And until probably the final thing
 for me is putting the notes down. And I don't--I may sort of work out a system
 as far as determining pitches. But anything that I put down on the paper, as
 soon as I put it down, whether I'm going to keep it or not, I know if it's right
 or wrong because I've already heard it. It's not that I'm trying to make, it's
 not that I'm taking something and developing that, and where it will go. I've
 already heard the whole thing.

PO: You could do the same thing... auditory ? exercises, or
 even kinetic, somatic, body sensations, how much movement you can feel in (snaps
 fingers twice). You could transfer it to every sensory mode actually via
 marvelous meditation. I mean it's marvelous anyway ? ?

(end of interview)