

Boston University
College of Fine Arts

Thesis

THE PATRONAGE OF COMPOSERS
IN THE UNITED STATES

by

PAULA J. BISHOP

B.S., North Carolina State University, 1983

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Music

2005

© Copyright by
Paula J. Bishop
2005

Approved by

First Reader

Dr. Joel Sheveloff, Ph.D.
Professor of Music

Second Reader

Dr. Thomas Peattie, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Music

Acknowledgments

Without my mentors at Boston University, this project would not have been possible. In particular I owe an extreme debt of gratitude to Dr. Joel Sheveloff and Dr. Thomas Peattie, both of the Department of Musicology in the School of Music, College of Fine Arts. In addition, I wish to extend my thanks to Dr. Jeremy Yudkin of the School of Music, College of Fine Arts, as well as Holly Mockovak, (Librarian), Erin Mayhood (Assistant Librarian), and Olga Khurgin, Donald Denniston, and the many student workers in the Music Library of Boston University.

Others who have assisted me in my research include: Joy Kiser, Librarian, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC; Mike Vitale, Consulting Archivist, American Academy in Rome Archives, New York; Stephanie Poxon, Music Specialist, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC; the staff of the Government Documents Division and the Music Division of the Boston Public Library; Dr. Kenneth W. Rose, Assistant Director, Rockefeller Archive Center; and Lyn Liston, Director of New Music Information, American Music Center. In addition Dr. J. Peter Burkholder of Indiana University, and Dr. Denise Von Glahn of Florida State University, provided valuable insight at a critical point in my research.

As important as all of these people have been to me throughout this project, the final version of this thesis would never have seen the light of day without the love and dedication of my husband, David Dice, and my son, Jacob Dice. I can never express adequately in words how blessed I feel to have these two people support me in this endeavor.

THE PATRONAGE OF COMPOSERS IN THE UNITED STATES

PAULA J. BISHOP

ABSTRACT

Patronage of composers in Europe has a long and substantial history, dating back to at least the Middle Ages, with the church, the court, and the aristocracy acting in the role of patron to varying degrees at different times. In many cases, these institutions employed the composers to produce musical works that both benefited and glorified the institution, as well as to teach and perform, and in exchange they often provided housing and food along with a salary. The French Revolution brought about many changes in the European patronage system, but in effect the state became a substitute for the royalty and aristocracy of previous generations. Cultural life in America came of age at a time when the old patronage system in Europe was in decline and while American leaders were shaping their ideas about democracy. Rejecting a system of patronage based on a strong central authority, Americans preferred a pluralistic approach to supporting creative artists that emphasized diversity and placed responsibility for making a living directly on the artist. This thesis explores the history of patronage as it developed in the United States with an emphasis on the attitudes of composers towards their patrons and the system of patronage on which they rely. It focuses on three types of patronage—private individuals, philanthropic foundations, and government support—and is based on archival material, the writings of composers, and a variety of other historical documents.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – Introduction	1
Chapter 2 – Building the Infrastructure	11
Chapter 3 – Private Patronage	23
Chapter 4 – Philanthropic Foundations and Other Organizations	49
Chapter 5 – Government Support	74
Chapter 6 – Conclusion.....	92
Appendix I – Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music.....	98
Appendix II – Fromm Foundation	100
Appendix III – Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation Commissions	104
Appendix IV – Serge Koussevitzky Music Foundation.....	106
Appendix V – McKim Fund Commissions	111
Appendix VI - Guggenheim Fellowships	113
Appendix VII - Pulitzer Prize in Music	120
Appendix VIII - American Academy in Rome Fellows in Musical Composition.....	121
Appendix IX – National Endowment for the Arts	123
Bibliography	136
Vita	147

List of Tables

Table 1 Musicians and teachers of music from census data, 1850-1910	20
Table 2 Composers and their occupations in the 17th and 18th centuries	33

Chapter 1 – Introduction

In 1939 Virgil Thomson published an essay entitled “How Composers Eat, or Who Does What to Whom and Who Gets Paid” in which he enumerated the sources of income for a composer.¹ He noted that a large number of composers relied on their own fortunes or those of their wives. He also included “gifts and doles” in his list, by which he meant prizes and private commissions, and receipts from compositions in the form of royalties and performing-rights fees. Because none of these sources constituted a significant portion of a composer’s income, Thomson observed that most composers had to find employment in a range of musical and non-musical settings. Though written over six decades ago, Thomson’s assessment still rings true and reflects the way in which composers have always earned a living in the United States. Lacking the elaborate patronage system of Europe—whether noble, aristocratic, or state-supported—American composers have relied on a complex web of support. Patronage of composers in the United States does exist, but it has developed in a very different fashion from its European models.

Patronage of composers in Europe has a long and substantial history, dating back to at least the Middle Ages, with the church, the court, and the aristocracy acting in the role of patron.²

¹ Virgil Thomson, “How Composers Eat, or Who Does What to Whom and Who Gets Paid,” in *The State of Music* (New York: W. Morrow and Company, 1939). Reprinted in Virgil Thomson, *A Virgil Thomson Reader*, with introduction by John Rockwell (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1981), 118-21. Citations refer to the reprint edition.

² For a thorough discussion of patronage in Europe, see Frederick Dorian, *Commitment to Culture* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964); Henry Raynor, *A Social History of Music from the Middle Ages to Beethoven* (New York: Taplinger, 1978); and Henry Raynor, *Music and Society since 1815* (New York: Taplinger, 1978). For a discussion of English patronage, see Walter L. Woodfill, “Patronage and Music in England,” in *Aspects of the Renaissance: A Symposium*, ed. Archibald R. Lewis, 59-68 (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1967); Michael Foss, *The Age of Patronage: The Arts in England, 1660-1750* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1971); and Jonathan P. Wainwright, *Musical Patronage in Seventeenth-*

These institutions employed composers to produce musical works that both benefited and glorified the institution, as well as to teach and perform, and in exchange they often provided housing and food along with a salary. To understand the background against which the American system developed, this chapter offers a brief description of the history of patronage in England, Austria, Italy, and France, concentrating especially on the period between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, the time when the American colonies were being settled, struggling for independence, and determining the form of their new society, culture, and politics.

Though permanent Spanish colonies had existed on the North American continent since 1565, the British eventually dominated the East Coast, and their cultural, religious and economic ideas exerted a profound influence on the future of the new country. Prior to the establishment of the Church of England in 1534, composers had benefited from both royal and ecclesiastical patronage in England. Though the change from the Latin rite provided new opportunities for composers, Walter L. Woodfill has pointed out that “the dissolution of many establishments which maintained choirs...meant fewer places for trained singers and performers, less incentive for musical training in the hope of a career, and fewer opportunities for boys to learn music.”³ Composers of the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries still found willing patrons among the nobility and the court, particularly the chapel of the royal household. For example, Queen Elizabeth I, who reigned from 1558 until her death in 1603, employed thirty-two “Gentlemen” and twelve boy choristers in the Chapel Royal and maintained a group of instrumentalists at court, known as the Queen’s Musick. William Byrd counted Elizabeth among his patrons, as well as members of the nobility such as Sir John Petre and Lord Paget.

Century England: Christopher, First Baron Hatton (1605-1670) (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1997).

³ Woodfill, “Patronage and Music in England,” 59.

When Charles I was crowned King of England and Ireland in 1625, he continued the tradition of strong patronage of the arts, at one point employing eighty-eight musicians. Friction with Parliament over money eventually led to the English Civil War of 1642-1649, which culminated with the execution of the king. Parliament, having won the war, ruled the country, and Oliver Cromwell, the Puritan leader of the Parliamentary side, became Lord Protector in 1653. Court patronage of musicians declined during the war—between 1644 and 1660 there were no musicians listed on the court's payroll—and did not exist during the Commonwealth Period. In fact, the government banned elaborate sacred and theatrical music. The situation seemed so dire that in 1657 the Committee for the Advancement of Music petitioned the government to alleviate the general hardship of musicians. Most musicians found employment during this time as teachers and organists, though some still had private patrons.

Cromwell died in 1658 and his son, Richard, took over as Lord Protector. He was overthrown in 1660 and the monarchy was restored with Charles II as King. During his exile in France, Charles II had admired Louis XIV's patronage of artists, musicians, and writers. Upon his return to England, he attempted to imitate the French court by surrounding himself with both sacred and secular music: he restored the King's Musick and the Chapel Royal and allowed theaters to reopen in London. Though Charles II and his successors, James II (r. 1685-1688), Queen Mary II (r. 1689-1694) and her husband William III (r. 1689-1702) all appeared to be great patrons of the arts, court patronage actually declined in this period. The financial instability of the country after the Restoration played a key role, as did a series of disastrous events during the reign of Charles II, including the Plague (1665) and the Great Fire of London (1666). The Clarendon Code re-established the Anglican Church, ended tolerance for nonconformists, and resulted in the exclusion of some musicians from court. Some composers, such as John Blow and

Henry Purcell, continued to benefit from royal patronage, but most relied on public performances and patronage by wealthy aristocrats for their livelihood.

Michael Foss has suggested that the arts did not develop well after the Restoration because of the decline in court patronage as well as several other factors:

Foreign influence exerted strong pressures; public patronage increased; wealth and better education diffused the arts through the country, away from the court. But also the Restoration which seemed so kind to artists—this society which appeared so interested and so amused—was in its actions hard and ruthless to the arts, destroying the roots while it tended the blooms.⁴

William Woodfill has further hypothesized that the status and position of the Church of England, a church “that seemed poor and that had disagreeing friends as well as enemies,” also contributed to the decline in an interest in music.⁵ Furthermore, the aristocracy viewed music as a skill to be acquired, but they hesitated to cultivate it in such a way as to compete with professional musicians or virtuosi, thereby reducing it to ornamental status.⁶ Patronage of composers therefore fell mostly to the government at a time when there was financial and political instability and a declining interest among the royals. All of these factors together resulted in a reduction in the output of English musical creativity throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the period of heaviest English migration to the American colonies.

The Habsburg dynasty in Austria began supporting composers as early as the fourteenth century when Rudolf IV (1339-1365), Duke of Austria, established the forerunner of the Hofkapelle. Later rulers firmly established Austria as a major cultural center in Europe by inviting artists from all over the world and by ensuring that there were suitable working conditions, performance venues, and enthusiastic audiences. Like so many of the examples of monarchical patronage, “Austria’s splendid art patronage... was partly designed to reflect the

⁴ Foss, *Age of Patronage*, 41.

⁵ Woodfill, “Patronage and Music in England,” 66.

⁶ *Ibid.*

imperial idea, to represent its grandeur, and to instill admiration of its patron, the Court,” but the Habsburgs, many of them musicians, demonstrated a genuine interest in the arts.⁷ By the turn of the nineteenth century, the Napoleonic Wars, economic conditions in Europe, and the emerging commercial market for music contributed to a decline in imperial patronage in Austria. The Holy Roman Empire under the Habsburgs collapsed in 1806, and successive leaders in Austria faced revolution and ultimately the First World War. Few composers of historical importance benefited from royal patronage during the nineteenth century, though many gained financial support from members of the aristocracy.

In the last century before the birth of Christ, Emperor Augustus appointed Gaius Maecenas, patron of Virgil and Horace, to administer the cultural affairs of the empire, making him the first minister of culture on record.⁸ With the establishment of the Christian church, a long era of ecclesiastical patronage began in Italy that lasted throughout the Middle Ages. The Medicis of Florence arguably became the most important patrons of the Renaissance era in part because their financial assistance and creative outlook helped to build the infrastructure that supported many of the innovations in music during the late Renaissance and early Baroque period. Ruling in Florence for more than 300 years (1434-1737), the Medicis fostered the careers of many composers and established a model of patronage that was emulated throughout Italy. In cities such as Milan, Naples, and Rome, the nobility employed composers and musicians, built theaters and concert halls, supported orchestras and opera companies, and financed conservatories. Like Austria, the Napoleonic Wars wreaked havoc on the economy and the political power structure in Italy. Composers continued to receive commissions from the nobility but increasingly offered their works on the open market. Patronage shifted from the nobility and aristocracy to the state throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century.

⁷ Dorian, *Commitment to Culture*, 11.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 52.

During the Middle Ages and Renaissance, the French cathedrals of Notre Dame and Chartres, along with the collegiate churches and the *saintes-chapelles*, figured significantly in the lives and careers of composers. By the fourteenth century, French kings and princes were directly employing musicians and composers at their royal residences. In the sixteenth century, François I centralized the court and increased the number of royal musicians. For him, the display of the musicians at court reinforced the vastness and security of his power, and princes and cardinals followed his example by establishing their own chapels with musicians and composers. In the seventeenth century, both Louis XIII and Louis XIV further centralized their rule in Paris and Versailles. The minor courts, churches, and chapels of the provinces found it difficult to attract musicians and composers because the royal patronage available at court offered better opportunities. In the final decades before the Revolution, however, the size of the *chapelle du roi* declined because of indifference, political instability, and chicanery.

The patronage of Louis XIV, the “Sun King,” warrants a close look as it played an important role in the aftermath of the Revolution. The musicians of his court, such as François Couperin and Jean-Baptiste Lully, held royal appointments in either the court in Paris or in Versailles. Louis XIV further extended his support by providing pensions for many composers in their later years. When the court musicians were off-duty, as for instance when the king traveled away from his court, they were allowed to hold posts with churches and private patrons. Louis XIV also created several institutions that provided opportunities for composers to work, such as the Comédie Française, the Academie Royale de Musique (later known as the Opéra), and the Opéra Comique. The influence and popularity of Louis XIV was so great that the nobility and aristocracy sought to emulate him by hiring their own musicians and supporting theatrical and musical activities, especially in Paris. His reign also saw the emergence of the salon, in which aristocratic women invited musicians, artists, and writers into their homes for discussions and

entertainment. Performing in these salons became an important step in establishing oneself in Paris in the hope of receiving a lucrative royal position.

The years of Louis XIV's reign and those of his successors witnessed excess and elitism. After the Revolution of 1789 and the abolishment of the royalty in 1792, the rulers of the new republic searched for ways to make art a part of everyone's life, not just a courtly privilege. Initially, a Utopian ideal was expressed in which "all people would participate in an art life attuned to the ideology of the new state."⁹ For the most part that goal failed, but a lasting commitment to patronage of the arts by the government endured through the various forms of republics and monarchies that followed.

Composers and other artists found themselves affected by the changes wrought by the French Revolution. The dissolution of the old regime, the declining aristocratic wealth, inflation and post-war depression after 1815, and the rise of the middle class meant that composers had to rely on paying audiences and subsidies from taxation, fundamentally changing the role of the composer in society:

Until the nineteenth century the musician had a definite if not exalted place in society and a clearly defined social function, writing and playing the music he was paid to write and play. So long as he was competent to do the work expected of him, his livelihood was assured and his audience, except in very unusual circumstances, was known to him. The nineteenth century deprived him of both place and function.¹⁰

Henry Raynor argues that the composer now found himself an outcast, in search of a compositional voice that would cause him to be noticed and justify his position in society. At the same time, the rising middle class made up more and more of the paying audiences and sought out musical instruction, often imitating the manners of the aristocracy.¹¹ The lasting effect of the French Revolution and the rise of romanticism, though, placed an emphasis on the individual and

⁹ Ibid., 156.

¹⁰ Raynor, *A Social History of Music*, 9-10.

¹¹ Raynor, *Music and Society since 1815*, 1-35.

on the notion of art for art's sake, causing composers to turn away from a dependence on the type of patronage that exerted too much influence over the composer.

The excesses of the French nobility and aristocracy that led to the French Revolution figured prominently in the minds of American leaders as they shaped their ideas about democracy in the United States in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Cultural life in America came of age within this emerging democracy; at the same time, the old system of patronage was in decline in Europe and composers were redefining their role in society. While Europeans based their new system of patronage on another strong central authority, the state, Americans preferred a pluralistic approach to supporting creative artists that emphasized diversity and placed responsibility for constructing a living directly on the artist. Censorship of composers in Europe during the nineteenth century may also have played a part in the rejection of a system of patronage based on the government or a set of strong and wealthy individuals.

With this background in mind, this thesis describes how the system of patronage evolved in the United States, focusing specifically on how composers of art music were supported. A basic framework for this system of patronage is identified, consisting of three types of patrons: private patrons, philanthropic foundations, and government support.¹² For the purposes of this study, a private patron is defined as an individual or group of individuals that provide financial support to composers, either directly in the form of grants, awards, and commissions, or indirectly as in providing housing or arranging for publishing and performances. Though individuals who attend concerts or purchase the products of an artist (as in sheet music or recordings) are considered patrons in the broadest sense, they will not be included in this discussion. The

¹² Though I have drawn a distinction between these three types of patronage, in reality the line between them is far more fluid. For instance a philanthropic foundation founded by one benefactor often reflects the views of that individual but conducts its business under the strict guidelines of the Internal Revenue Service. The National Endowment for the Arts awards matching grants to foundations, which in turn make grants to individuals and organizations.

appendices provide lists of composers who have received grants from various foundations, compiled from archival material, published reports, and personal correspondence with the organizations. The final appendix includes a list of composers who have received grants from the National Endowment for the Arts, assembled from the Endowment's annual reports.

Ralph Locke and Cyrilla Barr have pointed out that patronage remains largely ignored by scholars and others because of a kind of musical idealism or a “worshipful attitude toward the works of the ‘classical’ canon.” They further note that the “mention of money distracts (or even detracts) from the cherished qualities of the object of their veneration.”¹³ Approaching the study of patronage in the United States has proven challenging because of these attitudes—biographies tend to omit or minimize any mention of patrons. Henry Raynor has argued for the importance of just such studies, suggesting:

In so far as the conditions are imposed by the musical organisations—using the term in its widest legitimate sense to denote orchestras and choirs often linked to such extra-musical organizations as church, court or municipality, and singers and the whole structure of the musical printing or publishing mechanisms—through which he had to work, the study of such organizations, their influence on him and the way in which his work modified them, becomes historically important. This dimension of history may affect style no more than obliquely, but it demonstrates the conditions out of which styles and traditions arise.¹⁴

Locke and Barr concur with this stating that “the way in which a performing art, especially, is funded affects the repertoire that gets performed and the way that that repertoire is marketed to the public.”¹⁵

This thesis identifies the sources of funding available to American composers and lays the groundwork for future studies on the effects of the type of financial support on the music produced. The composers listed in the appendices of this thesis number well over two thousand;

¹³ Ralph Locke and Cyrilla Barr, “Music Patronage as a ‘Female-Centered Cultural Process’,” in *Cultivating Music in America: Women Patrons and Activists since 1860*, ed. Ralph Locke and Cyrilla Barr (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 4.

¹⁴ Raynor, *A Social History of Music*, 12-13.

¹⁵ Locke and Barr, “Music Patronage,” 5.

this data could be further analyzed for trends in American music during the twentieth century. Finally the philanthropic foundations identified in this thesis provide scholars with additional sources of information about a particular composer such as such as letters and manuscripts.¹⁶ An understanding of the the patronage system in the United States thus brings added insight to the history of American music.

¹⁶ For instance, the Paul Fromm archives housed in the Houghton Library at Harvard University contain many letters—some handwritten—between twentieth-century American composers and Fromm, as well as evaluations of works submitted to the Fromm Foundation for Music, public relations brochures, press clippings, programs, and manuscripts.

Chapter 2 – Building the Infrastructure

During the Colonial period in America, many of the conditions necessary to support composers did not exist, such as music schools, concert halls, and performance organizations, but they slowly emerged after the Revolutionary War when economic and social conditions improved. The nineteenth century became a period of building the necessary infrastructure to support professional musicians and composers. This chapter begins with a review of the conditions prior to the nineteenth century then explores the creation of educational opportunities for composers, the formation of performance organizations and venues, and the development of appreciative audiences.

Conditions in Colonial America

Jamestown, the first permanent English colony, was a business venture, as were most of the plantations and settlements established along the East Coast. North America was seen as a land full of natural resources, such as fish, furs, timber, minerals, and even gold and silver, that could be exported to England, thereby increasing English wealth and power. Once granted a royal charter, the promoters of these ventures recruited people with the necessary skills to make the venture successful, such as planters, merchants and skilled artisans. The 144 men and boys recruited by the London promoters of the Jamestown settlement sailed in 1606 as company employees. Even the famed Plymouth Colony was established under a charter granted in 1620 and financially backed by a wealthy merchant, Thomas Weston. Of the 102 passengers on the *Mayflower*, only thirty-five were of the religious separatist group that had first taken refuge in Holland. Weston insisted that all of the new colonists were to be his employees and that profits

generated in the colony were to be paid to him for a period of seven years.¹ However, Plymouth Colony, for all its commercial aspects, “can be seen in retrospect as one turning point in English colonization, for it marked the beginning of a voluntary movement of religiously discontented persons to America, a movement that would swell to a flood in the late 1620s and the 1630s.”² The early English colonization of North America thus represented a mixture of business and a desire for religious freedom and tolerance.

The pattern of recruiting farmers, laborers, and merchants continued with other settlements. To supply a sufficient pool of laborers, promoters even encouraged the English authorities to ship the inmates of the poorhouses and prisons to America. Many immigrants came as indentured servants; they agreed to a period servitude in exchange for passage and room and board in the new country. As many as one-half to two-thirds of all immigrants to the colonies came as indentured servants and included people in the lowest ranks of society as well as skilled craftsmen and even schoolmasters.³ In addition there were Africans brought to the colonies as slaves; by 1780 the black population, most of whom were not freemen, represented approximately 27% of the total population in the American colonies.⁴ At best, the American colonial society was composed of the middle class with a smattering of wealthy landowners who might have been considered part of the “gentlemen” class but were not part of the true English aristocracy. Colonial Americans imitated the hierarchical structure of English society but within a narrower range.

The earliest colonists faced harsh conditions, including lack of supplies, insufficient food and shelter, sickness, and strained relations with the Native American population. Every able-

¹ R. C. Simmons, *The American Colonies: From Settlement to Independence* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1976), 12-17.

² *Ibid.*, 17.

³ Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1991), 51-2.

⁴ Simmons, *The American Colonies*, 175-7.

bodied person was required to contribute to the work required to sustain the colony. As Captain John Smith of the Jamestown colony described it, “Now falleth every man to worke, the Councell contrive the fort, the rest cut downe trees to make place to pitch their Tents; some provide clapboard to relade the ships, some make gardens, some nets, &c.”⁵ Later colonists faced similar conditions until the settlements finally reached a sufficient size and stabilized both economically and politically. Because these colonies were chartered to supply raw materials to their English investors and were required to pay off their debts and return a profit, little time was left over for leisure activities.

The early colonial economy was based on the production and export of provisions and agricultural staples to England. Various laws passed in the early eighteenth century by the British Parliament restricted the ability of the colonies to manufacture goods. The result was that more goods were imported than exported, creating a scarcity of gold and silver within the colonies. Only a select few were able to trade directly with England which further limited the flow of real currency. The colonies therefore became a trading society based on a vast network of personal relationships. Those with money and status considered it their duty to lend to others with less and were in turn often beholden to someone higher in the chain.⁶ Historian Gordon S. Wood refers to these relationships as patronage, but the nature of this patronage differs from traditional models of artistic patronage in that it involves some form of nearly-equal reciprocity.⁷ This factor, along with the sense of duty mentioned above, played a role in shaping patronage in the nineteenth century and beyond.

⁵ John Smith, *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New England & the Summer Isles, Together with the True Travels, Adventures and Observations, and a Sea Grammar* (London: Michael Sparkes, 1625; New York: Macmillan, 1907), 87.

⁶ Simmons, *The American Colonies*, 64-71.

⁷ Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* 74-79. Wood addresses this theme throughout his book.

Passengers on the ships to America during the seventeenth century were restricted in the amount of possessions they could carry with them. Advice from men such as *Mayflower* passenger Edward Winslow and later colonist Reverend Francis Higginson suggested that settlers bring only the following items: food for the voyage and for the year after landing, weapons, tools for farming and carpentry, cooking and other household utensils, clothing and bedding.⁸ Items such as furniture and large musical instruments were considered unnecessary and too bulky for transport. In spite of the difficulties, some people managed to transport instruments to the colonies in seventeenth century: Nathaniel Rogers of Rowley, Massachusetts, reportedly had a treble viol in his possession and Rev. Edmund Browne of Sudbury, Massachusetts, had a bass viol along with music books.⁹ In later years it became easier to arrange for the transport of such items, as demonstrated by the fact that a small German religious group that settled near Philadelphia in 1694 brought with them a small positive organ. Thomas Brattle of Boston purchased and imported a four-stop chamber organ sometime between 1689 and 1708. The organ was installed in King's Chapel in Boston in 1713. After the middle of the century, American-built organs came into use, particularly in New York and New England. The building of other types of instruments increased in the latter part of the eighteenth century. In 1769 the *Boston Gazette* reported that John Harris had built a spinet, the first ever such instrument made in

⁸ Edward Winslow, "Certain Useful Directions for Such as Intend a Voyage to These Parts" in *Mourts Relation: A Relation of journall of the beginning and proceedings of the English Plantation settled at Plimoth in New England* (London, 1622) and Reverend Francis Higginson, *New England's Plantation, or, A Short and True Description of the Commodities and Discommodities of that Country* (London, 1630). Both available at Pilgrim Hall Museum, "It Came on the Mayflower?" <http://www.pilgrimhall.org/onmayfl.htm>.

⁹ Henry Wilder Foote, "Musical Life in Boston in the Eighteenth Century," *American Antiquarian Society Proceedings* 49 (1939): 298. See also Barbara Lambert, "Social Music, Musicians, and Their Musical Instruments in and Around Colonial Boston," in *Music in Colonial Massachusetts, 1630-1820*, vol. II, ed. Barbara Lambert, 416 (Boston: Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1985).

America.¹⁰ Benjamin Crehore, a manufacturer of bass viols, appears to have produced the first piano in the United States sometime in the last decade of the eighteenth century.¹¹

Education and Training of Musicians and Composers

The creation of singing schools in New England during the eighteenth century represents the first tentative steps in the education and training of composers. The Society for Promoting Regular Singing was formed in Boston in 1722, and by the middle of the century singing schools had been established in South Carolina, Philadelphia, New York, and Maryland.¹² Though singing schools eventually declined in importance, they provided the seed for both music education in public schools and the creation of conservatories in the nineteenth century. The Boston Academy of Music was founded in 1833 to teach sacred and secular singing with Lowell Mason as its first professor. Within a few years, the school was also teaching instrumental music, and its orchestra gave the local premiere of Beethoven's First Symphony in 1841. Beginning in the 1860s, European-style conservatories were being formed on the East Coast, including the Oberlin Conservatory (1865), Boston Conservatory (1867), New England Conservatory (1867), and the Peabody Conservatory (1868). Shortly after this, universities and colleges created music departments, including Harvard and Boston Universities. In 1875 John Knowles Paine of Harvard College became the first person appointed as a music professor at the university level. Most of these conservatories, college and university positions were initially staffed by European musicians who were either recruited to come to the United States or had already arrived as part of

¹⁰ William Arms Fisher, *Notes on Music in Old Boston* (Boston: Oliver Ditson Company, 1918), 10.

¹¹ Michael J. O'Brien, *Pioneer Irish in New England* (New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1937), 99, and Christ Church, *The Dorchester Book* (Boston: George H. Ellis, printer, 1899).

¹² H. Wiley Hitchcock with Kyle Gann, *Music in the United States: A Historical Introduction*, 4th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000), 7-8.

the steady waves of migration that occurred during the nineteenth century.¹³ Composition was eventually incorporated into the curriculum of many of these schools, but many composers continued to seek training in Europe, especially Munich. Once trained, employment at the music schools in the United States offered an ideal situation for composers, who could receive a steady income and use the summer months for uninterrupted composition. In a sense, universities, colleges, and conservatories became patrons of composers in the nineteenth century and remain so to this day.¹⁴

Performance Organizations and Concert Life

Public concerts were given as early as 1729 when the Boston Gazette announced that a “Consort of Musick [was to be] performed on sundry Instruments, at the Dancing School in King Street.”¹⁵ Other cities such as Charleston, South Carolina, also had a thriving concert life in the early eighteenth century. By the 1730s, English ballad operas such as *Flor, or Hob in the Well*, with text by Colley Cibber and music arranged by John Hippisley, and *The Devil to Pay* by Charles Coffey were being produced in cities such as New York, Charleston, and Williamsburg, Virginia.¹⁶ The performing forces for these concerts and operas were composed primarily of immigrant professional musicians, and the orchestras were temporarily organized for the particular production as opposed to being a permanent organization.

By the early nineteenth century, musical associations existed in most of the urban areas of the country. For example, the Harmonical Society and Apollonian Society in Cincinnati were

¹³ For example, after the German Revolution of 1848, many German musicians immigrated to the United States and filled positions in orchestras as well as in academia.

¹⁴ See Catherine M. Cameron, “The University as Arts Patron,” in *Dialectic in the Arts: The Rise of Experimentalism in American Music* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996) for an assessment of the role of the university as patron.

¹⁵ The concert advertisement from the *Boston Gazette* of February 3, 1729, is reproduced in Lambert, “Social Music, Musicians, and Their Musical Instruments,” 410.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 33. For a complete discussion of concert life in America, see Oscar Sonneck, *Early Concert-Life in America* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1907).

both founded in the early nineteenth century, as were the Musical Fund Society of Philadelphia (1820) and the Handel and Haydn Society in Boston (1815). Some of these societies only organized concerts, but others formed associated orchestras, usually temporary in nature, such as the Musical Fund Societies of Cincinnati and Philadelphia, the Harvard Musical Association, and the Handel and Haydn Society. The efforts of these associations helped to increase the awareness of music as a cultural activity. Richard Crawford has observed that the work of the Handel and Haydn Society, based in an area of the country with a strong sacred singing tradition, moved music from the sanctuary to the concert hall and shifted the emphasis to the composer, which became an important step in the growth of art music in the United States in the nineteenth century.¹⁷

These societies and their orchestras also became the basis of the permanent orchestras that followed. In 1842, the New York Philharmonic Society formed the first permanent orchestra in the country and remained the only one for nearly four decades. Beginning in the 1880s, a number of permanent orchestras were formed over the following decades, including the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra (1880), the Boston Symphony Orchestra (1881), the Chicago Symphony Orchestra (1890), the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra (1896), and the Philadelphia Orchestra (1900). Support for American compositions by these organizations was minimal at best through most of the nineteenth century. The New York Philharmonic Society included the following in its rules:

If any grand orchestral composition, such as overtures or symphonies, shall be presented to the Society, they being composed in this country, the Society shall perform one every season provided a committee of five appointed by the Government [of the Society] shall have approved and recommended the composition.¹⁸

¹⁷ Richard Crawford, *America's Musical Life: A History* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), 293-4.

¹⁸ John H. Mueller, *The American Symphony Orchestra* (London: Calder, 1958). Quoted in Henry Raynor, *Music and Society Since 1815* (New York: Taplinger, 1978), 175.

Theodore Thomas, who led his own orchestra as well as the New York Philharmonic and the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, was a key figure in elevating musical taste in the United States and promoting the music of American composers in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. George W. Chadwick wrote in 1905 that Thomas had treated the work of American composers “as a dignified and serious effort” and not “as the work of incompetent amateurs,” allowing them to “stand or fall by their own intrinsic value—the only position a real artist cares to occupy.”¹⁹ The Boston Symphony Orchestra under various leaders played a number of works by American composers, mostly those based in New England such as Horatio Parker, George Chadwick, Arthur Foote, Edward MacDowell, and Amy Cheney Beach. Chadwick characterized these Boston performances as potentially pivotal in an American composer’s career because they could lead to performances in other American and European cities, as well as publication of their compositions in England and Germany.²⁰

In the early twentieth century, orchestras were formed in many smaller urban areas around the country such as the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra (1903, later to become the Minnesota Orchestra), the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra (1916), the San Francisco Symphony (1909), the Cleveland Orchestra (1918), the North Carolina Symphony (1932), and the Louisville Orchestra (1936). The growing number of college glee clubs, music school settlements, municipal bands, radio broadcasts of concerts, and the birth of the recording industry reflect the rich musical life in the United States by the early part of the twentieth century.

¹⁹ Ezra Schabas, *Theodore Thomas: America’s Conductor and Builder of Orchestras, 1835-1905* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 253. Quoted in Crawford, *America’s Musical Life*, 312-3.

²⁰ Crawford, *American’s Music Life*, 353.

Audiences

The concerts performed by the various musical organizations around the country were crucial in elevating musical taste in the United States, but another key factor was that music-making in the home had become a flourishing industry by the middle of the nineteenth century. The display of musical skills was initially adopted by the middle class as a sign of refinement and gentility and reflected the growing wealth and leisure time of the country. As noted above, the manufacture of pianos in the United States had begun by 1800, but the invention of the one-piece cast-iron frame in 1825 by Alpheus Babcock of Boston helped to propel the piano manufacturing business in the United States to prominence. These American-made pianos were better adapted to the changing climate conditions of this country, and soon pianos became a standard piece of furniture in many American homes, with entire rooms set aside for them. Over 24,000 pianos were manufactured in the United States in 1870, and the numbers continued to grow dramatically reaching a peak of well over 300,000 in the first decade of the twentieth century.²¹

The rise in sales of pianos in the United States was greatly helped by the growth of the music publishing business, and vice versa. Music publishing began in the United States in 1787 when John Aitken, a Philadelphia engraver and metalsmith, published Alexander Renaigle's *A Selection of the Most Favorite Scots Tunes with Variations for the Piano Forte or Harpsichord*. By the 1850s approximately 5,000 sheet music titles per year were being published.²² The sales of pianos and sheet music also created a demand for music teachers among the middle-class and affluent consumers of these products. The rise in the number of musicians and teachers of music in the population statistics confirms that music was a growing and healthy concern in the latter

²¹ Cyril Ehrlich, *The Piano: A History*, rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 222. For additional information on the role of the piano in the home, see Craig H. Roell, *The Piano in America, 1890-1940* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989) and Crawford, *America's Musical Life*.

²² Crawford, *America's Musical Life*, 232.

half of the nineteenth century. In 1915 Henry J. Harris studied the census data from 1850 to 1910 and published the statistics concerning musicians and teachers of music, shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Musicians and teachers of music from census data, 1850-1910²³

Year	Total Population	Percentage Growth in Population	Musicians and Teachers of Music	Percentage of Total Population	Percentage Growth in Music Occupations
1850	23,191,876		3,550	0.015%	
1860	31,443,321	35%	10,354	0.033%	191%
1870	38,558,371	22%	16,010	0.042%	55%
1880	50,155,783	30%	30,477	0.061%	90%
1890	62,622,250	24%	62,155	0.099%	104%
1900	75,994,575	21%	92,174	0.121%	48%
1910	91,972,266	21%	139,310	0.151%	51%

The number of people who listed music or the teaching of music as their occupation in the census more than doubled each decade during this period. The rate of growth in these occupations was significantly greater than the overall growth in the population. Harris noted that while the total population of the United States almost doubled between 1880 and 1910, the number of musicians and teachers of music increased nearly five fold, with the most rapid growth in the decade between 1880 and 1890. Harris further suggested that “the increase in the number of musicians and teachers of music” could be “taken as a criterion of American musical development.”²⁴

In addition to private music lessons, young Americans also had the opportunity to learn musical skills through the institution of music classes in the public educational system. Many regard Lowell Mason as the “father” of music education in the public schools in the United States: after the success of his singing school for young children, which he opened in Boston in 1830, and the Boston Academy of Music a few years later, Mason petitioned the Boston school

²³ Henry J. Harris, “The Occupation of Musician in the United States,” *Musical Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (April 1915): 301. To Harris’s original table, I have added the columns showing percentages.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

board to allow him to teach free singing lessons in the newly formed tax-supported public schools. The classes were so successful that the board adopted the singing classes as part of the curriculum in 1838 with Mason as one of the teachers. General music education has remained a part of the curriculum of public schools to the present day, waxing and waning in importance and emphasis as tastes and economic conditions have changed.

The importance of the musical education of the audience to the American composer was expressed by Oscar G. Sonneck, editor of *The Musical Quarterly*, in an address on “The American Composer and the American Publisher” in the early 1920s. Arthur L. Manchester, writing for that same journal, used Sonneck’s viewpoint on music education to further his own argument for its importance:

His [Sonneck’s] point that the permanent settlement of the place of the American composer shall hold in the world’s scheme of music depends upon the education of the American people to an understanding and appreciation of really good music, and the complement of this truth, namely, that the American composer who will create music destined to live beside that of the best European composers will be the product of this ‘uncompromising music education,’ cannot be successfully controverted.²⁵

Manchester portrayed music education—of the potential audience as well as of the composers themselves—as the first step in a sequence, to be followed by the development of a “musical America” and finally by the emergence of the American composer. Manchester argued that this sequence “cannot be transposed; it must begin at the right end and develop naturally from cause to effect in logical order.”²⁶ Rather than this rigid order, I contend that all of these steps ran in parallel and were dependent on each other. Nevertheless, Manchester’s point about the importance of these factors in developing an environment conducive for American composers is well-taken. As we will see in the following chapters, patrons helped to build this infrastructure in

²⁵ Arthur L. Manchester, “Music Education, a Musical America, the American Composer, a Sequence,” *Musical Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (October, 1924): 589.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

the nineteenth century as well as foster and promote the talents of native composers, making patronage a fourth ingredient in Manchester's sequence.

Chapter 3 – Private Patronage

Though steady economic growth occurred in the United States before the Revolutionary War, industrial growth after the war created tremendous wealth in the country. In spite of the increase in wealth in the nineteenth century, identifying composers who benefited from the largesse of private patrons proves difficult. The twentieth century yields more results, but the nature of the income tax laws in the United States discourages individual private patronage; instead philanthropic foundations were formed to distribute money. Because some of these foundations are centered solely on one individual's philosophy, the line between foundations and private patrons becomes blurred. This chapter will restrict itself to dealing with individuals who supported composers outside of the structure of philanthropic foundations.

The scarcity of composers in the United States until late in the nineteenth century provides the simplest explanation for the lack of private patrons in that century. Furthermore, philanthropists concentrated their efforts on other perceived social needs. Even if philanthropists had desired to take up the cause of the composer, no acceptable models for doing so existed—the old style of aristocratic patronage was disintegrating even in Europe and was frowned upon in the new democratic nation. Americans also strongly valued the concept of self-reliance, a notion deeply at odds with traditional models of patronage. Finally it can be argued that Americans did not hold “art,” which would encompass music, in high esteem until after World War II.

The Value of Music in American Society

Some writers refer to music as the stepchild of art in America.¹ This characterization arises from the fact that the visual and literary arts gained some cultural stock in this country long before music did. The early cultural stewards in cities such as Boston and New York concentrated first on building art museums rather than concert halls. The musical organizers of the Columbian Exposition of 1893 (also known as the World's Fair in Chicago) recognized that one of their goals in the music exhibitions had to be to demonstrate the value of music as an art, which implies that it was not considered so in the late-nineteenth century.² Attempts to gain government support for the arts in the nineteenth century, with the exception of the chartering of the National Conservatory in 1891, rarely involved music. Music had a problematic role in the cultural history of America, torn as it was between its role as entertainer of the masses and vehicle for social elitism.

Historians often hold the Puritans responsible for both the slow growth of art music in this country as well as attitudes towards it. W. S. B. Mathews in his 1889 volume, *A Hundred Years of Music in America*, describes the musical culture of the late nineteenth century as having had “its root in the rude and unskillful efforts of the psalmodists of the Pilgrims; that it grew slowly through the painful and laborious essays of the Puritan pioneers in sacred song.”³

Mathews thereby places the blame for the slow growth of art music in this country on the

¹ A recent example of referring to music as a stepchild to the visual arts is Michael Broyles, *Mavericks and Other Traditions in American Music* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 3. Eric Salzman, “Charles Ives, American,” *Commentary* 46, no. 2 (August 1968): 37-43, goes further by placing music out of the mainstream of not just art but American intellectual life. Alan Levy and Barbara L. Tischler, “Into the Cultural Mainstream: The Growth of American Music Scholarship,” *American Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (March 1990): 57-58, note the marginalization of music by historians.

² For a comprehensive discussion of the goals of the musical organizers of the Exposition, see Kiri Miller, “Americanism Musically: Nation, Evolution, and Public Education at the Columbian Exposition, 1893,” *19th-Century Music* 27, no. 2 (Fall 2003): 137-55.

³ W. S. B. Mathews, *A Hundred Years of American Music* (Chicago, 1889; repr., New York: AMS Press, 1970), 8. Mathews echoes the viewpoint of earlier writers such as George Hood, *A History of Music in New England* (Boston, 1846; repr., New York: Johnson Reprint Co., 1970) and Nathaniel D. Gould, *Church Music in America* (Boston: A. N. Johnson, 1853; repr., New York: AMS Press, 1972).

Puritans. A half century later, Gilbert Chase attempted to place their supposed hostility towards music in historical perspective and interpreted their psalm-singing as an early form of American folk music.⁴ Chase's view was undoubtedly informed by the work of Percy A. Scholes, who in 1934 demonstrated that, in fact, the Puritans enjoyed music outside of the church.⁵ Debates have continued in this vein over the last century in a variety of scholarly studies dealing with both music and American culture in general.⁶ The moderate view holds that although the value systems of the Puritans penetrated some aspects of American society, these systems cannot be held accountable for the entire set of American values. In spite of this, the notion that the Puritans restricted America's growth as a musical nation remains a much-cherished myth. Even as late as 2004, Michael Broyles stated that "Americans inherited not only a general Anglo-Saxon aversion to music as opposed to other arts, and an accompanying moral uneasiness with it that can be traced to the Puritans, but also a suspicion that it promoted political values contradictory to the nature of American society,"⁷ thus condemning both the Puritans *and* the Anglo-Saxons. His words echo those of Alexis de Tocqueville, writing in 1834, who observed that Americans are essentially "that portion of the English people whose fate it is to explore the forests of the New World" rather than enlarging the "empire of the mind." He further stated that "their [the American's] strictly Puritan origin; their exclusively commercial habits; even the country they

⁴ Gilbert Chase, *America's Music, From the Pilgrims to the Present*, rev. 3rd ed. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987). Irving Lowens, *Music and Musicians in Early America* (New York, 1964) also takes a more moderate view of the Puritans' role in shaping attitudes towards music.

⁵ Percy A. Scholes, *The Puritans and Music in England and New England* (London, 1934).

⁶ The most notorious debate was instigated by Cyclone Covey in response to Scholes's book: Cyclone Covey, "Puritanism and Music in Colonial America," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., vol. 8, no. 3 (July 1951): 378-88; Clifford K. Shipton, Cyclone Covey, Walter Muir Whitehill, letters to the editor, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., vol. 9, no. 1 (January 1952): 128-36; Cyclone Covey, "Did Puritanism of the Frontier Cause the Decline of Colonial Music?," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 6 (1958): 68-78.

⁷ Broyles, *Mavericks and Other Traditions*, 4.

inhabit...seems to divert their minds from the study of science, literature, and the arts.”⁸ A full discussion of the influence of the Puritans on musical thought in America is outside of the scope of this thesis except to note that the Puritans shaped ideas about the value of music, though that in itself was only one component in this complex issue.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the population of the United States has generally been comprised of the middle class, both in terms of economic status and in its value systems. Michael Broyles has suggested that middle-class Americans did not think of music as art but rather as entertainment. They preferred minstrel shows and military bands, and operas and symphonies were remote from their experience. He goes further and suggests that the fact that foreign musicians dominated local orchestras and their programming reinforced the perception that art music was outside of the understanding of the average American.⁹ Perhaps late in the nineteenth century when Americans began to strive for a national identity, Broyles’s reading has validity; however, America’s population has always contained significant numbers of immigrants. In 1850, the foreign-born population was approximately ten percent and it fluctuated in the thirteen to fifteen percent range from 1860 to 1920.¹⁰ H. Wiley Hitchcock, on the other hand, argues that the influx of immigrants to the United States helped to develop both art music and popular music. He also notes that the rapid expansion of the territories throughout the nineteenth century contributed to this dualistic musical culture.¹¹ Until a firm division between the cultivated and the vernacular tradition was in place in the second half of the nineteenth century, something like a ballad opera could be performed alongside a Stephen Foster tune in a “high society” setting with

⁸ Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, ed. J. P. Mayer and Max Lerner, trans. George Lawrence (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 421.

⁹ Broyles, *Mavericks and Other Traditions*, 4.

¹⁰ Campbell J. Gibson and Emily Lennon, “Historical Census Statistics on the Foreign-Born Population of the United States: 1850 to 1990,” U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999, <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0029/twps0029.html>.

¹¹ H. Wiley Hitchcock with Kyle Gann, *Music in the United States*, 4th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000), 55-65.

no sense of incongruity. The same concert program would appeal to the populace at large, too. In this way, music seemed to function as an entertainment rather than as a higher intellectual activity.

Early reviews of concerts provide hints to this notion of “music as entertainment” since they were as apt to discuss the audience as they were the music: who attended, what they wore, how they behaved and so on. For example, in the first known musical review, the *South Carolina Gazette* reported the following in 1732: “On Wednesday Night there was a Concert for the Benefit of Mr. Salter, at which was a fine Appearance of good Company.”¹² Nearly one hundred years later, the penchant for reporting on the audience was still in full force, especially in New York. The *New-York Evening Post* of November 30, 1825, gushed over the “assemblage of ladies so fashionable, so numerous, and so elegantly dressed” at a performance of Manuel García’s opera troupe. Reviews such as these, which persisted even into the twentieth century, are often cited as evidence that musical performances were social events, thereby reducing music to simply a form of entertainment. However, Mark N. Grant cautions that in the early years of music criticism, both the newspaper industry and music criticism in the United States were fledgling endeavors. These supposed music critics used many tactics to disguise their lack of musical knowledge.¹³ The first competent music critic was Henry C. Watson, a trained musician who emigrated from England in the 1840s and began writing music and art criticism for various newspapers in New York. Even with his arrival, though, music criticism was still ripe with amateurism and plagued by boosterism, bribery, and blackmail. So though it might be tempting to read the words of early critics as speaking for American views on music, these must be weighed against other sources.

¹² Oscar Sonneck, *Early Concert-Life in America* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1907), 12.

¹³ Mark N. Grant, *Maestros of the Pen: A History of Classical Music Criticism in America* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998), 7-25.

Thomas Jefferson, the third president of the United States (1801-1809), wrote to Giovanni Fabbroni in Italy that music “is the favorite passion of my soul, and fortune has cast my lot in a country where it is in a state of deplorable barbarism.”¹⁴ John F. Petri, a Leipzig-trained music teacher, wrote that when he arrived in Baltimore in 1831, “music was yet in its infancy or cradle. Even in good society and among well educated people nothing was appreciated beyond waltzes, marches and variations on some familiar theme, or simple airs from some of Rossini’s operas.”¹⁵ John Quincy Adams, the sixth president (1825-1829), wrote that “American genius was very much addicted to painting...but that we had neither cultivated nor were very attached much to music.”¹⁶ Another letter written by Jefferson suggests that music amongst the intelligentsia, though prized, may have been seen as a diversion or a way to stave off boredom: “Music, drawing, books, invention and exercise will be so many resources to you against ennui.”¹⁷ Karen Ahlquist reads these post-Revolutionary War attitudes towards music as anti-genteel. In other words some early Americans equated music to over-refinement rather than a part of good breeding.¹⁸ The anti-genteel, anti-elitist feelings, coupled with a population that was largely middle-class, probably did in fact allow for tremendous growth in the notion of music as entertainment rather than art, and can be closely tied to the idea that music should be democratic—it should belong to anyone and everyone.¹⁹

¹⁴ Thomas Jefferson, letter to Giovanni Fabbroni, June 8, 1778, in *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. II, ed. Paul Leicester Ford, 340 (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1904).

¹⁵ Quoted in W. S. B. Mathews, *A Hundred Years of American Music*, 636.

¹⁶ John Quincy Adams, *The Memoirs of John Quincy Adams: Comprising Portions of His Diary from 1795 to 1848*, edited by Charles Francis Adams (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1874), vol I, 98-99.

¹⁷ Thomas Jefferson, letter to Martha Jefferson, March 28, 1787, in *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. V, 266.

¹⁸ Karen Ahlquist, “Mrs. Potiphar at the Opera: Satire, Idealism, and Cultural Authority in Post-Civil War New York,” in *Music and Culture in America, 1861-1918*, ed. Michael Saffle, 32 (New York: Garland, 1998).

¹⁹ The interplay between music and democracy in the United States has been explored by numerous writers over the years. For instance, see Daniel Gregory Mason, “Democracy and Music,” *Musical Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (October 1917): 641-57; James H. Stone, “Mid-Nineteenth-Century American Beliefs in the Social Values of Music,” *American Quarterly* 43 (January 1957): 38-49; Karen Ahlquist, *Democracy at the*

By the 1830s a perceptible shift began to take place in terms of music's perceived value and status, at least as seen through the lens of music criticism. Of the New York premiere of Mozart's *Magic Flute* on April 20, 1833, an unnamed reviewer in the *Albion* noted that

We cannot conclude without adverting to the improvement in music which is daily perceptible in this country. Here is a complete opera containing a selection of music by one of the great masters the world ever produced—brought out in New York for the first time in a style that would not disgrace the first cities of Europe.²⁰

The use of the word “style” in reference to the musical performance (rather than the audience), as well as the comparison to European standards, shows a growing self-awareness on the part of some members of the musical world, but the change occurred very slowly. William Henry Fry, in a series of lectures on music in the middle of the century complained bitterly about American audiences and the state of music in this country:

The public, as a public know nothing about Art—they have not a single enlightened or healthy idea on the subject. . . . As a nation, we have totally neglected Art. We pay enormous sums to hear a single voice, or a single instrument, the beauties and excellencies of which (if it have any) we cannot discover. We will pay nothing to hear a sublime work of Art performed, because we do not know enough to appreciate it, and consequently such a performance bores us terribly.²¹

When David Bispham, an opera singer, was given the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws at his alma mater, Haverford College, in 1914, W. J. Baltzell noted it as a significant event because universities and colleges had barely endured music until that point:

Music was tolerated as a means of entertainment or diversion for the young men students, but was not considered as having any claim upon the serious study of the educated man, or as offering a satisfactory and honorable career of the college graduate.²²

Music as an art form slowly came into focus over the remainder of the nineteenth century and was aided in that transformation by critics such as John Sullivan Dwight of Boston. Equally

Opera: Music, Theater, and Culture in New York City, 1815-60 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997); Samuel Lipman, *Arguing for Music, Arguing for Culture* (Boston: American Council for the Arts in association with D. R. Godine, 1990).

²⁰ *New-York Albion*, April 20, 1833. Quoted in Grant, *Maestros of the Pen*, 11.

²¹ Quoted in Irving Lowens, *Music and Musicians in Early America*, 217.

²² W. J. Baltzell, “The American College Man in Music,” *Musical Quarterly* 1, no. 4 (October 1915): 624.

important in this transformation was the fact that the growing wealth of the nation, and particularly of some members of society, allowed for the creation of permanent orchestras of an increasingly professional quality. Richard Hooker characterizes this period as one of a conscious effort to invent “an American fine-art musical culture [that] was primarily geared to the reformation of the American character, and specifically involved not the creation of a native compositional tradition but primarily a reform in the performance and appreciation of music.”²³ By the time of Antonin Dvořák’s arrival in New York in 1892, the impulse to find a national identity in composition had taken hold, though it would not find its greatest expression until the 1920s and the birth of American modernism.

In the nineteenth century, the idea that music was Art grew alongside the belief that music belonged to the masses and was primarily a form of entertainment. This conflict concerning music’s position in American society was even more evident in the twentieth century. As Gian-Carlo Menotti observed in 1952: “How are Europeans supposed to recognize the importance of creative life in America or, for that matter, even to know of its existence, if Americans themselves ignore or minimize it?”²⁴ Menotti’s further observations in the same article also provide insight into how this ambivalence affected American composers:

In music they [the American public] take great pride in their orchestras and in the men who interpret music for them, but they have always relegated the composer to a secondary place.

It is my contention that the average American has little or no respect for the creative artist and is apt to consider him as an almost useless member of the community.

[Americans] would accept as a perfectly normal phenomenon that a foreigner should choose art as his profession.

²³ Richard Hooker, “The Invention of American Musical Culture: Meaning, Criticism, and Musical Acculturation in Antebellum America,” in *Keeping Score*, ed. David Schwarz, Anahid Kassabian, and Lawrence Siegel (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1997), 121.

²⁴ Gian-Carlo Menotti, “A Plea for the Creative Artist,” *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, June 29, 1952, 8.

Menotti, who was born in Italy but who had lived in the United States for twenty years by the time he wrote these words, thought of himself as both an insider and an observer of the American musical world. American-born composers, such as Aaron Copland, expressed similar sentiments about the role of the composer in American society, stating, “It cannot be doubted that he occupies little or no place even today in the mind of the public at large. We seldom find his name, for instance, on impressive lists of celebrities, though American artists of other kinds are frequently mentioned.”²⁵

Self-Reliance

Returning to the issue of patronage, music at best played a conflicted role in American society. If, as John Quincy Adams said, Americans were not “attached to music,” or if it was primarily viewed as entertainment, then its importance as an object of patronage would have been low as compared to the visual arts. As music, or more specifically art music, achieved some level of esteem and the wealthy class began to distribute money towards musical endeavors, they favored financing of orchestras and concert halls rather than composers. This is in part due to the dearth of composers working and living in America during the nineteenth century and in part to the high prestige attached to the performance of the European standard repertoire. However, these factors only represent certain external forces at work for the composer. As glib as it might seem, something in the American “character” also contributed to the low levels of support offered to composers throughout American history.

Benjamin Franklin is often called “America’s first self-made man.” The son of a candle-maker, Franklin was largely self-taught. Over the course of his life, he was a writer, a printer, a

²⁵ Aaron Copland, “The American Composer Gets a Break,” *American Mercury* 34 (April, 1935). Reprinted in Aaron Copland, *Aaron Copland: A Reader: Selected Writings, 1923-1972*, ed. Richard Kostelanetz (New York: Routledge, 2004), 36. Citations are to the reprint edition.

publisher, an inventor, a scientist, a philanthropist, a politician, and a diplomat, all through sheer force of will and a deep desire to improve himself, his lot, and the conditions of others around him. Of course, he was not the only early American with ambition and drive, but as a prolific writer, especially of homespun advice on improving oneself, he became the archetype for the self-reliant American. His practical approach to life became iconic for many Americans and was woven into the sacred myth of the American dream. The immense popularity of Horatio Alger's rags-to-riches stories in the nineteenth century stands as just one example how this myth was perpetuated. Alger stressed that through hard work, strong determination, and honesty, anyone, even the poor, orphaned, and powerless, could rise up and succeed in America. Americans continue to value the concept of the self-made person as evidenced by the countless stories in the media of someone who triumphed over circumstances to become successful. Self-reliance also became a valued concept for the intelligentsia: Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote in his essay, "Self-Reliance," that "it is only as a man puts off all foreign support, and stands alone, that I see him to be strong and to prevail."²⁶

Composers likewise identified with this concept. Horatio Parker's parents "emphasized mental-discipline, self-reliance, and self-improvement, which were to remain features of Parker's character through life."²⁷ Because of the challenges that composers faced, especially in the early part of the nineteenth century, they had to be self-motivated in order to gain the training they needed or to train themselves, as well as to get their music performed and published. Well into the nineteenth century, they often earned a living outside of music. Table 2 provides a list of composers and occupations from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

²⁶ Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Essays* (Boston: J. Munroe, 1841; facsimile of first printing in the McKissick Library, University of South Carolina, introduced by Morse Peckham, Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969), 72-73. Citations are to the facsimile edition.

²⁷ William Kearns, *Horatio Parker, 1863-1919: His Life, Music, and Ideas* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1990), 3.

Table 2 Composers and their occupations in the 17th and 18th centuries

Composer	Occupation
John Antes	instrument maker, watchmaker, Moravian minister
Conrad Beissel	organist, supervisor of printing money and gaol-keeper in Williamsburg, VA
William Billings	tanner, taught in singing schools, owned music shop
Oliver Brownson	tunebook compiler
Thomas Carr	music publisher, organist, teacher
Benjamin Carr	publisher, sold instruments and sheet music, arranger, teacher, organist, choirmaster
Lewis Edson	blacksmith, taught singing schools
Jacob French	farmer, served in Continental Army, compiled tunebooks, taught in singing schools
Anthony Philip Heinrich	music teacher and concert organizer
James Hewitt	conductor of orchestra at Park Street Theatre (NY) where his duties included arranging and composing music for ballad operas and other musical productions; also at Federal Street Theatre (Boston); publisher, teacher, organist
Oliver Holden	carpenter, minister, tune-book compiler, taught in singing schools
Francis Hopkinson	lawyer, judge
Andrew Law	taught in singing schools
Justin Morgan	singing teacher, school teacher, farmer, horse breeder
Charles Theodore Pachelbel	organist
Johann Friedrich Peter	music director in Moravian schools, schoolteacher
Simon Peter	minister and teacher
Daniel Read	farm worker, surveyor, comb-maker, operated general store, sold tune books
Timothy Swan	hatter, merchant, tune book compiler
Raynor Taylor	teacher, organist at St. Peter's Church, Philadelphia

In the nineteenth century, composers were more often able to earn their living in music-related fields, such as performing, conducting, teaching, and concert management, than in previous centuries. It also helped if they came from a family with money. In a sense, these early composers became their own patrons by supporting and promoting themselves. They also relied on the paying public, which is of course another form of patronage. The stories of two composers will help illustrate these points.

Anthony Philip Heinrich was born in Bohemia in 1781 and emigrated to the United States in 1805. His guardian, a wholesale merchandiser of linen, thread, and wine, left his estate to Heinrich when he died in 1800. Though Heinrich began his life in America as a businessman, his fortunes declined with the economic collapse in Austria following the Napoleonic Wars. Thereafter he supported himself as a music teacher and a church organist and performed in and directed theater orchestras. Throughout his life, Heinrich was engaged in producing concerts and became the first chairman of the Philharmonic Society of New York in 1842. After 1813 he turned his attentions to composing and moved to Kentucky. In 1819 Judge John Speed, a wealthy businessman and plantation owner, invited Heinrich to live on his estate outside of Louisville. Heinrich spent two years there, composing *The Dawning of Music in Kentucky*. The Speeds were an educated and cultivated family and enjoyed literature and music. One of Judge Speed's daughters herself became a composer. Though this appears to be the only recorded instance of direct patronage of Heinrich, he has been characterized as an opportunist and may have sought out others to assist him in his new career as composer. In the early 1840s, he met President John Tyler through a friend who was engaged at the time to teach piano to Tyler's daughter. One writer suggested that Heinrich hoped to gain the patronage of Tyler, but the meeting between the two ended poorly and did not result in any help from Tyler.²⁸ Despite his efforts at self-promotion, he died penniless in 1861.

William Henry Fry was born into a prosperous Philadelphia family in 1813. For much of his life he was a music critic for his father's newspaper, the Philadelphia *National Gazette* and later for the New York *Tribune*. As a well-connected family in the Philadelphia area, the Frys were comfortable soliciting the financial support of other wealthy Philadelphians when they produced Bellini's *Norma* at the Chestnut Theater. In later years, the family financed Fry's opera

²⁸ David Barron, liner notes to Anthony Philip Heinrich, *The Ornithological Combat of Kings*, New World Records #80208.

Leonora. Complaining about the economic insecurities of American composers, Fry later described the situation this way: “An American composer cannot get his works brought out at home unless he has a fortune which will enable him to bear the expense himself.”²⁹

A composer can prove his worth within the American context by profiting from the products of his creativity. Capitalism has always figured prominently in American culture, dating back to the first settlement of Europeans on the North American continent. These ventures were as much business ventures, or at least driven by economic concerns, as they were opportunities to escape religious persecution in Europe. The colonies were mostly made up of what historians refer to as the mercantile class and so the exchange of goods and services for money became a fundamental tenet of American life. In fact, Richard Crawford has stated the strong relationship between music and business in the following way:

There’s little ambiguity in the openly commercial grounding of many American musical transactions. But as we recognize “business” as the very turf upon which American musical life has been constituted, we see more clearly that musicians’ need to make a living has been the driving force behind two centuries of American music-making.³⁰

This relationship can be observed even in the earliest compositional attempts: William Billings, often referred to as America’s first composer, compiled and sold tunebooks that included his own compositions as well those of others. The selling of tunebooks became a major means of support for many of America’s earliest composers, such as Oliver Brownson, Jacob French, Daniel Read, and Oliver Holden. The sheet music industry of the nineteenth century and the broadcasting and recording industries of the twentieth century became a source of income for many composers—a source that carried a certain acceptance, if not esteem, within the larger American society.

²⁹ Quoted in Lowens, *Music and Musicians in Early America*, 218.

³⁰ Richard Crawford, *The American Musical Landscape: The Business of Musicanship from Billings to Gershwin* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 47. This theme also runs throughout Crawford’s *America’s Musical Life: A History* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001). Other writers have noted the “music as business” concept: Gilbert Chase devoted an entire chapter to it, entitled “Progress, Profit, and Uplift,” in *America’s Music: From the Pilgrims to the Present*, 131-46. Various aspects of the music business are discussed in numerous recent writings about American music, especially on contemporary and popular music.

However, being successful in business endeavors sometimes carried a stigma within the community of composers. Rogers Sessions lamented in a series of lectures in 1949 at the Juilliard School of Music in New York that the composer “has become no longer a cultural citizen, one of the assets of the community with purely cultural responsibilities, but what is sometimes called a cog in the economic machine.”³¹ Gian-Carlo Menotti echoed this opinion a few years later when he noted that an interpreter of music (i.e. a performer or conductor) “is more readily tolerated” because “the nature of his contribution...is easier to appraise and consequently has greater commercial value than that of a creator.”³² Crawford’s “music as business” theory means that the nature of a patronage relationship is necessarily altered from the old European models: how does a patron justify supporting a composer who will ultimately profit from his own creative work? Furthermore, the opportunity to make money in the open market could have dissuaded some composers from seeking patronage in order to avoid complicated ties with patrons.

The paradigm of the self-made man or woman, of course, sits uncomfortably in the same sphere as the artist dependent on another for financial support. For example, when J. Montgomery Sears, one of the wealthiest men in Boston at the time, offered Edward MacDowell enough money to free him to write an opera, MacDowell turned it down because “he did not wish to write an opera on order and feared the opera he might produce would not be a good one.”³³ Charles Martin Loeffler at times chaffed at Isabella Stewart Gardner’s patronage.³⁴

³¹ Quoted in V. I. Seroff, review of *The Musical Experience of Composer, Performer, Listener*, by Roger Sessions, *New York Times Book Review*, April 29, 1951, 15.

³² Menotti, “A Plea for the Creative Artist,” 22.

³³ Nicholas E. Tawa, *The Coming of Age of American Art Music: New England’s Classical Romantics* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), 37.

³⁴ Ralph Locke, “Living with Music: Isabella Stewart Gardner,” in *Cultivating Music in America: Women Patrons and Activists since 1860*, ed. Ralph Locke and Cyrilla Barr (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 106.

To summarize to this point, in the nineteenth century composers were emerging at a time when the idea of patronage was considered elitist in America as well as Europe. The society around them had no aristocrats and valued self-support. Early American composers lived in a world where transforming creative work into business opportunities carried a certain respectability. Private patronage of the old European style had little hope of being instituted in America on a large scale, as much because of the attitudes of the potential patrons as because of the outlook of the composers themselves.

Philanthropy

Minna Lederman, editor of *Modern Music* (1924 to 1946) once noted that being a patron was “like tithing.”³⁵ In other words, patronage is essentially a form of philanthropy, therefore a brief look at the history of philanthropy in the United States is warranted. In this context, I will adopt historian Thomas Adam’s definition of philanthropy as “the process of providing financial, material, and intellectual resources for cultural, social, and educational institutions by upper-class citizens.”³⁶ Patronage as it concerns the composer then becomes a specific category of philanthropy, though some would argue that patronage is generally carried out without any reference to a larger public good.³⁷

The first generation of leaders after the War for Independence was busy establishing a new form of government and determining how a democratic society should look and function. As the nineteenth century progressed though, the spirit of entrepreneurship took over and industry

³⁵ Carol J. Oja, interview with Minna Lederman, March 3, 1988, in Carol J. Oja, *Making Music Modern* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 203.

³⁶ Thomas Adam, “Philanthropy and the Shaping of Social Distinctions in Nineteenth-Century U.S., Canadian, and German Cities,” in *Philanthropy, Patronage, and Civil Society: Experiences from Germany, Great Britain, and North America*, ed. Thomas Adam (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 17.

³⁷ Margaret Eleanor Menninger, “The Serious Matter of True Joy: Music and Cultural Philanthropy in Leipzig, 1781-1933,” in *Philanthropy, Patronage, and Civil Society: Experiences from Germany, Great Britain, and North America*, ed. Thomas Adam (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 120.

began to boom. Laissez-faire capitalism led to vast accumulations of wealth throughout the nineteenth century until the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890. As certain Americans grew exceedingly wealthy they began to engage in philanthropic activities. Their motives appear on the surface somewhat less than charitable. For instance, the Vanderbilts were considered “new money” by the older, more established families such as the Knickerbockers. The Vanderbilts “were not accorded social recognition from the Knickerbocker elite until they could link their wealth to cultural prestige through their financial involvement in the establishment of the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Opera House.”³⁸ Other upper class families undertook philanthropic projects for the good of the community and to claim leadership positions in society. They were “architects of their own fortunes and represented the industrialists and entrepreneurs who were wealthy but lacked social recognition from the older elites. They tried to copy the behavior of the old elites in order to gain entry into high society.”³⁹ Henry David Thoreau expressed his skepticism of such philanthropists in *Walden*, charging the rich with using philanthropy as a device to atone for the way in which the wealth was acquired, as well as perpetuating the misery they were supposedly trying to relieve: “He who bestows the largest amount of time and money on the needy may be doing the most by his mode of life to produce the misery he strives in vain to relieve.”⁴⁰

Alexis de Tocqueville, while noting that the benevolent actions of the wealthy could indeed have motivations that were personal, also found the American people to be inspired by a sense of duty to their community:

³⁸ Adam, “Philanthropy and the Shaping of Social Distinctions in Nineteenth-Century U.S., Canadian, and German Cities,” 18.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁴⁰ Henry David Thoreau, *Walden, or Life in the Woods* (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1854). Reprinted in Henry David Thoreau, *Walden, or Life in the Woods*, ed. Edwin Way Teale (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1947), 73. Citations are to the reprint edition.

I have often seen Americans make really great sacrifices for the common good, and I have noticed a hundred cases in which, when help was needed, they hardly ever failed to give each other trusty support. . . . At every moment they bring his mind back to this idea, that it is the duty as well as the interest of men to be useful to their fellows. . . . At first it is of necessity that men attend to the public interest, afterward by choice. What had been calculation becomes instinct. By dint of working for the good of his fellow citizens, he in the end acquires a habit and taste for serving them.⁴¹

Tocqueville and other European observers noted that American society in the nineteenth century enacted philanthropy through voluntary associations. In other words groups of philanthropists organized their efforts around particular causes as opposed to individuals acting independently. Robert Bremner, a historian of philanthropy in the United States, has demonstrated that these voluntary associations were in place by 1820.⁴² These organizations often involved an element of social engineering as their underlying motivation. Thomas Adam charges all of the philanthropic culture of the nineteenth century with not only social engineering for the good of the community but as a way of shaping society to the philanthropist's wishes.⁴³ If the philanthropic culture of the nineteenth century primarily centered on voluntary associations operating for the good of certain segments of society, then the idea of an individual patron supporting an individual composer would seem somewhat antithetical.

Philanthropists in the early part of the nineteenth century focused their efforts on churches, hospitals, orphanages, and other institutions designed to provide relief to the poor. They created and endowed educational institutions, primarily for the training of ministers at first, then later expanding their efforts to research and intellectual inquiry. After the Civil War, philanthropists began to organize their efforts with a more "scientific" approach by investigating the causes of various social needs and searching for efficient solutions that addressed those causes. Scientific philanthropy became the basis of the future philanthropic foundations of the

⁴¹ Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 483-4.

⁴² Robert H. Bremner, *American Philanthropy*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 44.

⁴³ Adam, "Philanthropy and the Shaping of Social Distinctions in Nineteenth-Century U.S., Canadian, and German Cities," 17.

twentieth century. The large donors of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, such as the Carnegies and Rockefellers, dedicated most of their philanthropic funds towards the creation of institutions that would alleviate the sufferings of the poor, in a kind of grander and more organized form of the earlier social engineering concepts. The creation of the income tax laws in 1913, along with the allowance for deductions of contributions made to charitable organizations, helped to funnel most of the available philanthropic money away from individuals, such as composers, and towards organizations that qualified as non-profit organizations. The creation of philanthropic foundations, to be discussed in the next chapter, further distanced the individual patron from the individual composer because of the corporate structure required by law.

The Musical Patron Emerges

By the middle of the nineteenth century, some philanthropists turned their attention towards the arts and culture, helping to establish orchestras, build concert halls, and found music conservatories. As seen above, the creation of these institutions was vital to the emergence of composers and so their importance to composers should not be undervalued. On the other hand, the focus of these early patrons was on the performance of the European repertory, which was valued far above any works produced by native composers. By the second decade of the twentieth century, however, American patrons began to turn their attention towards the composition of new music and in particular towards the work of American composers. This change in attitude was helped in large part by patrons such as Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge and Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney. The 1920s in fact turn out to be one of the most active periods for private patrons of composers in the United States. Since that time, circumstances such as the Depression, World War II, and the changes in the tax laws noted above have shifted philanthropic attention away from the arts and away from the individual artist.

Ralph Locke and Cyrilla Barr have characterized music patronage in the nineteenth century as a form of social work, filling a gap between the marketplace realities of supporting an orchestra through subscriptions and the lack of government support.⁴⁴ This depiction must be tempered against the issues raised by Thomas Adam about the personal motivations of the wealthier philanthropists; on the other hand, patronage as a form of social work would seem to be an appropriate interpretation in the case of the smaller contributors and those who volunteered their time in the orchestra associations and the music clubs. A further difficulty with Locke and Barr's interpretation is that the "gap" between a self-sustaining musical organization and government support assumes that the concept of government support for the arts existed in the American consciousness in the nineteenth century. In fact, Americans wanted government to remain small and unobtrusive. As will be shown in Chapter 5, all of the plans put forward in Congress during the nineteenth century were not for the support of the arts but rather for someone to guide the acquisition of art for the government, including making artistic decisions on the architecture and decoration of federal buildings. With the exception of a bill to establish the National Conservatory in 1891, legislative proposals regarding the arts in the nineteenth century concerned the visual arts. The Works Progress Administration programs of the 1930s marked the first time that Americans truly recognized that the government could play a larger role in culture.

In spite of the difficulties with Locke and Barr's depiction of the origins of musical patronage in the nineteenth century, they are correct in suggesting that certain forms of music patronage were easier to support than building a concert hall as Andrew Carnegie did or completely financing an orchestra as Henry Higginson did. These opportunities opened the doors

⁴⁴ Ralph Locke and Cyrilla Barr, "Patronage—and Women—in America's Musical Life," in *Cultivating Music in America*, 30.

for smaller investors, including women, to become involved in supporting the arts.⁴⁵ These “smaller” forms of patronage included financial support for training, providing lodging, organizing performances of a composer’s works, providing living expenses, and commissioning new works. All of these found their first expressions in the nineteenth century and continue to the present.

Composers in the second half of the nineteenth century recognized the need to secure training in composition. Without adequate institutions in the United States (coupled with the attitude that a European conservatory necessarily provided a better education for a musician), they traveled to conservatories in Europe, especially Germany. To finance these trips, they often raised money by organizing concerts or working at a musical or non-musical job for a number of years in order to save the money needed. On occasion, though, some composers were able to find a patron who would subsidize all or some portion of their European training. For instance, Horatio Parker’s training in Germany was funded by a man only identified as Mr. Burr.⁴⁶ Thomas Mott Osborne, a wealthy industrialist (but not on the scale of the Vanderbilts or Carnegies) from Auburn, New York, underwrote Arthur Farwell’s first year and a half of study in Europe. Farwell wrote in his diary on August 27, 1896, that Osborne had secured for him a \$250 scholarship that would allow him “to live in decent quarters next winter.”⁴⁷ Alma Morgenthal Wertheim gave Roy Harris at least \$1,800 so that he could study with Nadia Boulanger.⁴⁸ Such scholarships remain an important part of a composer’s early support system even to the present day.

⁴⁵ Locke and Barr, “Patronage—and Women—in America’s Musical Life,” 38. Of course, Locke and Barr emphasize the opportunities afforded women to become music patrons.

⁴⁶ Tawa, *The Coming of Age of American Art Music*, 37.

⁴⁷ Arthur Farwell, *Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist” and Other Essays on American Music*, edited by Thomas Stoner (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1995), 45.

⁴⁸ Oja, *Making Music Modern*, 208.

As described above, Judge John Speed provided Anthony Heinrich with a small cabin on his estate outside of Louisville. This appears to be one of the earliest documented example of a patron providing lodging for a composer specifically for composition. Mrs. Ole Bull provided Arthur Farwell a place to live in 1897, possibly for the simple reason that he was without lodging at the time or possibly because he was out of funds.⁴⁹ At various times, Carl Ruggles lived with Charles Seeger, Rockwell Kent, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, among others.⁵⁰ Blanche Wetherill Walton reportedly provided room and board to a number of modernist composers in the 1920s, including Ruggles, Henry Cowell, and Ruth Crawford.⁵¹ Also of importance in this connection was the formation of artist retreats such as the MacDowell Colony in Peterborough, New Hampshire, founded in 1907 by Edward and Marion MacDowell, or Yaddo, the artists' retreat in Saratoga Springs, New York, founded in 1900 by Spencer and Katrina Trask.

In rare instances, a patron provided enough money for living expenses in order to free the composer to do his or her work. Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney provided Edgard Varèse with “an adequate allowance” in 1921 so that he might focus on composition.⁵² Whitney was also well-known for providing money to visual artists for various expenses. The painter John Sloan once said, “I was one of innumerable artists whose studio rent was paid, or pictures purchased just at the right time to keep the wolf from the door, or hospital expenses covered, or a trip to Europe made possible.”⁵³ Alma Morgenthal Wertheim gave Aaron Copland \$1000 in 1925 and smaller stipends to others such as Israel Citkowitz.⁵⁴ Betty Freeman's support of John Cage is one of the most prominent examples in the twentieth century of a patron providing a more complete form of

⁴⁹ Farwell, “*Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist*”, 43.

⁵⁰ Marilyn Ziffirin, *Carl Ruggles: Composer, Painter, Storyteller* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 70-73, 83.

⁵¹ Oja, *Making Music Modern*, 211-2.

⁵² Louise Varèse, *Varèse: A Looking-Glass Diary* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972), 155.

⁵³ Quoted in *Juliana Force and American Art: A Memorial Exhibition, September 24-October 30, 1949* (New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 1949), 35-36. As quoted in Oja, *Making Music Modern*, 205.

⁵⁴ Oja, *Making Music Modern*, 208.

financial support. Freeman provided annual grants to Cage for living expenses from 1965 until his death. In a list of commissions and grants that accompanied an interview of Betty Freeman in *NewMusicBox*, the web magazine of the American Music Center, we learn that she also provided yearly “grants for living” to Harry Partch from 1964 to 1974 and to Paul Drescher “to assist generally” from 1985 to 1997. Three composers received annual grants of an unspecified nature but which were possibly for general assistance: Nicolas Slonimsky (1988 to his death in 1995), Steve Reich (1980 until at least 2000), and La Monte Young (1961 through the 1970s).⁵⁵ General assistance with living expenses, though, has remained a rare occurrence. The attitudes of the composers themselves factors heavily into this. Recall Edward MacDowell’s refusal of J. Montgomery Sears’s offer of enough money to compose without distraction. It seems to be one thing to accept money for composition-related expenses such as copying, or as remuneration for works created such as commissions, but quite another to accept money for general living expenses.

There were many patrons who provided composers an opportunity to be heard, an essential component to the success of any composer. Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, patrons hosted “at homes,” in imitation of the famous French “parlors” and “salons.” Isabella Stewart Gardner held many such concerts in her home in Boston. Clara Kathleen Rogers said these concerts were an “opportunity to be heard and appreciated by an intelligent audience.”⁵⁶ The patrons of the modernist composers in the 1920s often hosted recitals

⁵⁵ American Music Center, “Betty Freeman’s Commissions,” *NewMusicBox*, Issue 16, Vol. 2, No. 4 (August, 2000). <http://www.newmusicbox.org/page.nmbx?id=16fp15>. Presumably this list was supplied to Frank J. Oteri, who interviewed Freeman for an accompanying article in the same issue of *NewMusicBox*. Freeman had given Ralph Locke a list when he interviewed her in 1991. She indicated to Locke that she does not normally give composers direct aid for living expenses, though John Cage and LaMonte Young have both received unconditional grants over the years. Ralph Locke, “The ‘Grand Composers’ of the Present Day: Betty Freeman Discusses How She Chooses and Supports Them,” in Locke and Barr, *Cultivating Music in America*, 59-64.

⁵⁶ Clara Kathleen Rogers, *The Story of Two Lives: Home, Friends, and Travel* (Norwood, MA: privately printed, 1932), 37.

in their homes in New York City, inviting an impressive list of guests. Through these gatherings, composers were exposed to powerful allies within the music world of New York City and able to create connections that further assisted their work. In addition to these smaller gatherings, some patrons arranged larger performance opportunities and often commissioned works or awarded prizes in conjunction with these concerts or festivals. For example, Carl and Ellen Stoeckel began the Norfolk Music Festival in 1900 in Litchfield, Connecticut, and commissioned works by George Chadwick, Victor Herbert, Horatio Parker, Samuel Coleridge-Taylor, Percy Grainger, and Jean Sibelius. In 1918 Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge built an auditorium near her home Pittsfield, Massachusetts, to host chamber music festivals and sponsored the Berkshire Competition for the composition of chamber music.⁵⁷

Gardner also exemplifies another type of patronage: she actively worked as an agent for Charles Martin Loeffler, offering his music to publishers in France and the United States. In a similar vein, Betty Freeman produced recordings of work by composers such as Henry Brant, Lou Harrison, Daniel Lentz, Harry Partch, Mel Powell, Frederic Rzewski, and Steven Schick.⁵⁸

Actively promoting the music of American composers was the primary goal of such early-twentieth century organizations such as the League of Composers, which was sponsored by Alma Wertheim, Clara Reis, and Minna Lederman, among others. These women not only provided the money to keep the League and its journal *Modern Music* operational but also gave of their time as concert organizers, editors, publishers, and all-round agents on behalf of the League's composers. Carol Oja has characterized the role of these activists as vital to the avant-garde movement of the

⁵⁷ A complete list of the composers who won the Berkshire competition or were awarded commissions personally by Coolidge or through the Library of Congress is contained in Cyrilla Barr, *The Coolidge Legacy* (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1997), 51-62.

⁵⁸ American Music Center, "Betty Freeman's Commissions."

1920s, primarily for turning the attention of other American patrons away from the performance of the European repertory.⁵⁹

By far, the most prevalent way of supporting composers in the United States in the late nineteenth century and through to the present time has been to commission a specific work. Commissioners have ranged from those with modest means to the very wealthiest, from those who are simply interested in music to fully-trained professional musicians. This last category includes patrons such as Elise Boyer Hall who commissioned many works for the saxophone in the early twentieth century, and Serge Koussevitzky who personally commissioned many symphonic works. Symphony orchestras and other performing groups also commission works and often have larger funds available for that purpose, but commissioning by individuals does not appear to have slowed down since the beginning of the twentieth century; it has even gained larger attention in recent years. A recent *New York Times* article described the work of Jack and Linda Hoeschler, who commissioned their first piece by Stephen Paulus in the 1980s.⁶⁰ Since then they have commissioned around seventy works and formed the Minnesota Commissioning Club, a group of five couples that each commit \$2000 a year. Other commissioning clubs have formed around the country, including Sound Investment, a commissioning club run by the Los Angeles Chamber Orchestra. Sound Investment allows individuals to contribute as little as \$250 and provides them access to the composer and rehearsals. Bang on a Can created a People's Commissioning Fund that patrons can join for as little as \$5. David Lang, one of the founders of Bang on a Can, explains that the fund's goal is to provide opportunities for emerging composers

⁵⁹ Oja, *Making Music Modern*, 203-4.

⁶⁰ Anne Midgette, "Music Fit for a King, Written for a Dentist," *New York Times*, January 23, 2005, sec. 2, 1ff. Additional information about Meet the Composer is available at <http://www.meetthecomposer.org> and for Sound Investment at <http://www.laco.org/soundinvestment.html>.

and to build a closer connection with the audience.⁶¹ Meet the Composer, a foundation that also attempts to bridge the gap between composers and audiences through its composer residency programs, has recently published *An Individual's Guide to Commissioning Music* and often acts as a broker between patrons and composers.

Perhaps because of the scattered and fragmented nature of the patronage available in this country, composers at various times provided assistance for one another. They built a support network that provided encouragement and helped establish contacts within the music world as well as the publishing and recording businesses. At times they were even able to help each other financially. Charles Ives, though he tended to stand outside of the network of American composers, supported several composers in his later years. He supplied one-third of the financial support to Henry Cowell's quarterly, *New Music*, which published new music in addition to scholarly articles. Jan Swafford has reported that Ives gave generously to many composers over the years, including Arnold Schoenberg, Edgar Varèse, John J. Becker, and Lou Harrison. In 1947 Ives divided the money from his Pulitzer Prize between Lou Harrison and John J. Becker.⁶² When he began using commercial publishing firms to publish his music in the late 1940s, he assigned his royalties to Cowell, Harrison, and others.⁶³ Ned Rorem claimed that Aaron Copland assisted composers such as Irving Fine, Leo Smit, Arthur Berger, and Harold Shapero.⁶⁴ The veracity of Rorem's statement cannot be verified, but it does suggest that the concept of composers supporting composers played a role in shaping the patronage scene in the twentieth century and deserves further study.

⁶¹ Midgette, "Music Fit for a King," 29. Additional information about Bang on a Can can be found at <http://www.bangonacan.org>.

⁶² Jan Swafford, *Charles Ives: A Life with Music* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1996), 370-1, 422, 497 n. 19.

⁶³ Frank R. Rossiter, *Charles Ives and His America* (New York: Liveright, 1975), 296.

⁶⁴ Ned Rorem, *Knowing When to Stop: A Memoir* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994), 345-6.

After World War I, Americans grew more aware of their reputation abroad and sought to address the perception of the country as lacking a rich cultural life. Among musicians and composers, this became a mandate to develop a “national” voice, a move which had tentatively begun with Antonin Dvořák’s visit in the 1890s but did not gain much ground. The post-World War I ambition to create distinctly American music created one of the most active periods for private patrons of composers. There was no way that anyone could anticipate the radical changes about to happen with the passage of the income tax laws and the creation of philanthropic foundations. Composers and performers initially must have thought they were about to experience paradise. As will become apparent, it did not quite work out that way.

Chapter 4 – Philanthropic Foundations and Other Organizations

In 1911 Andrew Carnegie created the Carnegie Corporation, ushering in the era of individual and family foundations that disburse monies to various causes. Leaving aside issues of personal motivation, foundations, with their corporate-like structures and prescribed giving, emerged for several reasons. First, the number of millionaires in the United States had increased from approximately 100 in 1870 to nearly forty thousand in 1916, and likewise the number of people and organizations requesting money had increased. Many of these wealthy individuals found themselves being petitioned on the streets, on trains, at church, and elsewhere. The use of an organized and administered corporate structure provided a buffer between supplicants and the fortunes of these men and (in some cases) women.

Second, many of the early twentieth-century philanthropists, such as Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller, Sr., were influenced by the ideals of “scientific” giving. Giving directly to the poor was eschewed in favor of searching out the root causes of poverty. Rather than building a hospital to treat the sick, the causes and cures of diseases were sought. Frederick Gates, Rockefeller’s philanthropic advisor, and Julius Rosenwald, founder of the Sears-Roebuck Company, characterized this type of philanthropy as “wholesale” rather than “retail.” Retail in this sense meant “direct customer-to-customer giving.”¹ Supporting a larger vision requires more people to research ideas and administer and manage the distribution of money.

Changes in tax laws in the twentieth century contributed to the formation of foundations. Before 1913, there was no income tax in the United States; the Sixteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution gave Congress the “power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source

¹ Judith Sealander, “Curing Evils at their Source: The Arrival of Scientific Giving,” in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, ed. Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 221.

derived, without apportionment among the several states, and without regard to any census or enumeration.” The income tax may have influenced some of the wealthy to give away portions of their wealth through philanthropy to avoid taxation, but a provision to allow for the deduction of charitable donations added on to the War Revenue Act of 1917 further encouraged this. The Revenue Act of 1935 substantially increased the tax rate for wealthy Americans and corporations. Judith Sealander argues that the impact of the tax laws on the philanthropic attitudes of the very wealthiest was minimal until the passage of this act.²

Foundations as we know them today have their roots in England’s Statute of Charitable Use, enacted in 1601, which provided for the creation, control, and protection of charitable funds. Individuals or groups of individuals were granted certain privileges in exchange for charitable acts meant to support the public good such as maintaining a hospital or college. The American foundations created in the early part of the twentieth century were different in that they had a broader agenda and generally larger endowments than their predecessors. Because of the tax-exempt status of these foundations, they came under Congressional scrutiny in 1915 and later in the 1950s, but no legislation was passed regulating foundations until the Tax Reform Act of 1969. Today Sections 501(c)(3) and 509(a) of the Internal Revenue Code dictate the legal definitions and responsibilities of foundations.³ In general terms, though, a foundation is defined as:

an entity that is established as a nonprofit corporation or a charitable trust, with a principal purpose of making grants to unrelated organizations or institutions or to individuals for scientific, educational, cultural, religious, or other charitable purposes. This broad definition encompasses two foundation types: private foundations and public foundations. The most common distinguishing characteristic of a private foundation is that most of its funds come from one source, whether an individual, a family, or a corporation. A public foundation, in contrast, normally receives its assets from multiple sources, which may include private foundations, individuals, government agencies, and

² Sealander, “Curing Evils at their Source,” 225-6.

³ See U.S. Department of the Treasury, *Tax-Exempt Status for Your Organization*, Internal Revenue Service Publication No. 557 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2003).

fees for service. Moreover, a public foundation must continue to seek money from diverse sources in order to retain its public status.⁴

Nothing prohibits an organization of any type from using the word “foundation,” and a true tax-exempt philanthropic foundation is not required to have “foundation” in its name. Some of the organizations identified in this chapter, particularly those operating before the tax reform laws of 1969, may not fit the strict legal definition of a foundation, therefore a broader definition will be used. Because many of the foundations were founded by individuals and initially reflect that individual’s personality, it is often difficult to separate foundations from private patrons.

Foundations, particularly the large ones such as the Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford, have tended to award grants to institutions rather than individuals, and music has represented a small portion of the total monies distributed. But that is not to say that they have not been generous: the Carnegie Corporation spent over seven million dollars from its inception in 1911 to 1943 on organs for schools, churches and other institutions, as well as aiding music schools and distributing recordings, books, and scores to libraries around the world. In 1954 the Rockefeller Foundation gave the Louisville Orchestra \$400,000 to commission, perform, and record new works, and included money to commission new works as part of its financing of Lincoln Center. The large foundations continue to this day to support performing arts organizations, and composers benefit indirectly by receiving commissions from these organizations. A significant exception to the practice of large foundations giving primarily to organizations rather than individuals has been the Guggenheim Foundation.

More significant for composers has been the smaller foundations formed specifically for the benefit of musicians and composers. These include the Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation at the Library of Congress (1925), the Serge Koussevitsky Music Foundation in the

⁴ Foundation Center, “What Is a Foundation?” <http://fdncenter.org/media/faqs/foundfun.html>.

Library of Congress, the Fromm Music Foundation (1952), and the Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music (1957), all of which are discussed below in more detail.

Foundation support of performing arts organizations and composers was initially low. In 1956 *Musical America* reported that the number of foundations supporting music had “in the last 25 years...greatly increased in quantity and purpose.” Most of that growth came in the early 1950s in the form of the smaller foundations, which *Musical America* credited with being more valuable to the individual who might be overlooked by the large foundations. The smaller foundations also allowed more people to participate in the philanthropic process and increased the types of assistance available, such as financing a recording or paying for a visiting scholar at a music school.⁵ The number of foundations supporting music continued to grow throughout the 1950s and 1960s. By 1961 *Musical America* was including a list of foundations concerned with music in their annual directory. Of the forty-two foundations listed in 1961, most of them provided support for performing arts organizations and the education and training of individuals, however nine of them specifically mentioned composition or commissions, namely the Jean Tennyson Foundation, the Rogers and Hammerstein Foundation, the Huntington Hartford Foundation, the Fromm Music Foundation, the Magnavox Corporation Inc., the Koussevitzky Music Foundation, the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation, the Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation, and the Ford Foundation.⁶ The following year, the list of foundations grew to sixty-six, of which fourteen listed support for composers; the additions to the list included the American Academy in Rome, the American International Music Fund, the Leonard Bernstein Foundation, the Huntington Hartford Family Fund (distinct from the Huntington Hartford Foundation), and the Yaddo Foundation.⁷

⁵ R. A. Ericson, “Foundations—Patrons of Music,” *Musical America* 76 (Feb. 15, 1956): 14ff.

⁶ “Foundations,” *Musical America* 81 (January 1961): 365.

⁷ “Foundations,” *Musical America* 82 (January 1962): 277-8.

After this initial burst of growth, the number of new foundations supporting composers slowed down. For example, the *Foundation Grants Index* for 2001 listed twenty-four foundations that award grants for composition or commissioning as shown below:⁸

Jerome Foundation
 Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, Inc.
 Greenwall Foundation
 Rockefeller Foundation
 The Trust for Mutual Understanding
 Meyer Memorial Trust
 Howard Heinz Endowment
 William and Flora Hewlitt Foundation
 James Irvine Foundation
 GE Fund
 Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation
 John S. and James L. Knight Foundation
 General Mills Foundation
 Honeywell Foundation
 McKnight Foundation
 Target Foundation
 AT&T Foundation
 Mary Flagler Cary Charitable Trust
 Irene Diamond Fund, Inc.
 Ford Foundation
 Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
 New York Community Trust
 Alcoa Foundation
 E. Rhodes and Leona B. Carpenter Foundation
 Gannett Foundation
 Norfolk Foundation

Most of the grants awarded by these foundations fell into three categories: (1) grants to performing arts organizations such as orchestras to support a commissioning program; (2) grants to performing arts organizations to support the performance of new music; and (3) grants to other non-profit organizations that then redistribute the money in the form of subsequent grants (called “regranting”). The two most prominent organizations in the last category are the American Composers Forum and Meet the Composer. Many of the foundations listed above make very wide-ranging grants in a number of fields including science, health, community support and

⁸ Foundation Center, *The Foundation Grants Index* (New York: Foundation Center, 2001).

activism, and arts and culture. Much of the money is directed towards organizations within the United States, but over the last two or three decades more grants have been made to groups operating outside the U.S., reflecting the “globalization” that is reportedly taking place.

The following is a list of organizations that award grants directly to composers as of 2003:⁹

Djerassi Resident Artists Program
 Whitelight Foundation
 Rhythm and Blues Foundation
 Union League Civic and Arts Foundation
 American Composers Forum
 Edward Albee Foundation
 American Music Center
 ASCAP Foundation
 Bush Foundation
 Kleban Foundation, Inc.
 Koussevitsky Music Foundation
 Jonathan Larson Performing Arts Foundation
 Meet the Composer, Inc.
 National Foundation for Jewish Culture – The Susan Rose Recording Fund for
 Contemporary Jewish Music
 New York Foundation for the Arts
 American Academy of Arts and Letters
 Cintas Foundation, Inc.
 Kentucky Foundation for Women, Inc.
 Bascom Little Fund
 Music for Youth Foundation

Two of these organizations, the Djerassi Resident Artists Program and the Edward Albee Foundation, award residencies in their artist colonies and no monetary support. Several of the organizations award grants to very specific populations, such as the New York Foundation for the Arts (residents of New York), the Bascom Little fund (composers in the Columbus, Ohio area), the Cintas Foundation, Inc. (Cuban citizenship or lineage), and the Kentucky Foundation for Women, Inc. (only for women residents of Kentucky). Some of the grants are for a specific genre of music such as rhythm and blues, Jewish music, and musical theater. Several of the

⁹ Foundation Center, *Foundation Grants to Individuals*, 13th ed. (New York: Foundation Center, 2003).

organizations award grants to visual artists and writers as well as composers. The American Composers Forum, American Music Center, Meet the Composer, the ASCAP Foundation, and the Koussevitsky Music Foundation awards grants and commissions to a fairly wide range of composers with no restrictions on residency within the U.S. They are also the only organizations of this list focused exclusively on composers.¹⁰

The following sections describe several of the foundations that award (or have awarded) grants or commissions directly to composers. Two so-called “regranting authorities” are also discussed as well as two foundations that award prizes that are considered substantial, if not in monetary value at least in stature.

Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music

Martha Baird Rockefeller (1895-1971) was a concert pianist in her early life. She trained at the New England Conservatory where she won the school’s annual piano competition in 1917 and graduated with highest honors. Her first public recital was at Jordan Hall in Boston of that same year. Three years later she gave her first New York performance, followed by her London debut in 1923. She performed all over Europe and United States over the next ten years. In one of her most remarkable series of concerts, she performed over one hundred piano works by Chopin in four concerts at the Barbizon-Plaza in 1931. The *Musical Courier* speculated that she was the first woman to do so.¹¹ After her marriage to Arthur M. Allen, she continued to perform

¹⁰ The Internal Revenue Service does not currently list the Fromm Foundation as a tax-exempt organization, therefore it is not included in either of the references cited. It is currently administered by Harvard University and may be managed as part of a larger philanthropic effort by the Trustees. Other foundations such as the Guggenheim do not appear on the list of foundations that support composers because they designate their awards for a broad category of recipients.

¹¹ *Musical Courier*, January 10, 1931, in scrapbook (Record Group 18, box 24, Martha Baird Rockefeller Papers, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center; herein called “MBR Scrapbooks”). The biographical information on Rockefeller was drawn from Michele Hiltzik, “Martha Baird: Concert Pianist,” *Rockefeller Archive Center Newsletter* (Spring 2003): 19ff, and the annual reports of the Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., especially the first annual report published after her death in 1971

in the Boston and Providence, Rhode Island area, often giving benefit concerts. Arthur Allen died in 1950 and one year later, Martha Baird Allen married John D. Rockefeller, Jr., whose wife had died two years earlier. As a wedding present Rockefeller gave his new wife a trust fund with which she established the Martha Baird Rockefeller Aid to Music Program in 1957. The program was administered by a set of advisors on behalf of Mrs. Rockefeller, guided by her vision for the program. Upon her husband's death in 1960, she supplemented the fund with yearly contributions of \$600,000 from her inheritance. The fund was incorporated the fund in 1962 with a board of trustees and renamed to the Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc. Officers and staff were hired to manage the day-to-day operations. Martha Rockefeller died in 1971 and her will provided an unrestricted bequest of \$5,000,000. The trustees continued to manage the fund until the monies were exhausted and then dissolved the fund in 1982. The final one million dollars in the fund were distributed to major musical service organizations, including the American Music Center and Meet the Composer.

Acutely aware of the difficulties of establishing oneself as a concert artist, Martha Baird Rockefeller concentrated her interests on young soloists who either received direct grants from the fund or were assisted indirectly through grants to performing organizations. Aid was made available for such purposes as "private musical study and coaching, debut recitals and concert tours, travel and related expenses for auditions leading to employment, promotional materials, management services, and purchases of concert clothing and other necessities for study or performance."¹² The Fund also supported various organizations, including performance organizations, service organizations, scholarly organizations, and the Library of Congress.

(The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc. Annual Report, 1969-1973 [New York: The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., 1969], 5-7). The annual reports will herein be referred to as "MBR Annual Report" followed by the year.

¹² MBR Annual Report, 1962-1969, 7.

Rockefeller was also interested in the preservation and study of music and to that end, awarded individual grants to graduate students in musicology in the final year of work toward a Ph.D.

A conscious decision was made in the early years of the Fund not to award commissions or individual grants to composers but rather to support organizations that provided services to composers, including the American Music Center. Though exceptions were made, the administrative committee felt (and Rockefeller concurred) that composers were being well-supported by private patrons and foundations such as the Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation, the Fromm Music Foundation, and the Koussevitzky Foundation.¹³ In a memorandum to Rockefeller from Donald L. Engle, the director of the Fund, Engle explained:

We have purposely avoided any attempt to wholesale individual assistance to composers. Screening is difficult, and as a group they are faring better now than at any time in the recent past, with federal aid still to come. Our contributions to organizations serving composers is a commendable secondary way of helping them. (I am pleased to report parenthetically that our one composer grantee, Ezra Laderman, recently received a commission from Mr. Rudel for an opera).¹⁴

In the early 1970s, the Fund re-examined its programs and began to entertain the idea of an individual grant program for composers. In 1974 the board of trustees approved the Composer Grant Program in principle and the first grants were made in 1975.¹⁵ The grants were intended for mid-career composers who had completed their training and all academic courses, had obtained a significant number of professional performances of their work, and were United States citizens. Grants were awarded for such purposes as recording, publication, rehearsal,

¹³ Informal minutes from meeting of the Administrative Committee of the Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, April 10, 1957, December 4 and 6, 1957, and memorandum from Cesar Saerchinger, December 2, 1957 (Martha Baird Rockefeller Aid to Music Program, 1957, box 101, Martha Baird Rockefeller Aid to Music Dockets, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center).

¹⁴ Memorandum to Martha Baird Rockefeller from Donald L. Engle, September 22, 1966, folder 334, box 16, Record Group 18, Martha Baird Rockefeller Papers, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center. Further citations will refer to record group 18, box 16 as “MBR Papers” and will include the folder number.

¹⁵ The Martha Baird Fund for Music, Inc., Minutes of Meeting of Trustees and Members, May 9, 1973 (Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Minute Books, 1962-1982, volume IV, Record Group IV 3B-19, box 133, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center). A complete list of composer recipients can be found in Appendix I.

performance, and travel to attend performances. Because the Fund took a project-oriented approach, the composition had to be complete before the application would be considered. Furthermore, support was not available for “jazz, folk, ethnic, or popular music, or for copying of scores and parts, commissions, institutional study, or living expenses.”¹⁶ The Fund relied on an advisory panel of composers to judge the appropriateness of an application. Over the years composers such as Jacob Druckman, Donald Erb, Ezra Laderman, and Louise Talma served on the panel.

Rockefeller insisted that her advisors carefully consider each individual’s circumstances and to show genuine concern for the grantees as human beings. On the other side of the equation, she wanted the recipients to have a legitimate need, to be clearly focused on their goals, and to have shown a measure of self-sufficiency. Attention to the grantees was not to stop once the award was made—Donald Engle, the director of the fund from 1958 to 1971, as well as the staff of the foundation, regularly attended concerts of grantees and reported back to Rockefeller. She wrote to Engle after one such report, and the contents are worth quoting at length because they summarize the tone of the fund and Rockefeller’s vision:

I always read with great interest all of the material you send me and I wouldn’t miss doing my “home work” on any of it. It is extraordinary how many human-interest angles emerge again and again—playing no small role in the program that is such a constantly rewarding experience to me. When, as can happen, I come upon a two-page spread of reviews in the morning Times and see three to five or more grantees recognized as in the top levels of their profession, I find myself beaming with pride – for them. Whether or not a given performance receives a good or less good review, so many, many of them have arrived, and – best of all – on their own steam; we didn’t give them their talent or their often delightful personalities and keen minds (as observed on television, for example), only a boost up from discouragement into self-confidence – and then “away they go”, more power to them. What we (mostly you and company!) are doing is truly something rather special if not, indeed, remarkable when one contemplates the over-all pictures of what has developed from the germ of an idea – hopeful though it was when it emerged.¹⁷

¹⁶ MBR Annual Report, 1973-1977, 7.

¹⁷ Martha Baird Rockefeller to Donald L. Engle, June 27, 1967 (MBR Papers, folder 332).

When the fund was dissolved in a 1982, a concert was held in Alice Tully Hall to acknowledge the work of the foundation and its creator. Among the guests were Tobias Picker, who told an interviewer, “My grant was terribly important to me; it made my first recording possible. And what is more important to a contemporary composer than a recording? A recording disseminates the composer’s work and makes for a permanent document.”¹⁸

Fromm Music Foundation

Paul Fromm was born in Kitzingen, Germany, in 1906, but immigrated to the United States in 1939. He settled in Chicago and became a successful wine importer. In 1952 he established the Fromm Music Foundation using a portion of his business proceeds each year to award commissions to composers. He maintained close ties with dozens of composers throughout the country and closely administered the foundation. Even when the foundation moved to Harvard in 1972 so that it might “exist independently of any one individual,”¹⁹ Fromm remained on the Board of Directors until his death.

Unlike most other foundations, the Fromm Music Foundation has been acutely focused on the individual composer. Fromm summarized the purpose of the foundation as restoring “to the composer his rightful position at the center of musical life.”²⁰ In addition to awarding commissions, the foundation has financed the performance and recordings of new works, established and supported the Tanglewood Festival of Contemporary Music, sponsored seminars,

¹⁸ Tim Page, “Finale for a Music Fund Is Marked by a Concert,” *New York Times*, November 30, 1982, C14.

¹⁹ Paul Fromm, “The Fromm Music Foundation: Past, Present, and Future,” in *A Life for New Music: Selected Papers of Paul Fromm*, ed. David Gable and Christoph Wolff (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), 72.

²⁰ Fromm, “The Fromm Music Foundation: Past, Present, and Future,” 71.

funded a music journal dedicated to new music (*Perspectives of New Music*)²¹, and endowed the Fromm Foundation Visiting Professorship at Harvard University.

The commissions are currently in the amount of \$10,000 with up to \$3,000 also made available to the group that will perform the commissioned work. Residencies at La Mortella, the home of the late Sir William Walton on the Italian island of Ischia in the Bay of Naples, are also available to the recipients. Though Fromm awarded multiple commissions to single composers during his tenure, current recipients must wait seven years before reapplying. During his lifetime, Paul Fromm commissioned 164 works from more than 150 composers, averaging between four and five works per year.²²

Library of Congress

In the early 1920s, Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge had a unique vision of establishing a trust fund to be administered by Music Division of the Library of Congress.²³ The goal of the trust fund was to aid the Music Division in the study, composition and preservation of music. Coolidge had already built an auditorium adjacent to the Music Division and the trust fund seemed to her the next logical step. Under the laws current at the time, the federal government had no way of accepting a cash endowment. Coolidge worked with Carl Engel, Chief of the Music Division, Herbert Putnam, Librarian of Congress, and Richard Hale, her attorney, to craft proposed legislation that would enable the government to accept and administer the trust fund. President Calvin Coolidge signed the act into law in 1925 and the Library of Congress Trust Fund

²¹ In 1972 Fromm withdrew his funding after ten years of support because he disagreed with the narrow editorial focus of the journal.

²² A list of composers who received commissions from the Fromm Music Foundation is included in Appendix II.

²³ For a detailed account of Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge, see Cyrilla Barr, *The Coolidge Legacy* (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1997) and Cyrilla Barr, *Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge: American Patron of Music* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1998).

Board was established. The legislation allowed for the administration of future endowments, which today numbers seventeen.

Of the funds administered by the Library of Congress, seven of them commission new works from composers: the Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation, the Serge Koussevitzky Music Foundation, the McKim Fund, the Mae and Irving Jurow Fund, the Kindler Foundation Trust Fund, the Moldenhauer Archives Foundation, and the Anne Adlum Hull and William Remsen Strickland Fund. Most of the funds favor chamber music, perhaps because supporting the premiere of a chamber music piece is easier to accommodate at the Library of Congress or perhaps donors have been influenced by Coolidge's original donation and intent. The Mae and Irving Jurow Fund specifically commissions works for the harpsichord, the McKim Fund for violin and piano, and the Moldenhauer Archives Foundation for works based on materials in the archives. Only the Koussevitzky Music Foundation is more general in its commissions.²⁴

John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation

The John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation was founded in 1925 by United States Senator and Mrs. Simon Guggenheim in memory of their son, John Simon, who died in 1922 shortly before entering college. The stated purpose of the foundation is to "promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding, and the appreciation of beauty, by aiding without distinction on account of race, color or creed, scholars, scientists and artists of either sex in the prosecution of their labors."²⁵ Senator and Mrs. Guggenheim envisioned scholars, scientists, and artists furthering their studies in other countries in order to share their

²⁴ A list of composers who received commissions from the Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation, the Koussevitzky Music Foundation and the McKim Fund are included in Appendices III., IV and V of this thesis. Information was unavailable at the time of this writing about commissions by the other funds.

²⁵ As quoted in Senator Guggenheim's Letter of Gift, March 26, 1925, Guggenheim Foundation, <http://www.gf.org/gift.html>.

knowledge and perspective with others and also to gain from them. Hence many of the recipients have used their Guggenheim Fellowships to study abroad. For instance, Ruth Crawford, the first woman to receive one, traveled to Berlin and Paris to study. Her hope was to meet Schoenberg, but this never occurred; however, she was profoundly influenced by Bartók and Berg, and this period is often considered the high point of her compositional career.²⁶

Unlike other foundations, grants are only made to individuals, not to institutions or organizations. Two separate competitions are held for the Fellowships—one open to citizens and permanent residents of the United States and Canada and one for citizens and permanent residents of Latin America and the Caribbean. The amounts of the grants vary and are determined based on the scope of the planned work and the other financial resources available to the recipient. The average grant in 2004 was \$37,762.

The foundation has awarded over six hundred Fellowships to U.S. and Canadian composers since 1925, averaging between seven and eight per year.²⁷ Until 1991 one could apply for and receive a grant in multiple years; in fact, Dante Fiorillo was awarded four grants. The recipients represent a broad range of musical styles—from Aaron Copland, the first recipient, to John Cage, Ornette Coleman, David Diamond, Ellen Taaffe Zwilich, Sonny Rollins, and John Corigliano. Some composers are quite well-known and others have not achieved a high level of recognition. Women and minorities have received if not equal then perhaps proportional representation. Approximately nine percent of the grants to composers have been to women.

²⁶ Judith Tick, “Ruth (Porter) Crawford (Seeger),” *Norton /Grove Dictionary of Women Composers*, edited by Julie Anne Sadie and Rhian Samuel (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1994), 131.

²⁷ John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, “Lists of Fellows,” <http://www.gf.org>. A list of the Guggenheim recipients is included in Appendix VI.

Pulitzer Prize

The newspaper publisher Joseph Pulitzer originally conceived the Pulitzer Prize as a means of recognizing excellence in journalism, letters and drama, and education. The number of awards has expanded to twenty-one, including a prize for music, since the first prizes were presented in 1917. Initially funded through the investment income from the endowment established in his will, declining resources in the endowment forced the board of directors to establish a foundation for a secondary endowment and solicit donations.

The award for music, in the amount of five hundred dollars, was added in 1943 “for distinguished musical composition in the larger forms of chamber, orchestral, or choral work, or for an operatic work (including ballet), first performed or published by a composer of established residence in the United States.”²⁸ The music jury meets in New York City each year to listen to recordings, review scores, and submit three nominations to the advisory board. The advisory board meets in April to review the recommendations of the juries. For the music category, a music subcommittee of the board leads the discussion and debate, which usually last for a period of two days. The board has broad discretion in choosing the recipient of the award and can elect to award no prize if the nominations do not meet its standard of excellence.²⁹ The announcement of the award, which is \$10,000 as of 2005, is made in early April. Along with the prize winners, the finalists in each category are also announced.

William Schuman received the first prize for music. The recipients over the years have tended to be rather conservative and well-established in their careers.³⁰ The types of works acknowledged by the Pulitzer Prize have included symphonies, ballets, operas, and large choral works, as well as a few smaller works such as string quartets and solo piano pieces. Recognizing

²⁸ James Heintze, “The Pulitzer Prize in Music: 1943-2002,” <http://www.american.edu/heintze/Pul1.htm>.

²⁹ The advisory board as of 2005 is made up entirely of newspaper editors, journalists and academics involved with journalism, and historians.

³⁰ A complete list of recipients is contained in Appendix VII.

that the prize has typically gone to composers of American “classical” music, the advisory board broadened the definition and entry requirements in 1998 to “attract a wider range of American music” and to “bring mainstream music into the Pulitzer process.”³¹ The new guidelines stated that the award was for a “distinguished musical composition of significant dimension by an American that has had its first performance in the United States during the year.”³² As a reflection of these changes, the 1997 prize was awarded to Wynton Marsalis’s “Blood on the Fields,” a composition with strong jazz elements. In response to criticism for failure to recognize “two of the country’s foremost jazz composers,” the board awarded posthumous awards to George Gershwin (1998) and Duke Ellington (1999).³³ Despite the board’s hopes to “attract a wider range of American music,” the prizes over the following years continued to be awarded to composers of the “classical” style, such as Aaron Jay Kernis, Melinda Wagner, John Corigliano, and John Adams. The board again refined the definition in 2004, dropping the words “significant dimension” and allowing the public release of a recording to substitute for a public performance. The board believes that these changes will allow them to “consider and honor the full range of distinguished American musical compositions—from the contemporary classical symphony to jazz, opera, choral, musical theater, movie scores and other forms of musical excellence.” Two other changes were also made to potentially broaden the scope of recognition: scores are no longer required for submission, and the music jury, which over the last ten years consisted of four composers and one newspaper critic, now only includes three composers to “permit greater participation of by presenters of musical programs, orchestra conductors, musical artists and other

³¹ Seymour Topping, “Joseph Pulitzer and the Pulitzer Prizes,” The Pulitzer Prizes, Columbia University, <http://www.pulitzer.org/history.html>.

³² Pulitzer Prizes, “Pulitzer Prize in Music,” guidelines, <http://www.pulitzer.org/EntryForms/musicbbn.pdf>.

³³ Ibid.

knowledgeable members of the musical world.”³⁴ Only time will tell whether this change brings the added dimension that the board seeks.

American Academy in Rome

The Columbian Exhibition in 1893 (also known as the Chicago World Fair) inspired the architects Charles Follen McKim and Daniel Burnham, painters John La Farge and Francis Millet, and sculptors Augustus Saint-Gaudens and Daniel Chester French, to create a center for study of the arts in Rome. Rome was chosen for its long tradition in the arts, the richness of its galleries, museums, and monuments, and because “no other city offers such a field for study or an atmosphere so replete with precedents.”³⁵ With the financial help of Andrew Carnegie, J. P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., William K. Vanderbilt and Henry Clay Frick, they created the American School of Architecture in 1894. In 1905, the school received a charter by an Act of Congress, and in 1913 it merged with the American School of classical Studies in Rome, created in 1895 by the Archaeological Institute of America, to form the American Academy in Rome. The program expanded over the years to provide support to individuals working in archaeology, architecture, classical studies, design arts, historic preservation and conservation, history of art, landscape, architecture, literature, modern Italian studies, musical composition, post-classical humanistic studies and visual arts. Through its fellowship program, known as the Rome Prize, artists and scholars reside at the Academy in order to pursue their independent projects. The community at the Academy also includes other visiting scholars and artists who finance their own stay. During the summer months, the Academy hosts a number of seminars.

³⁴ Pulitzer Prizes, “The Pulitzer Prize in Music: It’s Time to Alter and Affirm; A Statement by the Pulitzer Prize Board, June 1, 2004,” <http://www.pulitzer.org/EntryForms/musicchanges.pdf>.

³⁵ American Academy in Rome, “American Academy in Rome: Overview of the Academy,” <http://www.aarome.org/overview.htm>.

The Academy began awarding the Rome Prize to composers in 1924, with Howard Hanson and Leo Sowerby receiving the first. The prize is intended for emerging artists and scholars in the early to middle stages of their career. Currently, the applicant in musical composition must have a bachelor's degree in music, musical composition, or its equivalent. Along with a resume, project proposal, and letters of reference, the applicant must submit two scores, one of which must be for a large ensemble or orchestra. This requirement obviously narrows the field of recipients. Of the 117 fellowships granted since 1924, five have been awarded to women, the first being awarded to Barbara Kolb in 1971.³⁶

Other Organizations

A number of foundations essentially act as agents for other foundations, private donors, and the federal, state, and local governments by accepting large grants and redistributing them to composers in the form of individual grants, fellowships, scholarships, commissions, and awards or prizes. The most active organizations in this respect are the American Composers Forum, the American Music Center, and Meet the Composer. All three organizations assist composers through programs for commissioning, performing and recording new American music, and all three receive grants from other foundations, private donors, and the government agencies, such as the National Endowment for the Arts and local and state arts councils, for redistribution through their various programs. Each of these organizations, along with the dozens of other service organizations, provide valuable assistance in the complex support system that a composer requires in order to make a living. The combined efforts of these organizations represent nearly every facet and style of music being composed today in the United States, including large-scale symphonic works, solo and chamber pieces, performance art, and multi-media productions. In

³⁶ A complete list of recipients is contained in Appendix VIII.

the last decade or so, many government agencies and large private foundations have elected to channel their money through these organizations rather than retain their own internal experts on the subject of contemporary music.

The American Music Center was founded in 1939 by Marion Bauer, Aaron Copland, Howard Hanson, Otto Luening, Harrison Kerr, and Quincy Porter “to foster and encourage the composition of contemporary (American) music and to promote its production, distribution and performance in every way possible throughout the Western Hemisphere.”³⁷ Initially the organization created a library of scores and recordings of new American music and maintained a non-profit publishing and recording operation. Over the decades, the center expanded its professional services, sponsored festivals of new music, and provided information gathering and distribution services. In the 1950s the center created the first significant national program to commission, perform, and record new music, following that in 1962 with its Composer Assistance Program, which provides grants to composers to assist with copying scores and other expenses related to the first performance of a piece. In 2004 alone, the Composer Assistance Program distributed \$23,765 to twenty-seven composers. The center also administers the Aaron Copland Fund for Music which promotes American music through grants to performance ensembles that have demonstrated a commitment to contemporary American music. Other funds administered by the center also focus on performance and recording. The work of the center is sponsored through large foundations such as the Carnegie Corporation, the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, and the Fidelity Foundation; foundations established on behalf of musicians such as the above-mentioned Aaron Copland Fund, the Edward T. Cone Foundation, the Alice M. Ditson Fund of Columbia University (one of the Center’s first sponsors), and the Virgil Thomson Foundation; government agencies such as the National Endowment for the Arts and the New

³⁷ American Music Center, “AMC: Past, Present & Future,” <http://www.amc.net/about/history.html>.

York State Council on the Arts; and industry foundations such as the ASCAP Foundation, the BMI Foundation, and the Music Publishers' Association of the United States.

In 1974 composer John Duffy founded a program called "Meet the Composer." Initially sponsored by the American Music Center, the vision was to "enable composers to make a living writing music, and to increase their visible presence as creative artists."³⁸ The program grew to become an independent organization that commissions music and provides grants to artistic and civic organizations for commissioning and composer residencies. An important philosophy behind Meet the Composer's mission is to create more opportunities for composers by increasing the contact between composers and audiences through the residency program and educational programs that raise awareness about composers and their work. The organization also actively promotes the commissioning of work by other patrons by assisting in connecting composers and patrons and publishing an information guide on commissioning.³⁹ Seven of the seventeen members of the board of directors (as of 2005) are identified as composers and reflect a wide range of compositional styles with a slight emphasis on the more avant-garde: Eve Beglarian, Chen Yi, John Corigliano, Leroy Jenkins, Harold Meltzer, Bernard Rands, Steve Reich, and Julia Wolfe.

The American Composers Forum was founded as the Minnesota Composers Forum in 1973 and grew to become a national composer service organization that "provides composers at all stages of their careers with valuable resources for professional and artistic development" through "granting, commissioning and performance programs."⁴⁰ Like Meet the Composer, the American Composers Forum emphasizes a community outreach program in order to educate the

³⁸ Meet the Composer, "History and Mission," <http://www.meetthecomposer.org/about.htm>.

³⁹ Johanna Keller, ed., *An Individual's Guide to Commissioning Music* (New York: Meet the Composer, 2003).

⁴⁰ American Composers Forum, "Mission and History," http://www.composersforum.org/about_mission.cfm.

public and stimulate demand for new music. The Forum also connects individual patrons with composers for commissioning, sponsors residencies, administers several of its own commissioning programs, awards fellowships, and provides professional development seminars to its members. In addition to membership fees, the Forum is supported through numerous large foundations such as the Target Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the McKnight Foundation, and the Ford Foundation; it also receives grants from the National Endowment for the Arts and the Minnesota State Arts Board. Six out of the thirty-two board members are identified as composers: Anne Le Baron, Patrice Rushen, Alvin Singleton, Steve Heitzeg, Cary John Franklin, and Jennifer Higdon. Seven out of the ten members of the advisory board are composers: Marilyn Bergman, Meredith Monk, Stanislaw Skrowaczewski, John Cávavas, Peter Schickele, Bobby McFerrin, and Stephen Sondheim. The composers on the advisory board in particular represent a wide range of genres, including Broadway, popular music, and electronic music.

Evaluation of Foundation Support

When the Rockefeller Fund awarded \$400,000 to the Louisville Philharmonic Society (the Louisville Orchestra), *Musical America* praised this move, stating:

Here indeed is an occasion for rejoicing, not only by the composers for whom it will be a dream come true, but by all who are concerned for the welfare of music in this country, present and future. It discloses an appreciation of and a vital interest in the development of creative art on the part of those controlling private resources (as distinguished from the public treasury) that have had few parallels in history since the Renaissance and certainly none in the United States. And it speaks volumes for the progress our native art has made in recent years toward the sort of recognition and acceptance that lift it out of the realm of the eccentric and inconsequential and place it where it belongs a viable and momentous factor in our total culture. Music too long has been the poor relation to whom a crust of bread is tossed from time to time but who, under no circumstances, could hope to sit down at the festive board with the rest of the family.⁴¹

⁴¹ “Rockefeller Fund Grants \$400,000 to Underwrite Contemporary Works for Five Years,” *Musical America* 73 (May 1953): 3.

The editorial further expressed the hope that the action by the Rockefeller Fund would “serve as a signal and a beacon to other great foundations.”⁴² Joseph Wagner noted in 1957 that foundation support had helped composers but called for a large, permanent trust fund to support community orchestras in presenting contemporary music.⁴³ The editor of *Musical Courier*, Lisa Roma Trompeter, said in 1959, “The face of music in America is being changed to a large degree by the munificent gifts being made to promote this art by leading foundations.”⁴⁴ Though this sounds positive on the surface, her statement may signal the beginning of some skepticism about foundation support.

In December, 1960, Winthrop Sargent, music critic for the *New Yorker*, wrote a review of William Schuman’s Seventh Symphony in which he attacked contemporary music and suggested that one of the root causes of its failure was that it was supported by commissions from foundations whose advisory boards consisted mainly of composers. He asserted that these composers were selecting music for composers and not for audiences and that this was “a major source of the stagnation and monotony in contemporary American music.”⁴⁵ His suspicion of the integrity of Schuman’s Seventh Symphony was apparently rooted in the fact that it was commissioned by the Koussevitzky Foundation, on whose board of advisors Schuman was a member.⁴⁶ Robert Sabin clarified the circumstances of this particular commissioning in an article in *Musical America* two months later, noting that the Boston Symphony Orchestra had approached the Koussevitzky Foundation about joining it in commissioning fifteen works for its seventy-fifth anniversary. The orchestra had final approval of the list of composers to be

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Joseph Wagner, “A New Approach to an Old Problem,” *Musical Courier* 156 (November 15, 1957): 7.

⁴⁴ Lisa Roma Trompeter, “Patronage Then and Now,” *Musical Courier* 159 (February 1959): 3.

⁴⁵ Winthrop Sargent, “The Inside Track,” *New Yorker* (December 10, 1960): 231.

⁴⁶ Other members of the advisory board at that time included Gregor Piatgorsky, Leonard Bernstein, Aaron Copland, Howard Hanson, William Schuman, Richard Burgin, and Harold Spivacke, with Olga (Mrs. Serge) Koussevitzky serving as chairman of the board.

commissioned.⁴⁷ Regardless of the circumstances (which admittedly look a bit self-serving),

Sabin represents the other side of the debate over “foundation music”:

[T]he suggestion that much music is written for the board members who pick it for public performance is idiotic. The board members are perfectly aware that audiences are the tests of music and they are also perfectly aware...that there are audiences all over the world that have shown enthusiasm for the contemporary music that they pick. The “sort of genteel Tammany Hall aroma” in our musical life mentioned by Mr. Sargent exists only in his imagination and in the wishful thinking of composers who have not won public success and are therefore eager to attack those who have.⁴⁸

Paul Fromm, president of the Fromm Music Foundation, responded to Sabin’s article in a letter to the editor the following month, defending the role of foundations as the “modern equivalent of aristocratic patronage.” He further explained that it is appropriate for composers, as trained professionals, to sit on the judging panels of these foundations in the same way that architects pass judgment on the soundness of building proposals or scientists advise on the selection of Nobel Laureates in chemistry, biology, physics, and so on.⁴⁹ As a result of this editorial episode, Winthrop Sargent resigned from the editorial advisory board of *Musical America*, saying that the journal “should not retain on its advisory staff a man whose inquiries into the peculiar methods of the foundation juries it regards as dishonoring the critical profession.”⁵⁰

Though he was a staunch supporter of foundations in 1961, Fromm’s view seemed to change over the next two decades. Writing in 1979, he expressed the opinion that foundations viewed composers as orphans to be adopted, with the result that prizes, commissions, and fellowships had become a form of philanthropic work.⁵¹ He pointed out that foundations commission new works from composers and usually assist with the premiere of the work. All too

⁴⁷ The thirteen other composers besides Schuman who were chosen were Henri Dutilleux, Gottfried von Einem, Jacques Ibert, Darius Milhaud, Goffredo Petrassi, Samuel Barber, Leonard Bernstein, Aaron Copland, Howard Hanson, Bohuslav Martinu, Walter Piston, Roger Sessions, and Heitor Villa-Lobos. (Boston Symphony Orchestra, “75th Anniversary Commissions,” <http://www.bso.org>.)

⁴⁸ Robert Sabin, “The Dangers of Being a Destructive Reactionary,” *Musical America* (February 1961): 60.

⁴⁹ Paul Fromm, letter to the editor, *Musical America* (March 1961): 4.

⁵⁰ Winthrop Sargent, letters to the editor, *Musical America* (March 1961): 4.

⁵¹ In fact I have argued in this thesis that patronage is indeed a form of philanthropy.

often that is the only performance of the work, but the foundations continue to commission and composers continue to live from commission to commission. The result is a fractured musical scene for both audiences and composers and an excess of under-performed music.⁵² To validate Fromm's accusation would require taking a sampling of the thousands of commissions from various foundations and collecting the sales and rental statistics, a task beyond the scope of this thesis. The best defense of the practice of commissioning so much new music can actually be found in Fromm's own words from the 1961 article in *Musical America* when he compared foundations with the noble and aristocratic patrons of earlier times:

[W]ere the works commissioned by these "ideal" patrons artistic productions of the first quality in a majority, or in even a significant number of cases? Did they primarily result in the elimination of mediocrity and the glorification of genius? Or were most of the works commissioned representative of the established professional level of the time, thus serving to keep alive the activity and spirit of musical life?⁵³

In addition to the reasons cited by Fromm, the abundance of new music created through the commissions of the various private patrons, foundations, and the federal government also prevents homogenization. In the late twentieth century, the definition of "culture" in America broadened to include artistic expressions outside of the "Western" tradition. In contrast to earlier in the century when the search for a "national," and therefore homogenous, music prevailed, the current trend is towards supporting a wide diversity of styles, including folk-based musics of the world and jazz.

Milton Babbitt accused foundations such as the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations as focusing too much on the performer and not enough on the composer so that the results of their efforts have been to create vehicles for the performers rather than music to be performed on its

⁵² Paul Fromm, "Twentieth-Century Music: Trouble Along the Road to the Twenty-First Century," in *A Life for New Music: Selected Papers of Paul Fromm*, 32-33.

⁵³ Fromm, letter to the editor, *Musical America* (March 1961): 4.

own merit.⁵⁴ These large foundations have certainly trained their attention on creating performance opportunities, sustaining orchestras, and building audiences. Numerous smaller foundations, service organizations (such as Meet the Composer), and grants through the National Endowment for the Arts, however, have attempted to redress this balance, at least in part. Their relative success will be discussed in the subsequent chapters.

⁵⁴ Milton Babbitt, "Paul Fromm: A Memoir," in *A Life for New Music*, 4. See also pp. 22 and 33-34 in the same volume for Fromm's views on this point.

Chapter 5 – Government Support

The United States was nearly two hundred years old before it “committed itself to a program of sustained, direct financial support for the arts by the national government.”¹ After its creation in 1789, the government was understandably focused on issues such as establishing the role of the federal government in relation to state governments, military defense of the new country, the acquisition of land, and stabilizing the new economy. The priorities of the new government over the succeeding generations can be summed up by the words of John Adams, writing to his wife, Abigail, in 1780:

I must study politics and war so that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy. My sons ought to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history, naval architecture, navigation, commerce and agriculture, in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry, and porcelain.²

In spite of the fact that Adams included music with the other fine arts in his list of priorities for the third generation, we shall see that music did not figure directly in the early attempts to establish government patronage of the arts. Further, it took more than the three generations that Adams predicted for the federal government to recognize the role of arts in society as something other than a means of decoration or entertainment.

This lack official recognition of the importance of the arts in society, combined with the absence of a central government authority in the arts, has created perception that the federal government of the United States was not involved with the arts until the creation of the National

¹ Milton C. Cummings, Jr. “Government and the Arts: An Overview,” *Public Money and the Muse: Essays on Government Funding for the Arts* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1991), 31.

² John Adams, letter to Abigail Adams, May 12, 1780. In *Adams Family Correspondence*, vol. 3, L. H. Butterfield and Marc Friedlaender, eds. (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1973), 342.

Endowment for the Arts in 1964.³ However, from the signing of the Constitution in 1787, the federal government *has* been involved in numerous ways, some financial and some less tangible. For example, Section 8 of the Constitution includes the basis of the copyright law and states: “The Congress shall have the power...to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.” The copyright law is important to composers because it ultimately allows them to receive payment for the performance and publishing of their work. The next example of government patronage is the founding of the Library of Congress in 1800. Initially created to provide legal, economic and historical documents for the use of the members of Congress, the scope of the collection expanded greatly after Congress purchased Thomas Jefferson’s library in 1815. His collection included works on the arts, architecture, science, literature and geography. Both of these Congressional actions demonstrate that the new government was not ignorant of the arts (though perhaps a bit ambivalent), and both the copyright law and the Library of Congress eventually played a role in supporting American composers.

John Trumbull, American painter, became one of the first spokesmen for a more direct patronage by the government. In 1817 Congress had commissioned four paintings from Trumbull depicting important moments in the Revolutionary War and the founding of the country. The paintings were to hang in the rotunda of the new Capitol being designed by Charles Bulfinch. Congress paid \$8,000 each for the paintings but not without controversy. During the debates, Congressmen worried over the advisability of paying such a sum when outstanding debts, most resulting from the Revolutionary War, remained to be paid. The quality of Trumbull’s paintings

³ Cornelius Canon, “The Federal Music Project of the Works Progress Administration: Music in a Democracy” (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1963), vi.

also came into question by members of Congress. Senator Holmes of Maine complained that “those paintings, which cost thirty-two thousand dollars, were not worth thirty-two cents.”⁴

Searching for another commission from Congress in 1826, Trumbull wrote of the importance of government patronage, observing that through such support “the fine arts may be stimulated and encouraged, the national edifices decorated, authentic monuments of national history preserved, elegant and attractive rewards bestowed on the meritorious servants of the public, and the national glory essentially advanced.”⁵ In a letter to President John Quincy Adams, Trumbull proposed that painters be commissioned to record historic events on canvas. The originals would be hung in public buildings and engravers would be engaged to make copperplates of the paintings. The prints made from these would be sold to help defray the cost of the commission, as well as distributed to ambassadors to carry abroad and use as evidence to other nations of “our advance, not only in political, naval, and military greatness, but also in those arts of peace which embellish and adorn even greatness itself.”⁶ Trumbull’s plan, though meritorious, was probably doomed from the beginning because of the earlier controversies over the quality of his own paintings. In fact, the “prejudice excited” by Trumbull’s paintings may have been responsible in part for some of the aversion to government patronage in succeeding years: a congressional report in 1871 stated that the controversies had “served to defeat all

⁴ Quoted in Cummings, “Government and the Arts: An Overview,” 34.

⁵ Quoted in Doreen Bolger and David Park Curry, “Art for the President’s House—An Historical Perspective,” The White House, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/history/art/presart-1.html>.

⁶ John Trumbull, “Letter proposing a plan for the permanent encouragement of the fine arts: by the national government, addressed to the President of the United States,” (New York: printed by William Davis, Jr., 1827), no page number. Throughout Trumbull’s letter two important threads can be detected. The first is that Trumbull is careful to demonstrate how this will not be a money-losing venture for the national government. Second, he is at pains to explain that the support of the fine arts (by which he of course means painting) is an important part of a civilized society and is not to be confused with the excesses of the monarchies in Europe.

attempts to afford it [American art] government patronage, or even to call in the aid of American artists to decorate the Capitol.”⁷

Many more attempts were made in the nineteenth century to establish some form of national arts council. The role of these councils was to advise on the commissioning or acquisition of paintings and sculptures that were to adorn federal buildings and on the architecture of such buildings; in other words, art was a product, not a creative effort to be sustained and encouraged. The politics of the moment were also tied into every effort to create a national council and remain so even to this day. The story of President James Buchanan’s proposal for an arts council illustrates this point.

In 1859 Buchanan submitted to Congress a proposal for the establishment of a National Arts Commission to “superintend and direct the decorations of the new Capitol.”⁸ Congress authorized him to appoint three commissioners. He selected Henry K. Brown, J. R. Lambden, and John F. Kensett, a sculptor and two painters, respectively. The commission presented a report to Congress sometime during the next year, but no action had been taken by April of 1860.⁹ The commission was disbanded in 1861 for lack of appropriations.¹⁰ Much of the blame for the failure of the commission to secure funding or to even gain the attention of Congress may lie in the fact that James Buchanan had the misfortune of presiding over a nation deeply divided over the issue of slavery and states’ rights. His term was framed by two important events of this period: he was sworn into office two days before the U.S. Supreme Court announced its decision

⁷ U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, *Art in the District of Columbia*, Executive Document 315 (41st Congress, 2nd session, 1871), 727. Quoted in Cummings, “Government and the Arts: An Overview,”³⁴

⁸ “The Government Fine Art Commission,” *New York Times*, May 23, 1859, 4. This article about the commission refers to it as the “Fine Art Commission.” A year later, the *New York Times* calls it the “National Art Commission” (“Washington Matters,” *New York Times*, April 26, 1860, 1). The National Endowment for the Arts also refers to it by this name (National Endowment for the Arts, *National Endowment for the Arts, 1965-2000: A Brief Chronology of Federal Support for the Arts* [Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts, 2000], 6).

⁹ “Washington Matters,” *New York Times*, April 26, 1860, 1.

¹⁰ National Endowment for the Arts, *A Brief Chronology*, 6.

in the Dred Scott case and ended four months after South Carolina seceded from the Union. Numerous other crises occurred during his term, including the economic emergency that resulted from the collapse of the New York Stock Exchange in 1857, the Mountain Meadows Massacre of 1857 (part of the continuing problems with the Mormons in the Utah territory), and John Brown's raid of Harpers Ferry in October of 1859. Buchanan was also forced to defend himself in 1860 against charges of impropriety in the debate over the constitution of the Kansas constitution.¹¹ Congress was intensely focused on those issues and Buchanan was proving to be an ineffective leader. A hint of this last can be seen in the *New York Times* report on the formation of the arts commission: "It would have been fortunate for the country, as well as for the reputation of President Buchanan, if all his appointments had been made on the same principle that doubtless guided him in the selection of these gentlemen."¹²

Twenty years later in 1879, Representative Samuel S. Cox of New York introduced a joint resolution in Congress to establish an art council to whom would be submitted "all designs and proposals for paintings or statues ordered by Congress."¹³ The matter was referred to the Committee on the Library but never reported out of committee. Similar bills submitted over the next twenty years suffered the same fate.¹⁴ In 1897, the Public Arts League of the United States helped to forward a bill in Congress for the establishment of a National Art Commission, to be comprised of the presidents of the American Institute of Architects, the National Academy of Design, and the National Sculpture Society, along with two presidential appointees, but the bill

¹¹ Irving J. Sloan, ed., *James Buchanan, 1791-1868: Chronology, Documents, Bibliographic Aids* (Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana Publications Inc., 1968), 1-20.

¹² "The Government Fine Art Commission," *New York Times*, May 23, 1859, 4.

¹³ HR 126, 46th Cong., 2nd sess., *Congressional Record*: H 21.

¹⁴ Bills were submitted in 1886 (S 2625, 49th Cong., 1st Sess.); 1888 (S 1514, 50th Cong., 1st Sess.); 1889 (S 39, 51st Cong., 1st Sess.); 1896 (S 1922 and HR 6305, 54th Cong., 1st Sess.); 1897 (HR 3236, 55th Cong., 1st Sess.); and 1900 (S 2544 and HR 7266, 56th Cong., 1st Sess.).

failed because Congress favored a committee of all congressional or presidential appointees.¹⁵

In January, 1909, President Roosevelt appointed a thirty-member Council of Fine Arts, however his actions angered Congress. His term in office ended three months later and the incoming president, William Howard Taft, disbanded the Council the following year and appointed his own Council whose primary goal was to deal with the architectural appearance of Washington, D.C.

All of the legislation proposed throughout the nineteenth century and early twentieth century focused on the visual arts with one notable exception: the granting of a charter by Congress to Jeanette Meyers Thurber and the trustees of the National Conservatory of Music in New York in 1891. Three years earlier, Thurber had petitioned Congress on behalf of the Conservatory for financial support, noting that

America has, so far, done nothing in a National way either to promote the musical education of its people or to develop any musical genius they possess, and that in this, she stands alone among the civilized nations of the world.¹⁶

Her proposal failed to garner enough support in Congress, coming at a time when President Grover Cleveland was urging Congress to curtail spending on new projects. The modified proposal of 1891 requested a national charter with no Congressional appropriations and proposed moving the home of the conservatory to Washington, D.C.¹⁷ Upon passage of the bill and signing into law by President Benjamin Harrison on March 3, 1891, the *New York Post* noted that this was “the first instance of anything being done by the National Legislature on behalf of music.”¹⁸

¹⁵ “A National Art Commission,” *New York Times Book Review*, August 21, 1897, 4, and Commission of Fine Arts, “Background of the Commission of Fine Arts,” <http://www.cfa.gov/about/history.html>. There are two important aspects to this bill for future arts legislation. The first is that an organized group of artists lobbied on behalf of the bill and second that the council was to be made up of professionals in the various artistic fields. Congress’ rejection based on the lack of politicians on the council laid the groundwork for the final compromise of the 1960s: today’s National Arts Council is comprised of artists appointed by the President and members of Congress.

¹⁶ Quoted in Emanuel Rubin, “Jeannette Meyers Thurber and the National Conservatory of Music,” *American Music* 8, no. 3 (Autumn 1990): 302.

¹⁷ The plan to move the National Conservatory to the nation’s capital never materialized.

¹⁸ *New York Post*, March 18, 1891. Quoted in Rubin, “Jeannette Meyers Thurber and the National Conservatory of Music,” 304.

In fact, it appears that this was the first time anything concrete had been done by the federal government on behalf of *any* art aside from purchasing paintings and sculptures for federal buildings.

The Depression of the 1930s brought about the most significant change in attitude towards federal patronage of art in the United States.¹⁹ The desperate economic times left many artists and musicians (as well as millions of other workers) unemployed throughout the country. Under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal Program, the Works Progress Administration (WPA) was created. As part of the WPA's work relief program, three initiatives were created to provide jobs for artists: the Federal Art Program, the Federal Theater Program, and the Federal Music Program. Artists, musicians, writers, and actors were given employment in their area of expertise. For example, musicians were given jobs in orchestras that performed throughout the country, especially in rural areas that would otherwise not have access to performances.²⁰ Once the economic emergency of the 1930s had passed, the WPA program, as well as most of Roosevelt's New Deal policies, came under attack, but it served to define some of the parameters for the arts legislation that would be debated in the coming decades, particularly the notion that federal support of the arts could not be tied to work relief and that one of the goals of any program must be access for all Americans to the cultural output of the country's artists.²¹

¹⁹ Though Congress approved the legislation in 1925 that allowed for the administration of the Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation, no appropriations were required and therefore Congress did not have to consider its position on funding of the arts.

²⁰ Cornelius Canon, "The Federal Music Project of the Works Progress Administration: Music in a Democracy" (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1963) discusses the Federal Music Project at length. See also Milton Meltzer, *Violins and Shovels: The WPA Arts Projects* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1976).

²¹ In 1935, William Sirovich submitted a bill to the House for a "single department of the Government of the United States dealing wholly with science, the beaux arts, and the arts utile." His bill was later combined with bills introduced by Sen. Claude Pepper and Rep. John Coffee and became known as the Sirovich-Coffee-Pepper bill. The joint resolution (HJR 671) was eventually defeated largely because it confused federal support of the arts with work relief. Gary O. Larson reports that it was "swept aside in a sea of laughter" (Gary O. Larson, *The Reluctant Patron* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983], 43).

More importantly for musicians, the WPA program was the first time that music and drama were included with the visual arts in any discussions about federal support.

After World War II, a new urgency for federal funding of the arts emerged. The arguments in favor fell into three broad categories. The first was that cultural exchange programs would help to create allies for the United States, a notion which gained considerable ground as the cold war intensified and relations with the Soviet Union hardened. The second argument was that federal support of the arts was the missing ingredient in American civilization as compared with European nations. This argument was closely tied to the concern that the arts were floundering under economic pressures in the United States. Finally, some argued that art should be available to all Americans, regardless of where they lived or their income level—the “chicken in every pot and fine art in every home” concept of cultural democracy.²² Those against federal funding of the arts argued that the financial burden was too high, that the arts were a private concern and should not be subject to possible regulation and control, and that the federal government had more important issues with which it had to contend.²³

The intense fifteen-year debate over government support of the arts began in 1949 with a proposal by Representative Jacob Javits to create a national theater, opera, and ballet.²⁴ Javits was quick to point out that he was not proposing a physical structure but rather “an integrated, country-wide organization aided by the Federal Government.”²⁵ This was the first time that an

²² Larson, *The Reluctant Patron*, 6. Larson characterizes the range of support for a federal program during the 1950s as being one of an extreme hands-off approach to one of staunch advocacy of ambitious federal programs, with a large segment of opinion lying in the middle ground. The three arguments cited in favor of support were designed to sway this middle group towards support of a federal program and largely succeeded.

²³ Larson, *The Reluctant Patron*, 7.

²⁴ HJR 104, 81st cong., 1st sess. (1949).

²⁵ As quoted in Larson, *The Reluctant Patron*, 45. Javits was persistent in this viewpoint throughout his tireless advocacy of federal arts support. For instance, when he submitted a bill to establish the U.S. Arts Foundation a decade later (S 1598, 86th Congress, 1st session, 1959), he stated that “the emphasis of the Arts Foundation is upon people and places rather than upon bricks and mortar. I think this is very important, because there are other efforts to accomplish this general objective, but many of them are very

appropriation by Congress was suggested to *support* the arts rather than to procure artworks or supply work relief for artists. More importantly for musicians and composers, Javits's proposal centered on the performing arts and thereby expanded the notion of "fine arts" to include music and drama. Representative Emanuel Celler codified the definition for Congress in 1951, saying that the fine arts included "living drama and music, literature, architecture, sculpture, painting, ballet and dance."²⁶ In contrast to previous legislative attempts on behalf of the arts, the performing arts took center stage in the debates of the fifties and sixties. Though the Javits plan of 1949 was never reported out of committee, it opened a floodgate for proposals for federal support of the arts. In nearly every year after that, at least one bill was proposed to Congress, sometimes as many as twenty. They were all (except the final legislation of 1964 and 1965) rejected on various grounds, but each provided an opportunity to hone and shape a uniquely American solution to the question of federal support of the arts.

Because of the reaction against WPA-style programs, nearly all of the bills submitted throughout this period emphasized support of organizations such as museums, galleries, orchestras, and theater companies rather than individual artists, performers, or composers. In fact, the economic plight of orchestras became a decisive argument in favor of federal support by the end of the fifties. In the meantime, individuals such as composers were trotted out as an example of how the lack of support affected the progress of the arts in America. For example, Javits stated in 1959 that "our young artists and creators must fight all kinds of obstacles to make careers; and many give up the fight."²⁷ Amidst the dozens of bills over the years, at least two bills did specifically address the individual creative artist: Senator Francis Case proposed a

heavily based upon the idea of some memorial, some theater, some structure within which these activities may be housed." (*Congressional Record*, 86th Congress, 1st session, 1959, 5437).

²⁶ Emanuel Celler, "Development of the Fine Arts," *U.S. Congressional Record*, 82nd Cong., 1st session (1951), A3249.

²⁷ Jacob K. Javits, "Plan to Aid Our Lagging Culture," *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, April 5, 1959, 21ff.

program of “living awards in the creative and performing arts—art, sculpture, music, literature, drama, poetry and dance” which would annually recognize outstanding contributors in these fields.²⁸ In a similar measure, Representative Leonard Wolf proposed a plan to “promote, encourage, and provide financial assistance through grant, fellowship, and scholarship for composers and students of composition, playwrights and students of playwrighting, for the purposes of encouraging new plays and musical compositions.” In his prefatory remarks to the bill, Wolf said that “the United States as a nation lags far behind almost every nation in Europe in aid that is given to composers, playwrights, and the performing arts.”²⁹ Of course, neither measure passed.

The arts community of the 1950s was divided on the issue of government subsidy, and musicians no less so. Helen M. Thompson, executive secretary of the American Symphony Orchestra League (ASOL) and presumably speaking for the membership, came out strongly against subsidy in 1953, attacking it largely on the issue of control. Thompson equated government subsidy to turning people in the arts into “pawns in a centrally managed, nationalistic program whose control could be so buried in bureaucracy as to give little hint of its ultimate purpose.”³⁰ On the other hand, the American Federation of Musicians, a labor union, was strongly in favor, going so far as to include language to that effect in their constitution: “The international executive board is instructed to do all in its power to persuade the Federal Government to create a national subsidy for music in this country.”³¹

²⁸ National Academy of Culture Act, S. 2207, 86th cong., 1st sess. (1959). Senator Case’s prefatory remarks, cited above, are included in *U.S. Congressional Record*, 86th cong., 1st sess. (1959), 11261.

²⁹ Leonard Wolf, “A Bill to Establish a U.S. Arts Foundation,” *U.S. Congressional Record*, 86th cong., 1st sess. (1959).

³⁰ Quoted in Larson, *The Reluctant Patron*, 83. In fairness to the ASOL, they did modify their position from one of near unanimous opposition to government subsidy to a more moderate one, reflecting some ambivalence and division within the organization (Larson, *The Reluctant Patron*, 173-4).

³¹ Article 33, Section 17, of American Federation of Musicians Constitution. Quoted in Larson, *The Reluctant Patron*, 51.

Though few reactions by composers are recorded, what little is available suggests that composers were adopting a cautious middle-of-the-road position, neither stridently calling for subsidies nor outright rejecting them. In a forum sponsored by the *New York Times* and radion station WQXR in January, 1949, Arthur Schwartz thought that the time was right for Congress to provide “some” assistance, and Deems Taylor said he would be satisfied if the government “took its foot off the neck of music,” by which he meant abolishing the admission tax charged to performing companies.³² Two year later Roger Sessions openly worried that any composer supported by the government would become a tool of the government.³³ Aaron Copland recognized that the question of government-supported culture could produce “cogent arguments for both sides of [the] question” but concluded that:

The growing trend toward government involvement is clear...Everything points to the eventual admission of the principle at issue, namely, the principle that our government ought actively to concern itself with the welfare of art and professional artists in the United States...Bureaucratic control of the artist in a totalitarian regime is a frightening thing; but in a democracy it should be possible to envisage a liberal encouragement of the arts through allocation of Government funds without any permanently dire results.³⁴

While national organizations of performing musicians and labor unions articulated their positions numerous times over the years, the only response by a composer organization uncovered to date is a remark by Samuel Barlow of the American Composers Alliance and recorded by the *New York Times*. Barlow testified at a hearing held in New York City by Senator Herbert H. Lehman, saying that in civilized societies throughout time, “a fostering of the arts by the government has

³² “U.S. Aid for Music Is Urged in Forum,” *New York Times*, January 6, 1949, 28.

³³ V. I. Seroff, review of *The Musical Experience of Composer, Performer, Listener*, by Roger Sessions, *New York Times Book Review*, April 29, 1951, 15.

³⁴ Aaron Copland, “Blashfield Address: Creativity in America Part One,” *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Letter and the National Institute of Arts and Letters*, 2nd ser., No. 3 (May 1952), 33-40. Reprinted in J. Heywood Alexander, ed., *To Stretch Our Ears: A Documentary History of America’s Music* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2002), 367-70. Portions of Copland’s address also appeared in the *New York Times*, May 29, 1952, 24. Note that Copland’s willingness to speak about government support of the arts precedes his own troubles with Congress and the cancellation of *A Lincoln Portrait* at Eisenhower’s 1953 inauguration.

not been considered ‘government interference’ nor a sign of objectionable socialism.”³⁵ Barlow’s statement is similar to Copland’s earlier remarks in its ambivalence to government support: it seems inevitable and it does not necessarily spell disaster for the creative artist.

The caution expressed by these composers may reflect the backdrop against which the entire debate played during the early years of the 1950s. On the one hand, the media constantly retold the story of how Soviet composers had to work “in vain to solve their almost insoluble problem—to write music which the [Communist] party will consider satisfactory and ‘appealing to the people’ and which the people themselves will find appealing.”³⁶ At the same time, several composers, including Aaron Copland, became entangled in the workings of the House Un-American Activities Committee, either as witnesses or victims, and may have subsequently shied away from public statements concerning the government’s role in the arts.

Momentum for some form of government support of the arts began to build following President Dwight D. Eisenhower’s 1955 State of the Union address to Congress in which he proclaimed:

In the advancement of the various abilities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal government on ways to encourage artistic endeavor and appreciation.³⁷

The Eisenhower administration failed to secure the needed legislation for this commission, but his words are considered a breakthrough in terms of executive support of the *concept* of federal support for the arts. Indeed, Eisenhower continued to raise the issue during his administration,

³⁵ Murray Illson, “A U.S. Arts Board Is Endorsed Here,” *New York Times*, April 15, 1956, 86.

³⁶ Julie Whitney, “Music ‘in a Cage,’” *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, August 8, 1954, 45. Similar stories about the Soviet government’s use of the arts to build ideological coherency appeared several times a year in the pages of the *New York Times* throughout this period. The stories, as far as music went, most often involved Dmitri Shostokovich, Sergei Prokofieff, and Aram Khatchaturian.

³⁷ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Annual Message to Congress on the State of the Union,” January 6, 1955, *Public Papers of the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1955* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1959), 28-29.

and it would be addressed by the presidential candidates (John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon) in the 1960 election campaign. Lyndon B. Johnson would again be faced with the issue in his 1964 re-election campaign.

The inauguration of John F. Kennedy in 1961 signaled another momentous change in the administration's view of the arts: Kennedy invited dozens of artists, musicians, and writers to his inauguration. In the most cynical view, Kennedy's attention to the arts can be seen as part of a package to enhance his image in the White House, but it cannot be denied that the steps he took, particularly in naming several advisors who were strong advocates of federal support of the arts, had a decisive effect in the final passage of arts legislation in this country. His advisors, August Heckscher, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Pierre Salinger, helped to formulate a plan to create an advisory council on the arts. Kennedy would have preferred to create this council with Congress' approval, but when it did not happen, he decided to create it through an executive order. He finally announced the creation of the council (but without naming the members) on the morning of November 22, 1963; later that day, he was assassinated in Dallas.

Lyndon Johnson was left with the job of completing so many of the plans and promises of the Kennedy administration during a very chaotic time. To many in the arts world, it looked as if the plan for an arts council and any kind of federal support of the arts would be neglected, especially given that Johnson did not appear as enthusiastic about the arts as did Kennedy. Surprisingly, Johnson became the president who signed the legislation to create the National Council on the Arts and the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. Kennedy's advisor, Schlesinger, may have provided the incentive when he told Johnson that supporting such measures would "strengthen the connections between the administration and the intellectual community," a strong argument given that Johnson was facing a re-election campaign after only a

few months in office.³⁸ Johnson named Roger Stevens as his special assistant on the arts and Stevens worked closely with members of Congress to finally get legislation passed to create the National Council on the Arts in 1964.³⁹ The election a few months later kept Johnson in the White House and put the Democrats, who were more favorably inclined towards arts legislation, in control of Congress. In addition, many of the longtime opponents of such legislation lost their bids for re-election to Congress. Early in 1965, the administration submitted a proposal for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. Over the next several months, the bill was debated and amended until it was finally passed in September and signed into law by the president later that month. The creation of the foundation included two endowments, one for arts and one for humanities, to be funded through Congressional appropriations. Monies from the endowments were to be distributed in the form of grants to individuals and qualifying non-profit organizations, as well as to states arts councils for redistribution.

The act establishing the National Council on the Arts initially called for a twenty-six member committee appointed by the President consisting of twenty-four citizens, the chairman, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian *ex officio*. Appointees are confirmed by Congress for six-year terms. In 1997, Congress reduced the membership to twenty-one: the chairman, fourteen citizens, and six members of Congress (three from the House and three from the Senate) who serve in an *ex officio*, non-voting capacity for two years. The role of the Council is to “recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the Nation and to encourage and develop greater appreciation and enjoyment of the arts by its citizens.”⁴⁰ Independent panels consisting of nationally recognized experts review applications for grants for artistic excellence and forward their recommendations to the Council. The Council reviews the recommendations

³⁸ Memorandum, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., to Lyndon B. Johnson, 29 Nov. 1963, August Heckscher Papers, Box 6, John F. Kennedy Library. Quoted in Larson, *The Reluctant Patron*, 181.

³⁹ HR 9586, August 20, 1964.

⁴⁰ National Endowment for the Arts, *A Brief Chronology*, 10.

which are sent to the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts for final approval. The Chairman is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and serves a four-year term. Within a short period after the creation of the National Council on the Arts, state and local governments formed arts councils of their own. Today nearly forty percent of the federal funds available from the National Endowment for the Arts flow through these state and local government agencies.

In essence the form of federal support for the arts has not changed since the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Council on the Arts in 1965. Funding for the Endowment has risen and fallen based on the current administration and the makeup of Congress. Controversies such as the ones over the funding of an exhibition of work by Robert Rauschenberg and others have served to refine the scope of the Endowment's purpose and responsibilities and to heighten awareness over issues such as First Amendment rights. The most significant change for composers during the last forty years has been the elimination of direct grants to individuals by the federal government as a result of the obscenity debates of the late 1980s and early 1990s. Now funds must pass through other qualified re-granting authorities such as state arts councils and organizations such as Meet the Composer and the American Music Center. In addition federal monies from the Endowment can pass through nonprofit organizations such as symphonies and be used to pay for the commissioning of new work. This "arms-length approach" is modeled on the British tradition, and proponents believe that it represents the diversity and views of the people in the fairest way possible and will prevent overt control and censorship by the government.

In the first six years, the Endowment awarded grants to composers through the Composer Assistance Program which was administered by the American Symphony Orchestra League and the American Music Center. The program was established in 1966 "in recognition of the fact that

American composers have had a particularly difficult time in getting hearings for their work.”⁴¹ A composer with a completed work and a scheduled performance of that work could apply for a grant to assist in copying. The program was administered until 1972; annual reports beginning in 1969 list the names of composers who received grants under this program. In a five-year retrospective report, the Endowment reported that it had awarded sixty-seven individual grants of up to \$2,000 each in this category. In addition to the Composer Assistance Program, a number of programs indirectly assisted new music by awarding matching grants to organizations that perform new music.

In 1973 the Endowment began a direct grant program called the Composer-Librettist Fellowships.⁴² In the first year of this program, \$71,611 was awarded in grants ranging from \$331 to \$10,000. Twenty of the twenty-two grants went to composers. In 1980, the Endowment separated the composer-librettist category into two separate categories. The largest number of grants was made in the years surrounding the country’s bicentennial celebration (1976). Until the direct grants to individuals were discontinued in 1995, over one thousand individual grants to composers were awarded. The list of composers who received these grants represents nearly every conceivable genre of music being composed in the United States, from composers of large orchestral to small ensemble works and from the traditional to the less conventional, including electronic music and sound installations. Composers in all stages of their careers have received grants and nearly every state has been represented, though New York and California have had the largest numbers of recipients.

Since the creation of the National Council for the Arts, only four composers have served terms on the Council: Leonard Bernstein (1966-1968), Duke Ellington (1968-1974), Gunther

⁴¹ National Endowment for the Arts, Annual Report (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1967), 39. However, according to the American Music Center, they created this program in 1962.

⁴² A complete list of composer grant recipients is contained in Appendix IX.

Schuller (1974-1980), and David Baker (1987-1994). The music advisory panel consists of subpanels to advise on the specific categories of awards. The composer subpanel has generally consisted of a mix of composers and instrumentalists who have represented a wide range of compositional styles.

Over its forty year history, the Endowment has been subject to considerable scrutiny and like everything in American life and politics, there are those who strongly favor its existence and mission and those roundly who denounce it. During the height of the obscenity scandals of the 1990s, articles and opinion pieces appeared in journals, newspapers, and magazines. The central issue can be summed up by a question posed by Michael Straight, deputy chief of the Endowment during Nancy Hanks's term as chairperson: "Why should all of our taxpayers support activities that only a small minority of taxpayers enjoy?"⁴³ As many writers have pointed out, rock musicians do not receive grants from the Endowment, directly or indirectly, and have managed to flourish in spite of that fact. This course of reasoning implies that art music ought to be self-sustaining, which the creators and supporters of the original legislation contended was not the case.

Nancy Hanks, Chairperson of National Council on the Arts in 1972 said that "the Endowment's role has been and will continue to be that of a catalyst, encouraging many sources of support as well as new ideas and concepts for all the arts."⁴⁴ Similarly in the last year of her tenure as chairman of the council, she said, "The more talented artists there are producing, the greater the likelihood that something of merit will be created. The larger the pool from which

⁴³ Quoted in Bill Kauffman, "Subsidies to the Arts: Cultivating Mediocrity," Cato Policy Analysis No. 137 (August 8, 1990), Cato Institute, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa1137.html>.

⁴⁴ National Endowment for the Arts, National Council on the Arts, *Annual Report, Fiscal 1972* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1972), 3.

they are drawn, the greater the chance a superior talent will emerge.”⁴⁵ The list of recipients over the twenty-nine-year period confirms that the Endowment fulfilled its goal of distributing money to as wide a pool as possible.

⁴⁵ National Endowment for the Arts, *Annual Report 1978* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1978), 3.

Chapter 6 – Conclusion

Virgil Thomson followed his essay “How Composers Eat, Or Who Does What to Whom and Who Gets Paid” with one entitled “Why Composers Write How, or the Economic Determinism of Musical Style.”¹ As discussed in Chapter 1 Thomson identified the potential sources of a composer’s income in the first essay, including private fortunes, prizes, private commissions, royalties, performing-rights fees, and musical and non-musical jobs. In the next essay, he examined the relationship between the source of income and the composer’s “stylistic orientation,” which he argued maintain an intimate relationship:

[M]y theories about economic determinism do not demand that the composer live from any given source for a long time before his music begins to reflect that source. On the contrary, I maintain that composers vary their manner from piece to piece in direct conformity with their income source of the moment, the subject matter and the stylistic orientation of any musical work being largely determined by the source of the money the composer is living on while writing that piece.²

Thomson’s portrayals include “naïve” for the composer who lives off his own fortune, “abstract” for those working on commission, and “introspective” for those living on personal or impersonal subsidies (grants). While one could argue with Thomson’s particular characterizations, his basic theory that the source of income directly affects compositional style should be taken into account when assessing a composer’s work. For scholars of American music, the plethora of funding sources makes this task difficult.

In many ways, Thomas Oboe Lee typifies the contemporary American composer of the late-twentieth and early twenty-first century. He was born in 1945 in Beijing, China, and

¹ Virgil Thomson, “How Composers Eat, or Who Does What to Whom and Who Gets Paid” and “Why Composers Write How, or the Economic Determinism of Musical Style” in *The State of Music* (New York: W. Morrow and Company, 1939). Reprinted in Virgil Thomson, *A Virgil Thomson Reader*, introduction by John Rockwell (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1981), 118-21 and 122-47. Citations are to the reprint edition.

² Thomson, “Why Composers Write How,” 127.

immigrated to the United States in 1966. He received a bachelor of music from the University of Pittsburgh (1972), a master's in composition and jazz from the New England Conservatory (1974 and 1976), and a Ph.D. in composition from Harvard (1981). He has been on the faculty at Boston College since 1990. Over the course of his career in the United States, he has received numerous awards, fellowships, and grants including the Koussevitzky Tanglewood Composition Prize (1976), a Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music Recording Grant (1982), a Guggenheim Foundation Fellowship (1983, 1986), a National Endowment for the Arts Composers Fellowship (1983, 1987), and a Rome Prize Fellowship, American Academy in Rome (1986-87). He has also received over thirty commissions from foundations, orchestras, small ensembles, churches and private patrons. Lee has written over a hundred compositions including orchestral, vocal, choral, and string quartet works, along with solos, duos, and music for children and young adults. These various styles of works correspond closely to the types of commissions he has received. While Virgil Thomson may have been right that the source of funding affects a composer's style, Lee's résumé demonstrates that the variety of sources available to today's composers allows them to explore different compositional techniques. Such latitude in expression, however, requires arduous individual effort on the part of the composer to sustain himself financially.

Returning to the question of European patronage, Thomas Adam, a historian of philanthropy, has asserted that scholars have separated culturally the approach to philanthropy on either side of the Atlantic by emphasizing the role of the state in philanthropy in Germany in the nineteenth and twentieth century. His research has revealed that in fact, "the public cultural and social institutions of Leipzig, Boston, New York, and Toronto were, despite their geographical separation, more similar than disparate."³ He attributes this to the transmission of cultural and

³ Thomas Adam, "Philanthropy and the Shaping of Social Distinctions in Nineteenth-Century U.S., Canadian, and German Cities," in *Philanthropy, Patronage, and Civil Society: Experiences from Germany*,

social practices from Europe to North America by the upper classes during the nineteenth century. Though specific practices underwent changes when transplanted, the underlying sense of responsibility to the community remained the same. As far as the patronage of composers is concerned, Adam's view supports the idea that both the current European and American systems of supporting composers contain the same elements with the same motivations but in different proportions.

Most European composers have a large state-supported system of patronage on which they can rely. After World War I, the new Republic of Austria organized its arts subsidies under the Ministry of Education (now the Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture). The largest share of the federal budget devoted to the performing arts has traditionally gone to the federal theaters. The Italian constitution, written when Italy became a republic following World War II, defines the government's responsibilities in supporting the arts: "the Republic endeavors to promote the development of culture and to protect the historical and artistic heritage of the nation."⁴ Federal financial support is drawn from the general revenues and from taxation on public shows, sporting events, and betting. The substantial subsidies to the performing arts, especially opera, have often been criticized, mainly because of how the funds have been distributed and to which organizations. In France, periods of reduced governmental subsidies have existed in the years since the Revolution. When such a void existed, private patrons stepped in and attempted to fill the gaps. Overall, though, government support at the federal and local level has persisted since the days of the Revolution. Today, cultural activities are directed through the Ministry of Culture and Communications.

Great Britain, and North America, edited by Thomas Adam, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 16.

⁴ Quoted in Frederick Dorian, *Commitment to Culture* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964), 68.

One of the most successful and stable state-sponsored arts programs has been in Great Britain. The Arts Council of Great Britain, established and incorporated by a royal charter in 1946, assists and encourages arts organizations throughout the country. As an independent, non-political body, the Council distributes public funds, commissions research, promotes innovation in the arts and provides advice and information to artists and arts organizations. In addition to funding arts organizations, it administers grants directly to individuals; in fact, the newest long-range plan calls for doubling the amount of grants for individuals over the course of the next three years. A composer can also receive a commission from a performing arts organization, which in turn may have received its funding through the Arts Council. In 2003, eighty-five new works were commissioned in this way.⁵

The extensive state-sponsorship of the arts in Europe represents the majority of the support available to composers in those countries. Though there are still wealthy individuals in Europe who commission works or provide grants to assist composers, there are relatively few organized philanthropic foundations and still fewer service organizations to channel the smaller contributions. Because of recent economic conditions in Europe and elsewhere, many arts organizations are actively studying ways to increase private contributions to supplement state subsidies.

In the United States, on the other hand, government support has always been relatively modest. It has been estimated that about ten percent of the funding for the arts comes from government; of that ten percent, two percent is from the federal government and the remainder is from the state and local government.⁶ Of that two percent of federal support, only one percent actually comes from the National Endowment for the Arts; the remainder comes from other

⁵ Arts Council Engle, *Ambitions for the Arts 2003-2006* (London: Arts Council England, 2003) and *History of Arts Council England* (London: Arts Council England, 2004).

⁶ Estimates of arts funding proportions are taken from National Endowment for the Arts publication, *How the United States Funds the Arts* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2004), v-vi and 2.

federal departments and agencies that directly fund arts activities. The other ninety percent of the arts funding formula is supplied by individual donors (twenty percent), foundations (thirteen percent), corporations (seven percent), and earned income (fifty percent). These estimates of arts funding do not take into account any indirect subsidies by the government in the form of private tax deductions for giving to the arts and culture, currently estimated at \$5.4 billion. Dana Gioia, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts since 2003, characterizes the American system as “complex, decentralized, diverse, and dynamic.” He justifies the system as follows:

A decentralized and constantly evolving system of private and public support for the arts is more than just a political practice. It goes to the heart of artistic freedom, experimentation, and diversity. With resources and funding spread across a variety of agencies, foundations, and other institutions with different values and goals, no single power sets the cultural agenda and no single creed or outlook dominates. The result is an energetic mix of traditional and experimental approaches, Western and non-Western inspirations, populist and elitist perspectives, folk and fine arts.⁷

He concludes by saying that though the system is difficult to understand, “the extraordinary vitality of our artistic culture demonstrates that it works remarkably well.”⁸ Working well, of course, has to be understood as providing Americans with what they want: variety, access for all, individual freedom and independence, and as little government intervention as possible.

An examination of the lists of composers who have received grants, commissions, prizes, and fellowships collected while researching this topic (and included in the appendices) reveals that most well-known American composers have benefited at some time from the financial support of the government and the philanthropic foundations. On the other hand, the number of relatively unknown composers far outweighs those of the more familiar names on these lists. While it may be true that composers receiving commissions and grants in the last decade have not had time to establish themselves, examining the data for earlier years suggests that a significant

⁷ Ibid., viii.

⁸ Ibid.

number of the composers receiving financial support have not produced works that have entered the canon. For instance, between 1980 and 1982 nearly 250 different composers received support from the National Endowment for the Arts and the foundations included in this study.⁹ In most cases the financial award was tied to a composition, either one already written or one to be written as a condition of the award. Many of those works have received only a single performance and very few were ever recorded or published. To some extent the National Endowment for the Arts helped to create this overabundance of compositions. In its early years it supported hundreds of composers each year with relatively small grants. After it discontinued direct grants to individuals in 1995, the Endowment began providing grants to foundations and performance organizations that could in turn commission works. The result has been that, though even more works are commissioned each year, often the funders have been foundations that have little specialized knowledge of music. Though the pluralistic, de-centralized system of patronage in the United States allows for the desired artistic freedom, it may also contribute to an excess of works of questionable value. The data compiled opens avenues for further study.

⁹ Note that this does not account for other commissioning organizations such as the American Music Center and the various orchestras around the country.

Appendix I – Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music

Sources

The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., Annual Report, 1962-1969. New York: The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., 1969.

The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., Annual Report, 1969-1973. New York: The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., 1973.

The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., Annual Report, 1973-1977. New York: The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., 1977.

The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., Annual Report, 1978-1980. New York: The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., 1980.

The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., Final Report, 1981-1984. New York: The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., 1984.

The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., Minutes of Meeting in Lieu of Annual Meeting of Trustees and Members, October 13, 1982, Record Group IV 3B-19, box 133, volume VII, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center.

“The Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, A Musical Celebration of The Fund’s twenty-five years of service to music, Monday evening, November 29, 1982 at eight o’clock, Alice Tully Hall.” Program booklet (composer awards are listed on pages 22-23). Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center.

Remarks

Prior to 1975, when the Fund began the Composer Grant Program, seven individuals identified as composers were awarded grants. The final five grants in 1982 were not listed in the last annual report but were reported in the list of composer recipients in the program booklet for the celebration held in New York City at the end of Fund’s existence. These recipients were verified through the minutes of the board meeting held on October 13, 1982.

1962 Sergius Kagen
1963 Ezra Laderman
1964 Sergius Kagen

1969 Robert Baksa
1969 Eric Stokes
1970 Harvey Sollberger

1970	Charles Wuorinen	1979	Tobias Picker
1975	David Chaitkin	1979	Ramon Zupko
1975	Richard Felciano	1979	Ellen Taaffe Zwilich
1975	Brian Fennelly	1980	Conrad Cummings
1975	Harley Gaber	1980	Brian Fennelly
1975	John Heiss	1980	John Harbison
1975	William Hellermann	1980	John King
1975	Sydney Hodkinson	1980	Wendell Logan
1975	Peter Lieberson	1980	John Peel
1975	Erik Lundborg	1981	Vivan Fine
1975	Robert Pollock	1981	George Flynn
1975	Robert Selig	1981	William Hellermann
1976	Martin Boykan	1981	Barbara Kolb
1976	Neely Bruce	1981	Matthias Kriesberg
1976	Curtis Curtis-Smith	1981	Rodney Lister
1976	Lucia Dlugoszewski	1981	Judith Martin
1976	Sydney Hodkinson	1981	Priscilla McLean
1976	Barbara Kolb	1981	Jeffrey Mumford
1976	Walter Mays	1981	Frank Proto
1976	John Melby	1981	Marga Richter
1976	Phillip Rhodes	1981	Nicolas Roussakis
1977	Brian Fennelly	1981	Paul Schoenfield
1977	Sydney Hodkinson	1982	Chester Biscardi
1977	Jere Hutcheson	1982	David Chaitkin
1977	Bruce MacCombie	1982	Lauraa Clayton
1977	Loren Rush	1982	Conrad Cummings
1977	Gary White	1982	Paul Dresher
1977	Ellen Taaffe Zwilich	1982	Dennis Eberhard
1978	Joseph Hudson	1982	Matthew Greenbaum
1978	Jonathan Kramer	1982	Thomas Oboe Lee
1978	David Maslanka	1982	Fred Lerdahl
1978	Joseph Schwantner	1982	Glenn Lieberman
1978	Ezra Sims	1982	Ursula Mamlok
1979	Stephen Albert	1982	Andrew Newell
1979	Daniel Asia	1982	Ann Silsbee
1979	Christopher Berg	1982	David Stock
1979	Stephen Chatman	1982	Diane Thome
1979	Barbara Kolb	1982	David Tudor
1979	Wendell Logan	1982	Chinary Ung
1979	Tod Machover	1982	Ellen Taaffe Zwilich
1979	Jeffrey Mumford		

Appendix II – Fromm Music Foundation

Sources

Fromm, Paul. *A Life for New Music: Selected Papers of Paul Fromm*, edited by David Gable and Christoph Wolff. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Fromm Music Foundation. <http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~musicdpt/fromm.html>.

Harvard Gazette (January 29, 1998). <http://www.hno.harvard.edu/gazette/1998/01.29/FrommFoundation.html>.

Harvard Gazette (January 30, 1997). <http://www.hno.harvard.edu/gazette/1997/01.30/news.html>.

American Music Center. "Fromm Music Foundation Awards \$10,000 Commissions." *NewMusicBox* (November 29, 2004). <http://www.newmusicbox.org/article.nmbx?id=4163>.

Remarks

The list of commissions in *A Life for New Music: Selected Papers of Paul Fromm* was current up to 1987 and the website of the foundation included the recipients for 2001-2003.

Requests for additional information from the Fromm Music Foundation and Harvard University have not yielded information about the years from 1987 to 2001. Some additional information was located through the *Harvard Gazette* and *NewMusicBox*, the online magazine of the American Music Center.

n.d.	John Adams	1956	Alvin Epstein
n.d.	Luciano Berio	1956	Bernard Heiden
n.d.	John Cage	1956	Bohuslav Martinu
n.d.	Oliver Knussen	1956	Julian Orban
n.d.	Todd Macover	1956	Leland Smith
n.d.	Mel Powell	1956	Ben Weber
n.d.	Rand Steiger	1957	Gordon Binkerd
n.d.	Carolyn Steinberg	1957	Easley Blackwood
n.d.	Joan Tower	1957	Ingolf Dahl
1954	Walter Aschaffenburg	1957	Irving Fine
1955	Alan Hovhaness	1957	Alan Hovhaness
1956	William Denny	1957	Andrew Imbrie

1957	Ellis Kohs	1966	Henry Weinberg
1957	Ernst Krenek	1967	Carlos Roque Alsina
1957	Jan Meyerowitz	1967	John Eaton
1957	Harry Partch	1967	Kenneth Gaburo
1957	Burrill Philips	1967	Gerardo Gandini
1957	Wallingford Riegger	1967	Jeffrey Levine
1957	Gunther Schuller	1967	R. Murray Schafer
1957	Halsey Stevens	1967	Ralph Shapey
1958	David Diamond	1968	Easley Blackwood
1958	Arnold Franchetti	1968	Mark DeVoto
1958	Ernst Krenek	1968	Thomas McKinley
1958	Robert Lombardo	1968	Stanley Silverman
1959	Earl Kim	1968	Richard Trythall
1959	Hectar Tosar	1969	Theodore Antoniou
1960	Luciano Berio	1969	Robert Ceely
1960	Alberto Ginastera	1969	Edwin Dugger
1960	Ernst Krenek	1969	Philip Rhodes
1960	Ralph Shapey	1970	Richard Felciano
1961	Milton Babbitt	1970	Barbara Kolb
1961	Elliott Carter	1970	Alan Stout
1961	Richard Hoffman	1970	Richard Wenick
1962	Arthur Berger	1970	Olly Wilson
1962	Lukas Foss	1970	Jurg Wyttenbach
1962	Claudio Spies	1971	T. J. Anderson
1962	Stefan Wolpe	1971	Thomas McKinley
1963	Lawrence Moss	1971	Stanley Silverman
1964	Randolph Coleman	1971	Louis Weingarden
1964	Mario Davidovsky	1972	Primous Fountain
1964	David Del Del Tedici	1972	Celso Garrido-Lecca
1964	Robert Helps	1972	Fred Lerdahl
1964	Donald Martino	1972	Bruno Maderna
1964	Robert Newell	1972	Robert Selig
1964	John MacIvor Perkins	1972	Roger Sessions
1964	Loren Rush	1972	Ralph Shapey
1964	Seymour Shifrin	1972	Charles Wuorinen
1964	Harvey Sollberger	1973	John Harbison
1964	Charles Wuorinen	1973	John C. Heiss
1965	Charles Dodge	1973	Peter Lieberson
1965	Michael Martin	1974	George Crumb
1965	Salvatore Martirano	1974	James Drew
1965	Frederic Myrow	1974	Emmanuel Ghent
1965	Oedoen Partos	1974	John Huggler
1965	J. K. Randall	1974	Tison Street
1965	David Reck	1974	David Winkler
1965	George Rochberg	1975	Stephen Albert
1966	Michael Colgrass	1975	Martin Boykan
1966	Douglas Leedy	1975	Paul Chihara
1966	Roger Reynolds	1975	Joseph Hudson

1975	Joyce Mekeel	1987	Barbara Kolb
1975	Shulamit Ran	1987	Paul Lansky
1975	Preston Trombley	1987	Eugene O'Brien
1976	Dennis Riley	1988	Elliott Carter
1976	Ira Taxin	1988	John Anthony Lennon
1976	Richard Wernick	1996	Elizabeth Brown
1977	Edward Cohen	1996	Sebastian Currier
1977	Betsy Jolas	1996	John Eaton
1977	Leon Kirchner	1996	Michael Gandolfi
1978	Carson Kievman	1996	Hyo-Shin Na
1978	Gerald Levinson	1996	Andrew Rindfleisch
1978	Jay Reise	1996	Morris Rosenzweig
1978	Maurice Wright	1996	Pieter A. Snapper
1979	George Perle	1996	Sean Varah
1979	Shelia Silver	1997	William Albright
1980	Earle Brown	1997	Jonathan Dawe
1980	Joel Hoffman	1997	Jason Eckhart
1980	Ben Johnston	1997	Robert Eidschun
1980	Stephen Paulus	1997	Guy Garnett
1980	Joseph Schwantner	1997	Earl Howard
1981	Theodore Antoniou	1997	Stephen Mosko
1981	Jacob Druckman	1997	Pauline Oliveros
1981	Thomas Oboe Lee	1997	Kurt Rohde
1981	Walter Mays	1997	Melinda Wagner
1981	Ramon Zupko	1999	Chester Biscardi
1982	David Finko	1999	Ronald Caltabiano
1982	Joel Hoffman	1999	Brian Fennelly
1983	Milton Babbitt	1999	David Kipten
1983	Marc Antonio Consoli	1999	Shirish Korde
1984	Susan Blaustein	1999	Jorge Liderman
1984	Todd Brief	1999	Jeffrey Mumford
1984	Deborah Drattell	1999	Wayne Peterson
1984	Lee Hyla	1999	Carlos Sanchez-Gutierrez
1984	James Tenney	1999	Laura Elise Schwendinger
1985	Philip Fried	1999	Barbara White
1985	Matthias Kriesberg	2000	Dan Asia
1985	Alvin Lucier	2000	Laurence Bitensky
1985	Ingram Marshall	2000	David Dzubay
1985	Stephen Mosko	2000	Melissa Hui
1985	David Myska	2000	Wendell Logan
1985	Steve Reich	2000	Zhou Long
1985	Faye-Ellen Silverman	2000	Tristan Murail
1985	Morton Subotnick	2000	Diedre Murray
1986	Daniel Asia	2000	Richard Wilson
1986	Ornette Coleman	2001	Christopher Arrel
1986	Steve Mackey	2001	Derek Bermel
1986	Betty Olivero	2001	Eric Chasalow
1986	Bernard Rands	2001	Miguel Chuaqui

2001	David Crumb	2003	Bruce Christian Bennett
2001	C. Curtis-Smith	2003	Steven Burke
2001	Joshua Fineberg	2003	Eleanor Cory
2001	Ellen Harrison	2003	Cindy Cox
2001	Arthur Kreiger	2003	Michael Gandolfi
2001	Chinchun Lee	2003	Derek Hurst
2001	Carl Maultsby	2003	Leroy Jenkins
2001	Roger Reynolds	2003	Louis Karchin
2002	Edward Champion	2003	Eric Moe
2002	Jeffrey Cotton	2003	Mathew Rosenblum
2002	Richard Festinger	2003	Ken Ueno
2002	Daniel Koontz	2003	Ricardo Zohn-Muldoon
2002	Keeril Makan	2004	Gordon Beferman
2002	Liviu Marinescu	2004	Martin Brody
2002	Jeff Myers	2004	Paul Dickinson
2002	David Rakowski	2004	David Froom
2002	David Schober	2004	Elliott Gyger
2002	Stephen Siegel	2004	Padma Newsome
2002	David Taddie	2004	Richard Teitelbaum
2002	Mischa Zupko	2004	Scott Wheeler

Appendix III – Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation Commissions

Sources

Barr, Cyrilla. *The Coolidge Legacy*. Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress, 1997.

Library of Congress. Online catalog. <http://www.loc.gov>.

Library of Congress. “‘Plethora of Premieres’ and ‘Jamboree of Jazz’ Highlight Library of Congress 70th Anniversary Concert Season.” *News from the Library of Congress* (July 20, 1995). <http://www.loc.gov/today/pr/1995/95-105.html>.

Remarks

The majority of the recipients listed below were extracted from *The Coolidge Legacy*, which was current as of 1993. Requests for additional information from the Library of Congress have not yielded information about the years since then. Some additional information was located through the online catalog and published articles of the Library of Congress.

n.d.	Alfredo Casella	1940	Marcel Grandjany
1925	Charles Martin Loeffler	1940	Darius Milhaud
1925	Ildebrando Pizzetti	1940	Nicolai Berezowsky
1925	Maurice Ravel	1940	Roy Harris
1925	Frederick Stock	1944	Aaron Copland
1927	Arthur Bliss	1944	Carlos Chavez
1927	Arnold Schoenberg	1944	Paul Hindemith
1928	Igo Stravinsky	1944	Darius Milhaud
1930	Charles Martin Loeffler	1944	Walter Piston
1930	Sergei Prokofiev	1945	Heitor Villa-Lobos
1933	Roy Harris	1948	William Schuman
1933	Frank Bridge	1949	Darius Milhaud
1934	Bela Bartok	1950	Robert Palmer
1934	Roy Harris	1950	Aaron Copland
1935	Walter Piston	1950	William Schuman
1936	Arnold Schoenberg	1950	Gian Francesco Malipiero
1937	Louis Gruenberg	1953	Samuel Barber
1938	Frederick Jacobi	1954	Gian Francesco Malipiero
1938	Anton Webern	1954	Leon Kirchner
1939	Ildebrando Pizzetti	1954	Norman Dello Joio

1956	Paul Creston	1970	George Crumb
1956	Walter Piston	1970	Cristobal Halffter
1956	Henry Cowell	1970	Juan Orrego-Salas
1956	Gian Carlo Menotti	1970	Luigi Dallapiccola
1956	Peter Mennin	1970	Mel Powell
1957	Luigi Dallapiccola	1970	Jean-Calude Eloy
1957	Francis Poulenc	1970	Milton Babbitt
1958	William Bergsma	1974	Hugh Aitken
1958	Adnan Saygun	1977	Iain Hamilton
1958	Lyndol C. Mitchel	1978	Thomas Beveridge
1958	Olivier Messiaen	1978	Donald Harris
1958	Burrill Phillips	1979	Ned Rorem
1959	Ross Lee Finney	1980	Ralph Shapey
1960	Goffredo Petrassi	1980	Miriam Gideon
1960	Luigi Nono	1981	Russell Woollen
1960	Roque Cordero	1982	Yoritsune Matsudaira
1960	Blas Galindo	1982	Josef Tal
1961	Gunther Schuller	1983	Ezra Laderman
1961	Roy Harris	1983	Elie Siegmeister
1962	Aurelio de la Vega	1983	Sandor Balassa
1962	Roberto Caamano	1983	Donald Martino
1962	Gustavo Bercerra	1983	Stephen Douglas Burton
1962	Camargo Guarnieri	1984	Vivan Fine
1963	Irving Fine	1985	George Rochberg
1963	Gian Francesco Malipiero	1986	David Raksin
1964	Luigi Dallapiccola	1988	George Perle
1964	Riccardo Malipiero	1989	Richard Wernick
1964	Alberto Ginastera	1992	John Corigliano
1964	Virgil Thomson	1993	Sofiya Gubaydulina
1964	Howard Hanson	1993	Donald Martino
1964	William Schuman	1993	William Kraft
1964	Walter Piston	1994	Jon Deak
1965	Carlos Chavez	1994	David Diamond
1968	Alberto Ginastera	1995	Milton Babbitt

Appendix IV – Serge Koussevitzky Music Foundation

Sources

“Works Commissioned by the Serge Koussevitzky Music Foundation,” personal correspondence from Stephanie Poxon, Music Specialist, Library of Congress, Music Division, May 2004.

“Koussevitzky Foundation Announces 2002 Commission Winners,” *New from the Library of Congress* (January 15, 2003). <http://www.loc.gov/today/pr/2003/03-001.html>.

“Koussevitzky Foundation Announces 2003 Commission Winners,” *News from the Library of Congress* (February 10, 2004). <http://www.loc.gov/today/pr/2004/04-020.html>.

“Library of Congress Announces Koussevitzky Commissions for 2004,” *News from the Library of Congress* (March 1, 2005). <http://www.loc.gov/today/pr/2005/05-029.html>.

Koussevitzky Music Foundation. <http://www.koussevitzky.org>.

Remarks

The list supplied by the Library of Congress was current as of 2001. The commissions granted for the years since then were compiled from the press releases published on the Library of Congress website and on the Koussevitzky Music Foundation website.

1942	Samuel Barber	1945	Howard Hanson
1942	Nicolai Berezowsky	1945	Olivier Messiaen
1942	Benjamin Britten	1945	Nicolas Nabokov
1942	Bohuslav Martinů	1945	Harold Shapero
1943	Béla Bartók	1945	Heitor Villa-Lobos
1943	William Bergsma	1946	Gian Francesco Malipiero
1943	Robert Palmer	1946	Walter Piston
1943	William Schuman	1947	Blas Galindo
1943	Igor Stravinsky	1947	Earl George
1944	Aaron Copland	1947	Arnold Schoenberg
1944	Nikolai Lopatnikoff	1948	Arthur Honegger
1944	Darius Milhaud	1948	Randall Thompson
1944	Burrill Phillips	1949	Irving Fine
1945	David Diamond	1949	Tadeusz Kassern
1945	Lukas Foss	1949	Arthur Lourié
1945	Alexei Haieff	1949	Peter Mennin

1949	Virgil Thomson	1957	Salvatore Martirano
1950	Luigi Dallapiccola	1957	Julián Orbón
1950	Jerzy Fitelberg	1957	George Rochberg
1950	M. Camargo Guarnieri	1957	Michael Tippett
1950	Jacques Ibert	1958	Easley Blackwood
1950	Louis Mennini	1958	Marc Blitzstein
1951	Leonard Bernstein	1958	Ross Lee Finney
1951	Iain Hamilton	1958	Alberto Ginastera
1951	Leon Kirchner	1958	Mel Powell
1951	Armand Lunel	1958	William Russo
1951	Darius Milhaud	1958	Harry Somers
1951	Leo Smit	1958	Héctor Tosar Errecart
1951	Alexander Tcherepnin	1958	Edgard Varèse
1952	Paul Ben-Haim	1958	William Walton
1952	Ernest Bloch	1958	Yehudi Wyner
1952	Carlos Chávez	1959	Henry Cowell
1952	Raymond Chevreuille	1959	Kenneth Gaburo
1952	Edward Burlingame Hill	1959	Roberto Gerhard
1952	Wallingford Riegger	1959	Francis poulenc
1952	Bernard Rogers	1959	Ahmed Adnan Saygun
1953	Aaron Avshalomov	1959	Louise Talma
1953	Walter Sinclair Hartley	1960	Juan Orrego-Salas
1953	Andrew Imbrie	1961	Luciano Berio
1953	Ulysses Kay	1961	Roque Cordero
1953	Douglas Moore	1961	Arnold Franchetti
1953	Harald Saeverud	1961	Hans Werner Henze
1954	Samuel Barber	1961	Yoritsune Matsudaira
1954	Leonard Bernstein	1961	Hugo Weisgall
1954	Aaron Copland	1961	Stefan Wolpe
1954	Henri Dutilleux	1962	Celso Garrido-Lecca
1954	Gottfried von Einem	1962	Yoshirō Irino
1954	Howard Hanson	1962	Giselher Klebe
1954	Jacques Ibert	1962	Ernst Křenek
1954	Colin McPhee	1962	Luigi Nono
1954	Darius Milhaud	1962	Gunther Schuller
1954	Robert Moevs	1962	Seymour Shifrin
1954	Hall Overton	1963	Lester Trimble
1954	Vincent Persichetti	1964	Milton Babbitt
1954	Goffredo Petrassi	1964	George Crumb
1954	Walter Piston	1964	Mario Davidovsky
1954	William Schuman	1964	Peter Maxwell Davies
1954	Roger Sessions	1964	Vincent S. Frohne
1954	Ernst Toch	1964	Alexei Haieff
1954	Heitor Villa-Lobos	1964	Gyögy Ligeti
1956	Lukas Foss	1964	Edoardo Sanguineti
1957	Ingolf Dahl	1964	Karlheinz Stockhausen
1957	Karl Amadeus Hartmann	1964	Charles Wuorinen
1957	Alan Hovhaness	1964	Iannis Xenakis

1965	Gustavo Becerra Schmidt	1973	Chinary Ung
1965	Richard Rodney Bennett	1974	Harrison Birtwistle
1965	Arthur Berger	1974	William Bolcom
1965	John Cage	1974	Betsy Jolas
1965	Cristóbal Halffter	1974	Oliver Knussen
1965	Robert Lombardo	1974	Fred Lerdahl
1965	Ned Rorem	1975	Morton Feldman
1965	Ralph Shapey	1975	Tison Street
1965	Toru Takemitsu	1975	Ira Taxin
1966	Girolamo Arrigo	1976	Donald Martino
1966	Niccolò Castiglioni	1976	Tona Scherchen-Hsiao
1966	David Del Tredici	1977	Sándor Balassa
1966	Harry Partch	1977	Henri Dutilleux
1966	Krzysztof Penderecki	1977	Donald Harris
1966	Henri Pousseur	1977	Robert Hall Lewis
1966	David Reck	1981	Marc-Antonio Consoli
1966	Valentin Silvestrov	1981	Mario Davidovsky
1966	Harvey Sollberger	1981	George Edwards
1966	William Sydeman	1981	Paul Lansky
1966	Anatol Vieru	1981	Andrzej Panufnik
1968	Tadeusz Baird	1981	Steve Reich
1968	Leslie Bassett	1981	Nicholas Thorne
1968	Franco Donatoni	1981	Ramon Zupko
1968	Edward Miller	1982	Robin Holloway
1968	George Perle	1982	Nigel Osborne
1968	Noam Sheriff	1982	David Stock
1969	Charles Dodge	1982	Joan Tower
1969	Jacob Druckman	1983	Samuel Adler
1969	John Eaton	1983	Brian Fennelly
1969	Alexander Goehr	1983	Tod Machover
1969	Milko Keleman	1983	William Thomas McKinley
1969	Earl Kim	1983	Tristan Murail
1971	Friedrich Cerha	1983	Bernard Rands
1971	Karel Husa	1983	Robert Selig
1971	Barbara Kolb	1983	Ezra Sims
1971	Tiberiu Olah	1984	John Adams
1971	Stanley Silverman	1984	Todd Brief
1972	Theodore Antoniou	1984	Vivian Fine
1972	Earl Brown	1984	H. K. Gruber
1972	Zsolt Durkó	1984	Ezra Laderman
1972	Francis Miroglio	1984	Thomas Oboe Lee
1972	Thea Musgrave	1984	Rodney Lister
1972	Eugene O'Brien	1984	Makato Shinohara
1972	Joji Yuasa	1984	Olly Wilson
1973	Gilbert Amy	1984	Charles Wuorinen
1973	Edwin Dugger	1985	Martin Boykan
1973	John Harbison	1985	Jonathan Harvey
1973	Lou Harrison	1985	Lee Hyla

1985	Hugh Wood	1993	Zhou Long
1986	Martin Bresnick	1994	Ross Bauer
1986	Steven Mackey	1994	Donald Erb
1986	Michael Torke	1994	Robert Greenberg
1986	Scott Wheeler	1994	Peter Lieberson
1987	Allen Anderson	1994	Bernard Rands
1987	Daniel Asia	1994	Poul Ruders
1987	Tamar Diesendruck	1995	Henry Brant
1987	Kamran Ince	1995	Sebastian Currier
1987	Eric Moe	1995	David Froom
1987	David Olan	1995	Michael Tenzer
1987	James Primosch	1996	Franco Donatoni
1987	Francis Thorne	1996	Donald Martino
1987	George Tsontakis	1996	David Rakowski
1987	Isang Yun	1996	Steve Reich
1988	Lori Dobbins	1996	Morris Rosenzweig
1988	Jacqueline Fontyn	1996	Christopher Rouse
1988	Mark Gustavson	1996	Bright Sheng
1988	Aaron Jay Kernis	1996	Richard Wernick
1988	Scott Lindroth	1996	Richard Wilson
1988	Ursula Mamlock	1996	Charles Wuorinen
1988	George Walker	1997	Peter Alexander
1990	Leslie Bassett	1997	David Chaitken
1990	Michael Gandolfi	1997	Chen Yi
1990	Alexander Goehr	1997	James Dashow
1990	Gerald Levinson	1997	Richard Festinger
1990	Nicholas Maw	1997	Jonathan Harvey
1990	Wayne Peterson	1997	Robert Helps
1990	Julia Wolfe	1997	Edwin London
1991	Milton Babbitt	1997	Lewis Spratlan
1991	Arthur Jarvinen	1997	David Vayo
1991	Anthony Korf	1998	Daniel Godfrey
1991	George Perle	1998	Arthur Krieger
1991	Terry Riley	1998	Wynton Marsalis
1991	David Soley	1998	Kurt Rohde
1991	Steven Stucky	1998	Kurt Rohde
1992	William Bolcom	1998	Augusta Read Thomas
1992	Dean Drummond	1998	Julio Martin Viera
1992	David Felder	1998	George Walker
1992	Stephen Hartke	1999	Jason Eckhardt
1992	William Kraft	1999	Richard Felciano
1992	Frederic Rzewski	1999	Brian Fennelly
1992	Yehudi Wyner	1999	Pablo Furman
1993	Louis Andriessen	1999	Lee Hyla
1993	Karel Husa	1999	Pablo Ortiz
1993	David Sheinfeld	1999	Roberto Sierra
1993	Toru Takemitsu	2000	Lukas Foss
1993	Chinary Ung	2000	Tania Leon

2000	Thea Musgrave	2002	Alvin Singleton
2000	Quigang Chen	2002	Scott Wheeler
2000	Andrew Rindfleisch	2003	William Kraft
2001	Mason Bates	2003	Philippe Leroux
2001	Jonathan Dawe	2003	Nicholas Maw
2001	Robert Dick	2003	Tison Street
2001	Alexander Goehr	2003	David Taddie
2001	Jonathan Kramer	2003	Barbara White
2001	Kui Dong	2004	Shih-Hui Chen
2001	James Mobberley	2004	Miguel Chuaqui
2001	Laura Schwendinger	2004	Jacqueline Fontyn
2002	Claude Baker	2004	Lior Navok
2002	Gregory D'Alessio	2004	David Sanford
2002	Magnus Lindberg	2004	Mark-Anthony Turnage
2002	Hyo-Shin Na	2004	Zhou Long
2002	Wayne Peterson		

Appendix V – McKim Fund Commissions

Sources

Library of Congress, Music Division, correspondence.

Library of Congress. Online catalog.

Library of Congress, “Muhal Richard Abrams Orchestra to Open Library of Congress Concert Season on October 10.” *News from the Library of Congress* (September 26, 1996). <http://www.loc.gov/today/pr/1996/96-127.html>

Library of Congress, “2003-2004 Season Schedule.” <http://www.loc.gov/rr/perform/concert/2003-2004schedule.html>.

Library of Congress, “Music Division Celebrates Its 100th Anniversary with Special Performance Series.” *News from the Library of Congress* (August 25, 1997). <http://www.loc.gov/today/pr/1997/97-132.html>.

Remarks

Library of Congress provided a list of commissions as of 1997. Dates of the commissions were not provided; for those commissions, other sources such as library and publisher’s catalogs were consulted. Some additional information for commissions since 1997 were obtained from the online catalog and published articles of the Library of Congress. The dates indicated below generally reflect publication or premiere dates.

n.d.	Ezra Laderman	1977	Gordon Binkerd
n.d.	David Baker	1977	Robert Hall Lewis
n.d.	Arthur Weisberg	1978	Morton Feldman
1965	Elie Siegmaster	1978	William Bolcom
1972	Leslie Bassett	1981	David Diamond
1972	Ulysses Kay	1981	Morton Gould
1972	Ned Rorem	1982	Ernst Bacon
1973	Elliot Carter	1982	James Cohn
1973	Benjamin Lees	1983	Morton Subotnick
1975	Easley Blackwood	1983	Gunther Schuller
1976	Meyer Kupferman	1983	Lee Hoiby
1976	Robert Hall Lewis	1983	Roger Reynolds

1983	Ulf Grahm	1996	Ned Rorem
1985	Herman Berlinski	1997	Andrew Imbrie
1985	Otto Luening	1997	Dean Drummond
1986	Milton Babbitt	1997	Mark O'Connor
1986	David Loeb	1998	Elmer Bernstein
1987	Daria Semegen	1998	Steve Bulla
1987	Donald Erb	1998	Paul Dresler
1987	William Kraft	1998	Mark Dresser
1987	John Anthony Lennon	1998	Oleg Felzer
1988	George Rochberg	1999	Jon Jang
1988	Elliott Schwartz	1999	Dina Koston
1988	Jeffrey Mumford	2000	Dave Douglas
1988	John Harbison	2000	Ralph Shapey
1988	Robert Starer	2000	John Zorn
1988	Stephen Albert	2001	Don Byron
1988	Charles Wuorinen	2001	Paquito D'Rivera
1991	John Cage	2001	Donna Long
1992	Robert Stern	2003	Milton Babbitt
1993	Oliver Lake	2003	Lee Hoiby
1993	Anne LeBaron	2003	Robert Sierra
1993	Ellen Taaffe Zwilich	2004	Stephen Hartke
1996	John Adams	2004	Fred Lerdahl
1996	Muhal Richard Abrams		

Appendix VI - Guggenheim Fellowships

Sources

John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation website. www.gf.org.

Remarks

The official website of the Foundation publishes the list of all winners since the inception of the prize. For each entry, the list includes the name of the winner, his or her field of research or specialty, institution affiliation or geographic information, and year of fellowship. The list of composers below was extracted from the published list of all winners by searching on terms such as “composer” and “composition.” Being identified as a composer is not necessarily an indication that the recipient used the fellowship to compose. Only composers affiliated with an American institution or identified as living in the United States were included.

1925	Aaron Copland	1930	Robert Mills Delaney
1926	Roger Sessions	1930	Mark Wessel
1926	Leopold Damrosch Mannes	1930	Carl Bricken
1926	Aaron Copland	1930	Quincy Porter
1927	Theodore J. Stearns	1930	Ruth Porter Crawford
1927	Carl McKinley	1931	Otto Luening
1927	Roger Sessions	1932	Mark Wessel
1927	Bernard Rogers	1932	Adolph Weiss
1927	Roy Harris	1932	George Antheil
1928	Robert Russell Bennett	1933	Paul Nordoff
1928	Quinto Maganini	1933	George Antheil
1928	Roy Harris	1934	Douglas Stuart Moore
1928	Bernard Rogers	1934	William Grant Still
1928	Carl McKinley	1935	Paul Nordoff
1929	Randall Thompson	1935	Dante Fiorillo
1929	Robert Mills Delaney	1935	William Grant Still
1929	Quinto Maganini	1935	Walter Hamor Piston
1929	Robert Russell Bennett	1936	Dante Fiorillo
1929	Quincy Porter	1937	Robert Guyn McBride
1930	Otto Luening	1937	Ross Lee Finney
1930	Randall Thompson	1937	Dante Fiorillo

1938	Paul Creston	1947	Harold Samuel Shapero
1938	Dante Fiorillo	1947	Gian Carlo Menotti
1938	David Diamond	1947	Edward T. Cone
1938	William Grant Still	1947	Ross Lee Finney
1939	Anis Fuleihan	1948	Romeo Cascarino
1939	Paul Creston	1948	Herbert Owen Reed
1939	Ernst Bacon	1948	Leon Kirchner
1939	William Howard Schuman	1948	Hubert Weldon Lamb
1940	William Howard Schuman	1948	Nicolai (Tichanovitch) Berezowsky
1940	Alvin Etler	1949	Peter Mennin
1940	Earl Robinson	1949	Leon Kirchner
1940	Marc Blitzstein	1949	John Cage
1941	Hunter Johnson	1949	Robert E. Ward
1941	David Diamond	1949	Jerome Moross
1941	Alvin Etler	1949	Samuel Barber
1941	Earl Robinson	1949	Gerald Raymond Kechley
1941	Paul Bowles	1949	Alexei Haieff
1941	Marc Blitzstein	1949	Romeo Cascarino
1942	Stanley Bate	1950	Gerald Raymond Kechley
1942	Ernst Bacon	1950	Irving (Gifford) Fine
1942	Burrill Phillips	1950	Isabel Pope
1943	Normand Lockwood	1950	Elliott Cook Carter
1943	Harry Partch	1950	Ben Brian Weber
1943	Arthur Kreutz	1950	Harry Partch
1944	Normand Lockwood	1950	Leo Smit
1944	Gail T. Kubik	1950	Robert E. Ward
1944	Norman Dello Joio	1951	Dai-keong Lee
1944	Harry Partch	1951	William Bergsma
1944	Theodore Ward Chanler	1951	Robert F(rank) Kurka
1945	Samuel Barber	1951	Jacob Avshalomov
1945	Elliott Cook Carter	1951	Ingolf Dahl
1945	Charles Bryan	1952	Charles M. Mills
1945	Arthur Kreutz	1952	Howard Swanson
1945	Dai-keong Lee	1952	Lou Silver Harrison
1945	Nikolai Lopatnikoff	1952	Ben Brian Weber
1945	Norman Dello Joio	1952	Henry Bryan Dority
1946	Henry Dreyfuss Brant	1952	Robert F(rank) Kurka
1946	John Weedon Verrall	1952	Robert Moffet Palmer
1946	Harold Samuel Shapero	1952	Lockrem Harold Johnson
1946	John Ayres Lessard	1953	Bohuslav Martinu
1946	William Bergsma	1953	Nikolai Lopatnikoff
1946	Alexei Haieff	1953	Alan Scott Hovhaness
1946	Louise Juliette Talma	1953	John Ayres Lessard
1946	Gian Carlo Menotti	1953	Paul Fetler
1947	Alex North	1953	Andrew W. Imbrie
1947	Samuel Barber	1953	Henry Bryan Dority
1947	Louise Juliette Talma	1954	Lou Silver Harrison
1947	Jerome Moross	1954	Hunter Johnson

1954	Louis Calabro	1958	Ezra Laderman
1954	Benjamin George Lees	1958	Jan Meyerowitz
1954	Eugene Herbert Weigel	1959	Halim A. El-Dabh
1954	Julia Amanda Perry	1959	Mel Powell
1954	Robert L. Sanders	1959	Wen-Chung Chou
1954	Alan Scott Hovhaness	1959	Louis Calabro
1955	Peggy Glanville-Hicks	1959	Benjamin Burwell Johnston Jr
1955	Henry Dreyfuss Brant	1959	Lawrence Kenneth Moss
1955	Hugo Weisgall	1959	Gordon Ware Binkerd
1955	Hall Franklin Overton	1959	Seymour J. Shifrin
1955	Russell Smith	1959	Yehudi Wyner
1955	Yury Arbatsky	1959	John La Montaine
1955	Walter E. Aschaffenburg	1959	Karl Korte
1956	Earl Kim	1959	Karl Korte
1956	Ezra Laderman	1960	Ingolf Dahl
1956	George A. Rochberg	1960	John La Montaine
1956	Theodore Ward Chanler	1960	Salvatore John Martirano
1956	Richard Kenelm Winslow	1960	Robert Moffet Palmer
1956	Julia Amanda Perry	1960	Milton Byron Babbitt
1956	Bohuslav Martinu	1960	Andrew W. Imbrie
1956	Seymour J. Shifrin	1960	Hugo Weisgall
1956	Vladimir Alexis Ussachevsky	1960	Marvin David Levy
1956	Carlisle Floyd	1960	William Overton Smith
1956	Yury Arbatsky	1960	Paul Fetler
1956	Jan Meyerowitz	1960	Virgil Thomson
1956	Edmund Thomas Haines	1960	Vladimir Alexis Ussachevsky
1957	Earl George	1961	William Overton Smith
1957	Dominick Argento	1961	Burrill Phillips
1957	Ned Rorem	1961	Arnold Franchetti
1957	David Van Vactor	1961	Theodore S. Newman
1957	Wen-Chung Chou	1961	Halim A. El-Dabh
1957	Jacob Druckman	1961	Karl George Kohn
1957	Edmund Thomas Haines	1962	John Nathaniel Vincent Jr
1957	Gregory Tucker	1962	John Huggler
1957	Robert Starer	1962	Robert Walter Moevs
1957	Peggy Glanville-Hicks	1962	Ezra Sims
1957	Peter Mennin	1962	John Herbert McDowell
1957	Stanley Andrew Wolfe	1962	Gunther A. Schuller
1957	Attilio Joseph Macero	1962	Stefan Wolpe
1958	Attilio Joseph Macero	1962	John C. Eaton
1958	Lee Henry Hoiby	1963	Karel Husa
1958	David Diamond	1963	Billy Jim Layton
1958	Vincent Persichetti	1963	Gene Gutché
1958	Jerome W. Rosen	1963	Gunther A. Schuller
1958	James MacArthur Beale	1963	Peter Talbot Westergaard
1958	Jack Hamilton Beeson	1963	Michael White
1958	Irving (Gifford) Fine	1963	Charles Whittenberg
1958	Stanley W. Hollingsworth	1963	Alvin Etler
		1963	Robert Starer

1964	Robert Lombardo	1968	Gil Evans
1964	William E. Bolcom	1968	Vincent Persichetti
1964	Dominick Argento	1968	John Corigliano
1964	Charles Whittenberg	1968	Charles Wuorinen
1964	Donald H. Keats	1968	Luciano Berio
1964	Michael C. Colgrass	1968	William E. Bolcom
1964	Lester Trimble	1968	Lawrence Kenneth Moss
1964	Donald Waxman	1968	Robert Suderburg
1964	Halsey Stevens	1968	Robert Cogan
1964	Ernst Bacon	1969	Harvey Sollberger
1964	Roger Reynolds	1969	Edwin London
1964	Ezra Laderman	1969	Stephen Douglas Burton
1964	Gene Gutché	1969	John Edmunds
1964	Ulysses Kay	1969	John Huggler
1964	Marvin David Levy	1969	George Allan Russell
1964	Robert Helps	1969	George T. Walker
1965	George Barati	1970	Richard Hoffmann
1965	William R. Mayer	1970	Paul Earls
1965	Paul Cooper	1970	Charles Edward Haden
1965	Earle Brown	1970	Jon Howard Appleton
1965	John C. Eaton	1970	David Reck
1965	Gail T. Kubik	1970	Karl Korte
1965	Stanley Joel Silverman	1970	Stefan Wolpe
1966	La Monte Young	1971	Loren Rush
1966	Robert E. Ward	1971	Ilhan Mimaroglu
1966	Hugo Weisgall	1971	Halsey Stevens
1966	Fredric Myrow	1971	Charles Mingus
1966	Gerald Humel	1971	Michael Brozen
1966	Robert Carl Erickson	1971	Olly W. Wilson
1966	Bernhard Heiden	1971	Robert Leigh Selig
1966	Benjamin George Lees	1971	Marc-Antonio Consoli
1966	George A. Rochberg	1971	Barbara Kolb
1966	George Perle	1972	James M. Drew
1966	Morton Feldman	1972	Meredith Monk
1967	Kenneth L. Gaburo	1972	Charles M. Dodge
1967	Philip Thomas Bezanson	1972	Keith Jarrett
1967	Emmanuel Ghent	1972	Robert Di Domenica
1967	Ornette Coleman	1972	Dennis Daniel Riley
1967	William Kraft	1972	William Kraft
1967	George H. Crumb	1972	George Allan Russell
1967	Hall Franklin Overton	1972	Mary Lou Williams
1967	Edward Jay Miller	1972	Roy E. Travis
1967	Richard Aaker Trythall	1972	Paul Cooper
1967	Michael C. Colgrass	1972	Ann E. McMillan
1968	Stephen Albert	1972	Carla Bley
1968	Richard Felciano	1972	Donald H. Keats
1968	James P. Giuffre	1972	Theodore Sonny Rollins
1968	Jacob Druckman	1972	Charles Wuorinen

1973	Pauline Oliveros	1977	Olly W. Wilson
1973	Harvey Sollberger	1977	Shulamit Ran
1973	Vincent Persichetti	1977	Mary Lou Williams
1973	Cecil P. Taylor	1978	Charles Mingus
1973	Edwin Ellsworth Dugger	1978	Steve Reich
1973	Leslie Bassett	1978	Ned Rorem
1973	George H. Crumb	1978	Conlon Nancarrow
1973	Robert Pollock	1978	Curtis Curtis-Smith
1973	Louis Weingarden	1978	Elie Siegmeister
1973	Walter E. Aschaffenburg	1978	John C. Heiss
1974	Thea Musgrave	1978	Elizabeth Swados
1974	R. Murray Schafer	1978	Theodore Antoniou
1974	Meyer Kupferman	1978	Stephen Albert
1974	Robert Suderburg	1978	David M. Olan
1974	Pandit Pran Nath	1978	Joseph Schwantner
1974	Ornette Coleman	1978	Joseph A. Hudson
1974	Donald F. Wheelock	1978	Charles Israels
1974	Preston A. Trombly	1979	David Koblitz
1974	Primous Fountain	1979	Chester Biscardi
1974	Otto Luening	1979	Jay Reise
1974	Fred Lerdahl	1979	Phillip C. Rhodes
1974	George Perle	1979	Terry Riley
1974	David F. Stock	1979	John Carisi
1975	Charles M. Dodge	1979	Jere Trent Hutcheson
1975	Arthur Victor Berger	1979	Marc-Antonio Consoli
1975	Morton Subotnick	1980	Vivian Fine
1975	Pril Smiley	1980	Alec Wilder
1975	Claus Adam	1980	Odaline de la Martinez
1976	Roy Harris	1980	Leslie Bassett
1976	Thelonious Monk	1980	Lewis Spratlan
1976	Richard Wernick	1980	Marian McPartland
1976	Barbara Kolb	1980	Arthur V. Kreiger
1976	Paul Chihara	1980	Ellen Taaffe-Zwilich
1976	Robert Xavier Rodriguez	1980	George Edwards
1976	Kenneth Benschhof	1980	Brian Fennelly
1976	Erik Lundborg	1981	Larry Thomas Bell
1976	William H. Albright	1981	Tison C. Street
1976	Yehudi Wyner	1981	Gerald Busby
1976	Stanley Joel Silverman	1981	Tobias Picker
1977	Primous Fountain	1981	Edward Barnes
1977	Maurice Wright	1981	Menachem Zur
1977	Joan Tower	1981	Anthony Braxton
1977	Raoul Pleskow	1981	John Anthony Lennon
1977	Richard Hoffmann	1981	Warren Frank Benson
1977	Robert Leigh Selig	1981	Ramon Zupko
1977	Lucia Dlugoszewski	1981	Stuart Ross Dempster
1977	John Harbison	1982	Meredith Monk
1977	Sydney P. Hodkinson	1982	Bruce Saylor

1982	Nicholas Thorne	1987	Susan Morton Blaustein
1982	Stephen H. Paulus	1987	George T. Walker
1982	Donald James Martino	1987	David Lang
1982	Thea Musgrave	1987	William H. Albright
1982	Ran Blake	1987	Ira J. Mowitz
1982	Barry Lloyd Vercoe	1987	Kamran N. Ince
1982	Daniel James Perlongo	1988	Michael James Gandolfi
1982	Gerald Charles Levinson	1988	Eric H. Moe
1983	Robert Sirota	1988	T. J. Anderson
1983	Richard Busch	1988	Melinda Jane Wagner
1983	Steve Lacy	1988	Timothy Jackson Geller
1983	Robert Beaser	1988	Scott Allen Lindroth
1983	Paul Alan Levi	1988	Scott Wheeler
1983	Thomas Oboe Lee	1988	Ross Bauer
1983	John Melby	1989	Wayne T. Peterson
1983	Sheree Clement	1989	Richard Danielpour
1983	Todd Brief	1989	Juliana Hall
1984	Aaron Jay Kernis	1989	David C. R. Rakowski
1984	William Alan Finn	1989	David Murray
1984	Matthew Greenbaum	1989	James Dashow
1984	Martin Boykan	1990	Dianaruthe Wharton
1984	Eugene Joseph O'Brien	1990	Bright Sheng
1984	Laura Clayton	1990	Shulamit Ran
1984	Stephen A. Jaffe	1990	Paul Lansky
1984	Samuel H. Adler	1990	Jeffery V. Cotton
1984	Donald F. Wheelock	1990	Christopher C. Rouse
1984	Gary Smart	1990	Donald Grantham
1985	Lee Hyla	1991	Wendell M. Logan
1985	David Chaitkin	1991	Craig S. Harris
1985	Steven Mackey	1991	Allen L. Anderson
1985	Reynold Henry Weidenaar	1991	Anne LeBaron
1985	Joel S. Feigin	1991	Ann Marie Callaway
1985	George Edwards	1991	David M. Moss
1985	Jackson Mac Low	1991	David William Sanford
1985	James Primosch	1992	Ronald Caltabiano
1985	Joseph Dubiel	1992	James Mobberley
1985	William Thomas McKinley	1992	Richard Argosh
1986	Daniel Asia	1992	Sebastian Currier
1986	Glenn Lieberman	1992	Richard Wilson
1986	Walter Keith Winslow	1992	James Newton
1986	Eric David Chasalow	1992	Nathan Currier
1986	Michelle Ekizian	1992	John Gibson
1986	John H. Thow	1993	Armand Qualliotine
1986	Jean Eichelberger Ivey	1993	David Felder
1986	Thomas Oboe Lee	1993	Oliver Lake
1987	Andrew D. Frank	1993	Robert Dick
1987	William Doppmann	1993	David Soley
1987	Richard Toensing	1994	Long Zhou

1994	Jon C. Nelson	2000	Shih-Hui Chen
1994	Jeff W. Nichols	2000	David J. Vayo
1994	Pierre Jalbert	2000	Larry Karush
1994	Jay Alan Yim	2000	Milford Graves
1994	Benny Golson	2000	Martin Brody
1994	Jessica Williams	2000	Roswell Rudd
1995	James Emery	2001	Cindy McTee
1995	Dean Drummond	2001	Claude Baker
1995	Osvaldo Noé Golijov	2001	Daniel S. Godfrey
1995	Jeffrey Mumford	2001	Ricardo Llorca
1995	Ursula Mamlok	2001	Ray Anderson
1995	Andrew Rindfleisch	2001	Daniel W. Koontz
1996	Michael Daugherty	2001	Gregory D'Alessio
1996	George Tsontakis	2001	Kevin Matthew Puts
1996	Morris Rosenzweig	2001	Arlene Zallman
1996	C. Bryan Rulon	2001	Jeffrey Stock
1996	Chen Yi	2002	Dennis Eberhard
1996	Chambliss Giobbi	2002	Nicholas Brooke
1996	Chris Theofanidis	2002	Richard Lowe Teitelbaum
1997	Trimpin	2002	Robert Livingston Aldridge
1997	George Arasimowicz	2002	Bun-Ching Lam
1997	Stephen Hartke	2002	Arthur Levering II
1997	Michael Nathaniel Hersch	2002	Dewey Redman
1997	Donal Fox	2002	Louise Beach
1997	Dan Welcher	2002	Craig T. Walsh
1997	Melissa Hui	2003	Harold Meltzer
1997	Jennifer Elaine Higdon	2003	Patricia Barber
1998	Robert C. Maggio	2003	Fred S. Hersch
1998	David Crumb	2003	Barbara White
1998	Justin N. Dello Joio	2003	Martin Bresnick
1998	Timothy Kramer	2003	Alvin Singleton
1998	Hayes Biggs	2003	Henry Threadgill
1998	Lawrence L. Widdoes	2003	Anthony Brown
1999	Ingram Marshall	2003	David Froom
1999	Steven M. Burke	2004	Margaret Brouwer
1999	Tamar Diesendruck	2004	Frances White
1999	Paul Koonce	2004	Jason Eckardt
1999	Derek Bermel	2004	Marty Ehrlich
1999	Kurt Rohde	2004	Carolyn Yarnell
1999	Andrew Cyrille	2004	Alvin Curran
1999	Russell Pinkston	2004	Larry Polansky
1999	Randall Woolf	2004	Pamela Z
2000	Gerry Hemingway	2004	Joan La Barbara
2000	James Matheson	2004	Leroy Jenkins
2000	James Rolfe		

Appendix VII - Pulitzer Prize in Music

Sources

The Pulitzer Prize website. www.pulitzer.org.

Remarks

The Pulitzer Prize website lists the winning composition and the date and location of its premiere.

1943	William Schuman	1976	Ned Rorem
1944	Howard Hanson	1977	Richard Wernick
1945	Aaron Copland	1978	Michael Colgrass
1946	Leo Sowerby	1979	Joseph Schwantner
1947	Charles Ives	1980	David Del Tredici
1948	Walter Piston	1982	Roger Sessions
1949	Virgil Thomson	1983	Ellen Taaffe-Zwilich
1950	Gian-Carlo Menotti	1984	Bernard Rands
1951	Douglas Moore	1985	Stephen Albert
1952	Gail Kubik	1986	George Perle
1954	Quincy Porter	1987	John Harbison
1955	Gian-Carlo Menotti	1988	William Bolcom
1956	Ernst Toch	1989	Roger Reynolds
1957	Norman Dello Joio	1990	Mel Powell
1958	Samuel Barber	1991	Shulamit Ran
1959	John La Montaine	1992	Wayne Peterson
1960	Elliott Carter	1993	Christopher Rouse
1961	Walter Piston	1994	Gunther Schuller
1962	Robert Ward	1995	Morton Gould
1963	Samuel Barber	1996	George Walker
1966	Leslie Bassett	1997	Wynton Marsalis
1967	Leon Kirchner	1998	Aaron Jay Kernis
1968	George Crumb	1999	Melinda Wagner
1969	Karel Husa	2000	Lewis Spratlan
1970	Charles Wuorinen	2001	John Corigliano
1971	Mario Davidovsky	2002	Henry Brant
1972	Jacob Druckman	2003	John Adams
1973	Elliott Carter	2004	Paul Moravec
1974	Donald Martino	2005	Steven Stucky
1975	Dominick Argento		

Appendix VIII - American Academy in Rome Fellows in Musical Composition

Sources

Mike Vitale, Consulting Archivist, American Academy in Rome Archives.

Remarks

This list represents the winners of the Rome Prize and does not include composers who were awarded a visiting scholar fellowship.

1924	Leo Sowerby	1957	Richard M. Willis, Jr.
1924	Howard H. Hanson	1958	Stanley Hollingsworth
1925	Randall Thompson	1958	William O. Smith
1927	Herbert Elwell	1959	Salvatore J. Martirano
1928	Walter Helfer	1960	Higo H. Hirada
1929	Robert L. Sanders	1961	George B. Wilson
1930	Alexander L. Steinert	1962	John C. Eaton
1931	Roger H. Sessions	1963	Leslie R. Bassett
1932	Normand Lockwood	1963	Paul E. Nelson
1933	Werner Janssen	1964	Ezra Laderman
1934	Herbert R. Inch	1964	Marvin D. Levy
1935	Hunter Johnson	1966	Charles Whittenberg
1936	Vittorio Giannini	1966	Vincent Frohne
1937	Samuel Barber	1967	Stephen Albert
1939	Kent W. Kennan	1967	Richard A. Trythall
1939	Frederick Woltmann	1967	Philip G. Winsor
1940	Charles Naginski	1968	Morris Cotel
1941	William D. Denny	1969	John Heineman
1942	Arthur R. Kreutz	1970	Henry Weinberg
1949	Alexei Haieff	1970	Louis Weingarden
1949	Andrew W. Imbrie	1971	Barbara Kolb
1950	Jack H. Beeson	1971	Loren Rush
1951	George Rochberg	1972	James L. Heinke
1951	Harold S. Shapero	1972	Daniel Perlongo
1952	Lukas S. Foss	1973	Eugene O'Brien
1952	Ulysses Kay	1974	William J. Hellerman
1952	Gail T. Kubik	1974	C. Tison Street
1954	Elliot Carter	1974	Jeffrey Jones
1954	Frank Wigglesworth	1975	David S. Bates
1955	Robert W. Moevs	1976	Martin Bresnick
1956	Yehudi Wyner	1976	George H. Plain
1957	Billy Jim Layton	1977	Chester Biscardi

1978	Robert H. Beaser	1991	David Lang
1978	John Thow	1992	Stephen P. Hartke
1979	Dennis J. Eberhard	1992	Bun-Ching Lam
1979	Shelia Jane Silver	1994	Sebastian Currier
1980	Arthur Kreiger	1995	Edmund J. Campion
1981	John Lennon	1996	Nathan Currier
1981	Stephen Jaffe	1996	David Rakowski
1982	Todd Brief	1997	Arthur Levering
1982	Nicholas Thorne	1998	Andrew Reindfleisch
1983	Larry Bell	1998	Kenneth Frzelle
1983	William Neil	1998	P. Q. Phan
1984	Tamar Diesendruck	1999	Christopher Theofanidis
1984	Jay Gach	1999	Mark Wingate
1985	Aaron Kernis	2000	Shih-Hui Chen
1985	Paul Moravec	2000	Carolyn Yarnell
1986	Scott Lindroth	2001	Michael Hersch
1986	Rand Streiger	2001	Pierre Jalbert
1987	Thomas Oboe Lee	2002	Derek Bermel
1987	Michael Torke	2002	Kevin Puts
1988	Kamran Ince	2003	Mark Kilstofte
1988	Steve Rouse	2003	David Sanford
1989	Kathryn J. Alexander	2004	Mason Bates
1989	Michelle Ezekian	2004	Jefferson Friedman
1990	James C. Mobberly	2005	Harold Meltzer
1990	Walter K. Winslow	2005	Steven Burke
1991	Lee Hyla		

Appendix IX – National Endowment for the Arts

Sources

National Endowment for the Arts. *Annual Report*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1966-2004.

Remarks

From 1967 through 1970, the National Endowment for the Arts awarded grants through the Composer Assistance Program, which was administered by the American Music Center. Beginning in 1969, individuals were listed under the program in the annual report. In 1971, composers received grants through the Composer-Performer Commissioning Program (the Composer Assistance Program does not appear in the 1971 annual report). In 1972, one individual was listed under the Composer Assistance Program. From 1973 through 1979, the NEA awarded grants through its Composer/Librettist program. The annual reports did not distinguish between composers and librettists. Every attempt has been made to identify only the composers from the lists by verifying the names against a variety of sources, including the American Music Center's catalog of scores and online member directory, the New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, 2nd edition, and music publishers' catalogs.

1969	Thomas Briccetti	1969	Leroy Southers
1969	Alvin Epstein	1969	Alan B. Stout
1969	Robert Kelley	1969	Beatrice Witkin
1969	William Kraft	1970	Thomas Beversdorf
1969	Robert Middleton	1970	Gunther Schuller
1969	Richard A. Monaco	1970	David Sheinfeld
1969	Ron Nelson	1971	Louis Ballard
1969	John D. Robb	1971	Virgil Thomson
1969	Leroy Robertson	1971	Stanley A. Wolfe
1969	William Russo	1972	Arnold Black
1969	William Russell Smith	1973	Edward Applebaum

1973	Frank C. Boehnlein	1974	John M. Hennagin
1973	Louis Calabro	1974	Michael M. Horvit
1973	John M. Chowning	1974	Anthony J. Iannaccone
1973	Dr. H. Grant Fletcher	1974	Leonard Kastle
1973	Margaret Garwood	1974	Daniel A. Kessner
1973	Talib Rasul (Stephen Chambers) Hakim	1974	Meyer Kupferman
1973	John C. Heiss	1974	Marvin D. Levy
1973	Barbara A. Kolb	1974	Wendell M. Logan
1973	Felix R. Labunski	1974	Ronald B. LoPresti
1973	Daniel K. Lentz	1974	Otto Luening
1973	Edwin London	1974	Donald Lybbert
1973	Max Neuhaus	1974	Ursula Mamlok
1973	Earl Robinson	1974	Donald J. Martino
1973	George Rochberg	1974	Salvatore J. Martirano
1973	Jose Serebrier	1974	David H. Maslanka
1973	Elie Siegmeister	1974	Nicholas Meyers
1973	Clifford O. Taylor	1974	Ellsworth L. Milburn
1973	Francis B. Thorne	1974	Richard H. Moryl
1973	George T. Walker	1974	Marc E. Neikrug
1974	John L. Adams	1974	Larry A. Nelson
1974	Samuel H. Adler	1974	Harold S. Oliver
1974	Thomas J. Anderson	1974	Alice Parker
1974	Bulent Arel	1974	Robert Parris
1974	Dominick J. Argento	1974	William A. Penn
1974	Elaine R. Barkin	1974	Raoul Pleskow
1974	John W. Baur	1974	Robert E. Pollock
1974	Warren F. Benson	1974	Felix L. Powell
1974	William E. Bolcom	1974	Steve Reich
1974	Earle A. Brown, Jr.	1974	Phillip C. Rhodes
1974	Harold M. Budd	1974	Howard F. Rovics
1974	Stephen Douglas Burton	1974	Loren Rush
1974	Paul Cooper	1974	P. Peter Sacco
1974	Arthur H. Cunningham	1974	Gerhard Samuel
1974	David W. Del Tredici	1974	Max Schubel
1974	Charles M. Dodge	1974	Joseph Schwantner
1974	Paul H. Earls	1974	Elliott S. Schwartz
1974	Morton Feldman	1974	Daria W. Semegen
1974	Vivan Fine	1974	Jose Serebrier
1974	Emmanuel Ghent	1974	Gary L. Smart
1974	David R. Gibson	1974	David F. Stock
1974	Miriam Gideon	1974	Eric N. Stokes
1974	Philip Glass	1974	Steven Strunk
1974	Romeo Eugene Gutsche	1974	Morton L. Subotnick
1974	John H. Harbison	1974	Robert C. Suderburg
1974	Donald Harris	1974	Conrad S. Susa
1974	Robert J. Haskins	1974	Elias Tanenbaum
1974	Robert E. Helps	1974	Robert F. Taylor
		1974	Joel H. Thome

1974	Joan P. Tower	1975	Robert E. Helps
1974	Steven D. Traugh	1975	Sydney P. Hodkinson
1974	Budd A. Udell	1975	Lee Hoiby
1974	Vladimir A. Ussachevski	1975	James F. Hopkins
1974	Robert H. Waldman	1975	Alan Hovhaness
1974	Ben B. Weber	1975	Karel Husa
1974	L. C. Alexander Wilder	1975	Andrew W. Imbrie
1974	Charles P. Wuorinen	1975	Warner Jepson
1974	Robert A. Wykes	1975	Donald H. Keats
1975	Claus Adam	1975	Earl Kim
1975	Josef Alexander	1975	David R. Koblitz
1975	Barbara Elizabeth Anderson	1975	Karl G. Kohn
1975	Theodore Antoniou	1975	Barbara A. Kolb
1975	Bulent Arel	1975	Karl Korte
1975	Milton B. Babbitt	1975	Leo A. Kraft
1975	Jan M. Bach	1975	William Kraft
1975	Louis W. Ballard	1975	Daniel Lang
1975	Irwin A. Bazelon	1975	Henri Lazarof
1975	Jack H. Beeson	1975	Benjamin G. Lees
1975	Herman Berlinski	1975	Daniel K. Lentz
1975	Zelman L. Bokser	1975	Peter G. Lieberman
1975	William E. Bolcom	1975	Max Lifschitz
1975	Charles N. Boone	1975	Edwin W. London
1975	Martin I. Bresnick	1975	Nikolai Lopatnikoff
1975	Heskel Brisman	1975	Charles E. Lundborg
1975	Stephen A. Chambers	1975	Stanley G. Lunetta
1975	Paul Seiko Chihara	1975	Robert Mann
1975	Roque J. Cordero	1975	David H. Maslanka
1975	John P. Corigliano	1975	Joyce H. Mekeel
1975	Morris Cotel	1975	Ellsworth Lynn Milburn
1975	Curtis O. B. Curtis-Smith	1975	Lawrence K. Moss
1975	David W. Del Tredici	1975	Wilbur L. Ogdon
1975	Wallace E. DePue	1975	William A. Penn
1975	Norman M. Dinerstein	1975	Raoul Pleskow
1975	Lucia Dlugoszewski	1975	Roger L. Reynolds
1975	Charles M. Dodge	1975	Phillip C. Rhodes
1975	William F. Elliot	1975	George Rochberg
1975	Burt L. Fenner	1975	Robert Xavier Rodriguez
1975	Ross L. Finney	1975	John R. Ronsheim
1975	Carlisle Floyd	1975	Ned Rorem
1975	Lukas Foss	1975	Walter B. Ross
1975	Harley G. Gaber	1975	Loren Rush
1975	Courtland D. Gettel	1975	Joseph C. Schwantner
1975	Emmanuel Ghent	1975	Gary L. Smart
1975	David R. Gibson	1975	Harvey D. Sollberger
1975	Jon C. Gibson	1975	Carlos Claudio Spies
1975	Philip Glass	1975	Dorrance Stalvey
1975	John C. Heiss	1975	Robert Starer

1975	Halsey Stevens	1976	Mario Davidovsky
1975	Eric N. Stokes	1976	John Stephen Dydo
1975	Alan B. Stout	1976	Leo D. Edwards
1975	Louise J. Talma	1976	Robert Erickson
1975	Bruce J. Taub	1976	Frederick A. Fox
1975	Andrew W. Thomaas	1976	Andrew D. Frank
1975	Joan P. Tower	1976	Arnold Frenchetti
1975	Lester A. Trimble	1976	Kenneth L. Gaburo
1975	Preston A. Trombly	1976	Jack S. Gottlieb
1975	Ralph B. Turek	1976	John W. Green
1975	Vladimir A. Ussachevsky	1976	R. Eugune (Gene Gutche) Gutsche
1975	John W. Verrall	1976	Roger D. Hannay
1975	John Vincent	1976	Roy Harris
1975	George T. Walker	1976	Bernard Heiden
1975	Hugo D. Weisgall	1976	William D. Hellerman
1975	Chou Wen-Chung	1976	Richard B. Hervig
1975	Richard F. Wernick	1976	George Heussenstamm
1975	Paul W. Whear	1976	Lejasen Hiller
1975	Gary C. White	1976	Richard Hoffman
1975	James Willey	1976	Stanley Hollingsworth
1975	William O. Winstead	1976	Alan Hovhaness
1975	Paul M. Zonn	1976	John S. Huggler
1976	Hugh Aitken	1976	Roy Hamlin Johnson
1976	Thomas R. Albert	1976	Tom Johnson
1976	William Albright	1976	Joseph R. Julian
1976	Bruno Amato	1976	David Kechley
1976	Roger W. Ames	1976	Robert Kelly
1976	Garland Anderson	1976	Morris Knight
1976	Jon H. Appleton	1976	Robert C. Kogan
1976	Robert Ashley	1976	Karl Kohn
1976	William E. Averitt	1976	Jeffrey J. Kresky
1976	Ernst L. Bacon	1976	Phillip Lambro
1976	Larry Baker	1976	Bo Lawergren
1976	Elaine R. Barkin	1976	Frederick Lesemann
1976	Robert D. Basart	1976	Paul Alan Levi
1976	John O. Beall	1976	Robert H. Lewis
1976	Henry Brant	1976	Caroline Lloyd
1976	Alvin Brehm	1976	Larry P. Lockwood
1976	Gerald Busby	1976	Robert M. Lombardo
1976	Louis Calabro	1976	Donald Martino
1976	Elliot Carter	1976	William R. Mayer
1976	Joel Chadabe	1976	William T. McKinley
1976	Suzanne E. Ciani	1976	Barton McLean
1976	Robert K. Clark	1976	Gian Carlo Menotti
1976	David Cope	1976	Charles B. Mills
1976	Eleanor T. Cory	1976	Richard H. Moryle
1976	Richard Cumming	1976	Marc E. Neikrug
1976	James Dashow	1976	Roger Nixon

1976	Eugene J. O'Brian	1976	Rolv B. Yttrehus
1976	Juan Orrego-Salas	1976	Eugene Zador
1976	Robert Parris	1976	Ellen Taaffe Zwilich
1976	Thomas J. Pasatieri	1977	Claus Adam
1976	John M. Peel	1977	Stephen Albert
1976	Ronald C. Perera	1977	Theodore Antoniou
1976	Vincent Persichetti	1977	Dominick Argento
1976	Wayne T. Peterson	1977	Leonardo Balada
1976	Burrill Phillips	1977	Louis Ballard
1976	Liz Phillips	1977	Larry Barnes
1976	John W. Pozdro	1977	David Behrman
1976	Paul Ramsier	1977	Chester Biscardi
1976	Shulamit Ran	1977	Rudolph Bubalo
1976	Paul V. Reale	1977	Stephen Burton
1976	Steve Reich	1977	Richard Busch
1976	Phillip Rhodes	1977	John Celona
1976	Terry Riley	1977	Stephen Chatman
1976	Robert Rollin	1977	Paul Chihara
1976	Christopher Rouse	1977	Michael Colina
1976	Dane Rudhyar	1977	George Crumb
1976	George Russell	1977	Curtis-Smith Curtis
1976	Bruce Saylor	1977	Peter Davison
1976	Elliott S. Schwartz	1977	David Diamond
1976	Daria W. Semegen	1977	John Downey
1976	Alice Shields	1977	William Duckworth
1976	Seymour Shifrin	1977	David Dunn
1976	Stanley Silverman	1977	Charles Eakin
1976	Ezra Sims	1977	Paul Earls
1976	William R. (Russell Smith) Smith	1977	Bruce Eaton
1976	Larry J. Solomon	1977	Dennis Eberhard
1976	William J. Steinohrt	1977	William Elliott
1976	David F. Stock	1977	Milburn Ellsworth
1976	Donald Y. Sur	1977	Morton Feldman
1976	Conrad Susa	1977	Brian Fennelly
1976	Howard W. Swanson	1977	Paul Fetler
1976	Richard Swift	1977	Jack Fortner
1976	Richard L. Teitelbaum	1977	Harley Gaber
1976	Carter D. Thomas	1977	Margaret Garwood
1976	Francis Thorne	1977	Jon Gibson
1976	Roy Travis	1977	Beverly Grigsby
1976	Valerie Weigl	1977	Martin Grusin
1976	Louis S. Weingarden	1977	John Harbison
1976	Olly W. Wilson	1977	Carter Harman
1976	Beatrice Witken	1977	Jon Hassell
1976	Charles Wuorinen	1977	Doris Hays
1976	Yehudi Wyner	1977	Robert Helps
1976	Elie Yarden	1977	Richard Henninger
1976	La Monte Young	1977	Antonio Hernandez-Lizaso

1977	Ting Ho	1977	Nicholas Roussakis
1977	Sydney Hodkinson	1977	Dane Rudhyar
1977	Richard Hoffman	1977	Frederic Rzewski
1977	Joseph Hudson	1977	Joseph Schwantner
1977	Lockrem Johnson	1977	Allen Shearer
1977	Daniel Kessner	1977	Charles Shere
1977	Earl Kim	1977	Russell Smith
1977	Leon Kirchner	1977	Robert Starer
1977	Frederick Koch	1977	Robert Stern
1977	Barbara Kolb	1977	Eric Stokes
1977	Karl Korte	1977	Tison Street
1977	Gregory Kosteck	1977	Diane Thome
1977	Peter Kotik	1977	Chinary Ung
1977	William Kraft	1977	David Van Vactor
1977	Jonathan Kramer	1977	Yoshimasa Wada
1977	Ernst Krenek	1977	George Walker
1977	Meyer Kupferman	1977	Arnold Weinstein
1977	Arthur Laabs	1977	Hugo Weisgall
1977	James Lauth	1977	Philip Winsor
1977	Henri Lazarof	1977	Stanley Wolfe
1977	Daniel Lentz	1978	Harison Leslie Adams
1977	Alfred Lerdahl	1978	John C. Adams
1977	John Lessard	1978	Samuel H. Adler
1977	Frank Lewin	1978	Maryanne Amacher
1977	Alvin Lucier	1978	Robert Ashley
1977	Otto Luening	1978	Daniel I. Asia
1977	William McKinley	1978	William E. Averitt
1977	Kirke Mechem	1978	Elaine R. Barkin
1977	John Melby	1978	John W. Baur
1977	Louis Mennini	1978	John Beall
1977	Jan Meyerowitz	1978	Thomas E. Benjamin
1977	Carman Moore	1978	Alvin S. Curran
1977	Robert Moran	1978	Joseph A. Davidow
1977	Dexter Morrill	1978	Stuart R. Dempster
1977	Lawrence Moss	1978	David C. Felder
1977	Paul Nelson	1978	Andrew D. Frank
1977	William David Noon	1978	Donald W. Freund
1977	Linda Ostrander	1978	Philip Glass
1977	Thomas Pasatieri	1978	R. Eugene Gutsche
1977	Russell Peck	1978	Jae Eun Ha
1977	George Perle	1978	Talib Hakim
1977	Malcolm Peyton	1978	Stanley W. Hollingsworth
1977	Gerald Plain	1978	Jere T. Hutcheson
1977	Raoul Pleskow	1978	David B. Hykes
1977	Bernard Rands	1978	Jean Eichelberger Ivey
1977	Roger Reynolds	1978	David E. Jones
1977	Marga Richter	1978	Deborah H. Kavasch
1977	Neil Rolnick	1978	Ulysses Kay

1978	Jay P. Krush	1979	William Bergsma
1978	Felix Labunski	1979	Harold Blumenfeld
1978	Jeffrey L. Levine	1979	Paul Boesing
1978	Marvin D. Levy	1979	William Bolcom
1978	Wendall M. Logan	1979	Alvin Brehm
1978	David C. Mahler	1979	Martin Bresnick
1978	Ingram D. Marshall	1979	Frank (Neely) Bruce
1978	Odaline de la Martinez	1979	Harold Budd
1978	Robert D. Morris	1979	Michael Byron
1978	Charles G. Morrow	1979	Philip Carlsen
1978	Pran Nath	1979	Robert Ceely
1978	William G. Neil	1979	Sergio Cervetti
1978	Kirk Nurock	1979	Timothy Clark
1978	Leo Ornstein	1979	Marc-Antonio Consoli
1978	Stephen H. Paulus	1979	Paul Cooper
1978	Arlene Z. Proctor	1979	Michael Daugherty
1978	Paul V. Reale	1979	Stephen Dembski
1978	Jay Reise	1979	Roger Dickerson
1978	Walter H. Robinson	1979	Lucia Dlugoszewski
1978	Ned Rorem	1979	Charles Dodge
1978	Bruce S. Saylor	1979	Paul Dresher
1978	Allen E. Shawn	1979	Dean Drummond
1978	Alice F. Shields	1979	John David Earnest
1978	Ann L. Silsbee	1979	Bruce Eaton
1978	Ezra Sims	1979	James Eversole
1978	A. Wayne Slawson	1979	Richard Felciano
1978	Gary L. Smart	1979	Brian Fennelly
1978	Dorrance Stalvey	1979	Bill Fontana
1978	Robert E. Stine, Jr.	1979	Joanne Forman
1978	David F. Stock	1979	Lukas Foss
1978	Steven Strunk	1979	Frederick Fox
1978	Steven E. Stucky	1979	Hal Freedman
1978	Morton Subotnick	1979	Gerald Gabel
1978	Donald Y. Sur	1979	Robert Gerster
1978	Conrad S. Susa	1979	Janice Giteck
1978	Roy E. Travis	1979	John Graziano
1978	Barry L. Vercoe	1979	Martin Grusin
1978	Joseph F. Weber	1979	Ann Hankinson
1978	Bruce Wise	1979	Doris Hays
1978	Michael E. Woods	1979	William Hellermann
1978	Charles Wuorinen	1979	David Hicks
1978	ruth S. Wylie	1979	Lejaren Hiller
1978	Lenard L. Yen	1979	Sydney Hodkinson
1978	Ramon Zupko	1979	Richard Hoffman
1979	Larry Baker	1979	Katherine Hoover
1979	Virko Baley	1979	Earl Howard
1979	Leslie Bassett	1979	Joseph Hudson
1979	Robert Beaser	1979	Jerry Hunt

1979	Tom Johnson	1979	Howard Stern
1979	M. William Karlins	1979	Ira Taxin
1979	Leonard Kastle	1979	Richard Teitelbaum
1979	David Kechley	1979	Diane Thome
1979	Earl Kim	1979	Francis Thorne
1979	David Koblitz	1979	Frederick Tillis
1979	Karl Kohn	1979	Richard Toensing
1979	Barbara Kolb	1979	Joan Tower
1979	Philip Koplrow	1979	Lester Trimble
1979	Leo Kraft	1979	Bertram Turetzky
1979	William Kraft	1979	George Walker
1979	Matthias Kriesberg	1979	Robert Ward
1979	Deanna LaValle	1979	James Waters
1979	Henri Lazarof	1979	Arnold Weinstein
1979	Peter Lewis	1979	Richard Wernick
1979	Annea Lockwood	1979	Frank Wiley, Jr.
1979	Edwin London	1979	James Willey
1979	David Lopato	1979	Philip Winsor
1979	Samuel Magrill	1979	Maurice Wright
1979	David Mahler	1979	Yehuda Yannay
1979	William McKinley	1980	Samuel H. Adler
1979	Priscilla McLean	1980	Hugh Aitken
1979	Michael McNabb	1980	William H. Albright
1979	Charles Mills	1980	Judith S. Allen
1979	Stephen Montague	1980	Ruth Anderson
1979	Robert Moore	1980	Jon H. Appleton
1979	Robert Moran	1980	Daniel I. Asia
1979	Thea Musgrave	1980	Jacob D. Avshalomov
1979	Phill Niblock	1980	David N. Baker
1979	Eugene O'Brien	1980	Leonard Balada
1979	Robert Palmer	1980	William Henry Banchs
1979	Maggi Payne	1980	Robert D. Basart
1979	Stephen Peles	1980	Susan M. Blaustein
1979	Samuel Pellman	1980	Charles N. Boone
1979	William Penn	1980	Gerald Busby
1979	Thomas Peterson	1980	Louis Calabro
1979	Tobias Picker	1980	Robert B. Carl
1979	Katherine Quittner	1980	Nancy L. Chance
1979	Bernard Rands	1980	Paul Chihara
1979	Roger Reynolds	1980	Marc Antonio Consoli
1979	Marga Richter	1980	Conrad M. Cummings
1979	Frederic Rzewski	1980	Curtis O. Curtis-Smith
1979	John Sackett	1980	James Dashow
1979	William Schottstaedt	1980	Emma Lou Diemer
1979	Joseph Schwantner	1980	Norman M. Dinerstein
1979	Daria Semegen	1980	Michael S. Eckert
1979	Stanley Silverman	1980	Donald J. Erb
1979	William Steinhort	1980	Bruce L. Faulconer

1980	David C. Felder	1980	Harold Seletsky
1980	Ronald M. George	1980	Alvin E. Singleton
1980	Donald J. Grantham	1980	Stanislaw Skrowaczewski
1980	Joel Gressel	1980	Gary Smart
1980	Kevin F. Hanlon	1980	Carlos Surinach
1980	Higo H. Harada	1980	Ivan A. Tcherepnin
1980	Robin J. Heifetz	1980	Paul Theberge
1980	John C. Heiss	1980	Douglas Townsend
1980	George Heussenstamm	1980	Preston A. Trombly
1980	Lee Hoiby	1980	Fisher A. Tull
1980	Stephen A. Jaffe	1980	Donald F. Wheelock
1980	Thomas Janson	1980	Paul R. Wieneke
1980	Eric C. Jensen	1980	Charles Wuorinen
1980	Carson Kievman	1980	Christopher F. Yavelov
1980	John A. Klof	1980	Ramon Zupko
1980	Gregory P. Kramer	1980	Ellen T. Zwilich
1980	Ernst Krenek	1981	Robert Ashley
1980	Joan LaBarbara	1981	Zelman Bokser
1980	Benjamin Lees	1981	David Chaitkin
1980	Daniel K. Lentz	1981	Noah E. Creshevsky
1980	Paul A. Levi	1981	Raymond E. Fahrner
1980	Frank Lewin	1981	Margaret Garwood
1980	Peter G. Lieberman	1981	Jack E. Holloway
1980	Eric Lindemann	1981	Donald M. Jenni
1980	Harris H. Lindenfeld	1981	Earl Kim
1980	David B. Loy	1981	Paul Lansky
1980	Charles E. Lundborg	1981	Fred Lerdahl
1980	Bruce F. MacCombie	1981	Alvin A. Lucier
1980	Tod Machover	1981	Ursula Mamlock
1980	Ingram D. Marshall	1981	William R. Matthews
1980	Janis R. Mattox	1981	William T. McKinley
1980	Ira J. Mowitz	1981	Priscilla A. McLean
1980	Joel E. Naumann	1981	Ronald K. Melrose
1980	Kalvert Nelson	1981	Tobias Picker
1980	Andrew D. Newell	1981	Loren Rush
1980	Phill Niblock	1981	Brian Schober
1980	Roger A. Nixon	1981	David J. Snow
1980	David Olan	1981	Kathleen L. St. John
1980	John M. Peel	1981	David Tudor
1980	Daniel J. Perlongo	1981	Richard F. Wernick
1980	Mark D. Pevsner	1982	Adrian D. Anderson
1980	Elizabeth L. Phillips	1982	Edward Applebaum
1980	Paul V. Reale	1982	John W. Baur
1980	Frank A. Retzel	1982	Jonathan J. Berger
1980	Dennis D. Riley	1982	William E. Bolcom
1980	Ned Rorem	1982	Richard J. Brooks
1980	David A. Schiff	1982	William F. Brooks
1980	Elliott S. Schwartz	1982	Christopher D. Chafe

1982	Nancy Laird Chance	1983	George Perle
1982	John W. Downey	1983	Dennis Riley
1982	Paul Fetler	1983	Ned Rorem
1982	Frederick A. Fox	1983	David Sampson
1982	Donald W. Freund	1983	Allen Schindler
1982	Daniel Goode	1983	David Stock
1982	Doris E. Hays	1983	Ira Taxin
1982	David B. Hykes	1984	Judith S. Allen
1982	David A. Jaffe	1984	Robert Ashley
1982	David E. Jones	1984	Rudolph D. Bubalo
1982	Louis S. Karchin	1984	Harry T. Bulow
1982	Arthur V. Kreiger	1984	Wendy M. Chambers
1982	Eugene A. Kurtz	1984	Laura Clayton
1982	Gerald C. Levinson	1984	Marc-Antonio Consoli
1982	Eric Lundberg	1984	Alvin S. Curran
1982	Martin Mailman	1984	David Del Tredici
1982	Barton K. McLean	1984	Justin N. Dello Joio
1982	Richard C. Peaslee	1984	Donald J. Erb
1982	Bernard Rands	1984	Brian L. Fennelly
1982	Paul E. Schoenfield	1984	Aaron J. Kernis
1982	Max Schubel	1984	Barbara Kolb
1982	George T. Walker	1984	Jonathan D. Kramer
1982	Reynold H. Weidenaar	1984	Scott A. Lindroth
1982	Lawrence L. Widdoes	1984	Wendell Morris Logan
1982	Maurice W. Wright	1984	Alvin A. Lucier
1983	Robin O. Berger	1984	William R. Mayer
1983	Jared Beynon	1984	Michael D. McNabb
1983	Allan Blank	1984	Roscoe E. Mitchell
1983	Martin Boykan	1984	Dexter G. Morrill
1983	Martin Brody	1984	Kirgk Nurock
1983	Stephen Douglas Burton	1984	James Charles Oliverio
1983	Eric Chasalow	1984	Pauline Oliveros
1983	Glenn Hackbarth	1984	Morgan E. Powell
1983	Charles Hall	1984	Bernard Rands
1983	Matthew Harris	1984	Jay Reise
1983	Sydney Hodkinson	1984	Christopher C. Rouse
1983	Jean Eichelberger Ivey	1984	Gerard Schurmann
1983	Louis Karchin	1984	Stephen A. Scott
1983	Earl Kim	1984	Stuart S. Smith
1983	David Koblitz	1984	David J. Snow
1983	Libby Larsen	1984	Elliot B. Sokolov
1983	Thomas O. Lee	1984	Robert C. Suderburg
1983	Glenn Lieberman	1984	Lester Trimble
1983	David MacBride	1985	Daniel I. Asia
1983	William McKinley	1985	Ross Bauer
1983	Ellsworth Milburn	1985	Richard E. Cornell
1983	G. William Neil	1985	Matthew L. Harris
1983	Robert Parris	1985	Bern H. Herbolsheimer

1985	James D. Hobbs	1987	Rand P. Steiger
1985	Joel H. Hoffman	1987	Joji Yuasa
1985	Lee J. Hyla	1988	John Luther Adams
1985	Earl Kim	1988	Kathryn J. Alexander
1985	Peter G. Lieberson	1988	Judith S. Allen
1985	Douglas J. Lofstrom	1988	Paul M. DeMarinis
1985	Robert M. MacDougall	1988	David C. Felder
1985	Priscilla A. McLean	1988	Samuel P. Headrick
1985	Fredric Edgar Myrow	1988	Lee J. Hyla
1985	Janet E. Peachey	1988	David A. Jaffe
1985	Coleridge-Taylor Perkinson	1988	David Evan Jones
1985	Ned Rorem	1988	Bun-Ching Lam
1985	Gregg Smith	1988	Larry A. Lipkis
1985	Amy E. Snyder	1988	Steven Mackey
1985	Ramon Zupko	1988	Bunita J. Marcus
1986	Robert L. Aldridge	1988	Donald J. Martino
1986	Martin D. Amlin	1988	David H. Maslanka
1986	Todd L. Brief	1988	Meredith Monk
1986	Dennis J. Eberhard	1988	David J. Olsen
1986	Michelle L. Ekizian	1988	Mel Powell
1986	Hal Freedman	1988	Douglas H. Quin
1986	David B. Hykes	1988	Bernard Rands
1986	Karl G. Kohn	1988	Morton Subotnick
1986	Jonathan D. Kramer	1988	Elias Tanenbaum
1986	John M. La Montaine	1988	Augusta Read Thomas
1986	David A. Lang	1988	David Tudor
1986	Thomas Oboe Lee	1988	Jay Alan Yim
1986	Robert Hall Lewis	1989	W. Claude Baker, Jr.
1986	Allan W. Schindler	1989	Gheorghe Costinescu
1986	David Sheinfeld	1989	Kenneth L. Gaburo
1986	Bright Z. Sheng	1989	Glenn C. Gass
1986	Michael T. Torke	1989	Sydney P. Hodkinson
1986	Nancy Van de Vate	1989	Reed K. Holmes
1986	Hugo D. Weisgall	1989	Eleanor H. Hovda
1986	Dan E. Welcher	1989	Arthur J. Jarvinen
1987	Charles B. Amirkhanian	1989	Anne LeBaron
1987	David H. Balakrishnan	1989	Edward J. Miller
1987	Glenn G. Branca	1989	Stephen L. Mosko
1987	Robert J. Dick	1989	Steven E. Paxton
1987	Charles Dodge	1989	Robert X. Rodriquez
1987	Dean J. Drummond	1989	Robert S. Rouse
1987	Herschel D. Garfein	1989	George Tsontakis
1987	Scott R. Johnson	1989	Peter T. Westergaard
1987	Earl Kim	1990	Martin I. Bresnick
1987	Paul Lansky	1990	Todd L. Brief
1987	Pauline Oliveros	1990	Michael K. Daugherty
1987	Joseph Schwantner	1990	Donald J. Erb
1987	Elliott D. Sharp	1990	Primous Fountain

1990	Michael J. Gandolfi	1992	Lawrence L. Widdoes
1990	David K. Gompper	1992	Charles P. Wuorinen
1990	Joel H. Hoffman	1993	William Brunson
1990	Richard S. Karpen	1993	Rudolph Bubalo
1990	Jinhi Kim	1993	Christopher Chafe
1990	Andrew J. Kirshner	1993	Cindy Cox
1990	James T. Primosch	1993	Nathan Currier
1990	David C. Rakowski	1993	John Downey
1990	Gerald M. Shapiro	1993	David Froom
1990	Alvin E. Singleton	1993	William Kleinsasser
1990	Jan J. Swafford	1993	William Kraft
1990	Alicyn Warren	1993	Arthur Levering
1990	Dana R. Wilson	1993	Charles Mason
1990	Olly W. Wilson	1993	Paul Moravec
1990	Todd E. Winkler	1993	Jon Christopher Nelson
1991	Leonardo Balada	1993	Dorrance Stalvey
1991	Edward Barnes	1993	William Scott Wheeler
1991	Dana G. Brayton	1993	David Wolfson
1991	Laura Clayton	1993	Maurice Wright
1991	Sebastian K. Currier	1993	Long Zhou
1991	Charles Dodge	1994	Jane Ira Bloom
1991	David J. Dzubay	1994	Todd L. Brief
1991	Frank J. La Rocca	1994	Shih-Hui Chen
1991	Paul Lansky	1994	Yi Chen
1991	Behzad Ranjbaran	1994	Chaya Czernowin
1991	Mathew Rosenblum	1994	Thomas E. Flaherty
1991	Judith Shatin	1994	Joshua Fried
1991	Bernadette M. Speech	1994	Jose E. Halac
1991	Augusta Read Thomas	1994	Aaron Jay Kernis
1991	James H. Willey	1994	Andrew J. Kirshner
1991	Carolyn A. Yarnell	1994	Mary Jane Leach
1992	Charles B. Amrkhanian	1994	Janis R. Mattox
1992	Daniel I. Asia	1994	Lansing D. McLoskey
1992	Chalres L. Bestor	1994	Cindy K. McTee
1992	Ann M. Callaway	1994	Robert H. Ostertag
1992	Mario Davidovsky	1994	Daniel J. Perlongo
1992	Robert Dick	1994	Douglas H. Quin
1992	Gan-ru Ge	1994	C. Bryn Rulon
1992	David A. Jaffe	1994	Ray Shattenkirk
1992	Joseph P. Klein	1994	Bright Sheng
1992	Barbara Kolb	1994	Sheila J. Silver
1992	Timothy A. Kramer	1994	Frederick A. Speck
1992	Arthur V. Kreiger	1994	Jennifer E. Stasack
1992	Gerald C. Levinson	1994	George Tsontakis
1992	James C. Mobberley	1994	Yong Yang
1992	Pauline Oliveros	1994	Wes York
1992	Bernard Rands	1994	John Zorn
1992	Marilyn J. Shrude	1995	Jonathan J. Berger

1995	Marghreta Cordero	1995	Wendell M. Logan
1995	Robert W. Eidschun	1995	Daniel B. Rothman
1995	Michael P. Ellison	1995	Steven P. Sametz
1995	Kyle E. Gann	1995	Allen R. Shearer
1995	Osvaldo N. Golijov	1995	Clare Shore
1995	Donald J. Grantham	1995	David Stock
1995	Scott R. Johnson	1995	Mark A. Weber, Jr.
1995	Earl Kim	1995	Mark L. Wingate
1995	Bun-Ching Lam		

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Martha Baird Rockefeller Papers. Record Group 18. Rockefeller Family Archives. Rockefeller Archive Center.

Martha Baird Rockefeller Aid to Music Dockets. Rockefeller Family Archives. Rockefeller Archive Center.

Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music. Minute Books. Record Group IV 3B-19, Box 133. Rockefeller Family Archives. Rockefeller Archive Center.

U.S. Congress. *Congressional Record*.

Works Cited

Adam, Thomas. "Philanthropy and the Shaping of Social Distinctions in Nineteenth-Century U.S., Canadian, and German Cities." In *Philanthropy, Patronage, and Civil Society: Experiences from Germany, Great Britain, and North America*, edited by Thomas Adam, 15-33. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.

Adams, John. *Adams Family Correspondence*, vol. 3. Edited by L. H. Butterfield and Marc Friedlaender. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1973.

Adams, John Quincy. *The Memoirs of John Quincy Adams: Comprising Portions of His Diary from 1795 to 1848, Volume I*, edited by Charles Francis Adams. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1874.

Ahlquist, Karen. "Mrs. Potiphar at the Opera: Satire, Idealism, and Cultural Authority in Post-Civil War New York." In *Music and Culture in America, 1861-1918*, edited by Michael Saffle, 29-51. New York: Garland, 1998.

_____. *Democracy at the Opera: Music, Theater, and Culture in New York City, 1815-60*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997.

J. Heywood Alexander, ed. *To Stretch Our Ears: A Documentary History of America's Music*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2002.

American Music Center. "AMC: Past, Present & Future." <http://www.amc.net/about/history.html>.

_____. "Betty Freeman's Commissions." *NewMusicBox*, Issue 16, Vol. 2, No. 4 (August, 2000). <http://www.newmusicbox.org/page.nmbx?id=16fp15>.

- American Academy in Rome. "American Academy in Rome: Overview of the Academy."
<http://www.aarome.org/overview.htm>.
- Arts Council Engle. *Ambitions for the Arts 2003-2006*. London: Arts Council England, 2003.
- _____. *History of Arts Council England*. London: Arts Council England, 2004.
- Babbitt, Milton. "Paul Fromm: A Memoir." In *A Life for New Music: Selected Papers of Paul Fromm*, edited by David Gable and Christoph Wolff, 3-5 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).
- Baltzell, W. J. "The American College Man in Music." *Musical Quarterly* 1, no. 4 (October 1915): 623-36.
- Barr, Cyrilla. *The Coolidge Legacy*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1997.
- Barr, Cyrilla. *Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge: American Patron of Music*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1998.
- Barron, David. Liner notes to Anthony Philip Heinrich, *The Ornithological Combat of Kings*. New World Records #80208.
- Bolger, Doreen and David Park Curry. "Art for the President's House—An Historical Perspective." The White House, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/history/art/presart-1.html>.
- Boston Symphony Orchestra. "75th Anniversary Commissions." Boston Symphony Orchestra, <http://www.bso.org>.
- Bremner, Robert H. *American Philanthropy*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Broyles, Michael. *Mavericks and Other Traditions in American Music*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Cameron, Catherine M. *Dialectics in the Arts: The Rise of Experimentalism in American Music*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996.
- Canon, Cornelius. "The Federal Music Project of the Works Progress Administration: Music in a Democracy." Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1963.
- Case, Francis. "National Academy of Culture Act." *U.S. Congressional Record*, 86th Congress, 1st Session (1959), 11261.
- Celler, Emanuel. "Development of the Fine Arts." *U.S. Congressional Record*, 82nd Congress, 1st Session (1951), A3249.

- Chase, Gilbert. *America's Music, From the Pilgrims to the Present*, revised 3rd edition. Foreword by Richard Crawford and discographical essay by William Brooks. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987.
- Christ Church. *The Dorchester Book*. Boston: George H. Ellis, 1899.
- Commission of Fine Arts. "Background of the Commission of Fine Arts." <http://www.cfa.gov/about/history.html>.
- Copland, Aaron. *Aaron Copland: A Reader: Selected Writing, 1923-1972*, edited by Richard Kostelanetz. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- _____. "Blashfield Address: Creativity in America Part One." In *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Letters and the National Institute of Arts and Letters*, 2nd ser., No. 3 (May 1952), 33-40. Reprinted in *To Stretch Our Ears: A Documentary History of America's Music*, edited by J. Heywood Alexander, 367-70. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2002.
- Covey, Cyclone. "Did Puritanism of the Frontier Cause the Decline of Colonial Music?" *Journal of Research in Music Education* 6 (1958): 68-78.
- _____. Letters to the Editor. *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., vol. 9, no. 1 (January 1952): 128-36.
- _____. "Puritanism and Music in Colonial America." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., vol. 8, no. 3 (July 1951): 378-88.
- Crawford, Richard. *The American Musical Landscape: The Business of Musicianship from Billings to Gershwin*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- _____. *America's Musical Life: A History*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2001.
- Cummings, Milton C., Jr. *Public Money and the Muse: Essays on Government Funding for the Arts*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1991.
- Dorian, Frederick. *Commitment to Culture*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.
- Ehrlich, Cyril. *The Piano: A History*, rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. *Public Papers of the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1955*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1959.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *Essays*. Boston: J. Munroe, 1841. Facsimile of first printing in the McKissick Library, University of South Carolina. Introduced by Morse Peckham. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.

- Ericson, R. A. "Foundations—Patrons of Music." *Musical America* 76 (February 15, 1956): 14ff.
- Farwell, Arthur. "*Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist*" and *Other Essays on American Music*. Edited by Thomas Stoner. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1995.
- Fisher, William Arms. *Notes on Music in Old Boston*. Boston: Oliver Ditson Company, 1918.
- Foote, Henry Wilder. "Musical Life in Boston in the Eighteenth Century." *American Antiquarian Society Proceedings* 49 (1939): 293-313.
- Foss, Michael. *The Age of Patronage: The Arts in England, 1660-1750*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1971.
- Foundation Center. *Foundation Grants to Individuals*, 13th ed. New York: Foundation Center, 2003.
- Foundation Center. "What Is a Foundation?" <http://fdncenter.org/media/faqs/foundfun.html>.
- Foundation Center. *The Foundation Grants Index*. New York: Foundation Center, 2001.
- Friedman, Lawrence J. and Mark D. McGarvie, eds. *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Fromm, Paul. "The Fromm Music Foundation: Past, Present, and Future." In *A Life for New Music: Selected Papers of Paul Fromm*, edited by David Gable and Christoph Wolff, 71-73. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- _____. Letter to the Editor. *Musical America* (March 1961): 4.
- _____. "Twentieth-Century Music: Trouble Along the Road to the Twenty-First Century." In *A Life for New Music: Selected Papers of Paul Fromm*, edited by David Gable and Christoph Wolff, 27-36. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- _____. *A Life for New Music: Selected Papers of Paul Fromm*, edited by David Gable and Christoph Wolff. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Gann, Kyle. *American Music in the Twentieth Century*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 1997.
- Gibson, Campbell J. and Emily Lennon. "Historical Census Statistics on the Foreign-Born Population of the United States: 1850 to 1990." U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999. <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0029/twps0029.html>.
- Gould, Nathaniel D. *Church Music in America*. Boston, 1853. Reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1972.

- Grant, Mark N. *Maestros of the Pen: A History of Classical Music Criticism in America*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998.
- Guggenheim, John J. Letter of Gift. March 26, 1925. Guggenheim Foundation, <http://www.gf.org/gift.html>.
- Harris, Henry J. "The Occupation of Musician in the United States." *Musical Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (April 1915): 299-311.
- Heintze, James. "The Pulitzer Prize in Music: 1943-2002," <http://www.american.edu/heintze/Pull1.htm>.
- Higginson, Francis. *New England's Plantation, or, A Short and True Description of the Commodities and Discommodities of that Country* (London, 1630). Available at Pilgrim Hall Museum, "It Came on the Mayflower?" <http://www.pilgrimhall.org/onmayfl.htm>.
- Hiltzik, Michele. "Martha Baird: Concert Pianist." *Rockefeller Archive Center Newsletter* (Spring 2003): 19ff.
- Hitchcock, H. Wiley with Kyle Gann. *Music in the United States: A Historical Introduction*, 4th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000.
- Hood, George. *A History of Music in New England*. Boston, 1846. Reprint, New York: Johnson Reprint Co., 1970.
- Hooker, Richard. "The Invention of American Musical Culture: Meaning, Criticism, and Musical Acculturation in Antebellum America." In *Keeping Score*, edited by David Schwarz, Anahid Kassabian, and Lawrence Siegel, 107-26. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1997.
- Illson, Murray. "A U.S. Arts Board Is Endorsed Here." *New York Times*, April 15, 1956, 86.
- Javits, Jacob K. "Plan to Aid Our Laggin Culture." *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, April 5, 1959, 21ff.
- Jefferson, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, 12 volumes. Collected and Edited by Paul Leicester Ford. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.
- John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation. "Lists of Fellows." <http://www.gf.org/fellist.html>.
- Kauffman, Bill. "Subsidies to the Arts: Cultivating Mediocrity." *Cato Policy Analysis* No. 137 (August 8, 1990). Cato Institute. <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pal137.html>.
- Kearns, William. *Horatio Parker, 1863-1919: His Life, Music, and Ideas*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1990.

- Keller, Johanna, ed. *An Individual's Guide to Commissioning Music*. New York: Meet the Composer, 2003.
- Kirk, Elise K. *Music in the White House: A History of the American Spirit*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986.
- Lambert, Barbara. "Social music, Musicians, and Their Musical Instruments in and Around Colonial Boston." In *Music in Colonial Massachusetts, 1630-1820*, vol. II, edited by Barbara Lambert, 409-514. Boston: Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1985.
- Larson, Gary O. *The Reluctant Patron: The United States Government and the Arts, 1953-1965*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.
- Levy, Alan and Barbara L. Tischler. "Into the Cultural Mainstream: The Growth of American Music Scholarship." *American Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (March 1990): 57-73.
- Lipman, Samuel. *Arguing for Music, Arguing for Culture*. Boston: American Council for the Arts in association with D. R. Godine, 1990.
- Locke, Ralph. "The 'Grand Composers' of the Present Day: Betty Freeman Discusses How She Chooses and Supports Them." In *Cultivating Music in America: Women Patrons and Activists since 1860*, edited by Ralph Locke and Cyrilla Barr, 59-64. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- _____. "Living with Music: Isabella Stewart Gardner." In *Cultivating Music in America: Women Patrons and Activists since 1860*, edited by Ralph Locke and Cyrilla Barr, 90-121. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Locke, Ralph and Cyrilla Barr. "Patronage—and Women—in America's Musical Life." In *Cultivating Music in America: Women Patrons and Activists since 1860*, edited by Ralph Locke and Cyrilla Barr, 24-53. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- _____. "Music Patronage as a 'Female-Centered Cultural Process'." In *Cultivating Music in America: Women Patrons and Activists since 1860*, edited by Ralph Locke and Cyrilla Barr, 1-23. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Lowens, Irving. *Music and Musicians in Early America*. New York, 1964.
- Manchester, Arthur L. "Music Education, a Musical America, the American Composer, a Sequence." *Musical Quarterly* 10, no. 4 (October 1924): 587-95.
- Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc. Annual Report, 1962-1969*. New York: Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., 1969.
- Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc. Annual Report, 1969-1973*. New York: Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., 1973.

- Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc. Annual Report, 1973-1977.* New York: Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., 1977.
- Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc. Annual Report, 1978-1980.* New York: Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., 1980.
- Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc. Final Report, 1981-1984.* New York: Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, Inc., 1984.
- Mason, Daniel Gregory. "Democracy and Music." *Musical Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (October 1917): 641-57.
- Mathews, W. S. B. *A Hundred Years of American Music.* Chicago, 1889. Reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- Meet the Composer. "History and Mission," <http://www.meetthecomposer.org/about.htm>.
- Meltzer, Milton. *Violins and Shovels: The WPA Arts Projects.* New York: Delacorte Press, 1976.
- Menninger, Margaret Eleanor. "The Serious Matter of True Joy: Music and Cultural Philanthropy in Leipzig, 1781-1933." In *Philanthropy, Patronage, and Civil Society: Experiences from Germany, Great Britain, and North America*, edited by Thomas Adam, 120-37. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.
- Menotti, Gian-Carlo. "A Plea for the Creative Artist." *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, June 29, 1952, 8ff.
- Midgette, Anne. "Music Fit for a King, Written for a Dentist." *New York Times*, January 23, 2005, sec. 2, 1ff.
- Miller, Kiri. "Americanism Musically: Nation, Evolution, and Public Education at the Columbian Exposition, 1893." *19th-Century Music* 27, no. 2 (Fall 2003): 137-55.
- Mueller, John H. *The American Symphony Orchestra.* London: Calder, 1958.
- National Endowment for the Arts. *Annual Report* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1966-2004).
- _____. *How the United States Funds the Arts.* Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts, 2004.
- _____. *National Endowment for the Arts, 1965-2000: A Brief Chronology of Federal Support for the Arts.* Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts, 2000.
- O'Brien, Micheal J., *Pioneer Irish in New England.* New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1937.
- Oja, Carol J. *Making Music Modern.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Page, Tim. "Finale for a Music Fund Is Marked by a Concert." *New York Times*, November 30, 1982, C14.
- Pulitzer Prizes. "The Pulitzer Prize in Music: It's Time to Alter and Affirm; A Statement by the Pulitzer Prize Board, June 1, 2004." <http://www.pulitzer.org/EntryForms/musicchanges.pdf>.
- _____. "Pulitzer Prize in Music." Guidelines. <http://www.pulitzer.org/EntryForms/musicbbn.pdf>.
- Raynor, Henry. *Music and Society since 1815*. New York: Taplinger, 1978.
- _____. *A Social History of Music from the Middle Ages to Beethoven*. New York: Taplinger, 1978.
- Rockefeller Archive Center. "Martha Baird Rockefeller, 1985-1971." <http://archive.rockefeller.edu/bio/marthabaird.php>.
- Roell, Craig H. *The Piano in America, 1890-1940*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989.
- Rogers, Clara Kathleen. *The Story of Two Lives: Home, Friends, and Travel*. Norwood, MA: privately printed, 1932.
- Rorem, Ned. *Knowing When to Stop: A Memoir*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.
- Rossiter, Frank R. *Charles Ives and His America*. New York: Liveright, 1975.
- Rubin, Emanuel. "Jeannette Meyers Thurber and the National Conservatory of Music." *American Music* 8, no. 3 (Autumn, 1990): 294-325.
- Sabin, Robert. "The Dangers of Being a Destructive Reactionary." *Musical America* (February 1961): 60ff.
- Salzman, Eric. "Charles Ives, American." *Commentary* 46, no. 2 (August 1968): 37-43.
- Sargent, Winthrop. "The Inside Track." *New Yorker* (December 10, 1960): 231-3.
- _____. Letter to the Editor. *Musical America* (March 1961): 4.
- Schabas, Ezra. *Theodore Thomas: America's Conductor and Builder of Orchestras, 1835-1905*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989.
- Scholes, Percy A. *The Puritans and Music in England and New England*. London, 1934.
- Schuller, Gunther. *Musings: The Musical Worlds of Gunther Schuller*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

- Sciannameo, Franco. "Aspects of Alfano: Turandot, Mussolini, and the Second String Quartet," *Musical Times* 143 (Winter 2002): 27-41.
- Sealander, Judith. "Curing Evils at their Source: The Arrival of Scientific Giving." In *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, edited by Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie, 217-40. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Seroff, V. I. Review of *The Musical Experience of Composer, Performer, Listener*, by Roger Sessions. *New York Times Book Review*, April 29, 1951, 15.
- Sessions, Roger. *Reflections on the Music Life in the United States*. New York: Merlin Press, 1957.
- Shipton, Clifford K. Letter to the Editor. *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., vol. 9, no. 1 (January, 1952): 128-36.
- Simmons, R. C. *The American Colonies: From Settlement to Independence*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1976.
- Sloan, Irving J., ed. *James Buchanan, 1791-1868: Chronology, Documents, Bibliographic Aids*. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana Publications Inc., 1968.
- Smith, John. *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New England & the Summer Isles, Together with the True Travels, Adventures and Observations, and a Sea Grammar*. London: Michael Sparkes, 1625. Reprint, New York: Macmillan, 1907.
- Sonneck, Oscar. *Early Concert-Life in America*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1907.
- Stone, James H. "Mid-Nineteenth-Century American Beliefs in the Social Values of Music." *American Quarterly* 43 (January 1957): 38-49.
- Swafford, Jan. *Charles Ives: A Life with Music*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1996.
- Tawa, Nicholas E. *The Coming of Age of American Art Music: New England's Classical Romantics*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- Thomson, Virgil. *A Virgil Thomson Reader*. With an introduction by John Rockwell. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1981.
- Thoreau, Henry David. *Walden, or Life in the Woods*. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1854. Reprinted in Henry David Thoreau, *Walden, or Life in the Woods*, illustrated with 142 photographs, an introduction and interpretive comments by Edwin Way Teale, New York: Dodd, Mead, 1947.
- Tick, Judith. "Ruth (Porter) Crawford (Seeger)." In *Norton /Grove Dictionary of Women Composers*, edited by Julie Anne Sadie and Rhian Samuel, 131. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1994.

- Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. Edited by J. P. Mayer and Max Lerner. Translated by George Lawrence. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Topping, Seymour. "Joseph Pulitzer and the Pulitzer Prizes." The Pulitzer Prizes, Columbia University, <http://www.pulitzer.org/history.html>.
- Trompeter, Lisa Roma. "Patronage Then and Now." *Musical Courier* 159 (February 1959): 3.
- Trumbull, John. "Letter proposing a plan for the permanent encouragement of the fine arts: by the national government, addressed to the President of the United States." New York: printed by William Davis, Jr., 1827.
- U.S. Department of the Treasury. *Tax-Exempt Status for Your Organization*. Internal Revenue Service Publication No. 557. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2003.
- U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, *Art in the District of Columbia*. Executive Document 315. 41st Congress, 2nd session, 1871.
- Varèse, Louise. *Varèse: A Looking-Glass Diary*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1972.
- Wagner, Joseph. "A New Approach to an Old Problem," *Musical Courier* 156 (November 15, 1957): 7.
- Wainwright, Jonathan P. *Musical Patronage in Seventeenth-Century England: Christopher, First Baron Hatton (1605-1670)*. Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1997.
- Whitehill, Walter Muir. Letters to the Editor. *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., vol. 9, no. 1 (January, 1952): 128-36.
- Whitney, Julie. "Music 'in a Cage'." *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, August 8, 1954, 45.
- Winslow, Edward. "Certain Useful Directions for Such as Intend a Voyage to These Parts." In *Mourts Relation: A Relation of journall of the beginning and proceedings of the English Plantation settled at Plimoth in New England* (London, 1622). Available at Pilgrim Hall Museum, "It Came on the Mayflower?" <http://www.pilgrimhall.org/onmayfl.htm>.
- Wolf, Leonard. "A Bill to Establish a U.S. Arts Foundation." *U.S. Congressional Record*, 86th Congress, 1st Session (1959).
- Wood, Gordon S. *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, 1991.
- Woodfill, Walter L. "Patronage and Music in England." In *Aspects of the Renaissance: A Symposium*, edited by Archibald R. Lewis, 59-68. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1967.

Ziffirin, Marilyn. *Carl Ruggles: Composer, Painter, Storyteller* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994).

“Foundations.” *Musical America* 81 (January 1961): 365

“Foundations.” *Musical America* 82 (January 1962): 277-8.

“Rockefeller Fund Grants \$400,000 to Underwrite Contemporary Works for Five Years.” *Musical America* 73 (May 1953): 3.

“The Government Fine Art Commission.” *New York Times*, May 23, 1859, 4.

“Washington Matters.” *New York Times*, April 26, 1860, 1.

“A National Art Commission.” *New York Times Book Review*, August 21, 1897, 4.

“U.S. Aid for Music Is Urged in Forum.” *New York Times*, January 6, 1949, 28.

Vita

Paula J. Bishop
15 Wilkeson Way
Foxboro, Massachusetts 02035

Education

- 1980-1983 North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina
Bachelor of Science, Computer Science
- 1990-1992 Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts
Graduate courses in Computer Engineering and Computer Science
- 2001-2003 Wheaton College, Norton, Massachusetts
Undergraduate courses in Music
Received Garabedian Prize for Music for 2002-2003
- 2003-2005 Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts
Candidate for Master of Music in Musicology
Received Musicology Department Award for 2004-2005

Work Experience

- 1983-1986 Data General Corporation, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
Programmer
- 1986-1994 Phoenix Technologies Ltd., Norwood, Massachusetts
Principal Engineer, Software Engineering Manager
- 1994-1997 Foundation Designs, Inc., Norwood, Massachusetts
Principal Engineer
- 1998-2004 Original Congregational Church, Wrentham, Massachusetts
Children's Choir Director