

FULL COMMITMENT

See “higher solution”, “outlandish Ideas”/H700, extremes list/barriers

SUMMARY

As “barriers/extremes” was created because I hated being superseded by an unforeseen extreme, “Full Commitment” was created because I hated being superseded by the outrageousness of a concept - especially when it was a vindication of a seemingly bad idea or principle. Full commitment works have the spark of genius in them, although they may not always “work”. It is ultimately an approach - create a radical work by being fully committed to an idea and following the implications past or even toward the litany of “negative criticisms”. These “negative criticisms”, when listed, become a good guide: anything that is “too ___” is probably actualizing that aspect, becoming a symbol of it, becoming a language built around it - especially in the hands of a master who knows when to balance the radicalism with normative “back-end restorations” - and when not to.

Examples: Bach’s Well Tempered Clavier is “too much fugue”, “monochromatic”, “too intellectualized; too complex”. 2001: A Space Odyssey is too still, too slow, no human protagonist, not enough dialogue. Minimalism is too repetitive, Penderecki and the Rite of Spring are too violent. Ulysses is too esoteric, too personal. Rap has no melody. Most of these works are autistic (limited), but some are also discursive or outrageously anthological. Take all these criticisms and reverse them, and you see the gaping gateways for new languages - the main criticisms becomes their main strengths.

“Back-end restoration” is an optional step to supplement the extremity with normative elements, for a more well-rounded work.

Generalization/New Style significance:

Generalization:

All full commitment strategies, meeting full commitment definition “Axiomatic”

All full commitment works All full commitment languages/aesthetics

All parameters able to be maximized

+ Negative generalization: no...

NS: the new style *is* a full commitment style (the total “frame/shell”, and a default goal of each variation)

Each variation will be a self-contained full commitment object

In its confrontational Socratic aspect - Is argumentative variation form subverts each object

Tone-editing challenges the autonomy of each object

“Outlandish ideas/“impossible” + full commitment “saves” the new style from the more generic, inane forms it could take.

Ideally I will never have to do any ‘generic’ music if I have enough of these higher-level ideas.”

Counterintuition: taking a counterintuitive idea and giving it your full support - hence “full commitment”

Be fervently “whatever it is” - go more ridiculously into a concept than you would think is appropriate.

There are still strong concepts out there, before “blended” concepts should be tackled.

colonizing the extremes, in dialectic with the majority, which uses a language of mostly convention (“middle” styles)

See: negative criticism (because intuitively negative aspects will only be colonized by the counterintuitively bold)

More strictly into it w/o mitigating

Potency comes from exploring something in depth, without bringing too much periphery into it.

Beginning at a fundamental level, building a style from scratch

Making an art of it

More risk involved, because you are *forsaking norms* while increasing severity/frequency of other elements

override your natural sense of taste and restraint?

A severe, recognizable style that pervades the whole work - e.g. a musical axiom explored to full potential (see axiom examples)

Look for an absurdity at some level, a ridiculousness, an uncomfortability -

If it doesn’t make you uncomfortable, it probably isn’t a radical concept (see genius)

Versus what? Against pastiche or hybrid styles, the watered down, democratic “popular” aesthetic, “eclectic”, disparate-dramatic human-scale

“Transfigured ensemble” exists on this principle - use of minimal types of instruments (or extremely the opposite and completely plural)

Using only cohesive families of instruments as alienating/restricting/autistic - yet gives a cohesion

Drama: if you want a work to be ____, focus on the ____ contents of the plot

Characters can’t be censored - you can’t infringe on their rights.

Articulating a fully sincere POV

Art criticism: “rationalizing” (in a positive sense) any art

“Source matters” - the artist’s approach and how they feel/act about the art

(high art/seriousness, irreverence, experimentation, sincerity etc.)

One should be serious (you can be seriously ironic, seriously comical, etc.)

“**That Much**”: Examples of ‘full commitment’ in practice

Music:

12-tone music Webern’s concerto for 9 instruments (to call it a concerto)
 Bach’s WTC Hammerklavier fugue (outrageousness of subject, execution, length etc.) Grosse Fugue
 Threnody: no use of melody in the traditional sense, in favor of creating a truly new idea (sonorism)
 Xenakis’ Concert PH: renouncing almost all of the assumptions of music, yet technically fulfilling its characteristics (timbre, climax)
 Birds OST - no music, just sound FX
 In C, Hard Rain, most minimalist works
 Salome: portrait of true madness and lust (unafraid of “sensationalism/bad taste”)
 Sweeney Todd (Epiphany, Priest, Joanna flagellation) - unafraid of “bad taste” POV’s, instead for full commitment to the character/plot
 Chinese and Indian classical music: very rigorously unique, traditionally militant toward outside influences
 Drum solo battle: drums only
 Alkan: virtuoso piano solo works, seemingly to excess, virtuosity as an end in itself
 Doors “The End” - risky in lyric, episodic form, long lulls (freeform), generally outrageous, unembarrassed
 Eminem: lyric content, concepts (“Kim”, “Stan”), lyricist as being in the situation (thinking what such a situation would *really sound like*)
 Notorious B.I.G. “Suicidal Thoughts”, Ghostface Killah: lyricist as actor, with no restriction on realism
 808’s and Heartbreaks (Kanye West) - a rapper exclusively singing - exploring 808 and Autotune, with full seriousness, even tragic orientation
 Switched on Bach (full commitment to an ensemble, using it to its fullest - and not admitting any instruments contrary to it)
 see: monochromatic/transfigured ensemble
 Bolero Ligeti’s metronome
 Cage’s 4’33”
 Vivaldi “Summer 3” - intensity
 Rite of Spring: portrait of brutality and primitive culture using an audaciously new style
 Berio “Visage” - unabashed use of a voice in all its characteristics, esp. “ugly” ones
 Max Roach - “Triptych” (uncomfortable/visceral), “All Africa” = nothing but drums (‘autistic ensemble’ for a specific goal)
 Isaac Hayes: ostentatious, exaggerated versions of pop - heightening the romantic and epic intent they feign
 Feldman: use of silence low-profile music: almost inaudible
 Partch, etc.: inventing new instruments
 Holding of a pattern (WTC preludes)

Art:

Malevich/Suprematism Rothko - refracting the same style over many years (amplifying the profundity of any modification)
 Pollock Chihuly Warhol
 Pollock (and others): solving many small problems of your art by finding a total solution
 new method
 Barrett Newman Clyfford Still
 Being that focused on their niche in art (restrictive styles/languages), exploring them that much
 Newman’s Stations of the Cross: begins with austerity - then each gesture gains a monolithic quality
 Goya: Disasters of War = unabashedly realistic, even exaggeratedly so
 Kris Kuksi: taking the use of figurines to the epic level (where he could have stopped many times before - using less figures etc.)
 filling in the amount of detail (unafraid of “too much”)
 Bernini: elaborateness, scale entertainment value/spectacle of his ‘serious’ concepts: memento mori in tomb
 Hirst: controversial concepts
 Most modernists forsake a lot of ‘conventional richness’ in their discipline - what is considered rich by the majority
 Adams - Dr. Atomic “Hair”: audacious, over-the-top lyrics, focus on the theme to an obsessive degree

Drama/Cinema:

Single-minded concepts in general - theme-saturation
 2001 being that silent, using *that much* music (proportion vs. dialogue) having relatively little human presence
 the stargate sequence
 being that ambiguous
 audacious in its use of archetype and symbol
 Fountainhead: characters articulate their views in such a black/white, overt way (so much that it becomes the film’s language)
 Death of a Salesman being *that much* about the downfall of a man (dialogue centers around it at almost all times)
 That tragic (that melodramatic) (Swimmer too) Speaking *that much* to himself
 120 Days of Sodom: faithfulness to the book, however perverse (and extraordinary courage to produce it)
 American History X and American Psycho being *that* racist - characters saying and doing those things = full commitment to realism of character
 American Psycho stating its mission up front in a voiceover by the lead character
 Barry Lyndon being *that* slow (pace)
 The actions of Brando in Last Tango the realism of Last Tango’s conversations (self negation, flaws)
 Dialogue as flawed, imperfect (versus the Shakespearean stereotype)
 Satyricon: esoteric plot, highly symbolic scenes = thorough style, no consideration for audience understanding
 Great Gatsby (shirt scene): unashamedly escapist
 Noir monologues - that *archetypal* into genre, severe apocalyptic way of speaking 50’s Sci Fi
 No subplots (Wozzeck)
 Secondary characters as unabashed one-dimensional symbols

Esoteric dialogue, esp. of long winded nature (Godot)
 Iago's aria (Credo) - saying something that audacious in a climactic aria (see MLK)

Literature:

Joyce - Ulysses: audacity of metaphors, departure from consistent storytelling voice into allusions.
 Joyce - Finnegans Wake: invention and almost nonsensical language, portmanteau
 MLK's delving into negative point of views (and almost talking from their POV convincingly) before refuting them with his own point
 Waiting For Godot's pervasive triviality and finding poetry in it (venturing to make a whole work in the banal)
 The amount of dialogue, monologues
 Insulated concept
 George Carlin standup routines (standup comics in general) - directly addressing uncomfortable subjects, testing boundaries
 Shakespeare, Joyce: inventing words
 Full ramblings of an insane person

NEGATIVE CRITICISMS:

(that could be used to create a full commitment strategy)

Making a controversial element of a work *central*
 Taking a negative aspect of art criticism and using it as basis for art
 (one could take all negative criticisms and commit to them fully?)
 What do they actually imply - *what's behind them?* What normalized perspective lies at the source of these criticisms? Are any valid?
 How many of these are "dealbreakers"?
 Designing a style around these (comprehensively) would result in the *most controversial style*
 What artistic strategy would make these traits legitimate?

"not art" "not music"
 doesn't "work" in practicality doesn't work in reality (functionality) purely theoretical - refusal to consider the practical
 ___ in all the wrong ways (the potentially positive turns out to be a negative)
 grandiose pretentious ambition was greater than the product
 contrived unrealistic forced
 over-intellectualized micromanaged academic
 inhuman lack of human presence hygienic sterile foreign/alien doesn't relate to people
 violent vulgar explicit perverse pornographic unnecessarily violent
 over-sexed
 chauvinist
 inappropriate uncomfortable relies on shock value
 over-simplified/black-white preachy wordy idealistic
 simplistic too simple complexity/difficulty are 'higher' than simplicity banal
 clichéd points of view expressed strongly
 unethical exploitative irresponsible
 racist sexist classist elitist fascist implications "cleansing"/elitist/racist
 parallels ambitions of fascist groups (Nazis, etc.)
 weak
 corny
 reckless
 fragmented
 confusing
 boring hard to sit through doesn't retain my attention
 repetitive monotonous
 slow and uneventful overlong
 nonsensical non-sequitur incoherent meaningless
 wandering
 esoteric cryptic
 ambiguous - isn't clear in its message doesn't 'orient' the audience
 oversaturated too much information no focal point overcrowded "a mess"
 unoriginal
 overloud
 immature adolescent (implying that the artist should/would "outgrow" the phase and express a more profound one)
 structure-less
 self-indulgent
 escapist
 mechanical
 annoying
 scary
 dissonant
 myopic, obsessed with a single topic

stilted because of archaic language

bare/sparse

ugly

clichéd musical devices pop musical devices

work can't be considered in the intended genre (i.e. considering the work in another genre rather than one intended)

scene goes on too long

eclectic

distracting that a character would do that a character would never do that

an impossibly ambitious goal (there was no way to meet expectations)

"a mess"

over-idealizing the past

exaggerated

mannerist/distorted

doesn't go below the surface - presents only beginnings but doesn't follow them through

symbolizes what's bad about today's culture (or a certain culture)

"could do it, but didn't ask if he should"

wouldn't have existed except to display the current technology's abilities (ambition for no *real* reason/a hollow reason)

fusion: puts together the worst of _____

divisive (vs. "bringing people together")

condescending

mock/fake (the emotion/viewpoint is not real)

out of touch doesn't "relate to current issues"

revolution with no plan behind it (no depth beyond slogan)

unnatural

refused to consider the audience

etc.