

Montgomery Lectures On Contemporary Civilization

Howard Hanson

DIRECTOR, EASTMAN SCHOOL OF MUSIC
UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

MUSIC IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN CIVILIZATION
DEVELOPMENT OF THE CREATIVE ART
THE DECADES OF MATURATION
OBSTACLES TO PROGRESS



PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

AT LINCOLN

24998

25 JUN 52

1951

AGRA

Downloaded from www.jstor.org

THE MONTGOMERY LECTURESHIP ON CONTEMPORARY
CIVILIZATION

*is sponsored by the University Research Council
and published under the auspices of the
Committee on Publications of
University Studies*

Downloaded from www.jstor.org

THE MONTGOMERY LECTURESHIP ON CONTEMPORARY
CIVILIZATION

was established in 1946 from the income of the James
Henry Montgomery Memorial, an endowment
provided in 1941 by the Ora Clair
Montgomery Estate.

The lectureship brings to the University eminent
authorities to discuss topics of current interest
to the faculty, the students and the public.

The purpose of the lectures is to gen-
erate constructive thought on
contemporary problems.

MUSIC IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN CIVILIZATION

Downloaded from www.dbaulibrary.org.in

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CREATIVE ART



THE history of the development of the creative art of a country may be traced with considerable confidence. In music it is the chronicle not only of composers and compositions, but of facilities for the developing of the composer's craft, opportunities for dissemination of his works through publication, recording, and the like, and perhaps most important, of performances. These factors, together with an atmosphere which encourages interest in the arts both in their historical and contemporary development, present a rather complete account of the creative life of any period.

The problem of the evaluation of that creative art is infinitely more difficult, baffling to the professional as well as to the layman. The layman relies heavily upon the professional for evaluation of contemporary art. He may not care for the paintings of Dali, the writings of T. S. Eliot, nor for the music of Schönberg, but he respects, in his head if not in his heart, the opinion of the "experts." The experts, themselves, are not always entirely confident in their own judgments. Given a frame of reference sufficiently narrow, they may evaluate a given work in terms of that reference. Assuming certain criteria they may successfully assess a work of art according to given postulates. But the postulates may themselves be determined by personal prejudice rather than by any proven aesthetic "law" and the instinct of the layman is often at war with the erudition of the pundit.

In music, for example, there is a school of thought which judges contemporary music in terms of the following criteria. Assuming that evidence of "originality"—defined as novelty of

tonal relationship—is the most important element in judging contemporary music, the following syllogism may be worked out. The appeal of any music must be based upon the memory of past and pleasant aural experiences. For this reason new music which makes an immediate appeal to the listener cannot be "good" since its appeal can be due only to the fact that this new music reminds the listener of old music from which the listener had at some previous time derived pleasure. It cannot, therefore, be "good" music since, if it awakens memories of pleasurable music of the past, it cannot be "original." Since it is not original it is not good. Inverting the reasoning it follows that music which is disliked at first hearing is disliked because it raises no pleasant memories of past experiences. Since it does not awaken such memories it must be original, and, therefore, good!

The layman meets such reasoning with some skepticism since it contradicts his own instincts. His skepticism is furthermore supported in large measure by the evidences of history. He has heard early Beethoven which sounds to his ears strangely similar to Haydn. He has heard Brahms which reminds him of Beethoven, Wagner which recalls von Weber, Ravel which contains recollections of Debussy and Rimsky-Korsakoff.

The layman also realizes, however, that the importance of a work cannot be decided by a Gallup poll or an applause meter. He has, himself, too often had the experience of being tremendously impressed by a composition at first hearing only to find lack of confirmation of that impression upon a second and third hearing.

How then does Time, the great critic, winnow the chaff from the wheat, the genuine from the spurious? The winnowing has gone on through the centuries, selecting and preserving

works which we acclaim without hesitation as masterpieces and casting others into oblivion; granting to some a life-span of centuries and to others a life of ten years or a day. Even time can be fallible if the period under consideration is too brief, for one of the greatest works of Bach, the St. Matthew Passion, remained in virtual oblivion for a period of about one hundred years.

If Time is the great critic, he has many assistants: the experts—the professional evaluators, the performers, and the audience. The role of the first group is clear, for to it belong the scholar, the historian and the critic. The second group serves as intermediary between the first and the third since the successful performing artist must please at least two people, himself and his listener. The third group is the most important of all since it constitutes the ultimate jury.

This process of evaluation is going on constantly, sometimes consciously and more frequently subconsciously. The scholar in his writings may attempt to make conscious judgments. The conductor or performer in the selection of each program is, at least subconsciously, rendering verdicts as to his evaluation of the worth of the music. The listener each time he applauds, or refrains from applause, is expressing his opinion.

The criteria for these judgments are not the same and the judgments may be widely at variance. The scholar may over-emphasize the elements of craftsmanship. The performer may be too much swayed by the response of the critic in one case and the audience in another. The audience may give too much credence to its first impressions. There are also other influences, sociological, nationalistic, political and purely fortuitous, all of which add their contributions. Time, how-

ever, takes these judgments and opinions, allows them to play one upon the other, and finally, after many years or even centuries, hands down its pronouncement.

The progress of historical judgment—of evaluation by time—eventually produces a catalogue of music which we accept as the best of its period. There is every reason to believe that such evaluation is valid providing the period of gestation is sufficiently long. How long that period must be for complete validity is not yet determined since we are even today discovering music of unquestioned beauty from the sixteenth century, music which has remained virtually unknown for a period of almost four centuries.

Valuable as this historical justification of art may be, it is necessary to secure a more immediate evaluation of contemporary music. We do not wish to wait five hundred years to discover whether or not the new music to which we are listening is worthy of consideration. Moreover, there are many practical reasons why we must make contemporary critical evaluations no matter how unreliable they may prove to be in the light of future historical judgment.

I recall sitting a number of years ago with a group of musicians who had been called together by the cultural division of the Department of State to advise the Department on the preparation of a list of orchestral compositions by American composers to be used as a basis for cultural exchange with the countries of Latin America. We were all agreed that we should interchange only compositions which represented our best creative efforts. We agreed on general principles and criteria but when we approached the task of determining which contemporary music was "good" we found ourselves in hopeless confusion.

This disagreement among the experts is nothing new. One meets it in every prize competition where the problem is one of comparative judgments. I have served on dozens of juries of awards and have repeatedly seen the prize awarded, not to the work which any one juror considered the best, but to that which offended the smallest number of jurors.

About twenty-five years ago I proposed a study which would make use of what might be called the principle of current historical evaluation, in other words the determining of the trends of orchestral composition in the United States by a detailed study of symphonic programs over a period of years. This procedure, though by no means conclusive, has the merit of being factual and of enlisting the services of those critical forces to which I have already referred. It is, in effect, the opening of the curtain on the stage of time and the observing of these critical forces at work, of seeing the process of selection in progress. Since we are looking at a very short span of time, we must keep in mind certain co-efficients of correlation. A work may be immediately successful primarily because of the timeliness of the subject or because it is in the "mode" of the period. One composer may be at an advantage because he is also an able conductor and can serve as his own interpreter. Another may have geographical and environmental advantages; another may be temperamentally more aggressive in the propagation of his own creations, still another may have the advantage of position, influence, birth. Few composers have the advantage of all of these attributes, however, and the success of a composition will depend primarily upon the judgment of the conductor, the critic and the audience. The history of performance is in a sense the history of the critic time at work, and although it indicates that he changes his judgments from one

generation to another, it does give us a fascinating account of our own creative development.

Our record of the performances of American symphonic music goes back only to about the year 1850. America had had native-born composers since the time of the revolution when Francis Hopkinson, James Lyon and William Billings lived and worked. The early nineteenth century produced our first opera composer, William Henry Fry, and the only symphonist, George F. Bristow, whose First Symphony was performed by the Philharmonic Society of New York about the middle of the century. Both men were ardent propagandists for American creative independence and the account of their battles is graphically portrayed in John Tasker Howard's "Our American Music." This period also brought the thoroughly indigenous songs of Stephen Foster and the piano pieces of Louis Gottschalk, at least two of which, "The Last Hope" and "The Dying Poet" may still evoke our nostalgia.

Although the Philharmonic Society of New York, founded in 1842, had the honor of introducing the first American symphony—which never apparently went beyond the public rehearsal stage—it is the history of the Boston Symphony which gives us the first indication of the beginning of the development of an American school of orchestral composition. The Boston Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1881 and the first season brought the first performance of John Knowles Paine's "Prelude to Oedipus Tyrannus." Paine was born in 1839 and his works must be judged in terms of the age in which he lived. His contemporaries were Schumann, Liszt, Brahms, Wagner and Verdi, though his music seems to have a closer affinity to that of Weber and Mendelssohn, the latter of whom died when Paine was eight years old.

In addition to the music for "Oedipus Tyrannus," Paine wrote two symphonics, several symphonic poems and an opera, "Azara." The opera never achieved a stage performance but his symphonic works were played frequently in Boston, Chicago, New York and Cincinnati. Of these works the Prelude to "Oedipus" is the only one which shows some promise of remaining for any time in the symphonic repertory. I have conducted it on several occasions and have also recorded it. To me it still possesses freshness and charm. Although conceived in the harmonic vocabulary of the romantic period it is essentially classic in spirit, beautifully proportioned and adroitly contrived. It was not "advanced" music in terms of its own time, but neither was it "old fashioned."

As the first professor of music at Harvard College, Paine made an equally important contribution as a teacher influencing a great number of the young composers of his day, among them Arthur Foote, Frederick Converse, Daniel Gregory Mason and John Alden Carpenter.

An even more important name appears in the third season of the Boston Symphony concerts, that of George Whitfield Chadwick, whose overture "Thalia" received its Boston premiere in 1883-84. His most successful work, judging by performances, would seem to be the "Symphonic Sketches" which has been played by at least fifteen major orchestras and which is in the current repertory of a number of them. His "Melpomene" overture and the brilliant and dramatic Ballade "Tam O'Shanter" have also been widely performed. Chadwick's music is lusty, full-bodied, masculine, full of strength and humor. It is not derivative, but a personal expression of the man. Those of us who knew him, who remember the ever-present mischievous twinkle of his eyes, his salty humor and

pungent expressions, are easily able to recognize the man in his music.

I recall in 1930 presenting an all-Chadwick concert with orchestra and chorus at the Eastman School in his honor. Any concert consisting entirely of works by one composer is a stern test both of the music of the composer and the patience of the audience, but Chadwick emerged triumphant both as man and musician. Chadwick was also an inspiring teacher and counted among his students a number of future American composers, one of the most distinguished of whom was Horatio Parker.

The year 1885-86 brought to Boston the first performance of Arthur Whiting's "Concert Overture" and the year 1886-87 introduced Arthur Foote through his Overture "In the Mountains" and Henry Holden Huss through his "Rhapsody for Piano and Orchestra." Of these composers and their works only one work remains in the current repertory, Arthur Foote's Suite in E Major for string orchestra, which has been played many times both in Boston and New York and now seems to be making its way into the repertory of other orchestras. It is a classical work, beautifully constructed, exploring effectively the resources of the string orchestra. Another of his compositions, a work of great charm which is sometimes played, is the "Night Piece" for flute and string orchestra.

In 1889 there appears on the orchestral horizon the important figure of Edward MacDowell, whose "Piano Concerto in D Minor" had its first performance by the Theodore Thomas Orchestra in New York in March, 1889, followed a month later by a performance in Boston under Hans Gericke.

MacDowell, as has been frequently observed, is the first American composer to win wide acclaim in Europe as well as in America. His two symphonic works for orchestra which

have been most widely played are the concerto for piano in D minor and the "Indian Suite." It may be appropriate to comment at this point that here we have an interesting example of the validity of time as a comparative critic, for I feel confident that musicians who know MacDowell's music well would designate these two works as his best. They reflect the mature artist, personal, sensitive and impelling.

Although these two works remain in the active repertory it is difficult to understand why they are not played more frequently. Perhaps it is because most of our conductors are foreign-born and do not understand the peculiarly sensitive qualities of this music. The "Indian Suite" still stands in my mind as a land-mark in American music and the "Dirge" is still to me one of the noblest pieces of music which its period produced either here or in Europe. In its intensity, its depth of feeling, it seems to me to tower above its Wagnerian counterpart, "Siegfried's Funeral March." It may not be so loud, but it is more poignant and more genuine.

The D minor concerto is a work of surpassing tenderness, grace, and delicate beauty. It is music which should not be neglected, music of which we may be proud as an American contribution to beauty in sound and form, music to which we may rightfully pay homage as representing one of America's distinguished pioneers in creative art. Perhaps we may some day find an American pianist who is sufficiently interested in the culture of his own country and sufficiently gifted as an artist to reveal this work to us in all its beauty.

Two facts stand out in this summary of the first decade of American symphonic music. The first is the very small number of American composers appearing in the symphonic programs of the country, six in a decade. The second is the clear indica-

tion that the creative musical life of the United States revolved principally around Boston and the Boston Symphony Orchestra. Four of the six composers were New Englanders, three being natives of Massachusetts, and five of the six were first introduced to the public through the medium of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. If, therefore, Boston claims to be the hub of musical culture and the fountain-head of American symphonic music, its contention is well-founded. This tradition of support of the creative artist, begun in the 19th century, has been maintained through the succeeding decades of the orchestra's history reaching its peak in the magnificent work of Serge Koussevitzky, who until his retirement devoted his efforts to the American composer and gave him his distinguished support.

The last decade of the century adds to the list performances by eight new composers: Frederick Grant Gleason, Templeton Strong, Paul Gilson, Horatio Parker, Mrs. H. H. A. Beach—America's first woman symphonist—Frederick Converse, Frank Van der Stucken—in spite of his German name a native Texan—and Arthur Bird, in the order named. The works of Gleason, Gilson, Bird and Van der Stucken have disappeared from the active repertory. Templeton Strong is remembered for his somber and expressive "Chorale on a Theme of Hassler." Horatio Parker's lofty choral work, "Hora Novissima" remains in the choral repertory. Mrs. Beach's "Gaelic Symphony" widely performed in its day seems to have disappeared and she is remembered primarily for her sensitive songs. Frederick Converse has the honor of being the first American composer to have his opera, the "Pipe of Desire," produced by the Metropolitan Opera Company in 1910, but his symphonic works have been largely neglected. Horatio Parker's "Mona" was

also produced at the Metropolitan in 1912. It may or may not be a commentary on the times that two of the eight composers, Arthur Bird and Templeton Strong, spent their lives as expatriates forsaking their homeland to live abroad in an atmosphere which seemed to them more sympathetic to the creative art.

Four of the eight were introduced in Boston but the performing horizon was apparently expanding since two were first presented in Chicago, two in New York and one in Cincinnati. Boston was still the center but other centers were developing. The growth was small but evident.

The first decade of the 20th century adds only five new names to our list of performances: Philip Greeley Clapp, William Wallace Gilchrist, Henry Hadley, Arne Oldberg and Ernest Schelling. Of this group, Clapp and Oldberg have made important contributions as teachers. Hadley, an able conductor as well as a prolific composer, was widely performed during his lifetime. The work which shows the greatest vitality and which still remains in the active repertory is his jolly overture, "In Bohemia." Ernest Schelling was distinguished both as a pianist and conductor. His "Fantastic Suite" and "Impressions from an Artist's Life," both for piano and orchestra, were widely played, but his most popular work was his symphonic poem, "A Victory Ball," after the poem of Alfred Noyes. Written during the first world war and not produced until the war was over, it reflected the spirit of the time and was widely played by the New York Philharmonic under the fiery Mengelberg. It was a dramatic experience and a striking illustration of the relation of an art to its time as well as a moving protest against the futility of war.

With the second decade of the century the names of new composers begin to appear in constantly increasing volume: Edward Ballantine, Cecil Burleigh, John Alden Carpenter, Rosetter Cole, Eric DeLamarter, Henry F. Gilbert, Charles T. Griffes, Edward Burlingame Hill, Frederick Jacobi, Edgar Stillman Kelley, Daniel Gregory Mason, John Powell, Charles S. Skilton, David Stanley Smith, Leo Sowerby, Paul White and Emerson Whithorne. The number of names alone is impressive.

Most important is the growing evidence that our composers are beginning to break away from the German tradition which up to that time had been the model of much of our symphonic thinking. Though many of them are still more closely related to the 19th century than to the developments taking place in the 20th century, new styles as well as new names are appearing. Most striking perhaps is the example of Henry F. Gilbert who, breaking from all European tradition, wrote music influenced by the every-day forms of his time. His "Comedy Overture on Negro Themes" still shows surprising vitality and appears occasionally on our symphonic programs today. To the sophisticated ear his music may sound rough and uncouth but it is music of freedom and liberation.

This tendency to turn to indigenous melodies and rhythms is characteristic of two other composers of the period, Charles S. Skilton and John Powell. Skilton, though a New Englander by birth, went to Kansas in 1903 to take charge of the music department of the University of Kansas. Here he became intensely interested in the tribal songs and dances of the American Indian. His best-known work, the "Suite Primeval," reflects this influence. It has been widely played and still remains in the active repertory of some of our orchestras.

John Powell, a native Virginian, has found his inspiration in the songs of the south. Since he is himself a gifted concert pianist it is perhaps natural that his "Negro Rhapsody for Piano and Orchestra" is his most widely performed work. His overture "In Old Virginia" and his charming "Natchez on the Hill" reflect his preoccupation with the American scene which he knows best.

Charles T. Griffes may be considered to be the founder of the impressionist school of composition in the United States. His influences are French and perhaps Russian rather than German, but in such a work as his "Sonata for Piano" he establishes a tonal logic which is his own. His most frequently performed orchestral works include the notable tone poem "The Pleasure Dome of Kubla Khan" after the poem by Coleridge, the "Poem for Flute and Orchestra" and the delicate orchestration of "The White Peacock" from the "Roman Sketches." His death at the age of 36 from pneumonia widely attributed to fatigue caused by the copying of the orchestral parts of his "Pleasure Dome of Kubla Khan" is a sad example of society's wasteful neglect of distinguished talent in the arts. If society had realized how genuinely gifted Griffes was, I am sure that funds for the copying bill could have been raised many times over! Alas, the discovery was made too late!

Both Edward Burlingame Hill and John Alden Carpenter along with Griffes have also broken away from the Germanic tradition. Hill's delightful "Stevensoniana Suites No. 1 and 2" are still occasionally performed, as is his Poem for Orchestra "Lilacs," the first of the suites having been most often played.

Carpenter remains the most frequently performed composer of this group. In addition to his highly sensitive songs, his suite "Adventures in a Perambulator" and the ballet

"Skyscrapers," first presented at the Metropolitan in 1926, are his most popular works. The "Adventures in a Perambulator" together with the ballet "Krazy Kat" illustrate both his delightful sense of humor and his deft powers of musical characterization. The "Adventures" is a chronicle of a baby's impressions of his daily ride in the park with his nurse, of the big, burly policeman, the pleasant tinkling music of the hurdy-gurdy, the placid lake and the noisy but friendly dogs which greet him on his perambulatory excursion, and finally the epilogue of his nap and sweet dreams.

Cecil Burleigh is known chiefly for his "Second Violin Concerto" which is still frequently heard on conservatory programs. Edgar Stillman Kelley is remembered principally for his monumental "Second" or "New England Symphony." A great deal of his interest, however, lay in the field of program music—the "Alladin Suite," "Alice in Wonderland," "Gulliver's Voyage to Lilliput." I recall in the season of 1935-36 conducting a program in his honor. We were discussing the orchestration of the "Lilliputians" and I asked him some question about his use of the flutes. His reply was, "I think I should have used only piccolos. You see the Lilliputians were very small people." When I talk with some of our modern young cerebralists of today about their music it occurs to me that they might profit by some of the humor which the older masters possessed in such abundance.

Stillman Kelley was one of the first American composers to be appointed to a chair of composition which was founded not for teaching but for creation. In 1910 Western College at Oxford, Ohio, awarded him its Fellowship in Musical Composition, thus becoming one of the first colleges to assist the creative artist in a practical way. During his teaching career he

had as students many young composers, the most distinguished of whom is the well-known modernist, Wallingford Riegger.

David Stanley Smith, whose early overture "Prince Hal" was the most widely performed of his works, studied with Horatio Parker and succeeded him as Dean of the School of Music at Yale University. Daniel Gregory Mason, now retired from the MacDowell professorship of music at Columbia, was a student of John Knowles Paine, and, like Paine, Parker and Smith combined composition with an academic career. Mason is perhaps the last of the distinguished American romantic-classicists carrying on the Brahms tradition in this country. Only last year I had the pleasure of conducting a revival of his First Symphony—which by a curious coincidence was also being given a performance on the same day by one of the German orchestras. I found this early symphony to be remarkably fresh and impelling music which may well defy the ravages of time. A much later work the "Suite after English Folk Songs" is a creation of great sensitivity which shows signs of lingering in the repertory.

The music of Edward Ballantine and Rosetter Cole is seldom performed today though the former is pleasantly remembered for his witty variations on "Mary Had a Little Lamb" and the latter by his compositions for the organ.

Emerson Whithorne is best known for his "New York Days and Nights," Eric DeLamarter by his ballet "The Betrothal" after Maeterlinck, and Paul White by his suite of "Miniatures." Both Eric DeLamarter and Paul White again illustrate the firm place which humor has acquired in American music. In the compositions "They Too Went to Town," and "The Giddy Puritan," DeLamarter mixes history and humor in masterly fashion. In the final movement of the "Miniatures"

entitled the "Mosquito," Dr. White chases the erring insect to its final demise at the hands of the percussion player. I was once present at a discussion between a symphony manager and a conductor when the manager was remonstrating with the conductor against the inclusion of this suite on a symphony program. Said the manager, "This work is not sufficiently serious for a symphony program." The corollary would be I suppose, "At symphony concerts people should suffer a little."

The last composer to be discussed in this lecture is Leo Sowerby, the youngest composer to make his formal debut during the second decade of the 20th century and without question one of the most gifted. His introduction to symphony audiences came in the season of 1917-18 when his overture "Comes Autumn Time" was first performed by the Symphony Society of New York, under Walter Damrosch, and his "Set of Four Ironics" was performed in Chicago under Frederick Stock. Sowerby was then in his early twenties. In 1921 he was appointed to a fellowship at the American Academy of Rome and was for two years a colleague of mine at the Academy. His list of compositions is long, varied and distinguished. He is best known for his early works, the overture "Comes Autumn Time" and "The Irish Washerwoman," for his ballad "King Estmere" for two pianos and orchestra, his "From the Northland" suite, his symphonic poem "Prairie," the "Medieval Poem" for organ and orchestra, many organ works and contributions to the literature of the church, his magnificent "Symphony" for organ and his "Canticle of the Sun" which won the Pulitzer Prize in 1946.

The history of the performance of Sowerby's works over the past thirty years is an outstanding example of the capriciousness of public taste. In the third decade of the century there

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CREATIVE ART

was no American symphonic composer more widely and consistently performed. With the advent of the fourth decade, however, critical taste seemed to turn toward music which was more objective in character and the introspective, almost ascetic cast, of much of Sowerby's music was temporarily out of favor. This, I believe, is a passing phase and the best of Sowerby's music will, in my opinion, remain as an important part of American literature.

In this chronicle of the forty years of the American symphonic repertory from 1880 to 1920 I have tried to present what I hope has been a not too dreary account of the American composers who made orchestral history during that period. We have seen the roster grow steadily from the small but stalwart band of composers of the eighties to the already substantial company of the twenties. The visiting foreign conductor who was reported in the press to have said that the reason that he played no American music was because there was none, was more prejudiced than informed. We have also observed in this period the beginning of the composer's emancipation from the over-powering German influence of the mid-century and the emergence of independent musical personalities. With this liberation came also a new consciousness of music as an indigenous part of American culture evidenced both by the choice of subject matter and by its manner of presentation. I hope that I have also illustrated the value of the study of evolving historical criticism.

The soil has been well tilled, the seed planted and the first growth has appeared. The following decades were to see a tremendous development, more rapid and more startling even than that of the period we have discussed. In our next lecture we shall discuss the decades from 1920 to 1950 and, on the

basis of that study, attempt to make some prognostication of the probable future of American music. We shall also discuss some of the new aesthetic problems which contemporary music brings to the listener with particular attention to the subject of music as emotional expression.

Downloaded from www.dbraulibrary.org.in

IN my first lecture I discussed in some detail the history of the performance of American orchestral music from 1850 to 1920. In that discussion I attempted to show the tremendous growth in orchestral composition, particularly within the period from 1880 to 1920. I also called attention to certain interesting developments, the gradual breaking away from European tradition, the early influences of folk music and popular dance rhythms, and the rather frequent excursions into musical humor which were not characteristic of the European tradition. While doing this I also attempted to make a case for the study of what I termed the progress of historical judgment as particularly appropriate in the art of music.

During this discussion I made no special plea for the support of the creative artist because I am sure that would be unnecessary in such an audience as this. History teaches us, I believe, that there is no *need* for contemporary music at the time when it is contemporary. The audience of Beethoven's day was probably quite satisfied with the music of Haydn. The contemporaries of Richard Strauss were very likely happy to be satisfied with the music of Wagner. There was that famous old saying of a disgruntled listener to Strauss' music, "If it must be Richard, I prefer Wagner; if it must be Strauss, I prefer Johann!"

As far as American music is concerned I am asking only that we fulfill our responsibilities, that we develop our own talents and make our own contribution to the world's store of beauty. In this I have no feeling of chauvinism, for I be-

lieve that the development of the creative artist is the duty and obligation of *every* country where creative talent may exist. This is not a philosophy of exclusion, for as each country of the world develops its own creative talents the greatest of these talents are in turn poured into that great stream of music which eventually becomes a part of our international heritage.

A few years ago I had the privilege of inaugurating the Louis C. Elson lectures at Harvard University. In one of these lectures I undertook to enumerate the conditions in any community or nation for significant contribution to musical creation. Excerpts from this address were later published in the *Saturday Review of Literature* and I am venturing to recall them briefly here. These four essential elements for creative growth are, in my opinion, first a wealth of creative talent, quantity as well as quality, since it is difficult to find in all history one instance where a solitary master appeared. Nature with its characteristic prodigality scatters many seeds for each germination, many sprouts for each tree. So in art genius seldom, if ever, stands alone.

Second, there must be opportunity for the young composer to learn and practice his art, opportunities not only for study but for the hearing of his works. Third, there must be in such a period an interest by the performer in the presentation of new music. In a creative age new music is widely performed and widely discussed. Finally, for the successful stimulation of composition there must be an interested audience, curious to hear new music, an audience which has not settled down into the comfortable apathy of believing that all of the world's music has already been written.

There are evidences that with the beginning of the third decade of the 20th century these conditions either had been

met or were in the process of being realized. Of the quantity of creative talent there will be no doubt as we try to choose our path through an avalanche of names and attempt to determine which of these are most worthy of our discussion.

In education this period saw the foundation of the three great endowed schools of music, the Juilliard School of Music, the Eastman School of Music of the University of Rochester, and the Curtis Institute of Music. At the same time with the founding of the National Association of Schools of Music there began a movement for the strengthening of technical instruction in music in our American colleges, universities and conservatories which was to reach into schools in every section of the country. It was also at this time that the development of the teaching of music in the public schools, which was to become a model for general education in music over the world, began its spectacular growth.

In all of this educational fermentation the training of the composer was not forgotten. The student of composition entering a music school in 1925 found an attitude already much different from that of only ten years before, for the attitude toward music as a creative art was rapidly changing. I recall my own student days at the old Institute of Musical Art in New York City, and that great teacher and lovable personality, Percy Goetschius. I went to New York fresh from the Nebraska prairies intent upon becoming a composer. Dr. Goetschius was much interested in my youthful talent and suggested that I talk with Dr. Frank Damrosch, Director of the Institute, about the possibility of having my first orchestral work performed by the student orchestra. Dr. Damrosch, however, had also been informed that I had considerable facility as a pianist. Instead of asking to see my score, he asked me

if I would play for him. After I had played a Chopin Ballade he said to me with some asperity, "You have the talent to become a concert pianist. Why do you waste time on composition?" In telling this story I always hasten to add that this remark was made *before* he had heard the music. Later he became very sympathetic to my compositional ambitions and did actually read my newly created score with the student orchestra—in those days a very unusual procedure.

I suspect, however, that in the opinion even of the most able administrators of that day the tendency to compose was to be frowned upon as involving a waste of time, and the importance of a composer was infinitely less than that of a performer. Back of Dr. Damrosch's advice also undoubtedly lay the honest belief that all of the music which the world needed had already been written, with perhaps the subconscious corollary that if any music remained to be written it would not be written by an American.

Today there is not a first-rate school of music which does not consider the department of composition among its most important. Even the smaller schools of music today frequently have flourishing departments of composition. Most of them supply not only adequate instruction in the theory and art of composition, but also see to it that the young student has, whenever possible, opportunities for the performance of his works. This is a far cry from the student days of my generation.

In the field of performance the United States has always had more than its share of conductors who arrived from Europe the day before the orchestral season opened and fled back to Europe the day following their concluding concert, in the meantime taking very little interest in the development of the music of their adopted land.

With the beginning of the second quarter of the century, however, there was an increasing number of conductors who took an active, almost paternal, interest in the native composer. Many of the early conductors of the Boston Symphony Orchestra were generous in their performance of new scores. Theodore Thomas was like minded in his belief that new music should be given the opportunity of a hearing.

Leopold Damrosch, through the generosity of Harry Harkness Flagler, founded the Symphony Society of New York in 1878. His son, Walter, who became conductor of this society in 1885, was the first of the new generation of young conductors who believed in the responsibility of the conductor to the new art of his day. He was greatly interested in the American Academy in Rome which in 1921 established the first Prix de Rome for American composers where the fortunate recipient could for three years have the opportunity of working at his art under ideal conditions and free from financial worries. It was at the Academy that I first met him. He saw my latest work, a tone poem for orchestra and voices, called "North and West," and immediately invited me as an unknown young composer and conductor to come to New York and conduct my composition with the New York Symphony Orchestra. This kindness of Walter Damrosch was typical, and during his career many young composers owed their first opportunities to his generosity, a generosity which I am afraid we are all too likely to forget. Much of the new music he played I am sure he did not like, but he was true to his sense of artistic responsibility. Only a few years before he died I had occasion to see him about an award of the National Institute of Arts and Letters. We were both members of the jury and I had conducted the first performances of the awards

the previous year. We had a pleasant lunch discussing the planting of trees and shrubs, everything except music. When the time had come for the business at hand he suddenly said to me, "Hanson, don't you think it would be wise this year to pick out some young composers and give them an award for *not* writing any music?" Steeped in the tradition of German romanticism, and especially of Wagner, much of the "new" music seemed to him strange and unpleasant, yet his sense of the responsibility of the conductor to the living composer never wavered.

Even before my early performance by the New York Symphony, I had had the great advantage of having had works played both by the San Francisco and Los Angeles Orchestras through the kindness of Alfred Hertz in San Francisco and Walter Henry Rothwell in Los Angeles. Later I was to have the opportunity of hearing early works played by Ganz in Saint Louis, Verbrugghen in Minneapolis and Stock in Chicago.

Frederick Stock's contribution to the young composer was enormous. He was an artist who believed in the growth of art as a fundamental part of the culture to which it belonged. He had grown up in the Chicago orchestra under Theodore Thomas and when he became its musical director he carried on the pioneering spirit of which Theodore Thomas was the early embodiment. Frederick Stock was the musical father of his community, interested in its education and musical growth, in its young artists and composers. It was natural that during his lifetime Chicago like Boston should become a Mecca for the contemporary composer.

A discussion of Serge Koussevitzky's contribution to American music during his quarter century as conductor of the

Boston Symphony Orchestra would require a book in itself. Some time ago I attempted in a long article for the *Atlantic Monthly* to assess that contribution. I shall not repeat those observations here. It is worthwhile, however, to reassert in this connection that Dr. Koussevitzky represents the rare conductor who identified himself completely with the creative processes of his age. He has been, as a conductor, in a very real sense a creative artist. Many conductors have given to new music more than casual attention. Few, however, have been able to penetrate so successfully the inner aesthetic and spiritual meanings of a new score, to become so to speak co-authors in the revelation of new music.

To this task he has brought not only an extraordinary sensitivity to sound but a burning zeal and a profound personal conviction. One personal experience may serve as an illustration. In 1939 he performed for the first time in Boston my "Third Symphony," a large-proportioned, full-throated work written in honor of the tercentennial of the landing of the Swedes in Delaware. This symphony was by no means à la mode. Instead of being a thin, sparsely settled score, ascetic and parsimonious—economical to use the term of the day—it was generous, lyrical, dramatic and emotional. Its performance was received with enthusiasm by the audience but with invective by the critics. Dr. Koussevitzky's belief in the work was in no way impaired. He played the symphony in New York, played it repeatedly on tour, repeated it in Cambridge, and then played it again at a second pair of concerts during the same season in Boston, after which he recorded it! At least one of the critics completely reversed his opinion after a second, third or fourth hearing and the rest remained quiet—perhaps for fear that the indefatigable Koussevitzky

might repeat it again! Time will tell whether or not Koussevitzky's faith in this work was justified. Of his artistic integrity, courage and spiritual conviction there can be no doubt.

With conductors like Stock, Koussevitzky, Verbrugghen, Hertz, Sokoloff and Ganz all actively interested in him, the lot of the American composer in 1925 would have seemed a happy one, his future secure. There remained, however, at least one serious lack. The young composer whose work received favorable attention on first hearing might with some confidence expect his composition to be repeated by other orchestras. There were fewer major symphony orchestras twenty-five years ago, but there were also fewer composers, and a smaller repertory of American works from which to choose. When, in 1924, I returned to the United States from Rome, I brought with me my first symphony to which I had given the somewhat unfortunate subtitle "Nordic." Within a comparatively short time this work had been played from Los Angeles to Boston by the majority of the American orchestras. My conversation with young composers, however, indicated that there was a real problem in the securing of that first performance. This was particularly true of the composer who was making the difficult transition from the student cocoon to the great outer world.

Music is the only art which is completely dependent for its realization upon auxiliary forces. There are, of course, intermediaries in all arts, the publisher, the librarian, the museum director, and the like, but in no art is the creator so dependent upon their aid as in the art of music. For the manuscript of a score, until it is performed, is not music but only a complicated arrangement of visual symbols. The realization of an orchestral score by a professional orchestra is an ex-

pensive matter and no symphony orchestra supported by subscribers can devote much of its time to the playing of new scores and hope to survive.

The hearing of his music constitutes an invaluable part of the young composer's experience and since facilities for such hearings in the twenties were very limited the Eastman School of Music set up, in 1925, its now famous American Composers' Concerts. This was in effect the creation of a *laboratory* for composers, a place where the young composer might come and hear his works performed by a competent orchestra under conditions sufficiently sympathetic to give his compositions a fair test. It was desirable that these performances be removed completely from managerial and "box-office" pressure. This required money.

It was my good fortune to have as my superiors two great men; men of vision and creative understanding, the late George Eastman and Rush Rhees, who was President of the University of Rochester. They examined carefully the case which I presented and agreed that it was a worthwhile experiment. Mr. Eastman gave his consent to the financing of the project from Eastman School funds.

On May 1, 1925, the first American Composers' Concert was given in the Eastman Theatre. The program consisted of first performances of new works by Bernard Rogers, Quincy Porter, Aaron Copland, George McKay, Mark Silver, Donald Tweedy and Adolph Weiss. They had been chosen by a jury composed of Ernest Bloch, Albert Coates and myself from approximately fifty scores submitted.

The public reaction was favorable. Listeners began to discover for themselves the fascinating adventure of hearing new music. Sometimes they suffered, but they came again and

again, and in increasing numbers. It was interesting to hear the new music, to see the composer and, on occasion, to hear him talk about his own work.

The reactions, however, were by no means entirely favorable. Some felt that this "coddling" of the young composer was a waste of money. After all, was it not a tradition of good composers to starve in the garret and be "discovered" after they were dead? One ultra-conservative critic remarked to Mr. Eastman that the concerts had been going on for five years and he had not observed that we had discovered any Beethovens. George Eastman's answer was characteristic of the man, "If we discover one Beethoven in fifty years I shall consider this venture an enormous success."

Whether or not there were any Beethovens among them I cannot say, but many of the young composers whose works had first performances in Rochester many years ago have become important figures in the American music of today. Roy Harris heard his first orchestral performance in Rochester in 1926. Aaron Copland heard the first performance of one of his earliest works in Rochester in 1925. Ernst Bacon, Russell Bennett, Elliott Carter, Henry Cowell, Paul Creston, William Dawson, Robert Delaney, Nathaniel Dett, David Diamond, Herbert Elwell, Carl Eppert, Arthur Farwell, Vittorio Giannini, Walter Helfer, Werner Janssen, Harrison Kerr, Wesley La Violette, Otto Luening, Robert McBride, Colin McPhee, George Maynard, Douglas Moore, Spencer Norton, Quincy Porter, Wallingford Riegger, Bernard Rogers, Edward Royce, Lazare Saminsky, Robert Sanders, Elie Siegmeister, Charles Skilton, Leo Sowerby, Timothy Spelman, William Grant Still, Edwin Stringham, Randall Thompson, Burnet Tuthill, Charles Vardell, Bernard Wagenaar, Joseph Wagner, Adolph

Weiss, Mark Wessel, and Paul White, are some of the composers who have had first performances of some of their works in Rochester. Altogether in the past twenty-five years over a thousand orchestral works by more than four hundred composers have been performed at these concerts.

Twenty years ago an annual Festival of American Music was added to the original plan, a festival bringing out new works and repeating works previously performed. Although the first object of the concerts—to give opportunities to young composers—has always been preserved it has also been possible to perform works by established composers and to present to the public and to the students a cross-section of the creative musical history of the United States.

Every effort has been made to maintain the broadest catholicity of taste in the selection of the works performed to include everything from the experimentalists of their day to the conservatives, with the emphasis upon the great bulk of composers who do not belong either to the extreme "left" or "right." It has always been our aim to keep in the mind of the public the great historic figures of American music, men like Paine, Chadwick, Gilbert, Stillman Kelley, and MacDowell, whose music is too apt to be neglected under the insistent pressure of living composers.

Several interesting by-products of these concerts have developed. Of these the most important has been the creation of a center for the teaching of young composers through the provision of a practical laboratory for their development and I am proud that a great many of today's most gifted young composers are graduates of the Eastman School's department of composition.

Another by-product has been the publication by the Eastman School of Music of scores which seemed to be both of artistic importance and practical value, many of which have become a part of the repertory of symphony orchestras in America. Still another by-product has been the recording and broadcasting of American music.

The foregoing points up, I believe, the tremendous contrast in American musical life between the decade of the 1880's and the beginning of the second quarter of this century. Instead of a handful of composers fighting for recognition as Americans under the handicap of an overwhelming Germanic tradition which simultaneously fed and smothered them, we find a multitude of composers of many diverse styles and qualities. We find, also, new facilities for the performance of their works and a slowly awakening interest on the part of the public.

A discussion of the music which entered the concert repertory after 1920 presents great difficulty. In the first place much of it is still so new that time has not yet had an opportunity of proving either its permanent or transitory qualities. In the second place there is so much of it that a detailed discussion of the composers or their works is impossible. I can only mention a few of the composers whose works seem to have made, or are making a considerable impression on the modern orchestral repertory.

Two men in this group were born in 1874 and 1876, respectively, Charles Ives and Carl Ruggles, but their works did not become widely known until well into the twentieth century. They are, however, more at home with the younger names of today than with their older colleagues since they are both uncompromising individualists and the dissonances in, for example, Ruggles' "Men and Angels" would give pause to

the most ardent young radical. Charles Wakefield Cadman, well known for his highly popular songs, is best represented in symphonic literature by his symphony "Pennsylvania." Henry Eichheim, born in 1870, sought his inspiration in the exotic melodies and rhythms of the east and is chiefly remembered for his "Oriental Impressions" which has been widely played. Arthur Shepherd, born in 1880, is best known for the orchestral work "Horizons." Deems Taylor, born in 1885, is known not only for his successful operas "The King's Henchman" and "Peter Ibbetson," but for his picturesque suite "Through the Looking Glass" which has been played by virtually every orchestra in America.

The end of the century was apparently propitious for the birth of composers. Bernard Rogers was born in 1893, Walter Piston in 1894, Roger Sessions and the author in 1896, Henry Cowell, of tone-cluster fame, and Quincy Porter in 1897, and Roy Harris and George Gershwin in 1898. Piston, though well known as a scholar and teacher, has achieved his greatest popularity as a composer through the charming suite from the ballet, "The Incredible Flutist," and his moving and emotionally compelling Second Symphony. Bernard Rogers' short Soliloquy for Flute and Strings and his dramatic "Dance of Salome" have been his most frequently performed works. Roger Sessions whose recent symphony has been much discussed, is known by the symphony public through his early suite from "The Black Maskers." My own best known music at the present time is not the opera "Merry Mount" which was produced at the Metropolitan in 1934, nor my "Fourth Symphony" which received the Pulitzer award in 1944, but rather the second or "Romantic" symphony. Quincy Porter is known chiefly as an excellent writer of string quartets. Roy

Harris continues to be remembered by his much performed "Third Symphony."

Earlier I spoke of the many American composers who have successfully explored the possibilities of humor in music. This reaction against stuffiness in the concert hall was, of course, most clearly exemplified in the music of George Gershwin who employed the vocabulary of popular music in symphonic form. His "Rhapsody in Blue," concerto for piano and orchestra, and the symphonic poem "An American in Paris" have been universally performed. That American symphonic audiences are not averse occasionally to tapping the feet during a "serious" symphony concert is further shown by the fact that when Robert Russell Bennett, a gifted composer in his own right, made a symphonic metamorphosis of Gershwin's "Porgy and Bess," it was played within two years by every orchestra in the United States. An almost equally enthusiastic reception was accorded Bennett's "Scenario" on the music of Jerome Kern's "Showboat."

Randall Thompson's melodious and beautifully scored "Second Symphony" has been widely played and Herbert Elwell, who is a distinguished critic as well as composer, is best known for his early ballet "The Happy Hypocrite." William Grant Still, the negro symphonist, is widely known for his "Afro-American Symphony." Virgil Thomson, who has achieved distinction both as a critic and as the composer of the opera "Four Saints in Three Acts" has achieved his greatest success in the symphonic field with his suite from the film "The Plow That Broke the Plains." Other composers born in the last decade of the 19th century include Philip James, Werner Janssen, Harl McDonald and Harold Morris.

THE DECADES OF MATURATION

The beginning of the twentieth century chronicles the birth of George Antheil and Aaron Copland in 1900, Paul Creston, Robert Sanders and David Van Vactor in 1906, Burrill Phillips in 1907, Samuel Barber and William Schuman in 1910, Robert McBride in 1911, Wayne Barlow in 1912, Norman Dello Joio, Gardner Read, Morton Gould and Kent Kennan in 1913, Gail Kubik in 1914, David Diamond in 1915 and Leonard Bernstein in 1918. Of this post-1900 group the works of Samuel Barber have probably achieved the most performances with Aaron Copland and Morton Gould following closely. Paul Creston's "Choric Dances," William Schuman's "American Festival Overture," David Van Vactor's "Overture to a Comedy," and Kent Kennan's "Night Soliloquy" have also proven popular with symphony conductors.

There is an even younger generation of composers, most of whom are still in their twenties, who show great promise, for example, William Bergsma, Peter Mennin, Louis Mennini, Robert Ward, Vincent Persichetti and Ulysses Kay. Of these young men Peter Mennin, who has already at the age of twenty-eight written five symphonies as well as numerous other works, seems to be forging ahead as a creator of extraordinary vitality. Mennin as well as Bergsma, Mennini, Ward, Kay, Barlow, Phillips, Read, Kennan, Kubik and Diamond have all been students at the Eastman School, and I can, therefore, bear personal testimony to the tremendous creative talent in this group of young American composers.

From this account it will be seen that the years have brought forth not merely a list of composers, but a number of works which have found their place in the orchestral repertory. What is the nature of this music? Is it conservative, radical, consonant or dissonant? Unfortunately it is impossible to give

in a few or in many paragraphs an accurate description. It may be possible to gain an adequate impression of a new book by reading the "Book Review Section" of the *New York Times* or *Tribune*, or the *Saturday Review of Literature*, but in music no such painless method is possible. There are, however, certain broad lines which may be drawn.

Music today seems to follow in one of several general directions, though the composer may in certain instances seem to follow two paths at the same time and may follow opposite paths at different times. (1) He may regard music primarily as a means of communication, a method of personal expression, drawing heavily on his own emotional resources in that communication. (2) He may consciously or subconsciously follow folk patterns particularly in terms of melody. (3) He may be interested primarily in the dance and particularly in the popular dance rhythms of his own day. (4) He may be primarily concerned with the sensual beauty of sound. (5) He may be preoccupied with abstract rhythm. (6) He may be concerned primarily with the problems of formal construction. (7) His music may deny all implication of emotional expression and be solely the results of his own cerebration. The composer while following one of these paths may also develop special interests and techniques. He may be interested, for example, in the descriptive powers of music. He may explore music's possibilities for the expression of humor. He may be primarily concerned with music as dramatic expression and with the relation between words and music.

It will readily be seen that although within my seven roughly sketched headings there may be possibilities of the combination of one with the other, there is between numbers one and seven no possibility of compromise or agreement.

That there should be violent conflict between the exponents of the two opposite points of view is not surprising.

If we consider briefly the music of the contemporary American composers which we hear today, the logic of these classifications will become apparent. To the first group belong such composers as Randall Thompson, Walter Piston and myself, although both Piston and Thompson are also members of group 5, being more preoccupied with formal design as an end than am I, while I am also a member of group 4, being greatly concerned with the sensual beauty of sound. Roy Harris, too, belongs to group 1, but also is concerned with folk patterns as evidenced not only in his "Folk Symphony" but even in his more abstract "Third Symphony." Morton Gould fits quite clearly into group 3. Aaron Copland also falls primarily into group 3, as might be expected from the titles of many of his works, "El Salon Mexico," "Danzon Cubano," "Rodeo" and even his Pulitzer prize winning "Appalachian Spring." He is, however, in his non-programmatic works also a member of group 5, highly interested in abstract rhythmic problems. The later works of Wallingford Riegger on the other hand seem to fit securely into group 7. Roger Sessions would appear to be a combination of groups 7 and 6, since his cerebration is concerned equally with the working out of formal and classical designs.

Since man is not a static animal it is possible for him during his creative life to move from one pattern to another. I recall conducting an early work of David Diamond's, an "Elegy" in memory of Ravel. It was clearly scored but highly dissonant, so harsh in fact that one wag after the performance remarked to me, "How he must have hated Ravel!" Some years later I heard his "Romeo and Juliet," a score which re-

vealed a sensitivity which I had not suspected from the earlier work.

Which direction these young men will take remains to be determined. At the moment, unlike many of the young atonalists of Europe, they seem to be following a middle ground, neither eschewing emotion on the one hand nor experimentation on the other. Peter Mennin's work is an excellent example—strong, well-constructed, rhythmically dynamic but at the same time harmonically clear, melodically fluent, and emotionally communicative. This, I believe, is the new and young American music at its best, free both from clichés of the past and of the present, beholden to no "school" of modernism, but singing its own song with a voice that is confident, free and unafraid.

WE have seen the striking development of music as creative art in the United States particularly during the past quarter century. This intensification of the creative spirit has been accompanied by an enormous development in many phases of the art of music in America. We hear constantly of the gigantic strides in scientific and technological progress in the United States in the twentieth century, but I question whether that progress, though more startling in its implications, is intrinsically more amazing than our development in the world of music.

Twenty-five years ago music education at all levels was in its infancy. In the public schools of the United States there were a few scattered orchestras, bands, and choruses, and some desultory courses in sight-singing and appreciation. These were frequently taught by musical enthusiasts outside of school hours, outside the curriculum and often "outside" in every other sense. Music in the college was, with a few notable exceptions, in a sorry state and the impact of the arts on general education was negligible.

Today, public school music in the United States is a model to the entire world for there is, so far as I know, no country which gives to its children such rich opportunities for the study of music, and particularly for that type of practical study which involves participation in performance. Orchestras, choruses and bands comparable to those which abound in our schools are rare in foreign countries. And it is important to note that this development has taken place within a democratic frame-

work which to an amazing extent offers these opportunities to all regardless of economic status.

The development in the field of professional education in music is no less startling. Twenty-five years ago there were only a handful of schools of music giving adequate technical training in music. Those were, with rare exceptions, isolated from any possible contamination with the academic mind since the majority of them had no connection with a college or university. The universities and colleges, for the most part, felt no pain at being separated from the arts and so the education of the musician was likely to be conducted as though the musician were to take up his residence after graduation upon a planet peopled only by other musicians.

Today, in startling contrast, there are professional schools of music which form a part of important private and state universities, full-fledged conservatories attached to liberal arts colleges, and large numbers of flourishing departments of music within liberal arts colleges, many of which give instruction of high quality both to aspiring young musicians and casual students.

It is not possible to comment on the details of this development. It is possible to state now—and without chauvinism—that so far as technical proficiency is concerned the time is definitely past when a student need cross the ocean for technical training. Indeed, it can be said that it would be difficult to find in Europe today the high type of professional training available in certain of our American schools. For this development we are indebted not only to our own ingenuity but also to the many foreign-born Americans who have come to this country to give of their own talent, experience and artistry. Their contributions have brought to us the most cosmopolitan

points of view and we have been able through them to draw upon the musical wealth of the occidental world.

The development has manifested itself in many ways. Our symphony orchestras, which fifty years ago were essentially foreign orchestras, are today increasingly staffed with American-born and trained musicians. In traveling about the country I have not seen one major orchestra which did not have our students occupying important chairs in them. Under Edward Johnson's regime an increasing number of American singers have been added to the Metropolitan roster, and opera work-shops for the training of gifted singers are springing up over the country. Professional education has been largely taken over by American-trained instructors and the teaching of music has become closely integrated in the American university organization. In the creative realm our composers are coming into their own in the serious as well as in the popular field and the appearance of American music on our symphonic programs is becoming a fairly well-established tradition. The American artist is at least making inroads into that most difficult and challenging area of performance, symphonic conducting, and there are today important orchestras such as Cincinnati, Los Angeles, San Antonio, Dallas, and several minor orchestras which are directed by American-born and American-trained conductors. This would have seemed a wild fantasy of the imagination twenty-five years ago.

But it is my purpose today to devote my final lecture to a discussion of some of the important problems which have not yet been solved and some habits of thinking and patterns of action which we have developed which are obstacles to further progress. My account of these problems cannot be complete but I would like to discuss three important areas, music in

education, music in international affairs and music in business and economics.

The arts have been for some time reasonably well-respected members of the academic family, though for the most part in their historical and philosophical rather than their creative aspects. They should, I believe, be even more warmly welcomed, and welcomed in their completeness, for the creative arts constitute an important part of the chronicle of man, the expression of man's search for beauty, the creative expression of his spiritual hunger. They constitute not merely an intellectual exercise, or a study of history, or of creative techniques, but a study of man's spiritual self and its creative manifestations. The result of such study should be an increased sensitization to beauty, a deepening of the channels of emotion and the development of the student's mature powers of self-expression. We may therefore ask, "Are the creative arts in education fulfilling this mission?" To what extent is the student's spiritual life being deepened, made more sensitive, fuller and richer by his contact with the great creative minds of the past and present? Is his study of literature illuminating his mind with an understanding both of man's frailty and his greatness? Is his study of the arts sensitizing his spirit to the beauty that surrounds him?

If there is any failure, and I think we must admit that our teaching of the arts in the academic curriculum has been somewhat less than completely successful, the failure does not lie in the arts but in us. It is, I believe, fundamentally a failure on our part to understand the qualities which give to great art its spiritual vitality; a failure to understand the nature of the problem of instruction in the arts and to distinguish between the mechanics, the history, the technics of an art, important

as they are, and the creative expression which gives to art validity and meaning.

The art of music, for example—and this applies equally to all of the arts—calls for enthusiastic and devoted teaching. It might be possible that a well-informed but arid person could succeed as an adequate teacher of freshman rhetoric, but in the arts such a teacher could contribute nothing but boredom. For the arts are essentially of the spirit and their teaching must be imbued with the same spirit which created them. Whenever you find a class enthusiastic over the drama of Shakespeare, the poetry of Whitman, or the music of Palestrina you will surely find a teacher who has been touched with something of the divine fire which created those masters of drama, poetry and music.

Second, I believe that each of the creative arts must be approached in terms of its own intrinsic qualities and divorced from any artificial formulae which are extrinsic to it. As conservative educators we too frequently borrow patterns from one field of education, because they have been useful and effective, and superimpose them upon education in a new field, perhaps in order to give to that new field a certain air of respectability. In music we frequently refer to the practice of an instrument as being analogous to the laboratory period of the sciences because laboratory periods have become academically respectable, quite overlooking the fact that there is little if any similarity either in the problems involved or in the approach to those problems. There would be little harm in the name itself if it were not for the fact that having given the practice a respectable name we feel that the matter has been solved and thereafter make little attempt to analyze the very real problem of the relationship between techniques and skills

and the purpose which those techniques are to serve. In the same way, in teaching the appreciation of the arts we are frequently apt to rely upon the techniques of history which are probably valid, quite forgetting that the development of a sensitivity to any given art-form cannot be achieved solely by a knowledge of names, dates and terminology.

Third, we must—if the arts are to serve us—break down and destroy any artificial dichotomy which academic restrictions have built up. We must not, for example, divide music into appreciation versus participation; performance versus creation. I like to think of a remark made to me by the great American poet and historian, Carl Sandberg. In speaking of his monumental work on Abraham Lincoln, Mr. Sandberg said, "When I undertake the study of a subject I must become immersed in it." This is more than a casual statement. It is an educational philosophy. To get from an art even a small fraction of its possible contribution it is necessary to become "immersed" in it—in all of it. To get the full and complete meaning of the art of music one should not only hear it but sing it, play it, and if possible write it! Education which approves the study of the history of an art but frowns upon its practice, violates not only a basic educational philosophy but the fundamental unity of the art as well. Any sensitive student who has taken part in the performance of a great oratorio under an inspired conductor has had an aesthetic and a spiritual experience which could not have been achieved by years of study of the history of the composer, the form in which he wrote, or the age in which he lived.

Fourth, as the knowledge of the history and theory of an art should be accompanied by practical participation, so should participation wherever possible be accompanied by

creation. The arts and literature are essentially an outgrowth of the desire of the human mind and spirit to create. It is possible that music may have a more genuine meaning to the man or woman who has created a simple song than to an erudite scholar who has spent his life studying musical paleography. The obscure artist who has painted a few canvases may be closer to the spirit of Raphael than the curator of a great museum who has never attempted to hold a brush.

There is already too much evidence that we may be in the process of becoming a non-participating, non-creative race. In sports we are increasingly inclined to watch from the sidelines while eighteen hired men bat balls at each other. We set up huge athletic departments in our universities primarily for the sake—or at least so it seems—of producing a winning "team" which can be watched from the side-lines by cheering students and their slightly intellectually younger brothers, the alumni. Even in church we worship God vicariously through the sermon of the minister and the singing of a professional quartet or choir. Good congregational singing these days is a rarity. Why should they sing? Do they not have a paid choir for that purpose?

In the highest echelon of education, the graduate school, creation is almost non-existent so far as the humanities are concerned. The sciences are creative, the humanities are not. The sciences which might be excused for being statistical are not, but are rather engaged in blazing new paths, making new discoveries, working creatively toward the unveiling of new truths. The humanities, on the other hand, are engaged in counting the number of synonyms in "Paradise Lost" but making no progress toward a paradise regained, the paradise of new beauty as well as new truth. A doctoral thesis in the

humanities is still primarily in the field of history, criticism and analysis. In few graduate schools is it possible to submit as a thesis an epic poem, a drama or a symphony. You have probably all heard the waggish remark that the Ph.D. thesis is a "transference of dry bones from one cemetery to another." This criticism will in all probability continue to be valid in the humanities until our study of the humanities receives a transfusion of the creative spirit.

The reasons usually given for this curious situation are first, that the creative and scholarly qualifications are not always combined in the same individual—however, I add parenthetically that where they are combined it seems to make little difference to the authorities. And second, whereas a scholarly investigation can be evaluated in terms of its accuracy, the qualitative evaluation of a creative work is a much more difficult problem. I am not unaware of the reality of these difficulties, but I do most firmly believe that if the arts are ever to challenge the sciences for an important position in the institutions of higher learning in the United States, that challenge can be effective only if our graduate schools in relation to the arts and the humanities are shot through with and illuminated by the creative spirit, because this is after all their glory and their strength. The problems of the evaluation of scholarship and creative ability may, I believe, be met and solved; but without the creative point of view the arts remain sterile and second-hand manifestations of the human spirit.

In undergraduate education the arts are generally adversely affected whenever general education is conceived as a well-defined collection of basic courses; basic, that is, in the conception of the educators concerned. This theory, frequently referred to as the "core" of education, often does the gifted,

creative young student a disservice postponing his study of those subjects which are closest to his own interest until this "core" of education has been digested. As for me I believe that I should prefer to eat the apple and throw away the core!

An even greater danger may be the encroachment of Education, with a capital E, into the teaching and administration of the arts. The insistence upon countless courses in the history of education, principles of education, psychology—normal and abnormal—courses in methodology compounded and expanding in ever widening circles may eventually devour the art itself.

In the international field it does not require an authority to realize that the United States of America stands at the present time in a unique position, not only in its own history but in the history of the world. It seems obvious that we are required by the inexorable progress of history to exercise a leadership which has never before been required of us. We are reminded, also, that this leadership for the first time in world history has passed from one continent to another, from the races and countries from which we ourselves have sprung to a people who only a short time ago were considered as colonials, dependent, if not economically, certainly culturally, on Europe for their entire spiritual sustenance.

We have, I believe, been inclined to assume that the leadership now expected of us is primarily political and economic. This is an assumption which I believe has no foundation in fact, for responsible leadership cannot be fragmented, divisive nor partial. Our example will influence the world, not merely in material matters, but in spiritual matters as well. Our leadership in political affairs and economics will, whether we wish it or not, extend itself automatically to all of those fields

which are tangent to our material development, including the fields of philosophy, the humanities and the fine arts.

I think that there is no question that the direction of our leadership in material matters has been, on the whole, enlightened, altruistic and practically helpful. There is, I believe, no nation which has been so willing to give of its brains, its efforts and its resources to help other countries less fortunate than ourselves. This enlightened altruism in itself indicates an underlying philosophy which is primarily spiritual rather than material. Our willingness to share our material prosperity with the rest of the world has been amply demonstrated. It is our willingness and ability to extend our leadership in matters of the spirit that I would question.

I have for the past four years been a member of the United States National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and was a member of the American delegation to the conference in Paris. It became increasingly clear to me that the nations of Europe, almost without exception, regard the fine arts not only as the most important outlets of creative expression but as the most powerful propaganda agencies in their possession. The French Government, for example, relies to a surprising extent upon its contribution to the arts for political as well as cultural prestige. Russia's use of the art of music as a powerful agent for her own propaganda hardly needs comment. Even the United Kingdom, which we sometimes consider to be less interested in the arts than the countries of the European Continent, spends through The British Arts Council enormous sums of money in order to enable her artists and musicians to present their message to the nations of the world. The United States, on the other hand, has officially no conception of the vital role played by the

arts not only as agents of propaganda but as a means of promoting international understanding. As far as my information goes, I believe that there is only one man in the entire Department of State who has had professional training in the field of music and he is, as I recall, attached to the Division of Museums!

In the meantime we face perhaps the greatest problem of all, music as Big Business. In the past quarter century music has become very big business indeed, and in this development music has become to an alarming degree its captive. It almost seems at times that the art had, somewhere along the line, been lost in the machinery. Even the artist has become a property to be packaged and sold to Timbuctoo and Walla Walla. The progress of art is determined not by the practitioners of the art but by the manager, the impresario, the recording and broadcasting companies—and over all stretches the beneficent hand of the Musicians' Union.

When the miracle of radio broadcasting first made its appearance, the musician dreamed dreams of days to come when the finest of music would be available to the remotest village. Those dreams have been proven somewhat illusory since, although the independent stations offer programs of recorded music of importance, the amount of good music on the networks has steadily declined. Frequency modulation broadcasting, hailed as a boon to the broadcasting of good music, has in many cases, as I have before remarked, been used to allow us to hear "Portia Facing Life" with greater fidelity than she had ever faced it before!

In the field of recording the situation is now more deplorable for at least one great company would seem to have sold its soul almost completely to commerce even to the extent

of removing from its catalogue recordings of great importance to the educator and the musician because such recordings cannot compete in sales volume with "The Thing." At the same time the Musicians' Union for understandable reasons has almost completely priced itself out of the recording market. The result has been that the majority of recording is done abroad and imported to the United States to the great loss not only of the orchestral musician but the American artist and the American composer who must see his music gather dust on the shelf while the music of his foreign colleague is recorded abroad at a fraction of the cost and exported to America. This curtailment of American recording is particularly tragic for the educator since the record and the phonograph are to the musician what the microscope is to the biologist, the telescope to the astronomer, and the slide rule to the mathematician. And now we have television, that anti-social invention which promises to put the final quietus on the dying art of conversation and to reduce us all to a generation of permanent sitters. I have always been an advocate of private enterprise in American broadcasting and allied industries, preferring the ills that we know to those which might come under a bureaucratic government control. It is apparent, however, that private enterprise in the business of music must develop a maturity and a sense of responsibility which does not yet seem to be in evidence.

I would like to conclude by voicing my belief that the arts, if they are to become effective ministers to the well-being of man, must be undergirded with a sociological and, if you will, a moral viewpoint. We have developed over the past decades in our desire to become original and individualistic, a curious philosophy that the arts do not after all belong to the common

OBSTACLES TO PROGRESS

man. It seems at times that the composer is writing only for other composers, that the essayist is writing only for other essayists, and that the painter is painting only for other painters. In the development of techniques we seem at times to have forgotten the basic fact that the arts are essentially communicative; that their prime function is to *communicate* the creative thought of the artist to his fellowmen. To the extent that that communication does not reach its ultimate goal it seems to me that the art itself loses its effectiveness. And yet we seem to come in this latter day to a point of view where for the writer everything is important except the meaning of words, where to the musician everything is important except the beauty of the sound, where for the painter everything is important except the beauty of sight. We write poetry which can be appreciated only with the use of a glossary, painting which can be understood only by a mathematician, and music which can be heard only through a process of geometric analysis. This may be technical progress but is it spiritual progress?

The arts cannot serve Man solely as self-centered, self-conscious, self-seeking entities in society. Their mission is too vital, their message too important. In these days when the spirit of man needs beauty and inspiration as never before, the arts, if they are to survive, cannot fail their responsibility. The artist may well read and re-read a passage almost 2000 years old, but eternally true: "By their fruits shall you know them. For a good tree bringeth forth good fruit. For there is no good tree that bringeth forth corrupt fruit; nor again a corrupt tree that bringeth forth good fruit. For each tree is known by its fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes. The good man out of