LANGUAGE - NS "PROBLEMS"
PROBLEMS OF THE NEW STYLE
OPEN LIST, QUESTIONS

How each reification responds to these problems - is this higher than existing language parameters?
Modules, domains and reifs define themselves by how they respond to these problems
Some of these have been solved by post-July 2011 modifications (Pre-NS pool, etc.)

Generalization/New Style significance:
Generalization:
  All problems of NS
  All approaches/solutions posed by NS elements (subset) All solutions possible
  All incarnations of NS - every different solution chosen results in a different form for NS (esp. for holistic solutions)
  "No solutions possible"?
  + Negative generalization: no…

Don't you run the risk of simply being called "something else" rather than being placed in the context/discipline of music?

You don't understand any discipline but music, and in them you're still in a student's role, taking teaching material at face value w/ no means of discerning truth.

  With POTU as the driving force, won't NS be like reportage rather than creativity?

Isn't description a copout/shortcut?

  Physical musicianship is earned - describing it is a shortcut

  Optimum solution is earned/discovered - describing it is a shortcut

  It's imperialist to describe 'exhaustive sets' - it's the role of musicians/composers over centuries to explore these possibilities.

  Can description generate the desired/necessary emotion? (for both the composer and audience)

  Is description gratifying enough, especially vs. physical composition?

  Won't description leave holes at the detail level?

  Couldn't description exaggerate/distort the profundity of the music? couldn't it make any music seen profound?

  Could there be detachment between description and the actual sound of the music? (i.e. described profoundly, sound meaningless)

Currently, for each reification, you run the risk of describing/conceptualizing off the top of your head - isn't this just as arbitrary as the way musicians choose musical material?

Some of the NS objects have been done by modernists - you wouldn't have come up with these by yourself (argument against your genius)

How can 'objective principles' ever be truly objective? You can't erase the history of modernism and music from your mind.

There are things we *can/do* know in this world (scientific method, vs. idealism) - NS risks intellectual relativism.

You give too much credence to religion and other irrational viewpoints - NS risks intellectual relativism

Won't the NS objects have many similarities with existing music? (too many to call them revolutionary?)

Isn't "universal scale" music impossible b/c of audibility, pressure-wave limits and the vacuum of space?

The human brain is the "most complex thing yet discovered in the universe" - isn't the human/universal scale misleading/overly physical?

How can the human style exist without genre music? (genre music, esp. at its best, is the most complete expression of humanity)

You're still historically limited, because of future discoveries you can't possibly foresee (timbre, for instance)

What stops NS from being obsolete in the future?

As a human, you're inherently limited…

Because you set the qualia, doesn't that limit the new style?

> What about material/ideas you don't currently like/understand but may in the future? or ones you like now but may tire of?

> What about unforeseen solutions that are artistically optimum but don't fit one of the qualia?

The point of art is to choose…

If you're so much of an individualist, why is it so hard for you to take personal ownership of musical material like the greats did?

Couldn't the 'sacred'/personal aspect allow you to cut corners, because it shelters NS from outside criticism/"peer review"?

Your goal is to achieve historic genius, on the level of Aristotle et. al. - how can you possibly achieve this?

Genius is internal, not a "goal" or "wielded"

Genius is a title given to you, not self-designated

The variation sets, and perhaps NS as a whole, are arbitrarily divided.

The all-inclusive nature of NS sounds like finagling - anything NS doesn't have/can't do is suddenly fixed with a new modification/term…

Isn't there a risk that the tone-edits will remove essential parts of NS? (esp. orchestration)

Why is genre such a threat to NS?

What about the "no possibilities left in genre music" statement?

Couldn't NS be classified in a genre? If so, which?

Is the "being overtaken by current music as a whole" insecurity legitimate, and if so, can NS hold up?

What do you do when you hear a better solution than yours?

Your definition/view of "the future" and of "future music" feels historicist and endorses the "western progress" view of history - history isn't as exclusive and linear as this.

You criticize religion and dogma, yet there are a lot of parallels with religion in NS. Is it simply your version of religion?

Isn't "abstraction" a vague criteria - subjective and historically relative?

Also, isn't *all* music abstract?

For all the NS objects and domains you don't have time to describe, can the rest really be generalized with accuracy?

Are any extramusical analogies really applicable to music itself? Shouldn't music be its own sovereign domain?

PRACTICAL:

How do you tackle the totalizing worldviews and assertions of other objects/reifs?

How do you define the subject of the module?

What is the naming process?

How do you determine the ordering of the reifications: spatial/linear, "plot"/holistic (sequence) form of a module?

How many contrasting reifications are needed?

Why are there the amount of reifications there are? Isn't a single symbol enough sometimes?

Is there a "primary" reification, or are they all equal?

How is variation approached? What aspect of the reification is most prone to variation? Most necessary to confront?

If it is a totality/totalizing, how do you vary a totality?

How do you approach object/force dualism? Is subject more of a force or object? false dichotomy?
      Could you define a subject module in other than object/force dualism?

How are contrasting reifs different from a variation set?

How far does variation go?

Does every reif need an intellectual package?

Why is the variation set necessary? is it always necessary?

Is a language exposition always necessary? Is an implied language exposition enough?

How organic can/should the intellectual package get?

How are boundaries enforced?

In full theoretical potential, how do other processes react? (variation, language exposition)