for Al Otte and the Percussion Group Cincinnati

## Arun Chandra

# Crocker

## on a text by Chris Mann

for three percussionists and tape

January 17, 1997 Urbana, Illinois

### **Performance Notes**

In the score and parts, numbers in boxes are Cue points for the CD.

The tape begins (Cue 1) with the poet reading his text, about 66 seconds.

The percussionists begin playing at Cue 2, *immediately* after the text ends. The computer sounds on the tape begin about three seconds after the text ends.

The durations of silences in the performers' parts should be strictly observed.

If possible, the stage setup should be (from audience left to right): percussion 1, left speaker, percussion 2, right speaker, percussion 3. The speakers and percussionists should have ample space between them, and should not appear crowded together on the stage.

The playback should be equal to or slightly above the dynamics of the percussionists.

The tape has the last word!

#### Instrumentation

The instrumentation should be a mix of kitchen appliances and standard percussion equipment. Each percussionist should have a similar, but not necessarily identical, setup.

As an example, a percussionist might choose (from highest to lowest in pitch), the following instruments:

2 cymbals
2 wood boxes (small)
4 steel kitchen pots (small to medium in size)
4 tupperware containers (plastic kitchen containers)
2 low toms

The score would then be interpreted in the following manner (from lowest to highest in pitch):



tom1 tom2 tupper1 tupper2 tupper3 tupper4 pot1 pot2 pot3 pot4 wood1 wood2 cym1 cym2

#### Sticks

The sticks are to be chosen from wooden drum sticks, heavy knitting needles, and tight yarn mallets. The choice of *when* to use *which* sticks is up to each performer.

#### **Score and Tape Timings**

It may be helpful to have the cue locations, the approximate start times, and durations, for the sections in the score, and the text on the tape.

Please Note! There does *not* have to be an exact syncronization between the percussionists and the tape. The following is for coordination, only!

Note: e=57 means there are 57 eighth notes. q=12 means there are 12 quarter notes. silence(8) means there is 8 seconds of silence. The function used to calculate the durations was:  $duration = density \times 60/mm$ .

cues	bar	time	mm	density	duration	text on tape
1	1	0:00			66.56	(entire poem)
2	2	1:07	3*72	e=57	15.83	
	9	1:15				(The reason that something is an example,
	13	1:20				a fold
	15	1:22	3*60	e=16	5.33	
	19	1:27				(how many does it take to define a problem?
	20	1:28	72	q=12	10	
	22	1:34				(, a predicate)),
	23	1:38	108	q=12	6.67	
	25	1:42				an economy of virtual knowns,
3	27	1:44		silence	8	
	28	1:52	48	q=13	16.25	
	29	1:53				interrupts the idea of proof
	30	2:01				(those names of actions and events)
	32	2:09	108	q=10	5.56	
	32	2:10				that does a shy redundancy, a wave.
	35	2:14	72	q=13	10.83	
	36	2:17				Looks like a subject, but.
4	38	2:25		silence	7	
	38	2:27				I mean,
	40	2:32	168	q=13	4.64	
	40	2:33				is
	43	2:37	200	q=15	4.5	
	44	2:39				is-an-emergent-property-of-any-system-
						the-increasing-probability-of-asking-a-right-
						question
5	47	2:41		silence	5	
	51	2:46	48	e=19	11.88	a question
	51	2:51				(a parasite that adapts)

cues	bar	time	mm	density	duration	text on tape
6	53	2:58		silence	5	
	53	2:59				or no,
	54	3:03	3*63	e=43	13.65	
	58	3:10				a science of quantity, a legal?
	63	3:17	3*88	e=44	9.99	
	56	3:19				And the additions?
7	74	3:27		silence	5	
	75	3:29				A function. Of represents.
	77	3:32	3*60	e=38	12.67	
	79	3:36				Information after all is that failure of descrip-
						tion,
	84	3:44	3*56	q=57	20.36	
	85	3:46				an immune system a la consciousnessed, a
						parody
	94	3:55				(a typical number (probability is a product of
						real numbers),
	100	4:02				a base maybe parity in bags)
	103	4:05	3*132	e=83	12.58	
	110	4:10				that dags
	118	4:16				as some inductive random, a negative it,
8	119	4:17		silence	9	
	125	4:24				sit.
	127	4:26	132	e=93	21.14	
	135	4:34				Like
	143	4:41				a tautology is
	148	4:47	200	q=50	15	
	152	4:52				a square of the propensity to explain any
						point-function as
	162	5:02	48	e=13	8.12	(random is just like absence) a factor (D)
	164	5:11	132	q=32	14.55	of phantom flickers, a sort of they-type time
	167	5:21				(it disappoints (dusts)
9	170	5:25		silence	10	
	171	5:28				description) of non-linear possibilities, an
						avvy quit.
	175	5:35	72	q=21	17.5	
	175	5:36				Shit.
	177	5:43				The pragmatics of ignorance -
	178	5:48	1.00		10 -	something (decorative) you do on my time
	179	5:53	168	q=30	10.71	
	179	5:54				(my reduction is smaller than your reduction
	100	6.00	100		-	coz I is a large number)
	183	6:03	132	e=22	5	
10	185	0:04				an adstract that,
10	188	6:08		silence		
	189	0:10	70	- 17	1 4 17	an example of itself,
	190	6:15	12	q=17	14.17	
	190	0:17				a me-too no-risk of refers picks up
	193	0:20	40	- 20	175	a difference on a stick
	194	0:29	48	e=28	1/.5	a limba (como)
	199	0:55				a mindo (game)
	19/	0:33				(unterence, the first good) and licks
	195	6:38				(self-evident (a judgement is a perfect rule)):

cues	bar	time	mm	density	duration	text on tape
11	197	6:47		silence	6	
	197	6:48				dear sames,
	198	6:53	168	q=52	18.57	
	208	7:04				replica in drag, as names
12	215	7:11		silence	5	
	217	7:14				(deduction is the administration of violence
	218	7:16	92	q=19	12.39	
	220	7:22				(credit is the history (interest) of words with-
						out history)):
	221	7:28				claims it
	222	7:29	108	e=49	13.61	
	225	7:35				(the altruist)
13	231	7:42		silence	5	
	231	7:42				I's about.
	234	7:47	3*132	e=79	11.97	
	238	7:50				Conspires. In (surrogate)
	244	7:56				two's. No doubt it
	247	7:59	168	q=32	11.43	
	258	8:12				queues.

#### Acknowledgments

Many thanks to Al Otte for inviting me to write a piece for the Percussion Group Cincinnati.

Thanks to Chis Mann for allowing me to use his text.

Larry Polansky made the original recording of Chris Mann's voice.

Lori Blewett created the world in which I created this piece.

Arun Chandra Jan. 17, 1997

#### **Text by Chris Mann**

(The reason that something is an example, a fold (how many does it take to define a problem? (, a predicate)), an economy of virtual knowns, interrupts the idea of proof (those names of actions and events) that does a shy redundancy, a wave. Looks like a subject, but. I mean, is is-an-emergent-property-of-any-system-the-increasingprobability-of-asking-a-right-question a question (a parasite that adapts) or no, a science of quantity, a legal? And the additions? A function. Of represents. Information after all is that failure of description, an immune system a la consciousnessed, a parody (a typical number (probability is a product of real numbers), a base maybe parity in bags) that dags as some inductive random, a negative it, sit. Like a tautology is a square of the propensity to explain any point-function as (random is just like absence) a factor (D) of phantom flickers, a sort of they-type time (it disappoints (dusts) description) of non-linear possibilities, an avvy quit. Shit. The pragmatics of ignorance - something (decorative) you do on my time (my reduction is smaller than your reduction coz I is a large number)-an abstract that, an example of itself, a me-too no-risk of refers picks up a difference on a stick (difference, the first good) and licks (self-evident (a judgement is a perfect rule)): dear sames, a limbo (game) replica in drag, as names (deduction is the administration of violence (credit is the history (interest) of words without history)): claims it (the altruist) I's about. Conspires. In (surrogate) two's. No doubt it queues.)



for three percussionists and tape

Arun Chandra





















sempre forte























































(deduction is the administration of violence



















