

incorporating LILLIPUT

#67 -- 10 April 1972



ERHWON

THE WORLD'S SECOND MOST WIDELY CIRCULATED
POSTAL DIPLOMACY 'ZINE (after XENOGOGIC).

**Circulation
151**

Ah, so! This is the honorable ERHWON, a truly imperial journal of postal Diplomacy* and other sayings of the immortal Buddha. It may be obtained at the rate of 7 issues for \$1.00. Back issues are 15¢ each (10¢ each in lots of 2 or more). Available: 39-41, 43, 45-66 (and, at 30 cents each, 25-28, 30). There are no game openings, but stand-by positions are available under the provisions of House-Rule 13. This is Pandemonium Publication #488, edited and published by Rod Walker, 4719 Felton St., San Diego CA 92116; telephone, (714) 282-1921; member, PDC, IFW, IDS, PDRC, and the "DipOrg".

This issue is dedicated to Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry, whose expedition to Japan opened that country to western trade in 1854, and started the Empire on the road to world power. Commodore Perry was born on 10 April 1794.

*DIPLOMACY is a registered trademark for a game invented by Allan B. Calhame and copyright by Games Research, Inc., 48 Wareham St., Boston MA 02118. GRI sells the game, postpaid, for \$8, and the 1971 Rulebook for \$1.

NEW GAMES BEGIN!

Yes friends, two new games have filled in ERHWON. They have been full for some days, in fact, but I have not had time to type this issue until now. The games and players are as follows:

1972AL

AUSTRIA: Tony Pandin, 10406 Shaker Blvd., Cleveland OH 44104.
ENGLAND: Payton Turpin, P.O. Box 6560, LaJolla CA 92037.
FRANCE: Capt. Steven Brooks, 3601 E. 2nd St., Apt. 86, Tucson AZ 85716.
GERMANY: Nicholas Furcola, 602 Leverington Ave., Philadelphia PA 19128.
ITALY: Lon Lakofka, 1806 N. Richmond St., Chicago IL 60647.
RUSSIA: Major Elliot Lipsen, Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Denver CO 80240.
TURKEY: Don Horton, 16 Jordan Ct., Sacramento CA 95826.

1972AO

AUSTRIA: Tom Eller, 29 Winthrop St., Charlestown MA 02129.
ENGLAND: T. W. Pohrte II, 60 Ridgedale, Monroe CT 06468.
FRANCE: Eric Verheiden, 3245 S.W. 185th Ave., Aloha OR 97005.
GERMANY: Buddy Tretick, P.O. Box 34046, Bethesda MD 20034.
ITALY: Fred Winter, Jr., 2625 El Rancho Dr., Brookfield WI 53005. //60657.
RUSSIA: Larry Blandin, c/o Niemeyer, 3330 N. LakeShore Dr., Chicago IL
TURKEY: Ken Borecki, P.O. Box 255, RockvilleCentre NY 11571.

SPRING 1901 ORDERS are due on Thursday, 22 June 1972. This extremely long deadline is occasioned by the fact that my doctoral examinations are in May and I will not be publishing during that month (except for one or two small items as time permits). Those of you who do not already have a set of House Rules will find one enclosed. Please note that we are using the 1971 Rulebook. Please be sure you observe the HRs. In particular, read HRs 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16 carefully.

I NEED STAND-BY PLAYERS FOR THESE GAMES!

Country Preference Lists: In the lists below, countries assigned are indicated in MAJASCULE, the rest in miniscule.

| | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| <u>1972AL</u> | | <u>1972AO</u> | | |
| Fandin | A i g t o n f | Winter | I a f r g e t | No one received worse than his 3rd choice. |
| Furcola | r i G f a t o | Blandin | R e a g i f t | T.W.Pohrte stated he had no preference...and got England! Some normally unpopular countries were selected as first choice, |
| Lakofka | c i r a t f g | Borecki | r T e f g a i | |
| Horton | T o r f g i a | Eller | A r e t f i g | |
| Turpin | E r t f i g a | Vorheiden | F t e r a g i | |
| Brooks | c F s t g i a | Trotick | G f r e t a i | |
| Lipson | R t a g o i f | Pohrte | - - - - - E | |

Austria twice, Italy and Germany once each. In addition to 9 1st choices, there were 3 seconds and 1 third (plus one unclassified). As to our players, we have a wide mixture of very experienced and moderately experienced players, and one newcomer. Of 14 players we have 12 states represented (we have 2 Chicago players, one in each game, and 2 California players, both in the same game but living at opposite ends of the State). On the whole, things worked out very well.

CONTEST NUMBER TWO

In EREHWON 63, I announced a new contest. The deadline was subsequently extended. Alas, to date only two entries, from Bill Linden and Denise Bonis, have been received (plus a humorous one from Edi Birsan). As I noted with Contest #1, that is simply not enough entries to justify having a contest. I regret having to cancel out on this, but if I cannot get more response than that, the whole thing is futile. However, the answers are below.

1. "...Destroy this temple,..." [complete quotations are in EREHWON 63, page 4]. John 2:19. Bonis & Linden identified the verse. Linden notes the difference in wording in Matthew 26:61 and Mark 14:58, but fails to get the point. In John, these words are attributed to Jesus. In Matthew and Mark they are also attributed to Jesus, but by persons characterized as "false witnesses". In short, John says Jesus made the statement, while Matthew and Mark say he did not. Says Birsan: "Since it is not subsidized by the state nothing is going to be raised in three days."

2. "Arise, go to Nineveh...". Composite of Jonah 1:2 and 3:6. Both got the first reference. Nineveh is represented in Jonah as being the metropolis of Assyria. However, the book is set in c.780 B.C., when the capital of Assyria was still at Kalhu (Calah), and Nineveh was a mere village. (Qualification: Not all scholars agree on this; Nineveh may have been built as capital as early as 805--but that leaves it only 25 years to become the sin city of the Middle East.)

3. "And Darius the Median took the kingdom...". Composite of Daniel 5:31 and 9:1. Linden noted both, Bonis the first. This is replete with error. The conqueror of Babylon was Kurush (Cyrus) II, not Darius (Darayavahush) (who was a Persian, not a Mede). Ahasuerus is Khshayarsha (Xerxes), who was the son, not the father, of Darius. The author of Daniel, who lived centuries after the events he describes, is understandably confused.

4. "Now this man purchased a field...". Acts 1:18. Bonis and Linden got the source and part of the problem. "This man" is Judas, who is described as using his 30 pieces of silver to buy some land and then dying of some sort of seizure. Matthew 28:5, however, says Judas Hanged himself. The account in Acts is more convincing, but there is no way of determining which of them, if either, is true.

5. "They answered...out of Galilee ariseth no prophet." John 7:52. Nobody got this one. Some Pharisees are telling Jesus he can't be a prophet because he is from Galilee and no prophet has ever come from Galilee. They

are dead wrong. In II Kings 14:25, the prophet Jonah is "the son of Amittai the prophet, which was of Gath-hepher". Gath-hepher is in Galilee.

6. "...behold, I come quickly." Birsan: "Actually he is only breathing hard. But then again if he does come quickly it may explain the Virgin Birth routine." Nobody found this. It is Revelation 22:12, and a similar phrase may be found a chapter or two earlier. This is one of numerous promises in the New Testament in which the Second Coming is promised "soon". More specific verses promise this event before all who lived at the time of the crucifixion had died. Now, more than 19 centuries later, it should be pretty obvious that this promise went unfulfilled.

7. "And thine house...". II Samuel 7:16. Psalms 89:4 is similar, but not the same, Bill. Denise identified this. This is the prophet Nathan making that promise to David. The Kingdom and Throne of David were destroyed in 586 B.C., which is a long way from "forever".

8. "They gave him vinegar...". Matthew 27:34. Both cited this and the correct contradiction, Mark 15: 23 (Bill only; Denise, Luke says "vinegar"), which says "wine mingled with myrrh". Mark is undoubtedly correct. Matthew is overly concerned with making things conform to Old Testament writings which may or may not have been prophecies.

9. "He saith unto them,...". Matthew 22:43-45. Both cited at least Matt. 22:43. This needs some punctuation, which the K.J. did not provide: He saith unto them, "How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, 'The Lord said unto my Lord, "Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool."'? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" This is Jesus answering the pointed question as to his paternity. Instead of saying he is a descendent of David, he denies that the Messiah must be descended from David. He argues that David calls the Messiah "Lord", a term of respect not accorded by father to son. This whole line of argument is superfluous if Jesus is descended from David, and therefore suggests that he was not. This contradicts other New Testament claims as to Jesus' ancestry.

10. "There is a man in thy kingdom...". Daniel 5:11, which both noted. The speaker is the wife of Belshazzar (Bel-shar-usur), who says his father is Nebuchadnezzar (i.e., Nabu-kudur-usur II). Not so. His father is Na(r)bu-na'id. And, in fact, Belshazzar is also not King, he is only viceroy for his father. The author of Daniel ignores Amil-Marduk, Nergal-shal-usur, and Lashbi-Marduk entirely (they intervened between Nebuchadnezzar and Nabu-na'id, making the "King" Belshazzar succeed his "father", Nebuchadnezzar. The proto-Daniel was hopelessly confused.

YOU WON'T READ IT IN GRAUSTARK DEPARTMENT

A friend of ours sends the following item: "In the New York Times Book Review of March 19, one Leonard Lewin admits to the hoax of writing the Report From Iron Mountain. To prove his mala fides, he had planted two imaginary "references" in the footnotes. You will remember that this book purported to be the report of an oh-so-secret study group of the evil wicked U.S. Government which had decided that War Is Good. When he found that people doubted that the Report was real, John Boardman wailed that it must be genuine! It says so right in its own introduction! And last year he was proclaiming it as "impossible" that some benighted people "still" believed that the book was a hoax. Of course, knowing Boardman, he will probably deny that he ever printed those statements in GRAUSTARK, but he cannot destroy all the copies in collectors' hands, unfortunately. Heh heheheheheheh cacklecackleshriek!!!!!!!!!"

To add to what my correspondent notes: One has to be extremely careful what one believes that is printed in GRAUSTARK. Boardman tends to believe and report as fact only things which he finds congenial. He is very much like the proverbial blind man feeling part of an elephant. Another favorite harp of John's is the Senate Resolution for Captive Nations Day. This curious document lists every nation, real and improbable, subsumed within the U.S.S.R. during and after the Russian Civil War, from Georgia to Idel-Ural. This resolution, drawn up by someone whose knowledge of the Russian Revolution is full of many details but few facts, lists those nations which the Senate regards as "captive". Boardman, typically, claims that this resolution commits the United States to a war of partition against the Soviet Union, when in fact no such action is suggested or contemplated by the text.

This sort of thing goes on all the time in GRAUSTARK. On the other hand, John has a keen sense of humor, a witty writing style, and a wealth of trivia which he enjoys showing off. His biweekly 'zine is thus always interesting reading. Subs are 8/\$1. John Boardman, 234 E 19th St., Brooklyn NY 11226. I might add that his games are extremely well-run, often with good press releases. I recommend his 'zine. Finally, an article of mine, "The Improbable Alliance", is scheduled for GRAU 263, to come out 22 April. This deals with the problems of an Austro-Turkish alliance in Diplomacy.

DIPLOMACY GEOPOLITICS

Dave Lebling

[Ed. note. In EREHWON 64 we published How to Play Austria, an article Dave Lebling wrote three years ago. We sent a copy of that issue to Dave, since it was his article, although he has been relatively inactive during the past 2 years. Much to our pleasure, Dave responded with another article, which reflects his later thinking on the subject. Dave begins by noting that EREHWON's timing was good, because #64 reached him "two days after a game in which I was utterly crushed and mangled as Austria [in the first] two game years". He then notes that he still agrees with most of his early article, but for different reasons.]

There are really two Diplomacy boards on each larger one. They overlap slightly, but usually by 1902 at the latest the overlap has gone away, to be replaced by two separate games/boards that persist at least until 1905. The first of these boards comprises England, France, Germany, and sometimes Scandinavia, Russia's north and west, and Italy. The second board comprises Turkey, Austria and the Balkans, southern Russia, and sometimes Italy and the remainder of Russia. The word "sometimes" obscures the fact that the two major centers of conflict in 95% of all Diplomacy games are on a line from Norway to the Low Countries to the Mid-Atlantic, and second, in the Balkans and Austria.

What this means is that early in the game there is generally a drift away from the famous "barren line" of supply center-less provinces running from Livonia to Piedmont, and toward two other areas located closer to the edge of the board. This movement separates the game into two games. The general structure of the first game, which involves (again usually) England, France, and Germany, can take two forms, a two-on-one fight or a three-man alliance. The second can evolve in several ways, most commonly two on two. That is to say, except on rare occasions, the barren line is not crossed until later in the game. There are obvious exceptions to this rule (such as German or English war with Russia, or a Franco-Italian conflict), and I will discuss these later. Keep in mind that the general result after about five years is going to be two winners on one side of the line, and two on the other. After that five years, they will end up fighting, which means it's time to cross the line. That means that the side which sorts out its area first is going to cross that line first, and the side that crosses that line

first in strength is going to win the game. I say this because, as experience shows, the barren line is where defenses can be set up which, if they are not impregnable, are certainly close to it.

Summarizing, in most Diplomacy games, the winner, or the winning side, is going to be that side which is able to cross the line of defense first, and that side is going to be the side which first sorts out its area of the board.

Consequently, play should be with an eye toward preventing the line from being set up. There are two ways of going about this. The first is to form alliances that will cause your side of the board to be sorted out rapidly. One of these alliances is Russia-Turkey; another is England-France. The second method is to form alliances that will boost the chances of the line being crossed in force before anyone starts to set up a defense along it; to eliminate the line's importance, as it were. England-Italy is one of these alliances, or Germany-Italy, or Germany-Russia.

There are problems with both of these approaches. The first suffers from the fact that the "speed" alliances, while usually successful, do not always keep sight of the problem at hand. An example is the Russia-Turkey alliance, probably the single most powerful on the board, which tends also to be the first to bog down. A few fleets in the Med. can stop it cold, sometimes before Italy falls. And in the north, Russian control of Scandinavia is never certain, since it cannot be held against an English attack. In fact, the classic game of speed alliance is England-France vs. Russia-Turkey, where the "barren line" always ends up the demarcation, given reasonably competent players.

The second approach, which I tend to call the "unorthodox alliance" approach, suffers from violation of one of the first laws of the game: Don't ally with someone to move toward each other. The second law of Diplomacy also admonishes: Don't invite someone to surround you. Most of the alliances which break across the barren line violate one of the two preceding laws. This is not to say they can never succeed, but only that they are extremely dangerous.

With one exception all the "unorthodox alliance" approaches involve alliances between corner powers and center powers, which are always dangerous for the center power, no matter what the circumstances. The one exception is an Italy-Austria alliance, which is one reason why I believe Calhoun makes it a "special pair". An Italy-Austria alliance has a reasonable chance to break across the line early, and with some good subsidiary alliances, of doing well against Russia/Turkey. In addition, and I believe this is another reason it's a "special pair", Italy/Austria avoids the single most ruinous thing they can do with each other: fight. Early in the game, for Italy and Austria to fight is utter madness, just as it is mad for Germany to attack Austria early in the. I would say that Italy/Austria is a special pair by default, as the two powers doom themselves if they fight early in the game.

It is my opinion that the "two smaller games" model, and the ways of getting around it, provide a useful framework for studying Diplomacy alliance patterns. I would also say that if combined with the "center-corner" model of describing the powers, it is very powerful indeed.

Finally, let me say that the foregoing is not intended to be an absolute description of what can happen in a Diplomacy game, but simply a description of the general tendencies. One thing it assumes rather blithely is that all the players are of roughly equal ability, an assumption that obviously breaks down in the real world. It also tends to assume rather good communication between the players and is thus more a "Diplomacy" than a "Postal Diplomacy" model.

I would like to get as much input as possible on the subject of what

the "politics" or "political science" of Diplomacy is. Why do some alliances last? Why do some form more than others? How do you play good Diplomacy? etc. etc.

[Thank you, Dave. Mr. Lebling's address is P.O. Box 281, M.I.T. Branch P.O., Cambridge MA 02139.]

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. STONED. Paul Stone, box 485, Parksville, B.C., Canada. At least one game is open. The fee is \$3. Subs 10/\$1, will trade. This is the latest in Canada's burgeoning publishing complex.
2. LOMOKOME may be coming back! Paul Bond, P.O. Box 6477, College Station TX 77840, plans to revive the 'zine. Whether any of the old games are revived will depend on how many of the original players are still interested. Paul plans to contact the original players shortly. He will also do a new edition of the maps/rules. The Second Edition is still available from me for 35¢. If you are interested in playing Imperialism VII-R, contact Paul. For those who don't know, Imp.VII-R is a 6-player game set in Europe just prior to World War II (the missing Power is Austria). Each player begins with 7 units and there are 72 supply centers. Fleets may convoy more than 1 army at a time. Players who are eliminated obtain fortress islands in the Mediterranean and a fleet, with the implied opportunity of reconquering their homelands. You thus cannot be eliminated from the game.
3. ZOTHIQUE 49, just out, contains a new game by Tim Tilson, Americana 1860. This is a 5-player game involving a United States disintegrated into five federations. Movement is possible on the Mississippi/Ohio and on the Great Lakes. ZOT. 49 contains rules/map, and is available from me for 10¢. A separate edition of the game alone is 15¢.
4. NUMENOR SUPPLEMENT. Game numbers assigned since last issue: 1972AH, XANADU, Tom Leahy [X-7]. 1972AI, CARBON-13, Fred Winter. 1972AJ, FERICOLO, Larry Peory [P1/6]. 1972AK, JASTRZAB, Stan Wrobel. 1972AL, see page 1. 1972AM, LA GUERRE, Buddy Tretick [LRY-1972-BA]. 1972AN, ['zine not yet named], Mark Weidmark. 1972AO, see page 1. 1972AP, BOAST, Herb Barents [#4].
5. COSTAGUANA. Conrad vonMetzke, P.O. Box 8342, San Diego CA 92102. The second oldest postal Diplomacy 'zine in the world under the same editor (founded 1965) has a limited number of game openings. The fee is \$7, which makes it the most expensive in the country. Still, Conrad's games are always interesting and his 'zine is full of surprises. For those who can afford the fee, it is recommended.
6. IMPASSABLE. John Boyer, 117 Garland Dr., Carlisle PA 17013. This is one of the most promising 'zines I have seen in some time. John is an editor of considerable talent. His mimeo (ink, i.e.) 'zine is a pleasure to see and read. The game fee is \$5 and must be accompanied by a Game Application form, obtainable from John on request. Subs are 6/50¢ (this is good only until 30 April, after which the rate will rise and longer subs will be allowed). Will trade. This is one to get!
7. LONG DEADLINES set in this issue and in #68 are due to my upcoming doctoral exams, which are in May. I will not publish during that month, except possibly one or two brief items.
8. MU. Chris Schleicher, 5122 W. Carmen Ave., Chicago IL 60630. Has openings in my PRINCEPS, a game set in the Roman Empire. There is no fee. Inquire; this offer may have expired.

9. RATING RESULTS. The results of two rating systems have just appeared. The GAMERS GUIDE Postal Diplomacy Player Poll (in GG) and the ODD Rating List (in PFENNIG-HALBFENNIG). The former is similar to the Beyerlein Poll and the latter is explained in #66. The top 14 on each list are below. In the GG list, column "S" is the score; "N" is the number of ballots naming the player.

| GAMERS GUIDE P.D.P. POLL | | | The O.D.D. Rating List | |
|--------------------------|----|---|------------------------|-----------------------|
| | S | N | <u>Top Board</u> | |
| 1. Bircean | 98 | 8 | 1. | 1324 Charles Turner |
| 2. Smythe | 83 | 6 | 2. | 1278 Tom Eller |
| 3. VerPloeg | 67 | 7 | 3. | 1210 Pete Rosamilia |
| 4. Beyerlein | 59 | 7 | 4. | 1209 Doug Beyerlein |
| 5. Prosnitz | 50 | 5 | 5. | 1205 John Beshara |
| 6. Walker | 49 | 7 | 6. | 1201 Rod Walker |
| 7. Bytwerk | 40 | 8 | 7. | 1173 Brenton VerPloeg |
| | | | <u>Second Board</u> | |
| 8. Naus | 38 | 6 | 8. | 1172 Lew Pulsipher |
| 9. Pulsipher | 37 | 6 | 9. | 1109 John Smythe |
| 10. Phillips | 32 | 5 | 10. | 1101 Gene Prosnitz |
| 11. McCallum | 31 | 5 | 11. | 1082 Randy Bytwerk |
| 12. Brooks | 29 | 4 | 12. | 1081 Andrew Phillips |
| 13. Thomson | 25 | 2 | 13. | 1041 John Koning |
| 14. Peery | 24 | 5 | 14. | 1031 Mehran Thomson |

10. SOLD in the Clearance Sale: the LOMOKOME and ZOTHIQUE sets, as well as the 2nd Ed. Youngstown Variant rule/map set. & EREHWON 48.

11. MOVINGS. Buddy Tretick is now at the address shown on page 1. Later this month he will move to: 11710 Coldstream Dr., Potomac MD 20854.

gag...gag...ooooooooo!p:
HISTORY OF PODERKAGG

Part 15 -- The Life and Times of Duchess Salome I, Part 3

At 12:01, 2 April 1448 morning, Duchess Salome, her consort George of Antioch, and their respective supporters, faced each other with undisguised surprise and hostility across the dark and empty throne room. Empty? Well almost. Near the Throne was a group of wandering minstrels, the D. S. X. Machina Orchestra, Opera Company, and Freak Show. At a signal from Her Grace, they began to play a languorous melody (later made famous by Maurice Ravel as "Bolero"). Duchess Salome, dressed for sleep, was wearing her now famous Seven-Veil Nightie. Slowly, she began to dance.

Now, it should be understood that Duchess Salome was what people who are really "hip" call a "dish". As she undulated to the sensuous strains of the music, all in the room were awe-stricken. As she danced, Salome began to remove her veils. One by one she took them off; the minstrels of Poderkagg still sing of it. All around her, eyes bulged. Mouths fell open.

Around and around she danced. Wearing only the last veil, she approached her husband. Suddenly, taking off the veil, she crammed it down his gaping mouth. George instantly expired, since that last veil was impregnated with a fast-acting poison. Thus was the plot foiled! There was of course a grand orgy to celebrate. The minstrels still sing of that, too.

Salome subsequently had George's head removed and stuffed. It was prominently displayed in the Great Hall of her palace, still with the 7th veil in its mouth and the other 6 veils artfully arranged about it. She kept that head around to the end of her reign, as a subtle reminder to anyone who might get ideas.

This whole story has since become famous, in a somewhat distorted form. It was adapted to a Biblical setting by Richard Strauss for an opera of his, Salome. A few years later, Cecil B. DeMille and Oscar Wilde conspired to have the Strauss plot inserted into the New Testament, where it may be read even today.

Salome had a son by George of Antioch, Prince Acrophobius, who later became King Acrophobius II. He was placed in the crib with Prince Pandemonium and told to stay there. The crib was later enlarged to accommodate Salome's two sons by Mudgrub, the Princes Avaricious and Vindictive. Mudgrub of Pol-luter, Salome's now consort, whose desires were rather basic--primitive, even--lived until 1474.

While no further threats to Salome's throne occurred during her reign, a new threat to the entire Duchy appeared. These were the Turks, already ravaging the Balkans and threatening to capture Constantinople (which they finally did in 1453). How Salome met this problem will be the subject of Part 16.

MUSIC IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Part 2: In the Moog

One of the most significant developments in our century is the application of electricity to music. The most simple application is to amplify and distort the sound of a well-known instrument. The electric guitar is the best-known example of this technique. In fact, the amplification and distortion of sound is almost the sole musical (to use the term loosely) technique of the "rock" school. The result is about what one might expect: something resembling a collage of a cat fight and a construction project. Such musical virtues as may be present are normally well concealed.

Another electronic gadget, the computer, has been used both to compose and reproduce something which is billed as music. Whatever it is, it leaves the listener with a vague urge to smash things. The kinds of things one hears from Boulez, Stockhausen, Messiaen, Xenakis, and others, with or without electronic gimmickry, is so much dada. Monkeys pounding on pianos instead of typewriters.

Finally, however, there is the Moog. It rhymes with "rogue", by the way. It is one, the most sophisticated to date, of a series of musical instruments called Synthesizers. A synthesizer is an instrument which produces an almost infinite variety of synthetic sounds. An electric organ, for instance, is a primitive sort of synthesizer.

It should be understood that the synthesizer does not simply play a piece of music. It has a keyboard and must be played just like any piano, organ, harpsichord, or what have you. However, one also does not just sit down at a synthesizer and play it. While the instrument is capable of producing all sorts of sounds, it cannot do them all at once. In order to "play" the synthesizer, therefore, the artist must break down the piece into its component parts, decide how they will appear in the final product, and then produce them, one or two at a time. These parts must then be blended together into a single tape, and what you hear billed as the "synthesizer" is really that final tape being played, not the instrument itself.

The synthesizer normally heard is one of those designed by Robert A. Moog. These range from relatively simple creations to incredibly complex monsters. A few years ago, Walter Carlos used the Moog synthesizer to interpret some pieces of Johann Bach, as an artistic experiment. The resulting album, Switched-On Bach, has sold over half a million copies. It has led to an increasing number of follow-on albums. Our next installment will be a discography of some synthesizer performances available today.