

Reading Response: *Artful Design* Chapter 4

Last week, when I told my friend I was enrolled in a computer music class, he got really excited at the prospect of me becoming one of those DJ guys with a sick Ableton setup and asked me if I could teach him some tricks. When I informed him that it was more of a coding and aesthetics class, his perception of “computer music” immediately shifted to assorted random bleeps and bloops, and he quickly lost interest in the topic. This exchange displays what I think is a very salient issue in the perception of computer music: many of the greatest examples aren’t very accessible to everyone. I definitely struggled with this issue in Music 220A for the first few weeks, as I had no context to some of the pieces and didn’t really understand how to appreciate them aesthetically. However, much like the sentiments expressed on page 186, I found *Table’s Clear* to be a cool song that I could show to anyone as an accessible piece of computer music (and I definitely showed it to many people).

*Night Traffic* was another piece that struck as both an aesthetically pleasing yet incredibly pedagogical piece. I think *Night Traffic* is one of the clearest embodiments of principle 4.9: Paul Lansky both audibly demonstrated exactly how a comb filter works and displayed Mark Weiser’s principle of computer music. The entire piece could not have feasibly been made without a computer. The harmonic structure (using a comb filter) and the beauty present in the interaction between dynamics and spatialization (using gain control) really solidify the atmosphere of the piece, and this would not have been possible without technology. I hope to create a piece that really exemplifies the necessity of the computer in its creation, much like Paul Lansky did in his entire *Homebrew* album, and his pieces provide plenty of inspiration for me to do so.