

3-25-1960

Portland Symphony Orchestra

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub

 Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.), "Portland Symphony Orchestra" (1960). *City Club of Portland*. Paper 191.
http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/191

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in City Club of Portland by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

REPORT ON THE PORTLAND SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
THE CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND

ASSIGNMENT

Your Committee⁽¹⁾ was originally asked to study the status of the symphony orchestras in Portland, Oregon, but the problems and complexities of the Portland Symphony Orchestra were so fundamental that, with your consent, this report is directed to an analysis of that orchestra alone.⁽²⁾ The Portland Junior Symphony Orchestra has recently celebrated its 35th anniversary⁽³⁾ and is distinguished as one of the pioneers in its field, and the Portland Chamber Orchestra has achieved recognition both here and abroad. These other orchestras, too, have their serious problems. Their continued existence is made possible by the devotion of their players, the dedicated personnel of their boards, their distinguished conductors, the work and sweat of countless volunteers, and—however much it has to be prodded—the gratitude of the community. The Portland Symphony is the major orchestra in this area, and its glories and woes are intensified by its size.⁽⁴⁾

THE STATUS OF THE ORCHESTRA

It is aptly stated in *Study of Legal Documents of Symphony Orchestras*⁽⁵⁾ that:

“At first, a symphony orchestra, like any other group of persons engaged in a common activity, is merely an aggregation of separate people, but, in time, under the influence of a competent conductor, and with the benefit of repeated rehearsals and performances, it acquires a quality, a personality and identity of its own, which is real to its members and is felt by the listening public.”

History

If one were asked “What are Portland’s greatest cultural assets?”, the answer would probably be: its Public Library, Art Museum, and Symphony Orchestra (aside from its colleges). As Theodore Bloomfield, past conductor of the Portland Symphony has said⁽⁶⁾:

1. The Committee consists of Ben L. Bernhard, proprietor, Helen Bernhard Bakery; Jerome S. Bischoff, attorney; Dean Janney, CPA, and Philip A. Joss, attorney, Chairman. Former Committee members who assisted in the earlier stages of the research were: Eugene Caldwell, then Executive Vice President, Hyster Company, former President, City Club of Portland and formerly a Director, Portland Symphony Society; Dr. Anthony A. Pearson, Professor of Anatomy, University of Oregon Medical School; Edward F. Ritz, United States National Bank; Ed H. Snyder, public relations, and J. Warrington Stokes, then Administrator, Multnomah County Public Welfare Commission.

2. Witnesses interviewed by your Committee included the following: Portland Symphony Society: *James F. Miller, Mrs. Ralph D. Moores and Lawrence C. Shaw*, former presidents; *Frederic Rothchild and Aubrey R. Watzek*, former Board members; *Dr. James S. Hart and Phil Hart*, former managers; *Henry M. Norton*, present manager; *Theodore Bloomfield*, former conductor; *Abe Bercovitz*, principal, second violin section, Portland Symphony Orchestra, and *Mrs. Archie R. Tunturi*, former Associate Board member. Portland Junior Symphony Orchestra Association: *L. R. Hussa and Moe M. Tonkon*, former presidents; *Dr. Rex F. Arragon*, Board member; *Mrs. Barbara Walker*, former executive secretary; *Herman Kenin*, then president, Local 99 and currently National President, American Federation of Musicians, and the following Portland Public Schools administrators: *Clifford Williams*, director, Gifted Child program; *Dr. Robert Wilson*, Director of Research, and *Vern Wilson*, Superintendent of Music. Also one or more members of the Committee interviewed the following: *Bernard B. Drum*, accountant, Portland Symphony Society; *Alfred Frankenstein*, music critic, San Francisco, California; *John Kornfeld*, former manager Portland Symphony Society; *George A. Kuyper*, Manager, Chicago Symphony Orchestra; *Jack F. Dailey*, Manager, New Orleans Symphony Orchestra; *Frank R. McKeever*, former Executive Director, United Fund; *Howard Skinner*, Manager, San Francisco Symphony and Opera Societies; and *Mrs. A. Castigliano*, former Secretary, Florida West Coast Symphony Association.

3. The Junior Symphony was founded in 1924 and its first concert was on February 14, 1925. For information on the Junior Symphony, see *Music Is Where You Make It* by Jacob Avshalomov, the Conductor of the Orchestra.

4. A prior City Club report on the Portland Symphony was published April 29, 1938.

5. Published by the American Symphony Orchestra League, Inc., p. 23.

6. Talk before the City Club of Portland, May 25, 1956.

"Two of these are housed in buildings to be enjoyed throughout the year; the third, however, is composed of living human beings gathered unto one building only at certain times during the year, to perform for the enjoyment of those assembled. And while one can return to see a painting admired last week, or to re-read a book enjoyed last year, those who make up the audience of the Portland Symphony Orchestra are having an experience which can never be duplicated . . . The requirements of our task must be met at the moment . . . even though it takes us . . . a year of operation to prepare for that moment."

Compared with the Art Museum, the Library, and other established cultural institutions in the community, the Portland Symphony Society started its existence relatively late. It has struggled to exist ever since.

An orchestral concert was given in Portland as early as 1868. A "grand orchestral and vocal concert" took place in 1875 at the skating rink as a benefit for victims of the great Chicago fire.⁽⁷⁾ In 1875 there was organized probably the first orchestral society in the city, and a number of other attempts were made to maintain an orchestra here.

It was not until 1911, however, that the Portland Symphony was formed. Under one form of organization or another it has continued to present concerts every year since then except for one period during the depression and World War II. Originally it was organized by the players on a cooperative basis, its conductors being chosen by ballot from the orchestra personnel. Carl Denton, who had served as one of its co-conductors since 1911, became the Orchestra's first permanent conductor in 1918 and continued in that post until 1925. In 1922 the Orchestra was formally organized as "The Symphony Society of Portland," a non-profit association. It was incorporated in 1926. The Symphony continued to grow in public esteem, and under Willem van Hoogstraten, its conductor from 1925 to 1938, the Orchestra attained national recognition.⁽⁸⁾

The depression, the threat of war, and the consequent effect on the sponsors who had carried the Orchestra's deficits, resulted in the Symphony's suspending its activities in 1938. For the first time in 27 years the community was without its Symphony Orchestra. From 1936 to 1942 summer concerts were given in Multnomah Stadium by the Stadium Philharmonic composed of Symphony players. There were attempts made to reactivate the Symphony and for a time there was an orchestra composed of volunteer players. In 1940 and 1941 symphony concerts were given with financial assistance from the Federal WPA agency.⁽⁹⁾ Finally in 1947, with impetus from the local chapter of the American Federation of Musicians, the Portland Symphony was reorganized. The Symphony's battle to survive has continued ever since.⁽¹⁰⁾

Since its rebirth the Orchestra's conductors have been:

	Season
Werner Janssen	1947-1949
James Sample	1949-1953
Guest conductors	1953-1955
Theodore Bloomfield	1955-1959
Piero Bellugi	1959-

7. The concert was interrupted when "Some scamp on the outside threw a stone on the roof, and as it rolled down, the audience supposed the roof was falling . . ." Many rushed for the doors, and all windows were shattered by patrons jumping through them. These customers "landed on their heads outside." Order was finally restored, and the concert continued.

8. Mrs. M. Donald Spencer was manager of the Symphony for twenty years—from 1918 to 1938.

9. These concerts were given by the Portland Philharmonic Orchestra in co-operation with the Oregon Music Project of the Works Projects Administration. See *collection of programs of Portland Philharmonic Orchestra in Multnomah County Library*. The Federal Music Project was formed nationally ". . . to employ and rehabilitate unemployed musicians and to enable them to retain their skill until their return to private employment. The majority of musicians employed by the project had been on relief rolls". *America's Symphony Orchestras* by Margaret Grant and Herman S. Hettinger, p. 205.

10. History sources primarily: *Portland: Musical Capital of the Northwest* by Susie Aubrey Smith, an article in *University of Portland Bookman*, July 1955, v. 7, No. 1; *scrapbook of press notices and campaign materials on Portland Symphony Orchestra*, in Multnomah County Library, 1919-1924, pp. 20, 21, and 96; and *City Club Report* of April 29, 1938, supra.

Concerts

The Symphony's concert activity has been centered in a subscription series of Monday night concerts. This consisted of ten concerts each season during the ten year period prior to 1957-58 and twelve concerts per season since. These concerts are given at the Portland Civic Auditorium over a period generally running from October to April. Traditionally, one of the regular concerts each season features the Portland Symphonic Choir—a separate organization.

During the first two years after the Orchestra's revival, an effort was made to build a second series on more popular programs. At first the concerts in the second series were given Sundays in the late afternoons, then earlier Sunday afternoons, and finally Friday evenings, but the effort was not successful. Another attempt was made during the 1952-53 season to build a second subscription series of Friday evening concerts, in addition to the Monday evening performances. The average attendance for Friday evenings was 1,591, compared with 2,032 on Monday evenings. There has been no further effort to maintain a second series of different concerts.

Tickets are sold for the concerts of the entire series at a discount up to one-third over the aggregate single concert prices. These subscriptions constitute the bread and butter of the Orchestra's earned income. Tickets for single concerts may be purchased.

In addition to its regular concerts, the Orchestra gives additional performances—usually involving the replaying of all or part of a regular Monday evening program. These are the concerts that the Symphony gives yearly to elementary and high school students of Portland, and to out-of-town audiences, and the six Tuesday night repeat concerts that the Orchestra is playing this season at the Oriental Theater in Portland. The school concerts⁽¹¹⁾ are made possible through an annual subsidy from the Music Performance Trust Fund.⁽¹²⁾ The Junior League has also underwritten children's concerts. The school concerts are played in various local high schools or at the Public Auditorium during school hours and are free to students. Generally from four to eight of these school concerts are given each year.⁽¹³⁾ Over the past ten years an average of five concerts each season has been given out of Portland in such communities as Eugene,⁽¹⁴⁾ Salem and Longview, with admission charged.

For seven years the Standard Oil Company of California sponsored and broadcast generally three concerts per year, but discontinued this service several years ago. From time to time Trailways and other firms have made possible radio broadcasting of a half-hour of the Monday evening performances, and in 1958-59 the Orchestra gave special television performances, the time and facilities being contributed by the station.

During the past several years, Pops concerts have been given.

Since 1947 the concerts have ranged from 18 to 38 per season. During 1958-59 there were 21 concerts (excluding school concerts), and it is estimated that the aggregate attendance was 48,000.

FINANCES

As symphony music has a central theme, so does the Portland Symphony. The music has endless variations, none of them dull. The Orchestra has a constant gnawing overtone. It is unendingly broke.

11. In the early days, school children were guests of the Orchestra attending the final rehearsals before its concerts. It was reported in 1922 that: "During the past five years, the orchestra has played to more than 52,000 school children in its complimentary educational rehearsals, Portland holding the record for children's attendance at symphony rehearsals throughout the country." *Scrap book on Portland Symphony Orchestra*, Multnomah County Library, supra, p. 137.

12. The Music Performance Trust Fund is administered by Judge Samuel R. Rosenbaum in New York City and is obtained from residuals derived primarily from phonograph records and motion picture scores. The Fund directly pays the Symphony musicians for playing at the school concerts and the one rehearsal in preparation for them. These payments are not included in the Symphony budget. The decision to provide for the school concerts is made annually by the trustee upon the recommendation of the local chapter of the American Federation of Musicians. The Fund has also helped the Portland Junior Symphony put on free concerts.

13. School concerts are really double concerts, for as soon as the first concert is finished, a new audience comes in and the Orchestra repeats the program. Each school concert is about an hour long. This season the Orchestra is to play six school concerts (three double concerts). Generally all of the school concerts are played in a period of several weeks.

14. On May 7, 1921, the Symphony gave a concert in Eugene: *Multnomah County Library Scrap Book*, supra, p. 95.

In this respect, the Orchestra is representative of symphony orchestras generally. Throughout the country the financial performance of symphony orchestras has a uniform pattern. Be the orchestra large or small, in metropolitan communities or rural, none of the 27 major⁽¹⁵⁾ professional symphony orchestras in the United States and Canada finance their operations through their own earnings. For example, during the 1958-59 season the expenditures of these 27 orchestras varied from \$40,000 to \$400,000 above earned income.

Orchestra managements believe that attempts to set a ticket price structure designed to pay more than approximately half of performance costs result in audience reduction and a lower gross return.

The earned income of the Portland Orchestra over the last ten years has averaged approximately \$75,000 per annum, or somewhat less than 50 per cent of its operating expense. Earned operating income has consisted of concert revenue, 82%; advertising income, 9%; and miscellaneous income, 9%.

The unearned income of the orchestra over the last ten years has averaged approximately \$78,000 per year. Of this figure, in excess of \$71,500 per year has been received as contributions, and something under \$2,000 per year as endowment income.

Applying an artistic concept to accounting, the Orchestra has ended a season with a surplus as high as \$26,000 and another season with a deficit equally large. Where there has been a "surplus," the funds have been somehow provided, but not earned.

The musicians' payroll alone exceeds concert ticket income. This is true with the Portland Symphony as with the other principal orchestras in the country. In the past several years the payroll of the Portland Symphony musicians has exceeded ticket income by approximately \$10,000 each season. This excludes the salary of the conductor, fees of guest soloists, promotion and production expenses, etc.

No special credit for its financial performance can be claimed by the Portland orchestra. Its confreres throughout the country suffer a like fate. For example, for the 1954-55 season, the average earned income of the comparable orchestras of Minneapolis, Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Buffalo, San Antonio, and Dallas came to 54% of their operating expenses.

For the statistically minded, there is included in the appendix to this report, two financial charts. Chart A details the financial operating history of the Portland Symphony over a period of ten years through a variety of operating conditions. Chart B details the 1954-55 operating experience of the comparable orchestras just described. A prolonged analysis of these charts will confirm what was known in the first instance—that culture is not commercial.

In any given community, a symphony orchestra composed of professional musicians can earn approximately half of its annual budget from concert revenue. It does not seem to make a great deal of difference in this regard whether the orchestra is large or small or whether the number of concerts is great or relatively few. A lengthy series of concerts in any given community requires an equally lengthy series of rehearsals, and costs generally rise in proportion.

On the other hand, the market for a symphony performance is limited by the size of the concert hall and the purse of the concert goers. The Portland Symphony plays in the Portland Civic Auditorium which has a seating capacity of 3,385 (without the wings). It has been a rare occasion in the last decade when the orchestra has played to a sellout house there. The average attendance at the Monday evening concerts during the past ten years has approximated two-thirds of the seating capacity of the Auditorium. Attendance figures are set forth on Chart C in the appendix to this report.

If average attendance were raised some 10 to 15 percentage points, which seems the optimum, it would increase the season's revenue somewhere between \$7,500 or \$10,000 per year. This added income still would not enable the Orchestra to meet its financial requirements.

15. Technically, in 1958, the Portland Symphony ceased to be considered a "major symphony" and became a "metropolitan orchestra." This is because it was determined at the New Orleans Managers' Conference that to be classified as a major symphony an orchestra must have an annual budget of \$250,000 or more and its players must have a guaranteed weekly minimum wage scale. Neither requirement is met by the Portland Symphony. The chief effect of this drop in prestige on the part of the Symphony has been to make it more difficult to obtain guest artists of the caliber that the Symphony previously had.

Tickets

Unlike the Junior Symphony, where a membership carries with it two tickets for each regular concert of the season, membership in the Symphony Society or contributions made do not entitle one to tickets to the concerts. Purchasers of tickets for the regular series do not as such become members of the Society for that season.

Current prices for a single seat for the regular series of 12 concerts run from \$40 for a main floor seat (\$3.80 for a single concert) to \$13 for a second balcony seat on the side (\$1.30 for a single concert).

Students at local high schools and colleges may obtain half-price rates for tickets (anywhere in the house). This practice commends itself as sound in building a foundation of appreciation for the Symphony among young people who in the future should be its friends and contributors. By enabling students to attend concerts that otherwise might be beyond their means, the Symphony is helping attain its object set forth in its By-laws:

"The object of the Society is to provide educational and cultural opportunities for its members, and for all people of the City of Portland and throughout the State of Oregon and neighboring areas, by making available to them under favorable conditions competent performances of the world's great music by the Portland Symphony Orchestra, with or without assisting soloists and choruses, under the sponsorship and management, and with the active encouragement and financial support of said Society, and generally to promote public interest in and familiarity with such music."

Ticket prices have increased only slightly in the last ten years.⁽¹⁶⁾ The committee has not seen any study of the effect of an increase in prices on the size of a symphony audience, but aside from general economic principles there are other factors. A great proportion of the subscribers for season tickets are contributors to the Society, and it has been feared that a boost in ticket prices would be counterbalanced by a reduction in contributions. Also the success of fund-raising drives is directly related to the success of the Orchestra and the size of its audiences. Where unsold seating capacity remains, there is a natural reluctance to increase prices. If young people and persons of modest income are priced out of attendance, many persons would refuse on principle to contribute to the Orchestra, and the Society would be serving only a limited economic segment of the community. On this general subject it has been written:

"It is the general opinion of managers that, once a price schedule is established, it is inadvisable to change it without compelling reasons. Increases are particularly inadvisable unless a very good case can be made for them by virtue of a greater number of concerts or undeniable improvements in the quality and attractiveness of concerts. . . Habit is a very important factor in the sale of subscriptions, and subscribers are likely to resent changes in the price of 'their' seats."⁽¹⁷⁾

Memberships and Contributions

Everyone contributing \$10 or more to the Society is a full, voting member for that fiscal year. Accordingly, memberships and contributions are synonymous for the purposes of the Society.

The financial success of the Symphony depends upon contributions to meet the gap between earned income and expenses. There is no financial angel to pick up the tab. Ten thousand dollars is the largest lifetime contribution made to the Portland Symphony in any single year, there having been two such gifts. For the 1958-59 season there were nineteen gifts of \$1,000 or over, twelve donations from \$500 to \$1,000, 229 gifts from \$100 to \$500, and 1212 contributions from \$10 to \$100. For the past ten years contributions have varied from approximately \$40,000 for the 1953-54 season to \$109,000 for 1954-55.

Organized fund-raising campaigns have been the Symphony's salvation. Relatively speaking they do not, however, produce the large gifts that are received by some of the other orchestras in the country. Portland does not have as high a ratio of substantial industrial firms or families of great wealth as the larger metropolitan communities. Although its financial woes are accordingly intensified, there is a compensation in that the Symphony is not operated by and for a few financial backers. It thus escapes what a conductor of another major symphony called a situation of "quasi-harlotry."

16. For 1950-51 single ticket prices were from \$3.30 to \$.90.

17. *America's Symphony Orchestras* by Grant and Hettinger (1940), supra, pp. 151-153.

Most large orchestras throughout the country have had to broaden the bases of their support. Not only have heavy income taxes made it difficult to obtain large contributions, but as stated in *The Reporter Magazine*:⁽¹⁸⁾

"... orchestral costs began to rise ominously. The New York Philharmonic Symphony, which six years ago budgeted \$750,000 now spends twice that amount. The Chicago Symphony in the same period saw its costs go up from \$657,000, to \$831,000. Income from endowments, like widow's pensions, won't stretch to keep up with runaway prices.

"Yet the symphony box office has been thriving during this period. Thomas D. Perry, Jr., manager of the Boston Symphony, explains the dilemma: 'To mount a Boston Symphony concert costs \$8,500. Selling one out ordinarily brings in \$7,100. We give 220 concerts a year; figure it out. What confuses people is that we're a "hit show" and thus they think we should make money. But we can't raise prices and still serve our whole public. Harvard has a full enrollment, and no one criticizes Harvard for not showing a profit.'

"To help replace the disappearing breed of big patrons, managers have turned to women's committees to bring in some money from smaller contributions. In the big cities they stage fashion shows. In the smaller ones, they employ whatever gimmicks are handy.⁽¹⁹⁾ The Beaumont, Texas, committee raises \$2,000 by charging women for the privilege of inspecting other women's kitchens. In Sioux City, an ice-skating spectacle brings in \$5,000. In Buffalo the women sell chocolates, and in Abilene they swallow their pride and sell tickets for the profitable baseball team to subsidize tickets for the unprofitable orchestra.

"But since the deficit for a major orchestra can run up to several hundred thousand dollars a year, women's committees do not provide the final answer."

When the Committee started its research it was told: "It is good that the City Club is making an autopsy of the Symphony before it is dead." Nonetheless the Portland Symphony still exists. Despite its crises through the years, our Orchestra has the status of an institution in the community. Its trials and tribulations have perplexed and troubled its friends, and the Symphony has died only to be resurrected so as to meet the craving that has existed for a long time in this community for a major symphony orchestra. It has proved that it is not just a coterie, gathered around the personality and ability of one leader. One may criticize the Symphony, its boards, conductors, managers, or players, but it has proved itself to be a tough institution that is deeply rooted in the community for the major contribution that it makes, and with many friends who may or may not attend its concerts regularly. Its direct and indirect influence upon the community is beyond comparison with the numbers who attend its concerts. Its audience inspires others to greater realization of the potential for music that is a part of every person. Its players either in the schools or by private instruction are the leading teachers in the community of instrumental music.

THE CONDUCTOR

The Symphony exists to provide good musical programs, and the conductor is probably the principal factor in a symphony's success. To understand the importance of the conductor, one must bear in mind the great technicality of a symphonic score which is played by from sixty to one hundred musicians, employing some fifteen to twenty-one different instruments. The musicians must receive the direction, interpretation, discipline and inspiration of the conductor to achieve the composer's intentions.

18. Article by Bernard Asbell in February 7, 1957 issue.

19. The Symphony benefit on September 21, 1959 marking the opening of the Sheraton Portland Hotel netted \$8,000 for the Symphony, thanks to the combined efforts of the Hotel and the Women's Committee of the Symphony.

Mr. Bellugi has succinctly set forth the responsibilities of a conductor⁽²⁰⁾:

"In my view, the conductor has a wide and continuing responsibility. He is responsible not only for what the orchestra plays but how well it plays. His responsibility extends even to how a certain note played by the third French horn sounds. It extends to a definite degree to the kind of musical taste the city develops through its orchestra."

The conductor is the musical director of a symphony, and a symphony fails or succeeds because of the music that it produces. The temperament of the conductor and his social or fund-raising activities are of relatively minor importance. As was said of a conductor in another city: "He is a pain in the neck to the Board; the players hate his guts; he drives the manager crazy; but his audience loves him." The conductor is first and foremost an interpretive artist. His success is based upon his performance on the podium and not on his popularity in the drawing room or at Board meetings.

It was Portland's good fortune during the last four seasons to have had Theodore Bloomfield as the conductor of the Symphony. His ability was outstanding. He brought much-needed discipline to the Orchestra and raised its musicianship to the highest quality that it had enjoyed in the past decade and perhaps in its entire history.

Mr. Bloomfield left the Society at the end of the 1959 season to become conductor of the Rochester (N. Y.) Philharmonic Orchestra. The Board, acting upon the recommendation of its Selection Committee, chose Piero Bellugi as the succeeding conductor. This Selection Committee, appointed by the Board and composed of both Board and non-Board members, carefully screened about seventy candidates. One committee member went to other cities to hear the leading candidates conduct their own orchestras. Before his final selection, Mr. Bellugi came to Portland and led the Orchestra in a special concert which—rather incongruously—belatedly raised funds in a do-or-die appeal for the Orchestra of which he was being asked to be the conductor. Portland has been enthusiastic about Piero Bellugi. About 3,500 persons attended his first concert this season—"the largest opening night audience in the history of the Portland Symphony."⁽²¹⁾

A conductor has a great stake in the decisions of his Symphony's Board of Directors. Musically he is most important to the Society. His public stature could be crucial to the success of a fund drive. The conductor's concern with symphony management in all its aspects is understandable because the business of the Board vitally affects him and his players.

The attitude of the Board of Directors toward the prerogatives of a conductor does not always result in a most cooperative and amicable relationship. The Portland Society has had its share of difficulties. The extreme case took place in 1952 when the manager resigned because of differences with the conductor. However, the current working relationship between the manager, board and conductor is a happy one.

Guest Conductors

For two seasons commencing in 1953 the Orchestra used guest conductors rather than a permanent conductor. This involved a fortuitous combination of providing interesting musical programs and a means of selecting a permanent conductor. Famous conductors like Mitropoulos, Stravinsky and Klemperer led the orchestra, as well as conductors who were candidates for the permanent appointment. There was an increase in interest compared with the doldrums in which the Symphony had recently found itself. However, when well known conductors were not on the podium, attendance sagged. The Orchestra suffered from lack of continuity of direction. Discipline declined. This experience proved that added interest might be obtained by a change of conductors for an occasional concert, and successfully resulted in the selection of the new conductor—Mr. Bloomfield. It is apparent, however, that the use of only guest conductors for more than one season is damaging to an orchestra.

THE PLAYERS

Although under Mr. Bloomfield the number of players in the Symphony increased from 68 to 79, our Orchestra is relatively small in size. New York has approximately 110 players, Philadelphia, Boston, Los Angeles and Cleveland, about 100. These players are all professionals, as distinguished from the musicians of the Junior Symphony, the Portland Chamber Orchestra, and other musical organizations whose players do not receive monetary compensation.

20. Quotation from article by Hilmar Grondahl in *Oregonian*, March 16, 1959.

21. Quotation from *Oregon Journal*, October 27, 1959.

The Portland Symphony, however, provides its professional players only a hobby income. Last season the player receiving base pay was paid approximately \$924 by the Society for his services. These included the twelve regular concerts, three concerts in Salem, one repeat concert at the Oriental Theater, two special concerts, three Pops concerts, and 56 rehearsals. In addition, the Musicians' Trust Fund paid for the services rendered at six school concerts and one rehearsal.

The general pay picture throughout the country has been explained as follows:

"Usually, unless there is a fixed minimum number of concert weeks scheduled, the paid performers are paid on a per concert, and per rehearsal basis. Where, however, musicians are required for a regular number of services (whether rehearsals or concerts) for a fixed number of weeks, they are usually paid on a weekly basis under contract for the season or for the specified weeks of employment. These terms are usually embodied in a trade agreement bargained out for the paid musicians by the Local Union of the American Federation of Musicians. While the payroll for musicians is almost invariably the largest single item of expense in the operating budget of a symphony orchestra, there is no instance in which a symphony orchestra pays any musician except its conductor a year-round wage; the average so-called full-time employment in a symphony orchestra does not exceed 20 weeks."⁽²²⁾

Basic pay for the Portland Symphony player is now \$12 per service for rehearsal and \$14 for public concert.⁽²³⁾ The first-chair players receive a minimum of one and one-half basic pay rates. The base pay per service has increased from \$8.57 in 1947-48 but the average seasonal pay has decreased since then from \$1900 to \$1200. Up to 1952 a rehearsal was of three hours' duration, but since then, 2½ hours. Under Mr. Bellugi the orchestra rehearses four times for each Monday evening concert. Rehearsals constitute the biggest expense of an orchestra. With wages per service up and time per service reduced, the trend is favorable from the player's standpoint, except that the total pay per season is less. The total seasonal take-home pay of the Portland Symphony player is low, and this makes it difficult to attract and keep musicians of quality.

Approximately 50% of the players teach music in the schools, and at least 25% of the orchestra personnel (excluding housewives) obtain their livelihood from jobs unrelated to music. One horn player works at Safeway Stores, another is a policeman, the pianist is a chemist, and a good number of the players are stenographers or housewives.

The Symphony's program of concerts and rehearsals is necessarily circumscribed by the economic necessities of the players. Rehearsals generally are in the evening from 6 to 8:30 because so many of the players teach in the schools; others have jobs until 5 p.m. or after; and after 8:30 in the evening there are jobs playing for dances. Before each regular Monday evening concert, a final rehearsal is held on Sunday morning at the Public Auditorium. Saturday is impractical for rehearsals or concerts: so many players teach music during the daytime, and Saturday nights find Symphony musicians making more money playing for dance jobs. Summer provides the opportunity for players to supplement their income by playing at vacation resorts and special events.

The orchestral parts for a concert are usually distributed ten days in advance of the first rehearsal. Ability to read orchestral passages at sight is a requirement for playing with the orchestra. A very few of the players are so proficient that "homework" is unnecessary. Most find it necessary or desirable to familiarize themselves with the score by study on their own at home.

The Portland Junior Symphony, whose players consist entirely of young people under twenty-one years of age, has contributed many musicians to the senior symphony orchestra, and in turn, the latter has furnished an incentive for the more talented of the younger group to continue their musical education and association. Generally there are a few high school or college students who play in both orchestras.

22. *Study of Legal Documents of Symphony Orchestras*, page 20. This study was made by a committee appointed by the American Symphony Orchestra League, Inc.

23. By contract with the local chapter of the American Federation of Musicians, 68 services are guaranteed by the Society this season. It is expected that these will consist of 18 concerts and 50 rehearsals. It is hoped by the Society that more concerts will be given, including out-of-town performances, but the Society has learned the danger of guaranteeing more services. The guarantee for the 1958-59 season was for 76 services, and the Society had to give extra concerts, on which it lost money, to meet the guarantee. School concerts are not included in the services covered by the contract, for they are paid for by the Music Performance Trust Fund, *supra*.

Most of the conductors of the Symphony have felt that where the community cannot provide the quality of musicianship required for key positions in the Orchestra, the players should be recruited wherever they can be found. Salary-wise, however, the Symphony has little to offer. To obtain the services of a musician from another city, it is sometimes necessary for the Symphony to find outside employment for him here before he can afford to come.

Musicians' Union

Local #99 of the American Federation of Musicians played a major part in the revival of the Symphony in 1947. Not only did it contribute greatly to the impetus behind the organization of the revived orchestral association, but also it instigated the donation from the Music Performance Trust Fund of \$10,000, in 1947. The following year, the Trust Fund contributed \$5,000 for free concerts for school children, and since has continued to subsidize school concerts with gifts of around \$3,000 per year.

In 1949-50, after payment of the salaries of six imported musicians, the remainder of the net income was divided among the players equally, except for the first-chair musicians who received one and a half shares. This cooperative experiment was not continued because of low pay (\$660 being the average pay that season, compared with \$1690 for the preceding year and \$1170 for the succeeding season), and because of a lack of control over the players.

The Symphony representation is an important part of the local Union because the Orchestra has the largest total musical payroll of any local organization and attracts the best local talent. All members of the Orchestra are required by the Federation to belong to the union, and the Portland chapter can keep a union member from another local from working in its jurisdiction. The power of the Federation is such that even the conductors are members, if not of the local chapter, at least of a chapter of the Federation elsewhere. It is a prerequisite that a Symphony conductor hold a union card. In one instance a local conductor was forced to come to a local union meeting in order to maintain his union standing.

Areas of serious conflict have arisen between the Union, the manager, the conductor and the Board. Immediately after the revival of the Orchestra in 1947, troubles arose when the conductor, Werner Janssen, imported 27 players. As a result of the reaction that this produced in the Union, the Society has since been required to show to the Union that there are no qualified local players available before a musician can be brought from outside to join the orchestra.⁽²⁴⁾ The Union appears to be democratic in the sense that the control rests in its membership. For example, the Union removed from its officers the right to approve the importation of players, and approval of the general membership of the Union is required for this.

Significant areas of conflict were pointed out to the Committee in the clash between the position of the Union that the Orchestra should be a community orchestra, supporting local talent, and the point of view that the community wants first and foremost, excellence in musical performance. The Union emphasizes that the players should be protected against the whims of a capricious conductor, but there was testimony that there have been serious problems of discipline. It appears that the Union played a major role in the selection of two of the early conductors for the revived orchestra and that this led to slackness in discipline. Morale sank to its lowest ebb under the period of guest conductors. Under Bloomfield, the discipline vastly improved, although not without some loss of popularity on his part with the players.

As one witness testified, areas of great conflict with the Union arise when the conductor wishes to get rid of a "botcher" or wishes to bring in a first "bazooka" from outside to improve that section, and there already is a local first "bazooka" player. A removed player can make a strong emotional appeal to the whole membership of the union. Once when this occurred the Board and the Union could not come to agreement, with the result that that section of the orchestra was short one player for the season. The Union, however, does co-operate with the Symphony in actively searching for good local talent for recruitment.

The Committee has been advised that there are few major orchestras in the country where the Union's power over the symphony can be compared in strength to the Union's

24. The Union also has a restriction that an "import" can not play casual musical engagements in this area for three years.

position in Portland. It is asserted that the Portland players' per-service pay is among the highest of the comparable symphonies in the country, whereas the average seasonal take-home pay is among the lowest.

The personnel manager is of great assistance to the Society and its manager in their relationship with the players. He is a player appointed by the manager, receiving extra pay from the Society. He is present at all rehearsals.

This season for the first time there is a steward appointed from among the players by the Union. So far the steward system has worked well. The steward and the Union appear to recognize the dual responsibility of upholding the rights of the players and also insisting on their fulfilling their responsibilities.

REPEAT CONCERTS

For years the Society has appreciated the advantages of giving repeat concerts. By following a Monday evening concert soon afterwards with another performance, repeating the same program, the Society can provide a second concert without additional rehearsal expense.

In about half of the cases, soloists make no extra charge for their performance at an immediately following repeat concert, and where they do charge, it is but a small fraction of their fee for the first concert. Hence, repeat concerts enable the Orchestra to give two performances for approximately the cost of one, as far as the expense of the guest artist is concerned.

Repeat concerts are economically and artistically most sound. They enable the Orchestra to reach a larger audience—to add to the players' seasonal pay, which is an important factor in attracting and keeping musicians of quality—and at a minimum of added cost.

For a number of years these concerts repeating a Monday evening program have been played out of the city or have been school concerts. This season, however, the Orchestra is playing six Tuesday night concerts at the Oriental Theater in Portland, repeating the program of the evening before. Prices are the same as for Monday evenings. It is gratifying that so far⁽²⁵⁾ this season these repeat concerts in Portland have been successful from an attendance and financial standpoint.

Out-of-Town Concerts

A good way to broaden interest in a symphony and increase the take-home pay of the musicians is to give special repeat concerts in other cities. The Symphony Board has tried to carry the Orchestra's performances to other communities in Oregon and nearby Washington. The Society's responsibility in this regard is recognized in its By-Laws where one of its stated objects is to serve "all people of the City of Portland and throughout the state of Oregon and neighboring areas." The Board has realized the advantages of the Orchestra being not just a Portland orchestra but one in which all of Oregon might have pride. Increased prestige and a larger area from which to draw support are important by-products.

The out-of-town city can play an affirmative part in bringing the Symphony there. Salem is an example. It has an active Salem Symphony Society that raises the funds necessary to pay the Portland Symphony its costs for playing a repeat concert there.

The trouble with out-of-town concerts is that the income is diminished by costs of travel; the attendance may be limited by the size of the concert hall (usually a high-school gymnasium or auditorium); and hardship results from taking the players away from their outside jobs (which pay better than the \$14 that would normally be paid a player for participating in an extra concert). Under the present contract with the Union, it costs \$6.00 more per player for each concert given at a distance of more than twenty miles from Portland. This is in addition to transportation, which is provided by the Society. The farther from Portland the Orchestra travels, the greater the travel costs and hardship for the musicians. Some years ago the Orchestra went to Bend and "lost its shirt." Concert artists perform in various cities in Oregon, and these communities are apt to ask, "Why should we underwrite a Portland Symphony concert costing \$2500

25. Two concerts have been given at the time that this is being written.

when we can get Rudolph Serkin for the same amount?" Several years ago Tektronix Foundation offered some financial assistance to help the Society bring the Orchestra to outside cities but the Symphony was unable to accomplish much in this regard.

As part of the Oregon Centennial celebration the Symphony last summer gave six concerts on a tour to Roseburg, Medford, Klamath Falls, Ontario, Pendleton, and The Dalles. All concerts had the same program, and constituted the first performances of the Orchestra under Piero Bellugi as its regular conductor. The tour was financed by the Centennial Commission which provided \$19,000. Tickets were priced at \$1.00, and the total attendance was about 2,500, so that approximately \$2,500 was returned to the Commission. The concerts were well received, and considering that the population of these cities totals about 88,000, the total attendance figure is not as low as it seems. In Ontario, 290 people attended the concert, but the population of that city is only about 4,800. Some of the more expensive "popular" productions put on by the Commission in Portland attracted even smaller audiences than did the Symphony tour. The trip was rewarding to the Orchestra and to the state as a whole. The Centennial Commission and the Society are to be congratulated for arranging it.

The economic facts of life for the Symphony have brought it to the policy that concerts in other communities will be given only if their cost is fully guaranteed in advance. Consideration is being given, however, to the practicability of playing more special concerts in nearby communities like Beaverton, Gresham, Oregon City, and Vancouver. A two-weeks period might be devoted to such concerts, staying within the twenty-mile radius to keep costs down. Also to reduce the expense, a smaller orchestra of thirty or forty players might be used, rotating the personnel so that all of the players would have the opportunity to participate. The program might be chosen to appeal particularly to young persons. The concerts could be given in school gymnasiums, where, for example, the orchestra might rehearse for an hour before the audience and then play for an hour. During rehearsal the audience might even walk around to observe the different workings of the orchestra and familiarize itself with the playing of the different instruments. Talks might be given about the music to be played. Hopefully, booster organizations or service clubs might be interested in providing a subsidy so as to keep the ticket prices low. The Seattle Symphony gives such Family Concerts or Little Concerts using an orchestra of reduced size.

PROGRAMMING

In the past the type of program of the Portland Symphony has depended a great deal upon the preference of the conductor. Mr. van Hoogstraten played a preponderance of classics—Beethoven, Bach and Brahms. The undiluted classics, as exemplified in the three B's, have had great appeal to the majority of symphony lovers. However, in recent years young conductors have introduced contemporary music. Werner Janssen once played an all-Rogers & Hammerstein program. This was popular but its appeal could not have a following in successive concerts. Janssen had a penchant for playing the music of obscure Hollywood composers. Abe Berkovitz, well-known Symphony musician, has stated that the Orchestra should play a more mixed program—some Gershwin, Strauss waltzes, and Pops—mixed in with heavier classics. James Sample had a liking for little-known French composers.

Yet with all this diversity, until recently the Orchestra had not played Beethoven's Fifth for twenty years and had not played a Tchaikowsky concerto since 1919.⁽²⁶⁾ In contrast to the pure classic lovers there is a growing enthusiasm for contemporary symphonic music. The Portland orchestra has had to cope with the great difficulty and complexity of modern music. When Mr. Bloomfield came he stated that he would play contemporary music only if certain that the orchestra could master its difficulties. It is necessary for the orchestra and the audience to be ready for modern music. Remember the all-Stravinsky concert in the year of all-guest conductors? The critics said about this program that it was roughly played and the orchestra undisciplined. Stravinsky drew a very comfortable house and was roundly applauded. The criticism demonstrated that the Orchestra was not then up to the demands of modern symphonic music. In later years audience and critics' acceptance of the contemporary music played by Mr. Bloomfield was enthusiastic, and he increased the number of contemporary works from season to season as the audience acceptance kept pace.

26. There are more than 15,000 symphonies published currently, and the Orchestra plays about 48 works per season.

Aisle comments express preferences for all types of music—jazz, classical and Pops. Thus no one type is all popular with the average symphony audience.⁽²⁷⁾ With a few exceptions, notably those conductors who have had definite likes and dislikes in music preference, the Portland Symphony has endeavored to strike a happy medium. It has been well within the American orchestra average for types of music played. To those who like the old masters, any contemporary work could come in for criticism; yet there are many who are bored with the classics and are vocal in their criticism of an all-classical program.

Mr. Bloomfield stated that he tried to obtain a good balance of the standard and the unusual, the classic and romantic, and the contemporary in music (contemporary is not necessarily more "unusual" than some of the rediscovered classics). He stated: "I believe that a conductor should decide what is right for a community and then provide it. If audience reaction is consistently unfavorable, this might necessitate a revision in plans." Your Committee agrees that the Symphony has done well in its selection of a varied program. Recently the Orchestra has supplied sufficient modern music to satisfy those whose tastes are so inclined. It is felt that this demand must be met in order to maintain a growing and sustaining support for the Portland Orchestra. Since going to Rochester, Mr. Bloomfield has stated: "In retrospect, I consider Portland among the best audiences."

Recent interest in symphonic music and a noticeable migration into Portland of people who regard good, live music as a necessary part of their lives give hope for a new era of support that may be a big help in Symphony problems.

It has been stated that forty percent of the program of the European orchestra consists of contemporary works, while the average American orchestra plays only twenty-four percent of contemporary music. This, it was explained, is due to the advanced musical traditions of the arts in Europe and the freedom of choice Federal and State subsidy allow.

Program variety has been restricted because of lack of funds for royalties and rental of music. The Portland Symphony has a good library of standard works. New scores must either be bought outright or rented. Some contemporary composers' royalties are excessively high for orchestras with tight budgets.

A consideration not to be overlooked in good programming has been pointed out as follows:

"One factor which is sometimes considered unimportant but which undoubtedly affects the spirit with which the audience leaves an auditorium, is the timing of the program. There is a definite point past which additional symphonic music yields diminishing satisfaction. The fact that many of the audience live in the suburbs also is a practical consideration in limiting the length of the program. Several conductors who are recognized as masters of program-making seldom devise concerts in which the actual playing time exceeds 80 to 85 minutes, and take particular pains to provide an adequate intermission period."⁽²⁸⁾

Orchestras with larger budgets have commissioned music from contemporary composers. The possibility of the Senior Symphony commissioning works has been considered but no steps have been taken. Commissioning works has generally not been financially successful for other orchestras; however, the value of fame may equal or surpass the value of fortune.

The Centennial Commission commissioned compositions from three composers, Jacob Avshalomov (the conductor of the Portland Junior Symphony), Darius Milhaud, and Roger Sessions, at a cost of from \$1,500 to \$2,000 apiece. In August, 1959, the Portland Symphony played the Roger Sessions' composition in Eugene, and the attendance was a gratifying 2,000. The Symphony plans to record these three compositions. This will have prestige value, for there are now no Portland Symphony records.

27. How old is the average symphony-goer? Around 1940 a questionnaire was distributed to the audience at a symphony concert in two cities and revealed that the median age for those in attendance was 27 years in Grand Rapids and 33 years in Los Angeles. *America's Symphony Orchestras*, by Grant and Hettinger, supra, p. 227.

28. Grant and Hettinger, *America's Symphony Orchestras*, supra, p. 161.

The Ford Foundation is providing funds for a composer-in-residence, James Kurtz, for the Portland public schools. He is to compose music for high school orchestras and choral groups. Portland is one of twelve cities where the Ford Foundation is supporting a composer-in-residence for the schools. The intent is to upgrade the importance of music in the curriculum and to provide an inspiration to the composer and to the students who will associate with him.

In 1957 the Portland Junior Symphony received a \$10,000 grant from the Rockefeller Foundation for commissioning six new compositions over a period of several years. The purpose was to increase the repertoire of contemporary orchestral works for performance by junior as well as major symphony orchestras. So far three of these works have been played by the Junior Symphony—the commissioned compositions of David Diamond, Roy Harris, and Benjamin Lees. ⁽²⁹⁾ In 1958 Roy Harris came to Portland to rehearse the Portland Junior Symphony in his composition and to meet with young musicians in a Composer Workshop that was financed by a group of Portland citizens.

Roy Harris, in a talk before the City Club, said,

“If a community will employ the services of a first-rate composer, it will stimulate the young and gifted of that community to remain and contribute their talents to the cultural life of that community. If no opportunity for cultural inspiration is provided within the framework of the local educational institution, these gifted people leave and are more than likely lost to their home town. This loss is not only in cultural values but the economy suffers because it is directly related to its cultural life.” ⁽³⁰⁾

Mr. Harris cited, as an example, cities in the eastern part of the United States that deliberately sought the best in music and art in order to attract and keep discriminating citizens and provide an atmosphere of culture. Mr. Harris also said there is a definite ratio of musically-gifted or genius class to total population, and Portland certainly has its share. If Portland does not see that these talents have the inspiration and incentive to remain here for their education, they will go elsewhere and be lost to their home town.

Guest Artists

The employment of guest artists has been successfully and consistently used. In 1956-1957 the Symphony instigated a policy of employing more guest artists. The purpose was to offer a series that would be attractive to a larger audience and provide the best in topflight concert artists. The cost was high. The fees of a guest artist run from \$750 to \$4,000 or more. The drawing power of these artists was such that this experiment paid off financially. The income and popular support for topflight artists were more than enough to overcome their high cost. There are a number of concerts each season that have no guest artist, but they are usually programmed with popular symphonic music or employ the use of local talent. Local singers, choral groups or instrumentalists are eagerly supported by our community.

Pops Concerts

The Portland Symphony has for the last several years engaged the orchestra in a three or four concert series of Pops. ⁽³¹⁾ Playbills have read: “Boston, New York, San Francisco, and now Portland have Pops.” “Gay, fun-filled musical evenings.” Such promotions in the 1956-57 season resulted in both financial and popular success. Monte Ballou, with his Castle Jazz Band, was engaged for dancing after the program. Along with refreshments, this attracted a different crowd of musically interested.

The next season the Pops revenues did not meet their costs, and for 1958-59, the Symphony lost a good deal of money on the three Pops concerts. The concerts have been fun, and it is not known why they have not been financially successful the last two seasons. It has been pointed out that they should not be mixed in with the regular concert season, but this could hardly be avoided because the Society's contract with its players ends April 30 of each season. In Portland it is difficult to create the informality that

29. In February 1960 the Junior Symphony plans to play another of these works—the composition of William Bergsma. Goffredo Petrassi and Robert Ward have also received commissions under this grant, and their works will be played later.

30. April 18, 1958, City Club program, “The Place of Music in Modern Society.”

characterizes successful Pops concerts in other cities. For example, beer cannot be served at concerts in the Public Auditorium—a city ordinance prohibits serving alcoholic beverages there. The Symphony has, however, made beer available for a Pops concert at the Oriental Theater.

Both the Auditorium and the Oriental Theater have the disadvantage of having fixed seats. It is thought that the large 6,000-seat Exposition-Recreation Center hall that is being built will be unsuitable for regular performances of the Orchestra, but it may very well be a good place for Pops concerts, for the main floor could be covered with tables and space be provided also for dancing.

It costs about \$3,800 to put on a Pops concert, and if there are featured artists, as there generally are, the cost is perhaps \$1500 more. Pops generally means popular prices, so ticket prices average about \$1.50 each, with a \$3.00 top. During the past two seasons, the concerts have been sold through the sponsorship of a number of different groups. Scrip tickets are sold by the sponsors who are given a discount of up to 40% depending upon the quantity sold.

This season the Board has authorized only one Pops concert, and that only if it is fully guaranteed by a sponsor.

PROMOTION

Advertising and promotion of Symphony concerts and activities have been handled in the main by the manager's office. We believe advertising should be the responsibility of the manager, but that he should be assisted by professionals in this field. Mr. Howard Skinner, manager of the San Francisco Symphony has said that it is essential for a symphony to have the services of a first-rate public relations person. He emphasized that the success of the San Francisco Symphony's fund-raising is largely due to a year-around public relations effort directed by a professional.

In Wichita, Kansas,⁽³²⁾ the Symphony helped sell itself to the community by having pictures of its concert artists appear during the season on about seven million cartons of milk. The milk distributors did this free. The plan for this season in Wichita was to have the Symphony advertising on paper bags used in grocery stores—thanks to the courtesy of the bag manufacturers.

Some symphonies have an arrangement with department stores whereby subscribers may charge their season tickets. A booth is set up in the store for several weeks to accommodate customers for this special service, and symphony literature is sent out by the stores in their mailings.

In Detroit every five season tickets sold by a Women's Committee member earns that member a free student pass to be given to a needy student by the Symphony Society.

The San Francisco Symphony schedules buses to pick up concert-goers at various points outside of the city and bring them to the city in time for a little shopping and luncheon before transporting them to the concert hall for Friday afternoon concerts. Afterwards, the buses return the customers to their points of origin. Another plan used by the San Francisco Symphony is to include in the price of tickets for a series of five afternoon concerts, transportation by special bus to a luncheon preceding the concert, at which special talks on music are featured—the entire series of luncheon-concerts being given at a discount.

During the current concert season the Portland Extension Center and the Symphony are sponsoring seminars on music. The discussion leaders are musicians from the Symphony, and qualified college faculty members.

Co-ordination of Musical Events

Other musical organizations in the community include the Junior Symphony, Chamber Orchestra, Symphonic Choir, and—at various times—one or two opera associations. There are a Chamber Music Society, a Young Audiences program, and other organizations. Musical talent is also booked in Portland by the many local colleges, the Ellison-

31. Pops concerts were also given by the Orchestra in 1920, 1921, and 1922. See *Multnomah County Library's Scrap Book on Portland Symphony Orchestra*, 1919-24, supra, pp. 70 and 109.

32. *Newsletter of American Symphony Orchestra League*, 1959, Vol. 10, No. 3-4, p. 7.

White Bureau and some independent impresarios. Of these, only the Junior Symphony and the Chamber Orchestra compete directly in the medium of the Portland Symphony, but all musical endeavors are in competition for support, both in interest and money.

The Junior and Chamber Orchestras operate on comparatively modest budgets, and financial support is primarily in the form of \$12 and \$10 memberships respectively for which tickets to the series are included. Both are primarily educational organizations and create potential players and support for the Portland Symphony. The balance of musical activities within the city depends somewhat upon—and provides some outside income for—Portland Symphony players. The Committee is impressed with the need for reasonable co-ordination of activities. An example in point occurred with the considerable delay of an opera performance because several members of the opera's orchestra were engaged in a Symphony rehearsal the night of the opera. As the community grows and facilities increase, co-ordination between various musical activities drawing from the same potential audiences and dependent upon the same performers will be imperative.

An unfortunate example of lack of co-ordination in the matter of timing was the presentation of "Aida" twice within four days in the same week by two different opera groups, one local, and one a touring company. Attendance figures showed the disastrous results of such needless duplication.

The generous offer of the Library Association of Portland to maintain a clearing house of cultural events for the planning and scheduling of such activities to avoid duplications has not been used as much as it should.

In view of the somewhat similar problems of the Portland Symphony and the Junior Symphony, your Committee explored the possibility of merger of the two organizations. The reaction was general opposition to any amalgamation of interest. The Junior Symphony spokesmen were concerned with the greater financial problems of the senior Symphony and felt that the junior group required the full-time services and attention of a conductor-educator. Those concerned with the Portland Symphony disapproved the combination mainly on the ground that their purposes were different. The main difference, observers said, was that the junior group is primarily for the education and training of young people in symphonic performance.

All interviewed felt that good relations between the two organizations existed. Some interchange would have mutual advantages, it was felt. Some spokesmen advocated a joint committee of members from each organization, or some liaison to co-ordinate problems and public relations.

Regional Co-ordination

The Committee considered the practicality of the establishment of a regional orchestra, combining the communities of Portland, Tacoma and Seattle. Little enthusiasm was found for such an orchestra, in that division between the cities might result in less total support because of lack of community identity, and also because of the impracticality of assembling the players for rehearsals and concerts. Transportation would be exorbitantly expensive, and a hardship would be imposed on the many players who must depend on daily outside work.

Short of such a proposed merger, some regional co-ordination could be achieved by an occasional exchange of concerts between the Portland and Seattle Symphonies, or an exchange of conductors. Your Committee feels that such an exchange between Portland and Seattle would be to the ultimate benefit of both orchestras, providing additional promotion and stimulation of interest.

City Arts Commission

In 1955 the Portland City Council created the Portland Arts Commission of ten members. Its functions include "the study, analysis and encouragement of the various arts as cultural attributes of the City; co-operation with existing and future organizations, and the co-ordination of these activities so as to arrive at a comprehensive plan for the healthy development of music, drama, architecture and the space arts in the community".

Music is one of the arts in which the Portland Arts Commission is interested, but so far there has not been occasion for the Commission to assist the Symphony.

MANAGEMENT

The management of a symphony society can be as complex as conducting an orchestra. Critics have pointed to instances of factionalism and dissension in the local Symphony as a peculiar defect of that organization or even of this community. Such difficulties are not a local phenomenon, however. The following quotation from *Variety* of May 16, 1956 illustrates this:

"Observers of the American musical scene have been increasingly struck by the seemingly incessant quarrels and dissensions which plague orchestral and operatic organizations almost without exception in this country . . .

"Frequent resignations and dismissals of conductors and managers under clouds of rumors and accusations, the sharp conflict and acrimonious recriminations among lay and professional personnel and the sudden drastic shifts and changes in announced plans, policies and programming, each accompanied by the most vehement and sometimes violent airing of bitter partisan charges and countercharges by organization members and sponsors are a recurring and familiar phenomenon of the musical picture . . .

"For those who seek the answers, certain facts are emerging as common denominators in the many unhappy situations.

"In the first place, it is well known that there is no recognized ultimate head or authority in the administrative make-up of these musical groups which function for the most part on a voluntary basis . . .

"This loose organization and haphazard functioning results inevitably in the heads of various departments, such as conductor, manager, personnel director, and the like, feeling free to trespass onto the activities of other departmental heads whenever they choose. The propensity of conductors and musical directors to usurp the functions of management, especially in financial and public relations matters, is a frequent cause of dissension . . .

"It is common practice, when a conductor or manager becomes disgruntled over some slight or situation, actual or fancied, to carry his grievance to an influential member or clique of the organization and enlist his or their support . . .

"Directors and trustees who up to this time have gone along complacently for the social ride now become violent partisans and all lose sight of their responsibility to the public which in response to public appeals for financial support is footing a large part of the deficits thus created everywhere. Nor has the current exaggerated emphasis of women's auxiliaries with their memberships dedicated to conductor-worship and other off-beat projects proved to be an unmitigated blessing — these subsidiary women's groups frequently ending up as the tail wagging the main dog.

"Because most musical societies are unwilling (1) to confer authority upon management or (2) to stand by management once such authority has been conferred, potential trouble is always in the offing. The spectacle of a manager proceeding to carry out a policy announced to have been approved by his directorate and then finding the rug pulled out from under him owing to pressure from other cliques or departments is another frequent manifestation which constitutes one of the big banes of musical societies, and it, together with interference by busybody volunteer officials, has caused some of the greatest griefs these societies have known . . ."

The problems of administration for a symphony are more complex than for most organizations, for it has not just one professional leader, but two — the conductor and the manager. When the conductor and manager are both persons of ability and working harmoniously, that symphony is most blessed; when there are open and active hostilities, the result — even with the best of Boards — is chaos.

The Manager

The manager of a symphony plays an important part in the teamwork that makes a successful orchestra. He should be the link between the Conductor, the Board and the musicians (including the union). As the full-time administrative leader he should relieve the Board of as much administrative detail as possible. The Board's cooperation in this regard is an essential. It should be free to concentrate on policy making and fund raising. The manager's task is to execute decisions of the Board and assist the Board in organizing and conducting fund-raising. Ideally he should provide continuity and experience. He should endeavor to see that policy decisions by the Board anticipate and prevent crises, and he should provide leadership to guide the Board in its responsibilities. He should be the one person who is familiar with the entire workings of the organization.

With a small office staff like the Portland Symphony's, no detail is too small for the manager — whether it be having rosin on hand for the string section's use, providing aspirin for the bassoonist's headache, or finding the missing celesta. His is a labor relations position also, for he should play a leading role in union negotiations and in resolving grievances. Public relations are a part of his responsibilities, for although promotion should probably be left for specialists on a part time basis, the manager has the many facets of the Symphony's activities at his finger-tips. If the manager is musically talented, so much the better, but it is submitted that this is not an indispensable requirement for the position, which has so many varied demands that one individual can hardly be expected to have all of the ideal qualifications — and rarely at the salary paid by the Society.

The function of a manager has been described as follows:

"He usually is charged with the duty of constructing a season which has a chance of survival, submitting a budget, and negotiating all contracts for the services of performing personnel, including soloists and sometimes even the musical director. In addition, he has *all the operating and housekeeping duties* — duties which require ceaseless attention such as rental of halls, printing of programs, advertising of performances, publicity, promotion, ticket sales, travel arrangements, supply of scores and parts, copyright clearances and other details. *Fund-raising* is usually a responsibility of the Board itself, the mechanics being carried out either by permanent staff alone, or together with outsiders engaged for that purpose."⁽³³⁾

At times in the past the Symphony Board does not appear to have appreciated the importance of the manager's role. It is no wonder that the Symphony had seven different managers during the ten years from 1948 to 1958.

The comment has been made that the Symphony Board has been overfearful of domination on the part of the manager. Some have felt that a charitable organization should have a weak manager and a strong board. Rather, it is submitted, the Symphony should have both a strong manager and a strong board, and generally a strong manager will attract a strong board.

The Board

The Board of Directors, serving without compensation, has the legal power and responsibility of governing the Society, subject theoretically to the authority of the membership which elects the Board and has the power to change the corporate structure. All who contribute \$10 or more are members of the Society, entitled to vote at annual meetings where directors are elected. As with most non-profit organizations the membership is too diffuse to exercise its fundamental authority. Not enough members attend the meetings of the membership to be representative, and contested elections are a rare exception.

A symphony board's responsibilities have been described as follows:

"To produce concerts will require the same application of good judgment as in any other business, and particularly some sense of the public relations problems of (a) any educational enterprise, (b) any

33. *Study of Legal Documents of Symphony Orchestras*, supra, p. 17.

entertainment enterprise and (c) any community promotion. With such qualifications, it is better to depend on professionals for (a) musical advice as to personnel, programs and timing, and (b) the state of the market for performers, soloists, conductors, and ticket sales, as well as for the myriad housekeeping details that go into a production.

"The board must decide how much it can afford to raise or give or spend. Within those limits, its employees must operate. In effect, the board is the agent of the community to raise the funds to support the orchestra. The orchestra will never support itself. The board's chief function is to set the limits of expenditure for each musical effort or season. The proper field for the board is the budget, not the concert."⁽³⁴⁾

Reduced to essentials the duties of the Symphony Board of Directors might be defined as: (1) To obtain the best possible conductor who will lead the orchestra to performances of the highest possible merit and then support him; and (2) to obtain the necessary funds to fill the gap between concert income and operating expense.

The Portland Symphony has not been conspicuous over the years for the quality of its Board. It has been suggested that one reason for this is its onerous responsibility to engage in active fund-raising. At times this had led to Boards that have been lopsided in favor of persons of wealth or influence in financial circles. It has been years since a labor leader (other than an officer of the Musicians' Union) or a clergyman, for example, has served on the Symphony Board.

A study of the boards of twenty orchestras in the country, involving in all about 700 board members, has been published by the American Orchestra League. This *Report of Study on Governing Boards of Symphony Orchestras* emphasizes that the Board is "a steward of a permanent community trust, charged with the responsibility of seeing to it that the community's cultural needs are placed ahead of all other considerations in decisions concerning orchestra policies and procedures"; and that effective board members are leaders within the community who have a strong personal interest in the arts.

The *Report* states that:

"Based on the statistical tabulations of the study, a 'profile' of the person most likely to be an effective board member would be something like this: a man or a woman between 36 and 65 years of age, who has a deep personal interest in the arts; a college graduate with added graduate or professional study who has traveled widely; a person of considerable personal wealth who is a member of one of the community's leading families and who definitely has influence in one or more spheres of community life with the following areas rating in the order given — general community leadership, influence in professional circles, social circles, business and financial circles, art circles; and a person who also holds a position of leadership in other community activities."

The *Report* makes a comparison between successful and unsuccessful orchestra boards and in so classifying them, employs standards of artistic quality, community service and financial stability. It emphasizes that "a balance of talents" is to be sought, but that:

"The unsuccessful orchestra boards include twice as many people elected to the board as representatives of some special group as do the successful orchestras. Apparently, this is an attempt to obtain support from those groups through representation on the board. The successful orchestras report that they find such representatives usually are interested chiefly in their own group, are serving on the orchestra board primarily as a courtesy, and can be counted on for little actual work or influence on behalf of the orchestra."

The *Report* emphasizes that: "If an orchestra seeks to draw support from the entire community, apparently it must attract to its board, people who are capable of exerting influence within all segments of the community"; that these are not persons who are merely "attracted by the glamour surrounding an orchestra" or who "have influence

34. Ibid, p. 28.

through professional connections with other community or civic organizations", but rather are persons who exert influence in their respective circles, be they professional, social, political, artistic, educational, labor, business or community.

The following quotations from the *Report* are pertinent:

"The artistic excellence of the orchestra, the soundness of its financial policies, its program of community service and education — these are matters of public concern. Decisions concerning them must emanate from a dedication to community needs and knowledge of orchestral potentials in meeting them rather than from personal preferences, prejudices and loyalties."

"Successful orchestra boards include a somewhat higher percentage of retired persons . . . have twice as many representatives from educational institutions . . . have 10% fewer persons connected with businesses (43% as compared to 52% among the unsuccessful orchestras) . . . have nearly four times as many musicians . . . a few more persons operating at top policy-making or executive positions in their business and professional connections . . . have more people holding acknowledged positions of community recognition . . . include many more people possessing personal wealth . . . but also include twice as many persons having no personal wealth (In other words, the successful orchestras have elected to their boards people of strong leadership regardless of whether or not those leaders possess personal wealth as one of their qualifications) . . . have deliberately sought board members having the necessary qualifications to give sound guidance and counsel in artistic matters (137 persons having influence in the arts, as compared with 46 within the unsuccessful orchestras) . . . and there is a small representation from labor circles in either the successful or unsuccessful boards, though it is three times as high among the successful orchestras as among the unsuccessful orchestras. Among the effective board members are 50% more persons active in other community affairs . . . and twice as many persons active in raising money for other civic organizations."

Summarizing, the *Report* states that "effective board members are leaders within the community who have strong personal interest in the arts, whereas the ineffective board members are individuals of little proven leadership and have only a casual or no interest in the arts."

The Society is not under the control of an "old guard". Membership on the Board is constantly changing. The By-laws wisely limit the directors to a maximum of two full terms of three years each, after which they are ineligible for election again until at least a year has elapsed. Of the 24 members of the present Board, only one was serving prior to the annual meeting six years ago, and three years ago only five of them were then on the Board. In fact the Board may be handicapped by too rapid a turnover. Resignations are not uncommon. The Board would doubtless be stronger if there were more directors of experience. Probably their fund-raising duties have made it difficult for the Society to achieve the proper balance between new Board members and experienced directors.

The President

The presidents ⁽³⁵⁾ of the Society have varied from the gentle director who leads by persuasion, to the dictator who rules the corporation as if it were his own private enterprise. The president's task is difficult. Board members do not have the single-mindedness of the directors of a profit corporation. Each is free-lance, so to speak. The president must work with the board members as individuals, but also weld them into a team dedicated for the single purpose of the Society's best welfare. He finds his Board of Directors has a personality of its own that is different from the sum total of the personalities of the individual board members. Recent presidents say they spend about half their working days on Symphony affairs. To find a person who has the time and energy to assume such a job greatly circumscribes the field of selection. A well-functioning organization should not make a back-breaking job of the presidency, as appears to be the case with the Society.

35. Only two women have been president of the Symphony: Mrs. Ralph D. Moores and the current president, Mrs. Paul Feldenheimer.

Committees

Criticisms have been made of some of the Symphony's Boards that they "hassled too much over minutiae" and neglected to put on the intensified drive necessary for fund-raising, or that they concentrated so much on campaigning that the organization went to pot. Aside from the fact that a volunteer board should delegate to the manager matters of administration, and realizing that the President should not take over the policy-making function, a Board with responsibilities such as the Symphony's generally can operate more effectively if working committees predigest for the full Board the many and various problems that are apt to arise at Board meetings. It has been aptly stated that the best board is a working board, and a working board generally means an efficient committee system, with use of Board and non-Board members. Not that committees are to dominate the board or make its decisions, but each committee concerned with matters in its own specialized area, should concentrate on the problem and reduce it to tangibles for a more understanding consideration by the full board. Spontaneous board decisions made when sporadic suggestions or remarks are raised at a meeting, without the benefit of advance consideration or study by a committee, are apt to result in serious mistakes.

The weakness of the Society's committee system is indicated by the fact that in as complicated a business as is the running of the Symphony, the By-laws only specify a Music Advisory Committee, a Finance Committee, and an Executive Committee, in addition to the Nominating Committee. Singularly enough, there is no standing campaign or fund-raising committee. There is a committee on out-of-town concerts. A strong and valuable committee has been the Women's Committee consisting of the chairman who is a Board member, and some thirty women, some of whom may be on the Board. Except that its chairman is appointed by the President of the Society, the Women's Committee is virtually autonomous. This committee undertakes the important assignment of neighborhood solicitation, mostly of \$10 memberships, with accompanying features of neighborhood teas, program discussion groups, etc. In 1959 the Women's Committee raised approximately \$40,000 in contributions for the Symphony—or about half the total contributions for the fiscal year.

An executive committee is provided for in the By-laws to exercise such authority of the Board of Directors between Board meetings as the Board may prescribe. In former years the executive committee was criticized as being too powerful. An executive committee should provide counsel to the President and Manager and help clarify problems that are to come before the Board, but it is submitted that with a good working Board operating under an efficient committee structure, actual decisions made by the executive committee should be the exception rather than the rule.

As with so many organizations, the importance of the nominating committee does not seem to have been fully appreciated by the Society. Too much care cannot be taken in the selection of new board members to insure they are persons who will actively participate in the responsibility of directing the Symphony. As stated in the *Report of Study on Governing Boards of Symphony Orchestras*, supra, "The successful orchestras use a great deal more care, study and planning in selection of board members than do the unsuccessful orchestras."

The By-laws place checks upon the nominating committee in that a majority of the committee must be non-Board members, and a majority must be persons who were not on the nominating committee the prior year. The committee's nominations must be communicated to the membership in advance of the meeting where they are to be voted upon. Any ten members of the Society may make additional nominations. A secret ballot is provided for if there is a contest.

It is suggested that the manager should generally meet with the nominating committee to give the members the benefit of his perspective and experience. The danger in this appears to be minimal in most organizations. The manager of course would have no vote. All board members must seem unpredictable at times to a professional serving under them, and a wise professional can have no higher motive than for the Board to have the best possible membership.

The By-laws provide for an adjunct to the Board that in theory commends itself, namely, Associate Directors. Associate Board members may be appointed to assist the

Board in carrying on the Society's activities. More specifically their appointment is to be made "with the object of obtaining the cooperation and advice of other representative and civic-minded groups . . . and individuals".⁽³⁶⁾ Associate Directors are invited to attend Board meetings, with full rights to participate in discussions—their votes, however, being only advisory. In the past, some Associate Board members have been chosen by the players, but this practice has been discontinued; others have been appointed because of special talents. Because of the opportunity that it presents to provide a proving ground for potential board members, to supplement the abilities of the Board with persons contributing special skills or experience, and to give recognition to constructive services being rendered by non-board members, it would appear that in actual practice this device might well be strengthened. A way of doing this might be for the Board itself to make the appointments based upon the report of the Nominating Committee, rather than for the President to make the appointments, as at present. It would seem wise that the appointments should expire with the next annual meeting following appointment, as is now provided.

Initially your Committee was disturbed to learn that the Conductor does not attend Board meetings unless specially permitted or invited. Traditionally, the Conductor of the Junior Symphony regularly attends its board meetings, and the experience of that organization in this respect has been successful. The obvious advantage is in bringing the Conductor and Board closer together, so that they may see the other's problems and be more fully apprised of what is happening. Apparently, however, with large orchestras generally, the Conductor is not privileged to attend Board meetings unless specially invited. Probably most conductors of large orchestras would not want to attend Board meetings regularly. In Portland, the Conductor has been an ex-officio member of the music committee, but seldom attends meetings of the Board. It has been suggested that were the Conductor to be regularly in attendance, freedom of discussion would be limited. It would be unfortunate if the services of an excellent musical leader were to be lost because of a clash of temperaments produced by his attendance at Board meetings. Certainly, the desire or adaptability to attend Board meetings is not a requirement for a conductor. One way or another, however, the Conductor's advice and counsel should be available to the Board in its consideration of vital Symphony problems.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

It is not unusual that the Symphony does not support itself. No college, public or private, is sustained solely by tuitions. The Boy Scouts, the Y.M.C.A., the Child Guidance Clinic and the other members of the United Fund must raise moneys beyond their fees for services. The Civic Theatre does not support itself by ticket sales alone, and its players are not professional. The Multnomah County Library and the Portland Art Association make no charges of consequence and are virtually 100% dependent on other financing.

Endowments and Testamentary Gifts

The Symphony has a small endowment for an institution of its age and importance. The invested funds of the Portland Art Association total approximately \$3,000,000⁽³⁷⁾ and produce over \$93,000 annually. Although essentially tax-supported, the Library Association of Portland has an endowment of over \$800,000⁽³⁸⁾. The endowment of Reed College is almost \$4,000,000. Although public supported in the main, and state-owned, Doernbecher Memorial Hospital, for example, has a private endowment of \$241,000. The Symphony's endowment is about \$90,000 and its annual income therefrom approximately \$2,700. Comparisons are odious, and the Committee realizes that the aforementioned institutions are far from rich, are in need of even greater benefactions, and in some instances could not exist were it not for these endowments. By comparison, however, the Symphony seems to be a poor orphan.

The endowment picture for symphonies generally over the country is meagre. For 1957-58, endowment income of various symphony orchestras was: Chicago, \$90,000 (aside from income from rental of its auditorium), New York Philharmonic, \$55,000;

36. Symphony By-laws, Article IV, Section 11.

37. Some of these funds have gone into the land and building of the Art Museum and School.

38. Exclusive of Carnegie grants.

San Francisco, \$27,000; Seattle, \$5,000; and St. Louis, \$859. One of the most outstanding endowments for symphonies is the Cincinnati Institute of Fine Arts⁽³⁹⁾ created in 1927 by a gift from Mr. and Mrs. Charles P. Taft of \$1,000,000, conditioned that an additional \$2,500,000 be raised the next year. Although the principal purpose of the Cincinnati Institute of Fine Arts was to furnish support to the symphony, it also contributes to art museums, a conservatory of music and a summer opera association. In 1958-59 the symphony in Cincinnati received \$145,000 from the Institute plus \$148,500 from the United Fine Arts Fund which the Institute also conducts⁽⁴⁰⁾.

There is less prospect these days for tremendously large endowment gifts, except in rare instances where foundations are created by some of the country's wealthiest families. High income, estate and inheritance taxes have greatly reduced the giving potential in terms of large amounts. Also in present times the emphasis appears to be more on unrestricted gifts (where the principal can be used to meet present needs) rather than endowments (where the principal is required to be kept invested with only the income available for expenditure). With inflation increasing costs of operation and with relatively low income yield from investments, this trend is realistic. As far as the Symphony is concerned, it appears to have been virtually essential that it place its emphasis upon annual donations to enable it to survive rather than to endeavor to promote endowment gifts.

The largest amount known to have been given to the Symphony is \$50,000 (testamentary) and the next largest, \$10,000 (inter vivos). It is doubtful whether the average symphony-goer or the person who can afford to make large gifts, let alone the average citizen in the community, realizes that the Symphony has been strangely lacking in receiving large lump-sum or endowment gifts. The Symphony should make public the fact that far from being a pampered beneficiary of the wealthy, the reverse is true.

It is likely that the Symphony's history of having suspended operations and more frequently threatening to suspend them⁽⁴¹⁾, has been a strong deterrent to endowment gifts. Large donors naturally expect stability of an institution, especially when considering making memorial gifts. No one wants to endow a dead duck. Donors however, could leave their endowment gifts under a form of trust whereby the benefits could be diverted to some other cause during a suspension of the Symphony's activities.

Foundation Support

Why doesn't some wealthy national foundation sustain the Symphony?

The Symphony has received no support from a national foundation, and it is unlikely that a national foundation will ever solve its financial problems. Generally the conditions for national foundation support appear to be some or all of the following criteria: not to subsidize an organization year after year but to help start a project that the community will continue when the grant is ended; to explore the possibilities of a new or different plan or idea as a worthwhile experiment, which the donee organization cannot afford to make; the project should be of general and not just local significance; and the donee organization must be especially well qualified to undertake the venture so that the conditions will be favorable for success. The Ford Foundation's aid to the Gifted Child Program of our public schools is a good example of the kind of grant made by national foundations. Major foundations do not appear to be doing very much for music, although the Rockefeller Foundation has made gifts to encourage contemporary American music, with grants to composers, to the Portland Junior Symphony⁽⁴²⁾, for commissioning new compositions from composers, and to the Louisville Symphony for programming contemporary music. The same foundation has also assisted in the production of new ballets, ballet scores, and choreography.

A foundation might well assist in the encouragement of instrumental and orchestral education by institutions of higher education in this area. Such a project would, among other contributions, be of inestimable value to the Symphony in helping it to obtain and keep musicians of high talent.

39. The pool endowment operated by the Cincinnati Institute of Fine Arts is \$10,000,000.

40. See page 133.

41. An article in the *Oregon Journal-Oregonian* for December 2-3, 1959, states: "The San Francisco Symphony opens its 48th season . . . amid warnings this may be its last. It needs \$225,000 more than its visible income to make ends meet . . . This would include paying off a deficit of \$71,000 accumulated over 13 years . . ."

42. See page 119, supra.

Annual Drive Planning

The annual drive constitutes one of the most important functions of the Society, for the life-blood of the orchestra depends upon it. Fund-raising is a business, a science, and an art, and as shown by the United Fund, is a year around job of preparation and organization culminating in an intensified and concentrated campaign of solicitation.

Fund-raising requires able, experienced leaders and many faithful, competent workers. It is hard work, and one of the most difficult tasks is to obtain the needed leadership and working personnel. Many of the best are already jaded by strenuous fund-raising efforts for other organizations. There are too few fund-raisers and too many drives.

Raising money requires leadership of virtually professional ability and experience. Truly professional leadership alone, however, is not enough. This was shown by the Society's experience in 1954 when it employed the services of a national fund-raising organization. Over \$109,000 was obtained in contributions that year—the largest amount that the Symphony has raised since 1947 — over \$69,000 more than was raised the preceding year, and almost twice as much as had been raised in any year for the prior five years. Still the campaign was considerably short of its original goal. The primary trouble appears to have been the difficulty in obtaining top-bracket solicitors. This experience showed the advantages of top-flight leadership, but also the fact that able, local solicitors are essential. After all, a drive "depends on who asks whom and for how much." It would be good policy for the Symphony at regular intervals to employ the services of an outside professional fund-raiser to keep campaign methods fresh and to provide alertness for strong campaigning.

Successful fund-raising also requires a strong staff to assist and provide as much relief as possible from the heavy work-loads involved. Volunteer workers vary from year to year and it is important that continuity be provided by staff.

Corporation Support

In this era of high income taxation, the Symphony must look less to private persons and more to business and industry for major gifts. This is the trend throughout the country.

"Business support of the arts now is at the stage where corporate aid to education was ten years ago and aid to medical and welfare work was thirty years ago."⁽⁴³⁾

As of October 1959, the larger gifts to the Symphony were as follows:

	Individual	Firms, Corporations and Associations
Guarantors (\$1,000 and over)	8	12
Underwriters (\$500-\$1000)	8	8
Patrons (\$100 to \$500)	178	88

Firms exceed individuals in making gifts of \$1000 and more, but they fall far behind in the gifts from \$100 to \$500. This appears to follow the pattern in other cities. By and large it is the corporations today that can afford the large gifts.

There is a question whether Portland businessmen believe that culture is a good investment. What would help locally would be more businessmen like the St. Louis donor who maintained that the orchestra was a force in "helping to sell shoes".⁽⁴⁴⁾ In Dallas, Texas, a power company explained its gift by saying "when it tries to attract power-consuming industries to Texas, one of the first questions asked is about the availability of culture and recreation for employees".⁽⁴⁵⁾

Portland suffers in that its corporations are not industrial giants compared with other cities. Important, too, is the fact that firms here are frequently branches of out-of-state corporations⁽⁴⁶⁾ or absentee-owned. Too often when a contribution is sought from a local branch of an out-of-state corporation, the answer is that the local manager is sorry, but such decisions are made in the "East"; when the head office in the "East" is contacted, the answer is that it's too bad the company didn't know of the appeal before, for its schedule of contributions had already been decided upon. Wisely, the Sym-

43. Edgar Young, as quoted in *Oregonian* editorial of May 20, 1958.

44. *The Reporter*, Feb. 7, 1957, p. 43.

45. *Ibid.*

46. For example, the Union Pacific Railroad Foundation donated \$2,500 to the Portland Symphony in 1959.

phony Society is devoting special effort to try to obtain a fair share contribution from multi-state firms.

In 1951, the Detroit Symphony was revived by an intensive campaign that obtained over \$250,000 in gifts from corporations contributing "not a penny more and not a penny less than \$10,000 apiece" and these donors pledged the same amount for each of the succeeding two years. The corporations varied from large automobile industries to department stores, breweries and banks. (47)

No quick miracle can be expected for corporate giving, but it is generally recognized that a sustained push should be exerted for corporations to realize their responsibility for contributing their fair share for the promotion of the improvement of the cultural aspects as well as other facets of the community in which they operate.

One Board for Fund-Raising and One for Management

There is a lack of recognition for those who lead the Symphony's fund-raising drives. Noticeable are the fluctuations of driving force, or lack of effort, over the years as regards active campaigning for funds. The Symphony's financial needs have been the one constant. The fund-raising efforts have not been as sustained. Why?

Fund-raising means intensive, driving and intelligent hard work. The intrinsic rewards to the campaigner may appear relatively slight, and with the Symphony, the recognition is niggardly. Fund-raising can challenge a worker to prove his abilities to his business or social peers or superiors. The Symphony gives little incentive for a person to volunteer his help for a campaign. During the Symphony's fund-raising drives, who knows who the campaign leaders are? Afterwards, who remembers them? Why should not those who have raised the funds to enable the Symphony to exist, be entitled to recognition comparable to that of members of the policy-making Board?

The fund-raising function of the Symphony should be upgraded and its workers should receive more public credit and recognition. Why, at least, should not their names appear on concert programs, on a parity with those of the Board of Directors?

Ideally the Symphony Board member should be constant in attendance, and active in policy-making for the Society twelve months out of every year, and also be able to neglect his business and family for a concentrated, intensive, all-out, fund-raising effort, and be equally skilled and experienced in both tasks. The ideal is hard to find, especially on a volunteer basis. The result is that some Board members appear to be chosen for their policy-making abilities, and others for their fund-raising talents, with the result that the Board, acting as a whole, is apt to do neither well.

Why shouldn't the policy-making and fund-raising responsibilities of the Board be channeled into separate functions? Churches have departments of business and separate boards of deacons. Colleges have separate boards of overseers and trustees. Why can't the Symphony have: (1) its Board of Directors and (2) its separate Sustaining Board? The Committee is unable to point to other symphony organizations where this concept has been put into practice. On the other hand, experimentation, after study, would appear to be hardly less hazardous than for the Symphony to continue in its schizophrenic way.

The fund-raising group — herein referred to as the "Sustaining Board", or Board #2 — would be chosen to lead the annual campaign for funds, and nothing else would be expected of it. The fund-raising function would be upgraded to equal public recognition with the Board of Directors, (Board #1.) Members of the Sustaining Board (Board #2) would be chosen, say, for one-year terms, yet persons who had proved their worth by prior service would be reappointed. With or without prior experience with the organization, they would be persons who were ready, willing and able to put on the concentrated, hard-hitting drive necessary to raise the funds required. The members of the Sustaining Board (Board #2), or certainly its principal officers, would as a matter of right but not

47. *The Reporter*, February 7, 1957: In all, \$389,000 was raised.

of duty be privileged to attend meetings of the Board of Directors (Board #1) and vice versa, but as ex-officio members only, without the right of vote.⁽⁴⁸⁾

There would be dangers of rivalry and conflict between the two boards so that from an organizational standpoint one should have the controlling power, and it is submitted that this should be the Board of Directors. Some parallel might be found in the United Fund in this community, where the campaign organization is subsidiary to the Board of Directors, and where the campaign goal, for example, is legally established by the Board of Directors rather than by the campaign committee. Nonetheless, the campaign committee of the United Fund is rightfully upgraded. The campaign chairman, although frequently not a member of the Board of Directors, rightfully receives more recognition in the community than any of the directors or officers except, possibly, the president of the United Fund.

Instead of trying to melt and merge the driving, intensive campaigner and the constant policy-molding planner into one entity known as the Board, would it not be better to recognize the value of each type of person and divide their functions and responsibilities so that each may be on his own kind of Board where he may work with equal distinction according to his specialized abilities, with fellows of his own kind on the phase of the Symphony's work for which he is best suited, without it being rubbed into him that he is a slacker because he cannot perform both functions fully?

Tax Support

One way in which other Symphonies have been helped to bridge the gap between income and expenses has been through public subsidy. The Committee understands that this is the case with many orchestras in Europe.⁽⁴⁹⁾ American skeptics state that the same pattern should not necessarily exist in this country. Some argue that public subsidy is a descendant of aristocratic forms of government where princes supported orchestras. Others argue that public support is socialistic. The critics from the standpoint of aristocracy overlook the fact that in Europe good music has been generally a cherished enthusiasm of the masses. The critics of the socialistic point of view argue that public subsidy would cause a corruption and prostitution of standards. This is not the experience of Europe or necessarily of the United States. In our own community for example, the Multnomah County Public Library and the State System of Higher Education are mainly supported by public appropriations. The Portland Art Association receives an annual grant from the County of \$10,000. It should also not be overlooked that charitable institutions that own and use real estate in the furtherance of their charitable purposes receive a tangible public subsidy in the form of exemption from real property taxation. The Portland Symphony receives no such indirect subsidy. It is not a landowner. Its office is confined to two small rented rooms in the Park Building.

The principal argument directed against the 1952 municipal ballot measure for tax subsidy for music was that: "The community as a whole should not be asked to contribute to an activity which is enjoyed by a few." As was pointed out in the City Club report⁽⁵⁰⁾ unanimously favoring this ballot measure:

"In answer to this argument, proponents point out that the community as a whole has always been called upon to support some kinds of activities which are not used and appreciated by everyone; libraries, the Historical Society, parks and zoos, to name four. Yet the necessity of these to the community is not generally disputed, and their value to the community in terms of education is generally recognized. Moreover, the presence of these in a city is generally assumed to add to the attractiveness of it in business and home-ownership terms."

48. Some may ask, if not raising moneys, what would the Board of Directors have to do? It is submitted that in determining the budget and living within it, negotiating with the Union, selecting a conductor when need be, fostering the combined teamwork of conductor, players, manager, Board and public for the benefit of the community as a whole, endeavoring to obtain and keep the services of the most qualified musicians, serving this and other communities by promoting repeat concerts both within and outside of the Portland area, helping to find a livelihood for players of standing here and for imports, promoting good houses and in many other ways setting the policy for the year-around endeavors and promotion of the Symphony, the Board of Directors would have a vital task to accomplish.

49. In Mexico also the Symphony is state-supported.

50. May 9, 1952.

The major part of the revenues derived by the State from betting at race meets goes by statute to the Pendleton Roundup, State and County fairs, various livestock, turkey, corn and other shows. ⁽⁵¹⁾

The taxpayers support the University of Oregon Medical School, where, like the Symphony, revenues cannot meet expenses, but this can hardly be regarded as socialistic; nor, considering its excellence, can one say that the result has been a corruption or prostitution of standards.

Public subsidies for music are not confined to Europe and are commonly found in this country. The Municipal Band, for example, receives half of its support from appropriated funds of the City of Portland. Of 26 major orchestras surveyed for their 1957-58 season, 13 received public subsidies ranging from \$7,000 to \$80,000, namely: Cincinnati, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Buffalo, Atlanta, Toronto, Seattle, Pittsburgh, New Orleans, Louisville, Montreal, Baltimore and Indianapolis. Of these subsidies, two were from the Canadian government, one from a school district and the rest from city or county governments. Some public subsidies are in the form of millage taxes, and others are appropriations made by city or county governing boards. In San Francisco, it is in the form of money paid for the purchase of services. San Francisco also contributes \$10,000 to its symphony to promote out-of-town concerts, which it is felt help promote the city.

The City of Portland makes no charge for the use of the Public Auditorium for Symphony rehearsals or concerts aside from a service charge for a stagehand, an operating engineer, and fuel oil, but if the Symphony employs guest artists an additional concert charge of \$200 is made ⁽⁵²⁾ apparently on the theory that it is then competing with a private business that books concerts for profit. Including service charges, the Symphony pays about \$4600 per season to the city for rehearsals and concerts at the Auditorium. Neither School District No. 1 (Portland), ⁽⁵³⁾ nor any other public body contributes anything to the free school concerts that the Symphony plays each year, or for the three Saturday morning children's concerts that the Junior Symphony gives annually. Although students are given a 50% discount on tickets for regular concerts, the Society is not permitted to put up posters in the schools for the concerts, and the School District begrudgingly permits its schools to make available scrip for its pupils to obtain tickets at half price.

The public authorities of our community can not take pride in the encouragement that they give the symphony orchestras of the city.

In May 1952 the voters of Portland defeated by a vote of 77,439 to 53,663, a measure to authorize a tax levy of not to exceed fifteen-hundredths of one mill towards support of the Symphony Orchestra, the Junior Symphony Orchestra and the Municipal Band. It was estimated that the levy would raise about \$85,000, which would have meant an average tax of less than 25 cents per person in Portland. The proposal received newspaper support and City Club endorsement. Ten thousand dollars was added that year to the deficit of the Symphony because of its costs of promoting the unsuccessful ballot measure.

Most of the persons interviewed by the Committee favored public support. Many felt that it was essential. If tax support were not to be for the Senior Symphony alone, problems would arise as to what organizations would be included, how the distribution would be made, and who should make it. The state enabling act, ⁽⁵⁴⁾ adopted in 1951 and still in effect, limits the levy, where authorized by the voters of the city, solely for the "purpose of maintaining and employing one major symphony orchestra, one band, and one junior symphony orchestra." Other musical organizations would be excluded. The levy submitted to the voters of Portland in 1952 provided that the sum to be allotted to each of the three organizations would be determined by the City Council with the approval of the Tax Conservation Commission, acting on budgets submitted by the boards of the organizations.

From a practical standpoint, tax support for the Symphony is more likely to come if there is a broad base of support. Some of the requirements for broad public interest

51. O.R.S. 462.280

52. The Oriental Theater charges the Symphony \$150 plus the cost of a stagehand for each concert played there, regardless of whether there is a guest artist.

53. The School District and Portland State College make no charge for rehearsals held in their auditoriums.

54. O.R.S. 357.920

are: good music of wide taste, popularly priced tickets, a minimum of snob appeal and extensive publicity. All of these take money, and the Symphony has not money in hand. Hence, the problem of tax support is like the chicken and the egg, which comes first?

In none of the cities having governmental support does the public subsidy maintain the orchestra more than in part, nor result in free concert tickets to all, or dispense with the necessity of raising funds in addition to ticket sales. The 1952 Portland ballot measure was expected to yield, at the maximum, approximately 40% of the combined then current budgets of the Symphony and the other two musical organizations.

Political acumen and luck are great assets for success at the polls. That one attempt in 1952 failed is no reason why the effort should not be made again. Also voted down in the same election were pay raises for the City Council and a city services tax levy. The following November the voters of the city rejected a proposal authorizing the issuance of bonds and a tax levy for a new zoo. Subsequently Rosy, the elephant, arrived on the scene to put over the new zoo and to carry with it a number of other special tax measures. What the Symphony needs is another Rosy!

United Arts Drive

The value of federated fund-raising has been recognized in the field of welfare, health, and recreation. Most communities, including our own, have their United Fund or Community Chest appeals. Such joint campaigns are realistic in recognizing the diminishing returns and waste of time and dollars that come from individual drives, and also that such united drives are apt to achieve more momentum and publicity than individual campaigns. Perhaps federated fund raising for Portland's many and various struggling cultural organizations will eventually prove to be the answer.

In at least one city the Symphony is a participant in the United Fund. In several other cities the art museum is included in the regular United Fund appeal.

In six cities, united fund-raising drives are conducted for the arts: Cincinnati, Ohio; Louisville, Kentucky; St. Paul, Minnesota; Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Ft. Wayne, Indiana; and Charlotte, North Carolina. In Cincinnati a United Fine Arts Fund⁽⁵⁵⁾ was founded in 1949 to federate the fund-raising drives of the Symphony, art museum, summer opera association, and Taft Museum. It was founded because "the endowment funds available to the various agencies did not cover the needs of the individual groups, and individual fund campaigns were becoming clumsy, a nuisance to the public, and generally unsuccessful."⁽⁵⁶⁾ The Symphony requirements spearheaded the organization. Cincinnati's United Fine Arts Fund has raised about \$350,000 annually and produced more than the total contributions from individual campaigns formerly did. For 1958-59, the Cincinnati Symphony received \$148,500 from the United Fine Arts Fund. It solicited no other contributions.

Your Committee is not aware of any reason why the Portland Symphony and other local established artistic organizations would not profit by the same kind of united campaign as in Cincinnati. It is expected that in other cities the plan of united fund-raising for the fine arts will be adopted.⁽⁵⁷⁾ As doubtless would be true in Portland, so in Cincinnati, the Symphony receives the lion's share of the total funds raised. Cincinnati was able to organize the United Fine Arts drive without including the numerous and multifarious other artistic organizations, major and minor, that must have existed in that city.

Federated fund-raising for social service organizations has proved its success nationwide. The Symphony and other local organizations might find the same plan the answer to their needs to fill the gap between earned income and expenditure. It seems common sense for organizations of common interests to combine solicitations. The result should be a saving in campaign costs and manpower. Prospective donors not sufficiently inter-

55. Conducted by the Cincinnati Institute of Fine Arts which also has a large endowment. Page 128, *supra*.

56. Letter from Leslie C. White, Director of United Fine Arts Fund of Cincinnati, to the Committee, dated March 1, 1956.

57. In a letter to the Committee, dated January 5, 1960, Leslie C. White (see f.n. 56) stated:

"... although only six cities currently conduct united fund drives (for the arts), we have on file inquiries from over 50 communities. I am confident that the next few years will see an almost geometrical multiplication of the federated campaign (for the arts) idea."

ested in one artistic organization might well contribute to a one-drive-for-all arts campaign. Numerous approaches from different directions are likely to irritate a prospective donor. A united front is more appealing. Also, unification of effort is apt to achieve stronger and abler leadership, not only professional, but from volunteers (who now frequently avoid getting involved in the fund-raising woes of an organization with independent drives). Nor should such a federated arts appeal, if responsibly led and working in harmony and close liaison with the United Fund's program, harm the United Fund.⁽⁵⁸⁾ The two drives could be timed so as to avoid conflict, and it is likely that both organizations would gain strength through the existence of the other.

CONCLUSIONS

Your Committee concludes that:

1. The Portland Symphony is one of the major institutions in this community, directly and indirectly influencing the thinking and well being of the people. Its influence goes beyond its concerts. The inspiration of its conductor, the cultural opportunities that it provides for its audiences with live performances, the incentive it gives to persons of musical talent, the extent to which it attracts or keeps in this community persons of musical ability, the educational values that result from its presence, and the teachings of its gifted players extend its influence into practically every home. It is a major asset of this area and should be supported.

2. Musically, the Orchestra is at one of its highest peaks.

3. Portland Symphony box office receipts, in common with those of most major orchestras, produce less than half the cost of performing, even though its players receive but a hobby income. It is impractical for the Symphony to increase the price of admissions enough to finance itself solely through box office income. This is also the case with most cultural or educational activities. The Symphony lacks patrons of great wealth, and has no appreciable endowment income and is dependent upon a broad base of support.

4. The Symphony's constant problem is money. It has few problems that more money couldn't solve.

5. The annual fund-raising drive is the life blood of the Symphony.

6. The Portland Symphony should receive tax support. Tax support is justified because of the cultural and educational contributions that the Orchestra makes to the community. It cannot be expected, however, that tax support alone will substantially finance its operations.

7. In six cities, United Arts Funds exist, and there is no reason known why such federated financing would not be practicable in Portland.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Your Committee urges the City Club to endorse its recommendations that:

1. The Symphony prepare the year around for its drive, obtaining the sustained services of able public relations persons, and employing at least periodically the services of an outside professional fund-raiser.

2. The Symphony up-grade the status of its volunteer fund-raisers, and consider the desirability of one board for fund-raising and one for management.

3. The Symphony not abandon efforts to obtain tax support.

4. The Symphony, with other major artistic institutions, explore the practicability of federated fund-raising for the arts in this community.

Respectfully submitted,

Ben L. Bernhard
Jerome S. Bischoff
Dean Janney
Philip A. Joss, Chairman

Approved March 3, 1960, by the Research Board for transmittal to the Board of Governors.

Received by the Board of Governors March 10, 1960, and ordered printed and submitted to the membership for discussion and action.

58. Now known as United Good Neighbors.

CHART A

FINANCIAL OPERATING HISTORY OF THE PORTLAND SYMPHONY SOCIETY FOR THE TEN YEARS 1950/51 TO 1959/60

(Rounded to nearest 100 dollars)

	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	(Estimated) 10-Year 1959-60 Average
<i>Earned Income:</i>										
Regular Concerts.....	\$ 48,500	\$ 55,100	\$ 51,200	\$ 42,600	\$ 35,800	\$ 48,000	\$ 59,300	\$ 66,400	\$ 73,300	\$ 80,000
Other Concerts.....	14,500	18,800	9,400	7,100	5,100	9,000	19,200	200
Program Advertising.....	4,600	8,800	8,600	4,600	4,100	5,000	8,100	6,800	7,000	11,100
Miscellaneous.....	1,600	500	8,400	6,200	6,600	4,300	6,400
TOTAL EARNED INCOME.....	\$ 69,200	\$ 83,200	\$ 77,600	\$ 60,500	\$ 51,600	\$ 66,300	\$ 93,000	\$ 73,200	\$ 80,500	\$ 91,100
<i>Unearned Income:</i>										
Regular Contributions.....	\$ 56,800	\$ 55,100	\$ 50,200	\$ 40,100	\$ 109,800	\$ 70,000	\$ 68,300	\$ 83,000	\$ 107,400	\$ 78,000
Special Contributions.....	4,700	10,800	5,200	8,200	200	5,700	2,600	7,200	6,000
Endowment Income.....	1,500	1,500	1,400	1,700	1,800	1,900	2,100	2,300	2,300	2,700
TOTAL UNEARNED INCOME.....	\$ 63,000	\$ 67,400	\$ 56,800	\$ 50,000	\$ 111,800	\$ 77,600	\$ 70,400	\$ 87,900	\$ 116,900	\$ 86,700
<i>Total Income.....</i>	<i>\$ 132,200</i>	<i>\$ 150,600</i>	<i>\$ 134,400</i>	<i>\$ 110,500</i>	<i>\$ 163,400</i>	<i>\$ 143,900</i>	<i>\$ 163,400</i>	<i>\$ 161,100</i>	<i>\$ 197,400</i>	<i>\$ 177,800</i>
<i>Expenses.....</i>	<i>\$ 139,100</i>	<i>\$ 153,200</i>	<i>\$ 155,300</i>	<i>\$ 115,500</i>	<i>\$ 137,400</i>	<i>\$ 128,300</i>	<i>\$ 166,800</i>	<i>\$ 179,600</i>	<i>\$ 180,700</i>	<i>\$ 177,100</i>
<i>Surplus (Deficit).....</i>	<i>(\$ 6,900)</i>	<i>(\$ 2,600)</i>	<i>(\$ 20,900)</i>	<i>(\$ 5,000)</i>	<i>\$ 26,000</i>	<i>\$ 15,600</i>	<i>(\$ 3,400)</i>	<i>(\$ 18,500)</i>	<i>\$ 16,700</i>	<i>\$ 700</i>

CHART B
FINANCIAL EXPERIENCE OF SYMPHONY ORCHESTRAS
IN COMPARABLE CITIES (1954-55)

	<i>Minneapolis</i>	<i>Indianapolis</i>	<i>Cincinnati</i>	<i>Buffalo</i>	<i>San Antonio</i>	<i>Dallas</i>	<i>Average</i>
<i>Earned Income:</i>							
Regular Concert Series.....	\$ 117,222	\$ 50,857	\$170,659	\$ 94,292	\$ 65,351	\$ 54,564	\$ 92,157
Other Concerts and Tours.....	162,788	88,704	121,392	98,788	158,881	55,288	114,307
Advertising.....	13,800	11,582	12,743	8,694	7,803
Other income (Broadcasting, etc.).....	29,383	121	821	22,300	11,189	10,636
TOTAL EARNED INCOME.....	\$323,193	\$151,264	\$292,872	\$219,191	\$248,164	\$118,546	\$225,535
<i>Unearned Income:</i>							
Endowment Income.....	\$ 1,508		\$ 18,500	3,337
Contributions.....	268,547	125,364	128,345	131,684	137,761	140,000	155,283
Municipal Grants.....	25,000	18,050	7,175
Fine Arts Funds and Miscellaneous.....	110,624	15,384	21,001
TOTAL UNEARNED INCOME.....	\$270,055	\$125,364	\$282,469	\$149,734	\$153,145	\$140,000	\$186,794
<i>Total Income.....</i>	<i>\$593,248</i>	<i>\$276,628</i>	<i>\$575,341</i>	<i>\$368,925</i>	<i>\$401,309</i>	<i>\$258,546</i>	<i>\$412,333</i>
<i>Expense.....</i>	<i>592,953</i>	<i>296,274</i>	<i>575,334</i>	<i>387,780</i>	<i>395,665</i>	<i>258,906</i>	<i>417,818</i>
Deficit of Earned Income.....	\$269,760	\$145,010	\$282,462	166,589	147,501	139,960	192,213
Deficit or Surplus.....	\$ 295	\$(19,646)	\$ 7	\$(18,855)	\$ 5,644	\$(360)	\$(5,489)

CHART C

Average Attendance
Portland Symphony Orchestra

<i>Season</i>		<i>Attendance</i>
1947-48		1,500
1948-49	Monday Evening Series.....	2,200
1948-49	Friday Evening Series.....	1,000
1949-50		2,284
1950-51	Monday Evening Series.....	2,203
1950-51	Extra Series	1,755
1951-52	Monday Evening Series.....	2,391
	Extra	1,614
1952-53	Monday Evening Series	2,032
1952-53	Friday Evening Series.....	1,591
1953-54		2,246
1954-55		2,113
1955-56		2,533
1956-57		2,540
1957-58		2,620
1958-59		2,540
	Average Attendance	2,222