

Group improvisation and prose notation in musical creation of the 1960's: heading new modalities of musical communication

Since the 1950's, the irruption of new aesthetics, such as indeterminacy, random processes and mobile forms, had caused the bursting of serial determinism, this putting upside down the traditional hierarchies in the field of contemporary music. The development of these new forms of musical experimentation generated a great number of musical writings and stylistic tendencies, which show an extreme personalisation of compositional attitudes in connection with the conventional rules of works transmission and diffusion. But, it is especially in the 1960's, with the development of group improvisation, live electronic music, artistic events including active participation of the public, that the questioning of the musical writing and its normative conventions brought to discussion the problems of the statute of the score and the part it takes in the communication between the composer and the performer. Do we have to keep the authority of the score, do we have to save its privileged position as a single medium between the composer's thought and the performer's action, although it would come down to freeze a sound reality which, by its very conception, should appear as a process and not as an object?

Taking over the problematic of the open form, some composers of the 1960's were led to elaborate new modes of musical communication which could be more flexible and better designed to fit the new artistic sensibility resulting from the specific context of this period. At the expense of being marginalised, rejected or ignored by official institutions, these composers endeavoured "to free the creation from the strong individual domination¹", beyond a certain hermetic and elitist vision of art exalting the all-powerful figure of the author. To this vision, the generation of the 1960's opposed the principles of collective creation and the idea that creative power is inherent in everybody, assuming that the function of the artist consists in conceiving the means able to stimulate and reveal the inventive potential of each individual. It is a question of relativising the traditional concepts of works, of composition, and finally of art, in order to deviate from the too narrow categories of thought, based on a system of hierarchical values. Thus, the questioning of the traditional concept of works of art does not represent a search of the limits of an aesthetic form; it rather expresses a deliberate rejection of the social and cultural models that this form conveys and which legitimate its authority. It is from this point of view that we can understand the correlation between the phenomenon of collective creation and the appearance of notation in the 1960's, elaborated exclusively by means of words of the everyday language. This correlation proceeds from the development of the musical notation throughout 20th century, but it also ensues from the wish of composers working within groups of collective creation to consider their activities as a way of questioning the various aspects of social reality and to carry on a reflection about the place of the artist in cultural institutions.

The examples of Jean-Yves Bosseur, Robert Ashley, Alvin Lucier, Cornelius Cardew, Frederic Rzewski, etc., working within groups as the Groupe d'Etude et de Réalisations Musicales (GERM, group of musical studies and realisations), the Scratch Orchestra, the ONCE Group, the New Music Ensemble, Musica Ellectronica Viva, are typical of a generation of composers who, although they come from various social and political backgrounds, show a similar involvement in the experimental research on indeterminacy, on improvisation, and on graphic and prose notations. Analysing their activities makes it possible to examine the links between the specific context of the 1960's and the development of a new artistic sensibility which tends toward new modalities of music communication beyond the elitist and hermetic conception of art. These modalities make us consider the collective activities of these musicians as a complex and dynamic process aiming to establish common methods of work and ethical principles, able to support the participation of each member of the group in the constitution of the musical phenomenon.

Remarks on contemporary improvisation

Unlike some artistic events, conceived as a superposition or addition of activities of several participants (even though, in many cases, the result of such procedures remains unpredictable, and therefore indeterminate), the principles of collective creation calls for the fusion of the various components which

compose the experiment in progress. In the musical field, such processes appeal to group improvisation, based on immediate and spontaneous invention of each performer.

Undoubtedly, the importance of group improvisation in the 1960's cannot be separated from the anti-establishment surge started by free jazz. Its protesting force, the intensity of sensations it arouses among the performers as well as the public could not but appeal to young musicians, offering them an alternative to the excess of abstraction and intellectualism of the serialism. In the search of a form of expression which would be more related to the concrete aspects of the musical phenomenon, they found in group improvisation an opportunity to claim spontaneity, intuition, irrationality, and the acting in the present, without subjecting the individual expression to the restricting rules of an arbitrarily imposed musical vocabulary.

However, to consider that the development and impact of group improvisation derives from the ideas of free jazz would be to deny the own vitality and significance of the group improvisation. Its expansion merges with the anti-establishment movements of May 68, but the logic of its development and its intrinsic problems lie undoubtedly within the context of the experimental music. Therefore, it is necessary for us to differentiate between the group improvisation practised by some groups of the 1960s and 1970s, such as AMM, Atelier of Warsaw, the New Phonic Art, the GERM, Musica Elettronica Viva, etc, and this kind of controlled improvisation integrated in open forms and indeterminacy processes as a way of making more flexible the relationship between composer and performers, inviting the performer to take some responsibilities in the progress of the musical process.

Furthermore, the borders between these two types of contemporary improvisation are often hazy and difficult to delimit, especially in some manifestations of live electronic music, where the methods of sound production imply a significant degree of unpredictability, allowing a free coming and going from free improvisation to the interpretation of a notation system.

It is the role that improvisation has in the realisation of a musical conception, which makes a difference between these two types of musical practices, though without fully opposing them. In fact, it is less an antinomy, which sets spontaneous invention against traditional composition, than a question of contextual divergence on the level of their conceptions: that is why these two practices have different musical and political implications. In the case of free group playing, improvisation represents a way of acting musically or an approach to the sound phenomenon condensed by the urgency of the moment, which suppressed the need of interposing a notation system between the musical conception and its realisation. On the other hand, in open forms and indeterminacy, the improvisation is one way of introducing a factor of unpredictability into the musical process. The improvisation is hence integrated in the formal structure of the work, being articulated according to a more or less fluctuating network of interconnected sound components.

The graphic scores, conceived in the 1960's and in the 1970's partly originated in the composer's need to find out a notation system able to stimulate performer's imagination and spontaneous inventiveness by giving him the opportunity to take a larger part in the realisation of the work. However, even if such scores grant the performer a certain amount of freedom by using suggestive drawings or verbal instructions, the performer's play must, in any case, obey the aesthetic purposes of the composer and stay in line with his logic, in order to ensure the coherence and the stylistic identity of the work. In fact, the heterogeneity of artistic purposes, the multiplication of notation systems, the deliberate search of an enigmatic aspect, which ambiguity becomes absurd at times, turn the score quite often into an obstacle between the performer's sensibility and the sound phenomenon. If graphic scores were intended at the beginning as a way of emancipating the performer, in reality, in many cases they could not fulfil this purpose: the performer remains quite often a skilful executant, able to adapt constantly to new languages, to non conventional play techniques or to notation systems elaborated sometimes for the needs of one musical situation only. This is particularly obvious in the following remark of the composer and performer Vinko Globokar, who has worked within the group New Phonic Art: "a significant point in this post-serial improvisation, is that the performer does not improvise for himself, but for the composer, who remains, at any rate, owner of the 'product'! His activity starts on the order: 'Performer, improvise please! You have the right to do this, but not that!' – 'this' and 'that' change according to the temperament of each composer, but 'improvise it!' can be considered as a constant phenomenon since 1950 until today²".

Being basically a utopian concept, free group improvisation raises a number of questions. We can wonder if the improvisation could constantly be renewed so that each moment of the playing can be lived

like a single form of expression, belonging to an experience in which place, time, partners each represents a sound stimulus? If improvising freely means that the playing of the musicians is not based on any common background made up of “ready-made” sound structures and stylistic conventions, then the formal organisation of the musical process can become problematic, its relevance and its progress being endangered. What is in question is how to preserve the coherence and the organic unity of the group’s playing, if all of the musicians come from different backgrounds, each one having his or her own musical personality, sensibility, and experience. Should they trust only their inspiration and their musical instinct at each point of the performance, to the detriment of the artistic values of their playing? Should they accept to run the risk of creating musical situations in which everyone withdraws in him or herself without taking into consideration the activities of his partners?

The experience of the New Phonic Art, founded in 1969 by Carlos Roque Alsina, Jean-Pierre Drouet, Vinko Globokar and Michel Portal, has clearly showed that group improvisation requires that the musicians starts a long process of crystallisation of the relationships within the group, with difficulties, failures, doubts, lots of trial and error. In the course of this process, the problems faced by the group are musical and aesthetical as well as social and psychological. In fact, in order to turn a group improvisation into a real collective creation, it is necessary for the musicians to establish a kind of “osmosis of personalities”, which supposes “a great deal of mutual concessions” and “a certain self-abnegation³”, as long as it does not lead the musicians to hide behind one another or to end up compromising their own principles. These preliminary conditions allow the members of the group to install unified style and aesthetic taste, and to conceive a common sensibility and capacity to communicate, based on the mutual listening and reciprocal understanding, in order to reach a continuity in reflection and experiment. Thus, in the collective playing the creative moment obeys an internal logic, consolidated by a sort of code of behaviour to which all the musicians refer implicitly. The process of creation is self-determined, the group being integrated in a kind of “world aside” having its own rules, that are intended not to privilege the personality of a leader, but to ensure the development of the inventive capacities of each musician while leading him to share the responsibility of the musical process.

Toward prose notation

How to arouse the active commitment of the performer without compelling him to submit his imagination to the restricting rules of an artistic form? It is because of such questions that some composers have endeavoured to go further in the exploration of the interdependence of notation and composition, excluding straightaway the idea that a notation system could be universal and able to fulfil a wide range of artistic objectives. For these composers, the notation should not be a symbolic representation of a sound phenomenon, based on a corpus of signs determined beforehand, nor submit to any other criterion than the intrinsic characteristics and problems of the work. The choice of notation system is the result of the constant questioning of the nature of the sound phenomenon and the modalities of its production, by confronting them, at each stage of the work conception, with the signs and musical symbols intended to transmit the compositional idea.

Play by Christian Wolff belongs to *Prose Collection* (1968), a set of thirteen pieces for any instrument or voice. Conceived as a short text, the work is intended to give the impulsion and the general instructions for individual or collective musical playing. The musical idea being transmitted exclusively by linguistic signs, the score provides a minimum information, that is to say the framework of the musical process which development depends only on the interactions between the musicians at the time of the performance. In reality what is given to the musicians is not precise instructions for the sounds activities to be achieved, but rather rules of behaviour, aiming to define a musical context in which the sound phenomenon is taken as a whole. This is just what enables Ch. Wolff to consider musical creation as a social activity deeply rooted in human nature; therefore, taking into account the psychological mechanisms that decide the behaviour of an individual within a group led the composer to leave the choice of material, the course of the sound events and their formal structure to the process of communication established between the members of the group.

Christian Wolff, *Play*

“Play, make sounds, in short burst, clear in outline for the most part; quiet; two or three times move towards as loud as possible, but as soon as you cannot hear yourself or another player stop directly. Allow various spaces between playing (two, five seconds, indefinite); sometimes overlap events. One, two, three, four or five times play a long sound or complex or sequence of sounds. Sometimes play independently, sometimes by coordinating; with other players (when they start or stop or while they play or when they move) or a player should play (start or, with long sounds, start and stop or just stop) at a signal (or within two or five seconds of a signal) over which he has no control (does not know when it will come). At some point or throughout use electricity.”

The research of Ch. Wolff goes along with this of several other composers such as Jean-Ives Bosseur, Luc Ferrari, Pierre Mariétan and Costin Miereanu in France, Robert Ashley, Paulina Oliveros and Frederic Rzewski, in USA, Karlheinz Stockhausen in Germany, etc. Independently one from another, they explored the possibilities of prose notation in order to stretch the scope of a musical conception which would be beyond the acoustic imagination of its author. In reality, the fact that the origin of this notation system does not lie in music itself but belongs to a different code of communication could be considered as an advantage insofar as prose notation is entirely in favour of heterogeneous artistic approaches to musical writing as well as musical practice. That is why there is no limitations to the aesthetic choice of the composer nor the means of its realisation, should it be in the fields as different as live electronic music (R. Ashley, A. Lucier, etc.), conceptual music (Fluxus), meditation (P. Oliveros) and mystic exploration (K. Stockhausen), games and pedagogical purposes (P.-A. Castanet) or music theatre (M. Kagel, L. Ferrari).

The search of common works methods urging to go deeper into the aesthetic and social implications of their activities, led some groups to conceive prose scores, which are sorts of scenarios sound actions that intend to give the performers a support for collective execution, explicit enough without becoming too imperious, able to provide a common direction to the sound activities of the group. The use of a notation system does not call into question the principles of collective creation; for the musicians, it is rather a way to avoid too obvious processes generally consisting of an alternation of tense or slack and also to keep the sound events from saturation, especially when the musical development is very intense. Therefore, we can also raise the question of the nature and the functioning of instructions which are given to the performer. In this context, the remark of Ch. Wolff is significant: “The matter of instructions is delicate. How explicit or ambiguous will they be? To what extent will you insist on their being observed? It becomes almost a question of what is legal, the letter of instruction or notation, and what is right, which cannot be formulated and will be evident only by its active presence. Can we have the latter without the former? Or rather, can we all have the latter without the former? Can we simply be set afloat, or will we need, say a piece of wood or stone, or a chart (such, I would choose, as may dissolve in the water)⁴⁷”

In this case, the score can be seen as a pretext for musical group activities, a starting point able to produce as many ramifications as the number of realisations achieved by the group. Beyond the pointillist aspect of traditional notation, prose scores enable to express musical idea in a more general way, which modifies straightaway the nature of compositional activities: instead of elaborating and organising sound microstructures according to a temporal and formal framework, the composer works in a more global level, supposing the articulation of the main lines of the musical process. Such an attitude implies that the composer does not absolutely control his work any more. However, the refusing to control all the parameters of the sound phenomenon does not mean that the composer resigns or abdicates, as critics of this notation system quite often asserted; this refusal rather conveys the composer’s wish to change the score from a closed and definitely fixed object into a sort of catalyst able to stimulate the imagination of the performer, inciting him to become aware of his own situation within the group. That is why, in such scores are omitted all the details that may disturb the musician’s concentration on his own musical gesture or on the activities of his partners, for the text which is given to him works like an ideographic notation deeply extraneous to the concept of equivalence between sound and graphic sign.

Plurality and divergences

Prose notation is a means, which intrinsically lends itself to the achievement of ideological aspirations. In this case, beyond a scenario of musical group activities, the text could take on the nature of a manifesto, claiming the political and artistic convictions of its author. It is precisely the case of some prose scores like *Spacecraft*, *Free Soup* or *Street Music*, conceived by Frederic Rzewski, co-founder of Musica Elettronica Viva⁵.

Frederic Rzewski, from *Free Soup*

"[...] We are all "musicians". We are all "creators". Music is a creative process in which we can all share, and the closer we can come to each other in this process, abandoning esoteric categories and professional elitism, the closer we can all come to the ancient idea of music as a universal language. [...] The musician takes on a new function: he is no longer the mythical star, elevated to a sham glory and authority, but rather an unseen worker, using his skill to help others less prepared than he to experience the miracle, to become great artists in a few minutes. [...]"

Such scores express a dream, changing into music the result of a social utopia. Particularly prolix, the text of *Spacecraft* (1968)⁶ describes a model of personal and collective fights, an image of successive failures and successes, all of them contributing to the experience of the human beings. The musical process follows the path of a labyrinth symbolising the hesitations of the individual, shackled in traditional conventions, stereotypes and automated reflexes; only the opening on the universe of the others makes it possible to the musician to escape his isolation, his own labyrinth, in order to be integrated into the collective expression of his or her partners. This music challenges the idea of stylistic purity and formal unity; it is moving forward by mixing means, materials and expressions, depending on its own criteria of form, instantaneously created at the moment of the performance. The form is more than a potential structure resulting from the sound interactions between the performers, it does appear as a tension between heterogeneous individualities, searching a balance through a "process of transformation of occupied space into creative space", as Rzewski writes on the score. In fact, Rzewski introduces in the logic of the musical process a socio-political utopia, which makes the situation of the performers all the more ambiguous, by unifying their personal motivations into a collective political orientation. Such a concentration on ideological aims, conveying a certain levelling inside the group, forces the musicians to face both the need of managing the musical situation, and the implications of the political commitment on their social and artistic relationships.

The political orientation of group activities, up to the point where the ideological design tends to replace the purely artistic objectives, also accounts for the orientations taken by the Scratch Orchestra, founded in 1969 by Cornelius Cardew, Michael Parsons and Howard Skempton. The crisis which tore in 1971 this group of about fifty musicians, leading to its disintegration a year later, is quite significant of the incompatibility between the utopian nature of its ideology and the isolationism in which the orchestra had confined himself. In a general way, this isolationism resulted from the incapacity of the orchestra to take on the consequences of its political standpoint, which would enabled this ensemble to affirm their authenticity within the structures of the contemporary society.

Composition and improvisation were not antagonistic concepts in the musical practices of the Scratch Orchestra, they complemented and interpenetrated one another, forming together what Cardew described as "scratch music". According to the principles of the "Draft Constitution"⁷ formulated by Cardew in May 1969, the members of the Scratch Orchestra contributed equitably to the conception and the realisation of collective plans, each musician taking initiatives and noting in his own way suggestions for a group play (rites of improvisation, arrangements of popular tunes, experimental works, etc). There had to be as many suggestions as the number of "scratchers" and only one suggestion had to give its author the role of the soloist: such a conception of balance, inside group, was intended to leave freedom and open spaces to the musicians, where each of them could express his or her originality; at the same time it aimed to develop among the members of the group a sense of self-discipline, which was, as Cardew wrote, "the preliminary and essential condition for improvisation"⁸. This comprehension of group activities also accounts for the

function of the “rites of improvisation” conceived by the “scratchers” and published in a collection entitled *Nature Study Notes*. In a form of short verbal instructions, the rites focus on a single element of everyday life, (a casual situation, a feeling, a particular activity), which was removed from its natural context, like a component of a social ritual, in order to pull it out from its usual signification. Thus, the rites proceed from a temporal gap and a contextual discrepancy, which gives to each particular musical situation a surprising game character, close to the children’s plays. Such scores seem to assign to the sound production itself a secondary, auxiliary role, unlike extra-musical occupations that appear as a suitable start point for the interactions between the performers. As a set of instructions, the rite does not fix a musical situation to be reproduced exactly, but it rather introduces a minimum stimulations and constraints, achieving the function of a catalyst for a process of communication.

Scratch Orchestra, from *Nature Study Notes*

CCIR2

“Initiate an improvisation in the following way:

All seated loosely in a circle, each player shall write or draw on each of the ten fingernails of the player on his left. No action or sound is to be made by a player after his fingernails have received this writing or drawing other than music.

Closing rite: each player shall erase the marks from the fingernails of another player. Your participation in the music ceases when the marks have been erased from your fingernails.”

FRFRR6

“Announce a collective improvisation in which anyone can take part. The announcement should be accompanied by the following text:

“Look around and let yourself be drawn to a person whom you like. Study his face, gestures, movements for a while. Then take a sum of money, preferably all you have in your pocket, and give it to him. Then start again”.

Musicians attempt to be more likeable than the general public. It is not important whether or no money is actually raised.

End is open.”

However, according to Cardew, the experiments of the “scratchers” showed a total misunderstanding of the mechanisms of modern society and of the needs of the lower social classes apart from the artistic circles. Lying always within the limits of “art for art’s sake”, the activities of the Scratch Orchestra did not manage though to get round the system of official culture, staying apart from social tensions and struggles. After a phase of euphoria and enthusiasm in its utopian struggle against the sectarianism of its ideological and artistic detractors, the Scratch Orchestra withdrew into itself, marginalised by the rejection of the official institutions and the incomprehension of its public.

Beside the desire to share their musical resources, what justifies the attitude of an artistic group is the necessity to free from the constraining supervision of the traditional structures of musical production. The distance taken from official institutions allow the musicians to keep some independence, with the possibility to defining themselves the principles of their aesthetic without taking into account prevailing tendencies and fashionable trends. Such motivations caused the formation of several groups of live electronic music, like the ONCE Group and the New Music Ensemble, founded in the early 1960’s on the West coast of the United States. The broadening of the musical field, at the centre of their artistic concerns, led the musicians to explore new modalities of sound production, orienting their activities towards musical theatre, sound installations, multi-media events, and group improvisation.

The introduction of new technologies in musical creation as well as the choice and the exploration of new electronic devices constitute a set of aesthetic principles which, in turn, influence the modalities of communication established by the composers within the group. In order to encourage the immediate contact with the public, obliterated by the use of “forest” of loudspeakers in the performance of electronic and concrete music, the members of the ONCE Group and the New Music Ensemble favour spontaneous

inventiveness in group improvisation as an essential support of the musical process. In fact, working with electronic sound sources in live conditions leads, in a way, to exhibit the process of creation, usually enclosed in the privacy of electro-acoustic studios. Elaborated and realised at the very moment of the performance, live electronic music requires, during the realisation of the work, in a logical way, unconditional complicity and commitment between the musicians. Either entirely written or only suggested, the musical process depends on the relationships established within the group, but also on the efficiency with which the various pieces of information – of a technique, gestural, or musical nature – are transmitted to the performers. We cannot be surprised to notice that thanks to the sophistication of the means of sound production, the musical transmission systems become simpler and clearer, allowing the performer to focus his attention not on the sigh-reading of the score, but on the problems directly involved in its realisation. Thus, prose notation provides a means particularly adapted to the specificity of this music. In the scores of Robert Ashley, Alvin Lucier, John Mizella, etc, this notation system fulfil essentially a practical function, by explaining the modalities of installation and utilisation of electronic circuits indispensable to the work realisation – the text playing the role of instruction to handle the various electronic devices. Far from any poetic suggestion addressed to the subjective world of the performer, prose notation ensures the explicit transmission of the composer's conception with efficiency and pragmatism.

However, despite the lack of ambiguity and the clearness of the text, prose scores remain primarily a reference point, a kind of memo, able and intended to communicate only the framework of a musical process. Often, the complexity of musical situations, the personalisation of electronic devices designed in many cases by the composers themselves, could not be fixed by means of any kind of notation. The transmission of the artistic conception then requires a quasi-oral mode of communication. If the need to abolish the score means that all notation systems prove to be insufficient, particularly when the musical process depends on the interactions between the members of a group, the use of oral communication can be seen as a logical consequence of the principles of collective creation. That is precisely what showed the experiments of the GERM⁹, aiming to go beyond the antithetic concepts like composition / interpretation, writing / improvisation, in order to establish the principles of a true collective creation, and allow each participant to take part in the group activities according to the methods and modalities he wishes to develop.

Beyond any restriction opposing amateur and professional musician, the GERM bases its programme of musical activities on the concepts of study and realisation. Reflection and action are thus two favoured centres of attraction, which interpenetrate and legitimate one another through their interdependence, finally becoming the essential keys to an experimental research which tends to go beyond the bounds of the mere objectives of group improvisation. Therefore, reconsidering the idea and the institution of concert and redefining the modalities of musical diffusion so that the musical phenomenon could really fit in the social space, both belong to the fundamental orientations of the GERM since its foundation in 1967. As Jean-Yves Bosseur emphasizes it, “the principle of our activities is not that of a juxtaposition of works put next to one another in order to give the public the illusion of representing each of the contemporary musical tendencies; the process is, on the contrary, to *combine* these various works so that they take part, through very diversified modes of writing, in a musical manifestation which is thought in global way and which presents itself finally as a unique musical event”.

Jean-Yves Bosseur, *Extrapoler*

“Un événement sonore constitué d'un nombre restreint d'éléments, eux-mêmes inscrits dans des espaces de jeu très réduits; ces espaces s'élargissent peu à peu; aux éléments de base de l'événement viennent se greffer d'autres; l'homogénéité originelle de l'événement cède peu à peu la place à une tendance à la dispersion; des éléments des plus hétérogènes contribuent à pulvériser la nature de l'élément originel, jusqu'à engendrer un événement aussi composite que possible.”

The work method elaborated by the GERM is based on the search for a balance between common objectives and the implicit recognition of the originality of each individual thought process integrated into the collective expression. For the musicians, the need of open-mindedness should not be confused with an immoderate freedom leading the group to anarchy; in the same way, reciprocal listening and respect are by

no means synonyms of withdrawal into oneself and self-deleting of the person to the benefit of the group. The prose scores conceived by Jean-Yves Bosseur, Pierre Mariétan, Philippe Drogoz, etc., hence fulfil a double intention: on one hand, they express a musical idea, a starting point for group playing, providing some general indications for the potential direction of the musical process; on the other hand, they fix a minimum precautions, or rules of behaviour, intended to safeguard the balance of the group. Without being an end in itself, oral communication occurs at all stages of such processes, preceding and accompanying the realisation of the playing proposition, until it substitutes entirely for the writing.

Conclusion

Such experiments aiming to establish new modes of musical communication have been too often assimilated to collective madness or anarchistic chaos, whereas they express the need of open space for the artistic creation, felt all the more deeply as the forms of expression intended to fulfil it appear ineffective and superficial. Questioning the phenomena of collective creation and prose notation, through the musical activities that contradict deliberately the fundamental conceptions of art, make it possible to understand better the aesthetic and socio-cultural stakes of artistic thought processes, which are often left in brackets by the official institutions and considered today as belonging to the old days. Beyond the too simplistic stereotypes according to which these phenomena represent an exaggerated expression of the ideological aspirations of a generation in the search of its identity, collective creation, being a specific mode of musical action, remains today based on values and ideals which are still present and relevant.

Notes

¹ Akira Tamba, "La poïétique musicale collective", in *La Création Collective*, Groupe de recherches d'esthétique du CNRS, Clancier-Guénaud, Paris, 1981, p. 198.

² Vinko Globokar, "Réflexions sur l'improvisation : le point de vue d'un praticien", *Analyse Musicale*, n° 14, 1989, p. 10.

³ Akira Tamba, "La poïétique musicale collective", *op. cit.*, p. 198.

⁴ WOLFF, Christian, "...let the listeners be just as free as the players", *Cues, Writing and Conversations*, Köln, MusikTexte, 1998, p. 80.

⁵ Musica Elettronica Viva was founded in Roma in 1966. The others members of the group were Allan Bryant, Alvin Curran, Jon Phetteplace and Ivan Vandor.

⁶ *Source : Music of Avant-Garde*, vol. 2, n° 1, 1968, pp. 67-68.

⁷ *Musical Times*, juin, 1969, *Source : Music of the Avant Garde*, vol. 5, n°2, 1971, p. 70.

⁸ Cornelius Cardew, quoted in Michael Nyman, *Experimental Music : Cage and beyond*, Studio Vista, London, 1974, p. 107.

⁹ The GERM was founded in 1967. The members of the group were Michel Amoric, Jean-Yves Bosseur, Philippe Drogoz, Gérard Frémy, Claude Grémion, Eugénie Kuffler, Pierre Mariétan, Anthony Marachutz, François Nowak, Nicolas Pigué, Philippe Torrens.

Radosvėta Bruzaud

**Grupinė improvizacija ir tekstinė notacija XX a. septintojo
dešimtmečio muzikos kūryboje: naujųjų muzikos
komunikacijos modalumų link**

Dvidešimtojo amžiaus septintajame dešimtmetyje buvo vykdoma nemažai eksperimentų, kurių tikslas sukurti naują muzikinės komunikacijos metodą – daug lankstesnį ir tinkamesnį kuriant tikrą kūrybinį bendradarbiavimą tarp kompozitoriaus ir atlikėjų. Grupinė improvizacija, taip pat ir kolektyvinė kūryba šiuo atveju suteikia puikią galimybę teigti už tradicinių muzikos praktikų hierarchijos bei normatyvinių konvencijų egzistuojant spontaniškumą ir išraiškos laisvę. Bendros kūrybos metodų tyrinėjimas, drauge gilinantis į savo veiklos estetines prasmes bei socialines idėjas, kai kurias grupes – pavyzdžiui GERM (Prancūzija), *ONCE Group* (JAV), *Scratch Orchestra* (Didžioji Britanija) ar *Musica Elletronica Viva* (Italija) privertė sugalvoti prozines/tekstines partitūras – savotiškus garsų veiksmo scenarijus – tikintis atlikėjams suteikti pagalbą bendrai atlikti kompoziciją, pagalbą, padedančią vieniems kitus girdėti ir gebančią sutelkti grupę.

Šiame straipsnyje pateikiama tekstinės muzikos notacijos detalių, tikslų ir mechanizmų refleksija, atsižvelgiant į grupinės improvizacijos ir kolektyvinės kūrybos principų plėtotę. Tipiški tos kartos kompozitorių pavyzdžiai yra Jean-Yves'as Boseuras, Robertas Ashley's, Alvinas Lucier, Cornelius Cardew, Fredericas Rzewskis ir kiti, dirbantys grupėse GERM, *Scratch Orchestra*, *ONCE Group*, *Musica Elltronica Viva*. Nors jų socialinė ir politinė patirtis bei kilmė yra skirtinga, jų veikloje esama ir tam tikrų panašumų – visi jie įsitraukė į neapibrėžtumo, improvizacijos bei grafines ir tekstinės/prozinės notacijos ieškojimus. Jų veiklos tyrinėjimas leidžia kelti klausimus apie ryšius tarp ypatingo dvidešimtojo amžiaus septintojo dešimtmečio konteksto ir naujosios meninės pajautos raidos, pajautos, kuri krypsta naujų muzikos komunikacijos modalumų, esančių už elitinės ir hermetinės meno koncepcijos ribų, link .