The Thirty-fourth Annual Meeting
PRESIDENT'S REPORT

The 34th annual meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music represents the completion of one mission and the beginning of an opportunity for wider service to music. Such a moment in our history is consequently one fraught with more than ordinary gravity both for the present status of this association and its future.

It will be recalled that in 1924 our organization was established by a group of schools of music, largely independent conservatories, who were concerned about the recognition of the Bachelor of Music degree. Through the years this concern has been broadened to include all degrees in music. Today such recognition is cooperatively created by the National Commission on Accrediting and the regional associations. The action of the North Central Association this year opened the membership rolls of the regional associations to all music schools on the same basis as to any other collegiate level institution in the United States. For this we all owe a debt of gratitude to the National Commission on Accrediting and its executive secretary, Mr. William K. Selden. Equal recognition is due the founders of this association who have worked through the years to enhance its effectiveness, often at great personal sacrifice to themselves, in order that it could achieve those goals which it set for itself at its founding.

Our acceptance into academic halls carries with it certain implications and problems. As you know from personal experience our concern is two-fold. The first is the proportion and scope of liberal education requirements in our degree programs. It is probable that we should consider raising our present minimum requirement in the future, since a recent survey indicates that this will work no hardship for a majority of our membership. At the same time we hope to make progress in the anomalous situation in which many of us find ourselves, in which our students receive no liberal education credit for music if they play an instrument but they get credit (liberal education, that is) if they read a book about it. All we ask is reciprocal recognition for music in the liberal education core.

As you are also aware we face pressures from the so-called professional educators who are organized more effectively today than ever in the history of American education, having combined the leverage of institutional accreditation, individual certification by state officers, and certification laws to build an effective control of the teaching profession analogous to that which other leading professions exercise over their membership.
The recently reawakened interest in subject matter content will result in increased discipline of the intellect and the individual. Music is no longer alone as the one subject of discipline in the curriculum as it seemed to be in the day of the "permissive environment." The goals in education which we must now seek to serve become rather the training of the youth of the country in the discipline of the emotions through the training of the imagination and through the development of standards of taste. Vulnerable to criticism as Progressive Education was, it should be noted in justice that it recognized that education is for the whole child, not for his intellect alone. With the new subject matter emphasis I am confident that we can work more effectively than ever with the professional educator in the training of professional music educators. It is my sincere hope that our joint efforts will produce an optimum program of music throughout the educational system in this country with emphasis on excellence of achievement throughout the curriculum.

Last and of most concern to all of us who have had the privilege of thinking about the policy and the future of this association is the inescapable conclusion that we have an important continuing role in the maintenance of standards which we alone are qualified to judge. It would be an error on our part to completely turn over this function to the regional associations or to any other agency. With the maintenance of standards as our major area of service we should seek to extend our assistance as widely as possible through cooperative action.

Although we are primarily academically minded people, our working room in this educational system of which we are a part, as is the case with the architect, the doctor, the engineer, and others who have national accrediting associations, will be in direct proportion to the effectiveness with which we operate in our local campus plus the status in society of our professional products. If this association is to serve effectively as a spokesman for professional curricula in music, then the liaison idea which we have tried to promote in the past few years means that we must join hands more effectively than ever before with our colleagues, not only at the elementary and secondary school level in education, but with the private teachers, with whom we have always had a close and cordial relationship, with the church musicians, and with other professional musicians who are increasingly dependent on such schools as ours to train the personnel which fill their ranks. The recognition on national or state level of status, whether by a ticker tape parade for Van Cliburn or the certification of the private teacher, assists us in achieving the most effective educational curricula. In outlining this scope for our activities I would specifically exclude manufacturing and publishing interests together with the copyright law as related to music, on which our opinion is being sought. The totality of music interests in our country are very effectively coordinated and represented by our National Music Council.

The professional musician today has progressed in American society as the art of music has been recognized. His pressures may have been from a local in Chicago, but they are strictly not academic. The private teacher can teach at a distance once removed from many pressures to which we in education will be increasingly subject in the years ahead. We should, therefore, join with these colleagues to provide us with the maximum freedom of action in the academic environment which will be increasingly ours in the years ahead.

E. William Doty, President
GENERAL EDUCATION IN MUSIC: A REVIEW AND AN APPRAISAL

DR. EARL J. MCGRATH
Executive Officer, Institute of Higher Education

The Institute of Higher Education established two years ago has as its first research project a study of liberal education in eight undergraduate programs, including music. Specifically, the purposes of this study are to discover how much education is received by music, and other undergraduate students outside of their own field, how the non-professional and professional courses are arranged in the entire curriculum, and which influences, administrative, teaching, curricular organization and others, appear to result in a well-rounded course of study and which seem to create an excessively narrow professional education. The final report will include the written views of the leaders of the profession (some of whom are in this audience), an analysis of curriculum practices in schools and departments of music, and more particularly observations made in visits to representative institutions.

The Institute's staff has been drawn largely from among those thoroughly familiar with the problems, issues, and developments peculiar to each field. The study is intended to identify policies and practices in these professional schools conducive to that broad education which, as Dr. Max Kaplan put it at the meeting of the Music Educators National Conference in March, 1958, produces "students who can handle the most important instrument of all—they themselves; students who can handle the New York Times as well as a new musical instrument; students whose training in the field has included knowledge about the factory, the church and the recreation center as well as the fifth grade or choral literature; students, in short, who are men and women of the twentieth century society, who are aware of the achievements and potentials of art and music in this country."

This is a big order, and one which can be accomplished only with your help and understanding. It is a pleasure to report that we have already had this cooperation in unostentatious measure from those concerned with musical education.

The final findings and recommendations are, of course, not yet available. Let it be clear, however, that it is not the purpose of this inquiry to impair professional instruction, to place music administrators or teachers in subjection to others, nor to divorce general from professional education. Quite the contrary.

It should be said at the very outset that the accomplishments in musical education in America deserve the admiration of all those dedicated to the advancement of our intellectual and cultural life. The beginnings of music, especially in our institutions of higher education, were not auspicious. And even in the early part of this century professional education in music, like that in medicine and law, was unsystematized, often commercialized, poorly taught, highly specialized within its own subject matter, and remote from disciplines which have long been recognized as an essential part of a generous education.

In recent decades, however, the members of the profession of music have re-organized and redirected music education in such ways as to improve the general education of the musical fraternity without reducing the professional competence of its members. Indeed professional proficiency has increased concomitantly with breadth of learning. It is consequently no accident that this period has been one of rich cultural development in the United States, as the facts in Concert Music USA so clearly demonstrate.

Why then review musical education today, and particularly the status of general or liberal education as an essential element in the whole? This topic was doubtless put on the program because you want to take stock of past achievements, and to consider what yet remains to be done.
Time does not permit a detailed review of the ventures in general education over the past quarter century. They have varied widely in structure, scope, content, and method. Yet they did exhibit at least one characteristic in common — they had the purpose of broadening the student's undergraduate learning experiences. These adventures in general education sprang from a growing recognition among educators and laymen alike that higher education had become so fragmented, and consequently the individual student's program so specialized, that young people were completely uninformed about and incapable of understanding or dealing with many life situations which nevertheless were the common lot of all. Some college graduates, however well informed they may have been in one narrow field of intellectual endeavor, were totally ignorant of many others equally important in intelligent living. Moreover, specialization had reached a point where those in one field were unable to communicate with others. There was neither common knowledge nor intellectual skill to form the basis of a common culture. Many graduates of the liberal arts colleges exhibited as narrow a range of intellectual abilities and cultural tastes as their contemporaries leaving the professional schools.

The developments in general education widely adopted in recent years were designed to offset this high degree of undergraduate specialization. In a very considerable measure, though by no means uniformly, they have been successful. General instruction in the major areas of knowledge, the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities are now commonly required for the Bachelor's degree. That these advances are observable in the field of music, even to an outsider, is evident from the remarks of Dr. Harry Lowery, Principal of the South-West Technical College and School of Art in London since 1938 and the author of numerous books and articles on acoustics and music. In a personal survey of musical education in the United States he found the presence of liberal education in the professional music curriculum the one feature here that the English could feasibly emulate. He expressed his views in the following pointed language:

A matter of great importance which I noted in all types of higher educational institutions in the U.S.A. is the desire to ensure that advanced courses shall provide a liberal education, as distinct from a narrow technical training. In this it is possible that England has something to learn, for alarm has recently been expressed by eminent educationists that our university and college courses show a tendency to become too highly specialized, with the result that graduates and diploma candidates frequently pass out without possessing that broad culture which should characterize the truly educated person. Opinions may differ as to how this is to be achieved. At any rate, the danger is recognized in the American institutions, and courses in general subjects outside the field of the selected specialized study are required of the students.

Perspective on the American situation may also be gained from the volume, *Music in Education*, growing out of the International Conference under UNESCO auspices at Brussels in 1953 on the Role and Place of Music in the Education of Youth and Adults. The essays in this volume are thrilling testimony to the dynamic and versatile quality of musical education in America, reflected against the larger international scene, and they suggest that the United States has a real international role to perform by its example in higher musical education.

Further advances can probably be made more quickly and more permanently, however, if the dual nature of American higher education is clearly seen. In a democratic society like ours all citizens may ideally be expected to be civically competent and personally effective. With equal justification all may be expected to share in the work of the world. Some types of occupations, but a rapidly decreasing proportion of the total, still require little or no formal education beyond the secondary school. And the knowledge and skills essential to good citizenship and a satisfying personal life are still within the reach of those who may not have the advantages of higher education. For an increasing percentage of our people,
however, in some communities forty or fifty percent of those of the appropriate ages, advanced education is desirable and now feasible.

For most of these young people instruction beyond the secondary school must be a combination of both general and special or professional education. Only a few will be willing or able to spend four post-high school years in acquiring a general education with no visible vocational goal. Even the major in philosophy will generally have at least tentatively chosen a life of teaching or preaching. Even in the liberal arts colleges, which allegedly offer a comprehensive program of general education, a large part of the instruction will be, and indeed is now, oriented toward a professional or vocational objective. A study recently completed by the Institute of Higher Education reveals the increasing practice of the liberal arts colleges to offer no less vocationally oriented instruction than their counterparts in professional schools.

At once an attempt to restore a more normal balance to university studies and a bold facing of the needs of the present day, general education programs have seldom been pursued by a student exclusively for four years after high school. Many students, however, have shown themselves willing and often eager to devote the same time to the unrelieved study of a single liberal arts subject, such as science or a professional program in engineering or music. This is demonstrated by the fact that when given the privilege of electing courses freely many students take additional instruction in their major field, and often in a narrowing sector. If these students are to be something more than slaves to a specialized occupation they must be introduced to a large body of knowledge and intellectual skills which at the time of learning may seem of only remote significance in their future professions or their private lives.

What specifically does the acceptance of this dual function of higher education imply in the field of music? The discussion of this matter can for convenience of treatment be divided into two parts. The first has to do with the amount, kind, and structure of general education which ought to be an integral part of all undergraduate programs in music regardless of the students' ultimate professional goal. The second is concerned with responsibilities of departments or schools of music for music instruction which should be an element in the general education of students who have no professional interest, and perhaps little competence, in any branch of music.

With regard to the first, obviously music majors need a substantial general education no less than physicians, engineers, or business men. They should acquire a broad knowledge of the facts and principles in the sciences of the physical world and of man. Moreover their specialized work in music should be buttressed by instruction in the related bodies of learning encompassed in the humanities. They ought to achieve at least an elementary competence in the use of the methods of thinking employed and gain enough understanding of the subject matter peculiar to each area of study to be able to extend their knowledge on their own. This type of intellectual experience can best be gained in broad courses embracing several subject matter fields in a major corpus of knowledge, rather than through the single courses customarily designed to fit the needs of those who expect to go on in the subject.

Music educators can properly demand appropriate instruction in the various divisions of knowledge so that their students can achieve a sufficient breadth of education without being unnecessarily burdened. In addition to these general courses each student will presumably take some instruction in his own language and its literature. And for most a foreign language should round out their general education. Depending upon the particular organization of courses in a given institution, these general education requirements would probably require 40 of the 120 or more hours usually required for the Bachelor's degree. This number is not excessive when the purposes and values of such instruction are kept in mind.
It is, however, no doubt adequate; for to it one might well add courses such as history of music, theory, and counterpoint, which, if they are properly taught, require the same kinds of discipline as are found in Liberal Arts training—and because of motivation probably in greater measure.

The value of such learning in the creative aspects of professional life has been fully attested by the most accomplished practitioners of the arts. The original long-haired musician, Franz Liszt, was most insistent that the performer be more than a mere digital expert: he had an almost messianic conception of the role of the musician as a cultural leader, the intermediary between the finest literary and aesthetic achievements of man and the general public, a genuine high priest of general culture. Many concert artists have been appointed to the staffs of universities, and contrary to a common but uninformed view, they are usually the most outspoken advocates of a broad cultural background for music. Edward Kilenyi, for example, Professor of Piano at Florida State University, in discussing the indispensable value of a rich cultural background for the student who wished to secure a doctoral degree in performance concludes his article by saying that: “The human touch must be cultivated at least as thoroughly as the pianistic.” Other renowned musicians and composers have been ardent advocates of breadth of education for the music student. Edward S. Converse, as long ago as 1907, for example, urged the Music Teachers National Association that they

... not allow the music student to become a specialist too early. “Teach him,” Dr. Converse said, “the kindred beauties of literature, of painting, of sculpture; give him respect for the thoroughness and exactness of science, the brooding influences of political and social history, the logical deductions of philosophy, the pitiless competition of economic forces, the glowing imaginative flights of poets and dreamers of all ages, the enthusiasms of religions, new and old, and insist upon a comprehensive knowledge of the history of his own art from its earliest sources, distant and dim, in Egypt, Persia, and Greece, through its various important windings and ramifications down to our present day ... In other words, give him a sane, comprehensive judgment, a high standard of requirement, a serious standpoint and you give him the fundamental elements of an artist.”

But why go so far afield to document a point which is made self-evident by one who sits among us, by the life, the works, and the superlative achievements of Dr. Hanson, in Music and in public life generally.

There is a common fear that a professional group will lose its identity by permitting its students to be intermixed with other students in a program of general education. This is a grievous error. It rests on an assumption which is groundless, as the history of medical, legal, and many other forms of professional education clearly demonstrates. All professions have been enhanced by the broadening of their education, and by the enriched cultural and social contacts which such enlarged educational opportunities necessarily entail.

Music educators can legitimately raise a question, however, as to whether the broad objectives of professional and general education can be accomplished if the student is really to achieve professional competence, which in the last analysis is the raison d'être of the professional school. Both objectives can be reached only if the compass of work in each is kept within reasonable bounds, if the sequence of studies is carefully designed, and if there are mutual respect and cooperative working relationships between all the faculty members involved. Basic in these considerations must be the controlling idea that neither general nor professional education can be completed in four college years, nor in any other period of formal education, however long. These years can only be viewed as the beginning of general and professional education, not the end.

One shortcoming of the original general education efforts still persists. It is the practice in some institutions, particularly professional schools, to treat the general education of the student as a thing apart from his total intellectual, social,
and professional development. The administrative policies and the structure of complex institutions often encourage this separatism by placing part of a student's education under completely unrelated academic units. This bifurcation of general and specialized or professional education rests on an inadequate conception of the complete and integral purposes of higher education.

General education can fulfill its proper functions best when it is an integral part of a professional program. In some institutions all or most of the requirements in general studies are concentrated in the first year or two. A common pattern, especially at some state universities, requires students to complete a group of general courses before they can even register in a professional program. There are reasons to justify this arrangement. On balance, however, especially in a field like music another arrangement seems preferable. Under this alternative plan the student enters upon his general and his special courses in the freshman year. In fact ideally he would consider both merely as different elements in a rounded education. This arrangement capitalizes on the student's motivation. He is not disgruntled by regulations which prevent him from beginning instruction in business, pharmacy, engineering, or music when he has already arrived at least at a tentative vocational choice. Moreover this parallel arrangement provides opportunity for interrelating general and special subjects to the benefit of both. In music there is the added factor of preserving and enhancing skills which for want of exercise quickly deteriorate. The negative aspect of the situation deserves consideration. A few students who enter a professional field find it uncongenial to their taste or beyond their ability. The sooner this discovery is made the better, so that they may leave or move into a more attractive department.

A prominent advantage claimed for the curriculum horizontally divided into general and professional subject matter is that, for a time at least, students devote their undivided attention to general education, while in programs in which both professional and general courses are offered simultaneously general courses suffer because they seem less important or less timely, or because teachers of professional subjects expect too much of students. The fault here lies not in the structure of the curriculum but in the faculty which devised it. Though the Institute's studies of professional education are not yet finished, there is evidence that student opinions toward non-professional courses to a marked degree mirror faculty attitudes. If teachers of music look upon courses in science and philosophy as a waste of time, or an unnecessary intrusion in a professional program, the morale and the accomplishment of students in these courses are likely to be low.

In this connection there is a whole complex of problems relating to the training and the recruitment of college teachers. These problems are found in the entire range of instruction in colleges of liberal arts and in all types of professional schools. The scandalous fact of academic life is that few of these teachers are adequately prepared for their responsibility. This criticism does not imply that a series of courses in education would solve the problem, though some such instruction is being given for future college teachers in a few universities, and being well received by those who voluntarily take it. The kind of education future college teachers need most is an extension of the broad liberal education which they are supposed to stand for and propagate. The situation at present in the graduate schools, with very minor exceptions does not encourage, nor indeed permit, the breadth of education in music nor in any other field essential to competent instruction in general courses for non-specialists in the undergraduate years. There are competent teachers of this type, but their graduate education had little to do with their broad knowledge of subject matter, their understanding of students, or their skills in teaching. These qualities of the good teacher, they acquired by hook or by crook, or by their own systematic and dedicated efforts.

In any case the intricate problem of designing a professional educational program cannot be resolved by turning half of the responsibility over to another
The professional school and its program will in the last analysis be known by the performance of its graduates in the totality of life's activities. A poor general education provided by another faculty will reflect not on this group but rather on those who have primary responsibility for the preparation of future practitioners. This is not to say that the best results can be achieved through policies of separation and the practice of aloofness. Indeed, the study, *General Education in Engineering,* reveals that the best results in designing a general education program for engineers were obtained when both the liberal arts faculty and the engineering faculty worked together on the matter from the beginning.

Whether both a general and a professional education can be provided in a four year integrated program will also be determined by the character and the timing of professional courses. Is it not good policy to agree that there is a general body of professional subject matter that ought to be the possession of all music majors? If so, then ought the early years of the four year sequence be primarily devoted to beginning courses in composition, the opera, or history, which are really the basic courses in a highly specialized sequence? Would it not be sounder practice to use this period primarily for elementary instruction common to all majors? Such an arrangement implies, of course, that the student will not go as far into his specialty in four years, but is this not as it should be? Advanced work of a highly specialized variety ought to be pursued in the graduate school, the institution established for this purpose. Under this plan the prospective professional musician will leave the undergraduate program prepared to live an intelligent life as a member of the civic community and also broadly grounded in his calling, prepared to carry on his professional advancement through additional formal education and through his personal efforts. Is this not really all that can be hoped for in the undergraduate professional school of music, or any other field? Several professional groups, engineering and teaching, for example, are answering this question in the affirmative.

The other major aspect of this topic relates to the need for general instruction in music for non-professional students. The music programs of the elementary and secondary schools in many communities have had a perceptible influence on the tastes and the accomplishments of young people. The programs, moreover, of institutions of higher musical education have stimulated the musical activities of those who live in or near urban centers. Through the radio and television fine music, old and new, is brought daily to all those who seek the delights of good music anywhere in the nation. In increasing numbers our people are taking advantage of these opportunities.

When all this has been said, however, an objective observer must admit that many college students receive absolutely no instruction in music, once one of the seven liberal arts—nor in any of the other fine arts for that matter. Worse still, many young people who had earlier achieved some musical skill are compelled to forgo these activities during the college years because of the pressure of other studies. Even when electives are permitted, as is generally true in undergraduate schools, music and the other fine arts are not chosen as frequently as other subjects.

Thus far some members of music departments have not been sufficiently concerned about the place of their own subject in the general education of college students. Some have been as preoccupied with future Tebaldis as the scientists are with future Einsteins. This may be a trait exhibited by all enthusiastic devotees of a subject.

Perhaps a parenthetical observation may not be out of place here with regard to recent actions in government and also among private organizations calculated to enhance the position of science and technology in our culture. We are all eager to find among promising youth potentially creative scientists and to provide for them the maximum opportunity for the development of their abilities. But to
single them out for special financial aid and other forms of preferment not generally available to students in other fields is not in the long-run interests of the nation. Survival is obviously primary, but every contemplated national policy ought also to be evaluated in terms of the kind of life it is designed to preserve. The greatest danger from totalitarianism is that we will unconsciously adopt its most repugnant features. Two of these are the excessive emphasis in communistic countries on the material aspects of life, and on the regimentation of life. Some of their present practices in connection with the improvement of the physical aspects of their culture through science and technology reflect these practices. Russian policies involve government selection of students, a curriculum prescribed in detail, restrictions in the fine arts and literature, and the general suppression of the freedom of the individual, as the case of Boris Pasternak so clearly shows. These are policies and practices which we do not want to emulate. Any actions of government or the public generally which favor students whose talents lie in the fields of science and technology while penalizing even indirectly those whose gifts are in literature and the other arts will only exaggerate a cultural disbalance which antedates the satellites. Such a course of action will in the long run devitalize and impoverish American life. It will not enhance our position in the world at large, for we are already accused by the underprivileged nations of over-valuing the material and under-valuing the cultural and spiritual aspects of life. In the competition for the loyalties of free men behind the Iron Curtain and elsewhere, Van Cliburn has undoubtedly strengthened the cause of democracy fully as much as the launching of a satellite. Cultural advancement in all aspects of life is the strongest weapon in our arsenal of national resources. Educational policies should be designed to strengthen rather than weaken the social and humane disciplines through which we gain understanding of men and nations, their basic impulses, their hopes, their spiritual convictions, and the cultural media through which they find expression.

Courses are needed which in one academic year will give the student a modest understanding of the nature of music, its place historically at least in Western culture, the technical methods by which music is created and produced, and its general relationships to the culture of which it is such an important part. As President Alan Valentine said in 1949:

...If the future of music education is to remain and expand in our colleges and universities, your problem is two-fold. First is the formulation of courses which will fit music into the post-war programs for general studies in undergraduate colleges. In formulating such courses musicians must take the initiative.

As the leaders in musical education consider the place of general education in their own professional curriculum they ought, therefore, also to consider their own potential contribution to the complete intellectual and emotional development of American youth. As they do both these things they will enhance their own position in the academic community, increase their already significant contribution to the improvement and the enrichment of our national life, and dignify American culture in the eyes of civilized men throughout the world.
Fellow members of the National Association of Schools of Music, I am very happy to have the opportunity of discussing, with my distinguished colleague, Dr. Earl McGrath, the subject of the fine arts, and music in particular, in the broad field of education. I have known Dr. McGrath first as Commissioner for Education of the United States Government, later as President of the University of Kansas City, and now in his present position in Columbia University where he is undertaking a thorough and illuminating study of the fine arts and their relation to general education—or perhaps I should more accurately say, general education in relation to the fine arts.

I use the verb, discuss, rather than debate, because from my reading of his articles and addresses I feel that we are in almost complete accord.

During the past year my attention has been increasingly focused on what we might call the general subject of the arts, education, and man power in the scientific and technological age and I would ask your indulgence in sharing some of these experiences with you.

Early in the year I had the opportunity of serving as a member of the Advisory Committee for the Ford Foundation in its exciting program in the humanities and the creative arts. A little later I had the equally interesting opportunity of participating in a national television forum with members of the Educational Policies Commission and a small group of consultants in a number of diverse fields. Still later I had the privilege of meeting with the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO in an attempt to impress on the other members of the Commission what seems to me to be the high importance of the creative arts in international diplomacy. This is a position which in theory seems to have the support of the U. S. Commission and the Department of State. I am afraid, however, that it is a support in theory rather than in practice for, as a matter of fact, the theory has received only slight implementation. In this respect, at least, we seem to be far behind our Russian rivals.

Finally, only a few weeks ago, I participated in the first meeting called jointly by the American Academy of Political Science and Senator Clark of Pennsylvania to discuss the whole vital question of the use of man power in the United States. I found this discussion particularly stimulating since the twenty consultants present represented almost every important area of American life from the head of the U. S. Civil Service, the Director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, college and university presidents, representatives of labor, of management, of medicine, law, the humanities, and the like.

In all these meetings, each of which had no connection with the other, and each of which brought together a different group of consultants in the various fields, one thing seemed apparent. Although there was no uniformity of opinion on details, certain basic ideas and conclusions seemed to run as a continuing thread through the fabric of all of the discussions. I would like to try to describe these strands, however inadequately.

First, there seemed to be a general recognition of the fact that we are being strongly challenged by Russia not only in matters directly related to the cold war but equally in the fields of education, technology, the creative arts, and the humanities. There was, furthermore, the strong implication that, at least in the minds of many of the consultants at the various meetings, all is not well with American education and American culture.

I should, perhaps, interpolate here as one ray of sunshine the remark of that very brilliant thinker and philosopher, Henry Wriston, who remarked that we seemed to have gone from a period of complete complacence characteristic of the first three decades of the century to a period of unparalleled criticism in the present
decade. He remarked, with a twinkle in his eye, that he hoped that he would not be considered unpatriotic if he expressed the opinion that conditions are neither so bad nor so hopeless as some of our American critics would have us believe!

Of all the areas under discussion, education seemed to come in for the most stinging criticism. The majority of consultants, for example, who had had the opportunity of first-hand observance of the Russian educational system, expressed the philosophy that, although they were strongly in favor of the American philosophy of intellectual freedom with its stress on the development of the individual in his own capacities, they nevertheless believed that the discipline and rigor of the Russian point of view were able to accomplish more in a shorter space of time.

Such criticism of education is, however, nothing new. All of us who have been in education for a long period of time remember that in every crisis in American life there seems to be the tendency to blame all of the ills of the world on the educational system! As a people we have always had an almost naïve belief in what I have referred to before as "curricular tinkering," the belief that the maladies of civilization can be easily corrected by the addition of some courses of study and the deletion of others, a theory which has generally proven to be false.

These criticisms, however, seem to be of a different order, more serious and at the same time more constructive. There was the belief frequently expressed that we needed more depth in education, even than we needed more breadth; that we would accomplish more by a deeper concentration on fewer subjects rather than spreading the curriculum to the point where it became, to use the words of Levant, "a smattering of ignorance."

It was natural that, correlated with this point of view, should be a criticism of the theories of teacher training existing today in many of our colleges and universities with the tremendous emphasis on the upgrading of courses in methodology, pedagogical materials and techniques, and "scientific" procedures, the validity of which was sometimes highly questionable, accompanied by downgrading of the importance of the subject matter to be taught.

This, of course, is again nothing new but expresses a general philosophy pertaining to all education with which we are thoroughly, and at times unhappily, acquainted.

Another area in the field of education which, especially in one meeting, was subjected to the sharpest criticism was the whole field of educational counseling which some of the members of the group considered to be carried on in a manner which was incompetent, irrelevant, but very material! This was accompanied by the strong belief expressed repeatedly that what our country needs is not more scientists, but better scientists, not more musicians, but better musicians. This is, without doubt, an oversimplification of the general manpower problem.

I was very happy to hear, particularly in the discussions of the manpower committee, the frequent use of the phrase "emotional involvement." I was particularly happy to hear this phrase in connection with a discussion of the best utilization of talent since it seems to emphasize what has always seemed to me to be a basic philosophy essential to a free society; namely, that every child should be given the opportunity of doing those things for which his talent best equips him, for developing his capacities as an individual rather than in conformity with a pattern which has been set by authoritarian control. "Emotional involvement," if I understand it correctly, means simply enthusiasm, the opportunity for the individual to concentrate in the field in which he has a personal enthusiasm, a field in which he is emotionally involved. The Russian plan may, perhaps, increase the number of scientists by converting a good poet into a bad physicist; but there is the strong possibility that such a political philosophy harms both poetry and physics!

There was another expression of opinion which was brought up again and again in every group and which greatly heartened me, although it did not surprise
me. This was the repeated expression of the great importance of the humanities and the creative arts in a technological age. It was particularly heartening, although, again, not surprising, that this expression of opinion came not only from the educators themselves, but particularly from the scientists.

To those of us who have been concerned with the position of the creative arts in the world today, for anyone who has been fearful that the creative arts might disappear in an age of science, the strong support of the creative arts coming from the scientists themselves should prove reassuring.

In the days ahead the arts in general and our own art of music may suffer some vicissitudes. These will come, if they come, not from the best minds of the nation but from less informed groups, perhaps from local boards of education who, spurred on by laudable but misguided patriotism, may seek to remove all of the so-called "frills" from the curricula of the public schools in order, once again, to convert talented poets, artists, and musicians into bad scientists. This, I am sure, will pass; and, I believe, pass quickly.

In the face of these problems what should be our attitude as musicians and teachers? Should we sit quietly by waiting for the day when the educational and cultural imbalance will right itself, or is there positive action which we may with profit pursue?

I believe that such a positive philosophy is not only possible but highly desirable. Such a philosophy would, I believe, have four important facets.

First, I believe that the creative arts should present their case in the court of public opinion more vigorously, more enthusiastically and with greater conviction. We, as musicians, for example, should not be apologetic because music is not a "useful" pursuit in a materialistic sense. We should, I believe, embrace the art—and for that matter, all of the arts—as a great whole. Music as creation, music as performance, music as scholarship, music as history, music as therapy, music as a social force. We should, as teachers, first understand the power which lies hidden in the creative arts so that, being convinced ourselves, we may be able honestly to convince others.

Second, I believe that we should increase our search for depth in technical education. We should find out for ourselves the tremendous depth, breadth, and height of this art which we all serve so that again, being convinced ourselves, we may honestly convince others.

Third, we should search for the best plan for the integrating of music with general education, and the integrating of general education with music. For the musician of the future—and, indeed, the musician of the present—finds it increasingly difficult to live in his ivory tower. He has become more than ever a part of the main stream of life and he must be able to swim with confidence and strength in that current. This is a formidable task but one which, I believe, can, with imagination and enthusiasm, be successfully undertaken.

Fourth, we, as musicians, as artists, must convince ourselves that music in a democracy must exist on its own proven merits. The social philosophy of the support of the arts by the courts of the old world or the patronage of the immediate past—royal or otherwise—is probably over and gone. We must meet the challenge of the arts today in the framework of today's social structure.

Speaking to the opening convocation of the Eastman School of Music at the beginning of my thirty-fifth year as Director of that institution, I referred, somewhat nostalgically, I am afraid, to the few things which I have learned over this span of three and a half decades.

The first thing I have learned, I said, is perhaps the enormous expanse of any field of human knowledge and endeavor; the tremendous demands if one is to hope to achieve expertness, or even what passes for expertness in any one field. I have worked, I believe, hard and conscientiously over the years and yet I am appalled at my lack of knowledge of my own field of music.
When I think, however, of the vast realms of man’s knowledge and of the infinite possibilities of new knowledge, of the literatures of the world, the arts of the world—not only of the west, but of the east, the north and the south—when I think of man’s exploration into the unknowns of the physical universe, I do not feel even literate.

A direct corollary to what we have been discussing would seem to be the importance of devoted and meticulous scholarship coupled with unlimited industry, if one is to begin to master even one phase of an art or a science.

The second corollary which I would draw might, at first glance, seem to contradict the first; but I, personally, see no basic contradiction. It is that regardless of the importance of the part, the whole is more important than the sum of its parts. No matter how important your studies or mine may be—no matter how expert we may become in one branch of a branch of a branch of a branch of knowledge of an art or a science—the total whole is more important. Translated into our own field this would mean that no matter how proficient you may become as a performing artist, that expertness is only a part of, a servant of, the art itself. And, again, that art is only a part of man’s creative life. And that creative life, the life of all of the arts combined, is only a part of the civilization which contains and harbors it; and that in turn is a part of the great stream of history which in turn is—but I must stop before some intellectual traffic cop calls for my license as an amateur metaphysician.

We have been talking so far primarily about technical education, the necessity of painstaking, laborious study and practice, with no short cuts, and no “easy” ways. But what have I learned about general education? What about the vast fields of knowledge which lie outside our own immediate sphere of interest?

Here, I must confess that the years have brought me to a state of confusion and frustration. And yet, even here, certain ideas appear to me vaguely through a fog as heavy as that which sometimes invades our island off the rocky coast of Maine. First of all I am coming to believe that we must distinguish between the terms “general education” and “cultural education” which have too often been used synonymously.

As far as broad general education is concerned, I have come to believe that, if literally interpreted, and if it is to imply any depth, it is for most people an impossibility, at least within the confines of a college course. It is of course possible to attain what Oscar Levant called a “smattering of ignorance.” It is quite possible for the layman to learn that Bach is a distinguished name in the musical fraternity without learning the correlative fact that there were quite a number of Bachs more closely related genealogically than esthetically. The same thing may be done in the fine arts, in literature and even in the sciences. This type of “general education” may have some value in polite after-dinner conversation, although there is always the possibility that the participant may make a profound ass of himself by indulging.

And yet to explore these broad fields even partially and with any depth would require, when coupled with the constantly increasing demands of technical education, more time than most students could spare. Suppose I were to say for example to a hypothetical son of mine: “Your father is an example of a rather highly technical education. I don’t want you to be illiterate like your old man, therefore, I am sending you to college for what the educators call a ‘broad general education.’

“First I want you to have a good classical foundation in Latin and Greek, at least four years of each. From then on to the modern languages, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, one from Scandinavian, and Russian. Later perhaps you can pick up some Japanese, Chinese, Hindustani, modern Arabic, etc. Since the first year accomplishes little and the second year not much more, you will not
reach the literature of the new tongue until the third and fourth years. At the end of four years you may actually be able to speak a little, although in some schools this is unlikely.

"Then you must study seriously the history of western civilization since we understand our own time only in terms of the flow of history. This should certainly embrace ancient civilization, medieval, renaissance, modern and with our shrinking globe the histories of Eastern cultures, also Islamic culture, African culture, and the like.

"You must know the literature, the poetry, the drama, the novel of your own tongue, from Chaucer to Carl Sandburg, together with an appreciation of the history and the literature of the arts of music, painting, sculpture, architecture, the practical arts and the folk arts.

"And now, we come to the sciences—physics, chemistry, biology, geology, anthropology, mathematics. Two years of each will give you some slight appreciation at least of their problems, although I would advise four years of mathematics since pure or abstract mathematics seems to me to be the most fascinating of all.

"And now the most important of all. What does man think of himself, of society, of his relation to his fellowman? You must devote a great deal of time to Philosophy, at least Plato and Aristotle to James and Whitehead. Nor must you neglect the fields of Ethics and Logic, comparative religion, epistemology. You should certainly take courses in economics, government and above all, psychology—general, educational, adolescent, abnormal, and the like. You may, if you wish, omit the course in History and Principles of Education."

"But Dad, I know the kick you have been on about this general education racket"—I deplore my son’s language—"but these courses you mention are for the most part six hour courses and I figure it will take me about sixteen years to get through the courses you want me to take, and I want to be a doctor, perhaps a surgeon."

"That’s all right, my boy," I replied. "You will be only 34 when you graduate from college. You can then pick up the additional pre-med requirements you need and with luck you should be through medical school and your internship by the time you are 40. After post-doctoral training you should be practicing at least by the time you are 45 or 50. Since I am a college professor, money is no object."

Now I have written this fantasy only partially as a joke for it poses a very real problem. Many colleges have tried courageously and imaginatively to solve them. The "core course" with its emphasis on conformity, putting all students in the same Procrustean bed devised by some omniscient educator or committee of educators, I passionately reject.

No college president, no committee of educators, I believe, has the wisdom to prescribe the essentials of education for every student, regardless of interest and aptitude.

We all agree, I trust, that music is a Good Thing, but should it be required of everyone? Witness the poor tone-deaf young man sitting in the back row of a college music appreciation course listening with complete and desperate boredom to a recording of the B Minor Mass because the President of his college, having enjoyed enormously a course in Music Appreciation at college, felt that every student of his college should have the same experience. But what an experience for the martyred young man.

Then again there are associations which have nicely divided knowledge into fields, areas, divisions—or whatever the current terminology may be—and prescribed appropriate doses of each. One association has succeeded in classifying, arranging all knowledge with all the neatness of bottles on the shelves of an apothecary's shop,
with prescriptions—one before each meal and two before bed time, with plenty of water.

But there must be other possibilities. When we change the title from “general” to “cultural” education I can see more hope. For here it is possible to separate “tool courses” or “technical” courses from those courses which are designed to give to the student deeper understanding of the art of living.

May I take just a few moments more? Certain things we must know to be proficient in our profession. Let us call these “technical.” Certain things we should know in order to carry on activity in the world of men, reading, writing, and arithmetic, and to these I would add the art of speech. Now we are equipped to earn a living but not necessarily to live.

In the vast field of human knowledge what more do we need, or rather, what do we need most, granting that all knowledge is important. I believe that such supplementary education should be peripheral, ancillary, directly connected with our own interests. It should, I believe, be centered about what we might call a practical philosophy, a study of what the great minds of the past and the present have analyzed as man’s greatest needs. It should be accompanied by the history of man, since man learns by his mistakes as well as by his achievements; and by the communicating arts of literature, language, and the creative arts. In the latter it should endeavor especially to sensitize man’s minds to beauty as well as truth, an endeavor especially which has never been seriously stressed in most American colleges. Any general education in the sciences should, I believe, be primarily concerned with the impact of scientific development on man rather than with the technique of the science. And in this I am consistent since I also believe that in general education we as musicians should be concerned with the impact of the art on the individual rather than with the study of the theory of tone-relations.

You see that I have assigned a high priority to the humanities and the creative arts in general education. I believe that this high priority is justified for in this technological age the arts and the humanities are desperately needed if man is to escape the death of spiritual automation.

Science can kill or cure, heal or maim, but it cannot, of itself, minister to man’s spiritual needs. It cannot supply him with the sustenance his soul demands.

But this is what the Arts can do. They can show you the beauty of the forest, the majesty of the sea, the mystery of the stars. Bach has done it, Beethoven has done it, even you and I have done it as we have played and sung great music together. This is our challenge. It is your challenge for the Lord has given you the gifts with which to show beauty, to reveal mysteries to the minds and souls of men.

This is what I have learned in thirty-four years, the importance of beauty and the importance of man and the glory of a great art which God has given to mankind for the communication of that beauty.
THE PROPOSED REVISION OF THE COPYRIGHT LAW

Dr. J. D. Robb

The progress of science and the arts and in particular the advances made in the movies, radio, television and mechanical reproduction of music, speech and sound and other factors have rendered our present Copyright Law obsolete in many respects. Several years ago Congress appropriated moneys for the purpose of a study or series of studies under the supervision of the Register of Copyrights looking toward a general revision of the Copyright Law.

Seven of these studies have now been completed and are available at the Copyright Office in Washington. The Copyright Office is eager to have the views of all persons and groups concerned with the problems considered in the various studies and suggestions for revision of the law. As a group concerned with both education and music the National Association of Schools of Music should be in a position to make valuable suggestions and it is for the purpose of eliciting such suggestions that this meeting has been scheduled.

In order to outline a background for our discussions I will first attempt to summarize briefly the present provisions of the Copyright Law.

THE LAW

Authority for the enactment of copyright legislation is found in Article 1, Section 5 of the Constitution of the United States and it is well to read this for its language rules out some of the more radical suggestions for revision.

"The Congress shall have Power . . . to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

The basic Copyright Law of today was framed in 1909. It has been amended from time to time and is now Title 17 of the United States Code.

The most important change in the copyright situation since 1909 took place when the United States became a participant in the Universal Copyright Convention on its coming into effect in 1955. This Convention in effect grants reciprocal rights to the copyright owners of the signatory states, some forty of them, including most of the free world. India is a member, as is Jugoslavia. The other communist states have not adhered to the Convention. Nor have most of the states of the Near East and Far East and Africa.

Section 1 of the Copyright Law gives, for the life of the copyright, the following exclusive rights in a musical work to persons complying with the provisions of the law:

To print, reprint, publish, copy and vend the work;
To arrange or adapt it;
To make transcriptions or records, and play or perform it in public for profit, etc.
To produce or reproduce it in any manner or by any method whatsoever;
To perform or represent it publicly if it be a drama.

The common law rights of the author or proprietor of an unpublished work in law or in equity to prevent its copying, publication or use without his consent and to obtain damages therefor are not annulled or limited. Music is one of the limited number of categories of unpublished works which may be copyrighted however. The period of the copyright is 28 years from the date of publication with the right of renewal within the 28th year for another 28 years, or 56 years in all.

The procedure for registration is simple:

In the case of published works a notice of copyright must be attached to each copy; two complete copies of the best edition must be deposited promptly in the Copyright Office; an affidavit that the typesetting and certain other work was done
in the United States must be filed; the registration fee of $4 must be paid and
certain other formalities must be complied with.

In the case of unpublished works the deposit of an executed registration form,
together with one copy of the work and the fee of $4, as well as the affixing to
each copy of the work of the prescribed copyright notice, is required.

The form of notice is merely the word "Copyright" or the letter "c" in a circle,
together with the name of the claimant and the year of publication (or registration
in the case of an unpublished work).

Failure to file after demand by the Register of Copyright, promptly, the
required copies of a published work may entail a fine and the loss of the copyright.
Failure to affix notice of copyright to every copy may operate to forfeit the
copyright, except that where the copyright proprietor has tried to comply with
the Law, as far as notice is concerned, an accidental omission from individual copies
merely defeats the right to recover damages from an innocent infringer or to obtain
an injunction unless the innocent infringer is reimbursed for his costs.

Assignments of a copyright must be filed in the Copyright Office within three
months.

Remedies for infringement are: an injunction restraining further infringement;
the right to recover all damages suffered as well as all profits of the infringer; (the
plaintiff need only prove the infringer's sales and the infringer must prove his
costs) the impounding of the infringing articles; and the destruction of all infringing
copies or devices including plates, molds etc. There are certain limitations on
the amount of damages recoverable for certain types of infringement. Suggested
amounts are: for choral or orchestral works, $100 for the first and $50 for each
subsequent infringement; for other music $10 for every infringing performance.
Criminal liability under the law for willful infringement for profit or for abetting
the same is a fine of $100 to $1000 or one year's imprisonment or both. Fines are
also provided for affixing a false copyright notice or for unauthorized alteration
of a copyright notice.

The special statute of limitations bars prosecution after three years. There is
a special exemption which reads as follows: Nothing in this title shall prevent the
performance of religious or secular works such as oratorios, cantatas, masses, octavo
choruses, by public schools, church choirs, or vocal societies, rented, borrowed or
obtained from some public library, public school, church choir, school choir, or
vocal society, provided the performance is given for charitable or educational pur-
poses and not for profit.

In addition to the above exemption, there are also certain special provisions and
limitations.

THE SEVEN CURRENT STUDIES FOR REVISION

The seven completed studies deal with the following subjects.

1. The Compulsory License Clause. The present law provides that if the copy-
right holder permits a commercial recording to be made of a work, anyone
thereafter may record the work upon the payment of a royalty of 2 cents for each
such recording. Notice must be given to the copyright holder promptly. The
reason for this provision of the law was the player piano had been developed
and one company, the Aeolian Company, had acquired or developed most of the
piano roll business. Congress apparently feared that it might achieve a monopoly
by tying up all the available artists. Arguments advanced for the repeal or modi-
fication of the clause are: that there is no longer any danger of monopoly in the
recording industry; that the anti-trust laws give adequate protection anyway; that
the clause is unfair to the copyright owner who has no control over who may record
his music and that fly-by-night companies can pirate recordings without detection
or paying the required fee and that finally the 2 cent fee set up when recordings
did not last over three minutes is no longer adequate for long playing records and
tapes. The clause should probably be eliminated or at least amended. There are many other questions raised by this study and all the other studies but I have only time to mention a few of them.

2. The Damage Provisions. Should not the damage provisions scattered as they are through the act be consolidated and simplified? Should they not be clarified? It seems clear that they should. Under the present law it seems that the court may assess instead of actual damages what it deems just, but except in special cases not less than $250 or more than $5000. This seems excessive for certain infringements. The special limitations are, I think, too arbitrary and should be simplified and clarified.

3. Duration of Copyright. The bulk of informed opinion seems to be that we have too short a period and that it should be extended to conform to the majority rule abroad which confers copyright for the life of the author plus fifty years. This period would start with the act of creation of the work, not at the date of publication. It is argued that this would eliminate the necessity of notice of copyright. The infringer would have the burden of proving that the author had been dead for fifty years. A subsidiary question which has been raised is this: should the additional fifty year period (that is, after the death of the author) run automatically and should its benefits redound only to the widow and dependents of the author?

4. Divisibility of Copyright. Should the owners of parts of a copyright, for instance an exclusive licensee, be authorized to register and sue upon a partial assignment without the necessity of bringing into the picture the owners of all the other parts of the copyright? Under the present law, I believe, only a total assignment of a whole copyright can be registered.

5. Unauthorized Duplication of Sound Recordings. Should the law give further protection against this practice? If so, how? Does the present law plus the common law copyright and the law against unfair competition give adequate protection? Should educational and charitable institutions be exempted?

6. Notice of Copyright. Should notice be retained as a condition of full copyright protection? Under the life plus 50 years rule it has been argued no notice would be necessary.

7. Protection of Unpublished Works. Should the present situation (providing protection by statute for works voluntarily registered, leaving all others to common law protection under state law) be continued? Should the classes of works eligible for voluntary recordation be expanded? Incidentally music is one of the classes of unpublished works which may be recorded under the Law. Should statutory protection be limited to published works, all others being left to common law? Should the statute be made to cover all works, published or unpublished, the common law of copyright being superseded by statute?

These are only a few of the questions raised in the studies referred to as I have previously stated.

**Other Questions**

There are other questions which have been asked. Here are a few of them. Should the so-called juke box provision be eliminated? Under this provision public performance of music by way of coin operated machines is exempt if admission is not charged. A bill to eliminate this exemption failed to pass the last Congress despite impressive support. Some of us may ask whether juke boxes advance the useful arts but the argument for repeal of the provision is that if live music were used or even a phonograph if not coin operated, royalties could be collected and that the law is therefore unfair and discriminatory.

What about works enjoying perpetual common law protection, like the diary of a soldier of the American revolution in manuscript, or out of print works where the copyright owner can not be located with reasonable diligence? Should scholars
have an exemption for the copying of such works for research or teaching purposes?

Should special provision be made by statute for copying of parts in an emergency when not enough parts have been sent or are available or if a part necessary for a performance has been lost?

Should the law exempt from liability institutions lending scores or recordings to students for educational purposes for unauthorized use of such material by the students?

Should the law provide specific protection for works recorded on discs, or tape or otherwise before they are reduced to manuscript form or copyrighted? Otto Luening contends that records, tapes, performances and even sound itself can be and should be covered by the copyright law, for instance works by the tape-sichordists which cannot be reduced to written form by existing techniques.

What new problems have been created by the widespread use of tapes, records and kinescopes? What new problems have been created by the institution of educational television programs? Do such problems require recognition in a new copyright law?

How is the public interest to be protected so that reasonable latitude is given for the non-commercial use by the public, educational and charitable institutions, of copyrighted works?

Since most educational institutions are not in business for profit would it promote the useful arts for such institutions to have broader blanket exemption than they now enjoy? It has been said that this would promote the performance of contemporary music since the competition of royalty-free works in the public domain would diminish. On the other hand it is said that performances depend largely on the availability of music through publication. Publishers will not publish unless assured of adequate royalties. Thus there will be more performances despite royalty requirements if there are more publications and there will be more money and incentive for composers if educational institutions pay for music used just as they pay for everything else.

**Conclusion**

These are some of the questions that have been asked. There are many others. We will be asked as educators to state our position either directly or through the National Music Council. I hope that the results of our discussions at this meeting and in the regional meetings which are to follow it will be reduced to writing for the use of the officers of the Association. There are many respects in which the Copyright Law affects us and the institutions which we represent. We are in a unique position to make suggestions of value. In conclusion I should like to recommend the appointment of a committee to study the question of revision in the light of our discussions here and to make recommendations to the next meeting of this body.

**THE SECRETARY REPORTS**

As of the annual meeting of 1958, we now boast a total institutional membership of 244 schools, including those newly elected. One member resigned and one was dropped during the past year. The Pittsburgh Musical Institute felt that it no longer belonged on our roster because of its lack of authorization from its state to grant degrees; as it was a Charter Member and its then Director, Charles N. Boyd, was one of the founders and for 12 years its treasurer, we mark its departure from our ranks with real regret.

The statistical figures are appended below and speak for themselves. While the enrollment shows a slight decline, the number of degrees granted shows an increase. The expenditure for books seems to have increased and for music to have decreased;
this is due to a change in the way the figures have been requested, in that music purchased for library is now included in the book figure and the amount for music is for orchestra, band and chorus use. The total of the two figures shows about $390,000 for 1956-57 and $443,000 for 1957-58. The expenditure for phonograph recordings shows about a $12,000 increase while there was a very marked decline in the equipment budgets. This may mean that fewer new buildings or alterations were attempted during the year covered by the reports.

STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of schools reporting</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1956</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEGREES GRANTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Music</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>1,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach. Mus. Ed.</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>2,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B. in Music</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Music</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorates</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total degrees</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>5,071</td>
<td>5,329</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>5,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per school</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ENROLLMENTS                 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Undergrad. majors           | 10,432| 23,423| 25,608| 22,407| 22,594| 22,139|
| Undergrad. non-majors       | 13,545| 19,517| 39,192| 44,964| 48,852| 35,405|
| Grad. students              | 1,150 | 2,299 | 2,363 | 3,301 | 3,503 | 2,919 |
| Prep. students              | 17,233| 32,460| 34,241| 40,528| 42,604| 39,471|
| Total                      | 42,019| 77,369|101,404|111,200|117,553| 99,934|
| Average per school          | 368   | 493   | 560   | 496.4 | 491.8 | 418.1 |
| Summer                      | 11,600| 11,391| 11,000| 9,491 | 10,981| 11,124|

| FACULTY                     |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Total                      | 2,703| 4,185| 4,835| 5,249| 5,191| 5,013 |
| Average per school         | 23   | 26.4 | 26   | 23.4 | 21.7 | 21   |
| Left during year           | 197  | 447  | 507  | 411  | 470  | 416  |
| Added during year          | 257  | 671  | 572  | 583  | 569  | 523  |

| EXPENDITURES                |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| For books on music         | 24,081| 59,760| 88,680|147,758|157,011|238,776|
| For music                  | 27,961|107,258|162,207|242,463|244,737|204,163|
| For phonoph. records       | 15,571| 34,736| 55,217| 88,800| 90,081| 96,953|
| For equipment              | 149,967| 561,242|1,179,676|2,372,881|1,892,591|954,740|
| Totals                     | 227,581| 756,895|1,485,872|2,851,902|2,384,423|1,494,636|
| Average per school         | 2,000 | 4,820 | 8,203 | 12,727| 10,412| 6,523 |
| Average per college level student | 9 | 16.85 | 22.10 | 40.39 | 32.00 | 24.7 |

TRIBUTE TO BURNET C. TUTHILL

Following this report President Doty presented the Secretary with a certificate of Life Membership signed by all officers. A standing ovation was accorded Mr. Tuthill for his outstanding service to the Association as its only Secretary since its founding in 1924.
THE ANNUAL MEETING OF 1958

The thirty-fourth annual meeting of NASM was held at the Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis on November 28-29, 1958. A total of 23 non-member schools were represented and a number of business firms were registered.

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

The method of nomination adopted a year ago was continued this year. The nominating committee, consisting of five of the nine regional vice-presidents under the chairmanship of Luther Richman, presented a slate of nominees on the first day of the meeting, allowing space for the members to add other names. The sheets were collected and on the second day ballots were distributed including all the names proposed. It turned out that those chosen by the committee received the approval of the voters and so the following were elected to guide the destinies of NASM in 1959:

President: Thomas Gorton, University of Kansas
Vice-President: Duane Branigan, University of Illinois
Treasurer: Frank B. Jordan, Drake University
Secretary: Burnet C. Tuthill, Southwestern at Memphis, until his retirement July 1st, 1959;
Thomas Williams, Knox College, to serve thereafter.

Commission on Curricula: Chairman, Earl V. Moore, University of Michigan
Walter Duerksen, University of Wichita, for his second term
Paul M. Oberg, University of Minnesota, for his first term

Graduate Commission: Chairman, Howard Hanson, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester
Karl Ahrendt, Ohio University, for his second term
Everett Timm, Louisiana State University, for his first term

Commission on Ethics: Sister M. Gabriella, Marymount College, for her first term

The following Committees and committee members were recommended by the nominating committee and appointed by President Gorton to serve in 1959:

Ad Hoc Committee on Revision of the Copyright Law:
John Donald Robb, Chairman
Erno Daniel
Bernard Fitzgerald
Edwin Gerschfeski
Quincy Porter
David Robertson
Wilbur Rowand
Clemens Sandresky
Mark Schubart
Edwin Stein

Aims and Objectives Committee—Subcommittees: the A.B. Committee, the B.M., B.S., B.M.E., and B.M. in Music Education Committee:
Immediate Past President, Raymond Kendall
E. William Doty, Chairman
Arthur Becker
Paul Beckhelm
Virginia Carto
Ward Davenny
C. B. Hunt
Warner Imig
A. Kunrad Kvam
A. I. McHose
Carl Neumeyer
David Robertson
Wilbur Rowand
Daniel Sternberg

Improvement of Teaching:
Rogers Whitmore, Chairman
James Aliferis
Harry Robert Behrens
Orville Borchers
Stanley Chapple
Erno Daniel
Sister M. Francesca
Sister M. Gabriella
Max Lanner
Sven Lekberg
Bruce Rodgers
George A. Stegner
Cecil Stewart
Kemble Stout
Helen Watson
Harry Welliver
Junior Colleges:

C. Burdette Wolfe, Chairman
Martha S. Biggers
Carimae Hedgpeth
Richard S. Johnson

Library and American Music Recordings:

Karl Ahrendt, Chairman
Bruce Benward
Robert Darnes
Melvin Geist
Kenneth Kitchen
Peter Mennin

Preparatory Music:

Marie Holland Smith, Chairman
Sister Mary Bede
Samuel Berkman
Harold J. Cadek
Bernard Dieter
Jackson Ehlert

Publicity and Public Relations:

Walter A. Erley, Chairman
Edward A. Cording

Research:

Robert Hargreaves, Chairman
Theodore Kratt

State Legislation:

Alabama, Wilbur Rowand
Arizona, Andrew Buckhauser
Arkansas, Duane Haskell
California, Russell Bodley
Colorado, Warner Imig
Florida, Karl Kuersteiner
Georgia, Hugh Hodgson
Idaho, Hall Macklin
Illinois, Duane Branigan
Indiana, Jackson Ehlert
Iowa, Frank Jordan
Kansas, Luther Leavengood
Kentucky, Bernard Fitzgerald
Louisiana, Everett Timm
Maryland, Gerald Cole
Massachusetts, Albert Alphin
Michigan, Walter Hodgson
Minnesota, Paul Oberg
Mississippi, Sigfred C. Matson
Missouri, O. Anderson Fuller

Teacher Education in Music:

Lee Shackson, Chairman
Sister M. Agnesine
Earl Beach
Samuel Berkman
Elwyn Carter
Ashley Coffman

Franklin B. Launer
William Meldrum
Donald F. Ohlsen
Ralph Osthoff

Leroy Robertson
William Schroeder
Virgil Smith
David Strickler
Alle D. Zuidema

Glen W. King
Edwin Kappelmann
William McPhail
Hugh Thomas
James H. Wood
Alle D. Zuidema

Arthur Wildman
Alle D. Zuidema

Warner Lawson
Daniel Sternberg

Montana, Luther Richman
Nebraska, Emmanuel Wishnow
New Hampshire, Karl Bratton
New Jersey, A. Kunrad Kvam
New Mexico, Edwin E. Stein
New York, Alexander Capurso
North Carolina, Harry Cooper
Ohio, Gene Taylor
Oklahoma, Harrison Kerr
Oregon, Melvin Geist
Pennsylvania, Charles Pearson
South Carolina, Donald W. Packard
South Dakota, Usher Abell
Tennessee, C. B. Hunt
Texas, E. William Doty
Utah, Leroy Robertson
Virginia, Volney Shepard
Washington, Kenneth Schilling
Wisconsin, Sister M. Theophane
Wyoming, Allen Willman

Walter Duerksen
Ellis Neece Elsey
Leigh Gerdine
Gene Hemmle
Lloyd K. Herren
Walter Hodgson
C. B. Hunt
Jack Juergens
Millard Laing
Harry Lemert
Craig McHenry
Gordon R. Nash
Max Noah
Walter B. Roberts

Wind Instrument Literature:
Himie Voxman, Chairman
Subchairmen:
Betty Bang (flute)
William Bell (tuba)
Thomas C. Collins (bassoon)
Bernard Fitzgerald (trumpet)

LIAISON COMMITTEES:

AAUW
George Howerton, Chairman
Ruth Bracher
Duane Branigan
Katherine Davies
G. Welton Marquis
Sister Teresa Mary

ABA-CBDNA-NACWAPPi
Bernard Fitzgerald, Chairman
Milburn Carey
Richard W. Farrell
Leonard Haug
Max Mitchell
Robert W. Smith

AGO
Rexford Keller, Chairman
Charles Finney
Robert Hufstader
LaVahn Maesch
Mother Josephine Morgan
Donald Packard
Leslie Spelman

AMS-CMS
Edwin Stein, Chairman
Henry Bruinsma
Arthur Byler
Leigh Gerdine
Richard Gore
Glen Haydon
Clemens Sandresky
Arthur Tallmadge

ASTA
John D. Kendall, Chairman
Thomas C. Bridge
Sister Mary Lucretia
Ralph R. Pottle
Emmanuel Wishnow

Myron Russell
Volney Shepard
Thomas John Stone
Gene Taylor
Everett Timm
Sister Rose Vincentia
J. Laiten Weed

Russell Howland (saxophone)
Josef Marx (oboe)
Gunther Schuller (horn)
David Shuman (trombone)
George Waln (clarinet)

MTNA
Duane Haskell, Chairman
David Campbell
Franz Darvas
Arthur M. Fraser
James Paul Kennedy
Franklin Launer
Millard Laing
Edwin Liemohn
Sister Lucy Marie
LaVahn Maesch
Lloyd Spear
Milton Trusler
Rogers Whitmore

MENC
Robert Choate, Chairman
Donald Bellah
Kenneth Cuthbert
Francis Diers
Helen Hosmer
Ralph Hart
Robert House

NATS
Joseph C. Cleeland, Chairman
George F. Barton
Hayes M. Fuhr
Dale K. Moore
Kenneth Schilling
David Strickler
Robert M. Taylor
B. Fred Wise
J. Campbell Wray

NATIONAL OPERA ASSOCIATION
John Brownlee, Chairman
Wilfred Bain
Richard Duncan
Roger Fee
Howard Groth
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AMENDMENTS TO THE BY-LAWS

Approved at the Annual Meeting, November 28, 1959

Article I, 1. (a) Delete the final sentence of paragraph.
4. Delete the word "Association".
5. Delete the words "or special".

Article III, section 8. Add "Vice-President" to those exempted from the limitation of two term service.

section 9. The first paragraph is completely reworded, as follows:
The Nominating Committee shall consist of five of the nine Regional Vice-Presidents, appointed by the President. It shall prepare nominations for all offices, commissions and committees which are not otherwise provided for by the Association. Independent nominations may be made from the floor. No member shall normally be nominated for service in more than two capacities whether as officer or member of a commission or committee.

section 12. (New)
A Council of Past Presidents shall review major actions of the Association and propose policy changes. It shall advise the Association through the Executive Committee as to the long range effects of such policies in the light of past experience and provide guidance to the Association.

Article IV, 1. At the end of this section add the sentence: The President is empowered to name such special committees as he deems essential to the development and welfare of the Association.

Prepared by the Special Committee on the Revision of the By-Laws, Thomas Gorton as Chairman

MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

Chairman Earl V. Moore of the Commission on Curricula reported recommendations of the Commission to full membership of the following institutions: Arkansas State College; Arkansas State Teachers College; Georgia State College for Women; Heidelberg College; Linfield College; Oklahoma College for Women; University of Mississippi. On motion the recommendations were approved.

Chairman Moore then reported the recommendations of the Commission on Curricula for election to Associate Membership: Brigham Young University; Nebraska Wesleyan University; St. Mary of the Woods College; State Teachers College, West Chester, Pennsylvania; Texas Women's University; University of Houston; Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pennsylvania. On motion these recommendations were approved.

The chairman asked authorization of the members to admit another school to Associate Membership which had been visited recently if it accepted the recommendations of the visitor and the Commission. This was granted and the school, San Jose State College, accepted.

Chairman Moore made further report for the Commission on Curricula, announcing the new curricula of member schools which had been approved, i.e.:
Knox College: B.A. in applied, theory and literature, music education, to replace present offerings
Western Maryland College: B.A. in history and literature
University of Georgia: B.M. in applied, theory, music lit., music education
B.S. in Ed. (Music Ed.) discontinued
B.F.A. degrees to remain as already approved
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Western Kentucky State College: B.M. in music education to replace present offering (Approved in principle subject to transcripts)
University of Wichita: B.M. in theory. A fine presentation of this request. Moore stated the Commission will accept requests for visitors after self-survey reports have been examined. 26 member schools will be asked for reports in 1959. The Commission has had conferences with many members in an effort to help them with their problems.

GRADUATE COMMISSION

Chairman Hanson reported for the Graduate Commission that it had approved the following master degrees: University of Alabama—M.A. in music education and M.M. in applied music; University of Washington—M.A. in composition, applied music, music education and musicology; Washington University—M.M. in applied music; Boston University—M.M. in applied music, composition, theory, church music, music education, history and literature—M.A. in music; Northwestern University—M.M. in applied music, church music, music education, history and literature, theory and composition.

Dr. Hanson asked the members to check the accuracy of their degree terminology. He repeated the history of the doctorate in music and reported that 23 schools were known to be giving it. He asked that the list of schools granting doctor's degrees in music be published for information with the statement that NASM and its Graduate Commission assumes no responsibility for the approval of these degrees.

COMMISSION ON ETHICS

Two matters involving ethical procedures were referred to the Commission on Ethics during the year. In one instance the case resolved itself and the commission has requested additional time to investigate the second case.

The chairman of the Commission on Ethics has been made a member of the Ethics Commission of the Music Teachers National Association. This should make for closer liaison between MTNA and NASM on matters of Ethics.

LUTHER LEAVENGOOD, Chairman

REPORT OF PREPARATORY MUSIC COMMITTEE

The committee on Preparatory Music submitted the following report based upon a study on The Objectives of the Preparatory Department of a School of Music.

The committee favors a preparatory department with a well-organized course, wherever it is possible to assemble the students in groups one day a week. Bulletin 20 is a useful guide to any school but much too complicated for the average student and needs revision. The 2-page pamphlet issued Feb. 24, 1950, is a valuable guide.

The committee feels that if a talented student has sufficient background to pass a regular college examination he could be given advanced standing, but not college credit for pre-college work. Accelerated summer programs for gifted high school students who have completed the junior year were discussed. The committee felt that such programs should be considered if the NASM and Regional accrediting associations approve admission of high school students who have less than 15 or 16 credits. (See By-Laws and Regulations, p. 12.)

Some administration problems of the preparatory departments are:

a. The difficulty of getting the students together for class sessions.

b. The difficulty of organizing classes that meet the varied needs of different age and talent groups.
c. The difficulty of procuring teachers who are effective for the various age groups.

It was suggested by the committee that in this period of technology and science, preparatory programs are most important in guiding talented students into music careers.

In future revisions of Bulletin 20 it is suggested that the needs of the private teacher (who might organize a preparatory class) as well as schools and departments of music should be considered.

REPORT OF RESEARCH COMMITTEE

QUESTIONNAIRE

JURY EXAMINATIONS

1. Does your school hold “jury” examinations in applied music subjects?
   Yes 94.4%  No 5.6%
   (By “jury” examination is meant a final examination in which the student plays a portion or all of his repertoire on the particular instrument [or voice] for a group of faculty members.)

2. Are all instruments (and voice) taught in your institution included in this jury examination?
   Yes 95%  No 5%

3. Are these examinations held for students studying applied music?
   a. Privately  Yes 100%  No 0%
   b. In Classes  Yes 20%  No 80%

4. The jury in each case is made up of:
   a. Entire music faculty  Yes 22%  No 78%
   b. Smaller committee of faculty members  Yes 70%  No 30%
   c. Teacher of the student only  Yes 0%  No 100%
   d. The jury is selected in some other way  Yes 8%  No 92%

5. Jury examinations are given:
   a. At the end of each semester  Yes 88%  No 12%
   b. At the end of two semesters  Yes 8%  No 92%
   c. At the end of two years of study  Yes 2%  No 98%
   d. At other intervals  Yes 2%  No 98%
   e. Students playing junior or senior recitals are excused from jury during that particular semester  Yes 64%  No 36%

6. What percentage does the “jury” grade count toward the total final grade in the applied music subject for each student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jury Grade</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Jury Grade</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Jury Grade</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. State the length of each jury examination for an applied music student who is studying the subject as a:
   a. Major
   (Give answer in minutes)
   b. Minor
   c. Free elective
   d. If no specific time limit is given, check here 23%
Items a, b, c—Length of Jury Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Minors</th>
<th>Electives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12 minutes</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 minutes</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8 minutes</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 minutes</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>No exam given</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 100% 100% 100%

8. On the jury examination the student plays:
   a. Compositions pre-selected for the jury: Yes 69% No 31%
   b. Any composition listed on the repertoire sheet: Yes 34% No 66%
   c. His complete repertoire for each jury: Yes 3% No 97%

9. On the jury examination the student plays:
   a. Only memorized material: Yes 30% No 70%
   b. Both memorized and unmemorized material: Yes 70% No 30%

10. In addition to the regular repertoire the student may be asked to play:
    a. Scales and arpeggios: Yes 89% No 11%
    b. Technical studies: Yes 71% No 29%
    c. Sight reading: Yes 70% No 30%
    d. Keyboard harmony exercises: Yes 30% No 70%

REPORT OF NASM-AAUW LIAISON COMMITTEE

Excellent progress is reported by the special committee working with representatives of the American Association of University Women toward a more favorable recognition of baccalaureate degrees in music. Recent interviews and correspondence have resulted in the appointment by the AAUW of a special committee to continue deliberations with the committee representing NASM.

Three main topics have been suggested for joint discussion:

A. In view of changing concepts in music training, would it not be advisable to consider possible re-evaluation of study in music?

B. Should not the question as to the quality of the baccalaureate programs be made a matter for discussion between the two organizations—the Association of University Women and the National Association of Schools of Music—rather than between the National Association of University Women and individual institutions?

C. Should not the present-day concept of the artist as a member of his total society be made a topic for consideration?

GEORGE HOWERTON

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON WIND INSTRUMENT LITERATURE

The Committee on Wind Instrument Literature is currently engaged in preparing material for distribution to NASM members and others concerning a competition for trombone and tuba compositions for use at the college level. Some unsolicited manuscripts have already been received. It is hoped that two numbers can be selected and published in the next year.

HIMIE VOXMAN, Chairman
REPORT OF THE REGIONAL MEETINGS

The Regional Meetings with their respective Vice-Presidents presiding devoted their discussion to proposed revisions of the U. S. Copyright Law. Stimulated by the forthright presentation of the implications of the Copyright Law by Dr. Robb the following suggestions resulted from discussion at the meetings:

1. **Duration of copyright.** A period extending fifty years after the death of the composer.
2. **Damages.** Actual damages and the infringer's profits, without the minimum and maximum penalties now specified.
3. **Divisibility of rights.** Recognize the divisibility of rights in accordance with the intention of the copyright holder.
4. **Notice of copyright.** The principle of copyright notice favored with appropriate safeguards against forfeiture of copyright by reason of failure to comply with technical requirements.
5. **Protection of unpublished works.** Maintain present regulations.
6. **"Juke-Box" bill.** Passage unanimously recommended.
7. **Protection of recordings by performing artists.** Appropriate measures to protect the financial interests of recording artist, regardless of method of recording, in the matter of royalty fees from recordings.
8. **Emergencies: loss of a part or incomplete set of parts.** Law should be liberalized, freeing from liability persons or institutions who in emergencies might be forced to copy parts for non-profit performances which otherwise could not take place.
9. **Reproduction for research.** Exempt from common or statutory liability reproduction of works which are out of print and for which the copyright owners cannot be located with reasonable diligence. Recommend that copyrighted compositions may be reproduced for purposes of educational research where no public performance nor profit is involved.
10. **Public non-profit performances by educational institutions.** The law should be clarified as to what is a public performance for profit. The present exemption should be extended to include all classes of music in public performance not for profit by charitable and educational institutions.
11. **Records and tape recordings of student and faculty recitals.** The law should be amended to permit wide latitude in the making of tapes or recordings of student and faculty performances for library or other forms of educational use and similar provision should be made for photographic representation for teaching and educational research.

It was further recommended that any action taken at this meeting be regarded as a tentative opinion of the NASM, to be supplemented by a committee appointed by the President which would report to the Association at its next annual meeting.

Three of the regions also recommended that consideration be given to a change of the time of the annual meeting to a period other than the Thanksgiving or other major holiday season.

The following were elected as Regional Vice-Presidents:
- Region 1. Leslie Speelman, University of Redlands.
- Region 2. Bruce Rodgers, College of Puget Sound.
- Region 4. Himie Voxman, University of Iowa.
- Region 5. James Paul Kennedy, Bowling Green State University.
- Region 7. Clemens Sandresky, Salem College.
- Region 8. Wilbur Rowand, University of Alabama.
- Region 9. Everett Timm, Louisiana State University
FINANCIAL STATEMENT

As in many previous years the financial statement submitted by our capable Treasurer, Mr. Frank B. Jordan, revealed a healthy financial condition.

Receipts for the year 1958 were in the amount of $16,636.14 and expenditures for Association operation totaled $13,643.77. The bank balance at the close of the fiscal year, August 31, was $10,174.71 and the Association has $29,687.58 invested in Bank Stocks, Treasury and Savings Bonds.

The report audited by Warner Imig and Thomas Gorton was found to be correct and was adopted on motion.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The Friday evening, November 28th, session was devoted to meetings of the following special committees: Aims and Objectives, Bachelor of Music Degree; Liaison Committees; Committee on Preparatory Music; Committee on Improvement of Teaching; Committee on Teacher Education in Music; Committee on State Legislation; Committee on Library and American Music.

ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOPS

Of unusual interest to all was the innovation of Administration Workshops with all members attending the group pertinent to his institution. The groups and their chairmen were: Universities—State Supported, Earl Moore; Universities—Privately Supported, Howard Hanson; Colleges—Church Related, Carl Neumeyer; Colleges—Privately Supported, Thomas Williams; Junior Colleges, William Meldrum; Teacher's Colleges, Robert Hargreaves; Women's Colleges, Clemens Sandresky; Colleges of Fine Arts, Thomas Gorton; Colleges or Universities—Municipally Supported, Walter Duerkson; Colleges and Universities—Church Supported, Cecil Munk; Independent Conservatories; Virginia Carty; Conservatories—partially or wholly supported by Colleges or Universities, LaVahn Maesch; State Colleges, Luther Leavengood.

It was the consensus of those attending that this procedure be followed in future years.

ST. LOUIS SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA CONCERT

Delegates to the NASM meetings were guests of the management of the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra for the Saturday evening program in Kiel Auditorium. The Association expressed its thanks to the Management for the invitation to attend this program.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICITY

NASM—St. Louis, November 28–29, 1958

The Publicity Committee held its first meeting in August, and a release was prepared which went out to some 60 magazines and periodicals serving the music profession.
Early in October, Edward Cording, Charles Mitchell and I visited all the radio and TV stations, and the two leading newspapers in St. Louis. We secured programs on the following stations: KCFM, KTVI, KETC-TV, and two programs on station KFUO. On each of these programs this meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music was mentioned. Most of these programs were put on live, tapes made and we understand that they were so good that the tapes are being re-run.

Both the *Globe Democrat* and the *Post-Dispatch* gave our meeting excellent coverage. Not only did we have notices preceding the National meetings, but reporters covered us with daily interviews and stories. The customary releases were sent out to delegates of all institutions attending, and the clippings show that this effort was productive of good results.

Releases and telegrams were prepared ahead of time covering the admission of new member schools, the heads of all such institutions being immediately notified by wire. Telegrams were also sent out to the public information offices of all institutions concerned with newly elected officers.

A post-convention release which covered the actual proceedings of the various meetings was prepared, and sent out to all interested magazines.

The official Symphony Program contained a welcome to the members of the Association, and various advertisers were also persuaded to give up part of their space in calling attention to our presence in St. Louis.

The Committee again wishes to thank all those who participated so willingly and unselfishly in various panels and other public programs.

The Committee is especially grateful for the splendid work done by its St. Louis Committee member, Charles P. Mitchell, and it was a pleasure to work again with Edward Cording and Arthur Wildman.

**Walter A. Erley, Chairman**