

14 June 1963

Ervin M. Wilson,
651 Huntley
Los Angeles 56

---I'm still afraid to send letters after getting those others back. Hope you have it straightened out with the postoffice by this time.

The last week or so I have been under the weather with a sore throat and other associated miseries.

Despite this, I have finally put all 60 notes on the organ unit and can now start thinking about the second unit to go with the pedalboard.

This unexpected development in "elastic tuning" complicates the problem of setting any temperament system on the instrument. Evidently I will have to build the third unit, another five-octave manual on a different electronic principle, before I can have a reference against which to set a temperament on this unit. In effect, the elastic tuning version of any of the several systems it may be set to, will be a new system.

Other elastic tunings are conceivable. If an instrument were carefully designed from scratch, and one did not have to use obsolete, surplus, and swapped-for parts as I did in this unit, one could adjust the elasticity, or turn it off entirely, or have it obtain between certain sets of notes and not others, and so on.

I probably won't have time to explore this the way it should be explored. One thing it may do is bridge the gap between the orchestra and organ ideas. That is, when band or orchestra musicians hear each other when playing together, they adjust to each other, chord by chord, with the result that many of their pitches glide or jump. This organ unit of mine does something similar, as the tone-generators "talk back and forth" to one another. The utmost care is taken in all the commercial and experimental electronic organs I know of, as well as in conventional pipe and reed organs, that nothing of this kind shall happen.

all

In pianos a slightly similar thing happens in that any note played will excite sympathetic vibrations in any others with overtones near enough to it, and the vibrating strings apply twisting and other movements to the bridges, but although this has a profound effect on the over tonal quality, it does not move the frequencies of the strings up or down, as these organ tone-generators do to one another.

The inventors of electronic pianos and organs and such are frantically trying to find something to "liven-up" the tones, and very few of the ideas tried are any good. One reason for this--or at least I think so--is that these attachments are not part of the tone-generators. For example, Allen's Gyrophonic unit, the Leslie speaker, the Hammond vibrato-scanner, the Wurlitzer phase-shift vibrato attachment, the pendulum-driven gadget in the Novachord

and some Solovox models, and the new noise-generator for Allen organs called "whind". This does not exhaust the list. Some of these inventions were dictated by the need to produce a reliable commercial mass-production item and keep the manufacturing costs down and the profit up.

Your quotation of the organ manufacturer who didn't care whether he made musical instruments or not, is just about what I expected. There is another more serious matter: whether in electronic organs, or in phonographs and hi-fi equipment, the manufacturers and their selling organizations seem to be catering to the lowest, least cultured part of the public--this apart from considerations of cost, advertising, profit, future growth and all that stuff. For example, stereo is being promoted for portable phonographs that have frequency response little better than a telephone or a cigar box. Most electronic organs are so constructed that Bach cannot be played on them at all. Today's pianos hardly ever have the tone quality pianos had 50 years ago. So much in the music stores now is flashy, tawdry, gaudy, for lowbrows, and backward-oriented (meaning that truly modern music cannot be played on it, and the possibilities and musical resources have been greatly restricted, apart from the 12T question).

I am now in a peculiar situation--the little theatre group has not yet arranged for me to see the play, so it may close without my seeing it. Besides that, I couldn't go for two weeks or more anyhow on account of my sore throat and other such troubles. They promise to bring the tape back, though, and I will get to see some other people in the experimental film field--I don't know how long from now.

You asked about Charles Thurlow. I was thinking mainly of the fact that he ~~x~~ has been a sort of professional meeting-attender for a number of years, and so knows about a large number of groups and people in and around Hollywood. He has some background in art, and in sign-painting, and relatives of his have been songwriters and cartoon animators, and he has been connected with some literary and intellectual groups. He has belonged to the general semantic group, the Humanists, the Great Books discussion groups, ~~the~~ and other such meeting-holders.

If I meet any more people from the experimental film and avant-garde groups, this may be a more promising avenue for you to introduce non-12.

Regarding the names for instruments, there is a semantic problem. "Organ" has come to mean so many different kinds of things that make noises and even some like "color-organs" that don't make a noise, that the original meaning of pipe organ has been obscured. When such different instruments as the Hammond, the Minshall, the Baldwin, the Conn, the Electro-Voice, the 1950 models of Wurlitzer, and the newer Gulbrandsens, are all called "electronic organs", the term loses most of its meaning. These I just gave as examples are as different as saxophones, French horns, clarinets, oboes, trumpets, and violins are from one another. They are as different as ukuleles, zithers, banjos, guitars, and harps.

Evidently, the name "organ" has something to do with the looks of the console, rather than how the thing sounds.

Now, the last couple of years, even more confusion, raising lots of questions. While the Novachord is no longer made (confidentially, it drove everybody in the Musicians' Union plumb crazy), its descendants are the "electronic organs with percussion". Percussion ought to mean, imitating harpsichord, banjo, piano, zither, guitar, and such. It doesn't--it is thoroughly confused with "sustain" (notes continuing to sound after keys are quit), and reverboration (synthetic, of course), and various attempts to imitate bells and chimes. How much percussion can be incorporated into an instrument before it ceases to be an organ?

Is a touch-responsive keyboard instrument not an organ because it is touch-responsive (it plays louder if you whack the key harder)? Is a Solovox an organ, or a part-of-an-organ, because it has octave coupling and stops, even though it can play but one note at a time? Apparently we need dozens of names, and provisions for changing these names again when the instruments denoted are obsolete or superseded.

When I first made the keyboard oboe, I was asked all the time whether it was part of an organ, or a horn, or almost anything except "oboe". Finally, I got real annoyed at one questioner and told him it was a Bgunkus. He didn't seem to mind. He was quite willing to call it a bgunkus. (But not to spell it that way.)

So maybe I'll end up asking people over here to see my bozzornk, my gleefwhirble, my gattyframmi, and the nergofying klamsydoobus. The advantage would be that they could do no further damage to these names by misspelling them or not remembering them correctly. Quite an advantage, I assure you.

Try your term "Panchromatic" out on the camber camera and film bugs and see if it increases their acceptance of your idea. Maybe it will. I may use Greek-derived terms such as Enharmonicon and Tetarton. It is unfortunate that the -voxes and the -phones have been so largely pre-empted. Trade names have also wrought much damage with the auto-'s and the -tron-'s and some other Greek and Latin word-forming elements I would have liked to combine in legitimate fashion.

Despite the current political situation, someone might get ahead by calling the instrument the Whatnik and saying it was inspired by the late 19th-century Russian composer Turnitoffsky. There are all too many people who would believe it.

The "ether" idea has been used to the point of exasperation. But the prize for musical name-calling must go to the pipe-organ builders, who ransack several languages for names, and then derive 45 stop-tablets from 6 ranks of pipes. A stopped flute may be a Stopped Diapason on one manual and a Lieblich Gedekt on another, and a Tibia on a third. Or the stop tabs bearing the same name on two different manuals may really be two different ranks of pipes, ~~xxxx~~ while the one "borrowed" on the second of these manuals will have a different name. You would think they would blush at the meanings of some of these terms: wonderful trumpet, lovely covered, sweet leg, wave of the sea, angel-voice. Yours,