

About music

Edgar Alandia

Music is a language whose codes have been shared by the dominant culture since the beginning of the twentieth century, and subsequently expanded to myriad possibilities which actually lead us to the composer's personal code, if not to a specific code in each work. On the other hand, the raw material of music has always been the sound and its fields of development, time and space.

Another constant element when dealing with music is the interaction between who makes music and who listens to music, i.e., the relationship between composer and listener. Actually, this subject has always determined the paths of many composers who focus on the issue of perception, with all its implications.

Perhaps it would be worthwhile to establish relationships between these two issues, an obvious but not-easy-to-solve problem when one writes music. In other words, how and when to consider and elaborate musical thinking through its raw material, the sound, both in time and space, so that the result is perceived or at least intuitively discerned by the listener?

One of the fundamental resources human beings possess is memory, which needs the clearest possible information in order to be activated. It seems opportune that, in this crossing of elements (information and memory), a subtle and not-easy (and also completely subjective) balance is achieved, in such a way that the listener is able to perceive information (sound signals and

their development in space and time) so that he or she participates in this sonorous event. On the other hand, this balance allows the composer to share his creative or recreational experience.

Throughout music history and considering, simply as a reference, concert music, we realize that composers, according to their own nature, possibilities and limitations, privilege sometimes the speculative aspect (the combination of sounds in space and time), and sometimes the sound, in space and time (organized by relatively simple and at times even banal combinations).

Without feeling necessarily obligated to express an opinion about which of the two options I consider the best or worst (these categories have always been typical of the dominant power), I limit myself to emphasize that these are simply two different points of reference. If I must declare a predilection for one of them, it goes to music which is thought and structured, which expresses or tries to express thoughts and possibilities of regarding and hearing sounds in a different way and which, in order to obtain such result, employs more or less complex (which is not the same as complicated) elaborations. I believe that a beautiful thought, with an intelligent development per se, produces a beautiful object. To make a beautiful object predetermining the concept of beauty sounds fake.

Back to the subject of sound and to the parameters in which it takes place (time and space), the combinatorial rules I use to make music are relatively simple and essential, trying to follow the sound and its natural laws (it seems to me that simplicity is the most evolved degree of speculation; beyond essential there is nothing but void). Every operation and every speculative “system” violate the nature of things – in this case the sound – but if this nature is respected, it seems to me that the result may be more “logical”, more fluid and, in any case, more “comprehensible”.

I have written and declared in many opportunities how symmetry is an instinctive and constant element in my work, in my way of thinking, in my way of being. I use simple (symmetric) materials and their natural harmonic unfolding, in order to create a succession of sound signals and gestures, which are transformed with time. I try to keep their nature so that their perception is not altered, but could actually be captured and, why not, comprehended by the ear. In such fashion, sound organization makes characterizations of rhythmical figurations unnecessary. The expression of gestures, conglomerates

and sounds is proportional: they may be long or short, of different dimensions, but complementary, such as timbres, notes and other parameters are complementary. These thoughts are not new at all. Complementarity may be found in Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Schumann, Mahler or Bartók. Finally, it seems to me that complementarity is part of the universal balance...

Having understood that, when writing music, I have nothing special to express, I limit myself to exploring “inside” the sound, in order to understand how it behaves, how it reacts, what it “says” through its media (the instruments) in space and in time. Without a time... without a time... until it almost becomes space.