BASTARD MUSIC

Tamara Murphy

Master of Music Performance (by Research)

VCA Music

The Faculty of the Victorian College of the Arts

The University of Melbourne

November 2008

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

Master of Music Performance (by Research)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration of Originality

This dissertation contains no material that has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any other university and, to the best of my belief, this dissertation contains no material previously published or written by any other person except where due reference is made in the text.

Tamara Murphy

Acknowledgements

I would like to formally thank those who have given their time and energy and in doing do, have contributed to this work: Eugene Ball, my Supervisor Dr. Rob Vincs and Kristilee Ransley.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Personal Context

Last year, I was driving in my car while listening to the radio. It was 5pm, and a local jazz program was just starting. Before the announcer said a word, a track started playing. It was a piano trio, and within two seconds of the song starting, I felt an unfamiliar, astounding sensation: "I know this piece of music! It's not just a song I have heard before, but I know this – I could almost say that it belongs to me! It is a part of who I am!" Within another 20 seconds, the melody had started and I realised that the song being played was *Everybody Wants to Rule the World* by 'Tears for Fears', this rendition being performed by New York jazz piano trio 'The Bad Plus'. I had never before had that experience: listening to jazz music that is, essentially, part of my growth and identity. I grew up listening to 80s and 90s popular music, and despite efforts to detach myself from my 1980's heritage this culture is a part of mine.

Even though I play jazz, and hear piano trios all the time, I had never really experienced that sense of *owning* the music. I have written and performed my own music countless times, but this was a different sensation. Hearing a song that I know so well, totally redone, with respect for the original work, augmented with a fresh approach: *This* music is a part of my make up. You don't have to be a musician to appreciate this, and to me, that feeling I experienced was why I like jazz so much. Could it be reasonable to suggest that this feeling is one I should be experiencing on a regular basis? I have been playing jazz for all of my adult life and the first time I had had that sensation was last year.

Delineating the Topic

This paper argues that throughout the development of the jazz art form, jazz has been shaped by ideas, repertoire and influences from its surrounding environment. Similarly, I will argue that jazz has been self-destructing over the last 30 years because in this time jazz has been taking language and repertoire predominantly from its *own* history. It could reasonably be suggested that any art form that does this is bound to

consume itself completely. American academic, Douglas Hofstadter, referred to this phenomenon as *contracrostipunctus*[1].

It is reasonable to state that an art form may take influence from outside sources in order to stay connected with its context and to evolve, as an art form connected with a changing culture must also develop if it is to remain a part of that culture. If this is not done, in the case of music for example, it may lead to a situation where the music has lost its cultural relevance and subsequently, its intensity and ability to shape cultural discourse.

If jazz has always been influenced by the culture around it, how does this affect jazz in Australia today? Is there an Australian jazz-style field of practitioners? Where does jazz sit in today's culture? In some 'jazz' festivals in Europe, the headlining acts are rappers, DJs and hiphop acts: Is this the new jazz? Has some of the music evolved so far as to fall out of the 'jazz' genre and into another category altogether? How does one define the term 'jazz' today? These are some of the questions explored in this thesis.

Currently in Australia, jazz appears as an art form struggling artistically and commercially. The language has not changed in a very long time – it has even regressed in some parts of the globe – and consequently, we have lost our larger audience as fewer and fewer people understand, or can connect with at the most peripheral level, jazz in Australia today.

Considering our current cultural environment, it is not surprising that jazz has a limited appeal. It could be reasonable to suggest that only very few in Australia understand jazz today. Really, the only people that 'speak' or understand the language of jazz are people who have studied it (namely musicians), or people who listen to this music enjoying a sense of nostalgia. As jazz musicians, we may feel that our larger audience has deserted us, but in reality it is the converse. The audience has evolved but, arguably, we as practitioners have not. Opposing views concerning the evolution of

[1] The term is used to describe self-referencing in a system which eventually destroys itself as a result: "we can think of the *Contracrostipunctus* as referring to itself indirectly, in that its own structure is isomorphic to the events it portrays" (Hofstadter, Douglas R. 1979. *Gödel, Escher, Bach: an eternal golden braid*. Hassocks: Harvester Press.)

jazz are also explored in this paper, as are the effects that these views have on jazz practitioners.

The Topic

This dissertation argues that throughout its history jazz music has been shaped by cross-cultural influences, hence the title "Bastard Music". However, recently the evolution of jazz has been adversely affected by practitioners drawing largely on the history of the art form for materials. This paper argues that for the art form to continue and thrive in Australia, Australian practitioners must reconnect their art form with their current cultural context. In common terms, keeping the music a 'bastard' to ensure its development and evolution in Australia.

Limits to the Research

This dissertation will focus predominantly on issues related to the problem of identity and authenticity from the perspective of a jazz practitioner, with particular reference to the Australian context. Jazz as an art form will be examined from the apparent disparity between encompassing definitions of jazz and the current practice of the art form in Australia. My intention is to explore the implied cultural constructs arising from an 'academic' theorising of jazz with my experience as an active practitioner of the double bass, working extensively within Australia as a jazz musician. As the topic matter is large and varied, some secondary topics that are uncovered may not be fully explored due to the size and nature of this document.

Synopsis of Content

Chapter 2 discusses how enculturation has influenced the jazz art form throughout its development and how this affects jazz making in Australia today. Chapter 3 examines the implications of the word 'jazz' in the context of improvised music and attempts to find a suitable definition for jazz that resonates with today's cultural context. Chapter 4 explores the notions of conservatism and innovation within the context of recent improvised music. Chapter 5 presents a summary of conclusions drawn from the process of this research.

CHAPTER 2
IDENTITY IN MUSIC

Cultural Identity

From the 1900's to the 1960's, jazz activity was generally centred in the metropolitan centres throughout America, most notably: New Orleans, Chicago, New York and Los Angeles. Whilst there were many stylistic differences between musicians from different regions, it is generally accepted that the development of jazz was confluent throughout the country.

As jazz music was more localised at this time and the scene was a lot smaller than it is today, the directions in jazz were consequently more homogenous. Before technology took the music into people's lounge rooms, live music was the most common way that jazz was experienced, which directly fuelled and affected the scene as an instantaneous medium. Ensembles travelled all over the country influencing other musicians, and in combination with radio play and record sales, the jazz art form was very alive with practitioners being aware of most new developments, and consequently they were, themselves, constantly spawning new sounds.

Today, however, jazz making has spread far beyond America and is now practised throughout the world. This, in conjunction with advances in global technology, has adversely affected the collective evolution of jazz. As jazz has spread far and wide there are numerous smaller jazz communities – so many that it is virtually impossible to keep up with all of them today. Also, with the development of information sharing technologies and the spread of global corporatisation, it seems that there are too many influences. Media is so easily accessible that there are an infinite number of roads to follow and currently jazz, as a genre, cannot collectively move in any one direction.

As it has travelled and taken root all over the world, it could be fair to state that jazz has developed a different sound or interpretation depending on where it is being created. In some parts of the globe, jazz has developed a local 'flavour' as its practitioners have responded to the idiosyncrasies of their local cultural environments. This localised development of identity is apparent in Australian jazz, just as it is in the music from Europe and Asia. If this is true, what then defines the sound of Australian

jazz? How is Australian jazz different from that of other parts of the globe and what makes it indicative of Australia's cultural environment?

Chapter two addresses the need for current jazz musicians to draw influence not just from global contemporary cultural trends, but also from the individuality of their local cultural environment. This chapter will conclude by exploring examples of contemporary influence upon the jazz standard repertoire. Furthermore, it will demonstrate that the development of the jazz standard repertoire was a result of musicians' connection and response to the cultural environment of the time and place.

The issue of cultural identity in Australian jazz is complex and problematic: In *The Oxford Companion to Jazz*, jazz author and critic, Terry Martin surmises that "Australians have faced a crisis of identity … one born of cultural displacement and isolation for the European-derived majority of the inhabitants" (2000:579). By stating this, Martin identifies that the majority of Australia's white population is descended from European immigrants, so while they may have some connection with European classical music (it is a part of a history connected with Australia's), playing jazz in Australia does not connect in any such way. This sense of cultural detachment may be observed through writings of neo-classicists such as Wynton Marsalis and Stanley Crouch, whose ideas about jazz resonate with strong ties to race, America and the history of jazz.

Cultural theory and popular music academic, Bernard Gendron, describes the neo-classicist stance by stating that, "Though the revivalists [or neo-classicists] bickered incessantly about the fine details of the proper definition, they agreed that no music could be called 'jazz' that was not collectively improvised and whose melodies, rhythms, phrasings and timbres were not primarily derived from Afro-American sources" (1995:35). According to the above quote, would the term 'Australian Jazz' be considered an oxymoron?

In his paper *Australian Contemporary Jazz in the New Millennium*, Australian promoter Peter Rechniewski states: "Today, Australian contemporary jazz musicians are open to engaging with any music that interests them" (2008:23). The lack of connection with America's roots and politics related to jazz may give many Australian

jazz musicians the freedom to connect with jazz in their own, *Australian,* way. Even in an 'ever-shrinking' world, the isolation of the Australian jazz scene has allowed many musicians here to develop their own sound, untainted by influences from neighbouring countries. (This is not to say that Australian jazz musicians are *not* influenced by other cultures, but that these outside influences are not as direct as they might be in other parts of the world, such as Europe and America, where neighbouring cultures are much closer and more present, through both vicinity and expatriation.)

Cultural integration and redevelopment occurring naturally throughout the planet spawns new and unique dialects of the jazz art form specific to where (and when) the music is created. In a world where globalisation is diluting many local cultures (from McDonald's to MTV and so forth), *glocalization*[2] may be the very thing that ensures that jazz continues to evolve in ways reflective of the time and place in which it is being made. This transculturation gives jazz a vitality that is relevant to the local culture as well as highlighting the very cultures that have influenced it.

An example of this environmental influence on music is demonstrated here by Miles Davis, where he comments on the album *Kind of Blue* and how he came to produce that unique sound:

> This time I added some other kind of sound I remembered from being back in Arkansas, when we were walking home from church and they were playing those bad gospels. So that kind of feeling came back to me and I started remembering what that music sounded like and felt like. That feeling is what I was trying to get close to (Davis and Troupe 1989:224).

In recalling powerful, early memories of music that was a great influence during his formative years and using those sounds, Davis was able to connect with a larger audience. The feelings he associated with those sounds would have been shared by thousands of people, and so, became a common reference for the musician and non-

[2] "These 'glocalized' styles use the basic syntax of the classic and contemporary hegemonic American jazz styles – in this context 'hegemony' means 'the rules of the game' by which others routinely play – that has been widely disseminated around the world (the globalisation process), but are reinscribed with local significance (the glocalization process). Glocalization can involve incorporating elements such as national imagery, folkloric, and cultural concerns that give the music relevance to its 'local' music community." In, Nicholson, Stuart. 2005. *Is Jazz Dead? (or has it moved to a new address)*. New York: Routledge. p. 172.

musician alike. In creating *Kind Of Blue*, Davis produced a new musical experience from current influences in combination with his own history and his existing jazz language. This is interesting because although Davis refers to his unique experience growing up, the feelings underlying that particular experience are universal themes that, arguably, are accessible for many.

This cultural integration can be difficult in Australia, as our culture is relatively new and its identity is still being defined. With a complex mixture of race, religion and ethnicity (each complete with individual traits and cultural histories), Australia does not have a unified culture of its own that is easily defined. However, it could be argued that Australia's identity is already present – as currently, many unique sounds are emanating from local jazz scenes in Australia[3]. These sounds have developed naturally without having to consciously alter this Australian concept of jazz into some other ideal of what jazz is 'supposed' to be.

For some time now, many unique voices have been emerging from the Australian jazz scene. It is refreshing to observe these voices existing in an environment that is being shaped and affected by influences that are truly Australian, rather than an approach which emulates sounds that came from America over 60 years ago. Only now is an Australian sound becoming more recognisable, as second and third generation jazz musicians take influence from previous Australian improvisers and continue to develop an Australian attitude to jazz music.

While some current Australian jazz artists are celebrating the individuality of their cultural influences, many are also suffering from what can be described as a global homogenisation of expression through jazz. It is widely recognised that there is, throughout the world, a glut of highly skilled and yet culturally generic jazz practitioners. Yet, with more practitioners than ever before, jazz venues, festivals and record companies are finding it increasingly difficult to generate custom. While some commentators attribute dwindling audiences to the expanding complexities of improvised music, others, perhaps more astutely, attribute the decline to the social

[3] It is considered common knowledge today that Australian jazz practitioners are creating their own sound unique to Australia, however, due to the nature of this paper this topic will not be explored further. This topic is explored in the recent text, Shand, John. 2009. *Jazz: the Australian Accent.* (University of New South Wales Press).

disconnectedness of the prevailing generic approach to making jazz. Musician and scholar, Salim Washington, confirms the necessity for the jazz musician to be both mindful of the conventions of jazz and innovative in the use of materials:

> Bebop conventions such as the harmonic language, rhythms, phrasing, and compositional and arranging practices are now found in the playing of virtually every established jazz musician, young or old. There was a time when a jazz musician could be unconventional enough to play with modernists without trying to copy their language (2004:33).

The first part of Washington's comment resonates with many jazz practices in Australia today, as the much of the repertoire and styles of performance in Australian jazz are influenced directly by the history of the art form. Arguably, this has led to playing styles today largely echoing those from the history of the music, rather than forging new sounds influenced by the environment in which they are created.

So far, this chapter has illuminated the notion that jazz, like any art form, is shaped by the culture in which it is made. This paper argues that if jazz is to survive and grow, practitioners must remain in constant awareness of their surrounding culture. The environment we grow up in gives us a particular and unique grounding that shapes us and helps us define the music we do or do not connect with. Arguably, a healthy art form will take on these influences and change accordingly (whether by integration or reaction). By integrating new sounds and sources, as practitioners we certainly don't want to forget where we came from artistically. It is worth emphasising that this paper is not endorsing change in a contrived or artificial way, but encouraging the natural evolution of the jazz art form, firmly in touch with its surroundings in time and space and encouraging each performer to connect with their art form in their own unique way. To quote Australian pianist and composer, Mike Nock: "I think what is going to happen is that we're going to see a broadening of the idea of what jazz is. Jazz is a child of the 20th Century, but it has now left home" (Nicholson 2005:163).

Standard Identity

Within the jazz community, there is a common repertoire known as jazz 'standards'. This commonality allows jazz musicians who have never played together before the opportunity to play and improvise over musical 'common ground' without rehearsal.

This means that musicians who have never before collaborated can instantly traverse new ground whilst improvising over these works.

In the middle of the last century this repertoire was still evolving and was made up predominantly of Tin Pan Alley tunes. These show tunes were introduced into the standard repertoire in two ways. Firstly, as many jazz musicians associated socially with musicians from musical theatre, they would appropriate tunes from these shows, using their melodies and harmonic structures as vehicles for improvisation. Secondly, players from the be-bop era (notably Charlie Parker, Dizzy Gillespie, Thelonious Monk and Bud Powell) would compose and perform intricate and technically demanding melodies (known as 'heads') over the harmonic structures of popular show tunes.

Many musicians also wrote their own original music within the particular musical style in which they performed and these pieces also make up much of the standard repertoire of today (examples of these are drawn from a bank of iconic tunes from the current standard jazz repertoire that are *not* written over existing show tunes, such as *My Little Suede Shoes* by Parker and *'Round Midnight* by Monk). However, jazz standard repertoire has not been updated for a very long time. The standard works performed today are predominantly made up of pieces that generally, were written or performed from the 1930's to the 1960's. This has led many to conclude that jazz has lost its connection and relevance to contemporary popular society today. [4]

Scandinavian saxophonist Jan Garbarek speaks of his own relationship with jazz repertoire: " 'It's really not my tradition,' he says. 'The so called standards are not my standards. I don't feel a close attachment to that music' " (Nicholson 1990:311). This sentiment is echoed by many Australian jazz musicians who, by drawing from their own experiences as Australians, have started discovering their own set of 'standards' relevant to them[5]. Currently, it should be possible to add to the list of jazz standards by

[4] Some may argue that there exists both an 'old' jazz repertoire made up of Tin Pan Alley tunes and a 'new' jazz repertoire containing compositions by Hancock, Corea and Jarrett etc. However, the current larger repertoire contains a relatively small percentage of these newer compositions.

[5] Examples of this include Melbourne ensemble 'The Hoodangers', who recorded *Khe Sanh* by Australian rock group 'Cold Chisel', and *Tea in the Sahara* by 'Sting' on their album entitled 'Cheep!'

recording and releasing new standards which may go on to become part of the standard repertoire. This concept is not a new one: "[Sidney] Bechet, for instance, claimed repeatedly that jazz should change as musicians respond to a changing world" (Ake 2002:39).

In 1996, pianist Herbie Hancock released the album *The New Standard*, featuring relatively contemporary repertoire, redressing compositions from artists such as Peter Gabriel, Kurt Cobain (Nirvana), Prince and The Beatles. This album was groundbreaking in the mid 90's, as very few groups were covering material drawn from popular music styles, sticking only to the existing standard jazz repertoire and original compositions. Hancock (whose name is considered synonymous with jazz) can be described as coming from the school of the 'evolving art form' (working with Miles Davis at the start of Hancock's career) and has taken on this approach throughout his journey as a bandleader and musician. As a result, Hancock has been at the forefront of many developments throughout jazz history, from the 60's Davis quintet albums to his own release *Headhunters*. Davis stated that: "to be and stay a great musician you've got to always be open to what's new, what's happening at the moment. You have to be able to absorb it if you're going to continue to grow and communicate your music" (Davis and Troupe 1989:263). Hancock's ability to stay connected with his culture has allowed him to grow and change as an artist and retain relevance in a changing cultural environment, while producing new music that is still, undeniably, jazz.

By employing current local concepts and language, music can become part of a larger community that the general populus understands (or can easily connect with). When saxophonist John Coltrane recorded his versions of *My Favourite Things*, this was considered groundbreaking, because not only was it so different from the original, but the piece being redressed existed as a part of the current language, so the general public had insight into what he was trying to achieve by reinterpreting it. It certainly would not have had the same impact if he had treated an unknown composition in the same way. Writer, Lee Brown, states that "with rare exceptions, improvised jazz is based on modest works – folk tunes, 'parlour' songs, marches, rags, blues songs and

---

International quartet, 'Snag', featuring Melbourne musicians Stephen Magnusson and Julien Wilson recorded the song *Isobel* by Icelandic pop singer 'Bjork' on their album, 'Hey, Guess What?'

Broadway show tunes" (1998:08). The musical works, or types of works listed above were popular music of the day. As jazz arguably becomes further alienated from the general populus and current culture, today's jazz musician may benefit from a return to the idea of absorbing current popular songs into their repertoire. Guitarist, Bill Frisell's album *Have a Little Faith* is a great example of this. In referring to this album, the repertoire of which ranges from 1862 to 1987, musician and writer, David Ake, states: "…the inclusion of [modern songs] suggests that jazz musicians might not merely recall great sounds from the first half of this century. They may also reflect sounds from 'our own time' as well, which is what jazz musicians had been doing since the music's earliest days" (2002:173).

Bill Frisell has shaped his career with an individual voice that has influenced many musicians around the world. His album *Have a Little Faith* is unusual because it does not feature newer pop songs by Bob Dylan and Madonna as part of a 'concept' album (similar to Hancock's *The New Standard*), but it blends this newer repertoire with music by Aaron Copland as well as more 'traditional' jazz standards by Victor Young and Sonny Rollins. In doing this, he is demonstrating that his approach to jazz is broader than the neo-classicist definition of the music and is also a non-exclusive approach. Whilst moving forward, Frisell demonstrates that it is also possible to embrace the music's history. He states:

> Jazz is in a funny place… [today] when you say something is jazz, it's supposed to fit into some classic idea. But jazz is not just Miles Davis in 1956; it's a whole attitude about feeling and ideas and what's going on around you. Charlie Parker used all the information around him, every scrap of it, from Stravinsky to pop. Rollins did too[6].

One of the essential elements of jazz is the ability to transform surrounding information and evolve it into something new through the immediacy of the art form. The information around us changes constantly, and differs according to who one is and where one is (in both space and time). This includes all of the events that define a person's character, as well as the environments or cultures that we find ourselves in. This is what informs us, so *that* becomes part of one's individual voice, which is

[6] From *Jazz Cultures*: "Bill Frisell: Using all the information" – Los Angeles View (Safford Chamberlin) p. 164

considered vital in jazz. By also being connected with one's environment, the music will be influenced in a natural fashion, contributing to the art form's ongoing development. Ake supports this concept:

> If jazz holds any hopes of remaining a significant ground of social and cultural renewal in this country or anywhere else, musicians, listeners, teachers, scholars and critics must remain open to the possibility of still newer jazz identities. Ultimately, jazz traditioning begins anew every time someone picks up an instrument, puts on a record, or walks into a club. It was that way with Jelly Roll Morton and Sidney Bechet; it remains that way nearly a century later. Despite the laments regarding miniscule record sales and the ever present factional squabbling, if we allow ourselves to trust in our own musical creativity, there is no reason to fear that the 21st century won't bring equally vital – though undoubtedly different – jazz sounds, identities and cultures (2002:175).

From after the second World War through to the 1960's, when jazz was at the height of its popularity, American jazz musicians were using the current popular culture as source material: They were 'covering' popular tunes of the day, as well as using these songs as inspiration and writing their own material extending from that repertoire. At the time, a considerable amount of jazz was dance music, but more importantly, the music being performed was created within the cultural context at the time. The creation of something new – something that has never been done before – with current contextual relevance, gives both the music and its audience a deeper connection and this is an element that, arguably, has been missing from jazz in recent times.

CHAPTER 3
DEFINING JAZZ

The term, jazz, needs clarification for the purposes of this dissertation. As jazz itself has changed so much since its title was born, the variety of styles that fall under the broad title of jazz make it difficult to define today in simple terms. The term jazz can conjure images of many styles of music: ragtime, New Orleans, swing, big band, bebop, post-bop, hard bop, free jazz, cool jazz, fusion jazz, Latin jazz - the list goes on and on. This dissertation will explore the more authoritative definitions of jazz and highlight differences and changes that have occurred as a result of innovation within the genre due to the practice of jazz artists. I will begin with prolific author on jazz, Joachim Berendt who offers this definition:

> Jazz is a form of art music which originated in the United States through the confrontation of blacks with European music. The instrumentation, melody, and harmony of jazz are in the main derived from Western musical tradition. Rhythm, phrasing and production of sound, and the elements of blues harmony are derived from African music and from the musical conception of the Afro-Americans. Jazz differs from European music in three basic elements, which all serve to increase intensity:
>
> 1. A special relationship to time, defined as 'swing'.
> 2. A spontaneity and vitality of musical production in which improvisation plays a role.
> 3. A sonority and manner of phrasing which mirror the individuality of the performing jazz musician.
>
> These three basic characteristics, whose essentials have been – and will continue to be – passed on orally from one generation to the next, create a novel climate of tension. In this climate, the emphasis is no longer on great arcs of tension, as in European music, but on a wealth of tension-creating elements, which continually rise and fall. The various styles and stages of development through which jazz has passed since its origin around the turn of the century are largely characterized by the fact that the three basic elements of jazz temporarily achieve varying degrees of importance, and that the relationship between them is constantly changing (1976:449-450).

Berendt's definition differs from that of writer and scholar, Steven Elworth, who states: "The concept of the jazz tradition has been formulated through moments of crisis. Far from being an unchanging and an easily understood historical field, the jazz tradition is a constantly transforming construction" (1995:58). Where Berendt states

that the elements of jazz remain constant (changing only in their balance or importance), Elworth states that jazz *itself* is "constantly transforming" (1995:58).

If Berendt's concept of jazz is true, it is reasonable to suggest that there would be minimal differentiation between jazz created in different parts of the world, such as Europe, America and Australia. These different permutations are evidenced through the work of musicians such as Norwegian saxophonist Jan Garbarek, Indian/American guitarist Rez Abbasi and Australian drummer Allan Browne. While each of these artists are recognised as leading jazz practitioners, each has tied their own ancestry and upbringing with their experience with jazz to create a different and new dynamic within the jazz art form. Even a cursory examination of their recorded work reveals almost irreconcilable variations between how they each conceive jazz. It is fair, then, to suggest that Berendt's concept of jazz (consisting of three basic elements) is no longer the case and today, it would seem that Elworth is more accurate in his current assessment of jazz.

According to Berendt, the first basic element of jazz is swing (referring to a 'swinging' or uneven quaver feel). American jazz scholar, Scott DeVeaux asserts that, "defining jazz is a notoriously difficult proposition, but the task is easier if one bypasses the usual inventory of musical qualities, like improvisation or swing (since the more specific or comprehensive such a list attempts to be, the more likely it is that exceptions will overwhelm the rule)" (1991:527). Berendt's first constriction has been nullified by exceptions in the manner described by DeVeaux. As our current cultural environment (worldwide) has come to encompass a large range of music created since 1976 (the year of Berendt's definition), the element of swing is not as present as it once was in jazz, yet this 'swing-less' music created today within the art form is still very much considered to be jazz. While the presence of swing can no longer be used as an indicator of jazz, it must be acknowledged that as 'swing' was such a monumentally significant element of jazz history, it will (most likely) always have *some* presence in jazz music as a whole.

Berendt's second element correctly identifies improvisation as a crucial component of jazz. Indeed, it would appear that improvisation is the only constant throughout the history of jazz. However, it must be noted that the presence of improvisation does not

necessarily identify music as jazz: consider the practice of figured bass in the 17th Century or the ragas in classical Indian music, which also contain improvisation but clearly do not fall into the jazz category.

According to academic and jazz writer, John F. Szwed, "[i]mprovisation – the art of composing in the moment, in the act of performance, without a written score – has always been seen as what sets jazz apart from other musics" (Friedwald et al. 2002:65). As Berendt states so eloquently: "improvisation plays a role" in the production of the music. However, there are many 'jazz' pieces that do not contain improvised solos as such, where the music itself is performed with the spirit of improvisation, such as Duke Ellington's 'Black, Brown and Beige' jazz operetta, 'Creole Rhapsody' and 'Harlem'.

Berendt's third element ("A sonority and manner of phrasing which mirror the individuality of the performing jazz musician" (1976:449)) recognises the propensity for jazz to celebrate the expressive idiosyncrasies of the individual. While this is indisputable, it must also be acknowledged that clear statements of individual expression are not exclusively the domain of jazz musicians. (Examples of this within the jazz genre include saxophonists Charlie Parker and John Coltrane, and outside of the jazz genre, Icelandic pop singer Bjork and electronic artist Aphex Twin. All of these artists are instantly recognisable due to the unique approach they each apply to the music they perform.) This part of Berendt's definition will never become dated – this universal concept is one that is present in all styles of music.

After examining and rejecting some elements within Berendt's definition of jazz, one part worth retaining is contained within the first paragraph. This is the essence of Berendt's definition and deserves further examination:

> Jazz is a form of art music which originated in the United States through the confrontation of blacks with European music. The instrumentation, melody, and harmony of jazz are in the main derived from Western musical tradition. Rhythm, phrasing and production of sound, and the elements of blues harmony are derived from African music and from the musical conception of the Afro-Americans (1976:449).

In attempting to define what jazz is (and tacitly suggest what it is not), Berendt identifies that jazz began as a fusion of two main influences: one culture influencing another culture, spawning a new style of music that would not have otherwise existed. This concept is supported by jazz writer, Will Friedwald, who states that, "the basic notion that jazz itself, even in its purest form (whatever that may be) is a fusion; jazz was already a mixture of a million other musics even by the time it had left New Orleans" (2002:62).

In a commentary on, musicologist, Andre Hodeir's book, Brown surmises that, "the sources of jazz music, whether European or African, are, in jazz, transfigured by their interaction with each other" (1998:01). Hodeir himself affirms that, "artists who belong to neighbouring civilizations borrow from one another and transform their own language, more or less profoundly" (1975:40). Hodeir's concept of transfiguration supports Berendt's definition of jazz to the extent that jazz has evolved as the result of an interaction between two (or more) cultures. However, it is reasonable to argue Hodeir's definition even further by suggesting that interaction of players who have different ethnicities, cultural experience and so forth, transfigure the jazz tradition in ways that keep the music culturally relevant and innovative. This idea also aligns with Elworth's concept of the transforming construction.

In his article *Jazz Inc.*, writer Andrew Gilbert also supports the concept of the transforming construction and affectation of the music by different styles: "The music's essence is a wilful sense of liberation, a refusal to recognize boundaries between high and low art, and the ability to absorb and transform influences while maintaining the core values of improvisation and experimentation" (1998).

Norwegian saxophonist Håkon Kornstad also supports Hodeir and Gilbert: "For us, jazz is an ever renewing music," says Kornstad, "It has to be. It has to absorb influences from other music styles, like it has always done because it is a mixture of music, a 'bastard music' " (Nicholson 2005:151).

While Berendt astutely observed that jazz was born of diverse cultural influences, he fell short of identifying that jazz must *continue* to be open to absorbing foreign influence if it is to remain true to its heritage of reinvention and innovation.

So far in this paper, the commentaries on jazz have been predominantly provided by musicians and music scholars. However, people from many persuasions have offered their opinions on jazz, which are significant insofar as they provide a cultural perspective on the music. For example, in the 1920's this description of jazz appeared in Ladies' Home Journal:

> Jazz originally was the accompaniment of the voodoo dancer, stimulating the half-crazed barbarian to the vilest deeds. The weird chant accompanied by the syncopated rhythm of the voodoo invokers, has also been employed by other barbaric people to stimulate brutality and sensuality. That it has a demoralizing effect upon the human brain has been demonstrated by many scientists (Ake 2002:117).

Over time, language evolves and changes – some words acquire different meanings and applications. The above paragraph demonstrates this, as, clearly, this description of jazz from the 1920's is very different to how we see it now, as is Berendt's (which was published in 1976).

While all of the elements examined here are valid, the act of defining jazz can place limits upon the art form. The nature of producing a fixed definition of jazz is problematic: if evolution is considered a vital part of the art form, the process becomes contradictory because a definition implies that boundaries or conditions are present. How can jazz evolve into something new – an unknowable future – if rules or boundaries are placed upon it? This paradox is acknowledged throughout jazz history, with many musicians disavowing the term 'jazz' altogether, finding it limiting and degrading. For example, when Charles Mingus released "probably his greatest record, *The Black Saint and the Sinner Lady*, he demanded it be labelled 'ethnic folk dance music' " (Ake 2002:26) rather than jazz. Similarly, Ornette Coleman felt that he "was constantly being limited by the term 'jazz' " (Rowland and Scherman 1994:33). Jazz writer, Stuart Nicholson, also supports this concept by stating that, "[j]azz eludes 'definition' in much the same way as there is no 'definition' of a beautiful melody. Attempting to define it is probably impossible…"(2005:70).

Clearly, we face a paradox when endeavouring to define what jazz is. To suggest that it in any way must conform to historic practices is to ignore that jazz was itself born of the amalgamation of myriad cultural and musical influences. If this idea is to be identified as being crucial to the definition of jazz, then surely one must also acknowledge that it can continue to merge with diverse influences, becoming perpetually reinvented according to the current cultural elements which shape it.

To follow Hodeir's advice: "Like the historian, the analyst must be careful not to let himself become imprisoned by his definitions. As circumstances change, even the labels that seemed to be most accurate become misleading" (Hodeir 1975:267). Better, perhaps, to encourage diversity within the music, rather than limiting ideas of what jazz is.

CHAPTER 4
EVOLUTION VERSUS TRADITION

This chapter examines the debate of evolution versus tradition in jazz and how it affects the larger jazz community, practitioners within the art form and, ultimately, the music created as a result.

To date, the history of jazz can be recognised as a pattern of evolution: innovations and developments initially rejected by many musicians and audiences alike inevitably changed the music and over time, *became* the mainstream. Today, as jazz music is being affected by and incorporated into popular styles of music, there is a backlash from some musicians (revivalists or neo-classicists) trying to deny this evolutionary development. The cry of 'It's not jazz!' which has been heard at every growth spurt throughout the history of jazz, is audible again today in all forums of jazz practice.

An example of this protest and change was seen during the rise of bebop in the 1940s. At the time, this new development was a shock to many conservatives. DeVeaux observed that: "Bebop's success in winning the loyalty of a younger generation of musicians and the admiration of a core of jazz enthusiasts was an especially bitter pill for many conservatives" (1991:533). This resistance to change is being expressed once again today, with some performers, jazz writers and critics looking down on the fusion of jazz with popular musical styles and culture. Musicians who bring together popular music with their jazz knowledge are often labelled 'sell-outs' when it can be argued that these are the very people who are saving the art form from extinction and helping integrate the language of jazz with contemporary culture, as has always happened throughout the history of the music.

The conservative viewpoint is clearly present in the commentary of trumpet player, composer and educator, Wynton Marsalis: while few would deny his instrumental mastery, it is generally agreed that Marsalis functions as a self-appointed guardian of the jazz heritage. In his article for the New York Times entitled *What Jazz Is – and Isn't*, Marsalis states:

> I recently completed a tour of jazz festivals in Europe in which only two out of 10 bands were jazz bands. The promoters of these festivals admit most of the music isn't jazz, but refuse to rename these events 'music festivals', seeking the [a]esthetic elevation that jazz offers. This is [a]esthetic name-dropping, attempting to piggyback on the achievements of others, and duping the public (1988).

We can observe from this quote that Marsalis has a very fixed notion of what jazz is, and that he clearly resents the misappropriation of the term 'jazz'. In the same article, Marsalis goes on to suggest that there is some kind of linear pedigree underpinning the history of jazz, and that anything 'crossbred' is inferior: "In other fields, purism is considered a form of heroism – the good guy who won't sell out – but in jazz that purism is incorrectly perceived as stagnation and the inability to change. Therefore, those who are most lauded by the record companies and writers and promoters are those who most exploit the public" (1988).

Marsalis has been termed a neo-classicist[7]. It is useful then, for the purposes of this discussion, to examine the attributes and attitudes associated with neo-classicism. As demonstrated by the above quote, purism in jazz is a hallmark of the neo-classicist stance. This trait is driven by both pride and conservation of African-American heritage, hence the rejection of influences from other sources. Music that does take on these other influences is seen as selling out by compromising these values. Marsalis insinuates that the converse of being a purist is being a sell-out ("the good guy who won't sell out"). For example, trumpeter Miles Davis, irrefutably one of the most well-known and well-respected jazz musicians, redefined the idea of jazz numerous times throughout his career and often took influence from contemporary culture. Under Marsalis' purist model of jazz, Davis would be disgraced and labelled a sell-out. Indeed, in an article in *The Independent*, Marsalis describes Davis as "a genius who decided to go into rock" (Byrnes 2003). Critic and author, Stanley Crouch, also supports this conservatism (or neo-classicism) shared by Marsalis. Crouch asserts: "Davis made much fine music for the first half of his professional life, and represented

[7] In numerous articles and texts: "The term comes from the description of some critics of 1950s hard bop as being a 'classic' jazz style. These young imitators of that style in the 1980s and 1990s are therefore neoclassicists." In, Eric Nisenson, *Blue: The Murder of Jazz*. Da Capo Press, 2000, p. 14.
"He's a neo-classicist, they say: safe, backward-looking, a curator of the styles of the past."
In, Michael Church, *Wynton Marsalis: Blowing his own trumpet*. The Independent, 16 September 2005.

for many the uncompromising Afro-American [sic] artist contemptuous of Uncle Tom, but he has fallen from grace – and been celebrated for it. As usual, the fall from grace has been a form of success" (1995:166).

Arguably, Davis was contributing to the evolution of jazz right up until his death in the late 1980s. It could be considered unusual that some denounce the latter work of Davis, when this music was a continuing part of his legacy. This malleable, forward-thinking approach was one that Davis applied throughout his *entire* career, and it allowed him to create music that was constantly culturally relevant and thus, forward moving. Davis did receive criticism throughout his life for his changing contribution to jazz, and in response to negative views he received (similar to those of Crouch and Marsalis), he stated: "Popularity didn't make my music any less worthy, or great" (Davis and Troupe 1989:196). Davis didn't see any separation between popularity of his work and the artistic value of his work:

> As a musician and as an artist, I have always wanted to reach as many people as I could through my music. And I have never been ashamed of that. Because I never thought that the music called "jazz" was ever meant to reach just a small group of people, or become a museum thing locked under glass like all other dead things that were once considered artistic. I always thought it should reach as many people as it could, like so called popular music, and why not? … I always thought that music had no boundaries, no limits to where it would grow and go, no restrictions on its creativity. Good music is good no matter what kind of music it is. (Davis and Troupe 1989:195).

Marsalis talks of purism, but looking to the history of jazz it can be reasonably stated that the art form would not have survived if musicians of the past had held this purist viewpoint. Hodeir asks: "Was there ever an *ideal moment* in its history when jazz was pure, untainted by any influence foreign to its African origin?" (1975:41). The themes of ownership and race lie at the core of Marsalis' staunch views and yet, even the most cursory examination of the history of jazz reveals that it was never the domain of exclusively one race. Jazz history shows us that it is a music that has always taken on many influences from many sources. "Strangely enough, there are some present-day 'observers' who accept everything jazz borrowed from the whites until around 1945 but who now refuse to allow jazz the right to keep on borrowing…" (Hodeir 1975:45).

Many musicians today have publicly responded to the neo-classicist views spread by Marsalis. Certainly, the term 'purism', much favoured by Marsalis, is permeated with connotations of mono-cultural doctrine. In response to this, American bassist Anthony Jackson states:

> I maintain that this latest crop of 'redeemers' is more artistically bankrupt, morally hypocritical, and historically irrelevant than any that has come before. We are, in my opinion, witnessing no less than a modern cultural parallel to Germany in the 1930s, with a megalomaniacal 'arbiter of good taste' undertaking a redefinition and reclassification of a country's expressive potential, ostensibly to weed out contaminating influences. The underlying purpose is simply the muzzling and suppression of people whose expressive power, originality, and vitality are likely stronger than that of the leaders (Lees 1994:230).

Marsalis' use of the media in his career has been a powerful tool in this debate. However, some also question his approach and image, such as DeVeaux, who states, that "Wynton Marsalis may pride himself on his refusal to 'sell out', but the aura of artistic purity is an indisputable component of his commercial appeal" (1991:528).

A respect for the tradition of jazz is another strong characteristic of the neo-classicist movement. Neo-classicists believe that many jazz musicians today do not have enough of an understanding of the music created throughout the history of jazz. The main point being that, as a practitioner, one cannot create jazz without a thorough understanding of this history. This attitude is illustrated in an article by Crouch, where he states: "We even have to endure imbecilic statements like 'the tradition of jazz is innovation' " (2002:26).

Many others have also contended with the neo-classicist concept of tradition. American composer, Roscoe Mitchell, asserts: "We've seen the institutionalizing of so called 'jazz'. We've seen a general turning away of new ideas and sounds… [Young musicians] are getting these messages from the media that they should do such-and-such to re-create the tradition. But the tradition will never be re-created as strongly as it was by the people who invented it" (Baker 1989:19).

'Tradition' is a word that has been bandied about a great deal in these 'Jazz Wars', carrying with it a tonne of baggage and responsibility. Composer Anthony Davis

"expressed the views of many when he was widely quoted as saying that the notion of 'tradition' was being used 'essentially as a vehicle for conservatism'" (Lewis 2004:87). Using 'tradition' as a banner for conservatism is problematic, as noted by Nicholson, who states: "T.S. Eliot pointed out that no artist can ever work outside the tradition because the tradition will stretch to accommodate anything artists do" (Friedwald et al. 2002:19).

The neo-classicist view is exerting negative effects on the jazz art form, especially, as it is perpetuated by influential and outspoken authorities on jazz, such as Marsalis and Crouch. DeVeaux highlights these effects, by stating: "What distinguishes the neo-classicist attitude is not so much its habit of retrospection, but rather its heavy-handed attempt to regulate the music of the present through an idealized representation of the past" (1991:541). This view is also supported by Elworth: "The emergence of Marsalis and the current generation of new traditionalists may lead to an acceptance of a stifling tradition in which musicians are ostracized for not following limited and pre-established protocols of both musical and non-musical styles" (1995:59). Writer, Andrew Gilbert, also rallies against Marsalis, in his article *Jazz Inc.*: "…there's no denying his [Marsalis'] constricted view of the jazz tradition" (1998).

Elworth and DeVeaux highlight that a strong and respected character such as Marsalis may convince many musicians to adhere to his narrow views or risk being left out of the community at large, forcing the art form even further into regression. However, this restrictive stance may also provoke musicians to rise up and question these strong views, inciting considered and deliberate music that rejects Marsalis' limiting doctrine and embraces a relevance to today's culture.

This neo-classicist attitude is actually not that surprising if one considers that Marsalis' career was originally based in classical music. DeVeaux draws comparisons between the classical music canon and the institutionalisation of jazz:

> … his celebrated feat of winning Grammy awards for both jazz and classical recordings underscores the extent to which jazz has become another kind of classical music – one indigenous to black culture and reflecting black values, but following the same pattern of

> institutionalization [sic] in conservatories and repertory groups, and demanding of its musicians an empathetic response to aesthetic sensibilities of the past (1991:541).

Similar to classical music history (in which composers are 'haunted' by the ghosts of past masters - made greater by each passing year), the obsession with the past is another corrosive effect that neoclassicism exerts on the jazz art form. The term 'neo-*classicist*' is no coincidence. If past musicians are elevated in such a way, this, in combination with the concept of 'tradition' that the neo-classicists afford so much currency, will never allow jazz to move beyond the ghosts of the past and evolve as it has always done.

It is worth emphasising, at this point, that tradition and innovation need not be mutually exclusive. Rather, tradition and innovation are two sides of the same coin: one, without the other, is meaningless.

The attitude perpetuated by redeemers such as Marsalis becomes conflicting because, very simply, jazz needs an audience to survive and without evolution the art form will become devoid of current cultural context and its audience is then lost. It can be fairly stated that the average Australian would not be educated in the history or language of jazz, therefore, if Australian jazz created today is not affected by its culture, the average Australian listener would not have any way to connect with it. Musician and jazz scholar, Ted Gioia, observes: "The relationship of audience to artist in the popular arts is, for the most part, quite unambiguous: the audience expects to be engaged by the work of art; works that fail to achieve this do not survive – if only because they soon have no audience" (1988:125). This relationship Gioia describes is not a perfect one: audiences vary, and these days it could be observed that the larger western audience has a relatively short attention span and is readily influenced by mass marketed 'cultural' trends. However, the relationship described by Gioia is, at least, an honest one. Sophisticated as the high arts may be, politics and trends (such as neo-classicism) within the jazz art form itself may cloud the simple relationship between performer and audience.

Gioia re-affirms that generally, jazz music that has absorbed popular influence is seen as selling out: "The end result is a complete flip-flop of traditional values – music that

is engaging or entertaining is seen not just possessing *lesser* virtues but actually becomes suspect in some undefined way" (1988:125). (This attitude demonstrated earlier by Crouch's disdain of Davis' success: "as usual, the fall from grace has been a form of success" (1995:166).) In the other extreme, there are some artists (revivalists or neo-classicists, such as Marsalis) that are reconstructing jazz as it was played 50 years ago and condemning its evolution altogether.

In a society that is full of change and growth, it is only natural that the art forms existing within this culture react accordingly. New York vocalist/composer Cassandra Wilson supports the idea that jazz must remain socially relevant by stating: "We have to take what we can and learn from the masters, but by repeating what they do, we're not really doing justice to the tradition. I think the whole point in jazz is to establish some kind of identity and help propel the music forward, make it speak of our needs today" (Nicholson 2005:92). Significantly, Wilson identifies the need for jazz practitioners to make a contribution to the jazz tradition through understanding the roots and tradition of the music but embracing an attitude of innovation, and making the music relevant to the culture of the practitioner and their audience.

Author and jazz historian, Eric Nisenson, confirms Wilson's earlier sentiment in terms of innovation and the ability to relate to current cultures around the world today:

> If jazz musicians – especially young jazz musicians – cannot find ways to build on that legacy and create music that reflects the reality of their own lives here and now, jazz cannot survive. This of course is the case to some degree with any artform, but with jazz it is crucial – and to understand that means comprehending why jazz is so profoundly different from music of the European tradition (1997:22).

When the resurgence of older styles of jazz started, trumpeter, Miles Davis "…was angrily outspoken in his denunciation of the current 'back to bop' movement. Upon hearing young musicians playing hard bop or post-bop, he would rhetorically ask 'Didn't we do it good the first time?'" (Nisenson 1997:13).

In Australia, the neo-classicist attitude may not be as present as it is in America. However, the narrow, stereotyped concept of jazz that it expounds is also perpetuated

and reinforced by other international artists, such as Michael Bublé (emulating Frank Sinatra), who are elevated into the public domain as 'jazz' stars. This backward, stylised concept of jazz is present both in our media and psyches and its epitome is represented in a personality such as Marsalis. Whilst his approach has been heavy-handed, his personal effect may not have direct consequences in Australia. However, our larger concept of what jazz is needs to be readdressed to bypass these pressures and move the art form forward freely.

Some of the core values of neo-classicism, such as respect for and knowledge of the history of jazz are fundamental values for jazz practitioners today. Only when taken to extremes do these ideas become threatening to musicians, inciting the responses displayed here. Jazz musicians should be aware of this history – only by knowing where we come from do we know where we are going – but the tradition of jazz *is* innovation, and it should be allowed to continue. It has been demonstrated here that purism, however, is a concept that has never truly existed within the jazz art form.

Throughout its history, jazz has always been affected by the culture and environment around it. Jazz writer, Sidney Finkelstein observes that: "Good music asserts the presence within it of a living, thinking and feeling human being, exploring the world about him" (1975:10). It can be said that music is a way of knowing – something that helps us make sense of our cultural and physical surroundings. As such, for music to resonate with the larger audience, it must reflect the complexities of their time and place. Social values and ways of thinking were reflected and challenged in jazz from its humble beginnings and this is a strong part of its continuing tradition.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

This paper has examined a number of facets of jazz and their relevance to Australian practitioners and audiences today. Revisiting the definition of jazz, it could be reasonably stated that jazz is essentially 'bastard' music. After examining the various definitions and descriptions available, it is apparent that an updated definition is needed. This definition should perhaps centre around the principles of progressive improvised music that demonstrates reference to the jazz heritage, which also has the freedom to break previous boundaries and evolve into something new. A contemporary definition of jazz is offered here:

Jazz is a style of art music, which began in America in the early part of the 20th century. This often rhythmic style of music is formed through a fusion of elements: different styles of music meeting; old songs redone in new ways; composed music fused with improvisation; spontaneous composition; old language mixed with and changed by the new. Evolution is an integral part of this music, as is a connection to the environment in which it is created in the present.

While the above definition of jazz has been designed to align with Elworth's concept of the "transforming construction", this definition may only be relevant to this current time and place, as tomorrow the art form may evolve into a new construction. As stated earlier, one of the aims of this paper is to encourage diversity within the music and see jazz language expand to embrace local cultural and socio-political factors, rather than limiting ideas of what jazz is, and can be.

Jazz is at one with its surroundings – a running comment or lively reaction - almost like a constructive, active, critical review. In fact, each performance could be considered a comment in some way, on another performance, environment or situation. Jazz is a very alive art form: constantly changing, constantly in progress. The concept of jazz as an ever-renewing music is supported by DeVeaux, who states, that "the term jazz [is] further extended – it's definition now more than ever dependent on ideas of continuous evolution and growth" (1991:534). If this was not so, the music would never need to evolve or change and as jazz practitioners we would be content to

play other people's music forever – never contributing to the art form or helping it grow in any way.

This paper has addressed the two sides of the evolution versus 'tradition' debate and demonstrated the many times throughout jazz history whereby enculturation has affected the art form and contributed positively to its growth: Garbarek, Frisell, Parker, Coltrane and Davis all created something individual using jazz language and form, combined with their own context and in doing so succeeded in creating music that resonated with their own cultural time and place.

There is no responsibility for the performer to preserve jazz in any certain type of way, or to steer jazz away from old ways of playing the music. As practitioners, our only responsibilities are to be honest composers, improvisers and performers.

Today, musicians have easy access to information concerning our surrounding culture, and as a *part* of a culture we should be able to change and evolve freely. As composer Scott Johnson states: "Evolution always involves a relationship with the environment, not just with one's own ancestors and descendants" (2000:21).

A progressive art form, such as jazz, that explores and evolves must also be connected with its current environment – embracing the music's history, its present and redefining a new future. To find this future, the creators and performers must be well versed in the languages of their present environment. Charlie Parker said that: "Music is your own experience, your thoughts, your wisdom. If you don't live it, it won't come out of your horn" (Nisenson 1997:119). Living and growing up in Australia today is a unique experience – the individuality of this experience must inform our musical identity, which, in turn, forms our expression, sound and statements as practitioners.

Personal Context Revisited

As an active jazz musician in Australia and as I continue to learn about the history of this music, I am becoming more aware of the absence of a larger jazz community and the effect that this has upon the art form as a whole. In the middle of last century, jazz

was primarily based in America, where most musicians could interact and influence one another. Australia's jazz community today is heavily affected by its geography: our main cities are far apart, separated by reasonably isolated small towns. Even with more accessible and affordable transport around the country, musicians in Australia do not have an established touring circuit whereby practitioners can easily influence one another. It could be suggested that even Sydney and Melbourne have produced musicians with two very different musical dialects formed by their respective environments.[8]

The strength of the jazz art form flourished throughout the middle of last century, however, wishing for the past or trying to recreate its success through the music of the past will most likely bury the future of jazz very quickly by turning the jazz art form into an inflexible renaissance and alienating its audience completely.

Many elements and materials within the jazz art form can be addressed to more accurately reflect the current Australian jazz musician. As an active practitioner in Australia, I *enjoy* playing traditional standard jazz repertoire. Within this varying repertoire are many great pieces of music that cannot, and should not, be easily cast aside. This material is part of the language – in fact, it is integral. However, the songs that generally make up the standard repertoire of today were popular songs of a different day. As was explored in this paper, the current repertoire used today in Australian jazz making is just one element that can be addressed by practitioners to meet their own needs. These elements can be addressed in a way that respects both the past and the present. This is up to the individual jazz practitioner to address elements within the music to align with their own concept for the future of jazz.

In Australia today, it is an exciting time to be creating music, or, indeed, any art. As our national culture is developing, our collective identity has the potential to become a larger part of our music. Young jazz musicians in this country now have a bounty of inspiring local musicians to take influence from, who have created their own definitions of jazz and helped shape this still-growing community. Musicians such as

[8] This is an observation made by the author as an active practitioner working in both Sydney and Melbourne. However, these dialects could also be considered common knowledge within the jazz community, with the number and type of venues situated in each city, differing music schools and the influence of older musicians contributing factors to the different sounds produced.

Graeme Bell, Mike Nock, Allan Browne, Judy Bailey, Sandy Evans, Don Burrows, Graham Lyall, Bernie McGann and Tony Gould have influenced and affected a great number of the younger generation of jazz musicians in Australia today and are all still contributing to the art form themselves. These musicians have striven to cultivate an Australian jazz identity that has influenced generations of younger musicians who, as a result, are now building upon and further refining an exciting and truly *Australian* approach to jazz. As Nicholson states:

> In the past, it was the Americans who were the leaders in adding new floors to this metaphorical 'house of jazz', but now it is the non-Americans who are taking the lead. These are not less authentic subvarieties of an American version of jazz, but new global dialects. As critic Gary Booth observed in BBC 'Music Magazine', "America has had a virtual monopoly on calling the changes in jazz music since the music moved out of New Orleans. But that's no longer the case" (2005:176).

This *Australian* quality is what becomes valuable in our music because it is uniquely and truly ours, rather than attempting to emulate jazz from another time or place. Australian pianist, Paul Grabowsky, shares this attitude:

> Australia is really only ever going to break through on its otherness, because they [overseas audiences] don't want to hear something that sounds like even a good copy of an American or European model … Any kind of cursory listen to Australian improvised music would suggest that it is indeed very different from the rest of the world (Wilson 2008:17).

Guitarist Pat Metheny supports this localised orientation of jazz, stating that, "It's no longer 'America's Classical Music' – the globalisation of the music is now fully underway and there's [sic] opportunities for musicians all over the world to address their own musical issues through the language of jazz" (Nicholson 2005:191).

Australian musicians, arguably, are able to create something that is specific to our circumstances. The fact that we are not American, and may not feel the need to preserve the music of the past (as it was not originally ours), affords many Australian musicians the option to draw inspiration from whatever sources they may. Australian saxophonist, Sandy Evans, describes this phenomenon by stating that, "… we are

liberated by not having such a weight on our shoulders. I think that does contribute to a general trend here to be able to look wherever we're interested at any given moment" (Webb 2008:37).

The many issues that this paper has addressed have led me to believe that for jazz to have a future in Australia, it must be informed by its enculturation – it must forever be bastard music. As we develop and embrace new music and sounds, there is no need to lose our heritage or past – this is something that cannot be changed or lost. As practitioners, we can move forward and also honour our past – in fact, only by moving forward do we truly do so.

Recommendations For Further Research

Researching of this paper has uncovered topics that, due to the nature of this document (and its inherent limitations), could not be fully explored. In order to readdress the current perception of jazz and its future in Australia, jazz education must, arguably, be examined as most Australian jazz musicians are schooled through our tertiary training centres.

This paper touches upon the theme of identity in music; how cultural identity is recognised, understood and manifested through musical art forms. Whilst the concept of expression of identity through the arts is well documented, the notion of bastard music in a broad context of what defines Australian culture is worth further exploration.

Reference List

Ake, David Andrew. 2002. *Jazz cultures*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Baker, Paul. 1989. 'Roscoe Mitchell: The Next Step.' Coda no. 228(October/November):18-21.

Berendt, Joachim Ernst. 1976. *The Jazz Book* / Joachim Berendt ; [with discography by Achim Hebgen, revised for the American edition by Dan Morgenstern]. St. Albans, Hertfordshire: Paladin.

Brown, L. 1998. 'Jazz: An Overview.' In *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. M. Kelly. New York: Oxford University Press.

Byrnes, Sholto. 2003. Wynton Marsalis: Miles Davis? He was a rock star. The Independant.co.uk. <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/music/features/wynton-marsalis-miles-davis-he-was-a-rock-star-601414.html> (18 Aug. 2008)

Crouch, Stanley. 1995. *The all-American skin game*, or, The decoy of race: the long and the short of it, 1990-1994. 1st Edition. New York: Pantheon Books.

Crouch, Stanley. 2002. '*The Jazz Tradition is Not Innovation*.' Jazz Times 32(1):1.

Davis, Miles and Quincy Troupe. 1989. *Miles: The Autobiography*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

DeVeaux, Scott. 1991. '*Constructing the Jazz Tradition: Jazz Historiography*.' Black American Literature Forum 25:36.

Elworth, Steven B. 1995. 'Jazz in Crisis, 1948-1958: Ideology and Representation.' In *Jazz Among the Discourses*, ed. Krin Gabbard. London: Duke University Press.

Finkelstein, Sidney. 1975. *Jazz: A People's Music*. New York: Da Capo Press.

Friedwald, Will, Ted Gioia, Jim Macnie, Peter Margasak, Stuart Nicholson, Ben Ratliff, John F. Szwed, Greg Tate, Peter Watrous and K. Leander Williams. 2002. *The Future of Jazz*. Chicago: A Capella Books.

Gendron, Bernard. 1995. "Moldy Figs' and Modernists: Jazz at War (1942-1946).' In *Jazz Among the Discourses*, ed. Krin Gabbard. London: Duke University Press.

Gilbert, Andrew. 1998. *Jazz Inc.* Detroit. Metro Times Detroit.

Gioia, Ted. 1988. *The Imperfect Art*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hodeir, Andr. 1975. *Jazz, its evolution and essence*. New York: Da Capo Press.

Hofstadter, Douglas R. 1979. *Gödel, Escher, Bach: an eternal golden braid*. Hassocks: Harvester Press.

Johnson, Scott. 2000. 'The Counterpoint of Species.' In *Arcana: musicians on music*, ed. John Zorn. New York: Granary Books, Inc.

Lees, Gene. 1994. *Cats of any color: jazz black and white*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, George. 2004. 'Experimental Music in Black and White: The AACM in New York, 1970-1985.' In *Uptown Conversation: The New Jazz Studies*, eds. Robert G. O'Meally, Brent Hayes Edwards and Farah Jasmine Griffin. New York: Colombia University Press.

Marsalis, Wynton. 1988. What Jazz Is - and Isn't New York. *The New York Times*.

Martin, Terry. 2000. 'Jazz in Canada and Australia.' In *The Oxford Companion to Jazz*, ed. Bill Kirchner. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nicholson, Stuart. 1990. *Jazz: The 1980s Resurgence*. New York: Da Capo Press.

Nicholson, Stuart. 2005. *Is Jazz Dead? (or has it moved to a new address)*. New York: Routledge.

Nisenson, Eric. 1997. *Blue: The Murder of Jazz*. United States of America: Da Capo Press.

Rechniewski, Peter. 2008. '*The Permanent Underground: Australian Contemporary Jazz in the New Millennium*.' Platform Papers(16):pp1-60.

Rowland, Mark and Tony Scherman. 1994. *The Jazz musician*. 1st Edition. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Washington, Salim. 2004. "All the Things You Could Be by Now': *Charles Mingus Presents Charles Mingus* and the Limits of Avant-Garde Jazz.' In *Uptown Conversation: The New Jazz Studies*, eds. Robert G. O'Meally, Brent Hayes Edwards and Farah Jasmine Griffin. New York: Colombia University Press.

Webb, Michael. 2008. 'Sandy Evans In Conversation with Michael Webb.' Extempore 1(1):23-39.

Wilson, Ashleigh. 2008. Blue Note The Weekend Australian.