6

Research Article

Ewa Mazierska*

Improvisation in Electronic Music—The Case of Vienna Electronica

https://doi.org/10.1515/culture-2018-0050 Received August 25, 2018; accepted November 18, 2018

Abstract: The purpose of this article is to establish what improvisation means and how it is used by electronic musicians operating in Vienna from the late 1980s till the present day: Peter Rehberg, Peter Kruder, Rupert Huber, Patrick Pulsinger, and the members of the band Sofa Surfers. It attempts to find out whether they believe that their choice of electronic instruments enhanced or impeded their ability to improvise and their sense of artistic agency; what type of improvisation they favour and what are their views on the changing role of improvisation in producing electronic music. It also examines the difference between old and new style electronic instruments in improvisation and music production at large. Finally, it asks a question whether the musicians had any views about the link (or the lack thereof) between the cultural milieu in which they operate and their willingness and ability to improvise.

Keywords: Improvisation, electronic music, idiomatic and non-idiomatic improvisation, Rupert Huber, Peter Kruder, Patrick Pulsinger, Peter Rehberg, Sofa Surfers

The purpose of my article is to establish what improvisation means and how it is used by electronic musicians operating in a specific place and time: Vienna from the late 1980s till the present day. I wanted to find out whether they believe that their choice of electronic instruments enhanced or impeded their ability to improvise and, in a wider sense, their sense of artistic agency, what type of improvisation they favour and what are their views on the changing role of improvisation in producing electronic music. Finally, while I realised that it would be very difficult to argue that there is a specific Viennese approach to improvisation in electronic music (and, indeed, improvisation in European music is almost never examined as a specific national phenomenon), I was interested to find out whether the musicians had any views about the link (or the lack thereof) between the cultural milieu in which they operated and their willingness and ability to improvise. By the same token, I look at improvisation as a process which is simultaneously musical, personal and cultural (Monson, qtd. in Racy, "Why Do They Improvise" 314).

The Musicians

For my research I have interviewed Peter Kruder, whose is best known as half of the duo Kruder and Dorfmeister, Rupert Huber, a member of duo Tosca, as well as solo artist, Peter Rehberg, who released solo albums as well as working with a plethora of other artists, mainly through his own labels Mego and Editions Mego, Patrick Pulsinger, who likewise is known for solo work and collaboration with numerous artists and Wolfgang Frisch and Michael Holzgruber from the post-rock band Sofa Surfers. The interviews, which were conducted between July and December 2017, were semi-structured. I asked each person about their understanding of the term "improvisation," the type of improvised music they practice themselves, the role

^{*}Corresponding author: Ewa Mazierska, School of Humanities and the Social Sciences, University of Central Lancashire, ehmazierska@uclan.ac.uk

of instruments, audience, geographical and social environment in their practice, as well as their views on the future of improvisation in electronic music.

I chose this group for practical and essential reasons. The first pertains to the fact that I know their music well thanks to conducting a study about their work and some of them I met on previous occasions. The essential reason is that the group is sufficiently homogeneous and heterogeneous to capture commonalities and differences in electronic improvisation. All its members were born in the late 1960s-mid-1970s, started their careers between the late 1980s and the early 1990s and are active in the music business till now. They began making music when electronic equipment was bulky, expensive and required advanced skills to operate it. Later they witnessed and benefitted from electronic technology becoming more accessible: lighter, cheaper, easier to obtain. They are thus in a position to assess the changes in the use of electronic gear in composition and performance. The majority of them can be described as "studio musicians" in a sense given to this term by Brian Eno; namely, they treat the studio as their principal musical instrument (Eno 2004). They cannot read scores, or even if they can, they are reluctant to do so. In order to communicate effectively with fellow musicians, these artists have to play for them a musical instrument or send them a specific electronic file rather than a sheet covered with notes. The road to composition in their case comes across as more direct, thus closer to improvisation, than is the case of classically trained composers. Although they achieved international fame, they represent a movement known as Vienna Electronica or Vienna Sound, hence are strongly associated with their geographical environment. They started their careers when geographical location was seen as a major impediment to an international career. In due course, this stopped being the case, thanks to the rise of the internet, which changed the way music is distributed. Although my interviewees use electronic instruments, they represent different subgenres of electronic music, working practices, relationships with non-electronic instruments, as well as relationship with the audience. Several of them oscillate between commercial and serious/experimental music, either because their different projects are planned as either commercial or experimental or because they try to overcome this division. It shall be added that all of them are male, and I hoped to include in my study at least one female artist, Susanne Kirchmayr, better known as Electric Indigo, but she refused on the grounds that she is not an improviser and has little to say on this topic.

Improvisation in Electronic Music: Basic Concepts

The existing literature defines improvisation as creating musical work without preparation, instantaneously, on the spot, during the performance, in real time, typically as a response to other musicians or the audience (Bailey 2002; Blum 2009; Alperson 2010). As one can see, this definition is problematic. First, it can be argued that all acts of composition include an element of improvisation—all start with something immediate, which the musician develops by elaborating on the first, instant idea (Benson 2003). Second, there is no performance without an element of improvisation, namely diverging from a script, as a musical script (score) cannot be repeated with complete precision. However, authors demand that this divergence has to be significant. For example, Roger Dean writes: "My circumscription of improvisation requires in the extreme case that at any moment the next event is not fixed or reliably predictable in advance by the participants" (Dean 134). Secondly, we designate music as improvisatory "not simply in cases when elaborate activity is present but rather when we notice an evident degree of spontaneity or free play in the activity" (Alperson 273). We are also more inclined to use this term in the context of composing and playing without notation. Many authors and musicians also use the term "improvisation" only in the context of group work and live performance. If the musician works in his/her studio, s/he simply "composes," as opposed to "improvising," even if it takes multiple attempts to find the right sound by playing with the equipment. However, this view does not go unchallenged, because solo improvisation is found in a number of musical practices from classical keyboard extemporisation to free improvisation. For the purpose of this article, I will use the widest possible concept of improvisation, which also includes studio work of a single composer. Although the improviser can also be a virtuoso of a particular instrument, there is a tension between the goals of improvisation and virtuosity. Virtuosity is achieved through repetition of certain musical units; improvisation is the antithesis of repetition. However, it can be argued that only a musician who knows his or her instrument well can transcend its boundaries. Here it is worth quoting Dominico Pietropaolo, who said that "improvisation was for medieval rhetoric a skill to be mastered after long hours of practice" (qtd. in Lewis and Piekut 4).

The scope for improvisation in electronic music seems in some ways wider, and in other ways more limited than in other types of music. The first results from the specificity of its production. Electronic musicians are predominantly studio musicians, who work in their own studios, not being limited by the requirement to make the most of the limited time of the rented space. This allows them to experiment for long stretches of time, in search of the perfect sound or their combination. The testimonies of electronic musicians confirm that they take advantage of this opportunity (Kaiser 2013). Moreover, it is assumed that the scope of producing new sounds using electronic equipment, especially computers, is larger than classical instruments and classical notation. This is because electronic instruments evolve all the time. while classical instruments remain, more or less, the same. Consequently, there are also fewer rules about using electronic instruments, as opposed to guitars and pianos, whose users are burdened with centuries-long traditions of playing them. To capture this specificity, it is worth referring to the concept of "affordance," as explained by David Huron and Jonathan Berec, who argue that musical instruments imply certain modes of interaction or encourage certain musical functions. For example, a "given passage may be playable on a variety of musical instruments but may be better suited to one particular type or class of instruments" (Huron and Berec 104). Electronic instruments afford their users more freedom than other types of instruments. Furthermore, the most advanced electronic instruments, mostly new generation computers, have "minds of their own" —they do not merely react to instructions imposed on them by their users but suggest solutions. They are thus examples of artificial intelligence and hence can act as "artificial improvisers" (Young and Blackwell 2016).

On the other hand, the situation of electronic musicians can be seen as not conducive to improvisation, due to the supposedly solipsistic character of their work, both in the studio and in the concert space, even if they perform with other musicians. This is to do with the difficulty of deciphering what the partner in performance is doing behind his or her laptop or console, with his or her hand operating a computer mouse rather than guitar and his or her eyes focused on the screen rather than on his partner. Moreover, such performance makes the audience suspicious that it is not improvised or even live—musicians just play what was recorded previously—their work is limited to pressing a button. The frequent collaborations between electronic and non-electronic musicians are at least in part prompted by recognition of this problem and an attempt to alleviate it.

It can be argued that it is thanks to the development of electronic instruments, most importantly tape recorders, that it became possible to investigate the practice of improvisation and progress it. Thanks to recording, the musician can return to what s/he did, listen to it and improve on it, either in the studio or in the next live improvising session. This was not equally easy before the ascent of recording technology. Hence, it is a well-known fact that Chopin was a great improviser, but it is almost impossible to discover how he improvised, most importantly how much his live performances differed from his scores (Hatten 2009).

Derek Bailey divides improvisation into two types, which he describes as "idiomatic" and "nonidiomatic." "Idiomatic improvisation, which is more widely used, is mainly concerned with the expression of an idiom, typically defining a genre-such as jazz, flamenco or baroque-and takes its identity and motivation from that idiom. Non-idiomatic improvisation has other concerns and is most usually found in the so-called "free" improvisation and, while it can be highly stylised, is not usually tied to representing an idiomatic identity" (Bailey xi-xii). The division between idiomatic and non-idiomatic is not clearly delineated due to the fact that idioms can have wider and narrower meanings, and are to some extent subjective. Even the term "free jazz," which is meant to convey non-idiomatic improvisation, suggests that their participants conform to the rules of a specific genre—that of jazz. Still, the division is useful if we treat it as delineating a continuum of improvisation, whose one boundary is creating music from scratch, ignoring any rules, and another experimenting within the confines of a specific set of rules.

The Purpose, Stages and Dimensions of Improvisation

The main goal of improvisation in music, including electronic, is to produce new work. After all, improvisation is a form of composition. However, music has many dimensions, such as melody, harmony, structure (form) and timbre. The last is foregrounded in studies of electronic music, because electronic instruments allowed expansion in the variety of available sounds and because electronic artists, arguably more than their acoustic predecessors, became interested in individual sounds rather than their connections (Kaiser 37).

All my interviewees confessed that they were attracted to electronic music because of its potential to create new music. This meant predominantly creating new sounds, but also re-working pieces of existing music. At the time of their beginnings, there was a sense that traditional rock music (understood as a specific musical style and the culture built around it) was in crisis and electronic instruments were a perfect means to overcome it. This required to approaching music in a new way, by trial and error. Peter Rehberg mentioned that at the beginning of his career he turned to techno because there was no blueprint about how to compose or play techno. Any way was permissible, as long as it pleased the composer and his/her audience. Not only did techno allow the artist to improvise, but it forced him or her to do so. The lack of a blueprint was also important because most of this group were not trained as musicians—thus they had no technique, style or teacher to follow. While this lack would work against them if they tried their hand at playing, for example, baroque music or traditional jazz, it was obviously not a problem on this occasion. Neither of them aimed at virtuosity; novelty was their ultimate goal.

Some alluded to two stages and types of improvisation which they practised. One of them, which Rehberg described as "noodling," consists of finding out about the potential of electronic instruments. Such improvisation takes place mostly in the studio and prevailed at the beginning of the musicians' careers and whenever they purchased a new instrument. Although few musicians stated it openly, I believe the main purpose of this stage of improvisation is timbral exploration. Normally the goal of this stage is not producing a finished piece, but units which can be assembled at a later stage. It also could be argued that—contrary to the pronouncements about the lack of ambition to become a virtuoso of any instrument—at this stage the musicians tried to achieve instrumental proficiency, which allowed them to play with others with a degree of self-confidence.

The second type usually starts when the musician knows his or her instrument well and improvises in order to compose a finished piece which can be recorded or played to a live audience. This stage typically involves other musicians. Some of my interviewees said that only this stage did they associate with improvisation because improvisation for them means working with other musicians. At this stage timbral exploration is still important, but other aspects come into play, most importantly melody and structure. This, to some extent, confirms the widely held view that electronic musicians composing and performing solo are at the cutting age of exploring new sounds but are much worse in attracting mainstream audiences who seek catchy melodies. Depending on the role of these two aspects (sound/timbre versus melody/ harmony), my interviewees privileged different types of improvisation. For Rehberg, improvisation meant mostly spending time communing with his computer or a modular synthesiser; for the members of Sofa Surfers, playing together during rehearsals. In practice, there might be many stages of improvisation involved in the productions of a specific piece. Patrick Pulsinger mentioned that in his case exploration of new sounds is often followed by improvising with other musicians (he discussed in detail his session with a trombone player) and this stage is typically followed by studio work when the composer "retouches" the jointly produced work, extracting pieces of music which do not sound well, adding to them new layers or even inviting the same or a different musician to work further on the material. It thus appears that for him the improvisation he practices is on occasions completely nonidiomatic; the idiom is inserted, so to speak, at a later stage, when he smooths the edges of the work of several musicians, on occasions subordinate their work to the rules of a specific genre. For this reason, Pulsinger also seems to be the most "omnivorous" in this group—most open to collaboration with different types of musicians. I believe this is because he

¹ Hatten describes "noodling" as random and contrast it with improvisation (Hatten 281).

believes the problems resulting from the perceived mismatch between musicians and instrument can be corrected at a later stage, through studio work.

Rupert Huber, by contrast, talked about Tosca's relying on a certain idiom-that of blues. His improvisations with Richard Dorfmeister are meant to overcome, as he put it, the clichés of this genre, evoking the idea that the appeal of improvisation lies in providing "relief from the sense of banality we sometimes associate with excessively familiar musical works" (Racy, "Musical Improvisation" 232-33). At the same time, he mentioned that he would not be able to play with everybody keen to improvise due to certain peculiarities of his and Dorfmeister's style, which he described using terms such as "delay" and "slowness." They understand each other's preponderance to this musical behaviour, so they do not "stay behind" with each other. Moreover, working together ensures what can be described as "democratic division of roles" and avoiding being dominated by the "loudest voice." Such sentiment brings to mind Ornette Coleman' description of jazz playing, in which "the individual is either swallowed up in a group situation, or else he is out front soloing, with of the other horns doing anything but calmly awaiting their turn for *their* solos" and "A strong personality with a star-complex would take away from the effectiveness of our group, no matter how brilliantly he played" (Coleman 254); a situation which a properly designed and executed improvisation was meant to prevent.

The general impression from the discussion was that improvisation is never about pure freedom, spontaneity or "adhocism." This element appears, but it is always balanced with its opposite deliberation or routine. What makes the musicians different from each other concerns the stage when improvisation appears and the purpose it serves. Pulsinger starts without anything premeditated and only later tries to harness his work. Huber, by contrast, brings to the table the baggage of his (informal and formal) education and during improvisation tries to shed some of this baggage. In this sense Pulsinger best fits the idea of an electronic musician, while Huber has much in common with a classical one.

At least in one case, that of Huber, the goal of improvisation appears to be not only making specific new music, but also new ways of composing and performing. In his studio, Huber showed me a kind of score which looked like an abstract painting to be used by musicians performing his work. Inevitably, such an image brings to mind graphic scores produced by the classical composers of electronic music, such as Morton Feldman and John Cage (Roquet 2009; Hall 2017), although in comparison with the work of these artists, Huber's picture looked more like a map. I believe his purpose in creating such a "score" is to find a middle ground between a classical and electronic medium (namely written and non-written music) and the middle ground between idiomatic and non-idiomatic improvisation. Such a search reflects Huber's multiple persona of classical—electronic musician, avant-garde and commercial artist, piano and electronic player and his desire to hold these personas in check.

Electronic Versus Classical Instruments

I asked my interviewees how they use electronic equipment in their work and how this has changed over time and how these changes affected their ability and willingness to improvise. They admitted that in the late 1980s and 1990s, when they bought their first synthesisers and samplers, they were so expensive that they treated them with utmost care, worried that they might misbehave or break if they misused them. At the time there were no easily accessible manuals for using such gear; one had to come up with one's own methods or styles of performance. One also needed much practice to learn about their potential. Such a situation encouraged improvisation in the studio, in order to check the potential of different functions of synthesisers, samplers and computers and, at the same time, required better preparation for performance, to avoid embarrassing situations when the equipment stopped working. Improvisation in performance was thus avoided. With the passage of time, they became familiar with the instruments and were able to use them with greater confidence, eventually developing their own style of playing them. This also translated into greater courage to experiment in a live environment. However, this was not the end of the process, because new instruments became available and this, again, required "improvisation" or "noodling" in the

studio. This was in step with electronic instruments becoming more versatile and easier to use, with laptops marking an important milestone in this process.

What has also changed over time is the relationship between the users of classical instruments, especially those working in classical/experimental music, and electronic musicians. In the 1990s, up to the early 2000s, there was a sense among the former that there is a gap between the knowledge and the working practices of these two groups; hence they should not work together. In the eyes of many classically trained musicians, electronic musicians verged on "barbarity," lacking virtuosity and self-awareness. Huber remembered a situation when he was meant to perform with a group of classical musicians in New York when the fact that he brought his computer had put off one of the members of the classical ensemble so much, that he refused to play with him.² A decade or so later this instrumental purity was abandoned, and it became a common practice to juxtapose electronic and non-electronic instruments, as much in the studio as in live settings. This can be attributed to the development of electronic instruments which gradually took over many genres, such as rock, and the development of the internet, from which musicians could download the software to be used in composing electronic music. Another possible reason is the growing importance of live events, for different types of musicians. Juxtaposing the two types of instruments allows to overcome the limitations of both types of instruments and make the performance attractive to different types of audiences.

Many of the artists belonging to the Viennese scene collaborated with musicians playing classical instruments, for example, Patrick Pulsinger with trumpet players and guitarists, and Rupert Hubert with fellow piano players. Asked about the advantages of such collaboration, they pointed to unleashing the potential of one type of instruments by others.

Electronic Instruments: Agents of Individuation or Homogenisation, Tools or Actors?

A large part of my conversation with the musicians concerned their equipment. As I" m myself not musically trained, there was no point for me to ask about the technical details of specific instruments. What interested me more was how they use them and what kind of a relationship they developed with their gear. In a nutshell, there was talk about "old" and "new" gear. The old is exemplified by the Moog synthesiser and ATARI computer and was described as expensive, bulky, difficult to use and largely analogue. Possessing such equipment felt like a great privilege and mastering it took time. As a result of the scarcity of these early instruments and the length of the process of learning how to use them, their owners were in a position to develop a personal style of composing and performing on them. They were thus seen as agents of individuation. Although the interviewees did not use the term "virtuosity" in this context, they alluded to this concept by emphasising the importance of mastering these early instruments.

By contrast, contemporary instruments are light, cheap and easy to operate—one does not need to spend long hours to read manuals to learn how to make music on them. Typically, they do not last long, because they tend to be replaced by ones which are even cheaper and more convenient. Such instruments are used by professionals and amateurs alike and are an important factor in blurring the division between them. Due to their abundance and short lifespan, being like "toys," as Patrick Pulsinger put it, which can be discarded when one grows up, they have less potential to allow the musician to develop a unique style. In his opinion, the rapid speed of the development of electronic equipment led to contemporary music being less versatile than those from the 1980s. This development made him to return to "vintage" equipment, as a way to secure a "unique signature."

My interviewees recognised two types of creative power on the part of electronic instruments. One, pertaining to the early electronic machines, such as ATARI computers, resulted from their imperfections, which gave rise to "glitches." These glitches, as they admitted, opened their eyes to musical possibilities which they would not otherwise discover, and often led to producing very melodic and pleasing tunes.

² This situation can be compared to the way previously folk artists were treated by those who were academically trained.

One can evoke here the concept of "aesthetics of failure," coined by Kim Cascone (2000). Glitches are not intentional, but a decision to incorporate them into one's work is. With the current, digital equipment, this is no longer possible to rely on (accidental) glitches, because they are too precise. If one wants to experience mistakes and glitches, one needs to programme randomness. However, checking these "artificial glitches" might take one forever. As Peter Kruder put it, "if I wanted to explore them, I would not be able to ever leave my studio." Such a statement, echoed by the testimonies of other composers, somehow undermines the (romantic) claim that improvisers are more interested in the process of creation than in its products (Lewis and Piekut 4). All the musicians whom I talked to, are ultimately oriented towards producing a finished piece. The second type, which pertains to the contemporary, most advanced equipment, reflects on its (artificial) intelligence. Such equipment or rather the software running on it, live algorithms, are thus able to surprise the musicians and exceed what these musicians are able to do without its support. There are two sides to this development, seen as both positive and negative. The positive consists of extending what the artist her/himself is able to do, and freeing him/her from dependence on live musicians who might be unreliable or not creative enough. The risk is losing control of one's creative process and even one's own creative power. Under such circumstances, music stops being human and becomes artificial. Of course, this is always to some extent the case with electronic music or even non-electronic music, but, so far, the human agent has been seen as dominant. However, from my discussions with Viennese musicians, I gathered that this is not their immediate concern. The more pressing issue is spending too much time communicating with something which might not understand the artist's intentions or take her/him in a direction where s/ he does not want to go. There is also a conviction that computer algorithms have so far not fulfilled their promise—rather than making music more varied and individualised, it made it more similar to each other. This might result from the fact that algorithms themselves are too similar to each other, which can be compared to the situation when different musicians play with the same session musicians or from the fact that musicians have not yet caught up with the technology.

The musicians who aligned themselves more with the experimental scene expressed a greater willingness to acknowledge the agency of electronic instruments—see them as equal partners to humans creating music. In fact, after finishing the official part of an interview with Rupert Huber, we moved to talking about developments of music-bots which, in parallel to sex robots, would possess the positive qualities of living musicians and avoid the negative, such as arrogance and substance abuse.

The Audience and Environment: Facilitator or Impediment to **Improvisation**

In his book, "Fear of Music," David Stubbs describes the experience of writer and musician Clive Bell, watching David Toop's Laptop Orchestra, a workshop project organised with his students, who improvised using computer processed sounds, in such words:

It soon became clear that this audience, this very nice, highly educated audience, hadn't got the foggiest idea what was going on... They couldn't get into it at all. And they started talking about it as if it was very freakish, very marginal behaviour they were witnessing. People were even talking in terms of insanity. (qtd. in Stubbs 16).

I had this description in mind when I asked my interviewees what role the audience plays in their ability and willingness to improvise. The majority of them admitted that they associate improvisation with live performance, namely playing for an "external" audience, rather than for fellow musicians. Of course, the audience attending a concert wants to listen to a different version of a work than one which is available from the record, but the question is how different this version should be and which aspects of their work the musicians are allowed to change without causing the confusion and outrage described by Bell.

With the exception of Pulsinger, all musicians admitted that the scope during their "regular" concerts is very limited and there is practically no chance then for non-idiomatic improvisation because each musician or band functions as a specific "brand." They have to deliver as this brand—to sound like Tosca, Kruder or

Sofa Surfers. Doing things differently, surprising the audience with a completely new music would mean losing one's fans, on whose support their livelihood depends. Here we can see at play a similar logic to that of making a record—each new record of a given artist has to be different from the previous one, but needs also to be similar to ensure the continuity of this artist as a brand. For these artists, the only way to improvise is thus when working in the studio or during their rehearsals with other musicians. Obviously, such an approach reflects the logic of "popular music," as described by Theodor Adorno: The whole structure of popular music is standardised, even where the attempt is made to circumvent standardisation" (302). A different answer was given by Pulsinger, who said that during concerts he wants to observe an artist who is "working with something, rather than executing" and he assumes that the same is true with his own audience. This attitude might reflect the fact that in the last decade or so he moved away from clubbing towards more experimental music, presented for the innovation-minded, educated or "expert audience," to use Adorno's vocabulary. That audience is open to and prepared to engage with the complex meaning of music, unlike the majority of listeners, who are "distracted from the demands of reality by entertainment which does not demand their attention either" (Adorno 310).

It also matters when such music is presented. The places associated with "serious music," such as those of experimental festivals, which Ars Electronica in Linz epitomises in the Austrian context, art galleries transformed into concert halls, best fit the bill. By contrast, spaces of music clubs and all those associated with commercial music, are not conducive to improvisation, especially of the non-idiomatic type.

I also asked if the environment affects their power, willingness or improvisation in a different way, namely reflects their Viennese identity. As I expected, knowing from previous encounters how the group feels about their national identity, the answer was an emphatic "no." The musicians said that it does not matter if they perform in Vienna, Paris or New York, whether they are able or willing to experiment—it is more a question of the type of audience they encounter rather than the country or city where they perform. Of course, such answers should be treated with some care, because we know little how nationality is reflected in art production, especially of music. In the case of Vienna experimenting in music is encouraged by the history of this city, in which music, including experimental music, played a great role.

The Borders of Improvisation, The Borders of Music

The conversations I had with musicians ultimately led to the question whether there is something which cannot be proposed during improvisation. By the same token, the question was whether there is something which cannot be considered as music. The answer was that in principle every sound or combination of sounds which are intentionally produced or chosen can be regarded as music if they are recognised as such. To have music, there has to be music itself, its human producer and consumer. It seems like the problem lies on the side of the audience. The widening of the possibilities for producing sounds is not accompanied by a broadening of acceptance of music pushing the envelope, probably reflecting deficiencies in music education and the fact that mainstream music is getting less rather than more accommodating to experiments. In conclusions, the current electronic musicians are free to improvise, but if they want to keep their audience interested, they have to balance this need with the requirement to work with templates and observing traditions.

Works Cited

Adorno, Theodor W. "On Popular Music." On Record: Rock, Pop, and the Written Word, edited by Simon Frith and Andrew Goodwin, Routledge, (1941) 1990, pp. 301-14.

Alperson, Philip. "A Topography of Improvisation." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Summer, 2010, pp. 273-80. Bailey, Derek. *Improvisation: Its Nature and Practice in Music*. The British Library National Sound Archive, 1992. Benson, Bruce Ellis. *The Improvisation of Musical Dialogue: A Phenomenology of Music* Cambridge University Press, 2003. Blum, Stephen. "Representations of Music Making." *Musical Improvisation: Art, Education, and Society*, edited by Gabriel Solis and Bruno Nettl, University of Illinois Press, 2009, pp. 239-62.

- Cascone, Kim. "The Aesthetic of Failure: 'Post-Digital'. Tendencies in Contemporary Computer Music." Computer Music Journal, 2000, pp. 12-8.
- Coleman, Ornette. "Change of the Century." Audio Culture: Readings in Modern Music, edited by Christoph Cox and Daniel Warner, Continuum, 2004, pp. 253-54.
- Dean, Roger T. "Envisaging Improvisation in Future Computer Music." The Oxford Handbook of Computer Music, edited by Roger T. Dean, Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 133-47.
- Eno, Brian. "The Studio as Compositional Tool." Audio Culture: Readings in Modern Music, edited by Christoph Cox and Daniel Warner, Continuum, 2004, 127-30.
- Hall, David. "The Art of Visualising Music." 2017. http://davehall.io/visualising-music-graphic-scores/, accessed 17/01/2017.
- Hatten, Robert S. "Opening the Museum Window: Improvisation and Its Inscribed Values in Canonic Works by Chopin and Schumann." Musical Improvisation: Art, Education, and Society, edited by Gabriel Solis and Bruno Nettl, 2009, pp. 281-95.
- Huron, David and Jonathan Berec. "Characterizing Idiomatic Organization in Music: A Theory and Case Study of Musical Affordances." Empirical Musicology Review, 3, 2009, pp. 103-22.
- Kaiser, Jeffrey Glen. "Improvising Technology: Configuring Identities and Interfaces in Contemporary Electro-acoustic Music." PhD, UC San Diego, 2013. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6bg2c417, accessed 18/11/2017.
- Lewis, George E. and Benjamin Piekut. "Introduction: On Critical Improvisation Studies." Critical Improvisation Studies, vol. 2, edited by George E. Lewis and Benjamin Piekut, Oxford University Press, 2016, pp. 1-35.
- Racy, Ali Jihad. "Why Do They Improvise: Reflections on Meaning and Experience." Musical Improvisation: Art, Education, and Society, edited by Gabriel Solis and Bruno Nettl, University of Illinois Press, 2009, pp. 313-22.
- ---. "Musical Improvisation: Play, Efficacy, and Significance." Critical Improvisation Studies, vol. 2, edited by George E. Lewis and Benjamin Piekut, Oxford University Press, 2016, pp. 230-49.
- Roquet, Paul. "Ambient Landscapes from Brian Eno to Tetsu Inoue." Journal of Popular Music Studies, 4, 2009, pp. 364-83. Stubbs, David. Fear of Music: Why People Get Rothko But Don't Get Stockhausen. Zero Books, 2009.
- Young, Michael and Tim Blackwell. "Live Algorithms for Music: Can Computers Be Improvisers?" The Oxford Handbook of Critical Improvisation Studies, 2, 2016, pp. 1-27.