

University of Wisconsin Library
Manuscript Theses

Unpublished theses submitted for the Master's and Doctor's degrees and deposited in the University of Wisconsin Library are open for inspection, but are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors. Bibliographical references may be noted, but passages may be copied only with the permission of the authors, and proper credit must be given in subsequent written or published work. Extensive copying or publication of the thesis in whole or in part requires also the consent of the Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin.

This thesis by Leroy August Cappert
has been used by the following persons, whose signatures attest their acceptance of the above restrictions.

A Library which borrows this thesis for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.

NAME AND ADDRESS

DATE

GOVERNMENT AND MUSIC
A STUDY OF THE FEDERAL MUSIC PROJECT (1935-1941)

BY

LEROY AUGUST CAPPAERT

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
(History)
at the
University of Wisconsin

1951

AWM
C1734

765880

DEC 13 1939

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	i
Chapter I	1
"Musicians Seek Federal Patronage, 1890-1935"	
Chapter II	19
"The Establishment of the Federal Music Project"	
Chapter III	29
"Contemporary Reaction to the Federal Music Project"	
Chapter IV	51
"The Federal Music Project in Wisconsin, 1935-1939"	
Bibliography	64

PREFACE

The Federal Music Project (1935-1941) occupies a unique position in the history of music in the United States. As part of a larger program embracing many fields of the fine arts, the Federal Music Project marks the first large-scale attempt of the United States Government to recognize the aesthetic needs of man.

The Federal Music Project was created as a work relief agency in a time of distress. The program was designed to employ destitute musicians. It sought to achieve the application of the New Deal philosophy to aesthetics as other work relief projects did in economic and social matters.

Prior to 1935 there had been no national bureau to buy the surplus product of singers, players, and composers as the Farm Board purchased surplus wheat. Some felt that it was fortunate that the government left this part of man's life alone. On the other hand, there were many who contended that it was not sufficient for the government to supply only the physical needs of man-- indeed, they argued that the character of a nation is not measured by its trade balances alone, but mainly by its culture. The establishment of the Federal Music Project pointed to the partial recognition, by the United States Government, that the creative spirit, which is intimately associated with the arts, is an extremely important and sustaining force in the growth and preservation

of society itself.

*

*

*

The Federal Music Project was established for a dual purpose. It was designed to extend relief to unemployed musicians; and, in the minds of administrative officials, the program presented the opportunity to extend the arts to the people.

There is an absence of sufficient materials in the University of Wisconsin's libraries pertaining to the administrative features of the Federal Music Project. For this reason the scope of Chapter II (The Establishment of the Federal Music Project) is limited primarily to materials available in secondary sources. It should also be pointed out that, because of the limitations of materials, there has been no attempt made throughout the paper to evaluate the operation of the Federal Music Project as a relief agency.

In this paper, the purpose, as stated by administrative officials, to extend the arts to the people is emphasized. I have attempted to present the cultural implications of the program as revealed through the examination of contemporary periodicals, newspapers, and government documents and publications.

In the first chapter of this thesis I have tried to show how the growth of interest in music in the United States had been a product of private enterprise and initiative.

How, by the 1930's, the music interest group had grown large enough to be considered in a national crisis.

Chapter I

MUSICIANS SEEK FEDERAL PATRONAGE, 1890-1935

Prior to the establishment of the Federal Music Project the United States Government had not actively patronized music on a large scale. The United States Government had limited its patronage of music to accepting gifts, sponsoring military bands, and providing materials for the scholar in the Music Division of the Library of Congress. The United States Government has not found it necessary to support or direct the aesthetic needs of the individual. It has concentrated on supporting the economic and physical desires of man more than providing for his aesthetic needs.¹

In this limited sponsorship of art, painting, sculpture, and architecture have been more frequently subsidized by the government than music. This is possibly true because the end product is concrete. A painting, statue, or building requires only the spectator and the work of art. A building once conceived by the artist need be constructed only once. Furthermore, these forms of art (painting, sculpture, and architecture) entail no further cost other than the original expense. The United States Government has long patronized these artists because of the

1. Ralph E. Purcell, Government and Art in the United States (University of Wisconsin, 1949), unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Mr. Purcell laments that the United States Government has not undertaken the support of the Fine Arts.

need for public buildings and for statues and paintings with which to adorn the buildings.²

The art of music provides neither the immediate necessity for shelter nor a permanent work of art to adorn government buildings. Government sponsorship of music would require not only the purchase of the composition but an ever-recurring expense of performance. The performance of music makes necessary an auditorium, rehearsals, and musicians. With all of this preparation, the same performance can never be heard again. It remains a memory. The essential distinction between the very nature of music and the graphic arts is expressed in the following poem by Flora Garris, a Federal Music Project musician:

You--who modeled clay
And all but brought to life
The figures that today
Still seem to be alive,
Your work will always be
A thing to touch, to see.

You--who painted dreams
And drew with skillful hands
The people and the scenes
Of near and distant lands,
Your work will always live
Forever pleasure give.

You--who wrote in verse
And sent thoughts of the best,
Throughout the universe
With honor shall be blest,
Your work on printed page
Will linger, age on age.

2. Loc. cit.

You--who acted parts
 And you whose voice once rang
 And you who stirred our hearts
 With music, There's the pang!
 Your work must always be
 A glorious memory!³

The absence of any broad government music program, prior to 1935, can be explained in part because of the huge expenditure of money that would be required. Of more importance, perhaps, is the refusal of the government to recognize the aesthetic needs of man as a governmental responsibility.⁴ Some musicians, music critics, and music organizations have expressed the desire that the government subsidize their art. This desire, however, did not find strong support until 1932 during the economic depression.

There had not been any concerted effort on the part of any group to seek governmental sponsorship for music until the last decade of the Nineteenth Century. This can be explained on the grounds that prior to 1865 there was very little recognition of the social and educational importance of music. A great change occurred, however, between 1865-1890. Prior to 1865 music teaching had not been recognized

3. Flora Garris, "Toast to Artists," Record of the WPA, Federal Music Project, Narrative report for Wisconsin, August 2, 1937 (Washington, 1951), National Archives.

4. Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians, III, ed. by J. A. Fuller Maitland (New York, 1910), 466.

as a true educational "profession". Between 1865 and 1900 the total number of American music teachers increased prodigiously, and their geographical distribution became extensive.⁵ The increasing number of music teachers was paralleled by the growth of music teachers' associations, both national and local.

Numerous music schools were opened during this period (1865-1890) to train the increasing number of teachers. The New England Conservatory was founded in 1867 and set a pattern for the specialized music education institutions.⁶ It was followed by the Cincinnati Conservatory (1867), the Chicago Musical College (1867), the Peabody Conservatory in Baltimore (1868), the Philadelphia Musical Academy (1869), the Cleveland Conservatory (1871), the Detroit Conservatory (1874), the College of Music in Cincinnati (1878), the New York College of Music (1878), the Cleveland School of Music (1884), the National Conservatory in New York (1885), the Chicago Conservatory (1885), the Northwestern Conservatory in Minneapolis (1885), and the American Conservatory in Chicago (1886).⁷

A large number of colleges and universities recognized the importance of music and established chairs of music or

5. Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians, American Supplement, ed. by W. S. Pratt and C. N. Boyd (Philadelphia, 1920), 33.

6. Loc. cit. Louis C. Elson, History of American Music (New York, 1904). In this book Mr. Elson describes the courses offered at many of these institutions.

7. Grove's, American Supplement, 34.

hired part-time music instructors. In 1862 J. K. Paine was appointed music instructor at Harvard College, and other important appointments followed at other institutions with F. L. Ritter at Vassar College in 1867, J. C. Fillmore at Ripon College in 1868, M. W. Chase/^{at}Hillsdale College in 1869, Thomas A. Becket at Girard College in 1870, Max Piutti at Wells College in 1874, H. A. Clarke at the University of Pennsylvania and F. A. Parker at the University of Wisconsin in 1875, Willard Kimball at Grinnel College in 1875, G. W. Chadwick at Olivet College in 1876, W. H. Schultze at Syracuse University in 1877, B. C. Blodgett at Smith College in 1878, C. B. Cady at the University of Michigan and Louis Lisser at Mills College in 1880.⁸ Both the collegiate and independent institutions were of primary importance in providing a broad base for the music culture of the Twentieth Century.

In addition to the collegiate music departments and the conservatories many other movements during the last decades of the Nineteenth Century gave impetus to the growth of the social status of music in the United States. Although public school music was established, for the first time, as early as 1838 (by Lowell Mason), no real general interest is found among the public to support public school music

8. Ibid., 35-36.

until the 1900's.⁹ Numerous music choral groups and festival societies were founded between 1880-1900.¹⁰ Also founded before 1900 were two of the leading present-day music organizations. The Music Teachers' National Association was founded in 1876 and has held annual sessions throughout the country ever since. The American Federation of Musicians was founded in 1895 and has been of great importance in the history of American music. The period between 1860-1900 witnessed the birth of many music institutions and music movements that were of great importance to the social and political status of the art of music in the Twentieth Century.

More people were receiving music instruction in 1900 than in 1860. In spite of the increased popular interest in music, the major music organizations were dependent upon the well-to-do for support. This is still true of present-day organizations. Musicians have long sought and welcomed this patronage of the wealthy, but have been more desirous of obtaining popular support. The growing number of flourishing music organizations may have been one reason for the request that the government patronize music.¹¹ The request

9. Louis C. Elson, op. cit., 87.

10. Ibid., 73-93.

11. John Dewey, in 1940, stated that "the more the arts flourish, the more they belong to all persons alike, without regard to wealth, birth, race, or creed; the more they flourish, the less they are privately owned and the more they are possessed and enjoyed by all... How...can an all-round and complete citizenry be developed without that development of creation and enjoyment of works of art to which the Government itself must contribute?" Congressional Record, 86

that the public or government support the art of music was brought forward for the first time in 1890.

Mr. Ellwood Gibson, Senator from New York, introduced a bill on December 8, 1890 to incorporate the National Conservatory of Music of America.¹² This bill instigated by Mrs. Jeanette Thurber, wealthy Philadelphia music-lover, finds its roots in the American School of Opera. The American School of Opera was established September 17, 1885. Its first quarters were on East 17th Street in New York. The incorporators of the school were a group of wealthy men in America and included W. R. Grace, August Belmont, W. K. Vanderbilt, Henry G. Marquand, Parke Godwin, Andrew Carnegie, Richard Irvin, Jr., Joseph W. Drexel, William G. Choate, Theodore Thomas, Jesse Seligman, and F. B. Thurber.¹³ The American Opera Company was designed to present grand opera in English with artistic perfection and, so far as possible, with American singers.¹⁴ Theodore Thomas was artistic director and the orchestra consisted of members of the

Congress, 1 session, part 15, 2477. Remarks by John Dewey over the NBC network April 25, 1940--a program in honor of American artists who have contributed toward decorations in U.S. Federal buildings.

12. Congressional Record, 51 Congress, 2 session, 3916. Hereafter this bill will be referred to as the "Thurber Bill."

13. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, A Bill to Provide a Site for the National Conservatory of Music of America, 70 Congress, 1 session, H. R. 8894 (February 8, 1928), 15-16.

14. International Cyclopedia of Music and Musicians, 5th edition, edited by Oscar Thompson and Nicolas Slonimsky (New York: 1949), 534.

New York Philharmonic.¹⁵ It is probable that the expense of maintaining a full opera company was too great because in 1887, after 66 performances, Mrs. Thurber decided not to continue the opera company and in its place organized the National Conservatory of Music of America.¹⁶

The National Conservatory of Music of America was founded with the object of providing all the advantages of European schools on a thoroughly practical basis.¹⁷ It was the dream of Mrs. Thurber to build in the United States an institution patterned after the Paris Conservatoire.¹⁸ She desired that a fine music library be included in the school and that instruction be given in all branches of music. It was her hope that musicians need not be imported from Europe and that a truly indigenous music culture might be cultivated here in the United States. This hope was not the sole property of Mrs. Thurber, however, for the same thoughts were expressed in many of the music periodicals of the day. In 1891, almost every issue of the Musical Record contained a letter in the "Editor's Letter Box" asking for a fair trial for the American composer.¹⁹ Other periodicals including Musical Leader, Music Review, Musical Echo, Musical Courier, Music (Chicago), sought, editorially, to urge the cultivation of

15. Loc. cit.

16. Loc. cit.

17. House Hearings, A Bill to Provide a Site for the National Conservatory of Music, 70 Congress, 1 session (February 8, 1928), 16.

18. Grace Overmyer, Government and the Arts (New York: 1939), 158.

19. Musical Record, ed. by Dexter Smith (Boston; 1891-92).

native talent.²⁰ The movement by Mrs. Thurber to establish a national conservatory of music was the first to seek recognition by the government.

The Thurber Bill was passed by both houses and on March 3, 1891 received the approval of President Harrison.²¹ No appropriations were sought, or made, in the passage of this Act. It provided only for the incorporation of the National Conservatory of Music of America and the right for this conservatory to be located in Washington, D. C.²²

The movement started by Mrs. Thurber to establish a national conservatory in Washington was never, in its long history, successful. Mrs. Thurber had received recognition when Congress incorporated the National Conservatory of Music of America, but she further desired that the United States Government provide a building site in Washington. Apparently she felt that a national conservatory could not have any prestige unless it was sponsored by the United States Government.

Mrs. Thurber started out with the ambitious undertaking of securing the services of Antonin Dvorak, celebrated Czech composer, as director of the school.²³ Dr. Dvorak

20. These periodicals are on file at the Wisconsin State Historical Library.

21. Congressional Record, 51 Congress, 2 session, 3916.

22. Loc. cit.

23. Brainard's Musical Record, XXIX March, 1892.

Dr. Dvorak accepted the contract which provided that he teach only the advanced students and that he direct four concerts per year. His salary was fixed at \$15,000, and he was to be given a four months vacation per year.

remained director of the school for only three years (1892-1895) and returned to Europe. Many distinguished musicians served on the staff of the National Conservatory. Among the outstanding teachers were Mme. Fursch-Madi, B. O. Klein, Adele Margulies, Joseffy, James G. Huneker, Henry T. Finck, S. P. Warren, Victor Herbert, Anton Seidl, Frank van der Stucken, Leo Schulz, Leopold Lichtenberg, and Mas Spicker.²⁴ Until 1915 tuition was free and the entire cost of maintenance was borne by Mrs. Thurber and others.²⁵ Mrs. Thurber had put a great deal of money and effort into her attempt to establish a national conservatory. She had been successful in establishing a school in New York, but was unable to obtain a government grant of land to construct a conservatory in Washington.

There is no evidence of any opposition (other than governmental) to the Thurber Bill until 1919. Earlier, in 1894, the United States Government had refused to award a building site to Mrs. Thurber and further suggested that the bill be postponed indefinitely.²⁶ In 1919, however, a new bill requesting the establishment of a national conservatory of music was placed in the Senate by Senator Fletcher of

²⁴. International Cyclopedia of Music and Musicians, op. cit., 1231.

²⁵. Loc. cit.

²⁶. Senate Report, #570, A Bill to Provide a Building Site for the National Conservatory of Music of America, 53 Congress, 2 session.

Florida.²⁷ The author of the Fletcher Bill, Mr. Jacob Hayman of New York, complained that the Thurber Bill permitted too much power to remain in the hands of a board of managers (headed by Mrs. Thurber) with no governmental control. In place of the Thurber Bill Mr. Hayman suggested the adoption of the Fletcher Bill which provided for an advisory board of directors and a general board of regents that would include government officials.²⁸ The Fletcher Bill also provided for the establishment of branch conservatories in various parts of the country.²⁹ In general, the proponents of the Fletcher Bill argued that branches of the national conservatory should be so placed as to offer an opportunity to Americans from all parts of the country.³⁰

From 1920 to 1930 the movement to establish a national conservatory of music was further complicated by a third group sponsoring a conservatory bill. This bill was introduced by Representative Bacon in 1924.³¹ It provided for

27. Congressional Record, 66 Congress, 1 session, 150. This bill was instigated by Mr. Jacob Hayman of New York. Mr. Hayman represented the American Federation of Musicians and several other music organizations.

28. House Hearings, A Bill to Create a Commission to Ascertain the Feasibility of Establishing a National Conservatory of Music, 68 Congress, 1 session (March 25, 1924), 28.

29. Loc. cit. The general board of regents was to include the President, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on Education of the House.

30. Ibid., 29.

31. House Hearings, A Bill to Create a Commission..., op. cit., 1-32.

the creation of a commission to ascertain whether or not it would be feasible to establish a national conservatory of music in the United States.³² The commissioners were to serve without salary, but an appropriation of \$20,000 was sought to defray the expenses of the investigation.³³

It seems impossible, from the evidence examined, to understand why these three groups opposed each other. All desired the establishment of a national conservatory of music. They all emphasized the need for the United States to declare her musical independence from Europe. While realizing that American children were receiving music instruction in the public schools, they wanted the government to provide further instruction for the talented students after they graduated from the public schools. The proponents of the Fletcher Bill, the Thurber Bill, and the Bacon Bill agreed that a national conservatory of music should be established, but could not agree to the method of organization and operation.³⁴

The larger and more important issue that was discussed at the various hearings for all of the conservatory bills was the relationship of the government to art. Senator Fletcher of Florida stated that it was time that the United States Government declare her musical independence

32. Ibid., 2.

33. Loc. cit.

34. The Fletcher Bill was introduced to every session of Congress from 1919 to 1931. It was introduced for the last time in 1937. The Thurber Bill was introduced numerous times from 1891 to 1937.

and that our government should extend its leadership "beyond commerce and industry and material enterprises into the fields of science, literature, philosophy, drama, and music".³⁵ Mr. Jacob Hayman of New York declared, in the same vein, that "it should be the policy of this Government to develop our own American resources in other respects".³⁶ Ernest Hutcheson, Dean of Juilliard School of Music, gave strong support to the movement in 1935 to establish a Department of Science, Art, and Literature. He sounded a note of warning when he testified that "Nations retain their fame in history and their influence on mankind by spiritual achievements, not by their material wealth or temporal power..."³⁷ Countless similar testimonies given at hearings could be quoted. Basically they all agree that it is a governmental duty to protect, preserve, and encourage the growth of art as an intangible, but nonetheless precious, resource.

The enthusiasm of artists for governmental patronage did not blind them to the possible consequent evils. The proponents of the Bacon Bill wanted a commission established with the express purpose of studying the "feasibility" of a

35. Senate Hearings, A Bill to Establish..., 68 Congress, 1 session, 4.

36. Ibid., 4.

37. Hearings before the Committee on Patents, H. J. Res. 200, Providing for the establishment of an executive department to be known as the Department of Science, Art, and Literature", 74 Congress, 1 session, 128.

national conservatory.³⁸ Ernest Hutcheson, Dean of Juilliard School of Music, admitted that his enthusiasm for a Department of Fine Arts was accompanied by a slight fear of the political influences that might creep in.³⁹ Herbert Witherspoon, Director of the Cincinnati Conservatory of Music, pledged warm support toward a Department of Science, Art, and Literature, but warned the Committee on Patents that there was much general fear among his friends about putting such an undertaking in danger of politics.⁴⁰ In spite of the fear of political entanglements, most artists agreed with Mr. Witherspoon that a bureau of fine arts and a national conservatory could do an enormous amount of good for the country at large and for music in particular.⁴¹

While it may be true that some musicians desired a national conservatory for personal and selfish reasons, an overwhelming number emphasized the practical necessity of governmental patronage. Until 1930 it was necessary for young musicians of talent to go to Europe to finish their training. Prior to World War I, it was estimated that 15,000 young men and women studied music and art in foreign countries and were spending millions of dollars annually for their education.⁴² Mr. Jacob Hayman, testifying in

38. House Hearings, A Bill to Create..., op.cit., 1.

39. Hearings on H. G. Res. 200, Providing for..., op.cit., 128.

40. Ibid., 316.

41. Loc.cit.

42. Senate Hearings, A Bill to Establish..., 68 Congress, 1 session, 6.

favor of the Fletcher Bill, emphasized the expensiveness of a musical education and pointed out that we were squandering money in Europe and wasting talent in the United States.⁴³

Of great importance to the artist was the gradual decrease of wealthy patrons of the arts. Arthur H. Compton, University of Chicago, in 1935 suggested that because of the "tendencies of our economic organization...toward more equal distribution of wealth, the arts and sciences cannot look forward in the future to support on anything like the same scale from individual patrons that they have received during the past generation".⁴⁴ Only three years earlier Catherine Baily Smith, music-reviewer for the Christian Science Monitor, complained that music, in its less popular forms has always been treated as "the plaything and hobby of wealth and social aspiration".⁴⁵ It seems somewhat ironic that later, in the same article, Miss Smith suggests that the death of Mrs. Edith Rockefeller McCormick and the collapse of the Insull finances were most instrumental in the demise of the Chicago Civic Opera Company.⁴⁶ With the loss of wealthy private patrons, musicians and music organizations could only turn to the public, or government,

^{43.} Ibid., 7.

^{44.} Hearings on H. J. Res. 200, Providing for..., op.cit., 4.

^{45.} Catherine Bailey Smith, "Music", American Yearbook, 1932, 877-8.

^{46.} Loc.cit.

for support.⁴⁷

Sponsorship of music by the United States Government, while not extensive, prior to 1935 has not been totally negligible. Of great importance particularly to music scholarship and in general to American culture was the Music Division of the Library of Congress. The Music Division, created in 1897, soon became one of the three or four best collections of its kind in the world. It was to prove of inestimable value to musicologists and historians of American music. The Music Division of the Library of Congress not only made its collection available to the public but engaged in active historical research. It has published scholarly reports on American dramatic music, American opera, American and South American folk music (including the recording of many folk songs), and on some of the American composers.⁴⁸

The United States Government has indirectly patronized music by the acceptance, in 1925, of the Coolidge Chamber Music Foundation.⁴⁹ This gift of Mrs. Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge included a chamber music hall, erected at a cost of \$100,000 in a courtyard of the Library of Congress, an

⁴⁷. To test the truth of this statement one needs only turn to the present-day appeal for public donations by the Metropolitan Opera Company.

⁴⁸. U. S. Library of Congress, Report of the Librarian of Congress for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1937 (Washington, 1937).

⁴⁹. United States Statutes at Large, XLIII, part I, 788-9.

endowment for a biennial chamber music festival in Washington, and an unusual prize for an original composition in chamber music form.⁵⁰ Although the auditorium was dedicated to the performance of chamber music, Mrs. Coolidge also made it available (at the discretion of the Librarian, and the chief of the music division) for any other suitable purposes, secondary to the needs of the music division.⁵¹

In spite of the excellent activities of the Library of Congress, the acceptance of gifts from philanthropic citizens, and the maintenance of military bands, the United States Government, prior to 1935, had done very little for the aesthetic needs of man.

Within the first three decades of the Twentieth Century, however, the vigorous growth of the music profession produced an interest group big enough and important enough to be considered in a national crisis or emergency. The powerful American Federation of Musicians, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, had 739 locals with 140,000 members and maintained an active lobby in Washington.⁵² Also important and capable of influencing legislation was the Arts Union Conference. This organization, comprised of twenty-five of the most important trade

50. Grace Overmyer, Government and the Arts (New York, 1939), 152-53.

51. United States Statutes at Large, XLIII, part I, 788-9.

52. International Musician, XXXVIII (June, 1939).

unions, represented over 100,000 persons engaged in all of the fine arts.⁵³ Pierre Key's Music Yearbook, 1938 listed 159 music organizations of national membership or of national scope in some phase of activity.⁵⁴ In 1890 there were only three major symphony orchestras, but in 1930 seventeen professional symphony orchestras, with annual budgets exceeding \$100,000, were flourishing.⁵⁵ The advent of radio, too, aided materially the growth of interest in music. Sixty-seven percent of all broadcasting time was devoted to music. And the broadcasts commanded an audience of sixty million persons.

The music profession in 1935 was strong enough to seek federal patronage. The exigencies of the depression years gave the musicians an opportunity to ask for aid. As a result, the United States Government inaugurated a temporary Four Arts Projects that offered economic assistance to a large contingent of the country's working artists and at the same time endeavored to extend the arts to a new public.

53. Senate Hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, 75 Congress, 3 session (May 17, 1938), 252. Local 802 (New York) of the American Federation of Musicians belonged to this organization. Also members of the Arts Union Conference were the Association of Actors, Artists of America, Actors Equity Association, United Scenic Artists, United American Artists, and the American Newspaper Guild. All of the unions in the conference had members who were employed by the WPA Federal Arts Projects.

54. Pierre Key, Music Yearbook, 1938 (New York).

55. Dorin K. Antrim, "Musical Culture Now Centers in America," International Musician, XXXVIII (March, 1940).

Chapter II

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FEDERAL MUSIC PROJECT

In August, 1935, with the establishment of Federal Project Number One, the United States government became a patron of the arts on a mass scale. The vastness of the program, both in creative artists employed and in money expended, made "Uncle Sam" a patron of the arts unequalled even in the days of Greece, Rome, Renaissance Italy, or Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century France.¹ Federal Project Number One consisted of five separate departments: Federal Art Project, Federal Theater Project, Federal Writers Project, Federal Music Project, and the Historical Records Division. Each project was designed to employ personnel of various talents; i.e., the Federal Music Project employed composers, singers, instrumentalists, music teachers, copyists, conductors, etc.

Prior to Federal Project Number One, the patronage of the fine arts by the United States government had been almost negligible. Artists, in general, were left to seek a private patron or to earn their living by doing work not directly associated with their talents. Economic aid had been granted in many forms--land grants, research foundations, Public Works Administration, subsidizing of agriculture, etc.

1. Grace Overmyer, Government and the Arts (New York, 1939), 109-10.

Education had been patronized by the United States government as a social responsibility. Yet, notwithstanding numerous attempts to establish a department of fine arts, art in the United States had been left to shift for itself. It was with the inauguration of the Federal Arts Projects that the United States departed from what had been, in the area of the fine arts, a comparatively strict policy of "laissez-faire".

The Federal Arts Projects were organized primarily as a relief measure. They were, in purpose, temporary measures designed to take artists off the relief rolls and to employ them in their professions. Previous emergency programs of work relief had provided work for professional people in different sections of the country, but the Works Progress Administration Project Number One was the first to organize a complete and carefully planned national effort to put every artist, musician, writer, and actor on work relief.²

The Administrative Pattern

Control of the Federal Music Project, from 1935-1939,

2. New York Times, September 15, 1935. An advisory committee was named by Harry Hopkins, WPA administrator, to assist and advise Dr. Sokoloff, Federal Music Project director. Walter Damrosch, Leopold Stowkowski, Lawrence Tibbett, Olin Downes, Paul Whiteman, George Gershwin, and Paul Weber were among the members of this committee.

was highly centralized.³ Dr. Nicolai Sokoloff, nationally known symphony orchestra conductor, was appointed national director of the project.⁴ He was responsible only to Harry Hopkins, titular head of the Federal Arts Projects. The forty-eight states were divided into ten regions and a regional director was appointed for each region. Unlike most WPA projects, the Federal Music Projects did not have to seek local sponsorship and consequently were not responsible to local or state officials. The regional directors reported directly to the Washington office of Dr. Sokoloff. This unusual control was explained because of the "peculiar professional and technical requirements" in the four artistic fields.⁵

From a highly centralized office such as that of Dr. Sokoloff's one might have expected a consistent policy. The very nature of the relief program, however, made a consistent policy difficult, if not impossible. As a result

3. The National Youth Administration and the Federal Arts Projects were the only WPA activities organized separately from the WPA state administrations. Arthur W. Macmahon, The Administration of Work Relief (Chicago, 1941).

4. Dr. Nikolai Gregorovitch Sokoloff was born May 28, 1886 in Kieff, Russia. He studied at the Yale School of Music and with Martin Loeffler and subsequently became a member of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. In 1916 he conducted the Philharmonic Orchestra of San Francisco, and two years later became conductor of the Cleveland Orchestra, continuing in that post from 1918 to 1932. International Cyclopedia of Musicians, Fifth edition, edited by Nicolas Slonimsky and Oscar Thompson (New York, 1949), 1748.

5. Arthur W. Macmahon, Work Relief, 253.

of the piece-meal legislation on which the WPA had to depend throughout its entire course, the WPA had a hand-to-mouth existence. The Federal Music Project officials were unable to plan any definite program. Nine times during its first six years the WPA had to ask Congress for money to continue its operations.⁶

A consistent policy for the Federal Arts Projects was also made difficult because they were constantly being made a target of political machinations.⁷ Throughout its entire existence, the Federal Arts Projects were often subject to severe criticism because they were part of the New Deal program. Some critics in criticizing the New Deal referred in general to all white collar projects as "boondoggling".⁸ As early as 1936, numerous charges were made questioning the influence of the Workers Alliance, a Communist-dominated union of relief workers.⁹ The charges of Communistic influence, repeated in 1939, were partially

6. Donald S. Howard, The WPA and Federal Policy (New York, 1943), 107.

7. Arthur W. Macmahon, Work Relief, 253.

8. House Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, First Deficiency Appropriation Bill for 1936, 74 Congress, 2 session, April 8, 1936, 102 et seq. Harry Hopkins pointed out to this committee that 100-150 projects had been singled out for specific criticism. Yet, these 150 projects were a small part of the vast group of 170,000 projects. He reasoned that a 2% spoilage was not considered excessive and concluded that such criticism was unfair.

9. Loc.cit.

responsible for the elimination of the Theater Project and for a complete reorganization of the remaining projects.¹⁰

In 1939 the Federal Music Project was absorbed into the regular WPA hierarchy. Local sponsorship had to be found for all projects or they would lose all financial aid from the national government. Dr. Sokoloff remained director of the Federal Music Project (now called the WPA music program) and he was placed in the Washington Division of Professional and Service Projects. It is pointed out by Donald S. Howard, WPA official and historian, that those who wished to see the WPA eliminated from participation in the creative arts had hoped that the insistence on local sponsorship would achieve this result.¹¹

The Problem of Relief

In August, 1935, the Works Progress Administration allocated twenty-seven million dollars to the Federal Arts Projects.¹² After four months of operation approximately

10. House Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Investigation and Study of the Works Progress Administration, part I, 76 Congress, 1 session, 203. The charges of communistic influence in the Federal Arts Projects were concentrated on the projects in New York City. Although the music projects were not excluded, the primary targets were the Federal Theater Projects and the Federal Writers Projects. Arthur W. Macmahon, Work Relief, 256.

11. Donald S. Howard, WPA, 140. Actually the insistence on local sponsorship did not harm the program--this will be fully explained in Chapter III.

12. New York Times, October 11, 1935.

forty-thousand men and women were employed on Federal Arts Projects. Of this number, Dr. Sokoloff reported that twelve thousand musicians were at work.¹³ The appropriation for the Federal Arts Projects was designed to provide useful work at usual occupations for those on relief.¹⁴ Ninety per cent of the personnel employed by the Federal Arts Projects had to be taken from the relief rolls.¹⁵ Because of this the Federal Music Project failed to provide employment for all unemployed musicians.

Numerous private organizations endeavored to aid unemployed musicians, who were not on relief, during the depression. In New York City the Musicians Emergency Fund, Inc., was organized as early as 1931. By October, 1935, this group alone had aided more than 4,500 musicians and were launching a new campaign to collect fifteen thousand dollars.¹⁶ Dr. Sokoloff, speaking at a meeting of this group, urged them to continue their aid to unemployed musicians. He pointed out that "hundreds of musicians... are not eligible for public relief..." and that private agencies must support them if "a valuable part of the musical culture of this country is not to be destroyed".¹⁷

13. Report on the Works Program, March 16, 1936, 34.

14. New York Times, September 15, 1935.

15. Ibid., October 11, 1935.

16. New York Times, October 17, 1935. A committee of this group reported that 2,567 musicians were on the present rolls.

17. Loc.cit.

Dual Purpose of the Federal Music Project

It was apparent from the beginning of the projects that the extension of the arts to the people was to be an important factor in the minds of the administrative officials. Mrs. Hallie Flanagan, national director of the Federal Theater Project, indicated the importance of the cultural and social values of the program saying, "While the immediate aim is to put artists back to work...one of the far more reaching purposes is to create theater enterprises of lasting value."¹⁸ Bruce McClure, director of Professional and Service Projects, also advocated this idea by saying that "the program will provide encouragement to the free growth of artistic expression and will make the finest products of our native artistic genius available to everyone."¹⁹ Harry Hopkins, administrative head of the Federal Arts Projects, pointed out the double purpose of the program:

We think, for instance, that music is important and art is important; that instead of being the sole privilege of a few rich people, they can well be extended to all of the people; and undoubtedly we have killed two birds with one stone. We have given relief to a needy person and we have extended music and the arts to the people.²⁰

-
18. New York Times, October 11, 1935.
19. Ibid., September 15, 1935.
20. Senate and House Hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, 73 Congress, 2 session.

Although the primary purpose of the Federal Music Project was to extend relief to the unemployed musicians, the cultural and social purposes received greater emphasis in contemporary literature. The emphasis on cultural and social values of the program can be attributed, in part, to the press releases given by the Federal Music Project officials. In almost all the statements given to the press by Dr. Sokoloff he reasserted the cultural and social values of the program. It is also possible that because the Federal Music Project was an emergency relief program, rather than a permanent establishment, contemporary sources such as musical periodicals, music critics, and musicians avoided any extensive discussion of the program's possible political and economic consequences. Almost all of these critics agreed on the necessity of a permanent social and cultural program. Apparently they felt that the social and cultural need must first be realized, and that the problems of organization could be solved later.

Federal Music Project Condemned as Part of the New Deal

There is very little comment, in contemporary accounts, that pertain specifically to the administration of the Federal Music Project.²¹ Indeed, on the whole, statements pertaining to the administrative set-up of the program were

21. One notable exception is the International Musician. This will be fully treated in the next chapter.

often colored by political prejudices that either vigorously supported or condemned the New Deal program in all respects. In this connection, Senator Dickinson of Iowa filled a page of the Congressional Record with a sweeping condemnation of the New Deal and citing the Federal Music Project as the newest child of this socialistic parent.²² Tom Freegaard Kelly, in the Nation's Business, was even more vitriolic in his condemnation of the relief program and called a great portion of the unemployed population of the United States "America's Happy Unemployables." He feared the results for a nation that would patronize any unemployed persons in its ranks--"We citizens of the United States are proud of our pioneering forefathers, and of the heritage of independence and progress they have given us. Can we who now carry the standard expect from our children such admiration?"²³ Fortunately, the preceding statements, and many others of similar nature, were not directed at the achievements or failures of the Federal Music Project, but were intended, primarily, to condemn the New Deal.²⁴

*

*

*

In a large number of articles pertaining to the Federal

22. Congressional Record, 74 Congress, 1 session, Volume 79, part II, 2472-5.

23. Tom F. Kelley, "America's Happy Unemployables," Nation's Business, June 1936, 130.

24. See p. 4 for additional examples.

Arts Projects found in newspapers, periodicals, government publications, and secondary sources, the cultural and social values of music are emphasized. The Federal Music Project provided a concrete medium through which critics could discuss and evaluate the place of music in American life.

Prior to the organization of the Federal Music Project, the place of music in the life of Americans was measured largely by the actions of a few privately endowed institutions such as symphonies and private schools. In contrast, the Federal Music Project was designed to cover nearly all of the forty-eight states and included projects that ranged from composer forums to music librarians and from highly trained string-ensembles performing in choice metropolitan locations to the recording of folk-songs in the "hinterlands." The extensiveness of this program provoked the expression of numerous opinions by people in all walks of life.

Chapter III

CONTEMPORARY REACTION TO THE FEDERAL MUSIC PROJECT

With the announcement of the Federal Music program from Washington, two music critics of the New York Times recognized the cultural and social implications of the project. Frank L. Kluckhorn wrote, "Under the Federal Music Project a new aesthetic crusade is alunched." He agreed with the artistic branches of the Works Progress Administration that enforced idleness or the wrong kind of work for trained creative artists destroyed something that the United States could not afford to lose; and he looked upon the efforts of Federal Project Number One as preserving an intangible, but nonetheless precious, national resource.¹ Olin Downes, in the same vein, announced: "Now, thanks to the newly organized Federal Music Project...the government is endeavoring to aid not only musicians, but music." Downes, in agreement with Kluckhorn, felt that the Federal Music Project could have a powerful and highly beneficial influence upon the development of music and on cultural life in the United States.²

Some writers were quick to say, in an enthusiastic tone, that the Federal Music Project was a "Renaissance" in

1. Frank L. Kluckhorn, "Uncle Sam Expands as Art Patron," New York Times, October 6, 1935.

2. New York Times, November 3, 1935.

American music; others went so far as to claim the project to be the "birth" of American music. As radical as these views seem to be, the fact remains that countless projects were undertaken by the Federal Music Program that previously had been impossible because of the absence of financial backing. As a result, many people in the metropolitan areas were able, if they desired, to see operatic and symphonic programs because of the free or low-priced admissions. The best in musical performance was made available to many areas in which there had been little or no musical life. It was for these reasons that music critics, musicians, government officials, social educators, and business managers for privately endowed music organizations, among others, were expressing a vital interest in the success or failure of the program.

Although most professional musicians and music critics were highly enthusiastic about this extensive music program, their enthusiasm did not blind them to the difficulties that would be encountered in such a wide-spread undertaking. Kluckhorn, music critic of the New York Times, immediately raised the following critical questions: "Will there be a clash with private enterprise? Can we lift ourselves by our aesthetic bootstraps? Is not American taste faithfully reflected by the cinema, the radio, and the stage plays it sees now?"³ Eduard C. Lindeman, although praising the

3. Ibid., October 6, 1935.

program as a whole, cautioned musicians that such a program could too closely control the musical art and thereby hinder freedom of expression.⁴ Some of these questions were postulated on the assumption that this program was to be permanent.

Many of these critics seemed to lose sight of the fundamental problem of unemployment in their enthusiasm for promoting a long-range cultural program. Often, they thought of the Federal Music Project only as a "sounding board" for a future permanent program. Dr. Sokoloff was also criticized for maintaining this attitude. Joseph Weber, president of the American Federation of Musicians, complained in a letter to Dr. Sokoloff, "I know that you desire to use the relief as educational propaganda...this is a fine idea... but this should not lead to the error of retarding the relief of thousands of musicians..."⁵ For the Musicians' Union, the problem of unemployment was paramount.

Most of the discussion of the Federal Music Project, however, was concerned with the success or failure of the program in disseminating cultural values. This central idea prompted the fundamental question: What is the status of art in American life? Although musical life in America

4. Eduard C. Lindeman, "Farewell to Bohemia," Survey, 26, April, 1937.

5. Joseph N. Weber, "President's Report to the Detroit Convention." International Musician, XXXIII (June, 1936), 6.

is but one facet of art, an appraisal of its status can be applicable, to some extent, to the other arts.

In most press releases Dr. Sokoloff was concerned with the status of the musical art in American life. He realized that the Federal Music Project was designed primarily to relieve unemployment; he also realized, however, that this program could do much to further the musical art in the lives of Americans.⁶ Hoping that the cultural and social values of the program would be of lasting value, he expressed a desire that, when relief was no longer needed, the projects be absorbed by communities as a cultural need.⁷ On numerous occasions he spoke of the vast cultural implications and of the social promise for the future because of the works program.

The Federal Arts Projects stimulated a proposal to Congress for the establishment of a permanent Bureau of Fine Arts. In 1938, while hearings for this Bureau were in process, Dr. Sokoloff offered testimony as to the cultural and social implications of the Federal Music Project.

Between October 1935 and December 31, 1937 Federal project musicians had been heard by aggregate audiences of 92,000,000 persons in 131,000 programs and performances...Under this program great music has no longer been the privilege

6. Senate Hearings before the U.S. Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, A Bill to Provide for a Permanent Bureau of Fine Arts, 75 Congress, 3 session, February 28, 1938, 87.

7. New York Times, December 29, 1935.

of a comparatively few Americans...instead, living music has been carried in the last two years to multitudes of our peoples who have heard the symphonies, the grand old choral works, the operas and operettas, the madrigals, ballads, and folk songs of other centuries as well as the vital works of American composers, for the first time. Instruction in music and music leadership generally, have been carried to the under-privileged, the relief population, and the needy in remote rural communities and the congested sections of our cities, both of which were found to be musically barren and mute.⁸

Dr. Sokoloff testified that he was heartily in favor of the establishment of a permanent Bureau of Fine Arts. He emphasized the success of the Federal Music Project and pointed out with pride that by virtue of attendance and participation the public had voiced its enthusiastic approval.

The musical world had long recognized the need for adequate performance of American works.⁹ The Federal Music Project was quick to respond to this need. Heretofore it had not been financially sound for a musical organization to perform a fair amount of American works. One of the difficulties was that the American concert listening public wanted to hear only the European classics. An editorial in the Musician suggested that American composers must realize that the "haughty, often high-handed attitude

8. Senate Hearings, A Bill to Provide..., op. cit., 87.

9. American composers such as Harris, Copland, Rogers, Mason, and Cadman were highly in favor of the Federal Music Project.

of the foreign conductor is predicated on the whole-hearted support of the American musical patron....There is as yet no box-office demand for native music."¹⁰

The box-office demand is closely heeded by one of the largest media of mass communication--the radio. The music of the classical composers is familiar to the general concert-minded public. Familiarity with music often begets the demand for repetition. It would be a costly business venture to make American works equally familiar. Frank Black, musical director for the National Broadcasting Company in 1937, believed that radio "...is proceeding musically on the assumption that the general public has good taste." "We perhaps do not broadcast as many modern works as the musical snob or sophisticate would like," he admitted, "but I do not agree with the group of musicians who think that radio should be like a doctor who feeds his patients only what he thinks is good for them."¹¹ Roy Harris, representing composers on the bill to establish a Bureau of Fine Arts (1938), complained of this attitude. Harris felt that the resources of the musical world had become absolutely concentrated and crystallized into a few concert bureaus, two or three radio companies, and two or

10. Musician, XXXVIII (September, 1938), 9.

11. John T. Howard, "Better Days for Music," Harpers, CLXXIV (April, 1937), 488. NBC's tabulation for the 1936 season of musical programs: 20% classical, 3% opera, 25% popular, 54% semi-classical (salon music, ballads, etc).

Between October, 1935, and December, 1936, they gave 57,000 concerts and the audiences totaled more than 50,000,000. John Tasker Howard pointed out in 1937, that, since 1929, major symphony orchestras had increased from ten to seventeen, and he gave credit to radio and the Federal Music Project for initiating added interest in music.¹⁴

Prior to the inauguration of the Project people in the metropolitan centers could not afford to pay admission prices to most performances. Larger numbers of people in the Middle West and West could not afford to support musical organizations. In praising the positive contribution to American culture made by the Federal Arts Projects Stuart Davis, national chairman of American Artists, testified: "Private patronage has no conception of the meaning of democracy in culture which includes a broad participation by the masses of the people both in the production and enjoyment of art. Private patronage considers art as a private affair; reserved exclusively for an aristocracy and its cultivated tastes and wealth." "Broad participation by the masses of the people...in the production...of art," Davis concluded, is particularly significant.¹⁵ Mr. Davis complained that prior to the Federal Music Project the American public was only a passive participant and was not actively taking part

14. Loc.cit.

15. Senate Hearings, A Bill to Provide..., 75 Congress, 3 session, op.cit., 17-18.

in the production of art. The Federal Arts Projects were designed to encourage participation by all classes of people.

Although wary of competition from the Federal Music Projects, the American Federation of Musicians advocated a governmental patronage of music. An editorial in the International Musician stated; "Every tax-payer makes a contribution to libraries whether he is a book reader or not. He also gives his penny to the museum, to the school, to the park in his city...So communal an art as music must have this background of public sharing before its potentialities can be realized.¹⁶ The American Federation of Musicians offered no plan for governmental subsidy, but was interested in putting federal relief on a permanent basis.¹⁷ This, they felt, would encourage the growth of the musical art.

Dr. Sokoloff told the public that training for participation in music by non-professional musicians is extremely important for the musical culture of a nation. He had hoped that the extension of arts to the people by means of the Federal Arts Projects would encourage more to enter the ranks of the amateur.¹⁸ This, in turn, would lead to a more intelligent criticism of musical experiences. The person who has played clarinet in the town band is more apt to be cognizant of the clarinet section in a symphony

16. International Musician, XLIV (August, 1945), 12.

17. Ibid. (January, 1939).

18. Charles A. Beard, America in Midpassage, 780.

orchestra. It is also probably true that this same clarinet player would be more interested in having his children obtain a music education--or, he may influence the boy next door. As more people became interested in music as a "hobby," it was more likely that a discriminating and sympathetic public would result. Although Dr. Sokoloff's position as relief administrator necessitated his interest in the contemporary professional musician, he was even more concerned with the status of the American amateur.

Many writers, as well as government officials, felt that the activities of the Federal Music Project were broadening the base of American culture. When the Federal Arts Projects budget was cut in 1937, Ralph M. Pearson, art critic for the Forum, admitting that as a critic he had been hard on the Federal Arts Projects' work, nevertheless believed that a reduction of the program would be a "cultural calamity."¹⁹ The dissemination of musical culture to people of all walks of life by means of the Federal Music Project cannot be overemphasized. Francis Taylor, in a paper to the American Philosophical Society, stated that "The problem of immediate quality is relatively unimportant, for, according to the law of averages, genius must occur every so often if the underlying base of

19. Ralph M. Pearson, "The Artist's Point of View," Forum, XCVII (January, 1937), 53.

mediocrity be sufficiently wide."²⁰ So far Mr. Taylor was agreeing with Dr. Sokoloff, but as he continued he took a step further to declare, "Our duty is to see to it that American Art has every opportunity of developing as a popular expression so that it may not be made the servant of a doctrinal minority as it is being forced to be in Europe."²¹ Because of the Federal Music Project, Dr. Sokoloff felt that "The whole base of American audience structure has been almost illimitably expanded..."²²

The extension of the arts to the people was uppermost in the minds of many who spear-headed the New Deal program. Harry Hopkins felt that providing works of art for public buildings was as much a responsibility of government as the actual construction of the building. President Franklin Roosevelt, in a letter to James Petrillo, expressed concern that people in the smaller cities were not getting enough first-class concert music.²³ Colonel Fred C. Harrington, successor to Hopkins as head of the WPA, testified, "I would like to emphasize the fact that these projects are providing employment for workers with highly specialized skills and are producing results which are

20. Francis Taylor, "The Fine Arts," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, LXXXIII (September, 1940), 565.

21. Loc.cit.

22. John T. Howard, "Better Days for Music," Harpers, CLXXIV (April, 1937), 485.

23. International Musician, XLII (August, 1943).

socially useful and important to American community life."²⁴ These men were decidedly against a "dole" to solve the unemployment problem; they wanted to put men to work, but insisted that they be employed according to their skills.

The masterpieces in art and the great classical symphonic compositions were declared, in the Thirties, a Nineteenth Century phenomenon.²⁵ The emphasis in art had been placed upon the genius and upon the production of the genius. Pearson, of the Forum, labeled the false emphasis upon the masterpiece as "antiquarian veneration."²⁶ He did feel that the masterpieces were of great importance, but they should not take precedence over the production and participation program of the Thirties.²⁷ The standards of workmanship set by the masterpieces were discouraging to the composers who must work in competition with them. Not only must they be of the same high aesthetic quality, but they must use the same techniques if they are to gain public acclaim. Composers were, at times, forced to mold their creations along conventional lines

24. House Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Making Appropriations for Work Relief, part II, 76 Congress, 3 session.

25. Charles A. Beard, America in Midpassage, 775. A statement by Holger Cahill.

26. Ralph M. Pearson, "The Artist's Point of View," Forum, XCVII (May, 1937), 319. In this article, Pearson condemned the acceptance of the Mellon art gift because he felt that "too many strings" were attached which, in effect, "would protect this gift from the crudities of Democratic Art".

27. Loc.cit.

of past art to earn a living. Holger Cahill felt that the emphasis upon masterpieces was primarily a collector's idea and had little realism to an art movement. "In a genuine art movement," he insisted, "a great reservoir of art is created in many forms both major and minor."²⁸

The Federal Music Project brought not only art but artists to the people. Private patronage often kept a great part of the composers' time and interest away from the public. The contemporary composer found it necessary likewise to go to the one or two cultural areas in the United States in order to gain any recognition. Early in 1935 the Federal Music Project organized a composers' forum laboratory with the express purpose of giving the American composer an opportunity to be heard.²⁹ The program was "To provide an opportunity for serious composers, residing in America, both known and unknown, to hear their own compositions, to test the reactions of auditors, as well as to present their own particular viewpoint, if any, and benefit by a public discussion of their works."³⁰ Ashley Pettis, director of the forum, complained

28. Ralph E. Purcell, "Government and Art in the United States," PhD. thesis, University of Wisconsin (1949), 151.

29. Grace Overmyer, Government and Art. Forum laboratories were held in New York, Boston, and Chicago semi-monthly and at less frequent intervals in Detroit, Milwaukee, Los Angeles, and Indianapolis.

30. New York Times, September 29, 1935.

that the American composer was an unknown quantity, but by means of the forum a closer relationship between audience and composer could be realized.³¹ In New York, within the first month of the composers' forum, first performances of works by Bernard Rogers, David Diamond, Solomon Pimsleur, and others were heard.³² These artists were enthusiastic about presenting their works to the general American public. They wanted recognition; they were quick to point out, however, that they did not want recognition merely because they were American composers. Some composers, on the other hand, desired a national school of composition. Against the latter group, composer Charles Wakefield Cadman pleaded for not any American music, but good American music.³³

Try to write good music, forgetting, if they must, any longed-for nationalism, and out of the forgetting may finally emerge the most national of all music. Let every composer in America try to write music which is good, whether it smacks of a European conservatory, or of the broad, free spaces of the West. The essential thing is to make music which shall calm, shall inspire, shall call forth pure and ennobling thoughts, shall fill the needs of the present hour, but shall also point to the next hour as something finer, higher to strive for.³⁴

Cadman, too, felt that a broad amateur base was necessary to a national culture. He hailed the Federal Music Project as the "finest constructive force that has ever come into

31. Ibid., November 24, 1935.

32. Ibid., November 21, 1935.

33. Grace Overmyer, Famous American Composers, 174.

34. Loc.cit.

American musical life," and because of it, he felt, "a vital musical evolution has taken place in every community it has reached. I am for the Federal Music Project with all my heart and soul."³⁵

There has been a contention by some, musicians and non-musicians, that America is essentially an unmusical nation. This is a serious indictment against a nation. To this charge many defenders of the American musical life would probably answer: Indeed, how could one expect to find a refined indigenous musical culture in America when the musical art, for the most part, is centered in one or two metropolitan centers patronized by the well-to-do and divorced from the nation at large? William Feinberg, secretary of the Federation of Musicians, Local 802, New York, felt that the Federal Music Projects had done much to alleviate these deficiencies in American music culture.³⁶ He noted that Americans often praised Italian music culture by telling the story of the ordinary Italian peasant woman who sings her favorite operatic arias. And why should this Italian peasant woman desire to sing operatic arias? Feinberg found the answer in the fact that there were one-hundred and fifty-eight government sponsored opera companies in Italy. The circulation of these opera companies

35. Senate Hearings, A Bill to Provide..., 75 Congress, 3 session, op. cit., 88.

36. Ibid., 33-35.

throughout Italy, he contended, had much to do with the high standard of musical culture attributed to the Italian nation. Edward Johnson, managing director of the Metropolitan Opera House, related how these opera companies were classified A, B, and C.³⁷ Persons with operatic talent entered a "C" company and as they became more proficient they were permitted to progress to a "B" company and then to an "A" company. Johnson believed that this was an excellent way to discover and train native talent.³⁸ Even though some American students had the talent, no such opportunity existed for them.

The fact that the Federal Music Project brought music to many people who had not previously had the opportunity to hear "live" music was by many contemporaries considered a major accomplishment. Tom Allen, Pacific Coast representative for the Musician, reported in October, 1936, that "The WPA concerts have revealed an entirely new potential audience...people to whom formerly the thought of attending a symphony concert never would have occurred, have now discovered...that music can be as fully appreciated as a day at the beach."³⁹ Dr. Sokoloff suggested that this "new

37. Ibid., 35. Quoted by William Feinberg.

38. Loc.cit.

39. Tom Allen, "Euterpe in Los Angeles," Musician, XLI (October, 1936). Allen also pointed out that "only two years ago Los Angeles compared to San Francisco was almost completely unmusical, but today that fact is no longer true."

musical public is neither biased or doctrinaire...but eager and hungry for music."⁴⁰ Mr. Allen indicated that not only had a new audience been developed, but that "this audience has been progressively educated to demand better performances and more interesting programs."⁴¹ There were, however, critics who would have argued with Mr. Allen that it is impossible to educate an audience.

In this new audience of music listeners, school children were included. Walter Damrosch had done much in bringing music to the school children of America by his radio broadcasts. The effectiveness of his program, however, was limited because the actual performances were not seen by the youngsters. In some communities Federal Music Project orchestras were given the duty of playing for the schools. Eugene M. Hahnel, supervisor for the St. Louis Public Schools, in a letter to Dr. Sokoloff, spoke in high praise of this program. "Never before in the history of civilization have children below the privileged classes been accorded an opportunity to hear and enjoy orchestral

39.(cont'd.) Senate Hearings, A Bill to Provide..., 75 Congress, 3 session, op. cit. An article by Redfern Mason in the Boston Evening Transcript is included in the hearings by Dr. Sokoloff in which Mason gives credit to the Boston State Symphony (FMP) for revealing an entirely new music audience of thousands of people.

40. John T. Howard. "Better Days for Music," Harpers, CLXXIV (April, 1937), 485.

41. Tom Allen, "Euterpe in Los Angeles," Musician, XLI (October, 1936).

music."⁴² He thanked Dr. Sokoloff for the orchestra, which had been playing for the past eighteen months, visiting two schools per day, and emphasized the importance of the fact that 75,000 children had direct contact with the musicians.⁴³

The directors of the Federal Music Project had pledged themselves to avoid a clash with private enterprise and it was this pledge which, in part, caused music to be carried to a new listening public.⁴⁴ In spite of the pledge made by Federal Music Project directors, they were soon receiving complaints from labor unions and private symphony orchestras. As early as October, 1935, Local 802 in New York had ordered a strike demonstration. Placards were carried by musicians saying, "Union Symphony scales, 9 services \$90.00; WPA Symphony scales, \$23.70."⁴⁵ Any serious disorders were averted when Federal Music Project officials promised to reduce the number of working hours required of Federal musicians.⁴⁶

⁴². Senate Hearings, A Bill to Provide..., 75 Congress, 3 session, op. cit., 89.

⁴³. Loc.cit.

⁴⁴. New York Times, August 4, 1935. This was called by Lewis Mumford one of the paradoxes of the depression because under its stress "we Americans achieved for the first time...many important things that should have been normal to our life as a people." He was referring to the cultural significance of the Federal Arts Projects. Lewis Mumford, New Republic (October 20, 1937), 307.

⁴⁵. New York Times, October 26, 1935.

⁴⁶. Ibid., November 26, 1935. The union also complained that the Federal Music Project was charging admissions to the concerts.

The American Federation of Musicians also complained that the purpose of the Federal Music Project, to relieve unemployment, was being subordinated to the whims and selfish purposes of some state officials. Present Joseph N. Weber protested that the music projects "were not established for artistic reasons, but for the purpose of alleviating the economic distress of unemployed musicians..." and "to turn such a government duty (and it is nothing else) into a general cultural experiment is an error which had the result that musicians on relief were often subject to injustices."⁴⁷ Weber cited a specific instance occurring in Jacksonville, Florida, where musicians were required to leave local project and go to Jacksonville to play in the State WPA orchestra. This was unfair because the musicians were forced to leave their homes and especially unfair when the local projects had been acceptable to the people.⁴⁸ Weber contended that this was done only to give the state director "an opportunity to shine as a symphony orchestra director."⁴⁹

The difficulties encountered by the Federal Music Project with musician unions and private musical organizations were, in part, unavoidable. During the depression, as one would expect, people eagerly welcomed free

47. International Musician, XXXVIII (June, 1939).

48. Loc.cit.

49. Loc.cit.

concerts. Yet, organizations, such as the New York Philharmonic depended upon a paying public. Nels Anderson, in *Survey Graphic*, felt that groups with something to sell and "old line" labor unions, which tried to maintain a certain standard, were by their very nature irreconcilable with unemployed groups such as the Federal Project musicians.⁵⁰ "Labor unions want the union rates. They also want the closed shop, or at least union member preference."⁵¹ Anderson reasoned that the Federal government could not make such a concession. Although admitting "the justice of labor's argument," he maintained that "The government cannot lose sight of the fact that unemployed non-union workers have rights too."⁵² Thus, the reconciliation of federal musicians and musicians in private employment was one of the principal problems of the Federal Music Project administrators.

The success of the Federal Music Project was partially responsible for the proposal, in 1938, that a permanent

50. Nels Anderson, "Pressure Groups," *Survey Graphic*, XXV (March, 1936), 168-70.

51. *Ibid.*, 168.

52. *Ibid.*, 169.

Bureau of Fine Arts be established.⁵³ Many persons who participated in the Federal Music Project were called upon to testify at the committee hearings. Roy Harris pleaded for need of government support of composers and pointed out the success of the Federal Music Project.⁵⁴ Governor Elmer A. Benson of Minnesota testified; "The arts have been decentralized through federal patronage. They have been extended and made available to the entire country...In short," he felt that, "Federal assistance to the arts...has provided a kind of 'people's patronage' of the arts, to replace vanishing private patronage and to support and expand already existing but limited municipal patronage in a few localities."⁵⁵ Sokoloff, Roy Harris, and others wanted a permanent Bureau of Fine Arts

53. Senate Hearings before the U. S. Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, A Bill to Provide for a Permanent Bureau of Fine Arts, 75 Congress, 3 session, February 28, 1938, 89. A letter from Erich Wolfgang Korngold, Viennese composer, was included in the hearings by Dr. Sokoloff. "Nowhere in Europe is there anything that even compares with the Federal Music Project. Of course, we have state subsidized opera, but no country in Europe has anything to equal this. It is heartening to see these splendidly trained musicians performing concerts of high caliber for the public for nominal admissions, and in most cases, free of charge as a phase of governmental activity."

54. Albert W. Kramer, editor of Musical America, reported that "85% of our composers spent 20% of their time composing and 80% earning a living." He felt that if that proportion could be reversed within ten years a fifty year standard could be met. New York Times, December 31, 1935.

55. Senate Hearings, A Bill to Provide..., op. cit., 2.

modeled somewhat after the Federal Music Project. They did not, however, want a Bureau of Fine Arts designed primarily to relieve unemployment.⁵⁶

The Federal Music Project, in general, received much praise from contemporaries for the dissemination of musical culture to a new audience and for the aid extended to American composers. The program represents one of the first large-scale attempts of the United States Government to recognize, by subsidy and direction, the aesthetic needs of man.

The Federal Arts program, highly praised for its achievements in the nation at large, also received the hearty praise of state and local officials. The activities of the Federal Music Projects, on the local level, prove the claims of the Washington office of Dr. Sokoloff that music was being extended to all classes of people. A new listening public was developed.

⁵⁶. Ninety per-cent of the personnel of the Federal Music Project was drawn from the relief rolls. New York Times, November 10, 1935.

Chapter IV

THE FEDERAL MUSIC PROJECT IN WISCONSIN, 1935-1939

The Wisconsin Federal Music Project officially became a reality in August, 1935, when the Federal Arts Projects were approved in the Congress of the United States. Not for five months, however, were any Wisconsin music units ready to perform.

The nation had been divided into ten regions and in each, a regional director was appointed. Wisconsin was placed in Region VII which also included the state of Illinois, the City of Chicago, and the City of St. Louis, Missouri.¹ Mr. Joel Lay, former director of the Century of Progress, Chicago, was appointed regional director.² Mr. Lay appointed a supervisor in charge of each one of the four divisions of Region VII. Mr. William V. Arvold of Reedsburg, Wisconsin was selected as state supervisor for Wisconsin. He had been the founder of the Wisconsin School of Music Association and had been a manager of the University of Wisconsin band.³

In Wisconsin, authority was highly centralized in the

1. New York Times, October 11, 1935.
2. Loc. cit.
3. Capital Times (Madison, Wisconsin), December 25, 1935. In an interview with the author, Mr. Arvold said that he had been suggested as a candidate by some authorities from the University of Wisconsin.

office of Mr. Arvold.⁴ The director of Region VII made infrequent trips to Wisconsin to examine the status of the program. The state supervisor, Mr. Arvold, however, was not directly responsible to the regional director. All reports concerning the state projects were sent directly to Washington. State officers and clerical help for the Federal Music Project were kept to an absolute minimum. In Wisconsin, the total administrative force consisted of one state director, two assistant directors, and one clerical person.⁵ Each director of the individual music units in Wisconsin performed his own clerical work and was responsible to Mr. Arvold alone.⁶

One of the major problems facing the newly appointed state director of the Federal Music Project was that of assigning men of various talents to musical organizations. The talent available was extremely diverse. All types of musicians presented themselves for positions: opera singers, dance-band vocalists, symphony directors, dance-band directors, symphony musicians, dance-band musicians, etc. Mr.

4. Arthur Macmahon, The Administration of Work Relief (Chicago, 1941), 253.

5. "Final State Report," Records of the Work Projects Administration, Federal Music Project, Record Group 69 (Washington: National Archives, 1951). This report is available on microfilm at the Wisconsin State Historical Library.

6. "Narrative Report for December, 1938," Records of the Work Projects Administration, Federal Music Project, Record Group 69 (Washington: National Archives, 1951). All narrative reports used in this chapter are the monthly reports of the state supervisor to the Washington office of Dr. Sokoloff.

Arvold first attacked the problem of organization by selecting a large number of cities most likely to have unemployed musicians. Among the cities first selected for music projects units were: Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha, Beloit, Janesville, Waukesha, Sheboygan, Oshkosh, Wausau, Superior, Eau Claire, La Crosse, and Madison.⁷ In each of these cities the unemployment offices and the American Federation of Musicians' locals provided lists of unemployed musicians. When, in a city, a large enough group of unemployed qualified symphony musicians were found, a symphony orchestra was formed. This was the case in Milwaukee, Racine, Superior, Oshkosh, and Madison. In Milwaukee a colored dance orchestra of twelve members and a theater pit orchestra were also formed.⁸ In Kenosha and Wausau concert bands were organized.⁹ Copying and arranging projects were set up in Milwaukee and Madison to provide employment for well-qualified musicians who were not adequate performers on instruments.¹⁰

Employees of the Federal Music Projects were selected on the basis of skill and need. The project was designed to give the professional musician, who for a long period of time had been without the opportunity for self-expression

7. Loc. cit.

8. "Narrative Report for December, 1937," op. cit.

9. Loc. cit.

10. Statement made to the author by Mr. Arvold. Mr. Arvold explained that this project was especially useful for employing musicians who were at one time excellent performers, but who had not actively participated in the profession for some time.

and without means of earning a livelihood, a chance to re-establish himself through his chosen profession.¹¹ Ninety per-cent of Federal Music Project musicians had to come from the relief rolls. Skill was determined by requiring musicians who applied for positions to perform before a local board and the state supervisor, Mr. Arvold. This was necessary, according to Mr. Arvold, because the budget for the state of Wisconsin was not sufficient to hire all of the qualified musicians.¹²

Also of great importance in the selection of locations for Federal Music units was the availability of co-sponsors. Local sponsorship of Federal Music Projects, however, was not mandatory until 1939. Wisconsin Music Project officials, however, thought it desirable to use all of the money granted by the federal government for wages, and, because of this, they sought local sponsors to pay for music and rehearsal halls.¹³ Co-sponsors of the twenty Wisconsin music units included: county-governments, city councils, private

11. "Narrative Report for November, 1938," op. cit.

12. Statement made to the author by Mr. Arvold. Mr. Arvold said that many men applied for music jobs when their only experience was in a high school band. In the "Final State Report," Mr. Arvold suggested that if such a program were to be set up in the future it would be best to have a state audition board rather than local boards.

13. In an interview with the author, Mr. Arvold stated that Wisconsin had a national reputation for having the lowest non-labor cost.

In 1937, he reported to Dr. Sokoloff that 98.5 per cent of the federal grants were used for wages. "Narrative Report for February, 1937," op. cit.

citizens, school boards, the American Federation of Musicians, vocational schools, and private organizations.¹⁴

By December, 1935, twenty music units were functioning. The early problems of locating units, assigning personnel, and procuring co-sponsors were, for the most part, solved. Throughout the state, administrative policy was effectively organized. No matter how efficient state organization might be, however, the entire project was subject to constant revision by the Congress of the United States.¹⁵

In Wisconsin, as well as in the nation at large, the smooth operation of the Work Projects Administration projects was made difficult by the temporary nature of the entire program. As pointed out in Chapter II, the WPA depended upon a hand-to-mouth existence. Many of the projects were often held up or dropped because of the lack of funds. On one occasion, in 1936, Mr. Arvold complained that the time sheets had been forwarded to Washington, but had been held up in the finance department for three weeks. He reported that during these three weeks the men were disconcerted and that he was "powerless" to act.¹⁶ More serious was the reduction of appropriations for the nation at large. When a recession in the budget was made in December, 1936, it was

14. "Final State Report," op. cit.

15. Donald S. Howard pointed out that the Work Projects Administration had to ask Congress for money nine times during the first six years. Donald S. Howard, The WPA and Federal Policy (New York, 1943), 107.

16. "Narrative Report for August, 1936," op. cit.

necessary for Mr. Arvold to drop five music units.¹⁷ It was also necessary, in July, 1937, to drop the Kenosha Band (reducing the total number of music units in Wisconsin to thirteen) because of an appropriation cut by Congress.¹⁸ Mr. Arvold tried to obtain additional local sponsorship in order to retain the Kenosha Band, but did not succeed.¹⁹ Because of this uncertainty no plans could be made for the future. Many schools, desirous of having Federal Music Project orchestras and bands perform, were unable to schedule concerts very far in advance. The day to day existence presented a constant problem to the administrative officials of the Wisconsin Federal Music Project.

The relationship between the Wisconsin Federal Music Projects and the American Federation of Musicians was marked by a high degree of cooperation. Both organizations had pledged to aid unemployed musicians, and on numerous occasions worked side by side. The union, anxious to protect its members, insisted that twenty per cent of all musicians playing at public concerts had to be union musicians.²⁰ Because of this ruling Mr. Arvold frequently appeared before co-sponsors for additional funds to augment organizations with union members.²¹ The union, far from

17. "Narrative Report for December, 1936," op. cit.

18. "Narrative Report for June, 1937," op. cit.

19. Loc. cit.

20. Statement made to the author by Mr. Arvold.

21. "Narrative Report for May, 1937," Records of the Work Projects Administration, Federal Music Project, Record Group 69 (Washington: National Archives, 1951).

being a thorn in the side of Mr. Arvold, contributed union funds to the Federal Music Project. In November, 1937, Mr. V. Dahlstrand, President of Local #8 of Milwaukee, offered five-hundred dollars to augment the Wisconsin Federal Symphony Orchestra.²² Union officials also extended aid to the Project by helping the administrators obtain sponsorship. Mr. Arvold reported in June, 1937 that he had spent much time in obtaining sponsors for the Project and was successful in getting \$4200. from the Milwaukee County Board "with the cooperation of the President of the Milwaukee Musicians' Union."²³

In spite of the temporary nature of the program and minor conflicts with union officials, the program in Wisconsin was largely successful in its operation. In the "Final State Report," Mr. Arvold stated that "the relationship with the union, the co-sponsor, the Washington office, and the WPA State Administrative office has been one of cooperation." He felt that this harmonious relationship "undoubtedly accounted for the success of the Music Project in Wisconsin."²⁴

It was pointed out in Chapter II that the cultural

22. "Narrative Report for November, 1937," op. cit.

23. "Narrative Report for June, 1937," op. cit. Mr. Arvold also reported that he had received a fine compliment from Joseph N. Weber, National President of the American Federation of Musicians, for the fine cooperation existent in Wisconsin.

24. "Final State Report," op. cit.

and social significance of the Federal Music Project, as well as relief for musicians, was emphasized in press releases by the national administrator of the project. In Wisconsin, too, the same emphasis is found. Mr. Arvold, in the "Final State Report," explained that the main objective of the Music Project was "to give to the people of the state an opportunity to enjoy culture through music..." and, at the same time, provide relief for the unemployed musician.²⁵ To this end, two major policies were followed in Wisconsin: first, numerous programs were presented in the schools by all the music units; second, each music unit presented concerts in the rural and urban areas conveniently adjacent to the territory where each unit was located.²⁶

One of the outstanding achievements of the Federal Music Project in Wisconsin was the aid extended to schools by the project musicians. All of the units participated in school programs. The school program initiated in October, 1937, had achieved notable success within a few months. A Racine, Wisconsin public school teacher was so enthusiastic that she wanted to do away with all the mechanical devices used in teaching music appreciation, and to draw up a regular schedule of appearances for the Racine Concert Orchestra.²⁷

25. Loc. cit.

26. Loc. cit.

27. "Narrative Report for July, 1937," op. cit.

The programs were designed to attract and interest the young school children; however, it was not necessary to reduce the musical quality of the performances. In Superior, Wisconsin, the Superior Concert Orchestra organized a school performance titled, "An airplane trip through Europe." The sound of the plane was produced with a small motor having a fan of small leather strips beating on a street drum. As the students soared through Europe (with the aid of a narrator) they heard the melodies of several masters and learned the nations they represented.²⁸ Most of the music groups presented programs designed to acquaint the students with the various members of the instrumental family.²⁹ An interesting experiment was conducted in a Manitowoc school for deaf and dumb children. After the Manitowoc Project Orchestra had played several times for these youngsters, many of the children, by recognition of vibrations, were able to identify several instruments without looking at the individual playing.³⁰

Federal Music Project Units encouraged student participation in music programs. In a few instances talented youngsters played solos with WPA orchestras. The directors of the units were careful, however, to make such an occasion a privilege rather than a habit.³¹ On one occasion

28. Loc. cit.

29. "Narrative Report for July, 1937," op. cit.

30. "Miscellaneous Correspondence," Mr. W. V. Arvold to Mr. W. C. Mayforth, Deputy Director of the Federal Music Project, Records of the WPA, Federal Music Project, Record Group 69 (Washington: National Archives, 1951).

31. "Narrative Report for April, 1937," op. cit.

a young high school student composed a march and a Federal Music Project Unit performed it before the school.³²

Mr. N. K. Brahmstedt, Band Director, Custer High School and Spencerian College of Milwaukee, praised the fine musicianship of the Milwaukee Project Band and told Mr. Arvold that as a result of hearing this band his students had shown much more interest in musicianship.³³ Programs for the schools were kept well within the experience of the children and the unit directors maintained a close relationship with the music teachers so that the students received a well planned course in music appreciation.³⁴

The school program constituted the principal activity of the Federal Music Project in Wisconsin. At the end of the third fiscal year Mr. Arvold reported that the Wisconsin units had played eleven concerts each school day for 1937 and 1938.³⁵ The attendance at these concerts exceeded one million students during the two years.³⁶ Mr. Arvold felt that these concerts had opened the "door" of classical music to many young children and had performed a "real work" of education.³⁷

Although many community leaders were skeptical about the value of the Federal Music Projects when first introduced,

32. Loc. cit.

33. "Narrative Report for April, 1937," op. cit.

34. "Narrative Report for November, 1937," op. cit.

35. "Narrative Report for July, 1937," op. cit.

36. Loc. cit.

37. Loc. cit.

they soon became staunch supporters of the program. The mayor of Oshkosh, Wisconsin, early in 1936, felt that musicians on relief should perform manual labor. Just a few months later, after hearing the Oshkosh Symphony perform, this same mayor made a donation of money for music and rented a rehearsal hall for the orchestra. Similar cases in other cities prompted Mr. Arvold to report: "We are actually selling music to the communities and their response to really good music is a revelation."³⁹

The Federal Music Project in Wisconsin brought music culture to all parts of the state. This was no small task for an organization that never exceeded 408 members. The units (which varied in number from eleven to twenty) averaged 250--300 performances per month. Each month the units made approximately thirty appearances in places outside of their official stations. "In this work," stated Mr. Arvold, "we really feel that we are reaching a people who never had this opportunity before."⁴⁰

In the larger cities of Wisconsin, the Federal Music Projects attracted large and enthusiastic audiences. The Wisconsin Symphony, under the director of Dr. Sigrid Prager, in its "under the stars" program attracted audiences which

38. "Narrative Report for August, 1936," Records of the WPA, Federal Music Project, Record Group 69 (Washington: National Archives, 1951).

39. "Narrative for July, 1937," op. cit.

40. These figures are rough approximates taken from the montly narrative reports.

averaged 30,000 people per concert.⁴¹ This sixty-piece organization, co-sponsored by Pabst corporation and the City of Milwaukee, had many guest stars including: Lily Pons, Lawrence Tibbett, Kathryn Meisle, Lotte Lehman, Albert Spaulding, Richard Crooks, and John Carter.⁴² Smaller units, too attracted large crowds. The Concert Orchestra of Wausau (15 members) commonly had an audience of 2400 to 3000 people.⁴³

The monthly narrative reports of the state administrator constantly refer to letters of appreciation sent to his office by community leaders expressing gratitude for the cultural services received from the Federal Music Projects. Judge Robert E. Curran of Superior wrote,

I was happy when our Government made it possible for the people in Superior here to have a WPA Band. For many years before that time this city had no band organization of any kind and consequently we had no music. Since the WPA Band was organized, we have been able to have the services of one of the finest musical aggregations one could wish for...⁴⁴

Mayor Ziedler of Milwaukee called the Wisconsin WPA Symphony Orchestra a "vital part" of the community life.

The Federal Music Project in Wisconsin had rehabilitated many musicians and had performed a public service. In the three and one-half years (1935-1939) the projects in Wisconsin

41. "Narrative Report for August, 1938," op. cit.

42. Loc. cit. In an interview with the author, Mr. Arvold said that the summer program "under the stars" (In Milwaukee) was started by the Federal Music Project and is still in operation (1951).

43. "Narrative Report for August, 1937," op. cit.

44. "Narrative Report for March, 1939," op. cit.

performed a total of 9,983 concerts to an estimated audience of 7,113,744 people. The program did not limit its performances to the metropolitan areas, but had extended its services to 344 communities.⁴⁵ Almost every section of the state had heard Federal Music.

⁴⁵. "Final State Report," op. cit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Secondary Sources

- Baker, Jacob. Concerning Government Benefits. New York: Vanguard Press, 1936. 120 pp.
- Barnes, E. B., and Ruedi, O. M. The American Way of Life. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1947. 270 pp.
- Beard, Charles A., and Mary R. America in Midpassage. (The Rise of American Civilization, III). New York: Macmillan, 1939. 977 pp.
- Clark, J. M. Economics of Planning Public Works. Washington: G. P. O., 1935. 194 pp. A study made for the National Planning Board of the FERA.
- Elson, Louis C. History of American Music. New York: Macmillan, 1904. 380 pp.
- Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians, American Supplement. Waldo S. Pratt and Charles N. Boyd, eds. Philadelphia: Theodore Presser, 1920.
- Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians, I-V. J. A. Fuller Maitland, ed. New York: Macmillan, 1910.
- Howard, Donald S. The WPA and Federal Relief Policy. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1943.
- Howard, John Tasker. Our American Music. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1931.
- Isakoff, J. F. The Public Works Administration. University of Illinois Bulletin #24, XXXVI. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1938. 150 pp.
- Macmahon, Arthur W. The Administration of Federal Work Relief. Published for the Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council. Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1941. 400 pp.
- Millett, John D. The WPA in New York City. Published for the Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council. Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1938.
- Overmyer, Grace. Famous American Composers. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1945. 160 pp.

- Overmyer, Grace. Government and the Arts. New York: W. W. Norton, 1939. 300 pp.
- Purcell, Ralph Elliot. "Government and Art in the United States." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Wisconsin, 1949. 160 numb. leaves.
- Rauch, Basil. The History of the New Deal, 1933-1938. New York: Creative Age Press, 1944. 350 pp.
- Thompson, Oscar, and Slonimsky, Nicolas, eds. International Cyclopedia of Music and Musicians. New York: Dodd and Mead, 1949.
- Wecter, Dixon. The Age of the Great Depression, 1929-1941. New York: Macmillan, 1948. 350 pp.
- Williams, E. A. Federal Aid for Relief. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.
- Zanzig, Augustus, D. Music in American Life. London: Oxford University Press, 1932. 560 pp.

Primary Sources

Periodicals and Newspapers

- Allen, Tom. "Euterpe in Los Angeles," Musician, XLI (October, 1936).
- Anderson, Nels. "Pressure Groups," Survey Graphic, XXV (March, 1936), 168-70.
- Brainard's Musical Record, XXIX (March, 1892).
- Capital Times (Madison, Wisconsin), 1935-39.
- de Vore, D. N. Musician, XLI (October, 1936), 151.
- "Federal Portfolio of Music and Art," Musician, XL (July, 1935).
- Forbes, Watson. "The Artist Becomes a Citizen," Forum, XCI (May, 1934), 277-79.
- Gelatt, Ralph. "Critics under Fire," Commonweal, XLVI (May 23, 1947).

- Herschmann, I. A. "Musician and the Depression," Nation, CXXXVII (November 15, 1933), 565-66.
- Howard, John Tasker. "Better Days for Music," Harpers, CLXXIV (April, 1937), 483-91.
- International Musician (1935-1942).
- Kelley, Tom Freegaard. "America's Happy Unemployables," Nation's Business (June, 1936), 130.
- Key, Pierre. Music Yearbook for 1938.
- Lindeman, Eduard C. "Values and Viaducts," Social Work Today (March, 1938), 13.
- _____ "Farewell to Bohemia," Survey Graphic, XXVI (April, 1937), 207-11.
- Luening, Otto. "Music," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, LXXXIII (September, 1940), 570.
- MacBride, Jessie. New Republic, LXXXIX (November 11, 1936), 48.
- Mumford, Lewis. New Republic (October 20, 1937), 307.
- Musician (editorial), XXXVIII (September, 1938), 9.
- New York Times 1935-1942.
- Pearson, Ralph M. "The Artist's Point of View," Forum, XCVII (January, 1937), 53.
- Smith, Catherine Bailey. "Music," American Yearbook, 1932 (1932), 877-78.
- Smith, Dexter, ed. Musical Record (1891-92).
- Taylor, Francis, H. "The Fine Arts," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, LXXXIII (September, 1940), 565-66.
- Vernon, Grenville. "Which Way Music," Commonweal, XXI (December 7, 1934).
- Zanzig, Augustus D. "Community Music During the Depression and After," Recreation, XXV (March, 1932), 6272-78.

Government Documents

Catalogue of Research and Statistical Publications, WPA.
Washington: G. P. O., 1941.

Congressional Record. 51 Cong., 2 sess., vol. 22
(March 3, 1891), 3916.

Congressional Record. 76 Cong., 1 sess., vol. 86 pt. 15
(April 25, 1940), 2477. Statement by John Dewey.

Division of Research, Statistics, and Records. Report
on the Works Program. Washington: 1936. 39 pp.

Records of the WPA, Federal Music Project. Record Group
69. Washington: National Archives, 1951. This
material is on microfilm at the Wisconsin Historical
Library. Record Group 69 includes: Monthly narrative
reports of the state director (Wisconsin) of the
Federal Music Project, 1936-1941, innumerable news-
paper clippings from Wisconsin that comment on the
Federal Music Project, and a group of miscellaneous
letters.

U. S. Congress. House. A Bill to Create a Commission to
Ascertain the Feasibility of Establishing a National
Conservatory of Music. Hearings, 68 Cong., 1 sess.,
on H. J. Res. 200. Washington: March 25, 1924, 28.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Patents. Department
of Science, Art, and Literature. Hearings, 74 Cong.,
1 sess., on H. J. Res. 208. Washington: April 15,
16, 23-25, May 14, 21, 1935.

U. S. Congress. House. Subcommittee of the Committee on
Appropriations. Appropriation for Work Relief and
Relief. Hearings, 76 Cong., 3 sess., Washington:
1941. Part II.

U. S. Congress. House Subcommittee of the Committee on
Appropriations. Investigation and Study of the Works
Progress Administration. Hearings, 76 Cong., 1 sess.,
on H. J. Res. 130. Washington: 1939. Volume I and II.

U. S. Congress. House. Subcommittee of the House Committee
on Appropriations. First Deficiency Appropriation Bill
for 1936. Hearings, 74 Cong., 2 sess., on H. R.
12624. Washington: April 8, 1936. 102 pp.

- U. S. Congress. House. Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. A Bill to Provide a Site for the National Conservatory of Music of America. Hearings, 70 Cong., 1 sess., on H.R. 8894. Washington: February 8, 1928, 15-16.
- U. S. Library of Congress. Report of the Librarian of Congress for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1937. Washington: G. P. O., 1937.
- U. S. Congress. Senate. A Bill to Provide a Building Site for the National Conservatory of Music of America. 53 Cong., 2 sess., S. Report #570. Washington: 1895.
- U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Hearings, 73 Cong., 2 sess., on S. 7527. Washington: 1934.
- U. S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. A Bill to Provide for a Permanent Bureau of Fine Arts. Hearings, 75 Cong., 3 sess., on S. 3296. Washington: February 28, March 1, 2, May 17, 1938.
- United States Statutes at Large, XLIII, part I, 788-89.
- Wrener, Minnie, ed. Principal Acts and Executive Orders Pertaining to the Public Works Administration. Washington: G.P.O., 1938. 84 pp.
- Interview with William V. Arvold, State Administrator of Federal Music Project in Wisconsin, 1935-40 (May 5, 1951).

Approved:

Merle Curti

Merle Curti
Professor of History

Date:

May 23, 1951
