

# THE NEW STYLE AND THE LISTENER

## + LISTENING REQUIREMENTS

### SUMMARY

The result of an aesthetic question: “how can the composer possibly transfer the way he hears his music, views his music and the background knowledge and experience that birthed the music to his audience with any accuracy?” This is especially important in a complicated musical system like NS that is predicated on so many layers of realization and terminology. To illustrate: the significance of many NS features is based on an answer to an aesthetic problem in “100 problems”, which were derived from Ideas Original. Certain features of NS, like reification/symbolism, variation, description, developing variation, ‘genius’, etc. must be understood and accepted by the listener. Some features, such as the assertion that music can represent real-life ideas/subjects is controversial, and must be defended first, and something like “description as central” that spawned “theoretical possibilities” can be easily misinterpreted and vilified. The ideal, of course, is a fully empathetic audience - exactly as educated and familiar with your musical language as you are, with nothing lost in translation.

With NS, listening isn’t passive - much is described and must be transferred to the listener’s imagination to fully bloom. This involves considerable work - reading this glossary, for example, or reading the Ideas Original documents themselves, or even going back to the source material or reading my journals if they were published. Art is only as important or impacting as your mind makes them: Rothko’s black canvases are only “abysses of death” if you believe it to be so - as he did (hence “fully empathetic”), and if you don’t believe it, interaction with the work is pointless. “Listening requirements” in general is a list of requirements the listener should go through before they approach my music. I mean it as objective reality, and not particular to me - it is the approach a listener should take to any work of art to fully appreciate it - “due diligence”.

Similarly the best “critic” isn’t a “reviewer” as much as an educated guide, trying to deepen the understanding of pieces of art.

Finally, it functions like a warning - if you don’t adhere to these recommendations, the works “won’t function in the way they are intended”.

#### How does the listener affect the New Style?

Art *does* demand that the listener/audience do certain things:

A metaphor works in the mind of the receiver

Art works by metaphor and extension:

For instance, superficially Rothko’s paintings may be small and simple, but the mind/imagination extends them to their true size and significance. Malevich’s White painting (or Rothko’s black) are chilling because the viewer is aware of the void that they stand at the gate of - death, totality, absolutism, aesthetic barriers.

A play must be understood as real at some level for it to be moving - the viewer must disregard the obvious elements - the audience, the stage/lighting, the actors.

You can’t guarantee every listener will undertake what you ask them to, but some will

This quality separates the listeners into groups - those that will, won’t, those who will but still misunderstand

Ideally, of course, every viewer/listener receives it “correctly” - as the creator intended.

The “Scriabin risk” - Whereas Scriabin viewed his music as a vehicle to “transfigure the world”, if the audience doesn’t see through Scriabin’s mind/experience, his work ends up hardly differentiable from other composers of the time = the difference is his *intent*, and how *he* saw his work - the *real piece existed in his mind*.

Beethoven, Wagner, Michelangelo, Coltrane, Hendrix, Bach (etc.) *set the expectations* at the universal level, so if the listener is to respect their work, they must receive them using their desired context. This explains (partially) why they are considered the highest artists, because of the aura they created for their own work.

The weaker “unassuming” artists (if they can be called “artists”), provoke weak reaction partially b/c they lent their work a weak context.

Thus the only way to experience art is with **true empathy** **“it must happen in their mind”**

In this respect, **the described style is real and the physical is a shadow.**

It is the mind that realizes the true intent of art

The mind is beyond reality<sup>1</sup> in many ways - beyond problem context; sovereign. (the mind can posit impossibilities)

If there is an audience, I want them to see from a much higher/broader vantage point. In this case the new style is like abstract or even performance art, provoking the listener into a unique experience. I ask the listener to do something they haven’t done before. In accordance with all the expansions, audacities and properties of the new style, it *should* lead to an unprecedented experience in the listener.

On the other hand, if listeners don’t want to empathize with me -the empathy necessary to experience any work the way it is intended - I don’t want them to experience the work at all. Some (or perhaps many) of the views in the new style are controversial and political, against music and people in general.

But then there is the variation set aspect, which tears down affirmative and negative objects alike. The listener, then, would basically be in the midst of a cosmic argument on every major issue. Is there a definitive conclusion? Should it be “open ended”? Should the lack of conclusion be determined as “unknowing” in general? The listener has options here - internalize the argument then make their own decision (like the mind processes a metaphor or humor) or determine that there *is no answer*...

There is the composer’s own “subjective subset” within the totalizing, generalized scheme, representing my own subjective views.

The variation orientation is akin to philosophical supersession theory: **what is true at one level is unsupported at a higher level.**

2 event classifications based on this: affirmation/support vs. supersession or dissolution

For example: the beauty of the human voice vs. subjectivity of beauty vs. *human* subjectivity against “alien languages”

One variation object would unconditionally affirm the first with all the passion of any great work

The next would take the controversial step of dissolving or superseding the affirmation.

there can also be “relapses” or “counter-revolutions” by the superseded arguments.

In this case, there will be many visceral, disturbing moments where hallowed norms are “killed”/“sacrificed” soft art, humanism, religion, the scientific method, sentimentality, loyalty, family

But, you also can create objects that fully affirm the above, sheltered from the critical dissection that is to follow  
(segmentation)

Even the highest “truths” of the objects are questioned, leaving the only remaining truth - the architecture of the holistic system itself.  
then there is one question still remaining - is this the “correct” system? The system itself could collapse?  
paradoxically, the collapse of the system would then prove the system?

#### Listenability (in rendered NS):

Listened to in one sitting, vs. listened to in short bursts (like pop is) vs. not listened to at all (but researched or considered)

Some of the nature style works are autonomous - they don't require a listener

Could some be physically impossible to listen to?

Too long, too loud, etc. - like some natural phenomena are too \_\_\_ to listen to

Some natural phenomena, despite tremendous subtlety, power or complexity, aren't traditionally/dramatically “interesting” to us.

...so we acknowledge their existence, but don't actively listen to them.

Examples: rain, crickets, wind, the “harmony of the spheres”, rivers/streams, volcano explosions, earthquakes

music not “intended” to possess traits that are favorable to listening - objective reifications and/or experiments

Listeners may have to use volume level modification to “zoom in” on the microscopic objects and “zoom out” (to avoid injury) on the loudest/largest objects. This is analogous to microscope/telescope/perspective in science.

#### There are multiple discourses with the listener:

The totalizing/generalized parameter-based aspect = discourse on choice, temporal limitation of the artist, optimization  
also the relationship of a single artist to a language, system or method of thought

The variation set aspect = discourse on the complex system, epistemology and argument/conflict between totalizing assertions

The described aspect = discourse on physicality/reality vs. the mind, possibility vs. impossibility, ideal vs. practical, concept vs. action  
also a discourse on physical barriers and limitation

The philosophical aspect = philosophical, “meta”-discourse, and discourse surrounding all my philosophical theories

Philosophical aspects

Each conceptual reification = a discourse in its own right

The new musical language of each reification = discourse, aesthetic debates surrounding every reification

etc.

#### SACRED/PERSONAL MUSIC:

The sacred, personal nature of your music also functions as a shelter against unnecessary, lower-level criticism - critics who are still under certain illusions that I have freed myself from. It conserves ‘critical waste’.

Keeping music personal

Having an ideal in your head, that the audio rendering is only a shadow of

Music deemed sacred:

Mozart “stealing” the once-a-year mass at the Sistine Chapel (Miserere (Gregorio Allegri)

“At some point, it became forbidden to transcribe the music and it was only allowed to be performed at those particular services, adding to the mystery surrounding it. Writing it down, performing it elsewhere was punishable by excommunication.”

Music only appropriate to listen to at certain places or at certain times

Times of day/night

Only with a certain atmosphere

Only with a certain frame of mind (stillness/meditation, certain character/emotion)

Only after you've experienced a certain thing

Only at a certain place/environment (see “certain atmosphere”)

**The Future:**

Say the future is a true turning point, or you *make it* a true turning point - thus the old evolution of history doesn't apply, and we can't use the past to predict the future - using, for instance, the strategy of putting ourselves in the past and thinking of today as "the future".

The future of music is limited by humanity and its need to relate to and understand music as a reflection of culture. So serialism is a "futuristic" language, but it cannot "sweep through" the entirety of music because its properties are counterintuitive to how humans hear music - music's features have evolved faster than humans can - a decade's change in music may take a million years for humanity to intuitively relate to the music. The stereotype at work here (because it may not be truthful but seems to be generally true) is that the current values we look for in music are hard-wired/inborn, and it will take evolutionary-level change in our brains to absorb (or at least a giant cultural change, which is impossible en masse because there are always counter-reactions and countercultures that could subvert this).

So we can deliberately wire ourselves to consume any kind of music. But for the inventor/explorer in music, ability to relate or understand the music shouldn't impede the creation of musical languages. Any kind of informational system can be encoded into music - whether or not it reflects how humans (today's or tomorrow's) think, process or learn. Or live, or love...etc.. The most popular criticism of a deliberately "futuristic" style is that it "leaves humans behind" or "doesn't factor humans into the equation". Think Le Corbusier. His problem was that he was working in the human domain and that humans always had to be part of the equation - they had to live in his buildings and cities (Brasilia). With "futuristic" music, on the other hand, the only question is of existence once it is divorced from the audience. Has it been posited or hasn't it? Has it been invented or hasn't it? The ability of humans to intuitively relate to a musical language would factor out many (the majority) of musical languages of the future. Leave humanism to the styles already discovered and let them toggle narrow genre parameters ad-nauseum.

It isn't hard to predict the "linear" human future - the needs and wants of the human will stay the same, but be aided by progressively advanced technology. We may be on a new planet, but humanism will always return us to the central features of what it means to be human, preventing a dystopian universal culture from ever taking over (barring universal totalitarianism). We will remain emotional, imperfect, dramatic, sexual, and limited in our cognitive ability.

footnote here is: the music of the future will be fundamentally changed if the can accelerate our evolution - through artificial intelligence, augmentative brain engineering, listening implants etc. Once our way of thinking and listening is changed (toward absorption of more complex pattern, subtlety in sound, increased attention and retention over longer time periods, ability to process multiple pieces at once), then what is considered natural or innate will change. Perhaps more complex brains will look for more complex pursuits.

Aside from new possibilities arising from the augmentation of the human mind, human palatability should be removed as an evaluative criterion for music of the future. We know what human limitations are - and serious art music hit many of these walls and surpassed them. But simply because art music is a little past the comfort level of the average human doesn't make it advanced.

Here we begin to question the laws of the universe and consequently the laws of our own minds. "Beyond problem context" becomes relevant. Multiverses leave the conjecture of physics and become a legitimate way to conceive new languages of universal laws. The "objective principles" of music in I.O. can be generalized to construction of the universe.

The only limitation at this point is that music must be in the form of sound - which is limiting and can be overcome by metaphor, but this is not a viable solution in my particular case.

Problem: Music that goes against intuitive laws of "the ear" won't sound like it's "working"

the only place this applies are the traditional melody/harmony categories - but if these are the prevailing traits to the listener in a future conjecture, it hasn't gone far enough to create a "new species" of music.

Implications: this is bigger than aesthetics and its concerns. Traditional aesthetic laws, even the ones in your own mind, have been left far behind.

How can we talk about a law of "taste" when the very laws of the universe are being questioned?

"reliability" is not a factor

"mature style" leaves behind weak aesthetic concerns - does it leave behind art?

we leave any aesthetic/moral questions of "should it exist?"