DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 316 24 EA 002 680

AUTHOR Lillehaug, Leland A.
TITLE Examining the Composer--Audience Gap in Contemporary Music. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Augustana Coll. Association, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-8-F-098
PUB DATE 8 Jun 69
GRANT OEG-6-9-008098-0047(057)
NOTE 82p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.20
DESCRIPTORS *Audiences, *Communication Problems, Concerts, Interviews, Listening Habits, *Music, *Musical Composition, *Music Education, Musicians, Music Theory, Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

To verify the existence of a communication gap between the contemporary music composer and his general listening audience and to assess the scope and causes of the gap, interviews were conducted with a cross-section of composers, performers, conductors, educators, and listeners throughout the nation. During the 9-month study, (September 1968-June 1969) structured interviews with 231 subjects were supplemented by informal conversations with hundreds of people. Although opinion was divided as to the causes, respondents generally agreed that a large gap exists between nonconservative contemporary composers and the general audience. The findings suggest several methods for bridging the gap, including composer-performer symposia, better teacher training in 20th-century music, more quality live performances of new music, creation of college-community resource centers, increased use of news media to provide information and recordings of 20th-century music, and inclusion of courses on new music in the curricula of schools and colleges. (JH)

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 8-F-098
Grant No. OEG-6-9-008098-0047 (057)

"EXAMINING THE COMPOSER - AUDIENCE GAP IN CONTEMPORARY MUSIC"

Project Director: Dr. Leland A. Lillehaug

The Augustana College Association
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57102

June 8, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

CONTENTS

	PREFACE	vii
	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
	SUMMARY	1
	PART ONE. MAJOR TOPICS OF STUDY	
I.	BACKGROUND FOR STUDY	5
II.	METHODS	7
III.	THE "CONTEMPORARY COMPOSER" AND "GENERAL AUDIENCE"	9
IV.	THE COMPOSER AND THE GAP	11
V.	THE COMPOSER-AUDIENCE GAP. THE INTERMEDIARIES	24
VI.	THE AUDIENCE AND THE GAP	32
VII.	THE COMPOSER CREATES--DOES HE THINK OF THE LISTENER?	36
VIII.	BRIDGING THE GAP	38
	PART TWO. RELATED TOPICS	
IX.	MIXED MEDIA AND ELECTRONIC MUSIC	44
X.	SHOULD MUSIC BE EXPLAINED?	46
XI.	THE PROBLEM OF NOTATION	48
XII.	WHO IS THE "NEW MUSIC" AUDIENCE?	50
	PART THREE. FINAL	
XIII.	CONCLUSIONS	51
XIV.	RECOMMENDATIONS	52
	NOTES ON SOURCES	54
	REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY	60

APPENDIXES

1. List of guide questions 63

2. Persons interviewed, those responding to correspondence, or otherwise contacted regarding the project. 66

3. Institutions visited or represented by respondents 72

4. Professional organizations visited 74

5. Musical performances attended 75

6. Securing contemporary music for performance 78

PREFACE

The author spent the school year 1968-69 attempting to ascertain the presence and scope of the gap between certain areas of contemporary musical composition and the general audience.

Interviews were conducted with composers, conductors, performers, teachers, and listeners throughout the United States. When interviews were not possible, correspondence was used. Additional information, previous to and during the study, was provided by reading, attending live performances, and listening to recordings.

Further details are contained in Chapter I (Background for the study), Chapter II (Methods), and Chapter III which introduces the main body of the material and defines the major terms.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses his thanks and appreciation to those Augustana College colleagues whose encouragement and help resulted in the undertaking of this personally rewarding project: Dr. C. L. Balcer, Floyd Florey, Dr. Don Fryxell, Jean Helland, Tom Kilian, J. Earl Lee, Dr. William Matthews, Dr. Arthur Olsen, Verlyn and Helen Smith, and Dr. Elliot Thorson; to Joan Nelson for assistance in typing and to my wife, Ardis, for her encouragement and assistance; to Mrs. Nancy Bloomer for her constructive comments; to those musicians throughout the nation who previous to the project's beginning offered support: William Bergsma, Eunice Boardman, Will Gay Bottje, Philip Browne, George Crumb, Aurelio de la Vega, Merrill Ellis, Donald Erb, Richard Hervig, Jack McKenzie, Nathan Rubin, Ralph Shapey, and George Wilson.

Thanks also for the many persons (listed in Appendix 2) who assisted so generously by granting interviews or by providing information. Many friendships were established which will continue in the future.

Failure to quote a person interviewed should in no way be interpreted to mean that his assistance was of any less value than those who were quoted directly!

SUMMARY

Description of the problem, scope, and objectives of the study. During the past five years the writer has become increasingly aware of a growing concern and interest in contemporary music among musicians and "laymen" listeners alike. Many music lovers have expressed a frustration in not being able to comprehend and enjoy much of the "serious" composition of today. Normally, the question follows, "Is the problem with me, with the composer, or with both of us?" They are asking, "Is there a gap between many contemporary composers and the general audience today?"

During the course of this year the writer attempted to verify the presence and scope of the gap, its causes, comparisons with other periods, variation according to geographic location, and possible means of bridging the gap.

Related topics included the composer's relationship to the audience during the process of composition, a consideration of the problems of the listener when hearing new music, possible solutions to the problems, and problems of the composer.

Relationships of composers to performers and other intermediaries were investigated and a brief examination was made of mixed media, electronic music, explanations of music during performances, the problems of notation, and the opinions regarding the makeup of the "new music" audience.

Methods. The writer felt that the answers to the questions could best be obtained by direct personal contact with a cross-section of composers, performers, conductors, educators, and listeners throughout the nation. Correspondence was used in some cases with interested parties who could not be reached for personal interview.

Persons interviewed and contacted represented 20 states and 79 school systems, colleges, and universities. Twenty-one professional centers or organizations were visited. A total of 231 persons responded through personal interview or correspondence. The author attended a total of seventy-one live performances. Reading and recordings provided additional insights and information.

In addition, the author visited with hundreds of people--in buses, trains, and airplanes; at conventions; in hotel lobbies, restaurants, and homes. Although this procedure may vary somewhat from traditional research procedures, it has given the writer a feeling of the pulse of the nation--a feeling of the attitudes of the musician and the man in the street toward music.

A series of guide questions (see Appendix 1 of study) were used in the interviews, but the conversations were not restricted to these. The tape recorder and/or written notes were used to record information.

Although the patterned interview served as the main research device, information gained from personal observation, contemporary publications, conversations, and the hearing of musical performances will be included when relevant.

Responses were grouped and analyzed.

Results. In the opinion of the writer, the study showed that a rather large gap exists between non-conservative contemporary composers and the general audience. Although most respondents "felt" that the gap is greater today than in other periods of music history, there was a reticence to speak conclusively because of a lack of objective evidence of its size in other periods.

This gap seems to be present rather equally throughout the nation.

Opinion was divided as to the causes. Some felt that composers had gone too far, too fast in departing from traditional procedures. The majority of respondents felt that listeners must learn the new language and make a greater attempt to follow the composer in his artistic quest.

A very strong majority felt that work must be done with youth to help them understand and appreciate new music and to develop an ability to differentiate between good and bad music.

Although composer-performer relationships are good in some instances, antagonisms also exist. Performers rebel against playing material which does not fit established "musical" concepts. Performers are criticized for being lazy, ultra-conservative, and giving poor performances.

An analysis of the gap and its relationships from the standpoint of the composer, performer, and audience is made in consecutive chapters (IV, V, and VI).

Major causes of listener problems include lack of familiarity and exposure, failure to become acquainted with the new language, the resistance to accepting sound as sensation or experience, and failure to realize one's expectations. Composers tend to label more sounds or combinations of sounds as "musical" than do listeners. Eighteen additional reasons are listed.

It is generally agreed that the audience is conditioned only to music which is tonal, based on repetition, and is essentially homophonic.

Bridging the gap. Methods for bridging the gap are chiefly concerned with attempts to assist the audience. Many of the suggestions relate to the roles that may be played by schools, colleges, and universities.

Suggestions include more listening to new music, composer-performer symposia, better teacher training in twentieth-century music,

and more quality live performances of new music. Additional recommendations are the inclusion of a greater percentage of new music in programming, creation of college-community resource centers, attempts to persuade good composers to write for youth, use of news media to reach the public with information and recordings of twentieth-century music, and inclusion of courses on new music in the curricula of schools and colleges.

A controversial topic is whether or not the gap is greater now than in other periods. The feasibility of such a study should be determined.

The recommendation of the writer is not that we blindly follow the avant-garde composer wherever he may lead. Rather, it is that the listening public must be much better musically informed than it is so that judgments of quality are possible. An educated public who can spot and expose charlatan "composers" can do much to encourage and support the good composers.

Even though there may be few giants in the field of music composition today, there are, contrary to a body of opinion, good composers. There is also much activity in composition throughout our country. Although it is impossible to predict from which soil our future masters will spring, the presence of the seed and the elements for nurture which are present in our society will, hopefully, bear fruit. This statement is made with the knowledge of the problems and causes for pessimism which exist.

Educational institutions must continually redefine their goals and alter their teaching procedures when necessary. Music education has not always reacted as well to new ideas and procedures as have other subject-matter fields. We must be aware that we are nearly three-quarters of the way through the twentieth century!

It is hoped that the information contained and the questions asked and partially answered in this report may serve as a stimulation to thought and action.

PART ONE. MAJOR TOPICS OF STUDY

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

During the past five years the writer has become increasingly aware of a growing concern and interest in contemporary music among musicians and "laymen" listeners. Many music lovers have expressed a frustration in not being able to comprehend and enjoy much of the "serious" composition of today. Normally, the question follows, "Is the problem with me, with the composer, or with both of us?" They are asking, "Is there a gap between many contemporary composers and the general audience today?"

Because of the interest generated whenever this topic was discussed, the author chose to spend his sabbatical year 1968-69 in a study of the topic.

The major topics of investigation during the course of the research project were as follows:

1. Is there a gap between the composer of "serious" contemporary music and the general audience? The writer objects to the use of the word "serious" to designate non-pop music but has found that it is the designation which seems to be most easily understood.

2. If a gap is present, what are its causes?

3. Is the gap greater now than in other periods of musical history, and if so, what are the reasons? It is realized that a complete answer to this question may go beyond the time limitations of this project.

4. If such a gap exists, is it essentially the same throughout the nation, or does it vary according to geographical location?

5. How do composers view the audience? Does the composer think of the listener when he writes? Should he, or does he, make any attempt to assist the listener?

6. If a gap exists, should attempts be made to bridge the differences? If so, what are the most effective methods of doing it?

7. What elements of "new music" give most listeners the greatest problems? What can be done to eliminate or lessen these problems? What can the listener do for himself?

8. What are the directions of contemporary music?

Included in Chapter V is a discussion of the relationship of the composer to the performer and other intermediaries. In some circles this is of even greater concern than that of the composer and the audience. Are performers reticent to rehearse and perform new music? Do composers fail to understand the professional performer and his problems? Are composers seeking to eliminate the performer? How can the performer prepare himself to play (sing) the new music?

Associated with the performer is the problem of new notational procedures used by some composers. Should and can composers standardize notational symbols rather than allowing a proliferation of them? (See Chapter XI.)

One also asks, "what are the possibilities of electronic music and mixed media?" (Chapter IX.) Does explaining new music help "sell" it? (Chapter X.) Who is the new music audience? (Chapter XII.)

The main thrust of the study was considered to be an information-gathering function in relation to the hypothesis that there is a rather wide gap between the contemporary composer and the general audience.

The writer felt that musicians are interested in what colleagues throughout the nation are thinking--not only among colleagues in a restricted field but embracing composers, conductors, performers, educators, and laymen. It was felt that a school year spent talking to people in all these areas might result in a statement of the situation as represented by a possible consensus. If a remedial procedure or procedures are desirable and possible, suggestions might be forthcoming for the implementation of these procedures. This is of special interest to music education in terms of curriculum, performance, and goals.

Finally, the author has asked what function can or should educational institutions play in the field of twentieth-century music. The century is already 70 per cent gone. The problems must soon be ascertained and attacked if we are to find any solutions before the twenty-first century is upon us.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

Introduction. The writer felt that the answers to the questions could best be obtained by direct personal contact with a cross-section of composers, performers, conductors, educators, and listeners throughout the nation. Correspondence was used in some cases with interested parties who could not be reached for personal interview.

Persons interviewed and contacted represented 20 states, 79 school systems, colleges, universities, and various professional centers. A total of 231 persons responded through personal interview or correspondence. As is to be expected, other contacts were attempted but no answers were received to the correspondence.

The writer attended 71 concerts or performances during the course of the year. A listing of the persons appears in Appendix 2, and the musical performances in Appendix 5. Institutions and professional centers are found in Appendixes 3 and 4.

In addition, the author visited with hundreds of people--in buses, trains, and airplanes; at conventions; in hotel lobbies, restaurants, and homes. Although this procedure may vary somewhat from traditional research procedures, it has given the writer a feeling of the pulse of the nation--a feeling of the attitudes of the musician and the man in the street toward music.

It may appear that the author's home region in the Midwest has been slighted somewhat. Because of the time limits of the project, the author chose to visit parts of the nation with which he was less familiar in terms of persons, procedures, and attitudes. It seems easier to feel the pulse of an area in which one has lived much of his life.

A series of guide questions were used in the interviews but the conversations were in no way restricted to these. The tape recorder was used in some interviews--not in others. The advantages of the tape recorded interview are obvious; the disadvantages are the reticence of some people to talk freely with a microphone and the additional and considerable time necessary for the interviewer to transcribe the conversation following its termination. Careful note taking proved, in most cases, to be the preferable procedure.

The friendship and hospitality on the part of musicians throughout the nation was beyond expectations. Nearly 100 per cent of those individuals contacted made themselves available for the requested interview. This confirmed a previously held opinion that we human beings are willing to spend an hour in conversation but find it more difficult to answer correspondence.

Although the patterned interview served as the main research device, information gained from personal observation, contemporary publications, conversations, and the hearing of the musical performance will be included when relevant.

Treatment of research findings. The writer has not attempted to constrain the responses so as to fit a statistical model but seeks to gain direction from them. This is an area which defies statistical description.

The responses obtained from the interview were categorized into natural groupings related to type of response. For the most part, key words or ideas were the specific determiners of classifications. Treatment of the groupings have formed the basis for the writer's analysis.

Judgmental inference of response. The writer recognizes that there is normally a polarity or range of response from one extreme to another. The purpose of the study, as stated previously, is to attempt to ascertain the existence and amount of the gap between the contemporary composer and general audience. One seeks to determine, if possible, a consensus among composers, performers, conductors, educators, and listeners. It is further recognized that the writer would have personal perceptions and biases which would shape his inferences. It is believed however, that his own training and experience would permit him to approach the data with an open mind.

Audience response. Responses of individuals to specific performances have been obtained by talking to them at intermission and following the performance, examination of press reviews, and the writer's observation of the audience reaction during the performance. This included an interview with one couple who walked angrily out of a concert. The writer has performed in and conducted hundreds of concerts during his career and feels that he has gained a certain ability to detect audience reaction through applause and watching physical responses, or lack of them, of the members of the audience.

CHAPTER III

THE "CONTEMPORARY COMPOSER" AND "GENERAL AUDIENCE"

Introduction and definition of terms. Even though we are now 70 per cent of the way through the twentieth century, the music of the past fifty years, or even of the entire century, seems to pose listening problems to many people. It has been said that the musical language of the nineteenth century has been so deeply ingrained in our senses that deviations from those norms are often met with distrust--if not rejection and scorn.

It is generally agreed that we must soon redefine certain terms in the field of music. The term "contemporary composer" is causing a great semantic problem at this time. Barney Child's witty comment that contemporary composers are from the "upper dregs" of society may facetiously define the composer's status but was not meant to define the term. Nor does the definition that "he is a composer living in our own time" provide us any insight into the great difference in styles between composers writing today. For purposes of our investigation of the gap, we shall restrict our study to the composers who designate themselves "middle of the roaders" to those of the avant-garde. Because the extremely conservative composer continues to use materials which are relatively familiar to his audience, the chance of the gap existing would be considerably less. This does not in any way postulate a judgment of quality as concerns the various styles.

The "general audience" offers still another problem in semantics. The writer, after a year of travel throughout the nation, believes that it is possible to speak of a general audience which will be basically the same in most regions of the nation. This excludes concert audiences which are, by their defined natures, specialized. Examples include the fine Monday Evening Concerts in Los Angeles, concerts of experimental music, and programs designed to attract only a very small segment of the listening public. The writer designates a general audience as a group of people interested sufficiently in music to attend concerts and/or purchase recordings. Although the pop music and art music fields seem to be approaching each other in some respects, our definition excludes the listener who is interested only in the pop field.

Such a general audience, in the opinion of the writer, might just as easily be found in New York City; Omaha, Nebraska; Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Tampa, Florida; San Jose, California; Austin, Texas, or Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Although American audiences may not be as consistent or similar throughout the nation as is Rinso or Campbell Soup, the American musical public does not seem to vary a great deal from one part of these United States to another. However, in any area a good college or university can raise the cultural level of its community.

Chapter IV discusses the composer-audience gap in relation to the

composer. Criticisms of the composer and his style together with statements of composers are included. Chapter V focuses on the intermediaries which are sometimes accused of preventing the composer from properly communicating with the audience. In this category one may place the performer, conductor, orchestral managers, teachers, and the entire American concert structure. The problem of "too much music" is also discussed.

Chapter VI considers the gap from the standpoint of the listener and his problems. The new aesthetics with which he is faced is also considered.

CHAPTER IV

THE COMPOSER AND THE GAP

Introduction. There is no question in the minds of the great majority of those interviewed that a composer-general audience gap of considerable size is present in the United States today. Although most "felt" that the gap is greater today than in other periods of music history, there was a reticence to speak conclusively because of a lack of objective evidence of its size in other periods. This gap seems to be present rather equally throughout the nation.

There did not seem to be an appreciable difference between the reaction of composers to the presence of the gap and those of conductors, educators, performers, and the general listeners. The latter group seemed to feel that the gap was greater than did the composers, but the difference was not as great as one might suppose.

Most, but not all, look to education of the young as a means of reducing the cleavage. Some feel that it should be present, will always be present, or that it will take care of itself.

Opinions about the gap. The American composer is an interesting person. The writer, not a composer, found the musical creative artist to be frank, sincere, dedicated, and concerned with his art. Because the greatest percentage of composers in the nation earn their livelihood as a part of college and university faculties, most do not have the time to compose as much as they would like. For some composition teachers, the teaching load may virtually mean the end to creative composition just as studio teaching or public school teaching sometimes leads to the end of performance on the part of the teacher.

Some composers expressed surprise that the writer would travel about the nation talking to composers--of all people! Others found that the questions asked touched sore spots and gave them opportunity to vent opinions which had evidently been boiling for some time.

Appraisals of the gap's presence--present and future, vary from the extremely pessimistic to the mildly optimistic. Henry Pleasants in his 1955 publication, The Agony of Modern Music, makes statements about the composer and the audience which still find considerable agreement in the nation in 1969:1

> The contemporary composer, preoccupied, not with himself nor with society, but with the problem of how to continue in a tradition esthetically and technically exhausted, and contemptuous of the music that exhausted it, produces a music of technical excogitation in which the listener finds neither pleasure nor the reflection of any-

> thing of the least concern to him. . . . Society's concept of the composer-audience relationship is as distorted as the composer's. It imagines the present situation to be a replica of what has been happening for generation after generation for a century and a half--which it isn't and assumes that the next generation will be listening to this music with rapture--which it won't.

A strong majority of the composers consulted felt that there is indeed a considerable gap between the contemporary composer and the general audience. In the following pages we shall discuss some of the charges leveled against composers for allegedly creating or sustaining the gap.

Composers are given opportunity to state their opinions--in the process confirming, denying,or expressing their thoughts on the subject. Quotations occur often because it is felt that the composers speak best for themselves.

Hindemith said that, "the so-called modernist composer and the ordinary concert-goer, each following his own line of interest and totally disregarding the other's considerations, are drifting apart, and the gap between them is widening with each further performance of an obscure piece."[2]

Pleasants paints a bleak picture and normally blames the composer for the gap which he says exists. He says:[3]

> In short, the puzzlement and frustration that trouble both composer and listener in their efforts to understand the unpopularity of modern music and the characteristics that make it unpopular, are derived, not simply from a failure to solve the problem of getting composer and listener together, but from a failure to recognize that the problem is insoluble. He [the composer] is both the beneficiary and the victim of a concept of musical history that proceeds from the assumption of music as the product of composers rather than of societies.

Elliott Carter, writing in The American Composer Speaks, offers a reason for the gap but feels that strong music has the power to get through to the public:[4]

> Likewise, the amassing of vast amounts of information about all branches of this art tends also to draw it away from the general public,since there is so much to know that the public simply becomes discouraged. For the composer, in spite of all, does write for a public. . . . For now we can see that strong commanding works of art, no matter how strange they seem on their first appearance, sooner or later reach the public. Their intrinsic quality acts as a centripe-

> tal force that first educates the musical profession and finally the public to understand.

Although listeners sometimes seem to feel that the composer has no concern for them, the French composer, Victor Legley, indicates otherwise:[5]

> In very recent years, not only the organizers, but also the composers, have, however, discovered that it is necessary to bridge the abyss between themselves and the public. . . . I fear my country is not the only one where one modern work on a programme is sufficient to make the public decide to go to a football match instead.

Has the gap always actually existed? It is the opinion of the writer that one of the key questions which has not been settled and which serves as the focus for so many arbitrary statements is, "Has there always been a substantial gap between the good composer and the audience of his own time, or is this something particularly unique about our own era?"

"There has always been a big gap," is a frequent statement. but there seems to be little or no research on the subject. Slonimsky's Lexicon of Musical Invective, interesting as it is, may not mirror the representative thinking of the general public in the period of the review quoted. The guidelines of this study did not allow the writer to pursue this extensive a study but there are persons who are quite convinced that there has not always been an extensive gap between the good composer and the general audience.

Pleasants says that, "the most devastating single inhibiting factor standing in the way of spontaneous and honest judgment of modern music is the general acceptance, among professionals and laymen alike, of the fable that new serious music is never 'understood' and appreciated in its own time."[6]

He says that society assumes that the present gap between the composer and public is the normal relationship and that it has always been so. "The truth," he reiterates, "is that every great composer, without exception, has been appreciated, admired, applauded, and loved in his own time; even those who died miserably died famous."[7]

Alfred Reed at the University of Miami at Coral Gables would seem to agree. He maintains that "the center of gravity is still the audience," and that:[8]

> The history of music is the history of the composition and performance of works that have been accepted by the audience as a whole--not just one portion of that audience, the critics, the academic, the wealthy, poor, or middle, the traditional, rock and roll (related to the present day), way out group, but as a whole.

Dr. Reed told the author that he had a $1000.00 check for anyone who could provide evidence to support a convincing position that any particular composer whom succeeding times generations consider as "great" did not leave his mark on the public as a whole within his own lifetime; whom we could not consider a "success" (aside from the financial connotations of the term) in his own lifetime.

If such a detailed study has already been made, the author would appreciate being apprised of it.

Stuckenschmidt takes a different, pessimistic position. He writes in his new book, Twentieth Century Music, that, "the recurrent complaint that there is a gulf between the art which is for the initiated and that which appeals to the naive general public, cannot be answered." He goes on to say: "But have things ever been otherwise?" This again then, is the bone of contention! He explains:[9]

> In the Middle Ages there was one art for the experts and another for the lay public: an irreconcilable, or apparently irreconcilable, split between the riddle canon and the isorhythmic motet on the one hand, the Minnesang and dancing songs on the other.
>
> Looking at the history of the arts in broad terms, at the ebb and flow of their outward forms, two tendencies, at times in conflict and at times reconciled, may always be seen. One is born of a feeling of community and a desire to be understood. The other stems from a feeling of individuality, with creative man seen as the measure of all things. Now, it is certainly the creative individual who makes discoveries and brings about the enrichments of language that are the medium of all Western intellectual and artistic development. But equally certainly there is an aspect of creativity linked with what Jung calls the "collective unconscious," with a shared, inherited recollection of experiences going back to the childhood of human history.

It is to be hoped that if we are not in the pendulum swing of community and a desire to be understood, we are at least in the period which may be or lead to a period of true creativity.

We acknowledge the presence of a large gap now. Whether this has always been true would be an exciting research project for some interested scholar.

"The gap always present theory" is espoused by Alfred Frankenstein in The Modern Composer and His World. However, he suggests that it is the role of the music critic to help close it:[10]

> Whether we like it or not--and many dislike it intensely--there has been a gap between the composer and audience for the past three hundred years. It is the function of musical criticism to close that gap, so far as a structure of words can do so; perhaps it would

be better to say that it is the function of musical criticism to speed the closure rather than effect it.

Is composer isolation desirable? Although musicians may be acquainted with the title of Milton Babbitt's, "Who Cares if You Listen?" (1958), many do not seem to be acquainted with the content. He acknowledges and frankly states that it is to the advantage of the composer to maintain and extend the gap:[11]

> Towards this condition of musical and societal "isolation" a variety of attitudes has been expressed, usually with the purpose of assigning blame, often to the music itself, occasionally to critics or performers, and very occasionally to the public. But to assign blame is to imply that this isolation is unnecessary and undesirable. It is my contention that, on the contrary, this condition is not only inevitable, but potentially advantageous for the composer and his music. From my point of view, the composer would do well to consider means of realizing, consolidating, and extending the advantages.
>
> The unprecedented divergence between contemporary serious music and its listeners, on the one hand, and traditional music and its following on the other, is not accidental and--most probably--not transitory. Rather, it is a result of a half-century of revolution in musical thought, a revolution whose nature and consequences can be compared only with, and in many respects are closely analogous to, those of the mid-nineteenth-century revolution in mathematics and the twentieth-century revolution in theoretical physics.
>
> Why should the layman be other than bored and puzzled by what he is unable to understand, music or anything else? It is only the translation of this boredom and puzzlement into resentment and denunciation that seems to me indefensible. After all, the public does have its own music, its ubiquitous music: music to eat by, to read by, to dance by, and to be impressed by. Why refuse to recognize the possibility that contemporary music has reached a stage long since attained by other forms of activity?

The majority of composers interviewed are concerned that people listen to their music and hope that their music will be well received. The Babbitt opinion, right or wrong, represents a minority opinion.

Peer pressures. There seems to be considerable social pressure within the composer's world. To be a traditionalist is to be old fashioned. In a recent television interview, Aaron Copland admitted that it seemed a bit strange to him to be considered old hat by younger composers. Legley speaks of this and mentions that the ultra-modernists are considered by the traditionalists as "mere makers of strange noises!" He concludes that:[12]

> Both are wrong. The public concludes that composers are a very strange kind of creature and lose their interest. . . . There are too many composers more interested in the problem than in the result. People don't worry about problems. If they don't find music, they stay at home. And--whether we like it or not--in the end it is always the public that is going to be right.

The noted American composer, Morton Subotnick, says that it is with his peers that the composer should be concerned as he writes--not with the masses, "or a whole vast audience of people that we've never seen and never will see."[13] The problem of identity for the twentieth-century composer has been discussed frequently. He feels that the composer not knowing what his group is and not having found his identity may have something to do with the explosiveness of style.

The composer and newness. We recognize the fact that in practically all of life's experiences, that which is new is strange. Ideas are often held long after their usefulness has passed because the possessor fears to espouse new ones. Virgil Thompson is quoted as saying that good music should have a unique strangeness, and with it the desire to hear it again and re-experience this attractive strangeness.[14]

But newness is present in other fields as well. Richard Bowles points out the gap between the specialist and the citizen may be greater in the technological and scientific fields than in the arts. He says, "I believe this gap is something we must learn to live with, rather than to oppose." [15]

It is the responsibility of composers to look for the new and they should not be blamed for the failure of an uncooperative audience to comprehend the new.

Although one recognizes that "new is strange," critics of new music wish it were not that new all at once.

John H. Mueller speaks of "increments of novelty" in his article on "The Aesthetic Gap Between Consumer and Composer." He strikes out at the commonly accepted theory that there has always been a gap and there always will be one (discussed earlier in this chapter), by saying:[16]

> Of course, all music was new once. But it was not always equally new. Great music has indeed introduced novelties, perplexing many auditors while maintaining and exciting the interest of others. It can be shown however, that these novelties represented the kind of deviations which could be more or less quickly absorbed and which enhanced, rather than smothered, public interest and curiosity. By and large, this is not true of much of our contemporary music of the last half century.

He goes on to say that a reading of music history shows that the only real gap between composer and audience is in the twentieth century. It is not newness itself which may alienate but. . . "rather whether the increments of novelty which they represented was within the power of the general audience to absorb them."[17] Mr. Mueller adds that:[18]

> Today it is the freedom, in fact the urge, for the experimentation which affords the artist some of his greatest satisfaction. He glories in this while technically, in eighteenth-century terms, he is actually unemployed. What is the composer to do? He has lost his place in society. To entertain himself, to cultivate self-expression for its own sake, he becomes experimental and free of control, but at the same time he is frustrated, fretful, and anti-social, musically speaking. Any conformity is derogated. If society is unwilling to understand him, this modern composer, he is even less willing to understand society. Consequently, in sociological language, the composer becomes musically alienated. . . . It is not merely the size of the gap that poses the problem, but rather it is the amount of apathy or resistance which the audience feels and the depth of the indifference which the composer displays.

Other composers also indicate that alienation results from too many "increments of novelty." Kechley says that in contrast to the present, previous avant-garde composers maintained a <u>link with the past</u> by using many of the same materials as had been used in the past. This kept an avenue of communication open between the composer and the listener.

<u>Criticisms</u>. Composers are eager to point out that a sifting process is continually taking place in the arts--differentiating the good from the mediocre and the bad. It is undoubtedly true that much music fails to get through to the listener simply <u>because the piece is bad</u>. The sooner it dies the better!

In addition to the charge that there is much bad music written today, other criticisms are being leveled against the music of the contemporary composer. In the following paragraphs we shall examine some of them.

Alfred Reed remarks that there are considerably fewer "true composers" than the number of people who call themselves composers when he says:[19]

> A composer does not become a composer because he has studied x number of years with x number of teachers or because he has written x number of compositions. He becomes a composer only when, and if, an audience listens to his music and says in effect, "yes, that really grabs me. That really says something to me; that communicates with me." At that point the composer may say he is a composer.

Reed also emphasizes that composers sometimes tend to forget that when we perform non-programmatic music we are asking the audience to grasp the structure only through hearing, not an easy task.

Although egotism, at least to some degree, is thought to be a necessary part of the personality of the creative individual, some persons feel that the avant-garde composer often loses sight of "reality." A music department chairman inquires:[20]

> Is it possible to regard the most ardent advocates of the "new music" as "generals without armies," who imagine that they lead vast hordes, but who in fact command only a corporal's guard? Does their loud lamenting about "aesthetic gaps," and their vociferous condemnation of all opposition only make them appear increasingly divorced from reality? Why do we not hear about aesthetic gaps from composers of the rank of Richard Rodgers?

He expresses a frequently heard question from listeners who ask why listening should not be pleasurable when he queries:[21]

> Why should listening to "new music" be commonly accepted as an experience to be borne with some fortitude, akin to taking castor oil or having a tooth drilled--a "useful discipline," somehow enobling to the spirit, but pretty painful? Is it really true that this results only from the lethargy, apathy, or stupidity of the general audience or from their perverse refusal to accept the new? Might the sheer paucity of musical content of the "new music" have something to do with it?

A leading trumpet player and teacher feels that the poor quality of much new music is the result of the type of person that sometimes decides to become a composer:[22]

> I feel the basic problem is that so many of the new music composers have questionable musical ability. In the many years I have been associated with music students, I find that most of the student composers come from the ranks of the unsuccessful performers. Some of these people of my acquaintance have become national figures in composition, and I have little respect for their musical ability and their compositions. Obviously, these people are recognized by someone or they could not become well known. It is difficult for me to understand how a poor trumpet player, turned composer, suddenly has the right to decide how the trumpet should sound and how it can best be written for. Often this same person has the chance to conduct his works when he very well might be the weakest musician in the room.

Another performer-teacher, several thousand miles away from the previous one, speaks in the same vein:23

> I really feel that composers and composition teachers encourage much of our current bad crop by being exceedingly permissive in what their students are encouraged to produce. Anything for the muse you know, and we must not stifle any creative urges. Unfortunately, unskilled composers are being turned loose on the entire sound and rhythmic spectrum, and their standards of excellence and abilities to organize materials are light years behind their desire to create the new sound.

Composer Warren Benson says that, "we have had a lot of innovation but not much artistry,"[24] while Bottenberg believes that, "if we aim less at immortal masterworks of overwhelming originality and more at something which can be understood, played, and enjoyed by the music lover, we will deceive ourselves less and give better service."[25]

Martin Mailman speaks of creativity as having two facets: 1. New things 2. Seeing things in new relationships. Mailman is presently especially interested in the second aspect. Perhaps there are many composers in the nation who are spending their time looking for novel aspects when they may have the talent to show us new and exciting things about sounds which already exist.

In summary, it seems to this writer that it would be wise for the music profession to remind itself of the self-evident fact that generalization is a dangerous thing. Let us avoid putting all new music into one category and either praising it or condemning it. All fields have their charlatans and their "inefficients." There are good and bad doctors, carpenters, and farmers. We need to learn to differentiate quality from lack of it within the field and thus speed the sifting process --already an accomplished fact with most of the music of the past.

While this is taking place, protagonists of new music need to be listening to the criticisms, and, when valid, heeding them. Surely it is the good composers who have the most to gain from a quality-knowledgable group of performers and listeners who will hopefully boo or bravo for the right compositions.

Additional criticisms. A particular segment of contemporary composition is blamed for over-intellectualism--a frequently stated contributor to the gap. The gamut varies from those who state that, "the arts are not about intelligence but about emotions and feelings,"[26] to Dr. de la Vega and others who say that, "Those who can enjoy the intellectual and the physical are the more fortunate. Those who can enjoy only the physical response of music are only enjoying half the possible."[27]

To define "expressive" is difficult, but the word occurs and reoccurs often in discussions of our present music. A graduate student, James Code from Miami states, "I feel that the composer, if indeed he is

concerned about reaching a larger audience, should try to write more expressively no matter what idiom he uses."[28] However, many composers are not at all concerned about the size of the audience which they reach. It is said that in some circles it is a mark of prestige to appeal to a very few.

Ingolf Dahl also scolds certain composers for contributing to the alienation by a lack of willingness to take the concerns of the performers into consideration. This will be discussed further in Chapter V. He also criticizes complexity for the sake of complexity, and for too much reliance on tone color as the main element in composition. Tone color, "is on a rather low level of the value hierarchy."[29]

Many of the procedures which bother listeners will be treated in Chapter VI because they are more a part of learning a new musical language than they are valid criticisms of the composer. Some listeners, of course, criticize the composer for anything which does not give them immediate pleasure.

Avant-garde composers may consider many of the above criticisms as compliments and feel that they are indeed making progress in pursuit of their individual feelings about music. The public is not always as sure.

Although Pleasants' carping is probably anthema to most avant-garde composers, he does verbalize rather well many of the comments heard during the year. His feeling that present composers are not a part of their time seems to be his ostinato:[30]

> It is his failure to meet contemporary requirements that distinguishes the contemporary composer from composers of an earlier epoch. Previously it could always be said that composers represented the taste and the emotional and intellectual characteristics of their own time.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> It is suggested that there is something superficial about the man at peace with himself and society, and something inferior about music which has no other purpose than to please.[31]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> In Haydn's day, composers wrote to please their listeners and were delighted and even moved when their listeners were pleased. Their point of departure was a style and a compositional frame of reference with which their listeners were familiar. This did not rule out novelty and originality. . . . He had both more sense and more humility than to burden them with more novelty than he estimated they could assimilate.[32]

This is another reference to the "increments of novelty" which were mentioned earlier in the chapter.

Pessimism--some reasons. The failure of many organizations to program contemporary American music is a source of constant annoyance to composers.

Ingolf Dahl is pessimistic about the future of the contemporary composer, pointing out that in certain esteemed concert series not one piece of American music is programmed. An audience can hardly learn to love new music if they are not given opportunity to hear it!

The cost involved in a large professional group rehearsing and performing a new work tends to limit even first performances. Insufficient rehearsal time often results in poor performances.

Many composers are turning away from writing for orchestra and now devote their attention to chamber groups. Only the person who has copied a full score and parts for a large group can appreciate the time, effort, and cost involved. Second performances of new orchestral works have even less chance of taking place. Is it any wonder that the composers may be discouraged?

Canadian composer Wolfgang Bottenberg and American Ron Nelson express the viewpoint that the gap has never been as wide as it is today.

Warren Benson believes that the generation presently through with their musical training will have to be written off as a loss as far as their reception of new music is concerned. Adult education anyone?

Perhaps in the twentieth century it is much more difficult to be a good composer and to be well received by a general public than it was in the past. There are many more musics and thus more publics than previously. The post-romantic era problems of, "where do we go from here?" have not yet been solved. Stuckenschmidt expresses a touch of the "good old days" in his description:[33]

> Works of art are messages despatched to constantly changing addresses. Until the eighteenth century composers were lucky. They wrote either for the greater glory of God or for the prince by whom they were employed. There was never any doubt as to what kind of music would appeal to pious church-goers or to the palace guests, albeit that now and then the authorities stepped in with little adjustments or admonitions on aesthetic matters. Not only was the artistic message sent, but it arrived, and was seen to arrive.

However, as the general public expanded, sub-audiences or publics began to form. Listeners developed specific tastes as we see today--limiting themselves primarily to chamber music, jazz, choral, band, opera, or symphony concerts. Within these categories we have additional

specializations. Is it necessary that the composer confine himself to one or more of these publics in order to know to whom he addresses himself?

Stuckenschmidt designates pre-World War I as the time when the gap between advanced composers and potential listeners had widened. He attributes this to the fact that compositions and styles were deviating sharply from the convention and tradition which the listener knew and "as composers pursued ever more single-mindedly some particular principle of style or technique, so the chances of music being comprehended dwindled. The message was still despatched, but it was no longer addressed. At worst it was a bottle thrown into the sea, its destination unknown."[34]

Veiled optimism. A slightly more optimistic view of the gap is expressed by Samuel Adler, who classes himself as part of the "radical center." His viewpoint takes the following form:[35]

> Generally speaking, I do feel that a gap exists between the contemporary composer and the general audience. But, I also feel that this gap has always existed, and there has never been a time when the artist and his audience were of the same mind at the same time. This is a kind of hindsight that we have at the present time. We always feel that composers were more appreciated than they are at this time. . . . I believe that the contemporary composer is again becoming a pragmatic symbol of music; very much in the Bach and pre-Bach tradition, and perhaps even in the Mozart-Haydn tradition. We are serving a need. Many of us are writing for schools, colleges, and specific groups. Many of us are extremely busy with commissions all the time; these are good signs. I feel that the complaining comes mostly from two sources: One, the composer who writes music with, not only no audience, but no experience. . . and from the composer who looks down upon anything that can be grasped at all by an audience or a performer.

One group of composers believes that radio, television, and recordings available in the twentieth century prevent the gap from widening.

Others place considerable hope in the possibilities of education making young people aware of a vital contemporary music. Suggested means will be discussed in Chapter VIII.

Conclusion. Most persons interviewed considered the gap as a normal thing but would like to do something about it. A few felt that it would always be present regardless of what might be attempted. Dr. Reed and others felt that it is peculiar to the twentieth century while Babbitt's article expresses his opinion that it is present and is good for the composer. Only a small percentage feel that the gap is getting smaller.

This chapter has been devoted to a perusal of the gap from the

standpoint of the composer and his critics. One of the greatest composers of our century, Igor Stravinsky, replies to his critics in his An Autobiography and gives us a glimpse of his motivating ideals:[36]

> What, however, is less justifiable is that they [the critics] nearly always blame the author for what is in fact due to their own lack of comprehension, a lack made all the more conspicuous because in their inability to state their grievance clearly they cautiously try to conceal their incompetence in the looseness and vagueness of their phraseology.
>
> Their attitude certainly cannot make me deviate from my path. I shall assuredly not sacrifice my predilections and my aspirations to the demands of those who, in their blindness, do not realize that they are simply asking me to go backwards. It should be obvious that what they wish for has become obsolete for me, and that I could not follow them without doing violence to myself. But, on the other hand, it would be a great mistake to regard me as an adherent of Zukunftsmusik--the music of the future. Nothing could be more ridiculous. I live neither in the past nor in the future. I am in the present. I cannot know what tomorrow will bring forth. I can know only what the truth is for me today. That is what I am called upon to serve, and I serve it in all lucidity.

Dr. Frederick Lesemann, a teacher-composer at USC, expresses his thoughts in this way:[37]

> All I feel I can do is freely and openly demonstrate to those about me my love for, criticism of, and, in general, my own relationship to music (or life, or whatever). We must not be afraid to expose our relationships to music of all kinds, and its position in our true lives, to others as an implicit model for them.
>
> That sounds much too serious. It is a joyful thing.

Dr. Gerald Kemner, talented composer, performer, and friend of many years, sums up succinctly and with good humor the viewpoint of composer, performer/conductor, and listener:[38]

> The composer thinks: who needs more new music (except mine)?
> The performer/conductor: wants something more out of it than just the satisfaction of having done something new.
> The listener: doesn't want yet another assault on his good will.

The twentieth-century composer who can answer to satisfaction the implied desires of these groups will become the musical Paul Bunyan of our time.

CHAPTER V

THE COMPOSER-AUDIENCE GAP--THE INTERMEDIARIES

Introduction. Should a visitor from Mars visit our planet and hear composers and performers talking about one another, he might conclude that they were locked in deadly combat rather than being mutually dependent and engaged in an endeavor which they both esteem and love.

There is a strong tendency for people generally to overrate their own problems and minimize those of their fellow men. The advent of electronic music has given performers a chance to say, "Aha! the composer has never liked me and now he is trying to find a way to eliminate me." There is no doubt that there are antagonisms between conductors and performers. On the other hand there are fine relationships in which the composer is very sympathetic to the problems of the performer--in fact the composer often writes specifically for certain performers. The author has also talked to performers who are making real attempts to understand the new procedures of present composers, and although they are already highly proficient musicians, they are spending countless hours "woodshedding" in order to perfect new sounds and techniques demanded by the composer.

Although it is dangerous to generalize, the relationships between chamber music performers and composers seem to be more cordial than those between major symphony performers and the composer--especially if he is of the avant-garde school.

In this chapter we shall examine some of the aspects involved in the transformation of notated symbols to musical sound via the intermediaries who make it possible--performers, conductors, and others.

The composers' complaints. Performers do not escape unscathed from criticism in explaining the causes of the gap. Composer Halsey Stevens says that a bad performance is a misrepresentation and therefore makes it impossible to properly judge a work. He takes a swipe at both the chance composer and the performer when he says, "With improvisation, the composer can blame the performer and get out from under a bad performance."[1]

Conductors and performers sometimes spend the greatest part of their rehearsal time on established works at the expense of new music--feeling that the audience will more easily recognize a poor performance of a known composition. "Is it any wonder," a composer asks, "that the audience receives a bad impression of a new work on the first hearing?" A conductor who really believes in the performance of new music can positively influence the reception of a new work by both his performers and his audience.

Milton Babbitt felt that he needed fifty hours of rehearsal with the New York Philharmonic in order to perform his Relata II properly but felt that he would probably be allowed about six hours. The performance could not be taped because of union regulations and the cost of recording was estimated to be approximately $20,000. So, if one wanted to hear that particular work, it was necessary to hear it in person.

The composer is continually at the mercy of bad performances. Stravinsky bemoans this fact as he gives the composer's position on a problem involving poor orchestral balance:[2]

> How often we composers are at the mercy of things of that sort, which seem so insignificant at first sight! How often it is just they that determine the impression made on the listener and decide the very success of that piece! Naturally the public does not understand, and judges the piece by the way in which it is presented. Composers may well envy the lot of painters, sculptors, and writers, who communicate directly with their public without having recourse to intermediaries.

Carter is not averse to eliminating the performer and feels that the electronic music may have some advantages:[3]

> Certainly, impatience at not being able to hear my works in performance and impatience at the inaccuracies of some performances have occasionally made me wish that I could have a machine that would perform my music correctly and without all the trouble and possible disappointments associated with live performances.

Most electronic composers interviewed replied that they were not interested in eliminating performers but were interested in compositions using electronic tape and performers.

Performers' reactions. Most performers have opinions, pro or con, on avant-garde composition. Some feel that they finally have something new and interesting to play. Others feel that most new music which they perform is not worth their time.

Many composers are now asking performers to create new sounds by doing new things--blowing through brass mouthpieces, hitting the body of string instruments with the hand or the bow, producing squawks or other "unmusical" sounds, hissing, grunting, et cetera.

Some performers are willing to go along with the wishes of the composer, feeling it is their professional responsibility to assist

him in the realization of his sound concept. This willing attitude is sometimes in conflict with an inner resistance that the performer feels. Other performers are willing to follow the composer's wishes, even to the extent of treating their instruments in an unorthodox manner--if there is no chance that damage could result to their instruments. Some feel that the composer makes excessive demands along this line.

Professional performers do not always accept new compositions in a positive manner. When the New York Philharmonic rehearsed John Cage's Atlas Eclipticalis, "The musicians rebelled too, laughing contemtuously, chattering, ignoring the score altogether, and noodling."[4] A few smashed their microphones which had been attached to their instruments as a part of the performance. Although this is one of the more violent recorded episodes on the part of dissident performers, there are other cases where the atmosphere was anything but friendly.

Another reaction concerned the active presence of the composer in the hall during rehearsals. There have been incidents in which much time was lost because the conductor and composer spent much of the time discussing things which, according to the performers, should have been settled previous to the start of the rehearsal.

A rather universal response from performers was that much of the avant-garde music was in conflict with their ideal of "music," concept of sound, and performance ability which they had worked much of their lives to attain. Now they are being asked to produce sounds which any beginner can produce and which they reject as being noise rather than music.

Positive reactions include: "this composer has given us the concept that the human voice is one voice--not several;" "the composers are showing us new possibilities of our instruments that we had failed to discover for ourselves," and "composers are writing music of our own time which is a challenge and is rewarding to play."

Composer Ben Johnston speaks of the possibilities of a new type of liaison with the performer:[5]

> Personally, and this is simply a personal statement, I'm getting awfully tired of an autocratic relationship. I don't want to tell a performer entirely what to do; I want--not an interpreter, certainly not somebody who "realizes" what I do, but a collaborator, and a real one; a person who is involved in the art somewhat more deeply than your best performer of the works of Beethoven would even aim to be in most cases.

Hill humorously suggests another type of liaison in performing modern music, "There should be two players on a part, one playing and the other praying."[6]

The conductor plays an important part in the performance of music and especially with new music. His own attitude can carry over to the performers and the audience. If he does not really believe in a work he should probably not program it. He must also be trained so that he can teach the new concepts and techniques.

Composers admonished. Composers and performers alike point out some of the failings of composers in their relationships to performers. Gunther Schuller, a former professional horn player and now a respected composer, writes in The Modern Composer and His World:7

> But do not force the player into a kind of suspended position. . . where he is unable to give you what you really want. It is just not within the means of human beings to do some of the things which composers have been asking performers to do.

Feldbrill, a Canadian composer, speaks of a practical matter. He suggests that if the piece is going quickly the composer should make the stems and bar-lines as few as possible. We all need to remember that it is easier to conduct and write very short fast notes than it is to play them. Halsey Stevens remarked that the composer must also respect the personality of the performer.

Paul Creston reacts strongly to certain extremes in contemporary composers and also has the performer in mind:8

> There is certainly a gap between the avant-garde composer and the performer. For decades, science has attempted to invent a machine that thinks like a human being. Now certain composers are attempting to develop human musicians to think like a machine by means of rhythms that require a slide rule to interpret. Fortunately, there exists already an antidote to all this extremism: the rise of folk-music in the life of America. More guitars are sold than any other instrument.

One would expect that Pleasants would not take the part of the modern composer in this arena either. His great respect for jazz is evident in his statement that:9

> Just how far serious music stands from this course of evolution can be seen in the fact that while jazz is removing the composer as an obstacle between musician and audience, the composer of modern music seeks to remove the musician as an obstacle between his own inspiration and his listener. . . . The contemporary composer of serious music, on the other hand, writes purposely in such a way as to reduce the performer's intellectual and inventive contribution to a minimum.

He feels that the composer resents the role of the performer as an interpreter between composer and listener.

Professional performers request the composer to remember that they (the performers) must perform very close to 100 per cent accuracy if they are to hold their positions. Consequently, if a composer writes a note or a passage than can be played accurately only 50 or 75 per cent of the time, it is not enough. It may be that even with a great amount of practice on the part of the performer, the note would tend to be unstable. A close interaction between composer and performer should give the former an understanding of what performers can or can't do, or, in some cases, will or won't attempt.

Failings of performers. Performers are charged with laziness, lack of imagination, reactionary attitudes, being behind the times, unwillingness to stretch the possibilities of their instruments, and generally poor attitudes toward new music. Coupled with these items is the lack of time to practice sufficiently due to schedules which they may not be able to control.

Monte Tubbs, a young and respected composer at the University of Oregon, explains that the performer considers the music to be a vehicle for his craftsmanship and tends to reject music which does not make use of his abilities. The composer may seize on this trait and capture the imagination of the performer by writing music which displays him to good advantage. This is especially true of solo performers.

An interesting controversy develops when one discusses whether or not most new music is more difficult to play than older styles. Admittedly, it is difficult to be objective without comparing piece against piece or passage against passage. The reader may find some of the following observations of interest:

de la Vega-- The standard good performer may take a long time to learn avant-garde music, but once he has learned it he often does it better than the person who specializes only in avant-garde music. The latter has only a narrow view of music.[10]

Ode (trumpet teacher and performer at Ithaca College)--The demands of new music are so much greater in range, endurance, and demand so much more consistency in rhythmic organization and ability.[11]

Walfrid Kujala (flute-piccolo, Chicago Symphony) disagrees when asked if new music was harder to play. "No, on the contrary, Bach and Mozart are still the supreme challenge, musically and technically. With a good attitude and motivation, new music is not really as hard as it's made out to be."[12]

Crumb: Effective performances depend more on good coaching and conducting than on types of players.[13]

Yet another respected trumpet player counters, "Who will know if "new music" isn't performed correctly?"[14] This remark was heard frequently during the course of the author's travels. Others also feel that the hardest thing about performing new music is not necessarily the greater difficulty but being able to "feel at home" with the new sounds, procedures, and in some cases with reading the score or part with the "new look." Others, composers and non-composers, feel that the person who creates should be able to write works of varying difficulty so that younger performers can also have the benefit of his creativity.

Composers should be aware of the many fine performers in the outstanding college concert bands in the nation. Band conductors and performers are hoping and wishing that composers will become interested in the band medium. The chances of new works receiving first and repeated hearings are infinitely greater than with orchestra. There are many college bands in the nation that are able to play nearly anything which is set before them. The attitude and the time is right. Will good composers realize the situation and respond to it?

In a sense, the contemporary composer has something in common with the concert band. The concert band, like the composer, seems to be caught in the middle. The band appeals to the masses if it plays a type of literature which is less than challenging or vital to the best musicians in the group. When it plays the "better literature" it becomes too sophisticated for most of its adherents. Yet it is too low-brow for patrons of the orchestral literature--they would not, as a department head once told the author, cross the street to hear a band concert. Perhaps good composers and bandsmen can understand the other's problem and mutually profit from it.

Orchestral managers and professional conductors; the concert structure. Statements that "the symphony is obsolete," "symphonies are not including enough contemporary music in their programs," and, "the symphony orchestra will soon be a museum piece," are heard frequently throughout the nation. Others say that musical institutions such as symphony halls and opera houses are pricing themselves out of existence. A composer compains that, "The contemporary traditional composer doesn't have a chance to be programmed by orchestra--it is either the older known people or the avant-garde!"[15] Orchestra managers are quick to reply that they are responsible for financial success and the general public will not buy large amounts of twentieth-century American music.

Reputedly, certain concert organizations will not engage a performer if he is too insistent on performing contemporary music. The audience is deprived of yet another opportunity.

A number of composers are questioning the entire concert structure of our society. Tony Gnazzo, director of the Mills College tape center, states the case when he says:[16]

> The whole phenomenon of concert going has been torn completely out of context. Considering the origins of the concert as a pastime for the idle nobility, and later (19th century), as another meeting place and forum for the exchange of "elite" culture, we see that current concerts serve no purpose. With radio, television, and recordings available, it is very hard to justify the collection of people in a room to listen to music. At the time when the concert was relevant, the only viable medium was live performance. Now it is anachronistic to do it that way. Most patrons want to hear the old things because a certain aura has grown up around the hallowed cultural tradition of music. Consider the stances, garb, and demeanor of performers and also the masquerading of first night audiences. A composer who is really interested in presenting a contemporary phenomenon would hardly look to the concert hall as his "out." Just as museums have become mausoleums, so has the concert hall become a dead, empty place.

Professional conductors who program too much twentieth-century music tend to lose both their audiences and their positions.

Where is this vicious cycle to be broken?

Too much music. Perhaps Americans are sated with music. Most of the music (with the exception of certain television commercials) is music of the past. One of the few women composers interviewed was concerned with this aspect when she stated:[17]

> The average concert audience has been conditioned to certain mundane harmonies since birth. These same harmonies are driven into people via canned music on the job, at the dentist's office, the doctor's office, the airplane, the elevator, et cetera. Hearing the same stereotyped and "stereotaped" harmonies day in and day out is bound to cause the average person to believe that all music should be based on mundane harmonies accompanied by a steady pulse pounded on the bass drum.

Perhaps a music lobby should regulate the amount of music performed just as the brick-layer's union regulates the number of bricks laid per man, per day!

The reader is directed to Stravinsky's interesting appraisal of too much music in which he says in part:[18]

> Oversaturated with sounds, blasé even before combinations of the utmost variety, listeners fall into a kind of torpor which deprives

them of all power of discrimination and makes them indifferent to the quality of the pieces presented. It is more than likely that such irrational overfeeding will make them lose all appetite and relish for music. . . . But for the majority of listeners there is every reason to fear that, far from developing a love and understanding of music, the modern methods of dissemination will have a diametrically opposite effect--that is to say, the production of indifference, inability to understand, to appreciate, or to undergo any worthy reaction.

Studio teachers. Music teacher training. Ingolf Dahl, a Los Angeles (USC) colleague of Stevens, blames many studio teachers who fail to acquaint their performance students with music of the twentieth-century American composer. There is no question that finding new, good literature is time consuming. Many applied teachers refuse to spend the time and thus rob their students of an acquaintance with the music of our own time. The music faculty at San Fernando State has stipulated that 40 per cent of the music performed in recital must be from the twentieth century.

There was general agreement that the young person could more easily learn to enjoy new styles than the members of the previous generation. But the minds and ears of many of their teachers have ossified. A classroom teacher reported that her music supervisor in a major American city ordered her to stop playing Stravinsky for the seventh grade class. The supervisor felt that Stravinsky was not "fit music" for the children.

Gnazzo attacks the conservative conservatories by saying, "Conservatories, music schools, and to a great degree music departments, still teach contemporary music as a last minute freak, a phenomenon. The sciences, on the contrary, are progress oriented."[19]

Music education will be treated at greater length in Chapter VIII.

CHAPTER VI

THE AUDIENCE AND THE GAP

A new esthetics. It is the audience which bears the brunt of the criticism for the gap which exists between him and the composer. Normally the creative artist leads and the listener must follow as best he can. It is generally felt that the listener must change his listening habits in response to a new esthetics. He will not succeed if he continues to "read Chinese using a Russian dictionary."[1]

Eunice Boardman says that we are bothered by a lack of "form" in the traditional sense in listening to new music. She continues:[2]

> We have been trained to find musical satisfaction in looking for repetitions, variations, and contrasts which are based on one of several preceived forms. Contemporary composers see each piece of music evolving its own form, which requires the listener to approach each new piece of music on its own terms, giving him no way of using past perceptual experiences to help him understand the new composition.

It has been said that one must approach a new contemporary composition like a novel--it unfolds with no necessity of a recapitulation at the end. A rather irate listener "cornered" a composer after a concert and protested, "But isn't it necessary that all compositions have a beginning, middle,and end?" "Yes," said the composer, "but not necessarily in that order."

Critics of the "a composition is like a novel" approach point out that a novel normally has characters who are present near the beginning and who evolve throughout the story.

Barney Childs, composer and former Rhodes scholar, suggests that the listener would do well to consider sound as sound. "Form is what happens; concentrate on the segment of time in which sounds may happen."[3]

John Cage, an advocate of many new procedures, suggests, "New music: new listening. Not an attempt to understand something that is being said, for, if something were being said, the sounds would be given the shapes of words. Just an attention to the activity of sounds."[4]

Ford Foundation grant winner Monte Tubbs suggests that the audience should listen for high-low, fast-slow, loud-soft, and thick-thin densities.

Even if the listener attempts to stretch his listening habits to include new, recommended procedures, he cannot suddenly abandon all that

has come before. He will be constantly tempted to use previously learned techniques and standards of judgment.

The composer has a right to ask that the listener take more than a passive stance--a greater participation and perhaps more knowledge is necessary if he is to derive the most from a new work. One would not think of really enjoying a sports contest without knowing something of the rules of the game. How strange it is that listeners often show reluctance to even learn the name of the game and are surprised that they are unable to keep score.

Babbitt agrees that the public's obligation to the composer is not fulfilled by his "mere physical presence in the concert hall or before a loudspeaker or--more authoritatively--by committing to memory the numbers of phonograph records and amplifier models."[5]

Joan Franks Williams of Seattle, Washington founded a contemporary music series called "New Dimensions in Music." She is intensely interested in helping listeners arrive at an appreciation of the best in today's music. Many of her ideas are expressed in the following paragraphs:[6]

> The sounds are, of course, different. We are not living in the days of Bach, Mozart, or Beethoven. Our era has its own excitement, its own philosophies and ideas. If we were to hear a work written today in the styles of the past, it would not ring true. It would be trying to express an age that today's composers cannot possibly experience. If one is willing to accept a work on its own terms, not comparing it to music of the past, then there is the possibility of understanding and enjoying music.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Without exposing oneself to what is new in the arts one denies oneself the pleasures of perceiving the gift of the creative artist whose insight into his own age can be profound.

Causes of listener problems. Lack of familiarity and exposure, failure to become acquainted with the new language, the resistance to accepting sound as sensation or experience, and failure to realize one's expectations are given as general reasons for the failure of audiences to keep up with many composers. In addition, the following reasons are listed:

a. Disjunct melodic lines
b. Non-functional harmonic basis
c. Lack of ability to relate to the past
d. Complexity generally
e. Complex meters and rhythms
f. Register extremes

g. Lack of the long line
h. Lack of traditional form
i. Atonality
j. Inability to concentrate on the same parameter as the composer
k. Irregular pulse
l. Lack of sufficient contrast
m. Lack of melody in the traditional sense
n. Extreme dissonance
o. Difficulty in following "chance" music
p. Music which is abstract and intellectual
q. Lack of expected repetition in the music
r. Music continues too long without change of timbre

It is generally agreed that the audience is conditioned only to music which is tonal, based on repetition, and is essentially homophonic.

The failure to realize one's expectations seems to be the facet that bothers many people. The disappointment that follows this failure is true of many other aspects of life as well. Schuller suggests that a readjustment of expectations may be necessary. This will be a difficult task inasmuch as:[7]

> Sixty years after landmark works by Stravinsky and Schoenberg music is often taught according to earlier traditions, and the ears of the layman are not conditioned to changes that have become familiar to composers. If you keep listening for harmony where there is no harmony, you will always be disappointed. . . . Preconceptions of rhythm give way to the "total splintering of rhythm" in a work by Boulez. Form may be dictated not by "development" but by "momentum." Instead of starting with a form and writing a piece to fit it, the contemporary composer tries to find "the piece's own form"--and is not bound by the old priorities of melody or harmony in letting it take shape.

One of the "expectations" that is seemingly not met for listeners is the development typical of classical music. Although new music may seem to lack coherence, it is a different kind of coherence which is present--"the isolated moment, i. e. the shortest perceptible impression, now fulfills the function previously performed by larger formal sections such as the working-out section."[8]

The frustrated listener, striving to learn, asks, "How can I judge if an individual new piece is good or not?" Musicians tend to hedge on this question, but answers included the following: "Some feeling of excitement must be present; it must have consistency of style but not be over-consistent";[9] "It must grab the audience."[10] Henry Leland Clarke, noted composer and musicologist, explains that good music is like a detective story. "It happened. . . you didn't expect it but you realize you should have. This creates excitement."[11] Other explanations include, "Instinct undergirded by training. . . . Is the scoring done well? . . . . No gimmickry."[12]

The more one becomes well acquainted with the body of contemporary literature the more one will feel qualified to judge quality.

One big source of disagreement seems to be between those who feel that the listener must pass from the traditional into an understanding of the new music and others who say that a thorough grounding in the traditional may retard or even prevent one from appreciating the new music, especially that of the avant-garde. No studies are known to the author on this point. Stravinsky indicated that he felt that the public was more apt to react positively toward a work when they were not predisposed favorably or unfavorably toward it previous to hearing it. He indicates a certain amount of confidence in the public:[13]

> I think, on the contrary, that it is the composers who sometimes lack talent and that the public always has, if not talent (which could hardly be the adjunct of a collective body), at least, when it is left to itself, a spontaneity that confers great value upon its reactions. Provided again that it has not been contaminated with the virus of snobbery.

As stated previously, the author attempted to determine listener reaction to contemporary music by talking to audience members both within and outside of the actual concert situation. In addition, conversations were held with concert managers whose job it is to know their audiences. Although it was not possible within the time limitations of this study, a thorough canvass of opinion of thousands of representative listeners throughout the nation would be of value. This might take the form of questionnaires at concerts and/or mailings to ticket holders of concert organizations.

If the listener is bothered seriously by even a few of the listener problems listed earlier in the chapter, he is placed in a very uncomfortable position. If he familiarizes himself with the new language he will most certainly find enjoyment in the good works of the twentieth century as he has in music of previous eras.

The words of Peter Maxwell Davies, although not explicit, may be thoughtful guidelines for composer and listener: "It is the duty of the composer quite simply to follow his own lights, and to try to be sensible about it. It's the duty of the audience to try to follow him and understand what's going on."[14]

CHAPTER VII

THE COMPOSER CREATES--DOES HE THINK OF THE LISTENER?

Most composers questioned indicated that they did not think of an audience when they wrote, unless of course, they wrote a commission for a special performing group or a special occasion. A representative reaction was given by composer George Crumb, a Pulitzer Prize recipient, who said, "The composer should be so involved with essential inner meaning of his music that any other considerations are irrelevant. In the last analysis. . . . one writes that which one has to write."[1]

Aurelio de la Vega does not think of the audience as such, but he tries to write such a "good piece" that someone will appreciate it. Arnold Elston at Berkeley says, "No, I'm not communicating a message. I am expressing my personal feelings and thoughts. In a sense my audience is myself--testing, reacting, ordering, learning from what I feel and think."[2]

Some composers say that they think of an audience but not directly or that they think of the performing context. Reference was made in Chapter IV to Babbitt's article, "Who Cares If You Listen."

However, a relatively large percentage of composers are vitally concerned with their audience as they see it. Responses representing this group are as follows:

James Beal--I think of a university-type audience.[3]

Joseph Brye--If the composer says he doesn't know who the audience is, he had better get out and do a little living.[4]

Leon Dallin--The composer cannot be oblivious to the hope that music will be played, but his writing must be an expression of his own ideas and hope that others may enjoy it too. Yes, I still have the archaic idea that music is a communication of a sort that could not be uttered in another way. If a great man comes along, he will always transcend whatever we may write about now.[5]

Andrew Imbrie--The composer, by determining if the music will come off, becomes a representative listener.[6]

Don Johnston--Normally, those composers who say they don't care about the audience are those who aren't successful.[7]

Ellis Kohs--Of course, I think of the audience. I write for them, as a writer creates for readers, and a painter for viewers. Anything else is childish self-indulgence.[8]

Many listeners are concerned by a feeling that the composer may have no concern for them. A teacher asks:[9]

> Why should the "new music" composer assume the privilege of producing absolutely any combination of sounds, calling them "new", and labeling them "music" often in high disdain of any potential audience reaction, and then feel that he can berate the general audience for creating an "aesthetic gap"? Why is it normal to assume that an aesthetic gap is the fault of the audience? Doesn't the composer--ANY composer--have an artistic responsibility to speak directly and immediately to his audience?

Halsey Stevens feels that many younger composers are shortsighted because they are producing a product without a probable consumer and suggests that if the composer is writing only for himself it is a form of self-pleasure only.

CHAPTER VIII

BRIDGING THE GAP

Introduction. Thus far it has been established that there is a wide gap between many composers of "serious" art music and the general audience and that there is a desire to see if there are means of bridging the gap.

Paul Creston suggests, perhaps facetiously, that the only solution he can think of, "is to wait patiently for a twentieth-century J. S. Bach to organize all these devices and knock some sense into their use."[1]

This statement demonstrates an underlying current which seems to be present throughout the nation. The author senses that the musical world is waiting for a "musical messiah," a "giant in the earth" who will lead us from the desert into the promised land. Until this twentieth-century J. S. Bach arrives, it behooves us to look for means to bridge the gap between composer and listener. The reader will decide for himself the relevance of the proposed solutions to his own area and situation.

More listening. Increased audience exposure to new music is one of the suggestions which is heard most frequently. This implies more quality, live performances of contemporary music. Contemporary music should be included on programs whenever possible. Special concerts and festivals of contemporary music are recommended.

Composer-performer symposia. In Chapter V, we discussed some of the problems between composers and performers. Closer communication between these two elements of the music profession could lead to a better understanding of what each is attempting to do.

Music education in schools. A great percentage of respondents felt that the greatest hope of helping audiences to a better understanding and enjoyment of new styles lies in the training of the young. This means that music teachers are going to have to update themselves in twentieth-century music.

Various pilot projects to assist present and future teachers are now under way under the sponsorship of the Contemporary Music Project, Music Educators' National Conference, colleges, and other agencies. Martin Mailman at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas met regularly with a selected number of classroom music teachers during the first semester. Each fashioned his own course in contemporary music for children which was used in the individual classrooms during the second semester. An evaluation of this should be made in the near future. This is in-service training. The author was privileged to visit two of these

classrooms and watch excited students create their own music with music concrete sounds.

Activities in the Greenwich, Connecticut schools are described by teacher Ann Modugno in the November (electronic issue) Music Educators Journal. The day spent in her classroom was an exciting one--observing students caught up in the joy of creating music. This was not a general music class to be endured but an adventure in the stimulating world of music. Creative musical activities such as composition and improvisation are much more interesting to children than verbal information from the teacher.

Ron Nelson points out that in working with young people there seems to be a point beyond which one can go in selling something to them which they perhaps appreciate for relatively uncomplicated reasons.

An interesting incident with young children was related by Shirley Mackie:[2]

> Today, I played a tape of the Redlands University Band doing my "Concertino" for a class of six and seven year old children. I told them nothing about the piece other than it was a band piece I wanted them to hear. They listened very attentively--when it ended, they applauded. Upon asking how many liked the music, all but one raised their hands. The one who didn't raise his hand said he didn't like it because, "it made me feel like I was in a jungle with a lot of wild animals." Other children said they liked it because it scared them and made them think of spooks and those men who make snakes come out of baskets. One little girl said she bet being alone in a cemetery at night would scare you just about as much as that music. To the kids, it was music--neither old nor new--they do not know there is a difference. But, I got a thought from their reactions, "Perhaps the gap is caused because the 'new music' frightens the listeners--adults don't enjoy being frightened--children do."

Children have a way of deflating one's ego as Miss Mackie soon found out. After the discussion, she told the children that she had written the music they had just heard and discussed. They were amazed! One child asked, "Did you think it up and get someone else to write it down for you?"

A prophet without honor in her own country!

Certain new music series are including more pieces by contemporary composers as a part of the materials. We need increased attention to this aspect and should seek to find good composers who are willing to write their best for children.

Karel Husa suggests that there is a lack of program notes where

they are really needed--in school programs. The need here is greater than in professional concerts where the audience is normally more highly trained. School conductors should write notes which explain musical elements of the composition in terms which are as non-technical as possible. Data on the love life of the composer may not prove to be especially illuminating to the musical composition!

Role of colleges and universities. Colleges and universities have an important function to play in several areas--not the least of which is teacher training. We cannot expect students to understand our century unless their teachers are thoroughly trained. Colleges and universities must accept the responsibility--not blame the public schools.

The university curriculum must prepare the student to know the literature and musical language of his own century. The common practice of allowing only the final month, or less, of the music history course for a consideration of the twentieth century must go the way of the horse and buggy, Model T Ford, long skirts, and crystal sets. Some teachers are now teaching the survey courses by beginning with the present and working back in time. Extensive experimentation in teaching of theory and twentieth-century materials is in progress in universities in various parts of the nation.

Colleges (the term "college" and "university" shall be used interchangeably) can serve as a resource center for area music teachers. New music recordings, books, and periodicals should be available. Seminars, symposia, and workshops serving students, teachers, and public have an important function to serve.

Groups of teachers might inaugurate periodic performance-analysis-listening sessions of new music. A college faculty member could prove valuable in stimulating this type of activity.

A student performer might consider commissioning a work from one of the composition students. The encouragement to the composer through this act of faith would be of greater importance than the fee involved. Playing a piece written especially for him would also be rewarding to the performer.

Performance groups and recitals are already important at most colleges--but contemporary music does not always receive its fair share in programming. Performers and conductors need to spend the necessary time to investigate new music. Mixing contemporary compositions with regular fare seems to be the best way to educate the listener in the new language. Suggested resources are given in Appendix 6. Most composers are extremely willing to share their music. Users are reminded that a fee should be offered even if not requested. Shipping costs, duplicating charges, and copying expenses leave little for the creative artist even when a rental is received.

Performance organizations would do well to consider allocating

a certain part of their budgets for new music commissions. The Ithaca High School Band has become well known, not only for its performance ability, but for its commissioning policy. Students are proud to perform a piece written especially for them. It also provides opportunity to bring a "real, live composer" to the school or campus for the first performance.

Although the first performance may be an item of prestige for the performer and conductor. it is the subsequent performances which are important to the composer. Do not be reticent to give a second or fifteenth performance of a good piece of music.

Colleges should support community groups which promote performance of good contemporary music. It is unfortunate when college and community organizations are at odds or in "competition" in promoting an ideal which both esteem. Some universities have established groups which specialize in contemporary music.

Ensembles for performing new music operating under Rockefeller grants, university, or private sponsorship are found at Mills College, University of Iowa, University of Washington, University of Chicago (Contemporary Chamber Players), Columbia University (Group for Contemporary Music), New Dimensions in Music (Seattle), and the University of Buffalo. Other groups are located at the University of Illinois, University of California, San Diego at La Jolla, Monday Evening Concerts at the Los Angeles County Art Museum, Rutgers University, University of Michigan, University of Colorado, and the University of Pennsylvania.

This does not presume to be a complete list but is included to acquaint the reader with representative groups.

Because colleges play an influential part in the music structure of most communities, cooperative ventures between college music faculty members and local communication media are sometimes possible. Articles in community newspapers and journals, programs on radio or FM with the college musician as disk jockey, educational and commercial television programs about new music are all means of bringing music to the community. Many people who are reached are those who would not previously have been interested enough to attend a live performance.

There are many who are optimistic about the possibilities for the future. Clarence Sawhill (UCLA) says that we have grown in literature and appreciation in the last ten years, and adds, "if the composers, conductors, and performers in the public schools and universities keep working together, I feel we will continue to develop."[3]

Vincent Persichetti reminds us that new music is not necessarily more difficult than old music--we must learn a new language. He is optimistic in children's ability to do this, for children learn languages readily.

The university as a patron of the arts. The arts have been supported in various ways throughout history. The Church, government, fraternal organizations, and wealthy individuals have all served as patrons.

The university should now examine the possibility that it is in a position to assume the mantle as a patron in our age. Because of the economic difficulties present in the professional music field, it is very difficult to gamble on new music and give it sufficient rehearsal time for top performances. The universities, even under their present organizational setup, can give the time necessary to do a good job in the performance of new music. Babbitt suggests that universities should publish music as they publish in other fields.

But, perhaps they should go further than that. Mel Powell, formerly of Yale and now the new director of the California Institute of the Arts, believes that the university should go beyond its present position of dedication to scholarship and recognize that it may also have an important role to play by dedicating itself to the arts as well. "Art is where the artist is."[4]

Powell also recommends audio-visual banks which would preserve at least the major performances in the country and make them available to other musicians throughout the nation.

Increased university support may take the form of composers-in-residence (already present at some institutions), faculty credit for performance, publishing, and increased budgets for departments.

Music making by amateurs. An area which is sometimes overlooked in school systems is assisting people to make music on their own--as avowed amateurs. Although chamber music performance is encouraged in some institutions, the emphasis is more often on large group performance. Outside of the formal school situation the guitar has become the amateur instrument. Recorders are also popular in some areas.

Bottenberg feels strongly about this:[5]

> Amateurs should be the real base of a musical culture. Most contemporary music is forbiddingly difficult to perform. . . . A difficult piece, even if played to a large audience, will never fully become the "property" of the listener; it comes and goes. However, what amateurs play themselves they usually understand very well. I believe that great damage to our musical culture has been done by two factors: the cult of the virtuoso, and the spread of mechanical reproduction of music. To counteract this, I think that musicians should be willing to work with more dedication with amateurs, even if the results are not the most satisfactory ones for their level of sophistication.

Some faculty members too often feel that this type of activity is

beneath their dignity.

Conclusion. This chapter has been devoted to what might be done from the position of educating the audience. One respondent indicated that from the tone of the author's questions all the change was to take place in the audience.

This is not quite true. In Chapter IV, the author suggested that the composer needs to listen carefully to criticisms and honor them when he considers them valid. In "Recommendations" (Chapter XIV, p. 53) it is suggested that the composer who wishes to reach the general audience will more easily achieve his objective if he operates within some part of the audience's frame of reference. The listeners cannot suddenly discard all of their accumulated listening habits and expectations. Many, however, are willing to accept the new if it appears with something that is familiar.

Educators have greater possibilities with respect to audiences than they do in relation to the individual composers.

Several composers urged the listener to form an opinion on the first hearing of a new piece of music but not be afraid to alter it after repeated hearings.

Other suggestions from respondents for listeners attempting to bridge the gap are:

1. A strong martini!
2. Attend informal concerts and open rehearsals.
3. Learn to read the musical score. Assistance by one trained in score reading is helpful.
4. Suggest concerts in which the same work would be played twice on the same program with discussion following the first reading.

If the listener will meet the composer halfway, two results may be forthcoming: (1) the listener will enjoy certain products of the contemporary composer, (2) it will help chart the course of contemporary composition and separate the good from the mediocre and the intolerable.

PART TWO. RELATED TOPICS

CHAPTER IX

MIXED MEDIA AND ELECTRONIC MUSIC

As a part of the study. Two questions were asked concerning mixed media and electronic music:

1. Will the union of the other media (light, drama, dancing, scenery, et cetera) with contemporary music make it more readily acceptable to the untrained audience?

2. Has electronic music (synthesized, taped) made it easier or more difficult for one to understand and appreciate non-electronic contemporary music? Why?

No conclusive concensus developed from the question regarding mixed, or as some prefer, inter-media. Some musicians were not well enough acquainted with the field to express opinions about it. Although a "yes" answer had a plurality in terms of number of responses, there were many "possibly," "probably," and probably not" replies. There is the feeling that inter-media presentations tend to conceal the music--something which the musician does not wish to see happen. On the other hand, it is felt that unconventional music can reach an audience through films, contemporary opera, et cetera, because of the other items of interest which the production includes.

Composer Earl Browne prophesies: [1]

> Mixed-media is one of the things that is going to explode in the future with artistic relevance. . . . This shuffling about between the extremes of control and improvisation is where the action is, and much of it is very beautiful.

Electronic studios are springing up in colleges and universities throughout the nation. The Moog and Buchla sythesizers are much in evidence and sophisticated recording equipment lines the walls.[1] Large loudspeakers stand like sentries around the periphery of recital halls, their stentorian tones muted but waiting for the command of performance.

Electronic music, or to its critics--electronic sounds, is here to stay.

Use of electronic sounds for background music on television may help people to become acquainted with the new sounds. We have no evid-

ence as to how a general audience will accept those sounds by themselves although there is a growing specialist audience of electronic music fans. The high sales of the "Switched-on Bach" recording indicate that the sounds have interest.

Opinion was quite evenly divided on whether or not electronic music has made it easier to listen to non-electronic contemporary music. Those who answered "yes" explained with the following reasons:

1. Any conventional contemporary music is easy to listen to after that electronic stuff!
2. Electronic music helps a person to think more abstractly which is necessary in listening to other new music.
3. Since the electronic composer does not have to go "through the performer" with the attendant risks of poor performance, he can convey his thoughts directly to the listener.

Negative answers included:

1. Electronic music is farther removed emotionally.
2. Who would want to develop a taste for the electronic?
3. Electronic "music" isn't music.
4. There is as yet no codification of construction principles in electronic music. This poses problems for the audience.

George Crumb states that electronic music has served as a catalyst for writing for standard instruments. This general observation was made by several composers.

Other fears concerning electronic music included, "It will eliminate the performer," or, "it is mechanical and impersonal." Composers using electronic means are quick to remind us that the creation of the sounds <u>is</u> controlled by the action of the human just as another composer may use a pencil as an implement to notate his sounds.

True, the electronic does offer a vehicle for eliminating the performer, but as was mentioned in Chapter V, most electronic composers with whom the author conversed, preferred a combination of taped sounds ar live performers.

Stuckenschmidt treats this subject by saying:[2]

Some may see the exclusion of human beings from the process of producing sounds as evidence of the death of art and the triumph of technology over culture. But there is also room for hope that the newly-developed possibilities in sound will open up a realm of new musical forms, as well as endow vocal and instrumental music with fresh inspiration and vitality.

CHAPTER X

SHOULD MUSIC BE EXPLAINED?

The author was interested in obtaining the reactions of musicians as to the value of verbal explanation in conjunction with the performance of music, providing that the explanation is well done.

The majority showed some preference, in varying degrees, for verbal explanations especially in relatively informal settings.

Positive comments included, "Anything which may help the audience is worth trying," "play the piece--then talk," "play the piece--panel discussion--and play it again."

Negative reactions were more violent:

> Music lives or dies by its sounds, not by its descriptions.[1]
>
> Probably minimally effective, or even irrelevant. Verbal contact with an audience is best as an expression of good will or of ordinary courtesy.[2]
>
> Explanations are superfluous to those who can hear and preposterous to those who hold it in contempt.[3]
>
> Untrained audiences want explanation but one must use technical terms in a good explanation. They are usually not ready for that. The explanation may help to understand the composer but not the music.[4]
>
> One is put in the position of defending something which does not need defense.
>
> There is danger of over-talking.
>
> Good music should not require an explanation. It sells itself.

Some feel it is advantageous to have the composer at the performance when possible and to let the audience know that he is there before the performance begins. It is felt that this creates a sympathetic climate toward the composition. Perhaps the audience, out of courtesy, would be more cautious in expressing an adverse opinion or would give more applause than was really justified!

The Atlanta, Georgia Symphony programs pre-concert lectures for those who wish to come.

The author favors explanation whenever the musical material seems

to lend itself to verbal explanation which would assist the audience in a more complete understanding of the work.

CHAPTER XI

THE PROBLEM OF NOTATION

Books by Gardner Read (see Bibliography), Erhard Karkoschka,[1] and John Cage[2] should be consulted by the reader when studying notational procedures. This study asked only three questions in this area and was not an in-depth study in the subject:

1. Do we have need for any additional publications in the notational field which would clarify the "new music," its techniques, or its symbols to the musician and to the layman?

Consensus: The layman has no need of technical knowledge in listening to a composition. There is need for continued studies in the field of notation for the musician--perhaps a translation of Karkoschka's book. Many musicians prefer to tackle individual problems of notation as they occur in the music rather than attempting to stockpile knowledge. Others would like dissemination of new information on notation in less specialized music journals with wide distribution such as Music Educators' Journal and others.

2. What unorthodox, new notational symbols do you or other composers use in your scores?

Consensus: Most composers still find it possible to express their musical thoughts within the orthodox notational system.

Graphic notation is finding wider acceptance, especially in avant-garde compositions. Examples may be seen in Source (periodical) and in the books quoted at the beginning of the chapter. Gnazzo states that, "Musical notation is beautiful as a graphic art. Everyone should look at such scores and appreciate them as graphics also."[3]

3. Would it result in better communication between composer, performer, and audience if these symbols and their meanings could be collected, standardized, and published for dissemination?

Consensus: There is considerable interest on the part of performers for a manual of the most used new notational symbols and their explanations. Many perfo.mers are unhappy because they find it necessary to learn five to ten different notations for exactly the same sound. They ask, "Can't composers agree on a notational symbol or fewer symbols?" Composers feel that it is difficult to arbitrarily standardize at this point in time and that the most practical symbols will eventually win out. Explanations should be included in the score and parts if unorthodox notation is used.

Paul Creston is presently writing a new book called, Rational Metrical Notation. He expresses his opinions on notational procedures in a letter to the writer:[4]

> We need not be concerned with those writers who must invent a system of notation decipherable only by them and their disciples. No invented system can replace one that has evolved. There are such ridiculous misconceptions of our present notational system that it is mandatory that we clear that up first.

CHAPTER XII

WHO IS THE "NEW MUSIC" AUDIENCE?

If a specialized group of listeners interested in contemporary music is emerging, are there any characteristics which tend to distinguish these people from others about them? We are considering aspects such as age, economic level, musical training, et cetera.

No objective research data was obtained. Respondents were asked as to their opinions. The most common answer was youth--normally defined as elementary children through college. The total splintered into a variety of responses with a range of extremes. They are listed here as a matter of interest without further explanation.

a. Children
b. Young people
c. In twenties (age)
d. Seventeen to forty (age)
e. Lower-middle economic
f. Middle economic
g. Upper economic
h. University families
i. Fairly advanced training
j. Music majors
k. Non-music majors

PART THREE. FINAL

CHAPTER XIII

CONCLUSIONS

In the opinion of the writer, the basic objectives of the study were realized. Information was gathered from representative and competent musicians in the specialized fields of composition, conducting, performance, education, and from a wide cross section of listeners.

The study showed that a rather large gap exists between the non-conservative contemporary composer and the general audience.

It was anticipated that the question as to whether or not the gap is larger than in other periods would be difficult to answer within the time limitations of this study. This turned out to be the case. It is suggested that this question might constitute a future research project.

The composer-audience gap seems to be present rather equally throughout the nation. The causes of the gap and recommended procedures for bridging the gap are treated chiefly in the summary and in Chapter VIII. Many of these procedures stem from a consideration of problems of the listener, discussed in Chapter VI. The composer and intermediaries (performers, conductors, et cetera) are apprised of criticisms relating to them. (Chapter IV, V.)

CHAPTER XIV

RECOMMENDATIONS

"Where is music going?" The answer to that question plagues the musical world just as the question as to the direction of our society is causing spasms in our social structure. The respected composer, Roger Sessions, responded to the question during the recent International Music Congress Forum session. He was quoted in Music and Artists as saying:[1]

> I don't know, of course nor do I think anybody knows, where music is going. In the course of the last 72 years I've been asked this innumerable times, and I finally worked out the answer some years ago. I had two answers, depending on who asked me the question. If a member of the lay public asked me, I would answer, "I don't know. If I did, I'd have taken it there myself." (Because naturally I've always written the music I wanted to write, and that I thought ought to be written.)

The major recommendation which the author would make is that musicians who are not aware of what is happening in contemporary music should make a real effort to inform themselves about it. Although the means are well-known--travel, reading journals and books, hearing recordings and live performances, many musicians allow themselves to become unbelievably out of date. If the professional person in music is not aware of his own age, how can one expect literacy and appreciation from the layman listener?

It has already been suggested that there is insufficient attention given to twentieth-century music--especially American twentieth-century music. Interested persons should take steps to correct the situation in their own areas.

This might take the form of the establishment of a center (large or small) for contemporary music, performing groups who would be especially trained in the techniques of new styles, balanced programming, festivals of contemporary music, contemporary music programs on radio, television and FM in the community, and the sponsorship of workshops or symposia to bring composers, performers, and listeners together. Colleges should investigate the possibilities of working more closely with the schools in the community, bringing them live performances, lectures, demonstrations and in-service training for teachers.

There is also the possibility that the college teacher would profit from the exposure to the elementary or secondary classroom!

College music departments should examine their curricula to see if they contain sufficient offerings in twentieth-century music. Do the students and the surrounding community have sufficient opportunity to hear the music of our century in live performance? Does the library or resource center have sufficient scores, recordings, books, and journals in this area? Are there composers of stature on the faculty? Are they given time to write? Might the community assist the college in supporting a composer who could contribute to the musical life of the community?

At the same time as the listener is making an attempt to close the gap, the composer must constantly examine himself to discover if he is following his own proper course. If the composer wants to reach his audience he must operate within some part of the audience's frame of musical reference. As listeners, most of us cannot suddenly plunge into a completely new, cold sea which causes us to continually gasp for breath and still wish to come back again and again. On the other hand, we may be eager to get our feet wet and be led gradually to an understanding and appreciation of new musical ideas. The composer must also be a persuader.

Conductors and performers make decisions as to which works are to be performed. The accuracy of their quality judgments is important to the composer and listener alike.

In speaking of the gap, composer Ellis Kohs says:[2]

The problem here is not limited to music, or to the composer, performer, listener group. Society is in a state of upheaval, and will continue to be for some time. Confrontation, negativism, anti-social actions that supposedly are in the interest of the socially desirable ends, will continue. The communication gap in the arts is just one aspect of the similar problem in society as a whole. Out of the chaos there will be a new social and artistic consensus. In the meantime, we hang on to the boat, and try to ride out the storm, counting on man's sense of destiny and desire to survive to provide the basis for a new optimism.

NOTES ON SOURCES

No notes on Chapters I, II, or III.

CHAPTER IV

1. Henry Pleasants, The Agony of Modern Music (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955), pp. 22 and 24.

2. Paul Hindemith, A Composer's World (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1961), p. 237. Reprint of the Charles Eliot Norton Lectures 1949-1950, first published by the Harvard University Press, 1952.

3. Pleasants, op. cit., p. 45.

4. Elliott Carter, "A Further Step," from Gilbert Chase, The American Composer Speaks (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1966), pp. 252-253.

5. Victor Legley, from John Beckwith and Udo Kasemets, The Modern Composer and His World (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), p. 3.

6. Pleasants, op. cit., p. 62.

7. Ibid., p. 63.

8. Interview with Dr. Alfred Reed, January, 1969 and tape recording of May, 1969.

9. H. H. Stuckenschmidt, Twentieth Century Music (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 150.

10. Alfred Frankenstein, from John Beckwith and Udo Kasemets, The Modern Composer and His World (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), p. 9

11. Milton Babbitt, "Who Cares If You Listen?" from Gilbert Chase, The American Composer Speaks (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1966), pp. 236 and 239. Reprint from High Fidelity Magazine, VIII, No. 2 (February, 1958.)

12. Victor Legley, from John Beckwith and Udo Kasemets, The Modern Composer and His World (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), p. 5.

13. Morton Subotnick, "The Sounds of Things to Come," International Music Congress Forum, Music and Artists, (February-March, 1969), 26.

14. Virgil Thompson, quoted by Richard Bowles in letter to the author, May 5, 1969.

15. Correspondence from Richard Bowles, May 5, 1969.

16. John H. Mueller, "The Aesthetic Gap Between Consumer and Composer," Journal of Research in Music Education, XV, Number 2 (Summer, 1967), 152.

17. Ibid., pp. 152-153.

18. Ibid., p. 157.

19. Interview with Alfred Reed, January, 1969. Tape recording of May, 1969.

20. Correspondence from Royal Stanton, March 14, 1969.

21. Ibid.

22. Correspondence from John Haynie, March, 1969.

23. Interview with James Ode, December, 1968 and correspondence of May, 1969.

24. Interview with Warren Benson, December, 1968 and correspondence of February 26, 1969.

25. Correspondence from Wolfgang Bottenberg, May 4, 1969.

26. Interview with Jerry Harris, May 1, 1969.

27. Interview with Aurelio de la Vega, March 12, 1969.

28. Correspondence from James Code, May 7, 1969.

29. Interview with Ingolf Dahl, March 11, 1969.

30. Henry Pleasants, The Agony of Modern Music (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955), p. 4.

31. Ibid., p. 18.

32. Ibid., p. 29.

33. H. H. Stuckenschmidt, Twentieth Century Music (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 234.

34. Ibid.

35. Interview with Samuel Adler, December, 1968 and correspondence of May 9, 1969.

36. Igor Stravinsky, An Autobiography (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1936), p. 176.

37. Interview with Frederick Lesemann, March 11, 1969 and correspondence of April 1, 1969.

38. Correspondence from Gerald Kemner, January 10, 1969.

CHAPTER V

1. Interview with Halsey Stevens, March 13, 1969.

2. Igor Stravinsky, An Autobiography (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1936), p. 143.

3. Elliott Carter, "Shop Talk by an American Composer," Problems of Modern Music (New York: W. W. Norton Co., 1962), p. 60. Essay first appeared in April, 1960 issue of The Musical Quarterly.

4. "Everything We Do Is Music," Saturday Evening Post (October 19, 1968), 47. (Interview with John Cage.)

5. Ben Johnston, "The Sounds of Things to Come," International Music Congress Forum, Music and Artists (February-March, 1969), 26.

6. Correspondence from William Hill, February, 1969.

7. Gunther Schuller, from John Beckwith and Udo Kasemets, The Modern Composer and His World (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), p. 38.

8. Correspondence from Paul Creston, May 9, 1969.

9. Henry Pleasants, The Agony of Modern Music (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955), pp. 175-176.

10. Interview with Aurelio de la Vega, March 12, 1969.

11. Interview with James Ode, December, 1968 and correspondence of May, 1969.

12. Interview with Walfrid Kujala and correspondence of April, 1969.

13. Interview with George Crumb, December 14, 1968 and correspondence of January 12, 1969.

14. Name withheld by author's choice.

15. Interview with Jack Jarrett, January 23, 1969 and tape recording of May, 1969.

16. Interview with Anthony Gnazzo, October 29, 1968 and correspondence of May 1, 1969.

17. Correspondence with Shirley Mackie, April 9, 1969.

18. Stravinsky, op. cit., p. 153.

19. Gnazzo, loc. cit.

CHAPTER VI

1. Interview with Jon Jonsson, December, 1968.

2. Correspondence from Eunice Boardman, May 9, 1969.

3. Interview with Barney Childs, April 12, 1969.

4. John Cage, "Experimental Music," from Gilbert Chase, The American Composer Speaks (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1966), p. 231. From Silence (Lecture and Writings). Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1961.

5. Milton Babbitt, "Who Cares if You Listen?" from Gilbert Chase, The American Composer Speaks (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1966), p. 241. Reprint from High Fidelity Magazine, VIII, No. 2 (February, 1958).

6. Joan Franks Williams, "The Sounds of Modern Music," Seattle Post-Intelligence (Sunday, October 24, 1965), Northwest Today, 7.

7. Gunther Schuller, ". . . And Discusses the Musical Generation Gap," Boston interview by Roderick Nordell reprinted in ? . (Clipping received by author. No indication of source or date.)

8. H. H. Stuckenschmidt, Twentieth Century Music (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 232.

9. Interview with John Boda, January 16, 1969.

10. Interview with Alfred Reed, January, 1969. Tape recording of May, 1969.

11. Interview with Henry Leland Clarke, May 5, 1969.

12. Interview with William Schaefer, March 11, 1969.

13. Igor Stravinsky, Poetics of Music in the Form of Six Lessons (New York: Random House, 1942), p. 91.

14. Peter Maxwell Davies, "The Sounds of Things to Come," International Music Congress Forum, Music and Artists (February-March, 1969), 28.

CHAPTER VII

1. Interview with George Crumb, December 14, 1968, and correspondence of January 12, 1969.
2. Correspondence from Arnold Elston, May 1, 1969.
3. Interview with James Beale, May 5, 1969.
4. Interview with Joseph Brye, May 1, 1969.
5. Interview with Leon Dallin, April 12, 1969 and correspondence of May, 1969.
6. Interview with Andrew Imbrie, October 28, 1968.
7. Interview with Don Johnston, September 19, 1968.
8. Correspondence from Ellis Kohs, April 23, 1969.
9. Correspondence from Royal Stanton, March 14, 1969.

CHAPTER VIII

1. Correspondence from Paul Creston, May 9, 1969.
2. Correspondence from Shirley Mackie, April 9, 1969.
3. Correspondence from Clarence Sawhill, May 5, 1969.
4. Interview with Mel Powell, December 11, 1968.
5. Correspondence from Wolfgang Bottenberg, May 4, 1969.

CHAPTER IX

1. Tape from Philip Browne, May, 1969.
2. H. H. Stuckenschmidt, Twentieth Century Music (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), pp. 178-179.

CHAPTER X

1. Interview with Samuel Adler, December, 1968, and correspondence of May 9, 1969.

2. Correspondence with Gerald Kemner, January 10, 1969.

3. Interview with Lawrence Morton, March 11, 1969.

4. Ibid.

CHAPTER XI

1. Erhard Karkoschka, Das Schriftbild der neuen Musik (Celle: Hermann Moeck Verlag, 1966.)

2. John Cage, Notations (New York: Something Else Press, 1967.)

3. Interview with Anthony Gnazzo, October 29, 1968 and correspondence, May 1, 1969.

4. Correspondence with Paul Creston, May 9, 1969.

No notes on Chapters XII and XIII.

CHAPTER XIV

1. Roger Sessions, "The Sounds of Things to Come," International Music Congress Forum, Music and Artists (February-March, 1969), 28.

2. Correspondence with Ellis B. Kohs, April 23, 1969.

REFERENCES

A. BOOKS

Beckwith, John and Kasemets, Udo. The Modern Composer and His World. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961.

Benson, Warren. Creative Projects in Musicianship. Contemporary Music Project, Music Educators National Conference, Washington, D. C., 1967.

Cowell, Henry. American Composers on American Music. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1962.

Hindemith, Paul. A Composer's World. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1961. (From Harvard Lectures of 1949-50.)

Lang, Paul Henry (ed.). Problems of Modern Music. New York: W. W. Norton Company, 1962. (First published in Musical Quarterly, April, 1960.)

Pleasants, Henry. The Agony of Modern Music. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955.

Read, Gardner. Music Notation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969. Second Edition.

Slonimsky, Nicolas. Lexicon of Musical Invective. New York: Coleman-Ross, 1953.

Stravinsky, Igor. An Autobiography. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1936.

Stravinsky, Igor. Poetics of Music in the Form of Six Lessons. New York: Random House, 1942.

Stuckenschmidt, H. H. Twentieth Century Music. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.

B. PERIODICALS

Copland, Aaron, Moderator. "The Sounds of Things to Come," Music and Artists (February-March, 1969), pp. 23-29. (International Music Congress Forum.) Comments by Subotnick, Carter, Davies.

Kobler, John. "Everything We Do is Music," Saturday Evening Post, (October 19, 1968), pp. 45-48, 92-94.

Mueller, John H. "The Aesthetic Gap Between Consumer and Composer," Journal of Research in Music Education, XV, Number 2 (Summer, 1967), pp. 151-158.

C. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

Babbitt, Milton. "Who Cares if You Listen?" from Chase, Gilbert. The American Composer Speaks. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1966. Pp. 234-244. Reprinted from High Fidelity Magazine, VIII, No. 2 (February, 1958.)

Brown, Earle. "Some Notes on Composing," from Chase, Gilbert. The American Composer Speaks. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1966. Pp. 298-305.

Cage, John. "Silence," from Chase, Gilbert. The American Composer Speaks. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1966. Pp. 226-233.

Carter, Elliott. "A Further Step," from Chase, Gilbert. The American Composer Speaks. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1966. Pp. 245-254.

D. NEWSPAPERS

Peyster, Joan. "The Affair Proved Traumatic," New York Times, Sunday, January 12, 1969.

Schonberg, Harold C. "A Merry Time With the Moog?" New York Times, Sunday, February 16, 1969, D 17.

Schuller, Gunther. ". . . And Discusses the Musical Generation Gap," Boston interview by Roderick Nordell reprinted in ? . (Clipping received by author. No indication of source or date.)

Williams, Joan Franks. "The Sounds of Modern Music," Seattle Post-Intelligence (Sunday, October 24, 1965), Northwest Today, 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Austin, William W. Music in the Twentieth Century. New York: W. W. Norton Company, 1966.

Bernstein, Leonard. The Joy of Music. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954.

Machlis, Joseph. Introduction to Contemporary Music. New York: W. W. Norton Company, 1961.

McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media. New York: Signet Books, The New American Library, 1964.

Reti, Rudolph. Tonality in Modern Music. New York: Collier, 1962.

Salzman, Eric. Twentieth-Century Music: An Introduction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

B. PERIODICALS

Drew, James, "Information, Space, and a New Time-Dialectic," Journal of Music Theory (December 1, 1968), pp. 86-103.

Martin, James Michael. "The Electronic Mating Call of the Wild Moog," FM and Fine Arts (March, 1969), pp. 14-19.

Palmer, Robert. "Which Way Contemporary Music," Cornell University Music Review. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, Volume II, 1968. Pp. 3-8, 13.

Slonimsky, Nicolas. "The Avant-Garde," Medical Opinion and Review (May, 1966), pp. 37, 40-43.

APPENDIX I

TO: NOTED COMPOSERS, CONDUCTORS, PERFORMERS, AND EDUCATORS IN THE U. S.

FROM: Dr. Leland A. Lillehaug, 18815 Tilson Ave., Cupertino, Calif.
Address after June 15: 1911 S. Prairie Ave., Sioux Falls, S. D.

RE: Research project on "EXAMINING THE COMPOSER - AUDIENCE GAP IN CONTEMPORARY MUSIC." Sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education (HEW) and Augustana College.

Explanation: Many musicians and "laymen" interested in music have become concerned about the seeming difficulties in performing and appreciating the "new music". It is the privilege of this writer to interview, correspond with, and talk to hundreds of composers, conductors, performers, and educators throughout the nation about the subject of contemporary music.

This is not a questionnaire in the usual sense but consists of guide questions for discussion. Because some of the terms are rather general, please feel free to define them according to your own use. When personal contact is not possible, I appreciate your willingness to put your thoughts in writing. In answering, you may refer to the question number. Should you wish to talk on a tape and send the tape, I would be happy to return the tape and pay postage. Thank you for your interest and willingness to assist with this project.

1. Generally speaking, do you feel that a gap exists between the contemporary composer and the general audience?

2. One composer has been quoted as saying that a gap also exists between the contemporary composer and the performer. What are your feelings on this?

3. If such gaps exist, what can be done to bridge the differences? Are these effective methods of bridging the gap?

   a. More quality live performances of contemporary music?
   b. Approaching contemporary music through the young people?
   c. More emphasis on contemporary music in the music programs of schools?
   d. New courses which stress the "new music" in the music curricula of institutions of higher learning?
   e. Possibilities of reaching the general public through news media?
   f. Other?

4. Will the union of other media (light, drama, et cetera) with contemporary music make it more readily acceptable to the untrained audience?

5. Do you as a composer give any thought to your audience when you write? Why or why not?

6. Has electronic music made it easier or more difficult for one to understand and appreciate contemporary music?

7. What elements of the "new music" do you feel give most listeners the greatest problems? Why?

8. What can be done to eliminate or lessen these problems?

9. How effective are explanations by the composer or conductor previous to, or in conjunction with, the performance of "new music"?

10. Do we have need for any additional publications in the notational field which would clarify the "new music", its techniques, or its symbols to the musicians and to the layman?

11. Much of the "new music" is not yet published. Where can the interested conductor-teacher secure such music for performance?

12. How could a college music department best serve in acquainting its community with contemporary music?

13. As one compares an attitude of open-mindedness toward new music with technical-training in the new idiom, do you consider open-mindedness:

a. More important?
b. Less important?
c. Equally important?

14. What type of listeners (age, economic level, training) make up the most enthusiastic segment of contemporary music listeners?

15. How can one most effectively perform contemporary music?

a. By hiring professional groups?
b. By using all-student groups?
c. Faculty groups when available?
d. Some combination of the above?

16. What unorthodox, new notational symbols do you or other composers use in your scores? (I refer especially to those symbols which are not in the standard vocabulary.)

17. Would it result in better communication between composer, performer, and audience if these symbols and their meanings could be collected, standardized, and published for dissemination?

18. Must the performer and/or conductor be of greater ability to perform the "new music" than most of the standard works? Or greater experience?

19. Other comments.

SUGGESTED CHANGES FOR FURTHER USE

1. Question six. After electronic music add: "taped, synthesized, et cetera," and after contemporary music add "performed by traditional means."

2. Delete question thirteen.

3. In order to group questions of similar thought more closely together, readjust the numbering to read:

Question 5 becomes 6.
Question 6 becomes 5.
Question 11 becomes 13.
Question 12 becomes 14.
Question 14 becomes 15.
Question 15 becomes 16.
Question 16 becomes 11.
Question 17 becomes 12.
Question 18 becomes 17.
Question 19 becomes 18.

APPENDIX 2

The author has contacted the following persons on interview visits or has had correspondence with them. Because a specific individual may wear many "hats" such as those of composer, performer, teacher, et cetera, no attempt is made to identify a person by profession. He is identified by name and location. Academic titles are not included.

1.	Adler, Samuel	Eastman School of Music, Rochester, N. Y.	14604
2.	Bachman, Harold	U. of Florida, Gainesville	32601
3.	Bailey, Mrs. Exine	U. of Oregon, Eugene	97403
4.	Barlow, Wayne	Eastman School of Music, Rochester, N. Y.	14604
5.	Barnes, Arthur	Stanford U., Stanford, Calif.	94305
6.	Bass, Eddie	2305 Revolan Drive, Greensboro, N. C.	27407
7.	Beale, James	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105
8.	Beckler, Stanworth	U. of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif.	95204
9.	Benson, Warren	Eastman School of Music, Rochester, N. Y.	14604
10.	Berdahl, James	U. of California, Berkeley	94720
11.	Bergsma, William	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105
12.	Berry, Sanford	U. of Illinois, Urbana	61801
13.	Bestor, Charles	Willamette University, Salem, Oreg.	97301
14.	Beyer, Frederick H.	5308 Wayne Road, Greensboro, N. C.	27400
15.	Bielawa, Herbert	San Francisco State College, Calif.	94132
16.	Blake, Ran	New England Conservatory, Boston, Mass.	02115
17.	Bloomer, Mrs. Nancy	3878 Corina Way, Palo Alto, Calif.	94306
18.	Boardman, Eunice	Wichita State U., Wichita, Kans.	67208
19.	Boda, John	Florida State U., Tallahassee	32306
20.	Bodine, Willis	U. of Florida, Gainesville	32601
21.	Bottenberg, Wolfgang	925 Purcell Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio	45205
22.	Bottje, Will Gay	Southern Illinois U., Carbondale	62901
23.	Bowles, Richard	U. of Florida, Gainesville	32601
24.	Brask, Willard	U. of Florida, Gainesville	32601
25.	Bratcher, Joe, Jr.	5602 Preswyck Dr., Austin, Tex.	78723
26.	Browne, Philip	California State Polytechnic College, Pomona, Calif.	91766
27.	Brun, Herbert	U. of Illinois, Urbana	61801
28.	Bryan, Paul	Duke U., Durham, N. C.	27706
29.	Brye, Joseph C.	Oregon State U., Corvallis	97331
30.	Burge, David	U. of Colorado, Boulder	80302
31.	Childs, Barney	Deep Springs College, Deep Springs, Calif.	
32.	Chittum, Donald	Philadelphia Music Academy, Phil., Pa.	19103
33.	Christianson, Paul A.	U. of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	33124
34.	Clarke, Henry Leland	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105
35.	Code, James	U. of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	33124
36.	Cole, William	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105

37.	Colwell, Richard	U. of Illinois, Urbana	61801
38.	Constantinides, Dinos	Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge	70803
39.	Corley, Robert	MIT, Cambridge, Mass.	02139
40.	Cox, Ronn	NTSU, Denton, Tex.	76203
41.	Crawford, Wilford	3744 Crown Shore Dr., Dallas, Tex.	75234
42.	Creston, Paul	Central Washington State College, Ellensberg	98926
43.	Crosten, W. L.	Stanford U., Stanford, Calif.	94305
44.	Crumb, George	240 Kirk Lane, Media, Pa.	19063
45.	Cunha, Clifford	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105
46.	Cuthbert, Kenneth	NTSU, Denton, Tex.	76203
47.	Cykler, Edmund A.	U. of Oregon, Eugene	97403
48.	Dahl, Ingolf	USC, Los Angeles	90007
49.	Dallin, Leon	California State College, Long Beach	90801
50.	de la Vega, Aurelio	San Fernando Valley State College	91324
51.	Dempster, Stuart	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105
52.	Denton, William L.	Atlanta Symphony, Atlanta, Ga.	30309
53.	Dinsmore, Jacqueline	2315 Eastmont Way West, Seattle, Wash.	98199
54.	Drew, James	Yale U., New Haven, Conn.	06520
55.	Driscoll, Don	Palo Alto High School, Palo Alto, Calif.	94306
56.	Duker, Guy M.	U. of Illinois, Urbana	61801
57.	Earls, Paul	Duke U., Durham, N. C.	27706
58.	Edlefson, Blaine	U. of Illinois, Urbana	61801
59.	Eitel, Butler	U. of Montana, Missoula	59801
60.	Ellis, Merrill	NTSU, Denton, Tex.	76203
61.	Elston, Arnold	U. of California, Berkeley	94720
62.	Epstein, Paul	Tulane U., New Orleans, La.	70125
63.	Erb, Donald	6809 Shady Brook Circle, Dallas, Tex.	75231
64.	Erickson, Robert	U. of California, San Diego, La Jolla	92037
65.	Fennell, Fred	U. of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	33124
66.	Fred, Herbert	U. of North Carolina, Greensboro	27412
67.	Freeman, Paul	6335 W. N. W. Highway, Dallas, Tex.	75---
68.	Fricker, Peter	U. of California, Santa Barbara	93106
69.	Friedman, Laila Storch	4955 Stanford Ave., N. E., Seattle	98105
70.	Friedman, Martin	4955 Stanford Ave., N. E., Seattle	98105
71.	Fuchs, Peter Paul	Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge	70803
72.	Gates, Everett	Eastman School of Music, Rochester, N.Y.	14604
73.	Ghent, Emmanuel	131 Prince St., New York, N. Y.	10012
74.	Gillespie, James	U. of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.	92374
75.	Gnazzo, Anthony	Mills College, Oakland, Calif.	94613
76.	Goodwin, Richard	1106 East Brackenridge, Austin, Tex.	78703
77.	Gray, Robert	U. of Illinois, Urbana	61801
78.	Graziano, John	402 Whalley Ave., New Haven, Conn.	06511
79.	Green, Douglass M.	U. of California, Santa Barbara	93106
80.	Greene, Dorothy	Casa View School, Dallas, Tex.	75---
81.	Groth, Earl	U. of Florida, Gainesville	32601
82.	Hadcock, Peter	Boston Symphony, Boston, Mass.	02115
83.	Hannay, Roger	U. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	27514
84.	Hansen, Peter S.	Tulane U., New Orleans	70125

85.	Harada, Higo	San Jose State, San Jose, Calif.	95114
86.	Harris, Don	New England Conservatory, Boston, Mass.	02115
87.	Harris, Jerry	3682 Stanley Lane S., Salem, Oreg.	97302
88.	Harris, Roy	UCLA, Los Angeles, Calif.	90024
89.	Harrison, Lou	San Jose State, San Jose, Calif.	95114
90.	Hart, Lawrence	U. of North Carolina, Greensboro	27412
91.	Haynie, John	NTSU, Denton, Tex.	76203
92.	Hazelman, Herbert	Grimsby High School, Greensboro, N. C.	27408
93.	Heisinger, H. B.	San Jose State, San Jose, Calif.	95114
94.	Hemke, Fred	Northwestern U., Evanston, Ill.	60201
95.	Hildner, Victor	1123 Monroe Ave., River Forest, Ill.	
96.	Hill, William	Georgia State College, Atlanta	30303
97.	Hindsley, Mark	U. of Illinois, Urbana	61801
98.	Hladky, James R.	U. of Oregon, Eugene	97403
99.	Hodkinson, S. P.	U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor	48104
100.	Hoffman, Ted	U. of South Florida, Tampa	33620
101.	Horvit, Michael	8114 Braesdale, Houston, Tex.	77071
102.	Hughes, Frank C.	Texas Christian U., Fort Worth	76129
103.	Husa, Karel	Cornell U., Ithaca, N. Y.	14850
104.	Imbrie, Andrew	U. of California, Berkeley	94720
105.	Ivey, Jean Eichelberger	13 Duzine Rd., New Paltz, N. Y.	12561
106.	Jacobsen, James	Texas Christian U., Fort Worth	76129
107.	Jaeger, Don	21 Columbus Ave., San Francisco, Calif.	94111
108.	Jarrett, Howard	McFarlin Auditorium, Hillcrest Ave., Dallas, Tex.	75205
109.	Jarrett, Jack	U. of North Carolina, Greensboro	27412
110.	Johnson, Herb	4735 35th Ave. S. W., Seattle, Wash.	98126
111.	Johnston, Ben	U. of Illinois, Urbana	61801
112.	Johnston, Darrell	San Jose City College, San Jose, Calif.	95114
113.	Johnston, Donald O.	U. of Montana, Missoula	59801
114.	Jones, Kenneth P.	4700 S. W. Archer Rd., Gainesville, Fla.	32601
115.	Jonsson, Jon	Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	57102
116.	Jorgenson, James	U. of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.	92374
117.	Karlins, M. William	Northwestern U., Evanston, Ill.	60201
118.	Kechley, Gerald	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105
119.	Keller, Homer	U. of Oregon, Eugene	97403
120.	Kemner, Gerald	U. of Missouri, Kansas City	64110
121.	Kennan, Kent	U. of Texas, Austin	78712
122.	Kirschner, Leon	Harvard U., Cambridge, Mass.	02138
123.	Klaus, Kenneth	Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge	70803
124.	Klein, Marjorie	2017 Amherst, Palo Alto, Calif.	94306
125.	Kohs, Ellis	U. of Southern California, Los Angeles	90007
126.	Kohut, Dan	U. of Illinois, Urbana	61801
127.	Kraft, William	4823 Ben Ave., North Hollywood, Calif.	91607
128.	Kuhn, Wolfgang	Stanford U., Stanford, Calif.	94305
129.	Kujala, Walfrid	Northwestern U., Evanston, Ill.	60201
130.	Lacy, Gene M.	2241 Alston Ave., Fort Worth, Tex.	76110
131.	Latham, William P.	NTSU, Denton, Tex.	76203
132.	Lerner, Jeffrey	U. of Houston, Houston, Tex.	77004
133.	Lesemann, Frederick	U. of Southern California, Los Angeles	90007
134.	Lynch, Anitra	NTSU, Denton, Tex.	76203
135.	Lyon, Margaret	Mills College, Oakland, Calif.	94613

136.	MacInnis, M. D.	Atlanta Symphony, Atlanta, Ga.	30309
137.	Mackie, Shirley	1815 Colonial Ave., Waco, Tex.	76707
138.	MacQuigg, C. H.	1505 Elm St., Dallas, Tex.	75201
139.	Mailman, Martin	NTSU, Denton, Tex.	76203
140.	Maltby, Richard	6918 Woody Trail, Hollywood, Calif.	90028
141.	Martirano, Salvatore	U. of Illinois, Urbana	61801
142.	Matthews, James	University of Houston, Houston, Tex.	77004
143.	McAdow, Maurice	NTSU, Denton, Tex.	76201
144.	McCarty, Pat	Loyola U., New Orleans, La.	70125
145.	McKenzie, Wallace	Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge	70803
146.	Meyer, Leonard	U. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.	60637
147.	Miller, Joan	629 West 115th St., 6D, New York, N. Y.	10025
148.	Milstein	Denver Symphony, Denver, Colo.	802--
149.	Modugno, Anne D.	Greenwich High School, Greenwich, Conn.	06830
150.	Moog, R. A.	Electronic Lab., Trumansburg, N. Y.	14886
151.	Morton, Lawrence	County Museum of Art, 5905 Wilshire Blvd. Los Angeles, Calif.	90036
152.	Murray, David	San Fernando Valley State College Northridge, Calif.	91324
153.	Nee, Tom	U. of California, San Diego, La Jolla	92037
154.	Neilson, James	3817 78th St., Kenosha, Wisc.	
155.	Nelhybel, Vaclav	229-49 East 85th St., New York, N. Y.	10028
156.	Nelson, Norman J.	Colorado Apts. H204, Austin, Tex.	78703
157.	Nelson, Ron	Brown U., Providence, R. I.	02912
158.	Newlin, Dika	NTSU, Denton, Tex.	76203
159.	Nin-Culmell, Joaquin	U. of California, Berkeley	94720
160.	Nixon, Roger	San Francisco State College, Calif.	94132
161.	Noerr, Robert	Atlanta Symphony, Atlanta, Ga.	30300
162.	Noss, Luther	Yale U., New Haven, Conn.	06520
163.	Nye, Robert E.	U. of Oregon, Eugene	97403
164.	Ode, James	Ithaca College, Ithaca, N. Y.	14850
165.	Ogdon, Will C.	U. of California, San Diego, La Jolla	92037
166.	Oliveros, Pauline	U. of California, San Diego, La Jolla	92037
167.	Olson, Robert G.	De Anza College, Cupertino, Calif.	95014
168.	Owen, Charley	348 Beechwood Rd., Berwyn, Pa.	19312
169.	Owen, Harold J.	U. of Oregon, Eugene	97403
170.	Palmer, Michael	Atlanta Symphony, Atlanta, Ga.	30309
171.	Palmer, Robert	Cornell U., Ithaca, N. Y.	14850
172.	Patnoe, Herb	De Anza College, Cupertino, Calif.	95014
173.	Persichetti, Vincent	Hillhouse, Wise Mill Rd., Philadelphia	19128
174.	Peterson, Wayne	San Francisco State College, Calif.	94132
175.	Poole, Reid	U. of Florida, Gainesville	32601
176.	Post, Alexander	San Francisco State College, Calif.	94132
177.	Powell, Mel	Yale U., New Haven, Conn.	06520
178.	Rasmussen, Warren	San Francisco State College, Calif.	94132
179.	Reed, Alfred	U. of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	33124
180.	Reeder, Barbara	880 N. W. 134th St., Seattle, Wash.	98177
181.	Reynolds, Veda	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105
182.	Ritscher, George	U. of Illinois, Urbana	61801
183.	Roberts, John	414 14th St., Education Building Denver, Colo.	80202
184.	Robinson, Don	786 Cleveland Ave., S. W. Atlanta, Ga.	30315
185.	Roller, A. Clyde	303 Teakwood, Houston, Tex.	770--

186.	Sacco, Peter	San Francisco State College, Calif.	94132
187.	Sawhill, Clarence	UCLA, Los Angeles, Calif.	90024
188.	Schaefer, William	U. of Southern California, Los Angeles	90007
189.	Schiffman, Harold	Florida State U., Tallahassee	32306
190.	Shapey, Ralph	U. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.	60637
191.	Shumway, Stan	U. of Kansas, Lawrence	66044
192.	Skapski, George	San Fernando Valley State College	91324
193.	Smith, Leland	Stanford U., Stanford, Calif.	94305
194.	Smith, William O.	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105
195.	Sollberger, Harvey	Columbia U., New York, N. Y.	10027
196.	Sperry, Gale	U. of South Florida, Tampa	33620
197.	Spies, Claudio	Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.	19081
198.	Stanton, Royal	De Anza College, Cupertino, Calif.	95014
199.	Stedman, Preston	U. of Pacific, Stockton, Calif.	95204
200.	Stevens, Halsey	U. of Southern California, Los Angeles	90007
201.	Stoltze, Robert H.	Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oreg.	97200
202.	Swor, William	Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge	70803
203.	Tandoc, Nelson	De Anza College, Cupertino, Calif.	95014
204.	Tanner, Paul	UCLA, Los Angeles, Calif.	90024
205.	Thompson, Lawrence	5435 Sheraton Oaks Dr., Houston, Tex.	770--
206.	Timm, Everett	Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge	70803
207.	Trotter, John Scott	1314 North Hayworth, Los Angeles, Calif.	90046
208.	Trotter, Robert	U. of Oregon, Eugene	97403
209.	Troupin, Edward	University of Florida, Gainesville	32601
210.	Tubb, Monte	U. of Oregon, Eugene	97403
211.	Tufts, Paul	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105
212.	Turetzky, Bertram	U. of California, San Diego, La Jolla	92037
213.	Vagner, Robert S.	U. of Oregon, Eugene	97403
214.	Verrall, John W.	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105
215.	Viscuglia, Felix	Symphony Hall, Boston, Mass.	02115
216.	Wagner, Irvin	Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge	70803
217.	Walters, Gibson	San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif.	95114
218.	Ward, William	San Francisco State College, Calif.	94132
219.	Ward-Steinman, David	San Diego State College,San Diego,	92115
220.	Weigel, Eugene	U. of Montana, Missoula	59801
221.	Welke, Walter C.	U. of Washington, Seattle	98105
222.	Werner, Robert J.	MENC, 1201 Sixteenth St., N. W. Washington, D. C.	20036
223.	Wernick, Richard	801 Ridley Creek Dr., Media, Pa.	19063
224.	Whitcomb, Manley	Florida State U., Tallahassee	32306
225.	Wiggins, Clarence	San Fernando Valley State College Northridge, Calif.	91324
226.	Williams, J. Clifton	U. of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	33124
227.	Williams, Joan Franks	1150 17th E., Seattle, Wash.	981--
228.	Williamson, John	Foothill College, Los Altos, Calif.	94022
229.	Wilson, Keith	Yale U., New Haven, Conn.	06520
230.	Winesanker, Michael	Texas Christian U., Fort Worth, Tex.	76129
231.	Zupko, Ramon	Roosevelt U., Chicago, Ill.	60605

APPENDIX 3

SCHOOLS VISITED OR REPRESENTED BY RESPONDENTS

CALIFORNIA:

California State College, Long Beach
California State Polytechnic College, Pomona
Cubberly High School, Palo Alto
Cupertino High School
De Anza College, Cupertino
Deep Springs College
El Camino College, Torrance
Foothill College, Los Altos
Mills College, Oakland
Palo Alto High School
San Diego State College
San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge
San Francisco State College
San Jose City College
San Jose State College
Stanford University, Stanford
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego at La Jolla
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of Pacific, Stockton
University of Redlands
University of Southern California

COLORADO:

Denver Public Schools
University of Colorado, Boulder

CONNECTICUT

Greenwich High School
Yale University, New Haven

FLORIDA:

Florida State University, Tallahassee
University of Florida, Gainesville
University of Miami, Coral Gables
University of South Florida, Tampa

GEORGIA:

Fulton County Schools
Georgia State College, Atlanta

ILLINOIS:

Concordia College, River Forest
Northwestern University, Evanston
Roosevelt University, Chicago
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
University of Chicago
University of Illinois, Urbana

KANSAS:

University of Kansas, Lawrence
Wichita State University, Wichita

LOUISIANA:

Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
Loyola University, New Orleans
Tulane University, New Orleans

MASSACHUSETTS:

Boston University
Harvard University, Cambridge
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge
New England Conservatory, Boston

MICHIGAN:

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

MISSOURI:

University of Missouri, Kansas City

MONTANA:

University of Montana, Missoula

NEW YORK:

Columbia University, New York City
Cornell University, Ithaca
Eastman School of Music, Rochester
Ithaca College, Ithaca
Juilliard School of Music, New York City
New York University

NORTH CAROLINA:

Duke University, Durham
Greensboro Public Schools
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina, Greensboro

OREGON:

Corvallis High School
Lewis and Clark College, Portland
Oregon State University, Corvallis
Salem Public Schools
University of Oregon, Eugene
Willamette University, Salem

PENNSYLVANIA:

Philadelphia Academy of Music
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

RHODE ISLAND:

Brown University, Providence

SOUTH DAKOTA:

Augustana College, Sioux Falls

TEXAS:

Dallas Public Schools
Houston University
North Texas State University, Denton
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth
University of Texas, Austin

WASHINGTON:

Seattle Public Schools
University of Washington, Seattle

APPENDIX 4

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS VISITED

Atlanta Symphony
Baton Rouge Symphony
Boston Symphony Orchestra
Broadway Musicals
Chicago Lyric Opera
Chicago Symphony
Dallas Symphony
Denver Symphony
Handel and Haydn Society, Boston
Honolulu Symphony Orchestra and Chorale
Houston Symphony
Los Angeles Philharmonic
Monday Evening Concerts, Los Angeles
Moog, R. A., Electronic Lab, Trumansburg, New York
New York Philharmonic
Philadelphia String Quartet, Seattle, Washington
Philadelphia Symphony
San Francisco Symphony
Soni Ventorum Woodwind Quintet, Seattle, Washington
Welk Productions, Hollywood
Western Opera, California

APPENDIX 5

MUSICAL PERFORMANCES ATTENDED DURING PROJECT PERIOD

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION
Oct. 22, 1968	Rosalinda	Los Angeles Music Center
Oct. 23	Lawrence Welk	Los Angeles
Oct. 24	Los Angeles Philharmonic Rehearsal	Los Angeles
Oct. 25	Los Angeles Philharmonic Concert	Pasadena
Oct. 26	UCLA Band Performance	Los Angeles
Oct. 29	The Performing Group, Mills College	Oakland
Nov. 2	My Fair Lady	Sioux Falls, S. D.
Nov. 13	Stravinsky's Le Rossignol and Oedipus Rex	Chicago Lyric Opera, Chicago
Nov. 16	University of Illinois Band	Urbana, Illinois
Nov. 17	University of Illinois Wind Ensemble	Urbana, Illinois
Nov. 23	Augustana College Band	Sioux Falls, S. D.
Nov. 23	High School Honor Bands	Sioux Falls, S. D.
Dec. 3	Promises, Promises	New York
Dec. 4	Radio City Music Hall	New York
Dec. 4	Fiddler on the Roof	New York
Dec. 4	Carnegie Hall Concert	New York
Dec. 7	Handel and Haydn Society--The Messiah	Boston
Dec. 7	Boston Symphony Orchestra	Boston
Dec. 10	Musical	New Haven, Conn.
Dec. 11	George M	New York
Dec. 12	New York Philharmonic Concert	New York
Dec. 13	Philadelphia Symphony	Philadelphia
Dec. 14	Philadelphia Symphony (Children's Concert)	Philadelphia
Dec. 18-19	Miscellaneous Concerts at the Midwest Band Clinic	Chicago
Jan. 7, 1969	New Music Concert, North Texas State University	Denton, Texas
Jan. 9	Music by William Latham, North Texas State University	Denton, Texas
Jan. 10	Dallas Symphony, Contemporary Music Concert	Dallas, Texas
Jan. 22	Atlanta Symphony, Children's Concert	Atlanta, Georgia

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION
Feb. 7, 1969	Santa Clara, Calif., Philharmonic	Campbell, Calif.
Feb. 8	San Francisco Symphony	Foothill College, Los Altos, Calif.
Feb. 15	Stanford University Music Dept.	Stanford, Calif.
Feb. 16	University of California Band	Berkeley, Calif.
Feb. 19	San Jose Symphonic Band	San Jose, Calif.
Feb. 23	Lenox String Quartet	San Jose, Calif.
March 1	Cupertino High School Music Department	Cupertino, Calif.
March 2	Stanford University Wind Ensemble and Brass Choir	Stanford, Calif.
March 6	Foothill and DeAnza Concert Bands	Foothill College, Los Altos, Calif.
March 8	Recital of Small Ensemble Music, University of Redlands	Redlands, Calif.
March 9	University of Redlands Symphonic Band	Redlands, Calif.
March 9	Western Division, Junior College Honor Band	Redlands, Calif.
March 10	Monday Evening Concerts	Los Angeles
March 18	Benjamin Britten's Noye's Fludde, MENC Conference	Eugene, Oregon
March 19	Eugene Host Night Festival Concert	Eugene, Oregon
March 19	Libby, Montana High School Band	Eugene, Oregon
March 19	University of Montana Concert Band	Eugene, Oregon
March 20	Eugene Wind Ensemble	Eugene, Oregon
March 20	Eckstein Junior High School Orchestra (Seattle)	Eugene, Oregon
March 20	Soni Ventorum Woodwind Quintet	Eugene, Oregon
March 20	Philadelphia String Quartet	Eugene, Oregon
March 24	The Performing Group, Mills College	Oakland
March 27	Brigadoon, Cupertino High School	Cupertino, Calif.
March 28	Young Audiences Concert, San Jose State College Instrument Ensemble	Cupertino, Calif.
March 30-April 2	Various Small Ensemble Concerts, MENC Convention	Honolulu, Hawaii
March 31	Hawaii All-State Choir, Orchestra, and Band	Honolulu, Hawaii
April 1	Honolulu Symphony Orchestra	Honolulu, Hawaii
April 2	Music and Dance of Asia and Oceania	Honolulu, Hawaii
April 8	Cubberly High School Band	Palo Alto, Calif.
April 11	Contemporary Concert, University of California, San Diego, Players	Santa Barbara, Calif.

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION
April 12, 1969	Contemporary Performance Demonstrations	Santa Barbara, Calif.
April 12	University of Oregon Woodwind Quintet and University of California, Santa Barbara, Men's Glee Club	Santa Barbara, Calif.
April 13	Cello Recital, Geoffrey Rutkowski	Santa Barbara, Calif.
April 19	CMEA Northern Division Band Contests, Lynbrook High School	San Jose, Calif.
April 22	Alea II and Theodore Antoniou, Stanford University	Stanford, Calif.
April 23	Western Opera Company, San Jose City College	San Jose, Calif.
April 24	Rock Concert, Fillmore West	San Francisco
May 4	Contemporary Group, University of Washington	Seattle
May 6	Assembly Program by Dr. William Smith, "Electronics and the Clarinet", Blaine Junior High School	Seattle
May 10	University of Michigan Symphony Band, Foothill College	Los Altos, Calif.
May 14	San Jose State College Band	San Jose, Calif.
May 20	Cupertino High School Music Department	Cupertino, Calif.
May 29	DeAnza College Concert Band	Cupertino, Calif.
June 1	Alea II, Stanford University	Stanford, Calif.

APPENDIX 6

SECURING CONTEMPORARY MUSIC FOR PERFORMANCE

1. ACA Pioneer Editions, 170 West 74th St., New York, N. Y. 10023
2. American Music Center (BMI) New York
3. ASCAP, 575 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. 10022
4. Canadian Music Center, 33 Edward St., Toronto 2, Ontario, Canada
5. College Band Directors' National Association. Committee on New Works for Band, Walter Welke, Chairman, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105
6. Commission your own works
7. Composers
8. Composer's Autograph, 1908 Perry Ave., Redondo Beach, Calif. 90278
9. Contemporary Music Project. Publications. Secure from Music Educators' National Conference, 1201 Sixteenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036
10. Foreign Publishers Catalogs
11. Indiana University--Latin American Center, Bloomington, Indiana
12. Melos
13. Moeck Publishers, Celle, Germany
14. Music Library Notes
15. Musical Quarterly
16. New York Times
17. Pan American Union, Music Division, Washington, D. C. (Music from Latin America)
18. Perspectives of New Music
19. Poland, Union of Composers in Warsaw
20. Polish Government
21. Publishers' catalogs
22. Radio stations in major cities of Europe
23. SAI
24. Source Magazine
25. University composition departments
26. West German Government, Bonn, Germany

The reader is reminded that these are suggestions and the list is by no means a complete summary of the possibilities.