

Phil Treloar / *Feeling to Thought*

Of Other Narratives

*tracings in the ground of
Collective Autonomy
people-practice-theory-history*

VOLUME 1 *INTEGRATIONS*

Trio '76

On September 5, 1976, Barry Guy, Roger Frampton, and myself, performed in the Concert Hall, Sydney Opera House, the improvised piece documented here. It was recorded by the ABC as a live broadcast. Barry played acoustic bass and one small woodblock; Roger, alto saxophone and acoustic piano; and myself, drum-kit, various percussion, and electronics – consisting of an array of contact microphones (about six), a mixer, two volume pedals, some ‘effects’ processors, and on-stage amplification. In certain respects ‘the music speaks for itself.’ But to be honest about it, I’ve never much liked, nor can I see the relevance of, that phrase. On the one hand it is to state the obvious and on the other, it avoids addressing issues of understanding that can often facilitate communication at a deeper level. Music is no more isolable than it is an absolute phenomenon. Just for example, on the concert just prior to this trio improvisation, Barry had played a couple of very difficult ‘dots-on-paper’ contemporary compositions for solo acoustic bass – one, as I recall, by the British composer, Bernard Rands (perhaps *Memos I*). These pieces not only made an impact upon audience members but also on Roger and myself. We were all influenced by their presence. Our trio improvisation was not an isolated event but part of a broader, interconnected series on this given occasion. Barry’s programming figured in this interconnectedness.

Barry Guy is a familiar name to most who have an interest in contemporary music – both composed and improvised. He’s an astounding musician, equally at home playing Haydn with The Academy of Ancient Music as he is improvising with the likes of Cecil Taylor. His cutting-edge compositions have been regularly performed by the London Jazz Composers Orchestra. He has played and recorded with colleagues such as Evan Parker and Derek Bailey, Marilyn Crispell and Paul Lytton, Tony Oxley and an ongoing list of musicians whose contributions to improvised idioms are legion. His project with the exceptional baroque violinist, Maya Homburger, has given yield to some of the most sublime music one is likely to hear, while Barry’s solo playing, literally, has to be heard to be believed. He has, without question, extended the performance possibilities of his instrument while contributing enormously to music’s aesthetic grace.

When Barry came to Australia to perform on this occasion, 1976, he was still a young man. Yet his ‘virtuoso’ reputation preceded him. Roger Frampton and I were approached by the then active organization, Music Rostrum, to accompany him

and we were, to understate the case, enthusiastic. Briefly, the background to this is that Roger and I, together with the Australian bassist, Jack Thorncraft, had been exploring non-conventional musical territory since the early '70s. Roger had had considerable hands-on experience with off-the-beaten-track improvisation through his involvement with David Ahern's Teletopa, an innovative, contemporary, and anything but jazz, initiative. Also, I think, it was through this group, and Ahern's *AZ Music*, that Roger was well informed regarding the latest in European and American composition. Ahern, a violinist and composer himself, had spent some time in the '60s working alongside Karlheinz Stockhausen. The turf Jack, Roger, and I carved out for ourselves was very different to this and it did bear strong overtones of jazz, but at the freer end of the spectrum, thus giving rise to some quite unusual music. An insignia document of this can be heard on the 1974 Jazz Co/Op double album (Philips 6641 225 – produced by Horst Liepolt). At around the same time Roger and I, together with Peter Evans, with whom Roger had worked in the Ahern context, worked on improvisation from a totally unconventional perspective, mostly using instruments that were either found or home made. This trio's explorations probably taught me more about sound-as-music than any situation I've been in. Whatever it was, it was made from the ground up, and totally free of predetermination. In this trio 're-hear-sing' was an irrelevant concept. Though Roger and I would continue to make music together for many years to come, even by '76, our paths were beginning to diverge. Nevertheless, whenever we shared creative space, our exchanges were always inspired. (For a fine example of Roger's extraordinary invention, and our inspired shared-exchange in a more traditional Jazz setting, I'd guide the reader to The Bruce Cale Quartet, *On Fire* the Sydney Concert (recorded 1980), released 2008 on Tall Poppies TP203.) Tragically, Roger passed away January 4, 2000. For an open-hearted statement regarding him I refer the reader to the 2003 Wangaratta Festival of Jazz program note which also introduces my musical dedication, *SHADES – in memoriam Roger Frampton*.

Due to the advent of *Primal Communication* 1976 turned out to be a watershed year for me. More will be said specific to this in the liner-notes to *Of Other Narratives* CD–3. In any event, for some years by then I'd been grappling with the problem of how to approach non-metered time and had already made somewhat of an inroad via questions pertaining to polyrhythm. This, by definition, and regardless of however extensively developed, remains bound to some kind of pulse orientation. The problem was, as I saw it, how to maintain the kind of rhythmic complexity, intensity, textural coloristic potential, and forward motion, polyrhythmic streams enable, while loosening the metric ties. I was looking for greater malleability between the vertical and horizontal domains of structure. For me, the double-question of *how* they related and *why* they needed to, was beginning to surface. Crucially though, the bottom line of all this was my concern for expression.

The problem was, I thought, further complicated by the question of internal precision in relation to phrase length. That is to say, phrases and their relationships freed from the dictates of meter while the material from which each phrase is formed might be made manifest as precise, clearly defined, chunks of 'internal time' – flexible in division yet unified as structure. And I must stress here, playing what simply 'sounded good' was not an adequate, or useful, option. I was looking for solid foundations from which to depart, not for joy rides to take on whim. Unbeknown to me at the time I was beginning to address seriously questions pertaining to counterpoint. I might just add here that I'd not have stated the case this way back then. It is only with hindsight and in the light of years of research that this kind of explanatory clarity has come into view. Nonetheless, although it was not that clear in terms of verbal utterance, it was absolutely clear as a feeling; that is to say, at an intuitive level. This is, I think, also a declaration by me regarding the interdependence between theory and practice.

The background as outlined here is germane regarding the contact I had with Barry Guy because, apropos the emergence of *Collective Autonomy*, it was due to this contact that the beginnings of a solution were put into place. Our one rehearsal for

the Sydney concert (we subsequently performed in Melbourne) occurred in a rehearsal room deep inside the Opera House. Barry (though perhaps he'd not remember doing so,) introduced Roger and I to the idea of anticipating (*feeling, sensing*) 'arcs of duration' (my terminology) *together*, without dependence on either visual cues or meter. I think, embryonically, this idea can be witnessed in the music we made. But as the years passed and the more I considered it, the clearer the various aspects concerning relationships between phrase length and the musical environment contained therein became. After some considerable thought, trial and error, and my dogged refusal to let it go, I came to realize the possibility of embracing precision within the context of malleable arcs of time; arcs that were not tied to chronometric measurement but arcs that were self determining, so to speak. In other words, these relationships were not dependent upon just one criterion but rather, criteria that were variously and flexibly interdependent; neither one governing the other, neither one hierarchically pre-dominant. The essential terms that enable this to function took, of course, years to fully draw into focus but have, by now, become fundamental to the expressive pallet of *Collective Autonomy*. It can function just as well in a solo context as it can in a group situation. And as I pointed out earlier, *expression* was my major concern, right from the beginning.

What this means, and it's a weighty advent, is that in light of several years of pondering the problem I came to understand the relationship between a given phrase and its constituent parts as something *not* bound and determined by a singular, all encompassing building block; that duration as phrase, and duration as constituent were not, necessarily, reducible to the same basic unit. The substance of this is that, on the one hand, a phrase might be determined entirely by the unfolding of constituents which, only in their having unfolded, is the phrase created, or, on the other hand, a phrase (a duration - an arch of time, however it might be perceived &/or measured) might be cast forth then defined by constituents whose sum culminates at phrase-end, yet *how* these constituents got there – the journey they took – is not determined by the cast duration *per se*. Clearly, it is *content* here that becomes crucial. And in so doing, the creative space is made more available to spontaneity. The plot, of course, is further complicated if one considers in the same light, the heterogeneous possibilities involved with the structure, "phrase–sub-phrase".

I had come to realize that questions of musical logic were as relevant to the rhythmic domain as to the harmonic; that, significantly, the question concerning 'freedom' was not so much to do with freedom *per se*, but rather, with the creative process being liberated from the pervasive restrictions of vertical hegemony—the vertical as categorical imperative, subsuming the horizontal. With this realization, I understood rhythm as being as significant a logical process as is harmony; that there is, essentially, no rational explanation nor grounds for *why* one should be subordinate to the other. I came to realize that rhythmic construals could function as cadential structures equal in the power of musical logic to that of the harmonic, and importantly, that one did not have to depend on the other in order that phrase closure might be spelt out; that they could be dependent, independent, or interdependent. This discovery, I realized much later, was the real birth moment of *Collective Autonomy*, not just as a creative musical pursuit but as a field on which *interdependence* might be discovered in the unlimited construals of relationship between the vertical and horizontal and the infinite gradations between. Although the embryo itself dates back to much earlier times its presence was made manifest on this logical terrain.

This signals a return to content as volume; to content as the play of forces in their states of Becoming; a return to the notion of breath (as duration) and not determined by the systematics of pre-established (chronometric) division, but rather, as intrinsic to creative (natural) spacing – the body as inextricable to expressed passions & feelings and these in their dynamic interconnectedness with thought, rather than body serving in a slave-like way to the dictates of temporal

systematics. (I refer the reader to my recently published, *of Paradox Once Found*, for renderings through improvisation.)

Temporal division becomes, again, a matter for expressive definition rather than the reverse, namely, expressive definition a matter for (subjugated by) temporal division. Clearly, this is no small concern. The implications are enormous. And this is precisely why questions apropos temporality have loomed so large in the long research process of *Collective Autonomy*. The idea of ‘arcs of duration’ made clearly visible what would remain a Pandora’s Box (though one not denying but *embracing*, wisdom!) for several years of research. We will see, and more to the point, hear, these temporal problems, and solutions, being addressed throughout this series, *Of Other Narratives*.

Integrations 1

Composed in Kanazawa, Japan, November 1991, *Integrations 1* was first performed in a Pipeline concert at the Old Melbourne Gaol, April 24, 1992. Written with the Pipeline trio – Simone de Haan, trombone; Daryl Pratt, keyboard percussion & percussion; and myself percussion – specifically in mind, the “Work” was commissioned by Pipeline with financial support from the Australia Council. The present recording was made in South Melbourne Town Hall, June 1992, mastered 1993, engineered by Jim Atkins with assistance from Garry Havrilay, and produced by Maria Vandamme under the auspices of the ABC. It was part of a larger Pipeline recording project designed so as to divide equally between us, both compositional and improvisational responsibilities. Though interaction assumed a privileged position in the project as a whole, how this might be made manifest was entirely up to each of us, and at times was the result of spontaneous decision making. The project was later released under the title, ‘In the Pipeline’, on Tall Poppies (TP095), 1996. Phil Treloar/Feeling to Thought extends sincere gratitude to Belinda Webster and Tall Poppies for permission to transfer the recorded sound of *Integrations 1* for publication on the present disc.

Simone de Haan has initiated state-of-the-art performance groups, among them, Flederman (with Carl Vine) and Pipeline Contemporary Music Project. He has held several head positions at music teaching institutions in Australia. Among these he was Professor of Music at the Conservatorium of Hobart (University of Tasmania). Daryl Pratt has also held significant teaching positions and among these he was Head of Percussion, Canberra School of Music. Daryl is currently Head of the Percussion Unit, Sydney Conservatorium of Music (Sydney University).

During the late-1980s early-’90s, collaborations with Pipeline Contemporary Music Project made a marked impact on the development of *Collective Autonomy*. This liaison was instigated by Pipeline’s forward looking artistic director, the extraordinary trombonist, Simone de Haan, though, and significantly, within the group’s egalitarian context. One of the primary foci of Pipeline concerned audience/performer relationships – dialogue through the music as well as by word, – while another was on newly composed pieces by Australian composers that sought to address these relationships within Pipeline’s cutting-edge aesthetic. Some of these included text. Pipeline’s creative trajectory was innovative and courageous. In addition to Simone and Daryl, the other core members – Mardi McSullea, flutes and piccolo; Geoff Dodd, cor anglais/oboe; and Michael Kieran Harvey, piano/ keyboards – were not only exceptional exponents of notated music but each had an

active interest in non-categorical improvisation. After moving from Sydney to Melbourne in '89 I became a core member of Pipeline. More will be said regarding this innovative body of musicians in the liner-notes to *Of Other Narratives*, CD-3.

Between '89 and '93 Pipeline covered an enormous amount of creative territory. By '93 I'd taken up residence in Kanazawa, Japan, making ongoing performance with them difficult. Thus, it was around the time of this recording that I'd decided to withdraw, playing my last concert with them, June 28, 1992. It was a heart-rending decision and one that marked a long-term hiatus in my own engagement with live performance. But it also marked the beginning of a ten-year period during which time I carried out extensive research regarding *Collective Autonomy* and, as well, learned and developed a friendly relationship with the marimba, an instrument I'd been in love with since the early '70s. Pipeline itself had changed too. And by about '92 its members were the trio recorded here.

Working with Simone and Daryl will remain with me as an outstanding experience, if for no reason other than the utter sincerity of engagement they brought to bear on the music. Their music-performance insight is remarkable, making the rehearsal process a positive joy. Simone's and Daryl's extensive experience with contemporary notated music as well as improvisation always rendered an exploratory yet musical result. "We explored our respective ideas and problems through several compositions and performances. ...All of these intensive explorations gave me a greater comprehension of the various issues and problems involved and how to address these in a musical composition." (Quoted from the score-note, 'The Composer's Perspective', to ...*Womb of Paradigm*. For more detail regarding this in relation to *Collective Autonomy*, I refer the reader to this source.) Where *Integrations 1* is concerned this is significant because this "Work" brings the two modes of music-making – composition/notation and improvisation – together in a structural complex that is, I believe, innovative. It was thus as difficult to grasp conceptually as it was demanding to perform and I doubt very much the work would exist at all were it not for the exchanges Simone, Daryl, and I shared.

By the time *Integrations 1* was composed I'd explored a multitude of avenues in the search for a productive field; an intersection; a meeting place; a space in/on which notated and improvised musics could co-exist and interact without the pretense and artifice of style and genre domination. Dr Graham Hair had given me a solid yet unbiased grounding in both tonal and atonal music composition procedures during my B mus. years at Sydney Conservatorium. Long-term engagement with improvisation, particularly at the freer 'jazz' end of the spectrum, had opened many doors. The intense years of penetrating exploration with the band I'd initiated, Feeling to Thought – Mark Simmonds, Steve Elphick, David Ades, and self – had taken me/us deeply inside the spiritual potential of music-making, and the very real, hands-on, Pipeline experience had removed an enormous amount of confusion, and debris, from the path I'd chosen to travel towards *Collective Autonomy*. It was around this time that I coined the term 'process counterpoint'.

As with the collocation, *Collective Autonomy*, 'process counterpoint' is both descriptive and active. It became my answer to questions concerning structural relationships that had been plaguing me relentlessly since 1976. Its innovation opened up limitless potential for the co-habitation of musics as they are rendered deriving from specific notation, and improvisation. It opened up the possibility to confront the vertical and horizontal domains, doing so with respect to both pitch and rhythmic materials, with &/or without, collision. In short, it provided a functional key to Pandora's Box. *Integrations 1* was, in effect, my first inside view. The nuts-'n-bolts of 'process counterpoint' are much too complex to expand on here. Indeed, this too is better left for a book-length exegesis. But where *Collective Autonomy* is concerned, crucially, the advent of 'process counterpoint' opened up this meeting place and provided space for interaction, even inter-penetration, without depending on hierarchically superior entities to realize the musico-linguistic 'game' and its corollary, forward motion. My research was beginning to find a

peaceful solution, one I'd believed possible right from the beginning. And this, as it happened, occurred at about the time of my relocation to Japan.

Structural problems in music composition are never easy to address, not, at least, if they concern untrodden territory. In certain respects it had been under my nose for years. I think that having taught traditional counterpoint and voice leading as I did in the Music Department at La Trobe University, Melbourne, for a couple of years (1989 ~ '90), helped clarify the structural turf I'd been attempting to broach in my own music-making; composition and improvisation. And although traditional counterpoint *per se* has no profile (though not excluded either) in the musical field of *Collective Autonomy*, there *are* fundamental principles that apply. These might be expressed as principles that bring to the fore the departure/arrival trajectory. And granted, not all musical expression requires this trajectory. Some, like 'minimalism' for example, have no need of it in order that its structure hangs together. On the other hand though, an overwhelmingly horizontal (modal) music like, for example, the Khayal of Nth. India, depends heavily upon voice leading (specific to given raga material) *and* rhythmic organization by which a departure/arrival-like trajectory not only binds the music together as a unified structure but also serves as a communicative device between performers and audience members, many of whom, at least in India, are well informed regarding raga (pitch) and tala (rhythmic) domains.

Certainly, the departure/arrival trajectory applies in the *Collective Autonomy* field of exchange, and not only because dialogue is fundamental to it. A sense of cadence, just as is the case with spoken communication, is crucial. The index towards linguistic concerns here is intentional. What it was that I was looking for was a creative environment that enabled streams of musical thought to occur simultaneously and, more or less, independent of each other, yet have them converge (optionally) when apposite – circumstance to circumstance. This image takes us back to my early days of exploration, though now with much less fuzziness around the edges. 'Process counterpoint' provides the ground for this kind of convergence, though I hasten to add here, it is still under development. *Integrations 1* has all its earmarks. *Building a Golden Wheel* (composed early 1992), though heavily notated and limited as a vehicle for improvisation, explores it with greater structural clarity and precision. (This "Work" appears in CD-4 of this series). And ...*Womb of Paradigm* (completed early 1993), albeit entirely notated, presents a thorough working of 'process counterpoint'.

This brings up the question regarding relationships between the general creative environment in which composed/notated and improvised musics abide as constituents in/of *Collective Autonomy*: Is either one privileged over the other? The answer in short, is 'no'. But this should be qualified. Given that 'expression' had been my concern right from the beginning and that an orientation towards communicative dialogue is fundamental, 'process counterpoint' enables the 'phrase — sub-phrase' structure mentioned above, (see notes to *Trio '76*) to be construed and nuanced precisely and thus *potentially* convergent. Absolutely critical here is the flexibility between composed (pre)-structure and improvised structure: potentially, convergence can be determined by both, or by either/or. *Integrations 1* explores this potential.

To my mind then, *Integrations 1* stands in relation to 'process counterpoint' as neither inception nor embryo but as the birthplace – the end of a long line of development that began in 1976, and the beginning of the next phase of development in the endeavor of *Collective Autonomy*.

...Womb of Paradigm

The Passage of time ...

Evaporate,

Thinking interposed.

Through distillation

(the)Essence becomes,

Again,

Close to nature.

This fully notated composition, written in the period September 1992 through March 1993 in Kanazawa, Japan, was performed by Ros Dunlop (bass clarinet) and David Miller (piano), as a live to air broadcast from the ABC Chatswood Studio, August 21, 1996, for New Music Australia. It is the second of two commissions from Ms Dunlop, the first, *Night Sounds at Ranthambhor* – for two channel tape playback and clarinets (soprano and bass) – having been written in July, 1988, both with financial assistance from the Australia Council.

...*Womb of Paradigm* is dedicated with gratitude to Dr Graham Hair, my composition teacher. The dedication runs thus: ‘Neither by imposing “the rules of art” nor being careless, he gently illuminated pathways that allow my natural inclinations to flower.’

Ros Dunlop and David Miller have had extensive experience with standard repertoire and new music. Ros has taught at Sydney Conservatorium since 1988; performed and given master-classes extensively throughout Australia, New Zealand, Asia, Canada, America, the U.K., and Europe; beginning in the mid-'80s she has commissioned many New Works by Australian composers; and, among her many contributive activities, for the past eight years she has been active with the recovery of traditional music in East Timor and is currently International Director of ‘Hadahur’ Music School, Timor. David has been on staff at Sydney Con. of Mus. since 1980 and in 1995 was appointed to the position of Chair, Ensemble Studies Unit. He has performed throughout Australia, New Zealand, Indonesia, Japan, China, Saudi Arabia, New Caledonia, Korea, Vanuatu, and Vietnam, conducted master-classes and recorded extensively. His distinguished career has included partnerships with many internationally renowned singers and in 1995 David was appointed as a member of the Order of Australia. Ros and David have been long-standing members of various leading performance groups and both currently work with Charisma.

This performance of ...*Womb of Paradigm* by Ros and David is remarkable. Albeit composed and fully notated, it is nonetheless a rigorous work-out on the terrain of *Collective Autonomy*. The requirements of considerable instrumental dexterity notwithstanding, it is the aspects of expression and inter-dependence that, I think, present the greatest difficulties in its performance. The notation is very precise and, generally, quite complex. And it is because of this precision and complexity being construed as ‘process counterpoint’ that a degree of ‘performance interpretation’ is requisite. With traditional counterpoint it is the clarity, precision, and balance of the individual lines that, ultimately, render the sum of the parts comprehensible. This applies no less to my concept, ‘process counterpoint’.

If given the choice, a performer would have a difficult score such as this well in advance of the scheduled performance. Indeed, Ros had this. But, through no doing of her own, she found herself having had no rehearsal and without a pianist

just one week before the broadcast. It seemed a performance would be impossible. Ros approached David, he agreed to do it. They had three rehearsals prior to the broadcast date. They render the structure clearly while the delicate (and demanding) expressive domain speaks of their having penetrated the dynamic terrain of 'process counterpoint'.

Two very short essays are included with the original score. The first of these, The Composer's Perspective, gives a brief introduction to *Collective Autonomy*, whilst the second functions as a header to the music itself, expressing at text's end, the poem located as an epigram to this liner-note.

If the *Trio '76* experience and Barry Guy's introduction to a different way of thinking about duration proved to be a foundational point of departure, ...*Womb of Paradigm* constitutes, in certain respects, a culmination. It not only stands as the first thorough working of 'process counterpoint' but, to date, the most rigorous as fully rendered in notation. As implied by the term itself, 'process counterpoint' concerns musical structure. And ...*Womb of Paradigm* is an extreme case of confrontation; one that brings to the fore, and solves through compositional procedures, many of the problems pertaining to the phrase—sub-phrase concept (ref. to *Trio '76* notes) as this relates to the departure/arrival trajectory (ref. to *Integrations 1* notes) within the field of *Collective Autonomy*. And again I stress here my central concern for expression as it may be found manifest in a space for interaction and inter-penetration without depending on hierarchically superior entities – entities that govern, come what may, the way in which structures and their perception are defined. The tritone, as it functions in the context of the tonal language, is an example. But there are others that bear the same weighty kind of dominance, a particular ordered series in an atonal context being just one of many possible examples.

The composition of ...*Womb of Paradigm* was aimed at clarifying, through thorough compositional procedures, some of the terms and their potential to be contextualized, that might enable expression and inter-dependence to function at their most flexible; to open up as wide as possible the creative space to spontaneity. There is perhaps an irony here because in order to achieve this teleology I set for myself some extremely rigorous parameters before embarking on the compositional journey. Far from granting myself 'freedom to move', I boxed myself in, so to speak, then had to discover the expressive space conducive to spontaneity in the composition process.

In 'boxing myself in' I made several pre-compositional decisions, all of which were aimed at addressing various problems as I saw these to be vis-à-vis *Collective Autonomy*, the most far reaching concerning form. I set out to address these problems of communicative/linguistic relationships in a well established context, namely, Sonata Form, deciding to extend the standard with a fairly brief Prelude and a Postlude. I established fields of pitch material in accord with certain intervalic characteristics. One field, for example, is abundant in diatonic material while another in major seconds, minor thirds, major thirds and perfect fourths. These are the two central fields and it will be obvious that there is already a considerable intersection between them. Both contain abundant material usually associated with tonality. It is the latter of these two fields however that performs the "Work's" primary structural mainstay. An index towards this is the opening chord, repeated in m. 1. These are not the only fields used of course, but the limited number of fields that are deployed bear specific intervalic relationships to this central material.

The harmonic language as made manifest in ...*Womb of Paradigm* is complex, yet it is based on a simple idea. It explores pitch fields construed in various ways and organized so as to depart and arrive at specific points yet doesn't depend on hierarchic structures to achieve this. To place further urgency on the process of problem-solving I sought ways to construe the *sonority* often identified as chord V but without it functioning as it does (relationally and hierarchically as V – I) in the tonal context. The relationship of V – I is problematized very early on when, from

(measures) mm. 12 through 23 short strings of these relationships are placed as quasi II – V – I material over pedals. Strings of this quasi-tonal material is construed in various forms throughout.

Even before I'd completed the Prelude (mm. 1 ~ 25) I'd taken two more structural decisions that made a decisive impact on the "Work's" form: a background transposition scheme that is symmetrical over the "Work's" entire duration, and a background rhythmic scheme able to be expressed in modules. Both these bear direct relation to thematic material as rendered in the Prelude; both are able to function structurally from the background through to foreground levels. Importantly, their potential to be rendered 'every which way' leaves them wide open to spontaneous decision making as compositional building blocks yet without any loss of structural grounded-ness on the middle and background structural domains – this material can, potentially, be multiplied both vertically and horizontally.

This ties in perfectly with the 'arcs of duration' idea I'd been grappling with since *Trio '76* and the "phrase–sub-phrase" concept that stemmed from it. It provides firm ground for 'content' as the play of forces in their states of Becoming; as intrinsic to creative (natural) spacing; and, significantly, as an unfolding process. The Prelude introduces three thematic/motivic idea which substitute for a 'primary subject' – fragments in lieu of; as a stand-in, so to speak. These occur at mm. 2 ~ 5, 9 ~ 11, and m. 18. A 'secondary subject' and a 'counter secondary subject' occur in the bass cl. at mm. 26 ~ 31 (the beginning of the Exposition) and mm. 40 ~ 49, respectively. In addition to this material being thoroughly explored in the Development (mm. 93 ~ 302), the "thematic material as stand-in" is explored as 'primary subject' proper, mm. 264 ~ 302.

A significant index to the interconnectedness between all this material occurs at m. 302, the concluding measure of the Development. A quasi dominant suspension (mm. 294 ~ 301) in the piano – a series of five chords repeated three times, offset against the meter, and over a pedal F in the bass – culminates in two construals of the 'quasi-tonal' material (but with no pedal), functioning as an upbeat to the Re-Cap, commencing at m. 303. The Re-Cap (mm. 303 ~ 391, including a brief coda), reasserts the 'secondary subject' and the 'primary subject' in a balanced structure – mm. 303 ~ 338; 339 ~ 379 (respectively) with 'secondary subject' material for the coda, mm. 380 ~ 391. It's worth pointing out that the 'secondary subject' re-cap is a piano solo, scored as four voices which realize eight permutations of the 'secondary subject' in a contrapuntal setting. Immediately following this the 'primary subject' material enters at m. 339, the piano renders a continuous stream of the quasi-tonal (II – V – I) material (either arpeggiated or chord-ally,) through to the Postlude, mm. 392 ~ 407. The Postlude juxtaposes the 'primary' and 'secondary' subjects in a contrapuntal setting which concludes on the same sonority as the "Work's" opening chord.

This analytical snap-shot of a much more intricately interwoven structural complex is, by way of example, to point out the kind of territory that ...*Womb of Paradigm* has trodden. It will also shine some light on the title. All this terminology – sonata form, exposition, development, re-cap, etc. – is paradigmatic. A womb is a place for nurturing and development. This not only provides a fertile location but can also serve to restrict movement. Hence, the title's ellipsis implies this restriction. All these paradigmatic structural ideas were put to work in their functional roles with the view in mind of finding ways through them and to establish a ground for spontaneous freedom. The idea was to get beyond the structural paradigms while concurrently respecting their formal implications; to establish 'content' consisting in malleable relationships rather than content being the filling of formal spaces (and I don't deny here the musical ear requisite for this). I sought content, not as 'predetermination' but 'content' as a kind-of coming together. To facilitate this I found myself writing in all sorts of additions – interludes, little codettas, a rondo, interrupted 'mirror structures' – and the language itself bears potential to express

digression, juxtaposed diversion, and alternate routes to a coinciding point of arrival. And vis-à-vis content, most of these decisions were made ‘on the run’. Thus, while much of the working material was predetermined, very little of the actual resultant content was. In other words, relationships, as made manifest, were established in the process.

Where a “Work” sets its sights on the inclusion of improvisation this is a crucial distinction. The strictures I set for myself in the pre-compositional planning were aimed directly at this target. Any deployment of a composition language in the field of *Collective Autonomy* needs, at its very foundation, ongoing access to three modes of relationship: dependent, independent, and inter-dependent. ...*Womb of Paradigm* sought this foundation out, paving the way for productive, creative intersections between improvisation and thorough composition. How the ‘content’ of these intersections might be made manifest on any given occasion will be a moot point. That is to say, the compositional materials and structures will need to be flexible enough to allow for unforeseen exchanges, these being a result of spontaneity. And in this, spontaneity – the hitherto unknown or unpredictable – can be considered a compositional element. On the other hand though, in the event of independent juxtapositions – where, say, notated materials proceed irrespective of the juxtaposed improvised, and vice versa – the improvised materials will need to be prepared for structural imposition (even something as simple and direct as a conducted down-beat). And in this, composition can be considered an element of improvisation. This is perhaps a little like looking at the world upside-down. But central to *Collective Autonomy* are the notions of difference and deference.

While these two terms may suggest a dichotomous distinction, for *Collective Autonomy*, they are ‘two sides of the one coin’, bearing an inter-dependent relationship that looks for intersecting characteristics. In their intersection *Collective Autonomy* doesn’t so much look for ways to blend or homogenize them, but rather, for ways that enable the retention of their specific characteristics to abide in a state of co-existence. In this, the play between them proves to be a rich resource for the discovery of relationships in all creative domains. Seen as this play of inter-dependence they give rise to a lively dialogue that will, inevitably, open up new or different horizons.

...*Womb of Paradigm*, albeit fully notated, is a rendering of one possible process that embraces this central issue of dialogue between difference and deference. *Integrations 1* is another. *Trio '76* yet another. And, as will become more apparent throughout the course of this series, *Of Other Narratives*, the various creative exchanges shared between those who engaged has been, in each case, a dialogue with a particular outcome: clarity in the three modes of relationship: dependence, independence, and inter-dependence.