

MARK HARVEY: What we're going to do is we'll have this lecture for most of the period, then at about quarter of or so, I'm going to stop and just hand out the assignment for the final project, which is fairly detailed, talk about just a couple of quick things, organizationally speaking, and then we'll be all set.

So postmodern, this is a term that gets thrown around a lot in different ways. It's usually, some people have applied it to the whole period of culture and history. Some people will take it back as far as maybe the 1950s or the 1960s in jazz. It begins roughly around that period, but there's a lot of development up to it.

And basically, it's a convenient catch phrase for talking about things that maybe don't fit in other categories or that are blendings and to some extent, as I say on this little handout, well, I guess I don't say it there, but the notion of combining things and also of blurring boundaries and this sort of thing.

So I'm going to talk about a few people, specifically, and then a couple of things of mine as we get into this, but let me just take us through this little chart briefly. And the reason I go all the way back to the turn of the previous century, meaning the 20th century, is that a lot of the things that were going on then, actually, have influenced composers in the present day. For instance, Charles Ives is mentioned there. Both Walter Thompson and I are deeply influenced by Charles Ives. And so here's somebody who was active over 100 years ago whose music still has influence and resonance for people.

You'll remember that New Orleans jazz was dominated, particularly in the earliest days, by collective improvisation. Then that concept went out of the music and came back in the 1960s, with people like Ornette Coleman and John Coltrane, so sometimes looking back is worth doing.

In the 1920s, Bix Beiderbecke, James P. Johnson, Darius Milhaud, Igor Stravinsky were all interested in different ways of blending jazz and classical, whatever that meant. For Stravinsky, in that period, it was more ragtime, but still an interest in this. Then a lot of the key elements, key pieces that we've talked about are on your chart like Harlem, all about Rosie. We've talked a little bit about third stream that was definitely a way of broadening people's thinking and making some very interesting musical investigations.

And there, again, what was going on in the '50s and '60s with third stream as an experimental period, down the road, you find all kinds of composers and performers right now who are deeply influenced by that, although they might not necessarily even use that term anymore. So these are stepping stones, you might say, along the way.

One thing that's very important in the middle of that chart where it says classical composers, there were two directions that were going on in the '50s, one was to a very rigorous, systematic, almost mathematical concept. Milton Babbitt is one of those, taking the serial, S-E-R-I-A-L, serial 12-tone notion of Schoenberg and taking it to an extent where everything was systematized. And many people thought it, to some extent, took some of the joy and spontaneity out of music, not necessarily so, but this is the way sometimes that whole movement was perceived.

Polar opposite was John Cage, who very often would come up with concepts of how you might approach music in a very open-ended way and blended things. Like he might have a radio playing, he might have two or three radios playing and ask the performers to change the dials, and then maybe a performer would play the violin along with that. That was a piece.

So that's a new-fangled conception consideration of how you would make a performance, how you would improvise but within certain boundaries. And there were a lot of jazz musicians in the 1950s who were being influenced to one degree or another by these events in the same way that people like Milton Babbitt, particularly, and some others were influenced by jazz. Cage never seemed to let on exactly about jazz, at least that I know of, but I think it's hard to believe that he wasn't influenced in some way by all of this.

Then we come to some of the key figures-- Mingus, Sun Ra, whom we're going to play a little bit about, say just a little bit about them, but let me keep going down this list. Ornette Coleman. His 1960 album, very important called *Free Jazz*, which really gave the name to the whole movement was, as many of you know, a 40-minute improvisational tour de force. It was essentially extended form music, but from improvisational background. That all feeds into what people then saw as possible for a jazz orchestra. The Free Jazz Group was a double quartet, eight players, but they sounded sometimes like they were about 24. But they gave an idea that other people could use.

Coltrane's "Africa." A lot of you know this from *Africa/Brass* has several seven or eight-horn section on that arranged by Eric Dolphy that's functioning like an African ritual group, you could say, but it's also taking the concept of horns from a large band and putting it in a totally different kind of a configuration.

Then we have Muhal Richard Abrams, who was the founder of the AACM, The Association for the Advancement of Creative Musicians in Chicago, and he had, in 1961, something called just simply the Experimental Band, a band that tried out things. This eventually spawned the Art Ensemble of Chicago, which was one of the great free jazz groups of all time. They're still going, although Lester Bowie has passed on, the great trumpet player.

And then you'll see just a few things, other things in the '60s, the Jazz Composers Guild, led by Bill Dixon; the Jazz Composers Orchestra Association, commonly called JCOA, led by both Carla Bley and Mike Mantler; and Liberation Music Orchestra, led by Charlie Haden. The only one that's still going is the Liberation Music Orchestra. Charlie Haden has revived that recently. That group always had kind of a political edge, and in the last year or two, he's seen fit to bring that back into being.

Then if you look at the last page, this is just my little list of what I call selected postmodern jazz orchestras. I put my own band there because we are in this category, also the Either Orchestra, you remember Russ Gershon who lectured to us, that's his band. They represent, clearly a world music blending, one of the many possibilities, with Ethiopian jazz as we know.

Jazz Composers Alliance Orchestra, JCAO, not to be confused with the JCOA, you get these initials in jazz, just like the Original Dixieland Jazz Band, the ODJB, well, you've got to get them straight. But the Jazz Composers Alliance Orchestra, another great group. They're having a concert this coming weekend, and I may have let you know about this, but I'll let you know again, with a lot of different points of view being expressed there.

And then others within this country, I've put the names down there. I'll come back and mention a couple of these, and Walter Thompson's own group is there, one of the leading exponents of this. And then in Europe, there's a whole variety, and there are others, but these are some of the more interesting ones.

Willem Breuker, from Holland, does some things that almost border sometimes on circus music and sort of a comedy show, you could say, with about 11 or 12-piece aggregation. They've been here at MIT, interestingly enough. Globe Unity, I'm not sure they're still around. Do you know if they're still around? They used to be based in a pan European group, but largely based in Germany. A guy named Albert Mangelsdorff, trombonist, was the motive for it, so I'm not sure they're still around.

Instabile Orchestra, which I'm assuming translates to unstable, great group in Italy. My band and their band always get compared. I'd love to meet them someday and have a battle of the bands. We see how much instability we could really put out in the world. The London Jazz Composers Orchestra sounds very stuffy, but it's not. They can do some very wild things, and the Vienna Art Orchestra, really a great group.

So we have some of these people on our syllabus, and if you see that any of these groups are playing any place or you come across a recording, it's worth your while to check it out. You won't be disappointed. You may be perplexed, befuddled, if not able to understand what they're doing, but you won't be without some kind of intrigue. Yes.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE] and Globe Unity is foregoing the 40th anniversary concert in 2006.

MARK HARVEY: There we go. 40th anniversary, 2006. Excellent. Thank you. The power of the internet. So let me just stop here and ask if anybody has any questions about this very rapid survey or some of these people or movements? Anything at all that's totally foreign to you or that you don't have a grasp of what I mean. So everybody is fairly well situated with this? OK, good.

So let me come back over, then and just say a couple of things about where some of the impulses that these groups now, and I mean now, the last 20 or 30 years, draw on. One of them is clearly, Charles Mingus. Mingus was one of the real progenitors of advanced thinking in the jazz orchestra world, and his groups tended to be not a full big band. They tended to be more like maybe 7 people, maybe 12 people. He got a lot of sound and a lot of interesting things going on out of a smaller big band.

And let me just back up a second, because going all the way back to the birth of the cool, in the late '40s and early '50s, you know that was a nine piece group, right, a nonet. That brought in the idea of what some people call the medium-sized big band, 9, 10, maybe eight players. That showed the possibilities of what you could do with smaller forces, but bigger than a quartet or a quintet. And so Mingus' group sort of following that, and in fact, there were a lot of those kind of groups in the 1950s and '60s.

But some of the things that Mingus did that were particularly interesting were, first of all, he began to really push this notion of multi-sectional form. And so if you think of some of the things that some of you know, like "Better Git It in Your Soul" or "Fables of Faubus," those are multi-sectional form pieces. They don't just stay with a 12-bar blues or a 32-bar form or something, they go through different types of things.

They have a lot of variety. They usually also have a lot of variety in terms of orchestration, in terms of mood, in terms of the way the improvisation is being utilized. And in some cases, what Mingus was doing was asking people to improvise, not necessarily freely, as in free jazz, but definitely, without regard to time limit or even sometimes specific chord changes.

If you go back to a piece called *Pithecanthropus Erectus*, which is from 1957, I think that's the right date, that's a pretty landmark piece. And after the tune is stated, there's an open vamp for soloing on two chords back and forth. And depending on what recording you hear, that can sometimes go for quite a long time.

The same thing happened with "Fables of Faubus." "Fables of Faubus," on the couple of recordings that most people know, is fairly well defined. It's a long piece, but in other performances, it's said that he would go a half an hour with that piece and weave all kinds of other music into it, making it really a framework for expansion. Well, all of that was the kind of thing that later groups would pick up on.

One of his great pieces, it's really one of his master pieces, I think, called *The Black Saint and The Sinner Lady*, and it was meant to be a ballet score. We have this on our syllabus, and I want to play the second movement of this, because I think it gives you a good sense of what Mingus was up to. It's also a wonderful piece that really bears listening to in its entirety. Let me get this in the--

And the liner notes alone are worth looking at. Mingus wrote a good share of the liner notes and has a lot of interesting things to say. If you know anything about Mingus, you know that his personality spilled over into the music in a very strong way. And the whole notion of what psychiatrists would call the id, the thing that governs your emotions, that didn't seem to be too governing with Mingus. A lot of stuff was very apparent in terms of what he was doing and talking about, and these liner notes are unbelievable.

Not the least of which is that the piano player, Jaki Byard, one of the great piano players, seemed to have been in tension with Mingus on this session. And so he says things like, I hope that one day, you'll figure out how to play what I want you to play. And I hope someday, you have a band and you call me as the bass player and I can be as cooperative with you as you were with me, which is a real satirical tone.

Now, Jaki was his regular piano player, and about three months later, they were back on the road playing both in Europe and in this country, making fantastic music. So clearly, whatever the rift was, whatever the tension got healed up, but it's very interesting to read this sort of thing in the liner notes.

In any case, on this *Black Saint and the Sinner Lady*, we're going to listen to the second movement, which is called "Hearts Beat." And I just want to give you a little sense of what some of the programmatic indications are, because this was another thing that Mingus was doing to stretch. It wasn't just that it was program music, but it was that he was giving instructions sometimes verbally, which you can hear sometimes on recordings, but also, written.

Now, I just want to take you through this and tell you some of the things that-- this is a score excerpt that was discovered by a former student here, doing a research project down at the Lincoln Center Public Library, this manuscript of Mingus. So at the beginning of this, Jaki Byard is asked to solo on the piano. There's a couple of chords, and the only thing it says is, solo in tempo, Duke, meaning play like Duke Ellington. It's interesting.

As we move along, he writes above the cut muted, two trumpets and cut mutes he says, "Felt, not heard." What does that mean? If you're a trumpet player, that's an interesting instruction as how to play. So very subtle.

Then there's a repeated riff idea. At some point, the alto takes the lead. You'll hear this. And then at some point, the lead trombone is instructed to sound like a sax. Interesting. How are you going to say that except to write that, sound like a sax, so this is one of the things that you wanted.

Then we get over, and this is where it really gets interesting, it gets very slow, and he says to the trombone player, who, on this recording, is not Jimmy Knepper, but evidently, it was supposed to be Jimmy Knepper, his long-time trombone player. This is what it says. It says, "Rest up, Jimmy, you're going to preach soon."

Then we get over here, and it says, plunger solo. And he says, "Preach." In the piano part, it says, "If you ain't been to church, don't play." Clearly, wants a very specific thing. Then later on, the piano is instructed, "Blues cryin' and answer the preaching." So this is a whole little dramatic monologue that's being put right into the music.

Now, you just don't find that in hardly anybody else's music around this time period. This is the early '60s, but later on, people are taking this and they're saying, OK, so we can make this little dramatic scenario, if you will, out of this. There's a couple other things happening musically, so let's listen to this. You won't be able to hear any of those, because those are just written instructions, but hopefully, you'll hear it in the music, but you'll hear some other things too.

Kind of things you hear happening there. It happened about midway, something I didn't mention. Something changed. Now, how did it change?

AUDIENCE: Faster

MARK HARVEY: Faster. And how did it get faster? Like right away?

AUDIENCE: Oh, no, it slowly increased faster.

MARK HARVEY: Slowly increased. The Cello Rondo. I think we talked about this the other day. There was a very small example of that in the Ellington piece, "Harlem." But this is a pretty dramatic slow build, and I know some of you in the FJE have done this when you've done a Mingus piece because he used that a lot. F Cello Rondo and D Cello Rondo, gradually getting faster, gradually getting slower. And this is only maybe 2.5 minutes of music that I just played.

And so you already had that plus you had it start off at a medium tempo, and then it slowed down. So in other words, he's dealing with a lot of variety in terms of feel and rhythmic concept just within two or three minutes of the piece. Anything else that you noticed?

AUDIENCE: It wasn't necessarily dominated by a block harmony,

MARK HARVEY: Right.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE].

MARK HARVEY: Right. Right. There was a lot of contra puzzle type stuff, polyphony, which we've talked about. And in this particular piece, there's at least sometimes at least three things going on, plus you add the soloists, that may be a fourth line, it gets a very rich texture. This is an 11-piece band. This is one of the ways you can get a rich sound out of a smaller number of players if you know what you're doing.

And in fact, that strange thing, that was one of the few places where there was some kind of block harmony and a very odd orchestration, but being since he had a tuba on hand, having tuba and string bass go this way and then the trombone and the three saxes doing the afterbeat, it's a very interesting sound. And the kind of thing you might expect from somebody like Prokofiev, let's say. If you're thinking classical orchestration, you think of *Peter and the Wolf*. There's some of that idea going on when the wolf comes on the stage, just a quick reference that came to mind.

But you're hearing things, in other words, that go well beyond what most people think about as jazz, the conventional sense of jazz, which is why Ellington didn't like to use that word, because he felt it was too limiting. Well, the other thing I was looking for was a certain kind of intensity. There's an intensity here, there's an emotional quality in every single person that's playing that's more than what can be put on the page. You don't get that by writing a bunch of notes.

You can write the greatest notes in the world. It doesn't matter. If the players are basically, let's just play that, that's nice, no. And Mingus was very much about having the players contribute their own particular approach. There was a story about Jackie McLean, one of the great alto players, who had played wonderfully in the Mingus band. And a new person came in to, essentially, play his part, his chair, and it was not doing very well.

Well, you're following Jackie McLean, so you would be intimidated. Anybody would be. But Mingus finally had to tell this player, he said, don't play the notes. You a man, play your mind, which is an interesting way to phrase. It in other words, be yourself. What I want you to do is not play necessarily what I'm telling you, I want you to play who you are in my band, which is a whole different kind of level of emotional intensity.

This is the kind of thing we talk about when we get into this land of the postmodern approach. This is not necessarily what was going on in the Thad Jones-Mel Lewis Band. Very often, that's what came out because those were also great musicians and they knew how to play within that style and to give that same level of performance, but it's just a different means of how you get to that point. And usually, the notes were very important in that band and maybe more so than they would be in something like the Mingus band. Let me move along now.

One of the great influences on all of this was Sun Ra, and Sun Ra-- how many people know who Sun Ra was? OK. So for those who don't, even for those who are here, it's always good to see a picture of the man. Here's the man, Sun Ra, who had a very interesting personal trajectory, personal understanding of who he was, literally situated in the universe, thinking, believing that he had somehow come both from the Egyptian pharaohs and from the planet Saturn.

How this works out, you'd have to ask him, but he shuffled off the astral plane, so it's a little difficult. But there are some books on Sun Ra, some video interviews he gave. A wonderful musician. One of the most, maybe the most far-reaching, the strangest in the best possible way, jazz musician that's ever come along. Really, just phenomenal.

His band, going back to the 1950s, nobody is even sure exactly when he put his band together, but he could play. He had played with Fletcher Henderson, and his band could play Fletcher Henderson or Duke Ellington just spot on, clean and clear as a bell, and then the next minute, literally, go into outer space or his conception of outer space interplanetary music.

He called his band The Arkestra, not Orchestra, but A-R-K, Arkestra, with various modifiers, like intergalactic Arkestra, interplanetary whatever, certain kinds of phrases to make a descriptive statement. But the sound is what's so interesting, and it drew on *Free Jazz*, but it also had things like the Mingus approach of instructions that would give a certain emotional intensity, and then they also played for music. So it just depended on what you had as to what came across.

I'm going to play some excerpts here from this album that I've had the little print out. It's called *Heliocentric Worlds*. We have this in the library. It's on the syllabus, and I'm going to play just a couple of things to give a little sense of this. And the first is a little bit of a piece called "Nebulae," and I'm going to fade that down and go into "Dancing in the Sun."

Some pretty wild stuff going on there, in some ways, a little wilder than Mingus. And this was recorded in the early '60s. Sun Ra was basically paralleling Mingus in terms of his career, but always more of a free thinker, I would say. Mingus really came out of the jazz tradition and helped to expand it. Sun Ra really did come in from an interplanetary direction, even though he understood the tradition and could play it, but his aesthetic was just out there from the get go.

Now, it's interesting in Sun Ra's whole conception, I've just given you a little fragment, because you can't really pick one piece as representative of Sun Ra. He was so varied in the kind of work that he'd done. But if you will listen to this entire album that we have in the library, in our syllabus, it takes you through about eight or nine pieces, they're all different one from another.

And if you were to listen to another Sun Ra album, that would possibly be different from what this one was. Just a tremendous variety. When he would perform, he would often perform three hours at a go. I saw him one time in a club in Boston, where they were supposed to have a second show, and that just went out the window. He just started in.

He would often have three or four people who sang and sometimes did processions around the room. And by the time you got to the end of three hours, you didn't know that much time had elapsed. You had really been taken on a different kind of a time-space continuum adventure. And sometimes in the pieces, you'll hear a kind of a chanting going on. It's a very unique world. I recommend that you get in touch with Sun Ra as a way to free up your mind and your entire being and put it on the interplanetary level.

I can't go into much more here, except to say that many of the musicians who have come after this and who have been interested in the post modern jazz orchestra look to Sun Ra in some way or another as one of the founding principles, because it's so rich.

And I should say here that the aspect of improvisation is absolutely crucial, and you get that in Mingus, but you get it even more in Sun Ra, meaning sometimes, one person with a rhythm section, a fairly conventional setup, sometimes collectively improvising, sometimes a small group of people improvising. In other words, paying attention to and honoring that aspect of the jazz tradition, but making sure that got put into the large-scale framework of a larger group and not just as a solo that would occur here and there. That's a pretty big difference from the way many things had gone on.

I want to now, give you an example from a friend of mine, a band I played in quite a few years ago. This is a band called The Year of the Ear, and unfortunately, the music is out of print. It hasn't been reissued on CD, but was some pretty interesting stuff. Basically, a jazz-funk crossover, and all I have left is my trumpet part. But as I'm passing this around, let me ask you what the first thing you notice about this. What's the first thing you notice about this manuscript?

AUDIENCE: Nothing on bar lines.

MARK HARVEY: So there's no bar lines. Right. So this is a breakthrough that, again, classical composers in the mid part of the 20th century made, getting away from bar lines, but it took jazz musicians a while to do that. Mingus was stretching for that. Sun Ra actually did that. I've never seen any of his scores, but he definitely accomplished that.

This was a band from the '70s. By the time we get to the bands like this one, at least, and a few others, people really didn't see a need for that. Now, the question is, what do you do? How do you cue these sections in? Well, you either have the conductor cue each note or you have to have subsets be associate conductors.

The other night with the FJE, I premiered a new piece. A couple of you may have been there. I know some of you were. A couple others may have been there. And I asked the trombone section to basically self-cue themselves. The lead trombone player was the associate conductor in this case. Well, that's a principle that's been around for quite a while, and we were able to use it the other night, and so it makes for a nice elasticity.

It also means that every time you play a piece, it's going to be slightly different. And this goes back to Charles Ives, for instance, who had a great belief in flexibility of forms and didn't necessarily need to have things come out the same way every single time. You'll also notice that letter B, I don't remember when we were asked to sing this, and I can't believe we did, and I would never want to do it again. But if you look at those intervals toward the end, there's an interval from a low E flat up to a high D. Well, good luck.

We must have had that together, we probably even practiced it, but as I say, I would not ever inflict this on anybody else, but we did play it. And I'm just going to play you a little bit of this, and I'll point out just a couple of things. There were solos around that you'll see at A, there's a couple of people are going to do some improvisation, and then there's more of a funk feeling that comes in, although we don't have that notated on this part.

And then these other sections, they're put in, they're sort of placed in as the composer wants to do that, who's also the guitar player in this case. And just a little thing, at letter E, I don't know that we'll get that far, letter E is this line that comes out of nowhere is it layered in.

[MUSIC]

It's a little slower. I must have been in the band playing this piece for about two years before somebody pointed out--

[MUSIC - JUAN TIZOL AND DUKE ELLINGTON, "CARAVAN"]

Right? Talk about disguising something. Once we heard that, it became a totally different phenomena to play that. So let me play you just a little bit of this to give you a little sense of how this goes.

So you can hear how that works, right? There's a lot more to this piece that goes on a lot longer. A couple of those themes recur, that little bop, bop, diddly-dat, diddly-dat, that occurs two or three times. It's kind of a little unifying aspect, but it's basically put together in a flexible way. The things always happen in the order that they're given, but within each performance, there is flexibility as to how this will work. And this is, again, part of the nature of these kinds of occurrences.

Let me move along and just hand out-- how many people were at the concert the other night in addition to the players? This is the first page of what was played. I think there's enough for everybody. I just want to point out a couple of things here.

This is a blend of conceptual music and a few notes that are actually written down. Sometimes all you would get would be more of the conceptual aspect, but this one actually has some notes. And so the notion is spacings, and there's a couple of different meanings to it, but one of them is that I've given some written notes.

And if you look at this, it says the duration of the notes, the performer determines that, as well as if there's crescendos or decrescendos. So depending on the sensitivity of the performers, right away, you have possibility of some very interesting musical interaction. As it turned out, the performance was at a very high level, I thought. I was very impressed by what the musicians did and the Festival Jazz Ensemble.

It says, three times. First time, play it as is. Play those notes. The second time, in between, where there's a vertical, sort of a diagonal line, the player is asked to interpolate some little improvisational aspect between those phrases, and then the third time, to use the seven pairs of notes-- so now, we've got a little different concept going on-- any order you want and stretch. In other words, more improvisation to vary the pitches, vary the rhythmic aspect.

This is pretty open-ended stuff. It's pretty flexible stuff, but you have to be very sensitive to do this. Because I have encountered people who think, oh free improvisation, that's easy to do. And they'll look at something like this and immediately, they all start playing fast or they all start doing something that they've learned in their workbook or whatever it was, their fake book, and it sounds like mush. Whereas, if you're really paying attention and if you're really listening, and if you're really open to what possibilities are, then you can get some actual, very interesting music. And yet the beginning framework here is really not that much.

But it's asking the musicians, it's asking the performers to add in. It's becoming a collaborative idea, and that's a really important aspect that is inherent in a lot of these other musicians, but it's something that I particularly am interested in. And it's something that Walter Thompson is interested in, and you'll hear more about that when he comes along.

Now, what I'd like to do for the final bit of time here is to talk a little bit about and play a piece of mine that we should be able to have enough to-- what have we got-- 1, 2, 3, 4. We got almost enough for an individual score for everybody. Let's try that out and see what happens.

This is a piece of mine that I, in fact, wrote for the FJE a number of years ago, and it's got a lot of these principles in it. I don't want to say too much because I do want to play the piece, but I'll just say a little bit about it. So when you get this, if you can-- it's called flex and it gets into this notion of flexibility.

If you look at the first page of the actual music, there's a solo out in front, which is undetermined, open meaning, any length, whatever you might want to do based on the E Phrygian mode. The little cells that are given at number 2, these are to be given individually, 2 and 3, and I was the conductor on this. So I get to determine who plays. Who's going to make another contribution along with the soloist, happens to be a guitarist who's soloing in this case.

When we come to the next page, it's the full band playing, but you'll notice that it says ensemble Q, and what it should say there is each note is conducted. So I can choose, or whoever's conducting can choose to take it at faster rate one time, slower rate another time, or maybe take certain parts of it faster or slower. Again, flexibility. It can be variable in every single performance.

Then we get to an actual little base line. That's a written bass line, drums add in. We get over to page 4. This is a little hard to decipher, but let me just point out what happens is the trombones come in with a little eight bar pattern that goes over to the next page. That repeats. The baritone sax adds in. At some point, the trumpets add in. And then once that all gets established, then on page 6, the saxophones come in.

So we've got a fairly modular type of structure, but it's not set as to who comes in is exactly how this is going to play out. In a given performance, the trumpets might go through their thing three times or two times, or maybe they don't get cued in at all. So it's almost like a mobile, those sculptures that are hanging in there, so it's like this. It moves around, and depending on what happens, different things work out differently.

Then everything comes together over on page 7, at least for the saxophones, except just when they come together in chords, the trombones are going off and doing something differently. And then we get into some free playing on page 9. There are some other things. There's a little interlude that I've written specifically.

Then we get to page 12. It's just several lines of music that the saxophones are asked to work with to build their own improvisational statement. And then we have some final chords, which are very specifically ordered in terms of who comes in when and where. Each time, more tone colors are built in. Each time, a fuller sense and a different harmonic sense is built in.

So let's play this. This is about 12 minutes, and you can follow it through, and then maybe you'll have some questions or comments, as we come along. So this is the Festival Jazz Ensemble from the year 2000, I think it is, playing on this.

[MUSIC - FESTIVAL JAZZ ENSEMBLE]

So kind of questions or comments does everybody have on that? You could follow it pretty well, because I could hear and see the music turning roughly where we were. Any things that differed from what was on the page? Was every note played exactly as it set forth? Probably not.

Well, that little thing that's marked x, x is always a good number to have in case you realize after you've numbered everything that you want to have something that can just be put in at a moment's notice. At x, at the end, there was supposed to be some other brass added into that chord, and the conductor, namely myself, evidently forgot, and so all you had was the last note in the bass trombone and the baritone sax. In theory, you would hear all of a sudden, out of nowhere comes this nice, soft chord, but that didn't happen.

And there were some other things where the players were working more closely or less closely with some of the suggested material, but part that is OK because part of the notion is it's collaborative, and it's meant to have the improvisational aspect be as important as whatever I came up with in terms of thinking this out ahead of time. And I should say that the reason that this is a relatively-- at least my approach with this flexible idea and Walter Thompson and a couple of other people-- the reason it's a relative small subset of the world of jazz and conductors, all that, because many composers don't like to have their music messed with in this way. If they write, it they want it played.

My perception is-- this is me, nobody has to follow this down the garden path-- what I write I can write some things that are more densely written. You saw "The Seeker." That's a pretty well-spelled-out piece with some occasions for solos. I'm more likely to want to have people collaborate with me. So I want to see what's going on. I want to hear. It's always an adventure, in other words.

So far, I haven't been bitterly disappointed when I've put a piece like this in front of people. I suppose it could happen, but I've been lucky that it hasn't been that way. It usually come out with a very good musical result, because I try to get good musicians to work with. That's a key ingredient. Any other comments or questions anybody might have?

AUDIENCE: I really like the effect that you get at 9, where everyone is playing that line in a canon line, coming in whenever they will and looping in. But there's sparse enough notes that you hear a harmony there, and it shifts around a little bit. And it's discernible, and it's a nice, slow effect.

MARK HARVEY: Good. Because that was part of the intent was that both the idea of simple enough for you, the performer to add in, but also, to have some semblance of coherence. Whereas, at the very beginning, I'm not sure there was a lot of coherence harmonically, but then at least, to me, one of the interesting things is after you have all that stuff on page-- whatever it is, page where the first thing is.

And then when you get to page 2, where the ensemble comes in, all of a sudden, that's a clearing, clarifying presence, because it comes out of what seemed a little dense and a little maybe somewhat chaotic, although I wouldn't call it that myself, but some people could. Then you have this big corral almost type of thing that comes out of that.

So it's a way of thinking a little differently than you might if you were thinking count of Basie, Thad Jones, whatever, sort of approach. All these are good approaches. There's nothing that says this has to be the main one or no, it's just that this is the variety that you get. Any other comments anybody might have?

OK. Well, as I say, this is a quick survey through this. And if you were to check out any of those bands on page 3 or page 2 of the handout, where it talks about select post-modern jazz, each of them is going to be different from the other. Not one of them is going to sound exactly like another group, and it's very important to know what group you're working with.

Vinny Golia, whose name is there, who's based in Los Angeles, has a group very similar to mine, and tends to write a lot more specific things, but can also have improvisational things. He and Walter and I participated in a project about 17 years ago, where we each wrote new music-- we had commissions, it was a nice project-- and then we took the commissions around each other's band.

So they came here and did it with Aardvark. We went out to LA, and then we went to New York to work with Walter. In LA, Vinny does a little bit of studio work, not a lot but he plays every saxophone and woodwind known to mankind, including contrabass clarinet. And he often jokes that when in a movie, if they need a whale sound, they'll call him. They won't call him for the regular session work, but if they need an odd effect or some space effect and *Star Trek*, they'll call him to bring some odd instrument.

Well, in his band he had about 25 people. He had a couple LA studio musicians, they shall remain nameless, but a couple of fairly well-known people, if you were to know that scene. One whom I had heard about since I was a kid. I was very impressed. I thought, wow, I got to get to conduct this guy. And when my score-- in that case, didn't have a lot of this stuff, but it had a couple of things where it had numbered cues 1, 2, and 3.

But then it said, conductor may choose these out of order, and these guys went ballistic. It was like, it's supposed to be 1, 2, 3 then it's supposed to be 1, 2 3. What do you mean? You're going to cue number 3 first? And I said, well, that's just--

And all of a sudden, there was this tension in the air, shall we say, because some people were not quite as open as others. Anyway, it was an interesting situation it all worked out, but there are certain players who gravitate more to this than others. There are certain audience members who do the same kind of thing, and so it's useful to know who you're talking about.

So I think we'll wrap up the lecture portion at this point, and as I say, if you can check out something on YouTube, even just a couple of minutes to get a sense of what Walter is doing, I think it will just help give you a little more preparation for when he comes in. And it would be great if we could all be here on time on Thursday so that we can get rolling in the right manner.