

Thursday 16 July 1981

Jonathan Galsier 3932 Alameda Place San Diego CA 1 92103

Greetings from Forest Lawn Centef=====

They ran the bulldozers and enormous dump trucks most of the day and completely erased all the dwellings across the street. So now somebody will come around and dig huge holes for the condominium # 3.

I had unexpected visitors and got far behind in everything as a result. In the morning they brought a filing cabinet--I thought I had made a deal but it cost more than I expected, and besides that it probably will have to be supplemented by a second one whenever I can save up enough for it or if I can find a going out of business firm or something who has to sell quick. (The horrid wooden affair in the back of the livingroom is useless since all the handles broke off the drawers in the numerous moves and it nearly fell apart moving into here; it would never survive the next move so all it is good for is a few pieces of playwood.) I guess you have known all about that problem for quite some time.

So that raises another question: whether if the Foundation ever gets better organized some of my Subject File---i.e. 45 years' accumulation of articles and clippings and various writings of myself and others and various booklets and pamphlets, ought to be part of the Foundation's Library for reference and for writing future articles--not just for Interval but for publication elsewhere. This actually applies to about one-third of the material I am now going to move into the new filing cabinet---new to me anyway, although it shows only the slightest evidence of use. I was expecting an affair that I would have to put in the yard and repaint at once.

What a shame that music and books about music and so forth are too big to go into a filing cabinet, and require special files which now are practically unobtainable. The only way I could get a music file would be to find a retired or extinct music teacher having left such behind.

Yesterday afternoon Dan Jameson from Corcoran near Fresno (the one who had had three guitars refretted to 19, 24, and 31) showed up with some friend of his, unexpectedly--as I was walking down the street near here to mail three letters----they were attending some kind of demonstration and master-class-lecture of Segovia and will be doing so again this weekend and promised to come back this afternoon. Jameson has some idea of getting a 19-tone electric refretted. Not sure, but I think that's what he said. They took some pictures.

Yesterday afternoon quite late----almost 5 PM, Chris Banta showed up as promised and brought the cello and my tuning forks and some other stuff over to his place in Pasadena and we went through it---determined the resonances of the cello--he had to put duct-tape over the "leaks"---the places where the top and bottom have come unglued on the cello---and used his new tiny probe microphone to locate resonance points. Oddly /enough, the wolf-note thing is almost absent now on my cello---it takes actual effort to make it wolf. Then the quartertone set of tuning bars and the 9 tuning forks and some other bars were checked--most of them turned out to be 2 1/2 or 3 c flat----but the temperature was about 90 and so that could be temperature----that is this slight flattening was CONSISTENT for fork after fork, bar after bar.

20° hotter would make some difference. Nothing was tuned at that temperature/except maybe one or two of those bars. I suspect the 17-tone tubulong is out of tune here and there because it was partly tuned on that Scalatron thing---what Glendhad done at Ervin's place originally---and then what I added to it was tuned at all sorts of different temperatures in the yard----but of course there wasn't time or space to take those tubes or the 19-tone set to Pasadena last night.

I wrote down all the checkings of the forks and bars as Chris Banta made them. He is wondering about how to arrange to demonstrate the special marimbas when he gets them done. He has made the wooden bars for the overtone series on C----1 through 16. Also pentatonic 5 equal set which will have several metal bars for the bass notes and wood for the rest of it.

He made up the demo with aluminum bars of a just major and minor chord and a neutral third for this set.

So I wasn't able to say anything definite on how many Partch-fanciers there are, or other people who might want an overtone-series marimba. But I suspect, where Prent Rodgers had spent two years or more just playing the overtone series on F and that on C till it wore deep ruts in our minds, there just have to be some people who would want an overtone series marimba. Whether he can reach all the possible people with a demo is another matter of course.

Got a note from Will Parsons----dreaming up more instruments evidently. And another set of impossible scribbles from Chalmers----this time complaining bitterly about Harry Conviser and his fixed prejudiced opinions. I also got a letter from Harry Conviser the other morning but it wasn't that much of a problem.

It will be a loss to the music-theory world because Chalmers has set out so many possibly-useful scale patterns and keyboard layouts or tuning-schemes, but nobody can read them, and a scientist-theorist is supposed to be neat and clean and tidy about such things and this is the sloppiest mess of accumulated piles of papers that I have ever seen and nobody will be able to find the tables and lists of numbers and layouts in it so it will doubtless end up in some wastebasket or worse after my demise instead of in the Foundation Archives or the University Archives or whatever Valhalla is proposed for non-12 info.

That is to say: Chalmers is defeating his own purpose and prejudicing people against him which will ruin his future reputation. He has angered Conviser----not as Chalmers thinks because of the arguments over points of precision or semantic definitions of what is a just system----but because of his impossible hentracks and hieroglyphics and sloppy careless writing which makes Conviser doubt whether the data are checked with care, if Chalmers doesn't care how a page looks. We don't demand copperplate engraving or formal engrossing; but there is a limit. Don't you expect more of a scientist with a degree? Would he go around in sackcloth and ashes? Or use a paper bag for a briefcase

Chalmers sent back my table where I had the ratios of adjacent harmonics and supplied the deviations from an octave of the pile of intervals, in those places where I had listed the nearest equal systems--i.e. I had listed the equal temperaments whose unit-intervals are closest to the consecutive-harmonic ratios in question.

----so he misunderstood what I compiled the table for. I suppose he was thinking in terms of 17:8 18:17 being an approximation to 12-tone, therefore let's raise 18/17 to the 12th power and find out how much $(18/17)^{12}$ differs from an octave---answer, 1187.460 ¢ according to Conviser. I guess that's correct, since the Spanish guitar-makers would adjust to the correct 12-tone fret-positions as they proceeded up the scale. And thus absorb the difference by one way or another. (Gosh though: Tom-Stone offered a keyboard fretted strictly to 18:17 !)

If you moved the bridge on such a guitar you would get most of the errors below the detection-point.

But of course Conviser has nothing to do with guitars; he is a keyboard buff. That isn't really the point. I am not concerned with the question, for instance, of the 7¢ over the octave obtained by taking the interval 44:45 31 times as an approximation to 1/31 octave! (44:45 was proposed as a gear-ratio for 31-tone organs by Fokker himself.) I am only concerned with the error in cents of just ONE use of 44:45. That is, in a future edition of my table I could append the errors as + or - this or that fraction of a cent for just ONE such interval as against the equal division of the octave which is closest to that successive-harmonic interval. So Conviser wasted an hour or so calculating all this useless information. Conviser's conclusion was the equally-useless fact that the closest approximation of a repeated interval to an equal division of the octave, in my table, is 37:38 taken 26 times, giving a result of 1200.344 ¢. Therefore, 26-tone-equal is superior to 17 19 22 or 31 ! Ouch!!!

Conviser simply missed a lot of points, and at age 73, maybe he can be allowed some foibles.

For your amusement: 17 repetitions of 24:25 ratio exceed an octave by only 1.4 ¢. Of course this doesn't really matter. Divide that error by 17 to get the difference between 1/17 octave and one use of 24:25, which is what you were talking about on one occasion.

Ran across 1963 and thereabout letters of Ervin's which I put in a box after throwing out all the junk mail between 1941 and 1971. That was about a year after my forced exile to Glendale began. Now here we come to a subject: he had sent me charts and tables, some of which I put together in a special pile and some of which were left with the letters written around them. If I decided to save all this and similar tables and data from other persons, I will need a second filing-cabinet, and then all this stuff will be available to other people for reference, if I don't lose everything when I next have to move. It's not much good to me or anybody, scattered among so many piles of papers and boxes of ancient correspondence.

Some of the stuff will be safe for two or three years since I have used it as second sheets to make carbon copies of my last 4 months of letter-writing since I ran out of yellow second sheets that long ago and cannot afford to pay \$5 a ream for newsprint or other cheap perishable paper for carbon copies. But it will be scrambled since it will now be filed according to the carbon copies of MY letters to other people and disregard whatever is on the other side of the st sheets.

What to throw away? Knotty problem. I am collecting lots of boxes to repack everything so I can get rid of some awfully dirty t'n cartons and throw out more junk.
Dizzy with the heat, alas! Yours