

## Earle Brown

There are two basic ways of achieving *Form* which continue to interest me. One could be called a method and the other a non-method, the latter, however, should not be taken to imply an aggressively *anti-method* attitude on my part. I continue to work with both of these basic approaches, at times exclusive of one another but more often the two are juxtaposed or inter-related within the same work.

The first, and the more conventional in that it is a "method", is basically "constructivist": the generating of a rational distribution of units, aggregates, densities, and qualities of sound elements; the numerical manipulation of micro-elements or structures of musical materials to obtain a rational evolution and generation of a macro-Form as a quasi-organic "growth" process.

The second approach is to *Form* as a function of a complex process of not totally rational developments within a chain of cause and effect extending from the original conception of the work, through the graphic representation as "score", to performance realization as actual sound. It is difficult to describe this process because at every point it is more or less a combination of rational and irrational signs and actions. Not irrational in the "mindless" sense but in the sense that the immense number of major and minor decisions which are made at all stages of the process, by all of the minds involved, create a labyrinth of cause and effect which is too complex to systematize before the event or to trace and rationally account for after the event. Each decision and development is intensely mind-full but so full of minds that the subtleties become impenetrable in terms of any *one* rationale. Rather than a pre-conceived constructivist rationale within only the sound material there is the conscious introduction of an ambiguous parameter; the human will and capacities for responsible action (both technical and esthetic) as a parameter acting and reacting upon the physical parameters which the composer has described in the score. More briefly, this is the possibility of form as a function of people acting directly in response to a described environment of potential . . . accepting the obvious fact that there is no such thing as a formless thing or event and wishing for the co-existence of rationality and irrationality in the "unfolding" of *Form* as a dynamic process.

Considering the developments which have taken place in extending the physical parameters of sound within recent years it seems reasonable to consider the potential of the human mind as a collaborative creative parameter. It always has been, of course, but to consciously extend it further into the actual generation of the work seems to me to be an inevitable and important step; a step which not only expands the potential of the "environment" of relationships (the work) but also the communicative potential, it's inherent multiplicity of "meaning". Rather than diminish the responsibility of the composer or anyone else, it expands and intensifies all of the dimensions of creating and perceiving. The performing of music is one of the most intimate collaborative involvements that any of the arts permit and the process and results are the most potentially ambiguous and abstract, which is to say, limitless, multiple, and infinite in effect. The "intimacy" and poetry is increased by liberating the form from strict time and a single configuration. One can not diagram response, how can one formalize a cause which is consistent with infinite effect: . . . by realizing that every cause and effect process (which everything is) is based on an infinite labyrinth of "feed-back" effects and to try and balance the input and output factors somewhere between determinism and anarchy. This "balancing act" is probably basic to the nature of man and inherent in every thought and action and as old as the first philosophical thought. The above, "non-method" of form and forming is new to music but by no means an unknown area for artists to approach.

In his book, "The Art of Assemblage", William Seitz guides the reader through the historical background and esthetic climate of "assemblage" by writing on, "The Liberation of Words", and "The Liberation of Objects". It is an example of how it is becoming more and more necessary to explain any one of the arts by referring to developments in other arts. For better or for worse, everything is being seen as being the same thing except that the "lighting" is different, as someone said, and the light seems to be falling on liberation in our time.

The equivalent liberation within music would be, "the liberation of sound", and it has happened, but more important to me in a discussion on *Form*, (which is not an *element* in an art (as are word, object and sound) but a manifestation of the *disposition* of elements) would be, "the liberation of Time". The equivalent of this in the plastic arts would be, "the liberation of Space", which I think has also happened but it is not the subject of Mr. Seitz's book. It might have been the subject had Mr. Seitz been dealing with the question of how does one proceed as an artist once the materials have been liberated; and that is what I am trying to get at. The liberated material demands very delicate handling or the essence of what we are left with will escape; as it has in many cases. "Assemblages", of the kind Mr. Seitz speaks of, do not need to be performed in order to be experienced (Kinetic assemblages are another matter). The new formal problems in New Music are specifically relevant to Time, given the fact that Time is the "canvas" upon which musical form becomes observable, and that the composer must activate his materials and concepts within this subjective variable and the catalytic agent is a variable subjective human mentality.

I am undoubtedly prejudiced but these incredibly complex conditions which exist within the natural areas of "musical art" set the composing of music in the absolute fore-front of the arts or sciences which can explore the new potentials of "communication", in every sense of the word. No other art has the potentials of "abstraction",

human intervention in the experience in the work, and the infinite possibilities of transformation and intimacy of nuance, actively (in the instant of its becoming "real"), between conception and realization. (The other performance arts, dance and theatre, are both limited in this respect by the psychologically "loaded" human body moving, and the habits of words, respectively).

Where there is so much talk of "liberation" there are sure to be very disturbing reverberations within the world of established, acceptable criteria. The "liberation" of words, objects, sounds, etc., should be seen as different from the confusions surrounding the idea of making them "free". They are *already* free, before anyone even thinks of using them. The idea of them being "liberated" is relative to the use that they have been put to (and enslaved by) in the past. They cannot be more free than they are but they can be liberated from their conceptual inheritance, and we from ours. That is the point at which we can realize that we are already as free as words, objects, and sounds are. Everything is then free to move in all directions to all meanings.

I hope that it is true, as Marshall McLuhan says, that "The power of the arts to anticipate future social and technological developments, by a generation and more, has long been recognized. . . . This concept of the arts as prophetic, contrasts with the popular idea of them as mere self expression."

One of the first things that I ever wrote about *Form* is the following, from notebooks, October and November, 1952; under the word, "Synergy":

"to have elements exist in space . . . space as an infinitude of directions from an infinitude of points in space . . . to work (compositionally and in performance) to right, left, back, forward, up, down, and all points between . . . the score (being) a picture of this space at one instant, which must always be considered as unreal and/or transitory . . . a performer must set this all in motion (time), which is to say, realize that it is in motion and step into it . . . either sit and let it move or move through it at all speeds."

In the notebook the above is connected to a space diagram of the "reading" principle of "December 1952" and the graphics of that work seem to me to activate the above intention. The word "synergy" was used as a co-title for the piece, "November 1952" which has as instructions:

"To be performed in any direction from any point in the defined space for any length of time. Tempo; as fast as possible to as slow as possible . . . inclusive. Attacks may be interpreted as completely separated by infinite space, collectively in blocks of any shape, or defined exactly within that space. Lines and spaces may be thought of as tracks moving in either direction (horizontally at different and variable speeds) and clef signs may be considered as floating (vertically over the defined space . . . The defined space may be thought of as real or illusory, as a whole or in parts. Either space (vertical or horizontal) may expand, contract, or remain as it seems to be here. Vertical space will vary according to the performer's view of the floating clefs."

*Synergism* is defined as: "Cooperative action of discrete agencies such that the total effect is greater than the sum of the two effects taken independently. (Theol): The doctrine that in regeneration there is a cooperation of divine grace and human activity."  
*Synergy* is defined: "Combined action or operation as of muscles, nerves, etc. (Medical): The combined healthy action of every organ of a system."

From the above notebook quotations (they and the scores are published in, "*Folio and Four Systems* (1952-1954)", with other works, by Associated Music Publishers, New York) and the "synergy" concept it should be clear that my approach to the question of *Form* cannot be separated from any of the other elements of the composing-performing process, and that there is a heavier than usual emphasis on the latter, not to the exclusion of responsibility to the former . . . the former not demanding a *Form* but attempting to provoke *many* forms through, "cooperative action of discrete agencies . . .", and at times, *in-discrete* agencies.

In the introduction to *Folio* I tried to clarify the notebook ideas and the synergy principle as they were meaningful to me as a composer:

" . . . to produce graphic situations, the implications of which would involve the performer's response as a factor leading to multiple 'characteristic' realizations of the piece as an audible event; . . . to extend and intensify the ambiguity inherent in any graphic representation and possible composer, performer, and audience response to it; a work, and any one performance of it, as 'process' rather than as static and conclusive."

"Two basic approaches:

- 1) a 'mobile' score subject to physical manipulation of its components, resulting in an unknown number of different, integral, and 'valid' realizations.
- 2) a conceptually 'mobile' approach to basically fixed graphic elements; subject to an infinite number of performance realizations through the involvement of the performer's immediate responses to the intentionally ambiguous graphic stimuli relative to the conditions of performance involvement."

Scores which satisfy the conditions of (1): "December 1952", "1953, for Piano" (both from *Folio*), "Twenty Five Pages" (1953), "Four Systems" (1954).

Scores from (2): "November 1952" (Synergy); "December 1952" and all of the scores from (1), "Available Forms I & II", "Light Music", "Novara", "From Here". Other scores, such as, "Hodograph", "Corrobborree", "Times Five", and the "String Quartet", are basically "closed forms" but there are interior areas of flexibility and/or mobility in which "the performer's immediate responses" are activated.

This latter category of "closed forms with 'mobile' interior structures" seems to create a further confusion as to just what *Form* actually is. "Closed form" in these works means only that a definite sequence of events is given. The mobility within the events within the given sequence must, however, certainly modify the formal effect which we experience from performance to performance, despite the fact that it is a diagrammatically fixed "form". This is the kind of enlivening confusion between form, content, and process which the arts (and people in general) must deal with now.

"December 1952" raises the question of whether a work whose form and content are different in each performance can be called, "open form". My personal answer is no; that to be called open form, a work must have an identifiable content which can then be *formed* . . . as in "Twenty Five Pages" or the "Available Forms" works. By this definition, "December 1952" is not a piece of music at all; it is a musical "activity", when performed. This creates a further confusion because the moment it is performed "December 1952" is as much a musical work as any ever *heard* . . . it is only one's attachment to the academic concept of "literature", an art *object*, that is violated. The form which it takes each time is a form of collective consciousness as it moves through

a labyrinth of environmental influences. A performance is composed rather than a composition is performed. I prefer to think of form as the result of activity in relation to a "labyrinth of implications" rather than as a fixed configuration.

It is clear that the simultaneous existence and non-existence of a "work" such as "December 1952" can cause considerable consternation in terms of criteria for judging it as a composition. Where everything changes from performance to performance except the graphic "key" and the basic instructions there is little for traditional attitudes of music criticism to "judge". The sheer experience of it as an audible musical event produced by collective human sensitivity and musicality must, however, be accorded a very high degree of consideration. This is by no means my primary concern as a composer but it is of considerable importance to "what is Art". It is absurd, given the potential imaginative flexibility of the human mind, to insist that *only* a "work" produced by *one* mind, in the romantic "ivory tower" of sleepless, anxiety ridden isolation, after weeks of "value" judgments, is the only "product" worthy of the label "Art". It is not possible, given any degree of optimism and generosity in regard to people in general, to set a time limit on creative reflection or a limitation on the number of people involved in the creation . . . that is to be a *victim* of tradition, and if tradition were the inviolable criteria we would still be banging rocks together as our highest form of musical communication. I only speak of this because this work, which is admittedly *not* "my" work (only my idea for a "work"), and seems to me to be a most intense possibility of communication *with* and *to* people, has been said to be "nihilistic". If the results of this kind of activity put pre-conceived "compositions" in a bad light, it only indicates that we composers, as individuals, have much further to go.

There are differences between concepts of order, structure, and form, but it is extremely difficult to delineate them in any useful way . . . they always co-exist in any intellectual or intuitive process of making or doing. In the perceiving of anything made or done the intelligibility of their exact function is totally beside the point, obscure, and, if they have been dealt with properly, totally unnecessary. There are thousands of pieces of music which are well ordered structures intelligently formed but that is obviously not enough to satisfy the demands of art . . . or we would not be here discussing *Form* in new music. Academic craftsmanship on inherited criteria will not resolve the question nor satisfy the unique conditions of involvement which our present "climate of consciousness" demands from art.

Of course there is no such thing as a "formless" thing. It's like what we call "disorder"; as Bergson says, disorder is merely the order you are not looking for, and that's the way it is with "formless". If something were really formless we would not know of its existence in the first place. It is the same way with "no continuity" and "no relationship". All of the negatives are pointing at what they are claiming does not exist. It is the same when people claim that there is "no communication". It is obviously a matter of attitude . . . mental inertia . . . calcification of outlook . . . so much easier to say "no" than to confront the actual situation and find the new way of accepting "yes". "Yes" is for a very young mind.

That leaves still the possibility of "good and bad" form, continuity, relationship, communication, and of attitude. Everyone may of course play that game but one of the rules is that you do not criticize a very good elephant for being a very awkward horse, or a forest for being a disorderly garden, or some other such misinterpretation of intent.

"This is not a mystical state, but the accumulation of decisions along the way and the eradication of conflicting beliefs toward the total engagement of the spirit in the expression of meaning. So difficult is the attainment that, when the state has finally been reached, it seems that a maximum of decisions has already been made in the process, that the artist has reached a limitless space of air and light in which the spirit can act freely and with unpremeditated knowledge. His action is immediately art, not through will, not through esthetic posture, but through a singleness of purpose which is the result of all the rejected qualifications and found convictions forced upon him by his strange ascent." . . . "Works of this nature are new in the history of Western Civilization and the spiritual state of their creation is as different from that of previous artists as is the look of the paintings different from that of previous paintings."

Frank O'Hara, on Jackson Pollock, "Action Painting".

"Disparity in form, color, size, weight, motion is what makes a composition, and if this is allowed, then the number of elements can be very few . . . Symmetry and order do not make a composition. It is the apparent accident to regularity which the artist actually controls by which he makes or mars a work."

Alexander Calder

In program notes and articles I have frequently reported that my first thoughts about making musical works in what I called a condition of "mobility", and what is now called, "open form", were influenced by the "mobiles" of the American sculptor Alexander Calder. At approximately the same time, around 1948, the paintings and working methods of Jackson Pollock began to be widely publicized in America. A correlation which I made (rightly or wrongly) between these two artists and their technical and esthetic points of view has been my rather obsessive primary motivation as an artist and composer since that time. The first works which I consider practical extensions of this point of view into music, (that go beyond the stage of "notebook" sketches) are in *Folio*, (1952-53), and reflect both of the above artist's characteristics which I feel are applicable to the composition, form, and performing and experiencing of music.

People who are not quite convinced that this kind of activity should be going on in music at all very often point out that my "mobiles" in time do not give the same effect (experience) as a "mobile" in space. This is obviously true and not at all what I expected or intended. The differences in realizing and perceiving works in the "time arts" and in the "space arts" is extremely significant and it is not possible, nor desirable, to try to make any 1 to 1 equivalence.

A similar over-simplification is often applied to questioning the validity of the spontaneous, *in performance*, forming process which I have asked conductors and/or musicians to apply to the realization of some of my works, which I relate to the immediate, "action" technique of painting (forming) which we know from Pollock. Here also, it should be obvious that no simple equivalence can be made between the realization and effect in working that way in the two media of time and space.

It is futile and dull to think of these influences from other arts as *models* for music making but to me it has been of the utmost interest to see the underlying "poetry" of the work and actions and to try to extend only this essential *quality* into an experience of sound

in time; the means, the materials and the effects must necessarily be different, and my intention was never otherwise.

After the original influences in this direction from Calder and Pollock I found that the basis of the general point of view is reflected in an astonishing number of areas of thought and action, in literature, philosophy and science, as well as in the "plastic" and performing arts, and its importance seems to have increased considerably since that time. I am obviously very much in sympathy with the observation of Baudelaire, "The arts aspire, if not to complement one another, at least to lend one another new energies."

As to Form in particular in my "open form" works, I have primarily asked that the form be left open until it is necessarily closed and the material formed by the responses and actions within the performing process itself . . . *per-forming* rather than *pre-forming*. I have not, however, prohibited pre-thinking and planning of various kinds in relation to a performance of the materials. It is obviously not sensible or desirable to expect "no-mind" in the process, and, in fact, the endless extensions of combinatorial possibilities, both before and during the performing, are intensely mindful. In the rehearsing of the composed material the conductor or musician naturally responds to their potential of relationship to his own responses and to their associative potential as sheer sound materials, subject to the entire material, esthetic, environmental (pre-thinking qualified by instant decisions) "gestalt". Out of all of this comes, in each performance, a form of these basically unchanging materials as they have influenced and been influenced by what I have composed and what I have designed as a procedure and by what the entire "gestalt" has provoked.

This probably seems radical and not to conform to the general idea of how a composer is supposed to work. The above approach may very well not be called "composing" in the old sense although it certainly has something to do with the production of a musical experience which did not exist before the "composer" did what he did. If the word "composer" does not apply I am perfectly willing to be called, "a designer of programmes". This possibility is presented by "work and working" concepts outlined in a series of essays called, "Designing Programmes", by Karl Gerstner, ("Programme entwerfen", Verlag Arthur Niggli AG). "Designing a Programme" is similar to the procedures I have described above and somewhat unlike the traditional concept of "composing" in that (as a negative attitude would say,) the final step of definitive arrangement is left out, or, (to see it affirmatively,) the final step is to allow and to provoke (programme) the possibility of many valid arrangements of elements. This is a process of inclusion and expansion of the concept of "a work of art" rather than one of deterministic contraction and exclusivity. One does not diminish the amount of "meaningful" control within a work but seeks to create the work as an entity, a quasi-organism, and to "programme" a life for it within which it comes to find its shape, extensions of meaningfulness, and its multiple formal identities of its basic nature (composed) through its programme of process potential.

Random Thoughts on Form and Process: -

Mallarmé said that he wanted to relinquish the initiative to the words themselves . . . this doesn't mean that he intended to eliminate the minds on either end of the process;

only that the materials *between* the writer and the reader be raised to the "power" of ambiguity.

The "stream of consciousness" idea has been sent up the river and has spawned a "stream of *un*-consciousness" mystique . . . neither one is a very good idea by itself but the latter lacks that uncertain *something*. (It is important not to confuse mindful ambiguity with mindless indecision.)

Is it more important to fill a form or to form a filling?

Phrases by Lawrence Alloway have something to do with all of this: "reduction of esthetic distance"; "non-hierarchical variety"; "The objects have an anonymous intimacy with our own lives" (from the Martha Jackson Gallery brochure on exhibition, "New Forms - New Media").

Not to express oneself but to seek insight into oneself and others. Discovery of potential through confrontation with a work. *Inclusive* methods . . . *Unity* of disparate elements and impulses. *Form* as the relationship of the mind to the materials as they evolve, inter-act and discover "meanings" . . . "infinitely extensible field of force" . . . inner energy . . . *synergy!*

There is no reason why it should be important to anyone else but I am not content with the piece of paper as the container of the work . . . the score can only contain the potential of the working; the directions and suggestions as to where the work and the performers might go . . . they will add also. Only *Time* itself is large enough to contain the work . . . the score must become even less the "work" and more a scenario (graphic and verbal) . . . the work is larger than any possible description of it.

I would like to have; anonymous materials (subjectively) passing through momentary stability and clear forms . . . multiple responses . . . opposing forces forcing by existing, not by forcing . . . unlimited occasions for incident . . . enlightened uncertainty . . . restless, tranquil . . . coordinated ambiguities . . . etc.

Notes to "Available Forms": -

*Time* is the structural element (as space in visual arts).

The *Events* have flexible *time* orientation but each basically different.

The *Events* have flexible *loudness* potential.

The *Events* have flexible sequence and over-lap potential.

The *Events* have fixed frequency fields (shaped, notated).

The *Events* have fixed timbre distributions.

When time (rhythm, tempo, continuity; stops, holds, starts,) and loudness and sequence and juxtaposition are flexible, *Form* must be left open for the potentials to operate. (Feedback between the events as flexible objects, infinitely combinatorial, and conductor/performer . . . Mallarmé's "operator").

Not re-creating a pre-conceived form (reading through a *thing*) but creating, in the moment of hearing, a form arising from those unique circumstances of composing, rehearsing, working and responding as one does *only* in that moment.

*Performance note to "Twenty Five Pages" (excerpts): -*

"The 25 Pages may be played in any sequence; events within each 2 line system may be read as either treble or bass clef; . . . A time structure . . . may be pre-set by the performer, obtained from the composer, or arrived at spontaneously during the performance . . . It will be seen that the basic 'mobile' elements of the piece; page sequence and inversion, clef disposition, and time; admit of a considerable number of different presentations of this material. All of these possibilities are valid within the total concept of the work provided that once a selection from the range of possibilities has been made, it be executed with devotion and accuracy in regard to the time durations, attacks and intensities. The variable factors are to be dealt with to any degree of simplicity or complexity interesting to the performer. The piece may be played by any number of pianos up to 25" (E. B., June 1953).

*Concepts: -*

Semantic ambiguity of notes, phrases, micro-structures, combinations, sequences, and form (macro-structure). Deliberately ambiguous form-conception.

Symbolists and Abstract-Expressionists allowing "reader" to collaborate responsively and responsibly implies the next step of the *work itself* being a multi-ordinal set of relationships within an "environment" created by the author. (programme!)

Schillinger, "Mathematical Basis of the Arts": -

Part One: Science and Esthetics: - "This Theory is Based on the Following Postulates: -

1. The fertility of a postulate.
2. Uniformity as the basic concept.
3. Fractioning of Unity as the potential of evolution.
4. Unstable equilibrium as a genetic force.
5. The principle of interference as a factor of growth and evolution."

"Part Two: Theory of Regularity and Coordination: -

Each system is valid when functioning within its own strictly defined limits and its own operational conditions (laws).

We discover in the evolution of method that new processes call for new operational concepts, new terminology and new symbols."

"Motion - that is, changeability in time - is the most important intrinsic property of music."

Are Schillinger's conditions met in the concept and "programme" of "Twenty Five Pages"? I didn't think so at the time of reading him (1948) or at the time of writing the piece (1953) but it now seems more likely. How fertile is a postulate allowed to be: Is the performer a "principle of interference as a factor of growth and evolution" within a valid "system" (programme): Are the "operational conditions" of "Twenty Five Pages" (and similarly, "Available-Forms" works) *laws*: I begin to think that they are; to the extent that art can be legislated.

*Some quotations which influenced my feelings about Form (around 1952): -*

65 From, "Alexander Calder", by James J. Sweeney, (Museum of Modern Art, 1951):

"... a sensibility to materials that induces new forms and an insatiable interest in fresh patterns of order."

"Staleness of matter and obtuseness of calculation are the two enemies of spontaneity of expression. Reflection, even long and arduous reflection, may have been concerned in the generation of the material. But an expression will nevertheless manifest spontaneity if that matter has been vitally taken up into a present experience" (John Dewey . . . "Art as Experience").

"Because the actual world, that in which we live, is a combination of movement and culmination, of breaks and reunions, the experience of a living creature is capable of esthetic quality. The live being recurrently loses and re-establishes equilibrium with his surroundings. The moment of passage from disturbance to harmony is that of intensest life . . . In a world made after the pattern of ours, moments of fulfillment punctuate experience with rhythmically enjoyed intervals . . . a world that is finished, ended, would have no traits of suspense and crisis, and would offer no opportunity for resolution. Where everything is already complete, there is no fulfillment" (also Dewey).

"Then the idea struck him (Calder) of making 'two or more objects find actual relations in space'. This was the first feature of his new approach: the organization of contrasting movements and changing relations of forms in space."

It seemed to me that it might be possible to bring about a similar "mobility" of sound-objects in time. (The use of the word, "organization . . . of changing relations" must take on a new meaning, in the case of either time or space "mobile" . . . I have obviously come to consider this "organization" to be a "programme relative to environment" . . . out of this comes "form".

"If I am questioned; if anyone wonders (as happens sometimes quite peremptorily) what I 'wanted to say' in a certain poem, I reply that I did not want to say but wanted to make, and that it was the intention of making which wanted what I said . . ." (Paul Valery, "Art of Poetry").

*From my notebooks, 1952-55: -*

I have always been drawn primarily to magic and mathematics . . . in that order. To magic in the sense that everything *is* and as it is, it is magical . . . I don't understand it . . . the impenetrable infinite complexities and connections of all things.

If it is possible to understand 1 2 3 4 5 it is possible to understand 9 1 3 6 8, but it's making a problem. Not of understanding but of appreciation. If it could only happen that appreciation was understood rather than understanding be appreciated. That is not to depreciate understanding.

The necessity of the appreciation of the meaning being dependent upon the understanding *through* the meaning is making the problem. The answer is in the meaning being the appreciation and not the understanding being the meaning. There is no doubting the fact that this is where we are now in art.

Not to contribute to the delinquency of the imagination . . . (to bring about), "the crisis of consciousness due in our time" (Max Ernst) . . . to allow the crisis is the thing now to do . . . and be appreciative of the unintelligible meaning, and *there* is the understanding (5/30/55).

Not to try to understand but to realize the lack of need to understand . . . which is all the understanding necessary . . . (the understanding which surpasses all love). The lack of understanding which puts one back into the flow of anything. The natural continuity of everything is incomprehensible from any point of view and is only comprehensible in the state previous to point of view. Understanding (knowledge) is an isolated set of approximations settled for out of either indolence or ego.

The unity lies in the conception. Act with the utmost intensity and conviction with nothing more than intuition as a guide ('55).

Apart from the general prevailing indolence, the difficulty people experience in experiencing this music is directed expectancy . . . which is to a degree natural as in physics; 'a body in motion tends to remain in motion' . . .

With *Folio* (1952-53) I intentionally extended the compositional aspect and the performance process as far out of normal realms as I could . . . just short of producing nothing at all. Within the same year I wrote works having extremes of finite control and extremes of infinite ambiguity, knowing full well that what I was looking for lay somewhere in between. (I wrote a note to myself at that time which was to the effect that, truth lies at a point somewhere on the arc stretched between the two extremes of a paradox, and that the point is always fluctuating . . . as I was.) ('55)

(The above, from notebooks, are critical reactions of mine to charges of, "no form, no continuity", leveled by music critics when confronted by works of mine between '52 and '55, regardless of whether they happened to be fixed or open form, precisely notated or ambiguous graphics.) (This still happens, of course.)

*From notebooks, about 1959: - (relative to open-form works, "Folio", "25 Pages" & "Available Forms").*

I can admire the form of my *conditioned* emotions without going to all the trouble of writing them down . . . what I prefer is to discover the continuity (forms) and discontinuity of my emotions as they arise from a relatively unconditioned complex of stimuli.

The *recognition* of these conditions (relations) and their contextual use is not based on function but on their un-conformed existence. (Not used for rhetorical effect.)

A unique independent existence for the work . . . keeping myself and performers at a distance (ambiguous) . . . the work to be its own definition. (revelatory rather than declamatory.)

Like most "overt" technical principles which can be isolated from context and formulated independently, 12 tone technique took itself too seriously and has "techniqued" itself to death.

The exciting dicotomy between method (technique) and spontaneity . . . the methodological severity of Schillinger vs. intuitive, hyper-conscious spontaneity.

Not to impose an emotional atmosphere upon the material but to observe the emotional atmosphere of the material *results*. (new and unsuspected and unexplainable relationships and emotional complexes) . . . the unfolding of *implicit context*.

Detached observation and deduction of primary conditions of sound and unconditional processes of combination (the tentative, unforeseen, implicit).

Intensification of ambiguities and paradoxes . . . relative and fluid rather than absolute states and definitions.

There are characteristics of today's art which may place it closer to religion than to "well ordered craftsmanship".

*Relevant background: -*

"The form itself makes an enclosure, but this, as a reflection of a theory of consciousness, does not stand as a receptacle but as a field of activity, 'a space of time that is filled always filled with moving.' She had, to a startling degree, no sense of alienation from the universe but took it as a miraculously given thing." (Donald Sutherland, on Gertrude Stein).

"The business of art . . . is to live in the actual present, and to completely express that complete actual present" (Gertrude Stein).

"I am I not any longer when I see . . . is at the bottom of creative activity." (G. S.)

"Things are together well enough by being next to each other and very well if inside something, whether a moment of consciousness, a space or an action" (Donald Sutherland on Stein).

"If it can be done why do it?" (G. S.)

"It has in a way been the mission of the 20th. century to destroy progressive history and create a single time in which everything in the past and possibly the future would be simultaneous. Proust and Joyce both did it in their ways and Gertrude Stein did it in her way." (D. S.)

"... the necessity of everybody rejoining lilies of the valley and everything." (G.S.)

"... all that was necessary was that there was something completely contained within itself and being contained within itself was moving, not moving in relation to anything not moving in relation to itself but just moving. I think I almost at that time did this thing." (G. S.)

"One may say that the isolation and extrication of immediate quality from the whole meaning complex of practical relations and associated substantives has been the essential meaning of art in the first half of the 20th. century." (D. S.)

"... out of discontinuous materials and forms - materials and forms which have 'parts' and are 'composed' - a continuum of intensity, which is not the sum of parts. She was 'expressing' a continuum of present movement, making it intrinsic to the work itself, and this inner thing is complete, not as a construction but as a continuum" (D. S.). (This quotation almost precisely describes the "materials and forms" concept in "Folio", "25 Pages" and in the more recent "Available Forms" works.)

"Joyce is indeed really the great poet of a new phase of the human consciousness. Like Proust's or Whitehead's or Einstein's world, Joyce's world is always changing as it is perceived by different observers and by them at different times. It is an organism made up of 'events', which may be taken as infinitely inclusive or infinitely small and each of which involves all the others; and each of these events is unique. Such a world cannot be presented in terms of such artificial abstractions as have been conventional in the past: solid institutions, groups, individuals, which play the parts of distinct durable entities - or even of solid psychological factors: . . ." (Edmund Wilson, "Axel's Castle",

Integral to the perception of structure is motion, for our present model of nature is

one in which the stable solid wall of substance has given way to a conception of things as fields of dynamic energies" (Gyorgy Kepes).

"It may seem a paradox that one of the cornerstones of modern physics is something called the principle of uncertainty. The idea of indeterminacy as a rule of science does, in fact, disturb many 20th century philosophers". (George Gamow; in "Scientific American") . . . and, I might add, many musicologists. But, as briefly reported above, it is a significant dimension of thought within the "climate of consciousness" of form-content-action-perception today and for many years past . . . in the visual arts, literature, science, and, finally, in music (E. B., Form in New Music).

The concept of "programme" will become, in the next years, the definitive "control" concept of art, as we do not yet accept it. Everything else in life, be it science or esthetics, prohibits a return to "idols", "monuments", the "museum mentality" in general. If art has anything to do with intuition, or being "prophetic" (as I am convinced it is), or with something more than simple wilful self-indulgence, it must continue in the direction of what Gerstner calls, "Designing Programmes" (Markus Kutter is credited with the actual title of the book). I have only recently come upon this definition of what I have been doing now for 15 years, but it also seems to be applicable to the constructing and "liberating" of a Calder mobile (his compositional control conditions the future unforeseeable configurations, via "process") and the "compositional" concept of Mallarmé's "Livre". The wind, the reader, the operator, the performer, the world, as collaborator (consciously invited!); the creator, author, as instigator (consciously programming). There is a small but essential step between accepting the public as variable (for 10, these many years) and accepting the stimuli as also variable . . . a consistency (not essential in itself) between concept and reality.

Given, that "designing programmes" will be an important *concept* of control (not a *technique*), the works produced can and will be as varied as any group of works ever were, regardless of the dominant "concept" of the period.

One extreme application of the "programming" concept would obviously be to programme for a computer, as Xenakis has already done, and perform the results in the normal way in which music is performed.

Another extreme would seem to be to create the intentionally ambiguous graphic "input" and the "programme" of realization, and allow the rational-irrational human computer called "mind", to fulfill the potentials of the programme; as in "December 1952".

An approach which falls between these two extremes would be the specific material-information "input" of "25 Pages" or the "Available Forms" works, where only the formal configurations are "programmed" as infinitely combinatorial. (The "continuum" flexibility of time and loudness prohibits being able to arrive at a finite number of permutations of the materials.) I prefer to employ spontaneity in arriving at the many "available forms" but I could as well employ a computer to work out any number of combinations of the "events". . . . This, however, would eliminate the "continuum" infinity and also the "poetic" intensity of the rational-irrational mind actively choosing and rejecting and changing in the actual moment of performing . . . the intense *confrontation*, which is "poetically" necessary to me.

The concept does not eliminate anything we have had before as artistic potential, . . . it can only *add* to the acceptable existing "palette" of processes now available.