Interlude. A Colloquy on the Future of Music, Music Education, and the American Orchestra

Robert S. Freeman

In thinking about the book at hand, Leonard and I drew up a list of questions which we sent to some two dozen composers, conductors, orchestral musicians, staff members, board members, audience members, and music critics, inviting them to join us in a discussion of this book's core themes, including the evolution of music education, the impact of technology, diversity in the musical world, and the future of orchestras and music education in the twenty-first century. While we originally sent out eighteen questions to each respondent, I have selected the following eight questions for inclusion in the final book:

- What has changed in musical education and do you have any ideas on how to improve the situation?
- Do you have thoughts about the direction(s) in which new music is headed?
- What would you like to see changed five years from now?
- How has the technology revolution impacted your own profession?
- Is the musical world becoming more or less diverse than when you started?
- What do orchestras need to do to survive in the twenty-first century?
- What needs to be changed in the education and training of young orchestral musicians?
- What needs to be done to make good music of all kinds a more central aspect of American life?

The responses of the following individuals are shared in the colloquy that follows (sometimes preceded by comments from myself and from Leonard Slatkin):

- Dr. Ayden Adler—Associate Professor of Arts Administration and Nonprofit Management, University of Houston-Downtown; and Founder and Principal, Adler Executive Strategies.

- Andrew Balio—principal trumpet of the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra.
- Jeff Beal—distinguished composer and conductor of film and orchestral music.
- Aubrey Bergauer—former holder of executive positions at the Seattle Opera and San Francisco Conservatory, and author of *Run it Like a Business*.
- William Bolcom—Grammy Award- and Pulitzer Prize-winning composer of chamber, operatic, vocal, choral, cabaret, ragtime, and symphonic music; professor at the University of Michigan's School of Music from 1973 to 2008; renowned also as a pianist, not least for the twenty-five albums he has recorded with his wife, mezzo-soprano Joan Morris.
- Michael Drapkin—technological entrepreneur and former clarinetist of the Honolulu Symphony.
- Glenn Dicterow—concertmaster of the New York Philharmonic for many years.
- JoAnn Falletta—music director of the Buffalo Philharmonic.
- Charles Geyer (1944–2024)—professor of trumpet at Rice University and former member of the Houston and Chicago symphonies.
- Barbara Haffner—former associate principal cellist of the Chicago Lyric Opera Orchestra for many years.
- Hilary Hahn—acclaimed concert violinist.
- Pam Hentges—retired assistant principal second violinist of the National Symphony Orchestra and teacher.
- David Hyslop—consultant and former executive director of the Oregon Symphony, the St. Louis Symphony, and the Minnesota Orchestra.
- Anne Midgette—former music critic of the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*.
- David Myers—professor emeritus and former director, University of Minnesota School of Music.
- Joseph Robinson—for twenty-seven years, both the principal oboe of the New York Philharmonic and head of oboe studies, Manhattan School of Music.
- Joseph Schwantner—Pulitzer Prize-winning composer and former professor at Eastman and Yale.
- Jenny Vogel—Executive Vice President of the LA office of Opus 3 Artists, an organization that manages the careers of concert artists and performing arts companies and is the successor of Sol Hurok and ICM Artists.
- John Bruce Yeh—associate principal clarinet of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra.

What has changed in musical education, and do you have any ideas on how to improve the situation?

Leonard Slatkin: Three choruses, two bands, an orchestra, and Peter Schickele as composer-in-residence. That is what my public school had in 1961. Can you imagine a similar scenario these days, whether in painting, ceramics, poetry, literature, or any art?

For almost two decades, the teaching of music, especially in non-private schools, has declined at an ever-increasing rate. And where it does exist, it is often relegated to before- and after-school activities. Back in the day, at least during football season, our band showed up a half hour before academic activity commenced, but that was because the team needed to have the field. Once the gladiators finished their season, the musicians gathered at the regular start of classes. The orchestra usually practiced before lunch.

In other words, the arts were part of the everyday curriculum, not tacked on as an elective. Everyone took something, whether painting, ceramics, poetry, literature, or any of the other subjects connected with the artistic past.

Today it is all about the money. There is not much going on at the federal, state, or city level. With a continuing emphasis on science, law, medicine, and sports, there seems to be little place for artistic enterprise. Our leaders—not all of them—have let us down. Despite pleas to Congress from luminaries in most fields, little has occurred to offer a true understanding of how vital the arts are in a vibrant society.

If our major authority figures are not willing to put this on the agenda, what are the rest of us supposed to do? For a few years now, I have been floating an idea, one that at least makes a first step with minimal cost to the taxpayer. It is best described by using one example: Beethoven's "Eroica" Symphony.

Originally to be called "Bonaparte," its composer flew into a rage upon learning that Napoleon had declared himself Emperor of Europe. He scratched out the dedication to the French leader, something that can be clearly seen in the autograph manuscript. We are speaking of events beginning in 1803 in world history , an extremely significant one in world history. (Further, see afterword.)

Imagine folding in what was occurring in the arts with what was happening that year around the globe? The Louisiana Purchase, Chief Justice John Marshall declaring that any congressional act violating the Constitution is illegal, Britain declaring war on France, the Fulton steam engine debuting and sinking. The completion of the Symphony in the following year also contains numerous points of historical interest, including the Hamilton-Burr duel. And visual art has changed from Classical to Romantic, much as in literature.

Perhaps while students are learning about these moments, the opening two bars of the symphony can be heard, painting a picture in music about the time and meaning of the piece. Context is everything, and understanding the art of the period is just as valuable as comprehending the complexities of society. By having aural as well as visual imagery, it is not difficult to see how a few young people might be encouraged to pursue a path that had not occurred to them before.

Everyone will have their own ideas regarding improvements to the educational system. Mine tend to lean toward the general populace. What we do in so-called "classical music" appeals to perhaps five to six percent of any given population. That is why I have embraced the idea espoused by Duke Ellington, among others. He said, "There are only two kinds of music. Good music and the rest."

Comment by RF: The idea just articulated by Leonard Slatkin, a superb and thoughtful artist, has been carried forward during the past thirty years—though with too little encouragement from others—by Joseph Horowitz, whose musically illustrated presentations on Dvořák in America, Copland in Mexico, and Boston in the 1890s should be repeated all over the nation, with others like them developed by Horowitz and others.

When Leonard and I were children, school teaching in the United States was largely the responsibility of women, who were poorly paid. School teachers are still poorly compensated in America, though in such competing countries as Russia, China, India, France, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries they are much better paid. The quality of the musicians who taught in the public schools of Leonard's childhood and mine has also fallen, I fear.

Just as Leonard remembers Mrs. Otto [see references in Leonard Slatkin's afterword to this book, "On Reinstating an Arts Agenda in Our Schools"] as a very positive force among the music faculty in the days of his childhood in the Los Angeles public schools, I have the fondest memories of Marjorie Truelove MacKown, who taught me piano and elementary theory in the Prep Department of the Eastman School before my family moved to Boston. Mrs. MacKown was a fine pianist and a wonderful musician who truly enjoyed making music a vibrant force for the children she taught. I remember her dictation exercises as the highlight of week after week!

But during my days as NEC president, we had a collaborative program called the Boston Music Education Collaborative in which the Conservatory, the Boston Symphony, WGBH, and the downtown Boston school district (comprising Roxbury, Charlestown, Dorchester, and Mattapan) worked to try to improve music teaching in the downtown Boston public schools. Every year we had a morning-long program in Jordan Hall in which fifteen or sixteen musical ensembles of fourth graders performed. Of these groups, one was

predictably outstanding, two were passable, and more than a dozen were just terrible, not the sort of experience to which I would have wanted to subject my children or grandchildren. Of the members of the Boston Symphony, only six were willing to undertake musical visits to the public schools, and only two of those had the presentational skills needed to make such appearances. Though the Conservatory offered free instruction to any BSO members, no BSO member raised his or her hand. Yet more mute testimony to the fact that we have allowed music as a discipline to fragment itself into a dozen or so disconnected islands!

Musical education in the public schools of Texas is much stronger, for each small town of 1,000 population must have Friday night football, with six men to a team if necessary, a celebration which is not possible without a marching band, thus requiring a wind and brass program. And, so long as one has a band program, one may as well have a choral program. I was once stunned as Eastman director to hear a recording of Stravinsky's *Rite of Spring* performed by a wind ensemble of Texas high school students!

I believe that substantial progress has been made during my lifetime with the principle that professional musicians need not only be able to play their instruments at the highest possible level but also need to acquire an array of other skills. Among these are the abilities to think analytically, to read with understanding, to write clearly, and to speak persuasively; the ability to listen and to make compromises with other people; technological literacy and the ability to dream of a better future while helping others overcome resistance to thinking about positive change are all among them. The growing interest in the relationship of neuroscience to music promises much for the future, I believe. Centers for this sort of study have already been developed at Houston, Rochester, and Los Angeles.

Andrew Balio: The public school system has been deprived of the best examples of music teaching to the detriment of children in their most formative years. However, music instruction remains on a high level in some of the private schools I know of. The million-dollar question is why we don't simply look at private-school curricula and provide some of those to our public-school students.

Jeff Beal: I wish we would start with the earliest years, and the importance of the arts in developing young brains. We now have study after study showing the dramatic improvement in all cognitive skills when young students learn music alongside math, science, and literature. Sadly, there is a cognitive dissonance here. In the past decades, since my childhood, most public schools in the US have relegated music education to

extracurricular and non-essential status, or eliminated the arts entirely. This is an educational and humanitarian travesty.

We need to reframe the narrative educationally in a society increasingly focused on education as simply a path to employability and the "right college," as contrasted with the development of the whole person—the creative thinker who is a member of a larger society.

I see a possible way forward in the encouragement of storytelling. First, we need to reconnect the educational experience to the idea of media and of music as a form of literature. This is very much a part of my mission with the institute that Joan and I have founded at Eastman—that is, to champion film and film music as legitimate forms of literature, worthy of inclusion in a concert hall or humanities class. Excellence in music is of value in its own right, but one of our greatest tools is storytelling, in these new forms of literature. It's all an extension of the age-old cavemen and -women telling stories around the campfire.

I also believe we need to find a way to foster the dedication and study needed to become truly excellent, artistically and musically: specifically for a generation of students for whom technology has seemed to make so many skills redundant or unnecessary. I don't see an app which will make the path toward playing the piano like Horowitz, or composing like Stravinsky, any faster or freer of the hours of practice and study involved in true musical mastery.

Of course, all of this begs the larger question, "why"? I'm on a plane to celebrate the moon-landing in Washington, DC, for which I've composed a musical score that will accompany a projection show on the Washington monument and gigantic projection screen on the Mall. Our film includes Kennedy's famous speech, "We choose to go to the moon and to do it in this decade, not because it is easy but because it is hard."

Musical excellence, whether it comes from Duke Ellington, Samuel Barber, U2, Ennio Morricone, or John Williams, makes us more human, inspires us, and connects us to a view of ourselves that transcends the banal and utilitarian. The communal appreciation and catharsis provided by the performance and appreciation of music cannot start at adulthood. It needs to be championed from the earliest ages possible and throughout one's education.

Glenn Dicterow: Music education has definitely changed during my lifetime. Exposure to classical music used to be a given in our public-school systems from grade levels 1 through 12. This is no longer the case. And, we wonder why people talk about the demise of classical music!

Michael Drapkin: A couple of years ago, I asked an Orthodox Jewish friend if observant (Orthodox, Hasidic) Judaism was dead if it doesn't evolve and change. His answer was, "It does change, but it changes very slowly." I think that the same can be said of music education, particularly for college music curricula. Colleges and universities put value on their accreditations to demonstrate their legitimacy as institutions of higher education. The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) accredits many of the college music programs in the United States, and I can only describe their standards as "unenlightened."

They send underqualified examiners from fifth-tier music schools to review programs that are many levels higher than their qualifications and judge these programs against a set of criteria that has not changed significantly in many decades. I consider myself very lucky to have selected Eastman for my undergraduate education because the school was always very accommodating to the proposals I made throughout my time there. Starting with my freshman year, I didn't feel as though I was getting enough orchestral experience, so I started the Drapkin Reading Orchestra that I ran for three and a half years. They gave me rehearsal space, the ensemble library let me borrow music, and even the Rochester Philharmonic librarian would keep their rental parts an extra day so that my group could use them.

By my senior year, I got funding from the Student Association and the director's office to rent music for readings. This was just one of many proposals I made, so that Associate Director Jon Engberg got to know me quite well, and rarely turned me down. The byproduct of this endeavor provided me with early practical experience in project management, which proved highly useful later in my career.

I have also been a great advocate for restructuring music higher education to include entrepreneurship as one of the basic skills to be learned by music students, irrespective of one's degree program. To help broaden the love of music in America, I have given numerous lectures, keynote addresses, master classes, and conferences on music entrepreneurship, where I shared what I learned in the business world and applied it to classical music.

The 800-pound gorilla in the room is the larger issue of why we are graduating so many music-performance majors each year trained toward auditioning and acquiring a job as a symphony orchestra musician at a time when there are virtually no jobs. I like to point out that there are more jobs for United States senators in this country than there are full-time, full-year jobs for major symphony orchestra clarinetists, and those openings only come up when someone moves to another job, retires, or dies. On the one hand, I don't believe that we should be in the business of telling people which dream to pursue, but on the other, I believe that we have enough music schools as it is, and that those we do have should be reluctant to raise their enrollments.

Comment by RF: Thirty years ago, I tried hard, though in the end unsuccessfully, to persuade Richard Colburn, a friend, not to found yet an additional school of music instead of a national foundation designed to underwrite needed change in our field. We should remember, of course, that college teaching is undoubtedly the field in which most college music-school graduates are employed.

JoAnn Falletta: Music education has become more challenging. In my opinion, this situation exists because music exposure in the home has become very rare. Schools and orchestras are left on their own to find ways of encouraging an interest in classical music, and many schools do not have the resources for that. In Buffalo, we have greatly increased the number of concerts for students, so that every student in grades 1 through 8 goes to a BPO concert in Kleinhans every year. I believe that the real solution would be to give every child the opportunity to actually play an instrument and perform in an orchestra, band, or chorus. Nothing fosters a love of music like hands-on experience. (LS and RF enthusiastically agree!)

Hilary Hahn: I believe that all access to the arts is worthwhile; in whatever form it can be provided, the experience will be beneficial. My unscientific opinion is that it is more helpful to join people together as a flexible goal than to lobby hard for a specific subject. Any one of the arts could be a child's only outlet or means of expressing him or herself. I was very lucky to have options. For all the instruction I received in music as a child, I was most naturally at home in the visual arts. The only visual arts classes I had were in school. I loved art class, to the point that I was invited to leave parts of my other classes in order to spend extra time working on my projects in the art studio. I remember every detail about the moment in class when I was sketching my shoe and realized that I could draw well.

Pam Hentges: From what I've observed in three cities, music education has not changed much in my lifetime, except that there are fewer programs offered in our public schools due to budget cuts. In order to change this, I fear that the entire system needs to be revamped. I do feel that, in general, there is a lack of quality teachers who are not being held accountable for student achievement. It seems to me that our private schools are doing better in this respect, for they have more faculty who are enthusiastic and dedicated to teaching, something that is unfortunately too often lacking in our public schools.

David Hyslop: Much has changed, as the education I received in a public school in Schenectady, New York has been cut back, as it has in so many communities.

David Myers: If we go back to the origins of American music education, it grew out of a community and church movement to improve singing and, later, to provide social opportunities for communities. Everybody learned music in one-room schools in the nineteenth century, but, by the turn of the century, specialization had set in, and the phonograph had advanced listening to virtuosi perform as opposed to encouraging everyone's musical participation. Music teachers began to emulate the professional world by starting choirs, bands, and orchestras, incentivized, of course, by the instrument manufacturers. By the early twentieth century, increasing specialization began to pull out the talented few, and music for all was increasingly taught by certified specialists rather than generalists. Participatory classroom music gave way to listening-based programs, and students were often bored by all sorts of information about music rather than the experience of music, which was reserved for those who had talent, money to purchase instruments, and the wherewithal to do music without sacrificing academic grades.

The ensembles focus took on a life of its own, replete with local, state, and national competitions—and the music industry did its best to ensure the continuation of these efforts. When taxes could not support the programs, parents raised hundreds of thousands of dollars to support expensive aspects of programs; and families were frequently assessed "participation fees" for students to belong to performing groups. Students were given quotas for selling everything from candies to candles and threatened with being excluded from fancy trips if they didn't fulfill their quotas. High school students were increasingly drawn into music ensembles by expensive trips and the goal of large group performing, often induced largely through rote training that prevailed over learning. Other than the occasional music elective—which often was populated by students who were not in academic tracks—less and less attention was given to students outside the ensemble experience. Even within the performance program, almost no attention was given to chamber groups—one of the most effective means of building independent musicianship, critical thinking, and the ability to communicate musically—something one can do with a few friends rather than a hundred other people. Over the past several decades, advocates have attempted to introduce guitar classes and, now, smaller band experiences, but these are largely alternative and are not geared toward ensuring systematic music learning for students across the board. Though a percentage of high school graduates who participated in music continued in college, many put away their instruments after graduation, saying they were tired of the pressure and time-consuming activities associated with being in an ensemble which they didn't have time for in college.

In my view, what is lacking in school music is a commitment to personal music making and independent musicianship that lays the groundwork for lifelong music meaning-making,

participation, and learning. And what is lacking in music education as a discipline is a commitment to the development of music learning that serves all people in all times and all places. K–12 music programs are *not* the training ground for students aspiring to become professional musicians, though the pursuit of a profession in music may certainly grow out of them. Pre-collegiate school programs should be teaching music as a fundamental human form of expression that emanates from a creative impulse, an affinity for nonverbal communication, the symbolic (not literal) capacities of sonic design and experience, and the life of human feeling.

We need a complete rethinking of the purpose of music education, both in schools, higher education, and in the community, where many of the sins of schools and higher education are simply repeated ad nauseam. Why is the academy not an incubator for new models of performing organizations, new ways of engaging audiences—and why are they not being researched for their influence and impact? Why do universities replicate the stultifying concert experience of professional organizations, where those of us who know how to work at listening can enjoy the performance, but where hundreds and thousands of others think they should enjoy the music but really cannot figure it out?

The field of music education needs a major overhaul in considering its purpose and how it fulfills that purpose. And conductors and performers who have not been educated on how to educate should not be teaching in music education programs.

Somehow, and some way, our conservatories, music schools, and departments need to instill a sense of inquiry, openness, and risk-taking that currently exists only among those students who are naturally gifted in such matters rather than as part of what should be the institutional culture. We need to get away from everyone's trying to become a star while getting into the mode of everyone's wanting to serve the greater good—in and through music.

Comment by RF: That was my principal goal as Eastman director. To be frank, nearly everyone who enters the profession of music realizes their income by becoming a music educator. Far more time, energy, money, and curricular resources should be devoted to the nature of music and to the nature of learning in music, the source of the nature of teaching in music.

Ramon Ricker: Perhaps one of the most significant changes over the past several decades is the decline of public-school music programs. Study after study demonstrates that teaching children to make music, beginning at a very early age, has far-reaching benefits. Cognitive and social skills are enhanced, and they tend to achieve success across multiple subject areas. The only way to improve this situation is to aggressively educate the public

about the impact music has on children and to support lawmakers who are willing to fund well-rounded STEAM (science, technology, education, arts, and mathematics) public education systems.

Once students are in the system, I think the music educators of the world have done a fantastic job of educating, coaching, and training their students. That, coupled with the use of advancing technology, has given rise to today's typical college freshman at a good music school, playing at what was a graduate level not so long ago. A further problem is that there are more and more of them who want to make music a career, a serious supply-and-demand imbalance.

Joseph Robinson: Changes in music education during my lifetime have been mostly negative. Sputnik in 1957 launched a space race with the Soviet Union that so dramatically shifted resources away from the arts toward math and science that within forty years half of the full-time instrumental teachers in America's public schools were gone. Both the North Carolina School of the Arts and Interlochen Arts Academy opened their doors to residential high-school performers in the mid-'60s, and university music schools and departments burgeoned. But just when Title III of the US Education Act provided the first federal money for arts enrichment in the schools—for "show and tell" concerts designed to ignite students' interest in playing an instrument themselves—the programs that engendered and sustained students' active participation in school bands and orchestras were being dismantled! As with foreign languages, it is not enough to hear the arts spoken; one must learn how to speak them oneself!

Some observers have argued that it is the loss of European hegemony in American culture that most threatens the future viability of American symphony orchestras; but two non-Western phenomena—"El Sistema" and "the Suzuki Method" from Tokyo—have dramatically pumped new life into the institutions of Western classical music. During my twenty-seven years as head of oboe studies at the Manhattan School of Music, both the number of applicants and the instrumental standard of those applicants went up every year.

Perhaps it is not a bad thing that more musicians than can find professional employment after graduation are being trained by conservatories and university music departments. In the tenth book of *The Republic*, in his description of an ideal curriculum for philosopher-kings, Plato assigns sport and music ahead of the study of mathematics and moral philosophy. Habits of concentration and collaboration, as well as greater acuity of perception, are the collateral benefits of years of intensive musical training. And studies by several orchestras have revealed that nothing encourages subscribers more than their

experience of playing a musical instrument. Failed performers of today become the audiences and supporters of orchestras tomorrow.

Jenny Vogel: What's clear to all is the absence of music in the school curriculum and the trickle-down deleterious effect on audience size and appreciation. When my children were in a relatively small school district, I was able to rally support and fundraise to present an outside music and drama education program, which the school and teachers happily accepted. This is a phenomenon that is not feasible, alas, in larger systems.

Do you have thoughts about the direction(s) in which new music is headed?

Leonard Slatkin: A lot depends on how one views new music. If it is inclusive of everything being written, then, more or less, music is following a tried-and-true historical path. One popular genre usually leads to another in a logical fashion. The pop song turns into the protest song, which in turn leads to early rap, then hip hop, followed by variations on all those forms. You can follow this same road for much of musical history. However, classical music, as it is usually defined, changed radically at the turn of the twentieth century. It is easy to see how Baroque leads to Classical and then to Romantic, followed by impressionism and modernism. It is with the latter that the divergence begins. At the same time that Schoenberg is developing his new system, Stravinsky is going in an entirely different direction. From that point, music for the concert world would become more diverse than ever.

When I was a youngster, the American symphonists were flourishing: Harris, Copland, Schuman, Piston, Diamond, Sessions, and so many others, dominated the scene. By the time I got to Juilliard there was an academic switch to a more rigorous set of rules coming out of Europe. Boulez and radicals like Stockhausen were revolutionizing and rejecting so much of what had come before. And in some cases, there was hell to pay if you did not heed their instructions. Outsiders were now allowed in, due to the efforts of performers to champion their own favorites. Cage, Bolcom, Lou Harrison, and so many others began springing up on season programs, usually with little protest from patrons. Commissions started to blossom, and new music was not the pariah it had been. Recently, the trend has continued but with a bit more emphasis on chamber works, pieces that could be performed in smaller spaces and not cost so much.

Where is it all going and what will last? I suppose that this is always the question, no matter what the time frame. From my own orchestral perspective, it is difficult to really see much that is new. When was the last time anyone said, "I never heard anything like that

before?" The works that seem to grow on me are ones that take many ideas from the past and refashion them into something a bit different. The building blocks of music still hold true, in terms of harmony, melody, rhythm, and sonority. What used to pass as avantgarde is now passé. Gone are the great experiments of the '60s.

My best guess as to what the future holds has more to do, at least in the States, with those who are arriving here from other cultures. It happened more than a hundred years ago, and it will occur once again. At this point, we do not know how many of these creative forces will enter the country, but hopefully they will help us engage in a new musical dialogue. Just as our national identity changes, so will our musical culture. I hope I will be around to hear the sound of the new!

Andrew Balio: I am happy to say that the audiences have shown over and over that tonality and coherent structures reign supreme. The direction is being shown by the people who listen to and perform music, not the thought leaders and pundits.

Comment by RF: When Milton Babbitt published his famous essay, "Who Cares If You Listen?," the title was not his but that of an editor at *High Fidelity* [February 1958]. Babbitt was trying only to make the point that, just as academic freedom makes it possible for a tenured professor to address whatever subject he wishes, no matter how narrow, a tenured composer ought to be able to write the music he feels called upon to put forward. This perspective neglects, of course, the fact that, if the tenuring university wants to protect such musical rights, an audience is likewise permitted to stay home when such music is performed.

Jeff Beal: Generally, I'm optimistic. We've never had more music available in so many forms and so easily. Technology has sped up communications and the way in which musical languages can evolve and grow. The downside is in eventual curation of all of this diversity in a new artistic canon. How that canon will look we will only be able to determine decades in the future. But I believe when future generations look back, this new canon will come from interesting places—it will include music written for the screen, streaming, video games, the concert hall, the popular-music stage, the jazz clubs, and more.

Glenn Dicterow: I am very pleased that composers are no longer afraid to write tonal music. We survived the twelve-tone system and total chaos (John Cage) in the midst of the twentieth century—thank goodness!

Michael Drapkin: New music has been a disaster for classical music but a boon for commercial music. I strongly believe that the move away from tonality led by the Second

Viennese School (Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern) put classical music on a course that ultimately alienated it from many audiences by forcing people to sit in silence and listen to music that appeals more to some academics than to the people who pay for tickets. Some notable mid-century exceptions were Paul Hindemith, Igor Stravinsky, and Béla Bartók, who continued to write tonal music. When I think of the great composers of the 1960s, for example, I think of Paul McCartney and a song like “Blackbird.” If I am asked what the greatest aria of the twentieth century was, I think I would pick “Maria” from Bernstein’s *West Side Story*. Are these works any less gorgeous because they are songs and not atonal symphonies? No. They appeal to us because they are stunningly beautiful examples of how the classical-music world ceded the high ground in great music to the popular venue. Are these not “fine art”? Who decides what is fine art? On the other hand, I believe that new music has been a boon for commercial music, and that most of the contemporary techniques we are taught in music school are very much present in film scores! The difference is that it is programmatic in nature and that we are not stuck listening to music that would be much more appropriate to foreshadow the approach of an axe murderer!

It is also interesting to note that classical composers are writing less music for orchestras these days than they are for smaller ensembles. Sales of concert-band music, for example, are much larger than sales of orchestral music because there are many more bands and wind ensembles in the country than there are orchestras. This music may be avocational for its performers, but bands are not hamstrung by having to perform over and over again the music of dead white European men. Many composers have gone the commercial route, writing for film scores and computer games because that is where the money is.

JoAnn Falletta: I am delighted that new music seems to be headed in *many* different directions—in all kinds of styles and forms. I do feel sorry that some composers have told me that they are not interested in writing for the symphony orchestra for various reasons, and are not interested in our orchestral canon.

Charles Geyer: When composers lean in the direction of the neoromantic, yes.

Barbara Haffner: Now new music is all over the place, and is much more accessible than it was thirty or forty years ago.

Hilary Hahn: I appreciate the availability of all kinds of music these days; you can find almost anything online, which means you can explore endlessly. If you’re interested in hearing a compositional style, not only can you locate recordings, you can often find a video interview of the composer speaking about his or her work, and you can listen to myriad

other works performed by that composer's advocates. Rabbit holes in contemporary music are invaluable: they help listeners develop a pride of identity, a sense of self through pieces that are sometimes pushed out of the spotlight by mainstream programming concerns. In addition, new music has a sort of street cred in nonmusical environments where older classical compositions are less welcome; its image allows it to align with the quest for relevance that is so prevalent today. I also really like that there seems to be a growing acceptance of a wide variety of contemporary styles. I have met many composers who are supportive of colleagues whose aesthetics differ from their own. That can only be a good thing for the expressions of our times that are built to outlive us, not to mention future composers who will be informed by the pieces being written now.

Pam Hentges: The hard thing is gaining the support of the listener to be open to experience new sounds. I think there was a shift from what was written during the '60s to now, just as there were trends prior to that in all of the different historical periods of music. Much of it was very difficult to listen to because of its complexity. I do think that in the last thirty years new music has become much easier to digest upon first hearing. There will always be creative juices flowing in new music, and in order to present it effectively, I believe that a brief oral introduction to the listener is important in order to open an understanding of the components that went into its creation.

Anne Midgette: New Music is headed in very good directions that seem to be most fruitful and creative outside the established institutions—the small opera groups and new music ensembles are the ones doing really creative work. We are starting to see a degree of institutionalizing this so that The Industry (LA) and the Prototype Festival (NYC) are places to watch, while Bang on a Can has developed a whole new brand and become, at long last, a part of the establishment that so long shut it out—a sign that some of the old perceptual division (e.g., uptown/downtown) is falling.

David Myers: I have served on the board of the American Composers' Forum and chaired its education and engagement committee. I think the recent return toward lyricism and melody and consideration for the listener to be able to make sense of the music is something that is increasingly modeled and valued. This is to suggest that if we expect to be valued, we must invite the listeners into the musical experience in ways that don't constantly baffle them or that feel like assaults on their ears. I once asked a panel of four young composers what consideration they gave to the fact that people would listen to their music, their answer was unanimous: "None." They had been primed to take the position that their art was *their* art and whether people chose to listen to it or not was beyond the

realm of their thinking or ability to influence. As with so many of our relatively pat answers to the questions of music making and listening, there is a kernel of truth in what they said. But the point they miss is that they want to earn a livelihood as composers (of course, they assume they will teach in a university where they will have secure incomes), which means someone has to recognize value and pay for it, and that generally means that one would have to have some regard for the consumer of the art—not in terms of pandering to consumers' tastes, but in terms of music that draws the listener into the experience and affords the opportunity to share in the co-creation of the musical experience.

Ramon Ricker: New music goes in the direction it wants to. Opera and the American theater seem to be able to present bold new works that audiences are willing to champion. If Rochester's local theater, Geva (which is very high-level and well attended with more than 10,000 regular subscribers to professional theater) were only to present classic works, my wife and I probably would not be subscribers. Orchestras should look to that model and try to replicate or adapt it.

Joseph Robinson: In my memoir I wrote about Atlanta Symphony Music Director Robert Shaw's courageous programming in the 1971–72 season: "Robert Shaw chose programs that paired symphonies by Johannes Brahms with major orchestral works of Charles Ives—an intriguing idea that backfired badly!" Shaw, always drawn to the singing melodies of Brahms, also had an affinity for the music of Ives, whose quirky creations quoted patriotic Americana Protestant hymn tunes. Despite its gradual assimilation into the canon of symphonic classics, Ives's polytonal music still presents most musicians and audiences with intractable problems of incomprehensible rhythm and tonality. No wonder performing so much of it in one season in Atlanta nearly cost Shaw his job!

In 1984 I was invited by the New York Philharmonic to choose a composer for a new oboe concerto to be commissioned by the orchestra. It was a great compliment, and I asked George Rochberg (the father of neoromanticism) to write it. My colleague, Richard Woodhams, who has performed the work frequently, has proclaimed the Rochberg "the best romantic oboe concerto." One of the most admired programs of my last season with the New York Philharmonic was led by film score composer John Williams, conducting music from his most successful movies. As soon as familiar themes were recognized, the audience burst spontaneously into applause. I believe movie and video game soundtracks and so-called world music offer the most promising directions for composers of new music.

Jenny Vogel: With the acceptance of more genres and diversity of composers over the past ten years, new music seems to have more prominence and is given a better chance for life incorporated within regular programming than it had previously.

John Bruce Yeh: I am optimistic about the directions in which new music is heading. Creativity takes many forms, and composers are always coming up with new ideas. At the Chicago Symphony Orchestra and Chicago Pro Musica we are fortunate to have the opportunity to play a great variety of new music as well as the classics. Much of it is really very good.

What would you like to see changed five years from now?

Leonard Slatkin: Aside from music education, as mentioned before, I believe that many musicians must remind themselves of why they got into the profession in the first place. With so many disputes over labor agreements, almost the only time I see the word "artistic" is when it has to do with money. Since when has an orchestra been considered the best just because it pays the highest salary? What young musician enters a symphony orchestra thinking about the pension agreement? Why do we hire with the idea to attract and retain the highest level of musician when there is almost no recourse when a player begins to deteriorate?

I would refer readers to my second book, *Leading Tones*, where I took one orchestra, the Minnesota, to task on all fronts. (I also deal with some of these issues in my third book, *Classical Crossroads*.) To me, this was the worst-case scenario playing out, and I knew as I was writing that it would set off a storm of controversy, not to mention never being invited to conduct that ensemble again. But I had sources on the inside who were giving me information on an almost daily basis. Much as the Detroit Symphony had gone through its own travails for six months, the Minneapolis musicians had to endure a year-and-a-half lockout. No one won; no one ever does in a work stoppage.

Fortunately, both groups have done a good job in the recovery process. They have recognized the need for community involvement, more transparency from the board, a team approach to negotiations, and a willingness to listen to each other. But many other orchestras are facing perilous times ahead. There comes a point when it is not possible to sustain salary levels, simply because the funding is not there. If we are to grow our audience, we cannot afford to price ourselves out of the market.

I genuinely wish that all outstanding musicians could make as much as they wish, but often that is just not possible. That corporation which is being courted for gifts into the millions has a problem explaining that financial output to employees earning far less. The

philanthropist who gives on a regular basis should not be asked to contribute more when he or she has expressed concern about the budget of a particular orchestra. Certainly, we are all aware that ticket prices cannot continue in an upward spiral.

A new paradigm, each geared toward the city where the orchestra resides, is what is needed. Serving the local community first is paramount. National and international fame will come via other means, if it comes at all or if it is even needed.

Jeff Beal: A new president for one. We are the wealthiest nation on Earth, but we spend way too much on our military-industrial complex at the expense of education and equipping our society for the jobs and industries of the future. I'd love to see green energy become a mainstream way of life in the developed world. I want us to measurably change the way we use our natural resources and protect our home planet. As a nation of immigrants, I'd love to see our country leverage and benefit from the influx of cultures and diversity.

We have a national ghost of racism, which our current president [Donald Trump] has tapped into. Unlike Germany, which has meaningfully and collectively addressed head-on the horrors of the Holocaust, America has never collectively faced its racial bias, prejudice, and hatred. I doubt that we can fully address this in five years' time, but moving toward this long overdue reckoning, on economic and social terms, is very important. Or we will become an even more divided and polarized nation.

Greed and income inequality are equally disturbing to me. As the middle class is further eroded and forced into a more dire economic position, the luxury and enjoyment of the arts are bound to suffer. I'd love for us to find ways to make art, concert-going, and enjoyment accessible to the largest number of people in meaningful ways. The current economic barriers to art are regressive for society. I think of the affordability and ubiquity of digital bandwidth as a possible way to leapfrog this. We also need willing performing organizations with the vision to make their concert halls and opera houses open to the world of those who cannot afford the price of a ticket.

Aubrey Bergauer: The job description for a professional, unionized orchestra member. In five years, I would like all of us—musicians and administrators alike—to agree that it is not enough to be a master of the instrument to fully serve the evolving needs of a professional orchestra. I would like us to agree that musical excellence is absolutely a non-negotiable part of the equation, but that other skills—from being a welcoming and inclusive colleague to embracing the digital world in which we live, to assisting with audience development and fundraising—are all qualities that would enhance everything we do as an ensemble.

Glenn Dicterow: I would like it if musicians of the future were more distinctive in their playing, as was manifest in the great artists of the first sixty years or so of the twentieth century. Sadly, I feel that there is a lot of generic music-making on display these days.

Michael Drapkin: The symphony orchestra has become one of the Fortune 500 in the arts, but it represents a small percentage of the totality of classical music. In addition, it is extremely expensive to run and to stage concerts. I would prefer to see much of that funding diverted to other musical ensembles. You can put on a concert with a string quartet at no more than 10% of the labor cost.

It is interesting to observe that string quartets are not commercially viable as independent arts organizations; they almost always need to plant themselves in a college position in order to underwrite their concertizing, and therefore, much of their income comes from teaching. Yet we focus a huge percentage of our arts funding on professional symphony orchestras, which I think not only gives one a poor return on investment (cost/number of concerts), but symphony orchestras, for the most part, have broken business models with malignant labor problems, poor management, and a negative attitude among the orchestral musicians and conductors. A symphony orchestra is first and foremost an arts organization that needs to work together as a unified whole to meet its goals. Instead, most of what we hear from orchestras are news of strikes, lockouts, financial problems, and bankruptcies.

If we are going to continue to support symphony orchestras, I would like to see orchestras adopt the "Brooklyn Model" developed by Alan Pierson and the Brooklyn Philharmonic, which I had the opportunity to observe when I was on the board of directors shortly before their demise. Brooklyn had a brilliant artistic model, but their financial model was a disaster, and I quit their board when the magnitude of their problems became apparent. But the artistic model was fantastic. Alan transformed the Brooklyn Philharmonic from a dusty museum piece being dragged along kicking and screaming with its traditional repertoire of the music of dead white European men into a group that was actually leading the arts in their community and engendering great interest on a broad scale. Their innovations included engaging such artists as Yasiin Bey (formerly known as Mos Def) and Erykah Badu, as well as programs for local singer-songwriters. The music was fantastic! Too bad they didn't have an equally brilliant financial model!

Tellingly, when I moved to Denver, I had a meeting with Jerome H. Kern, the CEO of the Colorado Symphony, who balanced their orchestra's budget during the Great Recession financial crisis of 2008 by cutting the musicians' salaries—musicians who still earn less than they had a decade earlier. I pitched the idea of the Brooklyn Model, for which I got stony

silence. I also asked what Kern had done to prepare for the next recession, for which I received equally stony silence.

JoAnn Falletta: A musical instrument (and training) in the hands of every child.

Charles Geyer: Much more government support for the arts.

Comment by RF (a poignant footnote from Rochester days): A prominent Rochester developer died, and half a dozen US senators joined the funeral and the wake which followed, from all over America. I had the privilege of having lunch next to Senator Fritz Hollings, then the junior senator from South Carolina. In the midst of our meal together, I asked Senator Hollings what sort of priority he thought relevant for the arts in his state. "Well, son," said he, "down at the very bottom, along with prison reform. And you have to remember that in my state those who have been in prison will never vote again." Put another way, if we are ever to dream of substantial federal or state support for orchestral music in America, it will be urgent for all musicians to work hard at developing much stronger political clout than we have ever had in the United States. Certainly, there is a tradition of strong federal support in several of the European countries, but that, alas, is diminishing as well, the result of waning levels of public interest.)

Barbara Haffner: Marketing techniques for bringing younger and older people to concerts need improvement.

Hilary Hahn: I hope that we can arrive at a point where crises are less extreme, so that we can have faith in both innovation and tradition. In other words, it would be nice to calmly continue the things that work and keep working on the things that do not.

Pam Hentges: Five years from now, I'd like to see stuffy barriers removed from classical music. We have made our performances elite events, and this needs to be eliminated in some way if we are going to engage the younger generations in classical music. Some concerts should be more casual and shorter in length. The younger professionals are about "the experience" these days, and if they've got disposable income, we must really revisit how we can get them interested in what we do. I'm participating in a new chamber-music venture here in a couple of weeks. It will be very interesting to see how it will be received by the audience. Perfect format, timing, and ambiance in my view.

David Hyslop: I would like to see orchestras realize that the fifty-two-week season and its trickle-down effect was driven by labor demand and not by market, and that what places like Baltimore need to get real on is what can and cannot be paid for.

Anne Midgette: I'd love to see a number of established institutions (in this context, orchestras) in the process of reinventing themselves significantly: streamlined administrations, more funding for research and development, and more varied kinds of concerts. I'd love to see the repertoire continue to broaden, as it certainly is in a lot of small orchestras around the country. I'd love to see some of the older institutions beginning to clear out, which will happen with much hand-wringing and anguish, to make room for these new impulses.

David Myers: A rich tapestry of musical influences, expressions, opportunities, and access that gets to the heart of music as a human experience, something other than a technical medium in which some people observe and admire the prowess of others while not being active participants.

Comment by RF: This reminds me of Roger Sessions's passionately expressed wish for much more active listening in his book published in 1950, *The Musical Experience of Composer, Performer, Listener*. It is my own strong hope that Robert Winter's Music in the Air (http://www.artsinteractiveinc.com) can lead to accomplishing this.

Ramon Ricker: I would like to see more entrepreneurial thinking in musical organizations. It seems to me that chamber music is figuring this out.

Joseph Robinson: What I would *not* like to see changed five years from now is the traditional sense of reverence and decorum in symphonic concert halls. My brilliant friend, S. Frederick Starr, caused a sensation when he addressed a convention of the League of American Orchestras in Chicago in 1988 with a speech entitled "Why I Applaud between Movements," in which he argued that the experience of attending symphonic concerts had become so stilted that the joy and spontaneity characteristic of performances in the composers' own time was lost. This ossification, intimidating to outsiders and discouraging to newcomers, he said, is the legacy of Boston moralists who long ago ascribed religious significance to the canon of western classical music, particularly to the symphonies of Beethoven.

Art becomes "classical" if it rewards scrutiny over a long period of time; and in order for symphonic art to be most skillfully projected by performers and most meaningfully perceived by audiences, a quiet acoustical space is required. Music is a listening art, after all.

Marcel Tabuteau once told me that he gave his life "for a few good notes . . . the ones that are still ringing!" Reverence from his point of view is not only appropriate; it is absolutely necessary in the concert hall. His affirmation points to the distinction between music as fine art, contemplated and understood as an end in itself, and music as adornment, like wallpaper, that enlivens spaces for ancillary activities such as drinking and dancing. Fred Starr has labelled this latter kind of music "vernacular."

As a leader in one of the world's greatest orchestras for more than a quarter-century, I was privileged (and well paid) to participate in a noble and unremitting quest for musical truth—a campaign that could not possibly be sustained by 106 individuals fifty-two weeks a year. Five years from now, I believe major orchestras in America will all retrench and consolidate as the St. Louis and Detroit symphonies have done, and pay their players fifty-two-week salaries to sustain concert seasons of not more than forty weeks. When W. McNeil Lowry created the Ford Foundation's colossal grant program in support of orchestras in 1966, enabling musicians to eschew outside employment and concentrate on their symphonic business full-time, it was for the stated purpose of having American orchestras compete more successfully against their European (and Russian) counterparts. Now there is a consensus that more is not necessarily better. The legendary American orchestras of the past never played subscription series longer than thirty weeks. There is simply too much symphonic product for the musical marketplace!

Just as when Nancy Hanks affirmed it fifty-four years ago, however, the fact remains that millions of Americans have never attended a symphony orchestra concert or heard a Beethoven symphony in live performance. Five years from now, I would like to see public policies reaffirm her original mandate for the National Endowment for the Arts—this time providing federal funds to disseminate consensus classics throughout America rather than funding experimental and untested new art. I would also like to see full-time instrumental teachers restored to the nation's public schools, a proposal which taxing assault-gun ownership could fully fund.

Jenny Vogel: Proper training for institutional leadership. This, to me, is crucial and urgent.

Felix Slatkin and Eleanor Aller founded the Hollywood String Quartet in 1939. In addition to his role as first violinist, Felix was also concertmaster of the Twentieth Century-Fox orchestra, participating in movie-music production with hundreds of other leading musicians. The Hollywood Quartet released over twenty-one albums on Capitol Records, won a Grammy for their late Beethoven quartets, and toured internationally. Tragically, Felix passed away at 47 from a heart attack in 1963. In 1994, the Hollywood Quartet won

the London Gramophone Award for their recording of Schoenberg's *Verklärte Nacht* and Schubert's Two-Cello Quintet. Felix also received a Grammy for his conducting of Offenbach's *Gaîté Parisienne* with the Hollywood Bowl Orchestra.

John Bruce Yeh: I would like to see more music lovers on the boards of trustees of our orchestras and other music organizations. I have observed that many of the problems encountered these days by American orchestras (Minnesota, Detroit, Atlanta, Baltimore, and here in Chicago this year) are precipitated by an unsavory attitude espoused by certain board members who are literally trying to break the musicians' unions. Rather, they try to impose cost-cutting measures, and in doing so, worsen the conditions and lower the standards of our great orchestras. It is so important that each and every member of orchestral boards of trustees put the needs of orchestra musicians first and foremost. It is not enough to have rich businessmen on orchestra boards; they must all be music lovers who put the musicians first.

How has the technology revolution impacted your profession?

Leonard Slatkin: First, at least for me, it was the 78. Then came the 45, EP, LP, cassette, 8-track, CD, DVD, streaming, and downloading. I am sure I missed much of the recording revolution, but I was certainly involved in a lot of it. It provided outlets for performers and composers and profits for the record companies. It is a whole new ballgame out there now.

If a classical musician is lucky, perhaps he or she will sell maybe two thousand copies of a disc. With today's technology, it is possible to reach many, many more. But careers are no longer dependent on a physical product in order to present one's musical bona fides. We are also at a time when there are few musical legends walking the earth. Not that we are lacking the talent. Rather, the mystery of what we do seems to have faded. We do not have Heifetz, Horowitz, Toscanini, Bernstein, Rostropovich, Caruso, or any of those other names that passed our lips. Each of those artists understood the value of getting their musical message out to a broad public. And the record companies were more than eager to please.

Today, a contract with a major label is almost meaningless. Yes, it can provide positive public relations for the artist, but when you are selling so few recordings, does it really draw people out to hear you in person? The immediate answer is that the video component is becoming the medium of choice. Much as in the pop-music industry, one uses the visual media to get you in front of the public. They become interested in seeing and hearing you in person.

Extended comment by RF: The age of the computer has made it possible for us all to see and hear a broad array of different pieces of music through YouTube, Spotify, and others,

with a musical score at hand and without the trouble of going downtown for the performance. Alas, people's eyes are a lot better than their ears.

It has increased the importance of learning the musical and educational backgrounds of those who attend, assessing especially why such people attend and what we can do to persuade those who do attend to return soon for their next musical experience. If we were selling cars or mayonnaise, we would have long ago put business graduate students in each orchestral city to work on this enterprise.

The results of such market research might persuade us to alter the format of a concert. At present, a concert comprises two hours of music, interrupted by a twenty-minute intermission in which the leading members of the community can shake hands and speak briefly with other community leaders. What would happen if some concerts were designed for millennials seeking significant others, in which two open-bar sessions of an hour each bookended the music?

Leonard Slatkin's experiment of streaming live concerts is worth trying elsewhere, as is the Berlin Philharmonic's development of an orchestral archive available all over the world for the fiscal support of the orchestra. Mark Hanson's idea of using the Houston Symphony as a means to bring together the differing (and too often warring) racial components of the city of Houston under the peaceful canopy of the orchestra is also worthy of emulation.

Andrew Balio: Many of us full-time orchestral musicians can't help but wonder if composers still had to write out their compositions by hand with ink and pen on paper instead of using computer software, whether they would make very different choices. Additionally, the technology revolution has highlighted how classical music is a unique human achievement that transcends the means by which it is played.

Jeff Beal: It is an essential and powerful part of my workflow as a composer. It has allowed the role of a film composer to be much more than that of a collaborative artist in the filmmaking process. It previously was impossible to engage a composer to work on a film while it was still being edited, while it is now practically the norm. The digital workflow of film editing now makes it possible for the composer's contribution to inform the filmmaking process in ways that were simply not possible in the past. I've actually designed a suitcase studio which has enabled me to travel the world for concert conducting and guest appearances while still working on my current film scores and/or commissions from the road.

Technology has made long-distance collaboration meaningful and possible. I've written commissions for soloists on other continents, and scored films for people I've never met in person; yet we've been able to interact and exchange our work and ideas in meaningful ways.

Aubrey Bergauer: With most of my early arts-administration experience in marketing, the technology revolution has hugely impacted my profession. I remember in 2007–8 being the kid in the office advocating to launch the organization's presence on social media, and I vividly remember the CEO resisting, asking, "What happens when we can't control the message of what other people say about us?" And I was able to show that by increasing our online presence, we were engaging with people in a way that others were not. Then, a year later, I was the kid bringing the data to meetings saying that a certain subject line in an email blast worked better than another subject line—and that using A/B testing is a way to drive more sales rather than a debate over the color of the image or size of the font. In other words, the technology revolution helped me learn that data, not subjective opinion, is how to outperform what our gut instinct or conventional wisdom tells us. Later, the technology revolution was how I stretched the marketing budget at my last two jobs by reallocating all print advertising to digital, and saw the increased sales revenue follow. More recently, it's been about how to design for a mobile online experience that surpasses that on desktop, and in seeing the numbers back it up. Over and over, every time I've chosen to embrace the trends in technology and consumer behavior; it has led to growth, and that has tremendously impacted my career.

Glenn Dicterow: Technology has actually put a lot of musicians out of business with the advent of the synthesizer, which is often used to augment or replace human instrumentalists. Another change: I have witnessed so many young musicians performing music reading from an iPad and foot pedal. I am not sure that this is progress.

Michael Drapkin: This is a two-part answer. In my technology career, it has been fantastic! The more that technology has developed, the more it needs people to implement, manage, and maintain it. It has been a huge boon to my income-producing activities that has allowed me to do things like purchase homes, cars, and send our kids through college—things that might be a challenge if I had relied solely on my current music income or as an orchestral player. Unlike the music work, tech work is always out there in great abundance, with very high pay. In addition, I enjoy the work.

On the music side, the answer also has two parts. The first part I would characterize as process improvement. We use electronic tuners, metronomes, and even iPads for reading our music. Clarinetists can even use synthetic reeds these days, although I don't particularly

like them. The second part is the proliferation of social media like Facebook, Instagram, and even plain email as ways through which we can now communicate with others and get geographical reach to potential audiences. This has caused the disintermediation of the old record companies that used to decide and control who got a record released and who got airtime. Gone are the days when you had to pay $10,000 for a studio recording session. You can now set up a high-quality home recording studio for next to nothing, with only a computer, a good microphone, and Pro Tools software. With some social-media savvy, you can then reach your audience directly and sell to them.

One of my favorite uses of social media is for market research for my publishing business, Drapkin Music Publishing. If I have an idea for a clarinet-related publication, I can go directly to the public to gauge interest by using a clarinet group on Facebook with over 50,000 members. I can make a post asking people what they think of my idea and the number of "likes" it gets tracks very closely to future sales. For example, one book I recently published, *Drapkin's Book of Clarinet Calisthenics*, got a pretty big response when I first pitched the idea, and it sold very well. Another book, *How to Work on Clarinet Reeds*, got an OK response and has sold only moderately well. Another idea I pitched, a book of edited clarinet parts to the Mozart Clarinet Concerto, with each part edited by a different clarinet master, did not get a great response, so I did not pursue it. But sometime I will publish something along these lines anyway, simply because I want to.

JoAnn Falletta: Technology has made many things, including access to information, much easier.

Charles Geyer: I appreciate that so much information is so easily available to my students.

Barbara Haffner: Between 1977 and 1984, when the use of actual musical instruments peaked, I think, I made my living recording TV and radio commercials. After the slide to sampled and electronic replication of music, it was only three years before I needed to get an actual job—as associate principal cellist of the Chicago Lyric Opera.

Hilary Hahn: It depends on the person. For me, it has been fantastic. I've always thrived on creativity and connection through the arts, and I feel comfortable when I can be myself and be perceived accurately as myself. Technology has allowed me to have an outlet for small creative projects, and I can show things from my own perspective.

I feel fortunate that I came of age in a pre-social-media world. I learned how to do things the old-fashioned way. I practiced without communication interruptions. I organized chamber-music rehearsals over landlines and wrote notes to friends with pencil and paper.

My first recording was released in 1996 on cassette and CD, and I pored over contact sheets of early photo shoots with a loupe [magnifying device]. When I took certain aspects of my career online, technology added more than it distracted, and that has continued for me as platforms have expanded. I didn't expect to find a community through Instagram, but when I started #100daysofpractice, I discovered that people could bond over the human aspects of working on music. Technology has allowed me to get to know my fans, to see how people relate to music, and better understand what people are interested in hearing and seeing and why. The one forum I used to feel conflicted about was YouTube, because I didn't know how to interact with it and was bothered by the videos that were posted without my permission. But I eventually came to understand the purpose of YouTube, took more initiative to protect my intellectual property, and changed my attitude. These days, I am more confident about my performances. I know how not to clam up when there's a camera and to just play. I leave all my energy on the stage. I'm happy for performances to live their own lives out in the world. Technology has also enabled me to stay in touch with family and friends while touring, and that is such a gift.

Pam Hentges: The main way technology has impacted my profession is that I can now use the internet for communication, musically, with people all over the world.

David Hyslop: Yes. If I had not gotten computer- and internet-literate, I would not have had a company.

Anne Midgette: It has impacted mine much as it has impacted everyone's—it's attacked the base economic model, and everyone is trying to figure out how to replace or recreate it. This is as true of journalism as of classical music—people don't see why they should have to pay for online content, and that is what more and more people consume in both news and music.

David Myers: More access to more people in more locations, including their living rooms. The challenge is how to maintain the distinctive richness of the live experience of music.

Ramon Ricker: Technology has helped composers. The computer has replaced the piano as a composer's most important tool. On the minus side, computers, synthesizers, and samplers have replaced live musicians in much (not all but in a large percentage) of the music used in film scores, Broadway pits, and recordings.

Joseph Robinson: Besides being a musical genius, Leonard Bernstein was an incomparable communicator who introduced symphony orchestras to a vast new public on television

during the 1950s and 1960s. Long-playing records preserved and disseminated musical performances as never before, followed quickly by more convenient compact discs. Now Spotify, MITA, YouTube, and iTunes put whole libraries of music of every genre into everyone's pocket. *Chariots of Fire*, the first movie with a winning soundtrack composed and performed by one man on a synthesizer, almost destroyed movie-score freelancing in New York City and Los Angeles for the ensuing decade, and Broadway pit orchestras shrank to little more than a synthesizer and percussion trap set. Fortunately, the richer sonorities of traditional instruments were missed, and movie scores are once again lushly orchestrated.

Microphones, amplifiers, and speaker technology have made it possible to project music electronically to crowds as big as 800,000—the New York Philharmonic's record audience at a 1986 concert in Central Park celebrating the renewal of the Statue of Liberty; but, once again, electronic gains of scale have not matched or displaced live acoustic sound. That is why I have never sought to use FaceTime or other remote video connectivity in my private teaching. The sound is simply not good enough. More intriguing for me in the present moment is research being done by Guy Légère in Berlin, using synthetic material to produce long-lasting artificial oboe reeds!

Joseph Schwantner: Over the last twenty years, newly emerging technological resources have become available to composers and other musicians that have improved their productivity. By using computers, music software, and electronic keyboards, my own workflow has been considerably enhanced. Previously, I would prepare the score and performing materials entirely by hand and took particular pride in the way the music was rendered. Until the ink on the final bar of a score had dried, I always felt the compositional process was like an opened door, allowing me to revisit, reconsider, and revise my musical ideas and materials. The digital score is a composer's tool that allows one to make changes and adjustments (sometimes inspired, sometimes not) but made quickly and efficiently.

My colleague George Crumb followed a different approach, creating innovative hand-drawn calligraphic scores that elevate the art of music notation to a sublime level. To my mind, his powerful and original musical personality is inextricably linked to the very personal and idiosyncratic notational strategy he employs in his works. As an ardent admirer of his music, his scores remind me of the richly illuminated religious manuscripts created by medieval monastic scribes! With his music, the performers play from copies of the full scores, allowing them to have a fuller understanding of the music's design when coordinating their parts with the other members of the ensembles. It's a necessary notational and performance strategy that works best with his many evocative chamber works.

With today's digital technology, performing materials can be easily sent directly to publishers as well as to performing organizations. It is now common for university and college music libraries to print complete sets of performance materials for use with their ensembles from a set of digital scores and parts. More and more musicians are adopting new technologies to read music digitally on an Apple iPad, for example, and go paperless. The move toward greater use of technology in the arts is inevitable.

Jenny Vogel: Positive side—faster and theoretically more efficient. Negative side—superficial and not substantive. Ultimately, it's people who matter and who have to take responsibility for their jobs, using technology as a tool and not as an easy way out of work.

Is the musical world becoming more or less diverse than when you started?

Andrew Balio: Yes, to the degree that many other cultures across the world have increasingly invested themselves in the arduous task of studying Western music. Where there has been a will, there has been a way.

Jeff Beal: Thankfully, more so. This benefits us all. Inclusion helps reduce cultural bias and promote empathy, which I think is a huge part of any artist's lifework.

Aubrey Bergauer: More diverse, slightly. Finally, we are seeing movement in the percentages of women conductors and composers, along with artists of color. However, we must also work toward this same inclusion on our staffs, because until we achieve parity and representation offstage, we will not have the decision makers necessary to fully achieve it onstage and in our audiences. I think I now see more women in leadership roles at large institutions, but I have seen very few non-white CEOs or women in the C-suite outside of education or HR roles. What's so interesting and incredible to me is that the more I talk about diversity and inclusion as something I care about, the more amazingly talented non-white transgender males enter my orbit—which in turn makes it much easier to have a diverse slate of people in my network every time I have a job to fill, a speaker to invite, or a board member to recruit. In other words, by loudly proclaiming we are working on these issues as authentically as we can, we draw people to us who are capable and qualified. It's not as hard to address the issues as we sometimes make it out to be.

Glenn Dicterow: I feel the musical world is more diverse these days as there are so many more crossover performers than ever before. I think classical musicians are desperate to bring in the public any way they can, and if that means more orchestras playing movie

soundtrack concerts and classical violinists playing rock concerts, so be it. The world is changing.

Michael Drapkin: Restricting my answer to classical music, I think that it has, but it has been closely related to the culture of the demographic in question. There has been huge interest in classical music among Asians, so now there are lots of Asians in classical music. Women broke the gender barrier starting in the middle of the twentieth century as well as in many other specific groups. Blacks and Hispanics tend to be small minorities in classical music, but that may be due to the general lack of interest in classical music in their respective cultures. The more interesting question might be, "How do you make the classical music world more diverse by generating greater interest in classical music among cultures that have not traditionally been interested in classical music?"

JoAnn Falletta: The musical world is becoming much more diverse.

Barbara Haffner: Yes. More minorities and much more contemporary music.

Hilary Hahn: Awareness is becoming more diverse, but perceived and real diversity are not necessarily the same thing. I have noticed that more women lead sections in orchestras than when I started touring, and I am gradually seeing more female conductors and composers than when I was a kid. Certain aspects of the profession were so male-dominated when I was little that I didn't even notice that all the role models in my mind were men. But that is only one aspect of diversity.

Pam Hentges: I think in many cities the music world is more diverse than in the past. However, there are still some that are and always will be stuck in the past—and therefore resistant to change and blind to what the resistance is really doing to the demise of these organizations.

David Hyslop: More, in that when I started, it was almost all white men in suits who had the CEO jobs. There are many more women and people of color in the administrative area now, and that's good.

Anne Midgette: I'd say it's more diverse in terms of gender—and that a lot of that shift has happened in the last five years of my twenty-five-plus-year career. In terms of race, we still have a long way to go.

David Myers: More diverse, but that is largely a function of societal change, not the success of the classical music field.

Ramon Ricker: It is more racially diverse, but has a long way to go. The Gateways Festival, which was founded here by Bob Freeman, brings together, for one week in August, classical musicians of African descent to perform together throughout Rochester, in schools, churches, and recital and concert halls. Part of the mission is to have side-by-side experiences with young students where they get to perform with professionals who look like them. Back home, the Gateways musicians may be alone or one of a small group in their own organization, but at our Festival, they are in the majority.

Joseph Robinson: The musical world is definitely more diverse than when I started. For one thing, jazz bands have become the ensemble of choice in schools as the traditional wind ensembles have waned. Rock bands using electrical guitars, pianos, and even violins are commonplace, and ethnomusicologists have introduced all sorts of exotic new sounds from all over a much smaller world into our musical culture.

Jenny Vogel: More.

John Bruce Yeh: The musical world has become more diverse than when I started. There have been many crossover ventures such as the Silk Road Ensemble of Yo-Yo Ma, collaborations between dance groups and the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, and the performance of live film shows to the picture. Our orchestras have become more diverse in their membership, with many more different ethnicities represented as well as gender equality. In 1977, I was the very first Asian-American ever to join the CSO. Now we have more than 20 Asians, as well as Australians, Eastern Europeans, French Canadians, African-Americans, and Russians; we are a veritable United Nations of musicians.

What do orchestras need to do to survive in the twenty-first century?

Ayden Adler: Three points: 1) Too often in our field, I see a nostalgia for days gone by, when we could put a subscription notice in the newspaper in the spring and fill the hall for the next season. I see resistance to engaging today's audiences on their own terms: their attention spans are too short; they didn't get a proper arts education in school, and so forth. These issues are valid, but it is more fruitful—and exciting—to embrace the twenty-first century and position our art forms within the reality of today's competitive landscape. Yes, we are competing with sports arenas, a wide variety of music genres, movies, and even our couches at home in a way that our predecessors did not have to. But we still have amazing

art forms to share and a whole new world of technology to help us share them. Let's use the resources available to us to understand the audiences and communities we have right now: What drives them? What are they seeking? When/where/what are they looking to experience what we have to offer? Then let's make those adjustments accordingly. And not just for today's audiences, but let's be thinking about what we can provide for tomorrow's audiences and for ten or even twenty years out! While yesterday's audiences may have sought spiritual uplift, education, and upward social mobility, today's audiences may seek interactivity with artists, social connection, fully immersive theatricality, edutainment—or simply the option of sipping an adult beverage and posting a photo to Instagram while experiencing art. Furthermore, we need to be equally creative in considering what we present and how we present it. Is our beloved canon, which resonated with twentieth-century audiences, meaningful to audiences within our twenty-first-century demographics? Who feels welcome—or not—in our spaces? Instead of fear and frustration, there is so much room for innovation, blue-sky thinking, and creative problem-solving. Let's embrace the present and the future, and leave wishing for the past behind us.

2). My scholarly work looks at issues of power and privilege in classical music from historical and sociological perspectives. My research adds to a current body of music scholarship that is versed in critical race theory, whiteness studies, and gender studies, and asks important questions about power and privilege from historical, educational, compositional, and performance perspectives. My inspiration to explore these areas, however, comes from my real-life experience performing in a symphony orchestra and working as an arts administrator. As audiences for the so-called fine arts continue to shrink, empathetic conversations about diversity and inclusion are increasingly important for the continuation of these art forms. As an administrator, the lack of diversity in our field has led me to think deeply about whom we privilege with our marketing structures, canonic ideologies, and the kinds of audiences that we celebrate. How might we broaden our outlook to include a greater diversity of voices and experiences on our administrative, artistic, and board rosters? I'm extremely excited by the conversations before us. Given the opportunity to think expansively and creatively, I've seen artists and administrators empowered to recruit, support, and build audiences in new and unexpected ways—whether in the classroom, gallery, theater, community, or the concert hall.

3). Effective board governance. This old chestnut continues to beleaguer our sector. People join nonprofit boards for many reasons, from social cachet to representing corporate interests, but, for the most part, board members care deeply about art and the organization they serve. Trustees and directors give more generously of their valuable time, talent, and treasure, yet, across the sector, with very few exceptions, nonprofit boards fail to govern

themselves in alignment with best practices—and show scant motivation to do so. Failures in board governance, from lacking understanding of fiduciary duties and micro-managing staff, to executive committees serving as mini-boards and other failures of internal politics, have been widely articulated. Yet tried and true ways for boards to self-reflect, learn, and improve their practices are hard to find. As executive director of a prominent arts organization with an underperforming board, I found funding to support board development that required individual board members to complete a short self-assessment tool. The board declined to do so. Nearly every senior staff member at an arts organization I know has expressed concerns about effective board governance in our sector. We know what needs to happen; now, we need to figure out with our board members effective mechanisms to motivate them to do this essential work.

Comment by RF: Wouldn't it be worthwhile for American business schools to offer MBA candidates a course on how and why to serve as a board member for a not-for-profit organization?

Andrew Balio: The orchestras need to grow up and stop trying to be revolutionary political platforms that fulfill the dreams of undergrads. Nobody buys it. They need to be truly aware of who loves them and who could love them if only given the right motivation; the two groups will look very similar.

Comment by RF: For this to happen, the responsibility for promoting the music inevitably belongs to musicians!

Jeff Beal: The audience is changing drastically from a subscriber base to an à- la-carte audience. Programming needs to evolve to challenge and engage and also invite an audience back to the concert hall. I see so many ideas in this area—the exciting ones breaking down the formality or context of the experience for a skeptical public.

A great concert should have some sense of its theatrical context. Not every program needs fancy screens or asides to the audience from the podium, but many programs could benefit from revisiting the idea of presentation and context for the listener. These solutions will work, in my opinion, when they are developed organically to suit the communities which the orchestra serves.

Aubrey Bergauer: The winning formula has three parts: 1) Update the experience—online and in the concert hall—listening to the audiences and potential audiences we say we need and following the data, not the vocal minority. 2) Focus on retention over acquisition. Stop saying, We need new audiences and diligently and strategically focus on retaining the

audiences we already have; new people are coming; we're just collectively terrible at getting them to come back again. 3) Make diversity a priority, not just because it's the right thing to do, but also because there is so much untapped revenue on the table when we authentically embrace and invite our full communities to be a part of this amazing art form.

William Bolcom: In these last years, I have worked more and more with the band world, which I have found refreshing. They are much more collegial among themselves than are orchestras. (Indiana University/Bloomington has their band directors' offices in one wing of the building, but orchestral conductors are kept as far apart from one another as possible.) The band directors' clubbiness has resulted in their suggesting new works to each other; for example, my 2008 *Band Symphony* has been performed 100 times already, and very few orchestral pieces of mine have had anywhere near this luck. (Well, over a thousand times for my *Commedia*, but that's since 1971.)

Glenn Dicterow: I think orchestras need to think out of the box nowadays to draw all types of audiences to the concert hall. It might help if there were more media attention devoted to classical music. It would also help if our government took the arts a lot more seriously.

Michael Drapkin: To begin with, the orchestra musicians and management need to be forged into a unified organization working together toward common goals. An orchestra where it is musicians versus management is like an animal chewing off one of its limbs. It is difficult to run a non-profit, which exists because we believe that something is worthy for our society even if it can't turn a profit—so we have already conceded that a non-profit organization cannot exist using the same models as a for-profit company (although how many rock bands do you know that are non-profit?) Yet, even with those challenges, we so often hear about bitter contract negotiations, strikes, and lockouts—even of big-name orchestras like the Philadelphia Orchestra. But unfortunately, that seems to be the standard and not the exception. The recent Chicago Symphony strike was a great case in point. The musicians could not even verbalize what they had achieved or the terms of their agreement. But according to them (as seems to always be the case), management and board are bad and need to be raising more money so that they can pay the musicians more, as they believe that the orchestra only exists for the financial benefit of the musicians. For their part, management is equally culpable, treating the musicians like idiot savants who don't know how to do anything beyond playing their instruments, and that they should be happy with whatever they are paid.

The fundamental challenges to be overcome are numerous and unfortunately ingrained in what has been the fabric of the professional symphony orchestra for the last 100 years: audiences based on rich white elitism, a fixation on the music of dead white European males, the problem of the Baumol cost-disease, uncomfortable concert formats that put up barriers (when to clap, when to emote, the need to sit in the dark, etc.) and the biggest of all: symphony orchestras are no longer part of the mainstream in our country. They need to look to the Brooklyn Model referred to earlier as a way of becoming a leader in music in their community, rather than remaining museum pieces.

I have written extensively on this topic in white papers ranging from "An Indexed Financial Model for Symphony Orchestras" to "The Rise of the Industrial Clarinetist," which can be accessed at the bottom of my www.drapkin.net/musica webpage.

I also believe that arts funding can be more effectively put into other areas of music than in symphony orchestras.

JoAnn Falletta: Orchestras need seriously to diversify—but at the same time, to continue to be stewards of the treasures of the past. Are both goals possible? I sincerely hope so.

Charles Geyer: All involved—boards, managements, and orchestral members—need more mutual respect for what is being done and what needs to be achieved. Working together!

Comment by RF: Amen!

Barbara Haffner: Since antagonistic board members have been the near death for a number of orchestras in this country, I feel that money should not be the only focus for engaging new board members. Maybe their love of music and musicians should be more relevant, not just the social and financial stature of board members.

Comment by RF: Without question, we should all work hard together on the development of more music lovers, of all ages. This has not only to do with music teaching in schools and colleges but with the development of better social skills among musicians.

Hilary Hahn: Empower people who have novel ideas to bravely try out those ideas. Fear is a valid reason to say no to new things, but that reasoning within artistic pursuits doesn't seem to lead to satisfactory conclusions. It's more interesting to help new ideas come to life.

Comment by RF: Beethoven would agree!

Pam Hentges: Orchestral mission statements need to be seriously revisited and updated. Many boards and musicians are stuck in the past. Orchestras need to be more creative to

find ways to retain the old but also to offer the new if we think the business is going to sustain itself in our very "instant gratification" world. Orchestral musicians need to get rid of their elite attitudes and recognize the importance of innovative change in our art form that will be intriguing to future audiences.

David Hyslop: Adapt to the world we now live in. All concerts don't have to be in a big hall. Music can be in many forms.

Anne Midgette: They need to energetically change the concert format and move beyond the formulaic subscription concert. It's the delivery method, not the music, that's holding back music's dissemination. Mix up the length and formats of concerts, try wider ranges of music and venues, and dare to relinquish tradition enough to allow in other people and other musical forms—to become, in short, a living art form. These days, orchestras are only barely hanging on to that status. The current orchestral model is decades old—it's as if car companies were still aggressively trying to sell their 1970s models of cars, insisting that they are good and solid, and trying to force people to want them.

David Myers: I'm not sure what "grow" means here. If we mean to have more orchestras, I think they will have to throw out their assumptions and, like music education, ask themselves where orchestras came from, why their practice is what it is, and what it means to be an orchestra in the twenty-first century. They have to stop trying to be things they can't be but instead apply the hedgehog thinking of Jim Collins (https://www.jimcollins.com/concepts/the-hedgehog-concept.html)—what do we do better than anyone else in the world and how do we maintain that goal despite temptations to do otherwise? But they also have to think about the multiplicity of ways people experience music, the broad interests that have arisen in a shrinking global society, and the ways the orchestra can intersect with other art forms and provide meaningful expressive experiences that are valued. They also need to incentivize getting to live concerts in some material ways—rethinking the business model, reducing ticket prices, reducing the star-power salaries of conductors and CEOs (orchestras are not major global industries), getting rid of the outdated union control that, in the beginning, served a purpose but which no longer serves the benefit of orchestras, collaborations between music schools and orchestras for research and innovation, shortening concerts that often run much too long, and many more.

Comment by RF: My original question was poorly put. I should have said: How can orchestras meaningfully survive in the twenty-first century?

Ramon Ricker: Be entrepreneurial thinkers. Reflect the makeup of the community they serve. Look to the future. Musicians must become stakeholders in the organization. Musicians must lose the factory mentality. The principal violist should not be the chief viola operator. Orchestras must be like Wayne Gretzky who, when asked how he scored so many goals, said, "I don't go where the puck is. I go to where the puck will be."

Joseph Robinson:. Ever since retiring from the New York Philharmonic in 2005, my career has been in free-fall economically. I did not realize how pampered and protected I was as a member of a top-tier orchestra. Fortunately, my fixed-rate pension—now a luxury that has long been abandoned by corporations and non-profits (including orchestras) all over the country—has softened the retirement landing for me! I realize that it has taken centuries for musicians to forge and justify true professionalism, handicapped as we have all been by the semantic misconception that our work is "play."

Living now much nearer the base of the cultural pyramid, I have also discovered that the elemental joy of producing musical sounds continues to bubble up from the ground as much as it always did. Human beings will always make music. And far from earning money by performing, many amateur musicians actually pay dues to belong to their own bands and orchestra clubs. Their activity is anti-professional, but it nonetheless forms the roots of our symphonic musical culture, nurturing and sustaining all the exemplary orchestral flowers at the top. In order for orchestras to sustain themselves productively in the twenty-first century, I believe they must be more concerned about music than money—more about the "shining eyes" (as [conductor] Ben Zander has described them) of their audiences. Nothing less than transformative experiences will justify and sustain live concert attendance in the future.

The North Carolina Symphony's present diversification of programming, venues, and scheduling may be a worthy model of new ways to enliven concert experiences for both players and audiences.

What needs to be changed in the education and training of orchestral musicians?

Ayden Adler: My vision is that music schools align our degrees, curricula, and pedagogies with what our students need to be successful and impactful now, and in the next ten to twenty years, not fifty years ago. That means expanding our canon to reflect the diversity of our current demographics, and teaching students how to better serve audiences in the concert hall, and also in the community, and in the digital space. It means integrating and utilizing contemporary technologies in our curricula, pedagogy, and performance. Finally,

rethinking the traditional concert-hall presentation of classical music allows students to bring immersive, connective, interdisciplinary, and theatrical approaches to their performances. I believe that the twenty-first-century musician is curious, adaptable, and creative, has a contemporary understanding of his or her own world citizenship, is aware of issues of inequity and privilege, and can build strong relationships and collaborate.

My vision is to see schools of music move from a predominantly music-centered to a more balanced audience-centered approach to performance and education where:

- students think about how to perform in the hall *and* in the community *and* in digital space.
- faculty rethink the role of the traditional canon in our curricula and pedagogy, and support students to rethink repertory as they serve contemporary, diverse audiences.
- students see their artistic work from the perspective of service to their communities, rather than as a kind of entitlement.

My vision is to see schools of music move from the twentieth-century "recreative" approach to musicianship back to the eighteenth-century creative approach to musicianship—but with twenty-first-century sensibilities, where:

- students learn how to compose, improvise, transcribe, arrange, mix, and produce, as well as to perform.
- students rethink the traditional concert hall presentation of classical music and bring immersive, connective, theatrical approaches to their performances (no fourth wall).

Finally, music schools have a responsibility to think about how to cultivate demand for music, not just create supply. That means music schools need to be an intellectual and academic home for pre-professional students and music majors who seek jobs outside of the confines of the major. English and history departments don't reject applicants who haven't, since early childhood, practiced toward becoming a famous novelist or historian! Music schools should compete for students who want a BA in music—not only a performance degree. These students, perhaps more than those pursuing pre-professional tracks, will be those who buy tickets to concerts, sit on boards of organizations, and build cities and communities that value music and the arts. They are also the people who will supply their creativity, collaborative skills, ability to work on diverse teams, discipline, and ability to plan

for and reach long-term goals (the very skills that music teaches) to jobs and professions we cannot even imagine right now.

Andrew Balio: Stop spending so much of their time on kinds of music that will never be heard outside the walls of academia. However, students would benefit from spending more time investing themselves in absorbing the many cultures from which classical music sprang. We have a bubble abuilding, a lack of cultural depth and erudition, if we only teach students to "nail it." Perhaps long, leisurely residencies across European enclaves, its capitals, churches, and among country folk. Every brass player needs to visit Bayreuth and to hear a real alphorn in the Alps. Classical music is exceedingly multicultural and should be approached as a vast stylistic canon.

Comment by RF: It would be wonderful if every college student from all over the world could spend a year in someone else's country!

Jeff Beal: I think we need a collective will as a society to invest in our teachers, and specifically the music teacher/professor. If we can establish the profession of music educator as a rewarding and respected job, so many of the solutions will follow. Music education already has so many of the social and teamwork activities that young people crave and thrive on. In districts where music is not offered in the earliest grades, we must make it a priority for all of the reasons offered above, and also to strengthen the later grades' education and experience.

Comment by RF: This model is already established and thriving in Scandinavia.

William Bolcom: A music school that takes students from all walks of musical life (maybe not the traditional conservatory model so much as the schools of music) will nurture growth in every direction musically. If the schools attract wider audiences because of compelling material, they can move toward answers for this question.

Comment by RF: Our university music schools that share a campus with students in other disciplines have the opportunity of persuading current music students of the importance of learning how to recruit new audiences from young people in other disciplines.

Michael Drapkin: If we are talking about college music programs, then I think the following:

- Deemphasize the symphony orchestra as the career goal for performance majors. There is a dearth of opportunities and a great oversupply of musicians. Stop

making students play orchestra pieces at juries that they will never get to perform.

- Music schools need to stop acting for their own self-aggrandizement. Why did Eastman grow from 450 to 900 students? That benefits Eastman financially but not the students. College professors fill their enrollment with students irrespective of the student's realistic potential for having a music career. Just because a student is good enough to study music performance doesn't mean that they should, and it is a tragedy when parents struggle to pay for a program where their kids won't be able to earn a living upon graduation.
- As a part of their degree program, students need to be formally trained in ways that they can share their music with others. And that shouldn't be optional or non-credit. This means more entrepreneurship programs (although not everyone has the temperament to be an entrepreneur) where they can learn to create the means to share their music. It doesn't mean getting in line with 100 other flute players to audition for a part-time job with a symphony orchestra. If that is the only goal, then they don't need to go to college—they can just take private lessons and save themselves a lot of money. Instead, make students get out in the community and share their music—teach them how to do that. Classical music should be for the masses, and not just for the chosen few.
- Innovation should be just as valued as great playing. Superstar violinist André Rieu is a mediocre violinist and fiddle player, but people turn out in droves for his shtick. They don't turn out in droves to hear *Wozzeck*. IBM figured this out a long time ago; they observed that some people should remain as engineers and not go into management, and that becoming a manager should not be the only career path. So, they created an engineering career path where their best engineers could remain engineers and not become mediocre managers. We need to do the same thing: great playing is important, but the ability to take your music out into the world and share it with others and have them organically understand why it moves others is equally important.

Comment by RF: During my twenty-four years as Eastman director, the enrollment grew from 600 to 900. We added majors in guitar and harpsichord as well as instruction in ethnomusicology and additional options in public school music.

JoAnn Falletta: Young musicians must learn to communicate verbally, to be teachers, to seek out new music and composers, and to embrace them. They will need constantly to

address the problems of preservation of the past, and growth and diversity in the present and future.

Charles Geyer: I think much more involvement in music through the public schools. The school boards and leaders need to be educated about the values of music in this world.

Comment by RF: It is up to each and every one of us to become involved in that process.

Barbara Haffner: Parental attitude and involvement are very important.

Hilary Hahn: There can always be more focus on preparing students for the self-directed aspects of their professional work. It's so difficult to switch from the student experience of applying someone else's standards to the professional experience of knowing your own mind and improving your own work. I think it would be great at the conservatory level, within the school's community, for students to prepare their own concerts without any preliminary feedback, the teacher stepping in afterward to guide the student in an intensive process review and improved plan for the next time. And then for the student to repeat the cycle until each knows his own voice.

Pam Hentges: My solution: Magnet conservatories/universities or colleges. There are too many schools that are not willing to be truthful to students about performance potential. Musicians in search of a performance career need a more focused, dedicated curriculum for their particular area of study; strings especially need to study the orchestral repertory more seriously. I think that there are way too many schools offering the option of a music performance degree. I don't think the number of performing jobs is likely to increase any time soon, and those jobs that will be open are only going to go to the absolutely highest-qualified candidate. The field has a large excess of well-qualified candidates for any one job. Yes, it's competitive, but like sports, only the top tier makes it. In my perfect world, only dedicated conservatories, public or private universities that have stats to show successes, should be able to offer performance degrees or certificates. I'd make universities that were not "performance degree-rated" focus on music education, composition, and research. Education majors should also be working with boards of education and local professional performing organizations to continue to integrate the culture for students to gain experience in the schools and communities.

Comment by RF: While athletics and music share the necessity of a large number of candidates for a small number of positions, an athlete has learned by the time he is thirty whether or not he is going to make it in professional competition, while a musician may go

through his whole life working at climbing an insuperable mountain. There are, in fact, too many nationally accredited music schools. The problem, at least as I see it, is that the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the national accrediting agency, works hard to try to see to it that those schools are as much like one another as possible.

David Hyslop: Angela Beeching's book, *Beyond Talent*, should be mandatory for all musicians in the conservatory. Also, letting future musicians know that, in order to make a full-time living, you don't get to play just what you like, as you need an audience for many kinds of music.

Anne Midgette: I'm not sure I have a useful perspective on that. Certainly, the whole #MeToo issue needs to be definitively tackled so that people are spared that kind of nonsense, which still flourishes at schools large and small and in training programs. In that regard, the field has a long way to go.

Comment by RF: While such problems are not limited to music schools, they represent a special problem in the context of a music school, where so much of the instruction is delivered privately.

David Myers: Emphasis needs to be on a much more circumspect approach to education that subsumes technical training within it. A few years ago, I was observing a classroom in which symphony musicians were serving as "artist teachers." They were a string quartet, and they had prepared a "tango" for the children. One of the musicians asked the third-grade kids what a tango was, and no one responded. The musician then went into a lengthy oration about the composers of tangos and how the tango is a dance that is done in South America, and showed a few (poorly done) postures from the tango, which made the kids laugh, and on and on. Finally, growing impatient, I asked, So what makes a tango a tango? All four musicians looked at me with blank stares and clearly had no idea. No attempt to share some common features of tangos, or to have kids discern a tango from a non-tango, or to have the kids feel or sense the tango. These were members of a prominent American orchestra and graduates of several of our major conservatories. Their technique was flawless. Their level of understanding was embarrassing.

Ramon Ricker: General music education in schools should be an important part of the K–12 curriculum. Both young and older musicians should strive for both great breadth and depth. In simple terms, musicians should know a lot about music and know everything about one's own specialty in music.

Joseph Robinson: The most important change needed in the training of young musicians is reversion to the practices and priorities of the past—which derived from a consensus that learning to play a musical instrument, far from being extra-curricular, is an essential component of the healthy development of every boy and girl.

Comment by RF: While learning music is vital in my view for every young person, we should be careful not to continue to glut the market with unemployable, narrow-gauge musicians. Joe Robinson, who spent twenty-seven years as principal oboe of the New York Philharmonic, did so, one must remember, with great distinction but without ever attending a professional music school or studying music history and theory.

Jenny Vogel: Attitudes about what to expect when they enter the workforce of orchestral players—ideally provided by those already employed and willing to share and to mentor.

John Bruce Yeh: The education and training of young musicians is a great responsibility which must be acknowledged by our leaders as a priority for our society's benefit. Music feeds the soul and all people should be exposed to it. In the first two decades of the twenty-first century, I have already seen movement at the highest levels of music schools toward instituting entrepreneurship programs. These are valuable and should continue as we graduate more and more professional-quality musicians. These musicians are finding their places in society to make their voices heard.

What needs to be done to make good music of all kinds a more central part of American life?

Andrew Balio: The incredible capacity of talented filmmakers to tell stories seems to me the most dynamic way to show the many layers of history and music all at once. It hasn't been such a moneymaker so far, so there aren't many jumping into this area yet. However, once this medium is really exploited, we will see some truly inspired new audience members sprout up. Good entertainment is seamless and pleasurable.

Jeff Beal: Finding creative ways to commemorate and share the stories of our nation and great musicians would be a start. Musical documentaries are a very popular form and perhaps investing in media that tells the story would be a way to strengthen the legacy. Ken Burns' *Jazz* series is wonderful, and I could see a similar project focusing on music from different cultures.

Longer term, the story of prehistoric homo sapiens is yielding fascinating knowledge in the fields of both language and musical development. This Radiolab episode is one of the best I've seen in recent years:

https://www.wnycstudios.org/story/91512-musical-language.

Also, the important modern research into neuroscience and music has promising elements to bolster our folding of musical history back into the more formal sciences. (e.g., Oliver Sacks's *Musicophilia: Tales of Music and the Brain* or *This is Your Brain on Music: The Science of a Human Obsessions* by Daniel J. Levitin are fascinating to me. These are tangential references to the larger question, but perhaps as we continue to discover just how elemental music is to all of our lives as humans, we can underline its importance in the humanities curriculum.

William Bolcom: Get more people to play and sing whatever music they want, but don't try to do it all. School is there for us to try to learn how to do something; we need disciplines in order to create anything at all. But I suggest: don't try to preordain the result, as no one can prefigure what the changes will bring in a particularly volatile world. It's true that small ensembles seem the wave of the future, but humans also need to participate in music made for and by many people. Choruses are life-giving because of this, and the same attitude could be studied for instrumentalists as well.

One thing that obsesses me nowadays: the new millennium means something to us, nothing physical, of course. But it is a psychic shift; one can talk of "the last millennium" now—and it tempts people to start over from scratch.

Historically, the new age will often violently crush the old to find space. We may see seismic changes we couldn't predict. We must carefully decide what we need to keep from the past, without limiting the possibilities of the future: it won't be easy, and there will be a number of disasters for sure.

Michael Drapkin: Music is already a central part of American life, just not classical music. For fun, I just googled "Who are the greatest musicians in America?" It returned a list with Elvis, Bob Dylan, Michael Jackson, Jimi Hendrix, James Brown, Bruce Springsteen, Eminem, Louis Armstrong, Stevie Wonder, Chuck Berry, Madonna, and others. Not a single classical musician, and I suspect that none of them attended college music programs. And popping up are "The Five Most Influential Musicians in American History." These include Louis Armstrong, George Gershwin, Aaron Copland, Elvis Presley, and Bob Dylan. At least Gershwin and Copland made it to this list.

So, then, what is "good music?" I already averred about the Beatles' "Blackbird" (which was inspired by a Bach bourrée) and Bernstein's "Maria" (which has elements of Gregorian chant).

I think that great music is already out there and a part of our lives. It is just not coming out of colleges of music or via symphony orchestras, which by and large are stuck in the past. It is emerging from popular music, Broadway shows, and computer games, among others.

The classical music world fails to understand the concept of "competitive differentiators." What makes you different from the competition? In an often-delivered lecture I have given many times to musicians, I talk about the economic concept of scarcity. Scarcity is the difference between our most unlimited wants and desires and our limited resources. Why is this important to musicians, I ask? If people have limited resources with which to spend money, then why should they spend it on you and not someone else? We need to focus on what we do well that nobody else can. In our final concert at BAM with the Brooklyn Phil and Erykah Badu, the orchestra performed alongside the band and did things that the band was not capable of doing, and that made a very compelling argument.

Classical music needs to play to its strengths. A string quartet played a movement of a Bartók string quartet in a bar for the South by Southwest Music Festival in Austin. But just one movement. They didn't make people sit in a darkened concert hall, nor was the audience expected to be quiet and not clap until all four movements were over. Play great music but know your audience. Play to your strengths, know what your competitive differentiators are, and compete on your terms and not just on being better at sameness.

JoAnn Falletta: This is perhaps the central question—to make classical music relevant, engaging, and enriching to the largest number of people. They need to realize that this is their legacy and that it can immensely enrich their lives and the understanding of themselves and others. I believe that hands-on experience for young people (playing or singing) is the most potent way to foster a lifelong love of music.

Comment by RF: Fully agreed. The trick will be to increase the love of music without persuading our young people that they should all want ardently to become professional musicians! The recent development of magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] will lead, I believe, to greatly increased societal interest in what music study for the young contributes to a broad array of skills for young people.

Charles Geyer: TV channels like Smithsonian, Nova, and PBS should develop music history programs that are attractive and entertaining.

Barbara Haffner: Online marketing! Part of every city's presence on public media: VisitAustin. VisitChicago. We should be as present as America's sports competition.

Hilary Hahn: Keep doing it, keep talking about it, keep writing about it, keep providing the highest quality performances possible. American music—of one genre or another—is already a central aspect of American culture, and most Americans have a grasp on some sort of recent music history. Classical music might benefit from embracing its current role and profile, because it is very respected even though it's not always well known. When I'm asked what I do for work, I say I play the violin, No one ends the conversation there; they want to know what kind of music I play. I've never seen anyone turn up his nose at the word "classical." To the contrary!

Pam Hentges: Education, and making it less intimidating to all.

David Hyslop: Not sure on this as music is everywhere in our society. It is not always classical and I'm fine with that. We have enough snobs in every musical form.

Anne Midgette: Good music is a central aspect of American life. But not all genres of music get a piece of that pie, and classical music and jazz are among the more marginalized niches. Classical music is not going to enjoy the central focus it once did: that has to do with the evolution of art, taste, and society. But if it can stop clinging to its vision of The Way Things Used to Be and start looking at ways it can productively exist today, there is plenty of room for it to reach a wider audience.

Comment by RF: Alas, one of the problems of classical music in America is that it is normally longer and more complex than other musical genres, competing for survival in a nation which now places a higher value than ever on making money, as much of it as possible, and whose attention spans seem to be diminishing rapidly.

Ramon Ricker: There are, among us, good storytellers. From the demonstration I saw a year or so ago, Music in the Air (MITA) combines good storytelling and technology that makes music history fun and interesting. It is definitely forward-looking and deserves very widespread use and recognition. It can be accessed at www.artsinteractiveinc.com.

Joseph Robinson: "Good music" has hortatory significance in the context of this question since listeners all have their own ideas about what is good or bad in the music they prefer. Music of all kinds—good and bad (one person's trash is another's treasure)—will continue to grow in American life as long as technology makes music more accessible and transportable. It remains to be seen, however, whether infinite diversity will narrow or broaden people's taste in artistic things generally.

Jenny Vogel: The current incarnation of music in American life before it's depleted (or extinct) is very important. The scale and focus may need to be smaller and more local, following the example of technology's specialized interest groups. Many regional successes lead the way.

John Bruce Yeh: In order to make good music a more central aspect of American life, we must work toward exposing our society to high-quality performance. I was taken very pleasantly by surprise just this week, on Labor Day, walking through Houston's Hobby Airport. There in the middle of the airport terminal was a live professional string quartet (the Apollo Chamber Ensemble) performing a varied program of mostly American—and some Texas composers'—music. Turns out, the City of Houston has instituted Harmony in the Air, a performing-arts program. A stage was set up and flanked by a banner reading "Hobby Airport Provides an Enjoyable Experience with Daily Live Performances by Houston's Best Professional Musicians." Now, that's just beautiful. It totally made my day!

Keywords: music, orchestra, musical life, economics of music, conducting, serious music, classical music, concert life, music education, Ayden Adler, Andrew Balio, Jeff Beal, Aubrey Bergauer, William Bolcom, Michael Drapkin, Glenn Dicterow, JoAnn Falletta, Charles Geyer, Barbara Haffner, Hilary Hahn, Pam Hentges, David Hyslop, Anne Midgette, David Myers, Joseph Robinson, Joseph Schwantner, Jenny Vogel, John Bruce Yeh, Leonard Slatkin

Freeman, Robert S. "Interlude. A Colloquy on the Future of Music, Music Education, and the American Orchestra." In "Contemplating the American Orchestra." Special Issue, *Music & Musical Performance: An International Journal*. Issue 8, article 6 (August 2025): 1–47.