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ABSTRACT

This case study has a three-fold purpose. First, it is intended to illuminate the aura of sentiments which surrounds a member of a professional symphony orchestra; second, it will examine the relationships which exist between an orchestra and its permanent conductor; third, it will focus on the fortuitous circumstance of the change of conductors by a major symphony orchestra.

As of September, 1962, Erich Leinsdorf replaced Charles Münch as Music Director of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. It was decided to examine the impact of this succession through the eyes of the musicians who play in the orchestra. A sample of 26 players from the orchestra was interviewed prior to the change. A portion of this interview was devoted to the problem of numerically rating the conductor of a symphony orchestra in each of three characteristics -- strictness, competence, and fairness. This rating process was applied to Charles Münch, his predecessor--Serge Koussevitsky, and then to a projected image of the new conductor--Erich Leinsdorf. After the change, the subjects were interviewed once more and were asked to re-rate Leinsdorf on the basis of observed reality.

The results of this study will be divided into two parts. First, a qualitative approach will recount the general impressions and pertinent anecdotes which emerged from the interviews. Then, against this background, a discussion of the numerical ratings will ensue. Through these chapters and the discussion which follows, a fairly revealing picture of the problems associated with conductor-player relations is presented.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

"'Dr. Koussevitsky, I know now who you are. You are GOD!' Koussevitsky said apparently quite seriously, 'I know my responsibilities.'" 1

Thus, a picture unfolds. Few descriptive phrases could be more telling than the above quote. In it are tin-type photographs of the "Friday-afternoon lady" and THE CONDUCTOR. The former has a chauffeur who stands on the steps of Symphony Hall and passes two hours each week in conversation with other chauffeurs, while the latter is inside the hall charming the former. If one travels in the right circles, one can place the conductor somewhere, in importance, between the most recent baseball hero and the President of the United States. There seems to be less public understanding of the conductor's responsibilities and more glorification of his image than those tendered any other leader in the performing arts.

Opinions run from the one quoted at the start to those which doubt that a conductor is a necessary and functioning part of an orchestra. Somehow, a balanced picture of the duties of a conductor and his relationships

with the musicians he directs has not been put into print.

One of the objectives of this study is to explore conductor-player relationships as they exist on a day to day basis. The vehicle used is the Boston Symphony Orchestra. The second objective is to capitalize on an extremely fortuitous circumstance which this same orchestra provided -- namely, the changing of its permanent conductor. As of September 1962, Erich Leinsdorf assumed the position of Music Director of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. He replaced Charles Münch who retired after 13 years in this post. It is worthy of noting that although the principal duty of this position is conducting the orchestra, the broader scope implicit in the title "Music Director" is realistic. It was decided, therefore, to make this succession of leadership the principal focus of the study.

If a Symphony Orchestra is viewed as a corporation (a realistic assumption in the case of the Boston Orchestra) several facts align themselves with the more general concept of the "normal" business entity. Certainly, the orchestra is composed of over 100 employees who put in regular, though peculiarly spaced, hours and receive financial compensation for their labor; certainly, there is a hierarchy of management which coordinates the activities of these 100+ employees; and certainly, this corporation produces an output of service to the community -- with an input of funds from the community in exchange.
There are, however, several facts which set the symphony orchestra apart from the business man's concept of an incorporated entity. Nowhere else is there such a high degree of technical skill required of ALL the employees; nowhere else is the "president", or leader, in such universal contact with all the employees simultaneously; and nowhere else is the output of the firm composed of such emotionally high but tangibly vacuous services.

An effort will be made in this paper to sort out the similarities from the differences. Even with the questions of musical expression and interpretation permeating every minute of the life of a symphony player, he must still face his conductor in a superior-subordinate relationship from day to day. It is these daily problems of "emotional working conditions" that form the core of this study. Against this background will be set the advent of leadership succession.

First, however, a probing backward into the regimes of Charles Münch and his predecessor Serge Koussevitsky will be attempted to set the stage for the coming of Erich Leinsdorf. With this background of two quite dissimilar conductors behind the men of the B.S.O., a look at their expectations about the new conductor will ensue. Finally, the observed reality of his personality and methods will be inspected.
To gather the information needed, personal interviews with a sample of 26 players from the orchestra were conducted during the last months of the tenure of Charles Münch. Then, three months after Erich Leinsdorf took over, the same group was interviewed again. In an attempt to quantify these nebulous areas of concern, a portion of each interview (both before and after the change) was devoted to a numerical rating of the three conductors on the axes of strictness, competence, and fairness. These three scales were chosen in hopes of extracting the non-subjective data from the interviewees in reasonably thorough fashion.

The summaries of these interviews appear in two forms. First, a section will be devoted to recounting, in anecdotal form, the sentiments and impressions which emerged from the interviews. This chapter then forms the background over which is set a discussion of the numerical results.

The last chapter is concerned with a general discussion of the results and proposes a hypothesis to explain some of the unusual findings. Following this is the actual data and an appendix on the Boston "Pops" which depicts the unique case of an orchestra which plays almost against its will.
CHAPTER II
GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Boston Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1881 by Henry Lee Higginson and, with the exception of the New York Philharmonic-Symphony Society which had been established 39 years earlier as the "New York Philharmonic Orchestra", stands as the oldest symphonic organization in America. Higginson engaged George Henschel as the first conductor. The following list summarizes the succession of leaders.

1) George Henschel 1881-1884
2) Wilhelm Gericke 1884-1889
3) Arthur Nikisch 1889-1893
4) Emil Paur 1893-1898
5) Wilhelm Gericke 1898-1906
6) Karl Muck 1906-1908
7) Max Fiedler 1908-1912
8) Karl Muck 1912-1918
9) Ernst Schmidt (temporary 1918)
10) Pierre Monteux (temporary 1918)
11) Henri Rabaud 1918-1919
12) Pierre Monteux 1919-1924
13) Serge Koussevitsky 1924-1949
14) Charles Münch 1949-1962
15) Erich Leinsdorf 1962 ----
A few notes should be appended to the above list. First, it should be added that it was during the second term of Gericke (in 1900) that the orchestra moved into its permanent home -- Symphony Hall. Second, the cluster of conductors around 1918 should be clarified. Ernst Schmidt was the assistant conductor under Karl Muck and filled out the sixth year of the latter's second term. It seems reasonably evident that it was an anti-German war panic that caused public pressure to demand Muck's "resignation". Subsequently, Pierre Monteux was requested to substitute in the fall of 1918 until a successor to Muck could be found. Rabaud merely relieved Monteux as a "substitute substitute" and would not stay on after the 1918-1919 season had closed. It was then that Monteux was re-engaged in 1919 on a permanent basis.

It was during this period of crises that the orchestra became an incorporated entity and a board of 9 trustees was installed. Today, there are 17.

As the focus of this study is limited to the terms of Koussevitzky, Münch, and Leinsdorf, no further historical comments will be made about seasons prior to the fall of 1924. It is interesting to observe, however, that although Serge Koussevitzky was the tenth conductor engaged by the management, his tenure combined with that of Charles Münch account for 47% of the life of the orchestra. A whimsical calculation points out that Mr. Leinsdorf need only hold his position for 5 years before we may state that the last
three conductors have shaped the second half of the orchestra's history.

When Serge Koussevitsky arrived in 1924, he found an orchestra which was put together with rubber bands and adhesive tape. In the preceding regime Monteux had been forced to work with a collection of students and aged musicians, recruited to take the place of the 30 or so members who had been eliminated from the orchestra because of German or Austrian nationality during the ticklish war years. Thus, the first task of the new conductor was the rebuilding of the orchestra. It was necessary for Koussevitsky to shun the emotionalism which prevented Monteux from cleaning house. It was apparently overcome.

"At the conclusion of his second season, 22 replacements were made, about half through discharge of musicians no longer in his judgement equal to the tasks before them; the remainder were through resignation."¹

Although Koussevitsky had done a reasonable amount of conducting before assuming the Boston position, it seems to be the opinion of those men who served under his command that he was really not very well qualified to conduct the Boston Symphony Orchestra when he first took over. In one man's words: "He knew three pieces when he came to this country". According to Koussevitsky's biographer, Moses Smith, the conductor kept Nicolas

Slonimsky in his employ to play piano reductions of new scores so that they could be easily learned. There seems to be enough evidence, however, to discredit the rumor that Koussevitsky was unable to read a score. As far as technical competence is concerned, the men feel that Koussevitsky improved during his 25 years with the orchestra. In fact, it was expressed that the conductor may have benefited more from the orchestra than vice versa. In any case, it is evident that Koussevitsky suffered from some technical disability. To quote Moses Smith:

"There was no question about who was to blame on an occasion in Brooklyn when the orchestra was playing the 'Forest Murmurs' from Siegfried. The music, it will be recalled, has numerous changes of time-signature. Through page after page of the score Koussevitsky conducted with the wrong number of beats to the measure. Then, to make matters worse, he began frantically giving cues in the wrong places. Koussevitsky was scarcely more horrified at the resultant confusion than the men themselves. At such a juncture, when the conductor obviously does not know what he is doing, the only hope is that the musicians will pay no attention to him. The Boston musicians, like good troupers, finally got together somehow and finished together.

"After the concert Koussevitsky called in two or three of the principal players and treated them to a tongue-lashing. It took a good deal of persuasiveness and tact to convince Koussevitsky that the fault was his own. Later Koussevitsky would refer to the incident philosophically, saying he could not explain what had happened to him."

The above incident is the standard model for Koussevitzky's personal relations to the musicians of the orchestra. Another incident will clarify this behavior. It seems that the conductor was criticizing a young player for a mistake the latter did not make. In good servile fashion, the musician did not respond, for to do so only would throw additional fuel on the fire. Koussevitzky continued his attack until the principal player of that section, whose mistake it truly was, could stand no longer to see his colleague harassed and announced that HE was responsible. The conductor stopped for a moment and then asked to see the innocent musician in his room after the rehearsal. At that time Koussevitzky began "Young man, you must learn not to talk back to me!!" The player had never opened his mouth. Because the conductor had been challenged on stage, he was forced to continue his fantasy in private. It seems nearly incomprehensible that this type of behavior is practised among civilized men, much less tolerated.

Behind Koussevitzky stood the figure of his wife, Natalya. She was a woman determined to help mold the success of her husband. It was not long before the members of the orchestra began to realize that she too was to be reckoned with. On one occasion she precipitated an incident with a brass player because she had noticed that everyone else in the section got red in the face when they played except this one man. This, she reasoned, must qualify him as a shirker worthy of her husband's censure.
There was another aspect to Koussevitsky's art, however. This same egotism made him an extremely dashing figure on stage. One of the interviewees tells of the time he was called into Koussevitsky's room, and while he was waiting for the conductor, noticed that the walls were covered with mirrors. Apparently it was here that the conductor practised his every gesture with an eye toward its audience appeal as well as its practical effectiveness.

With all his autocratic unfairness, certain positive statements can be made about Serge Koussevitsky. First, he had an uncanny natural gift for producing orchestral color. There are those who feel that the orchestra reached heights of greatness under his leadership unequalled by any other symphonic organization of the time. Second, Koussevitsky held a strange loyalty to the orchestra. It was HIS symphony. He could be arbitrary in his actions toward the men, but he would defend them with great passion if someone else tried to criticize their playing.

In 1949, Charles Münch became the new conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. Here was a man whose primary desire was to conduct rather than assume all the extraneous duties of the "Music Director" (the official title for the position). Before proceeding any further, a summary of the various positions of authority as they existed at the time of Münch would prove useful.

Most of the men of the Boston Symphony Orchestra have dealings with four conductors. During the winter
season, the bulk of the conducting was done by Charles Münch. Mr. Münch was assisted by Richard Burgin who retired at the same time after 42 years as concert master. He has, however, remained on in the capacity of assistant conductor. During each summer, the Boston "Pops" Orchestra is formed. This consists, for the most part, of a reduced version of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. The reduction is accomplished principally by pruning from the top -- the first and possibly also the second player from each section do not play "Pops". For 33 years, Arthur Fiedler has been the principal conductor of the "Pops" season. He is assisted by Harry Ellis Dickson who plays violin in both orchestras.

In addition to these four conductors, the orchestra normally comes in contact with other people representing management. Rosario Mazzeo plays bass clarinet in the orchestra and acts as Personnel Manager. Thomas D. Perry is General Manager, and above all looms the Trustees with their President Henry B. Cabot. Also in the picture is the figure of Music Administrator, played by Leonard Burkat. This last position seems to have been created especially to cater to Mr. Münch's lack of managerial desire or skill. There is mixed feeling among the men interviewed as to exactly what Mr. Burkat does in this job. Some felt that he acted as Mr. Münch's secretary, most agree that he participated in the choosing of programs, and one man considered his job "A complete waste of time".
It is interesting to speculate, in light of what will be revealed later about Mr. Leinsdorf's personality, whether the position of Music Administrator will continue to exist in the future.

Two traits seem to characterize Münch during his 13 years with the B.S.O. He was an extremely emotional conductor who would succumb freely to the inspiration of the moment during performances. Also, he had a fear of offending anyone by any show of strength associated with his position. The former practice gave rise to a widely fluctuating caliber of performance, while the latter acted in a way, as we shall see, which produced exactly the opposite effect of the one intended. He attempted to run the orchestra by means of love -- a strategy with dubious results. So strong was his aversion to formal disciplinary action that he often preferred to leave the stage during a rehearsal if a deportment problem arose rather than rightfully dismiss the offending musician.

An oversimplified, but convenient, way of summing up the two conductors is to say that Koussevitsky was guilty of sins of commission while Münch was guilty of sins of omission.
CHAPTER III

METODOLOGY

The only logical way to describe the methodology used in this study is to briefly trace the development of the thesis. Two previous papers acted as embryos. The first was a short report on an interview conducted with one member of the orchestra. In it, a search was made to unearth any attitude changes which may have taken place during his association with the symphony. As a result of this paper, a second study was conducted on a much broader scale and was intended to afford a rich collection of data on the relationship which develops between an orchestra and its permanent conductor.

In both these studies the interview technique was the same. Each subject was interviewed for a time which varied between 1 and 2 1/2 hours. There was a total of eight subjects and most of the interviews were tape recorded. The subjects were selected to best fit the following criteria: 1) the sample should include both old and new members; 2) the subjects should represent all sections of the orchestra (winds, brass, percussion, and strings); 3) in the sample should be principle players as well as tutti players; 4) for the mutual comfort of subjects and interviewer, a previous acquaintance of the
two would be desirable. For most practical purposes all these criteria were met. Because a varied set of data was desired, the questions asked had some framework but no diversionary replies were discouraged.

In general, each interview opened with a series of preplanned fixed questions. The first few of these were expressly designed to catch the subject off guard and thus relax him. This paradox is clarified if the reader will understand that each subject knew what the topic of discussion would be in advance and therefore brought a ration of preconceived ideas and reservations along with him to the interview. When the first question was asked ("What functions do the following men perform in the orchestra? Mr. Perry, Mr. Mazzeo, Mr. Burkat, and Mr. Cabot."), it was clear that the men did not expect this kind of factual recounting and relief was clear to see on their faces.

After some rapport was established, the questions began to converge on the main topic. The areas that were intentionally covered in each interview included rehearsal and performance atmosphere, grievance procedure, socialization between the conductor and the orchestra, and guest conductors. These topics were discussed in the framework of both Koussevitsky's and Münch's regimes.

This group of eight formed the nucleus of the current project. When it became clear that the focus of this study was the impending change of conductors, the
tape recordings were replayed and the pertinent data were extracted.

During the summer of 1962 I visited the Berkshire Music Festival at Tanglewood, Massachusetts which is often referred to as the "summer home" of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. At any rate, it formed a convenient way of enlarging the sample since the entire orchestra was present on a daily basis. In addition, most of the men rent or own cottages within a fairly small radius of Tanglewood. This made them easier to contact than in their diverse winter homes.

After I had attended all the rehearsals of the orchestra for 4 days, the sample was increased to 25. The musicians interviewed were drawn from a predetermined list and formed a fairly diverse crosscut through the orchestra. Factors of instrument, chair position, age, and tenure were taken into account to give a well-balanced sample.

It is perhaps timely to discuss the question of anonymity. In the previous papers, the subjects were told that their names would not be used. In preparation for this work a similar procedure was decided on. This was done to foster the comfort and openness of the respondents. In addition, a second important decision was made. The original group of eight were all personal friends of mine and were contacted and interviewed as such. However, it was clear to see that when the sample size was tripled,
a cognizance had to be made of the upper echelons of the orchestra management. The issue was: Should "management" be made aware of the existence and nature of this study, or should further contacts be made personally and individually.

In defense of the former was the cooperation of the management and the abatement of fears that a sub-rosa study might be discovered, and with some hostility, be discontinued forcibly. It was also anticipated that this cooperation would be granted at the price of inspection when the work was completed. On the other hand, if cooperation was not sought, then inspection need not be granted. This had the powerful argument of being able to guarantee to the men that the people "upstairs" would not read their words (anonymous though they were). The latter course was chosen in the hope of further relieving the pressures of inhibition on the part of the subjects.

Needless to say, neither the names of the subjects nor the instruments they play will be used, since a nearly one-to-one correspondence exists and a decoding list appears in every printed program of the orchestra's concerts.

For the remaining 18 interviews at Tanglewood, the following technique was used: After a brief introduction to the nature of the study, the rating scales shown in Figure (1) were introduced. Each of the three axes was carefully explained as to exact intent and scope. The
Figure 1
THE RATING SCALES
competence rating was qualified by stating that only technical competence was to be considered. In the matters of the fairness and strictness ratings considerable explanation was required to clarify the exact import. As the caption for each scale is actually unimportant if the meaning is clear, the reader will benefit from a similar explanation.

The strictness scale was defined as the type of demeanor the conductor evinced during rehearsals. As can be seen in Appendix B, the total "strictness" cues which a conductor radiates are not at all limited to his words. The situation depicted in this Appendix probably represents the "weakest" end of the rating scale. Another way of defining the scale is the measure of the conductor's anticipated retaliation to the musicians' improper rehearsal deportment.

The fairness scale required two qualifications. First, it was made clear that if a conductor foisted a musically poor interpretation of a repertory item on the orchestra, this was, to a measure, unfair. However, this was not the type of fairness to be considered by the respondent. Fairness is perhaps best explained by defining unfairness. The conductor who openly attributes poor musicianship to a player who has merely made a mistake; the conductor who finds scapegoats in the orchestra upon whom to vent his personal anger and frustrations; the
conductor who will not fairly judge disputes of chair positions; the conductor who singles out individual players to have them perform a passage alone (much in the manner of a teacher who places the class dunce on a stool in the corner)--these are the characteristics of unfairness. Finally, each subject was asked to think about the independence of strictness and fairness. A serious, hard-working conductor could be strict and fair; an unsure conductor who relies on camaraderie and forced "love" could play favorites and thereby be non-strict but unfair.

On each of these three rating scales the subject was asked to assign positions to Serge Koussevitsky and Charles Münch. Then, he was asked to venture a guess as to where he felt Mr. Leinsdorf would place on each continuum. This last request was usually met with a certain amount of resistance, since most of the men had had but little contact with the new conductor. After reassuring them that a mere guess was all that was needed, the ratings were indicated.

Generally, the technique described above was employed. However, in a certain few cases it became clear at the outset that the formal rating procedure had to be abandoned. Many of the interviewees responded instantly to the notion of a scale rating. They would stare for a moment at the particular axis under consideration, perhaps squint at it through one eye, and then firmly place a finger on
the number they chose. Others needed some prompting to translate what they considered ethereal notions into cold numbers. Some, however, made it plain at the beginning that the whole subject was difficult to talk about, much less quantify. At this point I decided that the rating scales would never make their appearance and that the material would have to be extracted by subtler means. Of necessity, this gave rise to a longer interview in which I gingerly proceeded to approach the required subjects by small steps. I cannot overemphasize the perceived futility of attempting to introduce any quantification to these few people. Their arguments usually espoused flowery descriptions of art and creative expression. I was sure they would pass off any attempt at assigning numbers with a wave of the hand. It was then necessary to weigh what they had said and place numbers for them. As this was only true in three cases, the data were kept in this "filtered" fashion rather than discarded. The contribution of these people towards general knowledge rationalized their inclusion in the study.

The interviews were all completed prior to Mr. Leinsdorf's first official contact with the orchestra. A period of approximately three months was allowed to elapse after the orchestra reconvened for its 1962-63 season under Mr. Leinsdorf's direction. The same group
of men were then interviewed again and were asked to rate the new conductor again, but this time based on what they had observed over the intervening period. It is important to point out that the previous individual "guess-ratings" about Leinsdorf were not revealed to their authors on this second interview set. All the data were then entered onto a composite form with the subject's code number attached.
CHAPTER IV

QUALITATIVE RESULTS

This chapter will be devoted to a discussion of the stories, impressions, implications, and facts which emerged from the interviews. Due to the fact that in the first eight-subject study the interviewees' responses were allowed to wander over a large number of topics, some of the opinions recorded here were extracted from this group only. In addition, a rich collection of data of this sort was gathered from the Tanglewood sample of eighteen.

The goals of this chapter are to convey the aura of sentiments which exist in the daily life of an orchestral musician in the Boston Symphony Orchestra, to express the view of these musicians about their relationship to the man who is their conductor, and to surround the numerical results which appear in the next chapter (relevant to the succession of conductors) with clarifying and enhancing experiences which the men related.

Needless to say, in this crucial period of the change of conductors, the personnel of the symphony have been individually assailed by friends, well-wishers, and muck-rakers; all of whom want the straight, inside dope on what the new conductor is REALLY like. "Do you like Leinsdorf? What was Münch like? Is Leinsdorf as good as Münch? Was
Koussevitsky as good as Leinsdorf?" Weary of this type of daily questioning, one of the respondents commented: "This is getting to be quite a game. It might even be more popular than Bull-Fighting!" Undaunted in the face of what very well might have been a not-so-subtle hint, the interviews proceeded according to plan.

It is interesting to note that to even what seem like straightforward factual inquiries there can be a variety of answers. In general, during the initial fixed questions, most of the men agreed on the functions of Mr. Perry and Mr. Mazzeo; the former concerned with financial and business matters -- the latter with everyday personnel problems. The question was then asked concerning the peculiar case of Mr. Mazzeo. Here we have a man who, while acting in a managerial capacity, also assumes the daily role of colleague musician. Does this situation lead to some sort of barrier between him and his fellow players? It certainly does. The subjects varied in their explanation of this separation (some thought it was aloofness, some thought it was ostracism) but all agreed that it exists. When asked whether Mr. Mazzeo was considered an orchestra representative who dealt with management, or a management agent who policed the orchestra, one of the men snapped back "A Judas!" Enough said.

The first approach to the actual player-conductor
relationships was a question about the form of address used by the men and Mr. Münch in their communications during rehearsals. There was no disagreement on this point. Every subject confirmed the fact that the conductor was most often addressed as Mr. Münch, occasionally called "Maestro", less often called by some French equivalent of the latter, and NEVER called Dr. Münch. Although he warrants the title, he has expressed the opinion that it should be reserved for men of the medical profession.

In the other direction, the conductor used several ways to address the men. Sometimes he would call them by instrument ("second oboe"), sometimes by first name, sometimes by last name. I must make it clear that this variety of titles was random both in respect to a particular player and to time. There are two notable exceptions to the above description. First, the obvious one concerning "tutti" players who are only addressed in a group, as, "violas"; second, the unique case of James Stagliano (the principal horn) who was always called "Gimmy" (the "G" is pronounced as in "beige"). The men rushed to the defense of this by explaining that "Gimmy" was Mr. Münch's golf partner.

This last comment is the natural pivot on which to turn to the question of the conductor's socializing habits. Opinion here was divided, but not without what seems like good reason. In a nutshell, the men with whom he socialized
reported that he was gregarious -- the others said he was not. They felt he gravitated toward the French-speaking population of the orchestra. Although he is said to have had no difficulty in English conversation, the "little extra" closeness with those who spoke his first tongue evidenced itself. One of the men interviewed expressed the feeling that on the occasions when Mr. Münch visited his home, he was further put at ease by the fact that "We don't lionize him. We don't take advantage of the fact that we are inviting THE CONDUCTOR."

Apparently Charles Münch was not much of a social personality in other respects as well. In addition to his sparse inter-orchestra fraternization, he also shunned social gatherings with prominent individuals of Boston society who might possibly have supplied the much-needed financial support for the orchestra. Some of the men felt that in this regard, Mr. Münch's introvertedness might have played to the detriment of the organization as a whole.

This picture of the shy, unassuming conductor had certain merits.

"What attitude should the conductor take toward the musicians to obtain the best results? "Let him not make long speeches to them. Musicians come to play, not to listen to lectures. Say what you must in as few words as possible. Experienced professionals hate to be given lessons. Let them retain some sense of responsibility. Never discourage them. Restore the confidence of those who are in trouble. Do not make much of their
errors. Correct them without embarrassing them before their comrades."

His deportment in rehearsals was reported to be excellent. He never "put an individual on the spot" by making him perform his passage alone. He frequently cancelled scheduled rehearsals and gave the orchestra the afternoon off. He was "very discreet" about indicating his approval or disapproval of the way a passage was performed in concerts. Those men who found it necessary to rationalize his behavior claimed that he has a philosophy that it was better to have an orchestra that was not rehearsed to ultimate perfection than one which came to the performance tired in mind and body.

As a result of this, many of the men felt that the orchestra was under-rehearsed. Also, it must be added that Münch's "inspirational" method of conducting made him virtually unpredictable in performance. He could rehearse a composition three times, give three different readings, and the weekend concerts would raise the total to five.

Certain men felt that this unpredictability kept the orchestra on its toes and often led to unsurprisingly exciting performances. Others, however, felt that the orchestra was never playing its musical or technical best when it was "distracted" by this extra anxiety in concerts.

An interviewee tells it very well.

"I think that—within reason—we're pretty well adapted as instrumentalists to do pretty much what a conductor wants of us, but we have to know (you see?)—we have to know—and with Koussevitsky it was wonderful in this respect because on Monday morning we knew that we were going to be taught a lesson. 1 We were going to be taught. So on Monday morning none of us did anything—we played straight. We knew he was going to stop. We knew he was going to say 'No, No, Kinder!'. He was going to sing it to us. He was going to say this and this and then we would do it. And on Tuesday he would say 'Well, that's better', and Wednesday and Thursday. Then it was swallowed (you see?). Then we were set for the rest of the time."

Another man put it this way:

"A conductor should have control at all times—a boss anywhere—and he should have clear conceptions of the music to begin with—what he wants. Now, with Münch we never know. We can rehearse it one way a whole week and play it entirely different at the concert—the tempos will be entirely different. He's that kind of a conductor. He goes on the inspiration of the moment. With Koussevitsky you always knew. You could close your eyes and if it were Brahms you could play—once you got the downbeat—you could play without even opening your eyes. You knew where the beat was going to be."

The indications present in these preceding two quotes begin to point up an interesting division of opinion. One camp feels that only with the type of spontaneous fire which Münch was capable of igniting could the orchestra reach peak performance efficiency on an emotional level. The other group felt that they absolutely could not get "into" the music while they were pre-occupied with the task of deciphering the conductor's tenuous beat and surprising new tempos. You see, it must be understood

---

1. See quote on Page 30.
that there is an interesting cycle of performance preparation as one travels the axis of orchestra competence.

At one end of the scale we find the amateur orchestra whose members need an abundance of rehearsal to compensate for their individually poor talents at reading and interpretation. Next comes the "pickup orchestra". This is a group composed of professional musicians of great competence who are assembled for a particular occasion. Examples of the latter include pit orchestras, summer theatre groups, instrumental ensembles brought in to complete forces necessary to perform a work with a well-rehearsed chorus, and "one-shot" recording orchestras. These groups can perform with little or no rehearsal due to the musicians' excellence at sight reading and vastly diversified experience with numerous conductors. In musicians' parlance, an instrumentalist who can adapt to any situation is called "fly". ("He was 'fly' enough to catch the new tempo even though the conductor didn't really make it clear.") The performances turned out by these orchestras are generally competent.

The third group is the professional orchestra. These are men of roughly the same competence as the pickup orchestra, but they have the additional advantage of being accustomed to each other and their one permanent conductor. These groups complete the "preparation cycle" because they need almost as much rehearsal as the amateur orchestra. This can be explained if the reader will understand that these groups are after something more difficult
to attain than "competent performances". As one man put it, "We don't have to rely on sightreading. We are supposed to be a well-rehearsed professional orchestra." The goal for performance caliber is set high. The things that this last group rehearse in the "additional" time (compared with the pickup orchestra) are fine points of interpretation which are over the head of the amateur orchestra and only desired as a luxury by the pickup group.

The counter arguments of the two previously cited "camps" are as follows: Münch's performances had fire SOMETIMES, but were often a confused jumble with the only goal of the musicians being to finish together. Koussevitsky's performances were constant, all right, but this consistency led to predictability which in turn led to stodgy, lifeless performances.

The rebuttals go thusly: "Yes, Münch sometimes got himself and the orchestra confused, but the electrifying impact of the performances that clicked made it all worth it." "No, Koussevitsky's performances were not stodgy. With sufficient careful, consistent preparation, we were able to see a unified, stable interpretation which we could then give our all to." And so it goes.

I had hoped to find some other characteristics of the two factions just discussed which would tend to explain their division. One possibility was the natural division of the orchestra into the string body and the remainder. The facts which suggested such a division were that in
the five string sections, each player is joined on every note he plays by from eight to sixteen other musicians (known as "tutti players") while every other member of the orchestra is solely responsible for the music before him. I toyed with the hypothesis that the solo players would have become used to greater responsibility and would mind the unstable readings under Münch's direction much less than the tutti players who conversely would appreciate Koussevitsky's dependability. Unfortunately there is neither support for this hypothesis nor any other way of classifying these factions since all other characteristics seem to be randomly distributed.

Although it did not emerge from the first study, there is one fascinating element which has revealed itself in the current project. As was referred to earlier, Charles Münch abhorred disciplinary responsibility and, when the occasion demanded it, went to great lengths to avoid it. The subjects cited examples where two-man disputes among the players were brought to the conductor who could settle them if he wished. Rather than do so, since the disposition of the case would surely offend at least one of the two, he shifted the responsibility back to the men who were then instructed to "Try and work it out between you". Needless to say, this attitude could hurt both men.

More and more stories of this type were encountered and the climax occurred when one interviewee actually said
that he preferred the intentional acts of overt discrimination and cruelty practiced by Koussevitsky to the "ricochet" type of unfairness inadvertently caused by Münch. "At least with Koussevitsky we knew where we stood."

With Münch, an unfair act might pop up and randomly strike any member.

As we shall see in the next chapter, those men who were victimized by Münch's brand of unfairness rated him low—generally almost as low as Koussevitsky. Those musicians who managed to escape untouched rated him high. Probably, due to the non-overt nature of the unfairness, many unaffected men were even oblivious to its existence. Certainly, there were no tantrums or seiges of name-calling which would spell things out even for the portion of the orchestra not directly in the line of fire.

A few words need be said about the area of competence as regards Koussevitsky and Münch. In their individual ways, each man had his own form of competence. Apparently Charles Münch was the conducting equivalent of "a good sight reader". This made him fairly lax about the amount of preparation he would put into a new score since he could learn it quickly on the stand. Many times the men thought he came to the early rehearsals of such a work rather unprepared. This can easily lead to a kind of chaos as individual questions and misprints further confuse the air. There was no doubt that the French romantic and impressionistic schools of composition supplied Münch
with his "show pieces". Orchestra and critics alike lauded his performances of these works. There will be very interesting reviews to read if Mr. Leinsdorf should ever perform Debussy's "La Mer", Ravel's "Daphnis and Chloe", or Berlioz' "Symphonie Fantastique". These three pieces were often performed together in one concert and truly offered the audience an "all Münch program".

Technically, Münch sometimes was lacking in clear baton technique. He was known to actually daydream during a performance and let the tempo drag. He would then suddenly come out of it and attempt to compensate by jumping ahead with alarming suddenness. The most amazing story I heard in this regard was about Münch's actually forgetting to "cut off" the final chord in the performance of a symphony. Somehow, the musicians found a singleness of mind and all stopped playing at the same instant. This not only speaks quizzically about Charles Münch, but also reaffirms the difference between the pickup orchestra and one which has played together on a permanent basis.

As a sidelight, two quotes from Charles Münch follow. They refer to his days at the Paris Conservatory where he taught conducting for two years.

"I did not permit conducting without a baton, which has unhappily become fashionable. It is a bad habit, in my opinion, that creates difficulties for the musicians. I am sure that
anyone who has ever played in a professional orchestra will agree with me."

"I did not require my pupils to learn their scores by heart. As Reynaldo Hahn said, 'You go to concerts to admire the music, not the conductor's feats of memory.' I have seen some of the greatest memory-acrobats make catastrophically sad mistakes. It is especially dangerous to conduct accompaniments by heart. I know that it always makes soloists nervous." 2

The amusing facet of these remarks (written in 1955) is the fact that they describe two of the dramatically evident features of the scoreless and batonless successor to Mr. Münch -- Erich Leinsdorf.

Lest the reader suspect that the picture of Serge Koussevitsky which has been presented is one of a semi-competent, autocratic "lady-killer", let me hasten to add that even some of the men who gave him low ratings would continue to insist that he was the greatest conductor they had ever known. When questioned further, they supported their claim by saying that the ratings asked for in this study were, as per instructions, exclusive of the truly nebulous areas of musical interpretation and expression. When allowed to include these, the subjects altered their "total rating".


2. Ibid., p. 33.
It seems that Serge Koussevitsky had a deep and genuine love for music. This and his charismatic personality made a seductive combination of persuasive tools. Musicians were somehow charmed into playing their best for him. It was this charm that electrified the audience and has made his tenure the longest of any conductor of the orchestra.

It is appropriate here to delve a little further into the various facets of player motivation. From a psychological point of view, this area of discussion with the men proved to be the most fascinating. I believe that it is chiefly this quirk which makes a symphony orchestra unlike any other business enterprise with 100 employees.

The approach to the question was generally as follows: "In this next question I'm not merely referring to the Boston Symphony or the Boston "Pops", but to any orchestra you may have ever played with. In your experience, have you ever played for a conductor for whom you had a strong dislike?" Usually I received an impish "Yes,.... ." I went on. "In addition, did you ever play for a conductor whom you not only disliked, but also felt was totally incompetent to conduct an orchestra?" Most of the time a thoughtful "Yes" was given. "Well, under these conditions, how did you perform? Did you play well?"

The universal answer was that the musician played as well as the conductor would allow. By this I mean
that the player would attempt to play his best, but if
the conductor's beat was unclear, naturally, clean attacks
and good ensemble would not be forthcoming. I attempted
to probe further to find out the reason for this. Usually,
the first answer I received was "It's my job." This
type of answer could generally be put into one of two
explanatory categories.

The first of these concerns the years of musical
training each one of the men received. For a reason that
is perhaps obvious, musicians know they're going to be
musicians from a very early age. Therefore, it is very
much the norm to find their musical education paralleling
elementary school, high school, and college and sometimes
extending further in time than that. It is not unreason-
able to say that what amounts to close to 20 years of
training will not be over-ridden by one single encounter
with a conductor of negative stature.

The second reason accounting for the "job" answer
is closely associated with reputation. Much for the same
reason I would not even name the instruments my subjects
played, the players know that if one of the principal
instrumentalists makes a mistake, the musically discerning
public can immediately attach a name to the sound. They
feel that any purposeful mistakes would certainly be
cutting off their noses to spite their faces. In addition,
there is the often unqualified, but overpowerful word
of the newspaper critics.
One man put it this way. "You read in the review 'The brass was too loud.' Never do you see 'The CONDUCTOR ALLOWED his brass to be too loud.' Then you read where the conductor conducted a marvelous performance. The stick doesn't make any noise." Another man: "We get blamed for the mistakes, the conductor gets the credit for the good performances."

One of the men mentioned in passing a point to which he later attempted to attach no importance. However, the fact that it came to his mind makes it worth referring to in the light of the previous few paragraphs.

Located one block from Symphony Hall is The New England Conservatory of Music. The majority of the instrumental instructors who teach there are members of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. Every Friday there is a mad scurry among the instrumental majors to try to get last minute tickets to the afternoon performance that day. The inter-student conversations which ensue candidly appraise the quality of the work of their own instructor. (All students, whether good or bad, are intensely aware of what they consider instrumental perfection.) It doesn't take long before the instructor hears about it. Now, despite the fact that these junior critics report to a limited audience of amateurs, it can become a source of annoyance to the symphony member. If, Heaven forbid, the player should have made some insignificant mistake during that concert, the buzz can be heard all over the
Conservatory. This is another argument for consistent good playing.

During the winter symphony season, the orchestra has several guest conductors come in for one or two weeks. Certainly none of these can be of the questionable stature of the "Pops" guests (see Appendix B), but the man may be making his initial appearance before the orchestra. A part of each interview was devoted to a discussion of the manner in which the orchestra reacts to a new conductor. The consensus of opinion was that he is always given the benefit of the first doubt—that is, they try to play their best from the very start, rather than wait to "feel out" the capabilities of the guest. If, however, he proves to be a magnificent piece of reputation with no talent, the men's minds will relax somewhat—so will the ultimate quality level. It is into this complex mixture of intellect, tradition, and emotions that any new conductor must step—whether he be temporary or permanent.

In September 1962, Erich Leinsdorf assumed the post of Music Director of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. Charles Munch was 58 when he took the job, Serge Koussevitsky was 50, and Mr. Leinsdorf is 50 also. Needless to say, the men of the orchestra did not sit idly by during the year following the announcement of Mr. Leinsdorf's appointment (April 22, 1961). The network of personal contacts surrounding the 104 member organization was put into operation to attempt to learn something about their new conductor.
A few of the men had played under Leinsdorf in other orchestras and all men had had one contact with him when he guest conducted the B.S.O. at the beginning of 1961. Through all these sources certain rumors began to precede his arrival. Prominent among these was the cloud of temper stories. In addition, his Viennese background might tend to nullify or reverse any "special" friendships which Münch had created with the French-speaking population of the orchestra. One thing the men knew with reasonable certainty was that the "party" of low discipline and cancelled rehearsals was over. It was therefore with a certain amount of trepidation that the men of the Symphony looked forward to the coming of Erich Leinsdorf.

Upon his first appearance before the orchestra, Mr. Leinsdorf made it evident that he had most of the names of the 104 musicians memorized. In response to the question of the veracity of this statement, several of the men replied: "Memorized? He not only knew my name, he knew my wife's name, he knew how many children I have, he knew my background, and he knew how long I had been with the orchestra!" Although a few interviewees felt that this was merely a mnemonic trick and attached no special meaning to it, the majority accepted it as a warm gesture and added that they couldn't help but find it flattering.

The above incident reveals the pattern of behavior which seems to be the core of Leinsdorf's personality.
The consistently high competence rating he received from the men is based largely on his thorough knowledge of the works he performs. He rarely uses a score since he has committed most of them to memory. When Leinsdorf conducted the new Seventh Symphony of Walter Piston, the composer, who attended the rehearsals, made a comment to the effect that it was slightly unnerving to find a man who knew the symphony better than its creator.

Leinsdorf's entire approach to his new job has been methodical. For the first time in 13 years, the rehearsal schedule is carefully planned and posted in advance. The rehearsals themselves are business-like and thorough. The conductor strives for technically near-perfect performances. He is meticulous about details.

In matters of everyday interactions with the men, he is polite to the extreme. He even seems to have invented a kind of protocol in addressing the men. Example: "Mr. X (a first chair player), would you be kind enough to inform your colleague Mr. Y (another player in the same section) that the passage at letter 'B' should be more legato."

Another precedent set by the new conductor is the writing of memoranda to various key players, or sometimes to all players. These notes will be found on occasion clipped to the musicians' folders. When they sit down to play, they are treated to reminders of difficult passages which need a last minute going over, or reminders of other deviations from the norm.
This process was carried to extremes when one of the
notes requested that, due to a problem of balance with a
singer, all musicians should shift all dynamic markings
one degree softer. This is a standard procedure and, as
I have stated it above, is readily understood by amateur
musicians from college level upward. However, Leinsdorf's
communique went on to define the process. "This means
ff becomes f, f becomes mf, mf becomes mp, etc." This,
in a way, was an insult to the men. "What? Are we babies
or something?" Another letter informed each player that
they should be on stage five minutes before performance
time and that 1 1/2 minutes later "Mr. Silverstein will
signal for quiet and then ask Mr. Gomberg for an 'A'."

Although this seems amusing and one is tempted to
add to the above instructions "Then Mr. Gomberg will play
an 'A' for 6 sec. and Mr. Silverstein will say 'Thank
you!'", it is merely another indication of the completely
organized way in which Mr. Leinsdorf is running the
orchestra.

A few of the men made reference to a postcard received
by the concertmaster from the conductor while the latter
was enjoying a two week respite in some tropical resort.
On the back was the typical island paradise photograph
while the message on the front began:

"Dear Silverstein,
About the bowings in the Bruckner----".

One of the men marveled at his seemingly inexhaustible
supply of energy. "He just loves work. He could go on to THREE rehearsals a day if he thought we could take it."

It is in this regard that one point was raised about the conductor's expectations of the musicians. "His mind functions like an I.B.M. computer. I only hope he doesn't think we work like machines too....we're only human, you know." The indications of Leinsdorf's pattern of behavior which have been witnessed in this three month introductory period have not supported this fear. His only demands upon the musicians of the orchestra have been in the interest of the common goal -- the production of an artistic performance -- and do not seem to be excessive. Of course, in contrast to the laissez-faire attitude of Münch, the simple request for an actual rehearsal on Friday morning instead of the theoretical one (which was most always turned into a vacation by Münch) could be the cause of a raised eyebrow. However, nothing more serious than that seems to exist in Leinsdorf's expectations of the orchestra. To the contrary, it was raised that his knowledge of human behavior has made him flexible in his dealings with the men of the orchestra. A large number of the respondents felt that Leinsdorf had devised appropriate psychological approaches to use with the different solo players. The results are said to be extraordinary, as each strategem is extracting the best playing these men have done in years.
In the discussion of fairness there is much agreement, but the minority voice will also be reported. The big question was whether the reputation of temper was going to be confirmed. In the three months Leinsdorf has been with the orchestra, there have been virtually no flare-ups with the men. In response to the question of whether this was due to an increased maturity on his part or an inhibiting pressure accompanying the "honeymoon", there was a variety of opinions. Tying for first place are the following: Leinsdorf himself is extremely happy with the job and with the players. This implies that it was his personal frustrations with the previous orchestras he has conducted that led to the temper explosions; with the excellence of the Boston Symphony players, he need never be provoked. There is also a faction that believes he has outgrown this type of immaturity because he has the intelligence to realize that he can get better results without it. In second place is the belief that it is only a matter of time before he "reveals himself". Faced with a reputation 20 years long, this minority replies: "Can a zebra change its stripes?"

In addition, another minority reports that the "zebra" has made no effort to change its stripes -- Leinsdorf has already shown himself. This is a small enough faction so that it can be discounted in any attempts to evaluate the total picture of the man, but it will be voiced here since it is fairly revealing of the disparity of opinions
which exist in the sample. It goes like this:

Leinsdorf is being meticulously careful not to commit an overt act of unfair practice. The word "overt" is the key to this line of belief and becomes synonymous with "legally restricted". The law referred to is the trade agreement which sets the basic tenets of orchestra-management relations. If a conductor violates any of the restrictions in this contract, he is naturally subject to disciplinary action. However, this minority indicates that Leinsdorf is dealing on a level which is, by legal standards, acceptable, but is ethically deficient.

An example will help clarify this stand. In the 1961-62 season auditions were held for the chair of concertmaster to replace the retiring Richard Burgin. Members of the orchestra auditioned (at their option) as well as violinists from around the country. There were two results of these auditions. The concertmaster was selected from within the orchestra -- Joseph Silverstein -- but several of the other B.S.O. violinists got a chance to play personally for Leinsdorf. This is not to be underestimated in its value to the men. In sections that are 17 men strong, any opportunity to keep afloat in the quicksand of tutti players is quickly utilized. Therefore, it was a good political move for these players to audition even if they knew they had no chance of winning the chair. Naturally, there were those to whom the opportunity
of a personal audition had petrifyingly opposite effects.

Mr. Leinsdorf wrote personal letters to all the B.S.O. players who tried out. These were highly complimentary and he was quoted as boasting: "I have an orchestra with nine concert masters!" According to the trade agreement, it is stated that "the conductor shall take responsibility for the seating of the orchestra." Over the years, an informal practice has grown up which has formulated a certain protocol in filling vacant chairs in the tutti sections. However, nowhere is this written down, and in the final analysis it can legally be at the conductor's discretion.

In this setting we find Leinsdorf "promiscuously" moving up some of the previously mentioned audition players without going through the "folkway" of holding additional competitive auditions with these players' peers. It was an act of ethical laxity but legal purity. "How can we fight a thing like that? Legally, he's clean as a whistle." Nonetheless, most of the men felt that, at least for the three month period, Leinsdorf has truly exhibited nothing which could give substance to the rumors which preceded him.

Several of the men exhibited remarkable psychological insights into the general pattern of Leinsdorf's behavior by classifying him as a compulsive personality. Although the word should not carry a particularly bad connotation
with it, the abundance of the data confirms this amateur diagnosis. The pertinent characteristics follow:

1) Meticulousness in detail
2) Searches for virtual technical perfection
3) Extremely well-ordered life
4) Memorization of scores and names of personnel
5) Interest in all facets of management

Far from being a detrimental characteristic, this compulsiveness may well qualify Erich Leinsdorf as the model Music Director for a large orchestra. However, it is interesting to speculate on whether or not the same relaxed atmosphere which seems to exist at Tanglewood will continue through the future summers of Leinsdorf's direction. It is possible that this relaxation may be perceived by the conductor as a threat to the proper functioning of his "well-oiled machine" and consequently eliminated.

To conclude this chapter, it will be interesting for the reader to mentally review the traits exhibited by Leinsdorf while reading a few selected passages by Peter Drucker.

"The greatest advantage of management by objectives is perhaps that it makes it possible for a manager to control his own performance. Self-control means stronger motivation: a desire to do the best rather than just enough to get by. It means higher performance goals and broader vision."  

"What the business enterprise needs is a principle of management that will give full scope to individual strength and responsibility, and at the same time give common direction of vision and effort, establish team work and harmonize the goals of the individual with the common weal."¹

"It is the purpose of an organization to 'make common men do uncommon things'—this phrasing is Lord Beveridge's. No organization can depend on genius; the supply is always scarce and always unpredictable. But it is the test of an organization that they are capable of, that it bring out whatever strength there is in its members and use it to make all the other members perform more and better. It is the test of an organization that it neutralize the weaknesses of its members."²


2. Ibid., pp. 144-5.
CHAPTER V
QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

There are two points which warrant explanation at the outset. As was mentioned earlier, the original sample was expanded to 25 subjects during the visit to Tanglewood. At the conclusion of each interview, the subject was asked if I might contact him again in the vicinity of December, 1962. This was the estimated date for the second round of interviewing. It was chosen to afford the longest feasible incubation period of sentiments within the orchestra in regards to the new conductor.

In the middle of December, all 25 of the respondents were contacted by telephone to arrange for the second interview. In general, this procedure went smoothly, but I must report with some concern that one of the subjects refused to be reinterviewed even though he too granted permission for a further talk at the end of the Tanglewood session. His reasons were vague. First, he thought that a second interview "would not be necessary". After attempting to explain that I thought it WAS necessary, his line of defense changed to one which attempted to discredit the study. "You're trying to take too scientific an approach to this thing." The most he could be persuaded to do was to suggest that if I happened to be in Symphony
Hall after the 10th of January (a strange date, considering it fell in the middle of a period when the entire orchestra was out of town, on tour) and ran into him, I might ask again. Unfortunately, by the time they returned, it would be too late. Therefore, while I have recorded his numerical and qualitative data from the Tanglewood interview, the sample size of the second set of talks is reduced to 25.

The second point necessary of clarification is the size of the sample in the three ratings of Koussevitzky. Not all of the subjects had played in the orchestra during his reign. This caused certain men to plead ignorance when confronted with the rating scales. It is fascinating to observe, however, that these men did not always disqualify themselves from ALL comments on Koussevitzky. For example, some men would go so far as to rate the conductor on fairness and strictness, but would not consider themselves qualified to give a competence rating. This explains the "question marks" in the data sheets. In these cases, the sample size of that "cell" was considered reduced. In the numerical presentation of the composite ratings, the effective sample size of each cell is indicated (see Figure 2). The composite ratings were derived from a simple arithmetic average of the pertinent sample in each cell of the data sheet.

As most of the subjects were quick to confirm, the whole business of putting numbers on human characteristics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>München</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRICNESS</strong></td>
<td>98.26</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>88.35</td>
<td>88.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 23</td>
<td>n = 26</td>
<td>n = 26</td>
<td>n = 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPETENCE</strong></td>
<td>61.68</td>
<td>68.65</td>
<td>94.42</td>
<td>94.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 19</td>
<td>n = 26</td>
<td>n = 26</td>
<td>n = 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAIRNESS</strong></td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>78.08</td>
<td>89.60</td>
<td>87.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 23</td>
<td>n = 26</td>
<td>n = 25</td>
<td>n = 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2**

NUMERICAL PRESENTATION OF COMPOSITE RATINGS
is a stiflingly subjective task. Because of this, it is natural to expect a variety of expressive nuances from subject to subject (see the data in Appendix A). Some of the common patterns are as follows:

1. Some subjects chose deliciously delicate gradations of rating to express their choice. See subjects No's. 5, 24, and 25. The ratings of 98 and 99 were chosen by their authors to reflect the fact that "no one's perfect".

2. Some subjects utilized the whole scope of the rating scales to make their choices. See subjects No's. 1, 4, 17, 19, and 21.

3. Certain of the subjects would cram their ratings up to the top of the rating scales. See subjects No's. 2, 6, 12, 24, and 25. Even though they chose some zero ratings, the next level given by these men is quite distant from this.

4. It is particularly interesting to speculate on the reasons for Leinsdorf's compressed ratings. Either he is truly a model conductor, or the men chose this unique way to express their feelings so that the absolute ratings were dutifully high and beyond suspicion. A similar argument can be given for the subjects in the above group 3.
Taking cognizance of this variety of approaches to the task of rating the conductors leads to certain conclusions. It is clear that the absolute values have only secondary importance if used as a vehicle for comparing subject with subject. The main information carried by the ratings is the RELATIVE dominance of the three characteristics as perceived by each subject. Therefore, it follows that only the relative positions of the composite average ratings have enough meaning to be worthy of discussion. It was toward the easy comparison of these relations that the graphical presentation of the composite ratings was introduced (see Figure 3).

On this diagram the reader can see the four "contours" of the ratings and thus quickly compare their relative shapes. The first point which virtually "pops" out of the graphs is that each conductor has a peak in a different rating axis. The subjects perceived "strictness" (with all the nuances previously described) as Serge Koussevitsky's dominant trait while Charles Münch was rated highest on fairness. Erich Leinsdorf's forte was seen to be his technical competence. These results tend to confirm the qualitative impressions recounted earlier. The only fact not obvious from the composite ratings is the cluster of low fairness ratings attributed to Münch.

The highest rating achieved in any area is the 98.26 given to Koussevitsky's strictness. As can be seen
Figure 3

GRAPHICAL PRESENTATION OF COMPOSITE RATINGS
from the data, 19 of the subjects gave this cell the value of 100, three of the subjects abstained from a rating, and the remaining four gave two 95's, a 90, and the low of 80. In none of the other cells was there as great a consensus as in this area.

The lowest rating in any cell was also won by Koussevitsky in the area of fairness. There was still good consensus in this cell with 13 subjects giving the lowest possible rating of zero. Three abstained, and the remaining 10 were fairly evenly distributed over the rest of the scale, with a high of 75.

It is fascinating to observe that of the 13 subjects that placed Koussevitsky at zero in fairness, 12 also rated him highest (100) in strictness — the remaining subject was barely beneath at 95. Devoid of any qualities that could be categorized as musical, this combination of absolute strictness and virtually no fairness could be a lethal combination of attributes with which to run an orchestra. Viewed from this position, the charismatic qualities of Koussevitsky must have been incredible in order to overcome his autocratic personality. You see, in even the cases of these 13 players, there was no one who painted a consistently bad overall picture of the conductor.

The next point of interest is the remarkable accuracy with which the predictions of Leinsdorf's numerical ratings matched the ratings of his observed behavior. In the
areas of strictness and competence, the predicted ratings were only .17 and .14 of a point respectively below the observed ratings. It was to show this dramatic accuracy that the calculations of the average composite ratings were carried to two decimal places. Even the "large" variance of 1.66 in the fairness evaluation is fairly insignificant, although it stands as the only rating where the guess was greater than reality.

However, the curious thing is that the individual opinions were mixed. In competence, only 9 of the 25 subjects rated Leinsdorf the same as before. Another 9 rated him higher than their guesses, and 7 rated them lower after seeing him. Yet, the average ironed out the variances to an extremely "smooth" discrepancy of only .14 of a point.

Similarly, in strictness, 8 subjects repeated their prediction with 6 topping their guess and 11 feeling the new conductor was less strict than anticipated. The resultant average, none-the-less, is only .17 higher than the average guess. In fairness, just 5 subjects predicted their own feelings correctly while 6 were pleasantly surprised and 13 were disappointed. The result of this large group of subjects who felt Leinsdorf was more unfair than predicted was to move the average less than two points.

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, the
individual fairness ratings given Münch seemed to be either high or low -- depending on whether or not the particular subject had been touched by the unfairness which resulted from the conductor's procrastination and indecisiveness. A cursory inspection of the ratings indicated that they were bi-modally distributed. Indeed, when a graph of their distribution was plotted, it proved to be bi-modal (see Figure 4). No one was indifferent to the question of Münch's fairness.

Showing an indication of the tendency to over-compensate, the group of 5 players who fell below the breakpoint in the distribution all guessed that Leinsdorf would have ratings above 90 -- including three 100's. The average guess of these optimists was 97. Wishing doesn't make it so, unfortunately, because the average of the observed evaluations of this small group fell to 93.4.
Figure 4
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CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

During the course of this study, certain interesting facts emerged which at first blush seemed to be unrelated and curious. In a discussion about the data, the following unifying hypothesis was suggested by Dr. Edgar H. Schein: From a psychological point of view, the men of the Boston Symphony Orchestra provide an abundance of evidence to indicate that there is widespread anxiety about their work and a stifled feeling of aggression toward their conductor (any one of the three). The beauty with which the facts fall into the hypothesis make it worth an exploration. First, let us examine the evidence.

A very interesting sidelight was observed during the Tanglewood visit. As an almost universal habit, both in respect to time and to the individuals involved, the members of the orchestra have adopted an extremely deprecating attitude towards each other's talent. It seemed as if it were the norm to religiously ignore the next man's status. A few examples will make the point clear.

The following are paraphrases, but their thrust is not at all distorted. Two men meet a third. "Hi, Joe. Who have you got with you, some kind of a plumber?" "Listen, you -------, when are you going to learn to play the fiddle?" Another case: "Why don't you give up music
and go into something you're more suited for." "I'll give it up when you learn which end of the horn to put into your mouth." This type of interaction generally takes place off the job in the relaxed atmosphere of an inter-
mission or rehearsal break.

To try to understand this behavior, it must be remem-
bered that a position in the Boston Symphony Orchestra
is viewed by most instrumentalists as the epitome of an
orchestral musician's achievement. Therefore, it is clear
that membership in this organization constitutes a status
symbol. Certainly no one recognizes this symbol more
readily than the members themselves. To join the orchestra,
each man endured his trial by fire -- the audition. By
definition, each man passed this exam. Therefore, the one
undisputed fact in the possession of all members is the
technical superiority of each of them. It cannot be stated
too strongly what importance this superiority has for the
men. Yet, it is this very competence that is the target
for social jokes. I feel that this attitude overtly re-
flects two things at once. First, it is a strange sort
of compliment. Second, it is probably the only harassment
which is safe to wield against all members of the orchestra.
No one can take offense -- the facts speak for themselves.
I would venture that if a man felt slighted in this game
it would weigh heavily on him since he would fear that he
truly was musically deficient.
Conversely, it is interesting to note that the inter-
member method of gently pointing to a musician's "goof"
is the compliment. "I really want to tell you how much
I enjoyed your solo in the Brahms!"

Closely tied to this is the strange custom of the
sincere compliment. Naturally, it is sometimes stated
with a simple "Bravo". However, there is another way. To
execute this, one needs to be seated. The feet are placed
side by side, both pointed straight forward. They are
then shuffled along the floor in opposite phase. While
the intended meaning of this sign is the instant approval
of the just-past solo activities of a member, its origin
(I suspect) is rooted in the action of someone who is
trying to free his feet from some unpleasant substance
which he has inadvertently stepped in! A gray area of
meaning is introduced when this ritual is performed for
the benefit of a player who has just competently played
a one or two note solo of great simplicity. So, the
"shuffle" is appropriate following a competent solo
performance. If the passage was truly difficult, then
the compliment is sincere; if the passage was childishly
simple, then the target musician is being given a ribbing,
or in common parlance, is being "put on". It is up to
the performer to evaluate the worth of his efforts and
decide whether to smile or blush.

Although the overt reasons for this deprecating
by-play may be as stated, Schein suggests that the under-
lying causes conform to the concept of "identification
with the aggressor", in this case, the conductor. What
better way is there to free oneself of pent up frustrations
than to vent them on a docile colleague. By attacking
the musical prowess of the target, one can have one's
cake and eat it too. This means that there is fertile
ground for selection of the target; that this whole process
satisfies the urge to let the frustrations which accumulate
on the job find an escape valve; and that (because of
reasons previously enumerated) the role playing aggressor
need not fear serious retaliation. By acting toward his
fellow musicians (overtly in jest) as a conductor might
act (in insidious cruelty), the musician assumes the role
of the conductor and by identification, somehow heals the
wounds of accumulated everyday aggressions.

Further information seems to support this theory.
It is relevant that the musicians of the orchestra have
not only wrapped themselves up in one protective cocoon --
the musician's union, but also have constructed a heavy
duty lining by reinforcing it with an orchestra committee and
a dismissal committee. A visitor from another planet might
find it vastly amusing to figuratively see 104 musicians
cowering in a corner, knees trembling. Industriously they
build wall upon wall of protection around themselves. It
is not a behemoth power they fear, it is merely another
man, much like themselves. Perhaps this is traditional
behavior passed down from Koussevitsky's era where incredible acts of dictatorship were practised. In any case, it throws more fuel on the fire.

As the interviews progressed, I began to become aware of a mannerism which was almost universally adopted. In the talks with the men, the first time they brought Leinsdorf's name into the conversation, it was disguised as: "This man" or "The current man", or "The new man", or "The present conductor". Only in one or two cases (usually principal players) was the word "Leinsdorf" freely bandied about by the subject.

At first, I thought it was related to the fact that several of the interviews in the second set were conducted in Symphony Hall where a raised voice might be overheard by the wrong person. Then I noticed it in meetings outside of the Hall and finally in a telephone conversation with a man safely within the confines of his own walls. Certainly the inability to speak the name of the conductor in an atmosphere which might be threatening (the uncertainty of the interviewer-respondent relationship until a tacit agreement is made which finds a compromise between interviewer probing and respondent restraint) is some indication that fear, or anxiety, exists.

Perhaps it is only a coincidence, but it is worth mentioning that several members of the orchestra act in the capacity of conductor in amateur groups. Without meaning to slight the few that truly possess a talent
for this, I would like to comment that many are about as competent at orchestral conducting as they are at auto repairing; they can raise the hood and look official.

Could it be that in this position of authority they find compensation for their daily servility? In amateur choruses, the conductor is often extremely temperamental. The observation of the sophisticated orchestral player about these choral prima donnas is "He screams at them and they love it!" Perhaps the members of an amateur civic orchestra enjoy being screamed at by a member of the Boston Symphony Orchestra even if he possesses no compensating musical ability as a conductor.

Could it be that practically all members of the orchestra physically "conduct" their students in private lessons for the same reasons? Perhaps playing the role of conductor by degrading their colleague musicians is not enough of an identification. Maybe the actual athletic ritual of stick waving is required to give complete catharsis to frustrations.

Looking at the process of the succession in a summary fashion, I feel that it has been ultimately successful up to the date of this writing. Mr. Leinsdorf has moved into his new role in an authoritative, efficient way. I see a parallelism with the calm father soothing his hysterical child by firmly moving in and relaxing the youngster merely by his undisputable command of the situation.
The indecision has gone out of the lives of the Boston Symphony musicians in all but one area. By the laws of the orchestra, the conductor is allowed to start dismissal proceedings against a maximum of four musicians in each season. Several of the respondents felt that everything looked rosy, but added: "I'll be able to tell you a lot more after the notices come out." It is an interesting point of speculation. Even though Leinsdorf may have already mentally picked out a list of men he wants to replace, will he find it politically expedient to exercise his power in the first season? I am willing to venture the guess that he will not.

It is as important for him to impress the trustees as it is for the men to impress him. By waiting at least another year, he will establish himself more strongly in the position of "giving the player a second chance" and will be more able to defend his choices for dismissal. Those men who remember the fateful period at the beginning of Koussevitsky's reign when the conductor cleaned out 22 "undesirables" in two seasons will be over apt to draw a parallelism if Leinsdorf even touches the limited number of players allowed. As Koussevitsky acted in a highly irrational fashion on occasion, the super-rational Leinsdorf will not be anxious to be classified as "another Koussevitsky".
Unfortunately the results of his actions will not be evident to the public until the 1964-65 season because the dismissed musician is given an additional year to play with the orchestra while trying to re-locate. Even then, it is impossible for the "outsider" to know whether no dismissals means smooth sailing or successful reinstatement tactics by the dismissal committee.

Optimistically, it is not unrealistic to hope that Leinsdorf's arrival marks the beginning of an era of practical, managerial leadership.
APPENDIX A

THE DATA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT No. 1</th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT No. 2</th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT No. 3</td>
<td>Koussevitsky</td>
<td>Müinch</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (Before)</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (After)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT No. 4</th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Müinch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT No. 5</td>
<td>Koussevitsky</td>
<td>Münch</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (Before)</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (After)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT No. 6</th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT No. 7</td>
<td>Koussevitsky</td>
<td>Münch</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (Before)</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (After)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT No. 8</th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT No. 9</td>
<td>Koussevitsky</td>
<td>Minch</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (Before)</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (After)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT No. 10</th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Minch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT No. 11</td>
<td>Koussevitsky</td>
<td>Münch</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (Before)</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (After)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT No. 12</th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subject No. 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strictness</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairness</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subject No. 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strictness</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairness</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT No. 15</td>
<td>Koussevitsky</td>
<td>Münch</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (Before)</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (After)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT No. 16</th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUBJECT No. 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBJECT No. 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUBJECT No. 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch.</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strictness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBJECT No. 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch.</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strictness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>Koussevitsky</td>
<td>Münch</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (Before)</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (After)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT No. 23</td>
<td>Koussevitsky</td>
<td>Münch</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (Before)</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (After)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT No. 24</th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT No. 25</td>
<td>Koussevitsky</td>
<td>Münch</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (Before)</td>
<td>Leinsdorf (After)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT No. 26</th>
<th>Koussevitsky</th>
<th>Münch</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (Before)</th>
<th>Leinsdorf (After)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

THE BOSTON "POPS" ORCHESTRA

Although of only peripheral interest, the additional light shed on the general problem of conductor-orchestra relations warrants the inclusion of the unusual case of Arthur Fiedler and the Boston "Pops" Orchestra. When in full swing, the "Pops" presents seven concerts each week. As in the case of the Boston Symphony, the players in "Pops" have a contract which requires them to render nine "services" a week. A "service" is defined as a concert or a 2 1/2 hour rehearsal. It is clear to see that the "Pops" only rehearses twice a week. Normally, this would be sufficient since there is great similarity among the seven concerts in a week.

Arthur Fiedler joined the B.S.O. in 1915 as a violinist. While he was so engaged, he developed the reputation of being the worst "cut-up, "hell-raiser", and "gay bachelor" in the orchestra. It therefore follows quite smoothly that when he assumed the job of conducting the "Pops" in 1930, it was difficult for his colleague players to take his demands for a business-like atmosphere at rehearsals seriously. This precedent set the pattern of conduct in "Pops" rehearsals for the next 33 years.
It is impossible for an outsider to attend a rehearsal of the Boston "Pops" Orchestra. Lest the strength of this statement be underestimated, allow me to add that friendship with a highly respected member of the orchestra is sufficient pull to get into a rehearsal, but in his own words, "as soon as they see you, they'll throw you right out again!" The result of this privacy (perhaps the cause) is a mayhem which, in its own way, rivals the Roman orgies.

Uncouth backtalk to the conductor is commonplace. Reading of newspapers is the norm. Clowning and standing on chairs is routine. Through all this, Fiedler's voice shouting for order is ignored. What makes him take it? Two answers emerged from the interviews.

The first of these is largely unsubstantiated, but unique in that it arose unprompted from two individuals independently. They both thought Arthur Fiedler has an inferiority complex. One of these men went further to say that even when friendly relations seem to exist, Mr. Fiedler has been known to growl back "I know what you're thinking!" In defense of what seems like a paranoid personality, I must add (and everyone agrees) that once the stage of Symphony Hall is left, Mr. Fiedler never holds a grudge.

The second explanation for Arthur Fiedler not invoking a large and powerful disciplinary force at his disposal--
the jobs of the players—is a peculiar one (not entirely unrelated to the first). I will let one of the men tell about his fellow players.

"A few years ago.....they decided, apparently spontaneously, at a "Pops" rehearsal that they would not say a word. Well, this completely threw him. The silence—it completely threw him. He had an attack and he couldn't conduct for a few nights. .....He was bewildered. He didn't know what—the-hell happened."

It seems that the old Fiedler still rears up its head. If the rehearsal gets too quiet, "he wants to start something".

None of the men enjoy playing "Pops" and Fiedler's conduct at concerts does not help. It is not at all uncommon for him to gesture menacingly at an individual player while in the midst of a performance. This is degrading to the men and if it weren't for the fact that they don't take that seriously either, I would join with the player who wondered why they haven't brought him up to some disciplinary board (probably formed in honor of Koussevitsky and yet to be tested).

Finger-wagging is not the total extent of Mr. Fiedler's distasteful concert behavior. It seems that the evening "Pops" concerts must terminate by 10:45 p.m. If we remember the way unions protect their own, we know that 10:46 is not 10:45. Even one minute past the appointed hour can run the orchestra into costly overtime. Unfortunately, the reverse is not true. The men do not
pay back "undertime". It is this basic philosophy that has led Mr. Fiedler into the habit of keeping the orchestra until the exact hour of 10:45. He has various stratagems. As he is accurately aware of the length of each selection he programs (he has one man in the orchestra who keeps a complete timing log, by stopwatch, of every program), it is a simple matter to call for an extra encore to fill the projected "undertime". Another way to accomplish the same end is to stretch applause by remaining offstage longer between bows. This last trick can be made flexible enough to fill almost any gap. In the final ovation all one has to do is remain off until the clock says 10:45 and then, while the audience is still applauding, merely signal the men off the stage without ever taking that final bow. There's more to conducting than meets the eye!

It is an understatement to say the men resent this type of sport. Perhaps it is one of the contributing factors to rehearsal disorder. This same sort of clock watching goes on there too. Once when consulting with Harry Ellis Dickson, Mr. Fiedler expressed some concern over the discipline problem. Mr. Dickson suggested that an experiment worth trying would be to announce at the beginning of a rehearsal that although there was much to cover in that period, with a little conscientious work they could get done early. My impression of the suggestion
was that of an impassioned plea. "--try it once, Arthur. Please try it just once--just once." The older man whipped back: "Don't be silly, that's what they're getting paid for!!"

The startling climax of this feud occurred in 1954 when Arthur Fiedler celebrated his 25th year as "Pops" conductor. I am not in possession of all the facts, but the up-shot of it all was that the men refused to buy him a commemorative gift. Reports have it that this hurt the conductor deeply. In the years that followed he is said to have mellowed, but he still picks up the circular wooden timpani covers (when the opportunity presents itself) and plays them like a pair of cymbals.

Amidst this confusion of practical jokes and arbitrary discipline, certain positive attitudes emerge. First, it is clear that the men respect certain technical aspects of Mr. Fiedler's art. They agree that he has an extremely accurate ear. They agree that he has succeeded in the primary function of the "Pops"--that of offering to the audience a good time. However, certain psychological precedents have been set in 33 years and all parties concerned seem to be loath to break them.

Being intimately aware of the problem as outlined above, Mr. Dickson has made it a point to act in such a way when before the orchestra so as to never be guilty of Mr. Fiedler's misconduct. He attempts to rely on his relations with the men as colleagues to secure the
atmosphere necessary to get results from the orchestra. It is with a certain sadness that I must report that it does not work and suggest that the element of fear seems to be necessary for ultimate control.

Before leaving the subject of "Pops", it is interesting to bring up the case of guest conductors. Many of the "Pops" concerts are devoted to college nights ("M.I.T. Night at the 'Pops'"). During the course of the concert, certain musical activities of the sponsoring school may be presented on stage. Perhaps it will be an outstanding soloist who will be given the opportunity to play a concerto with the orchestra, or the college glee club will sing a short program while the "Pops" musicians enjoy an extended intermission. Sometimes an individual from the music department of the school will conduct the orchestra in one selection. This is where the trouble begins. As often as not, this conductor will have had little or no experience with a professional orchestra—sometimes no experience with orchestras at all. Conductors of choral music are often guilty in this regard.

If an orchestra so chooses, they can make a fool out of any conductor possessing any level of competence—amateur and professional alike. The men of the Boston Symphony seem proud of the fact that they have never exercised this privilege. Apparently some other large orchestras have. One man referred to the New York
Philharmonic as "a bunch of gangsters". To the best knowledge of most of the men interviewed, the "Pops" orchestra has not only never sabotaged a performance, but indeed made an effort to "help" the ailing guest. They claim that this tremendous flexibility is the bi-product of living with a conductor who, for 13 years, could never be predicted in tempo or gesture. When asked if sabotage was ever attempted on one of these would-be conductors, one man suggested that the orchestra would be stepping beneath its dignity to do so. "It would be like stepping on an ant!" However, another player did recount an incident which does slightly tarnish the halo of orderly conduct in concerts.

It seems that many years ago, at a "Harvard Night at the 'Pops'", the university produced a man who was going to conduct the orchestra. At the concert, the man appeared on stage in an inebriated condition. "He could hardly find the podium." Apparently the orchestra took offense at this display and the brass musicians, who were to play the opening fanfare, decided that when the moisturized conductor raised his arms, they would raise their instruments to their lips (as usual), but when he gave the first down-beat, they would not play. They further plotted that when he turned to the audience (as they knew he would after several frantic attempts to start the orchestra) then they would enter—unprompted—with the fanfare. The plan was carried off to perfection and the shock the conductor received went a long way towards alleviating his condition.