

Monday 17 May 1971

John H. Chalmers, 345 Mulford Hall Genetics Dept U C Berkeley

Greetings from uphill---

They sent the howling wild winds down here. Blew out the pilot light in the furnace and blew down coconuts of palm and other tree-branches. Blew the lids off both my garbage can and the upstairs people's.

What with the rail strike this morning I had better send this airmail.

I have had more chance to examine the philosophy of science literature--and I don't like what I have been reading at all. This Identity Theory, for instance, which outdoes the Behaviorists. Opting for strict mechanistic materialism isn't so stoic and noble as the authors try to make it seem. They have to twist and slant everything to make it come out that way, and make less appeal to experimental data than even religious writers do! The "stacking of the cards" is as bad as that done by a right-wing evangelistic group, who got out a pamphlet on "Communism, Hypnotism, and the Beatles" several years ago (I just found this yesterday, after thinking I had lost it in moving here)--in which pamphlet they quote all manner of respectable documentation in the footnotes, but non sequitur--their argument has more holes than a Swiss cheese. The old story of taking things out of context and regardless of when or for whom they were written.

The Audio Exhibit and some other recent events disquieted me. ~~lax~~ Latest in this connection: John Reuschel showed me the other day a new book apparently under auspices of U A T and art museums: A giant Art & Technology exhibit will go to the local L A County Museum any day now--I think it's tomorrow, but I'm not sure. Anyway, the book tells of the exasperating experiences when the artist-plus-engineer projects were mounted in various factories or engineering offices or corporate premises--red tape and security and misunderstandings galore. One thing Reuschel said makes a lot of sense in this context, especially after all that disquieting reading of extremists in the Philosophy-of-Science Dept.: He says that Art-&Technology is NOT Art-&Science. I should have known! This explains everything.

The scientist asks "Why?"; the engineer asks "How?" and the engineer's superiors forbid anyone to ask why, or to consider means-vs.-ends; all they want is blind obedience. This Utilitarian philosophy is akin to that of those dreadful pests who have been badgering me for years because I am not a Useful Member of Society according to THEIR definition of such: I do not compose music to cure or relieve arthritis, asthma, or gallstones. No wonder the SAT projects are having so much trouble.

Now that you are in the San Francisco Bay area, there are a couple of topics: One is that one Bern Porter used to

live in the Sausalito area, and wrote a document called the SciArt Manifesto, and he had been a physicist and turned artist. His approach was Science and Art, not Art and Technology. James Seneville, if I spell correctly, wrote a book about him called THE ROARING MARKET AND THE SILENT TOMB. Schevill taught at Berkeley; maybe he still does. Anyway the book must be in some library accessible to you. I don't know whether Porter is still alive or not; Reuschel says he knew him some years ago. There is at least a slight chance that one or both of these persons might help you in regard to the philosophy of science.

The other topic is that Reuschel wrote a friend of his who holds a position at the San Francisco Art Museum--I don't know which one, but I presume the modernistic museum in the Civic Center, about scheduling some kind of lecture or program for me to put on there--I presume it takes about a year to arrange such things. Even if this fails to go through--I may still be very poor, I may be too ill to travel, there may be no funds or time available to put on the program--I will in any case have made a contact in avant-garde art circles, and this art museum director may call or write you about me, and perhaps you could have some program of your own later on, whatever your interest would be. It can't do any harm.

I sent you a copy-tape and hope it arrived. Comparison of 12 and 19 on the newly-rebuilt and overhauled organ unit--three qualities of tone now available. But I may have been too impatient: I composed some more in 19 since I copied that tape, and now have a much more rhythmic theme and a better recording at that. I had better do it over for you so that I won't get IM and other distortion in making the copy. I will wait until I have tuned the instrument to 17 and 22 and have other comparisons. It works much better now--the buzz and unevenness and distortion are largely corrected.

I just got over a dreadful cold that hung on for two weeks, running nose and sleepless nights. Worst in three years.

As usual, the question of second- and ~~high~~ higher-order temperaments occupies me. Last night I was taken to see an old piano on its last legs and the reverberant room compounded the beats from its out-of-tune-ness. Compare such old relics with the sound of any woodwind choir vs. strings and brass in any conventional symphony orchestra, and it should be obvious that the theoretical norms of 12-tone equal temperament mean nothing and are misleading besides. To tie this uncomfortable actual situation back to theory, we will need a theory of second-and-higher-order temperaments. I have hopes the development of such theory will help to undo some of the harm done by Yasser's instrument-less and sound-less argument, and by kindred seen-and-never-heard allegations of Barbour et al. Perhaps you will have ideas along this line which can be formulated ~~###~~.

By the way: there are now available, bindable thin flexible plastic LP records of 4 min. duration per side, at about \$200 a thousand copies or less. This would be the answer to incorporating actual sounds into the XQ if it ever gets launched. This removes my main inhibition. The sample record I have here was pressed on a square sheet to permit stapling it into a book.

Yours