**Abstract.** This article will explore the practice of brain-computer interfacing for music-making. While a history of the practice is not yet written, the recent resurgence of interest in bio-mediums, specifically the brain, calls for genealogical and theoretical efforts toward this subtype of brain art practice. To evolve, the discipline needs inward-directed critique. Yet, such reflective treatment of the practice and its history is barely represented among practitioners. For the art of making to become transferable, a sense of the timeline of the practice and important innovations that enabled further advancement of brain art are needed. To encourage maturation of brain art, specifically neuromusical practice, I would like to intervene and attempt to historicize the artistic uses of BCMI. Focusing on the work of BCMI pioneer, D. Rosenboom, who from the very beginning pursued a convergence of art-making and live research, I am intending to trace antecedents of his neuromusic, discuss key technological and theoretical advancements that facilitated BCMI, critically consider the development of brainwave musical practice from 1970 to now, and propose further refinements of this hybrid art-science practice.
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**Main Points:**

* Gestation (1969-70) and the evolution of Rosenboom’s idea of creating a *stable interface between the brain and computing systems* for music-making and research in experimental aesthetics. Historicizing the first brain-computer interface for music making. [Themes such as fascination with McLuhan, multi-media, creating emergent performance environments, etc. will be considered.]
* Qualitative difference from the earlier work of A. Lucier and R. Teitelbaum – argue the claim for the *hybridity* of Rosenboom’s practice and, to contrast, explain the artistic motivations of predecessors. [Briefly describe background, expertise, and influences in each case.]
* Synchronously overviewing developments in biofeedback research and music technology. Taking a glance at larger cultural processes and intuitions behind sonifying brain waves.

[Bi-cameral mind idea, psychedelic 60s, groovy science, cybernetics, repurposing of science technology for artistic means, etc.]

* Contextualizing Rosenboom’s dissatisfaction with contemporary music practices and his urge for a) engaging audience in the performance, b) initiating the co-creation of music by performer(s) and listener(s). As well as his c) protest against concert halls, rigid musical structures, and other intuitions informed by Rosenboom’s mentors (Martirano, Hiller, etc.) and the critique of experimental composers of the conventional compositional and performance practice. [Overview of the 1965-1970 critiques, based on Rosenboom’s Notebook and early articles/transcription of talks.]
* The waves of interest in brainwave music (and all related to “representation of man’s inner life) traced through over 50 years of Rosenboom’s practice (1970-77; 1994-95; 2013-2015). Conclusions re. to the crisis of paradigm and the lack of qualitative shift in neuromusical practice despite the emergence of more available and portable EEG technology and other devices used for biofeedback training.
* Attempting to answer the question about the audience(s) of neuromusic. (Both who attend performances and who support this kind of practice financially or otherwise). Inquiring about the identity of those engaged in the practice of neuromusic-making and their motivation. Making the point about the importance of brainwave music as a practice and identifying possible directions of refinement of the practitioner’s approach. [Illusion of transparency, participatory aspect; refinement of neuromusic as a hybrid practice – not just getting interesting data in an installation setting; initiating dialogue of people across disciplines and backgrounds, involving different cultures of knowledge, etc.]