# FREDERICK FENNELL AND THE EASTMAN WIND ENSEMBLE:
## The Transformation of American Wind Music Through Instrumentation and Repertoire

**Jacob Edward Caines**

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Master of Arts degree in Musicology

School Of Music
Faculty of Arts
University of Ottawa

## Abstract

The Eastman Wind Ensemble is known as the pioneer ensemble of modern wind music in North America and abroad. Its founder and conductor, Frederick Fennell, was instrumental in facilitating the creation and performance of a large number of new works written for the specific instrumentation of the wind ensemble. Created in 1952, the EWE developed a new one-to-a-part instrumentation that could be varied based on the wishes of the composer. This change in instrumentation allowed for many more compositional choices when composing. The instrumentation was a dramatic shift from the densely populated ensembles that were standard in North America by 1952. The information on the EWE and Fennell is available at the Eastman School of Music's Ruth Watanabe Archive. By comparing the repertory and instrumentation of the Eastman ensembles with other contemporary ensembles, Fennell's revolutionary ideas are shown to be unique in the wind music community.



## Key Words

- EWE (Eastman Wind Ensemble)
- ESB (Eastman Symphony Band)
- Vernacular
- Cultivated
- Wind Band
- Wind Ensemble
- Frederick Fennell
- Repertoire

**Acknowledgements**

This thesis could not have been completed without the support of many people. Firstly, my advisor, Prof. Christopher Moore. Without his constant guidance, and patience, this document would have been impossible to complete. I would also like to thank Profs. Roxane Prevost, Murray Dineen, Paul Merkley, and Dillon Parmer for their encouragement and insights. I am very lucky to have the support of such a distinguished group of people. I owe my growth as a student and person in the past two years to them.

I would also not have been able to complete this thesis without the help of the Sibley Music Library and David Peter Coppen. As a friendly, knowledgable, and dedicated archivist, David Peter made my research trips to the Eastman School a joy and a privilege. I am extremely lucky to have been granted access to the Fennell Archive, and I am very grateful. As there has yet to be a biography written on the late Frederick Fennell, the vast majority of the information regarding Fennell's life, has been pieced together by the writer from fragments of letters, documents, correspondences, autobiographical fragments of writings by Fennell held in the Eastman Archive. Prior to this collection being so meticulously assembled by Maria Cristina Fava after it was bequeathed to the Sibley Library, there was no one place for researcher to see and analyze these documents.

I also need to thank my fellow musicology students. Our weekly MA meetings were entertaining, helpful, cathartic and entirely necessary. Without a friendly and warm place to discuss and dissect the life of a musicology student, I feel this would have been a far less enriching experience than it has become.

I must also thank Dr. Mark Hopkins. As a professor and mentor, he has been a musical and academic inspiration for the past six years. As a friend, he has constantly been there

whenever I needed a kind word or kick in the right direction. My love of wind music and my drive to do more in the field is entirely due to him and his guidance.

Last and hardly least, I thank my parents for their constant support and never-ending pride in their son's endeavor to pursue a career that is often difficult, rarely lucrative, and always in constant flux. Thank you.

**Table of Contents**

## Chapter 1

Brief History of Winds Before the 19th Century

The evolution of wind music in North America is no less complicated than any other musical genre. There are many factors that have effected the growth of this niche style, however, there are several key individuals and ensembles that have made more of an impact than any others. This thesis will discuss: the biography and musical life of Frederick Fennell (founder of the Eastman Wind Ensemble and American wind pedagogue); the history of wind music prior to the phenomenon of the American wind band; the repertoire choices of pre-Fennell wind bands, Fennell's own wind bands, ensembles that existed at the same time as Fennell's wind bands and post-Fennell wind bands; and nomenclature and the status of American wind music in context of American music as a whole. The study will also include a brief section on modernism in 1950s American wind music and how it was influenced by Frederick Fennell, Robert Austin Boudreau, William D Revelli as well as a number of composers and other conductors. Though wind music still operates in a hierarchical and divergent manner among each organization, there are still differing views on how best to standardize wind music through repertory and instrumentation. It was with Fennell and the Eastman Wind Ensemble (hereafter referred to as the EWE) that these attempts at modernization through repertoire were first introduced.

An extensive history of wind music is not essential to include in this thesis as the majority of the topics discussed in this paper happen fairly late in the chronology of wind music. However, to set up the discussions of repertoire and the EWE, requires a short explanation of the repertory, instrumentational, and historical roots of wind music. A brief discussion of the cultural divide between internally competing factions of wind music and the larger topic of wind music as

opposed to orchestral music is necessary to clarify the place wind music holds in the greater music community.

Winds and percussion are unique among the instrument groups. They have a much wider range of timbres and dynamics at their disposal than their companions. They are also more mobile than keyboards and larger strings, and they have the added abilities of being able to be marched with, played sitting or standing, indoors or outdoors (provided the weather does not damage the instruments). This uniquenesses meant that winds were historically far more flexible in their functionality than most other instruments. It was a result of their natural characteristic that these instruments formed together to become marching ensembles, heralding ensembles, and outdoor ensembles. This left music for the hall, church, dance floor, and stage to the keyboards, voice, and stringed instruments. Of course, winds were far from banished from these performance spaces, but these places were generally dominated by other instrument families. By reasons of functionality, winds were nearly relegated to utilitarian uses until well into the Classical and early Romantic periods. This is evident in the number of pieces written for winds by Bach or Beethoven in comparison to the number of keyboard, string, or vocal works. Such a small percentage of works does not represent a proportional number of wind players or wind instruments throughout music history. Even Romantic composers like Wagner and Berlioz, who wrote extensively for winds, only did so when they were part of a symphony or opera. Although Romantic composers wrote hundreds of string quartets, concertos, sonatas, keyboard, and vocal works, there were relatively few wind quintets, sonatas, concertos or large ensemble wind works.

Finding wind works written before 1900 that are not utilitarian in intent, or which do not fall under the category of transcriptions of string or orchestral works, is not an easy endevour. The brass canzonas of composers like Gabrielli, the dance music of Teilman Susato, and Jean Baptiste Lully, the Royal Fireworks music of Handel, and a handful of sonatas, concertos, harmoniemusik suites, and chamber music pieces are all that exist for concert wind music from hundreds of years of music writing by hundreds of composers. The vast majority of pieces written for winds prior to the nineteenth century, were marches, dance suites, fanfares, and functional music for events. By analyzing a repertoire list of wind music written by the National Concert Band Festival[1], one finds that there are only a very small percentage of pieces on the list that were either written by orchestral composers, or were written over a hundred years ago.

A very small group of wind conductors, composers and musicians helped facilitate and create this growing and ever more "legitimate, high art" body of wind works. John Philip Sousa, Frederick Fennell, Percy Grainger, Ralph Vaughan Williams, Robert Austin Boudreau, William D Revelli, (among others) collectively nurtured and revitalized an entire genre of music that had largely been forgotten by historians and performers. It was the resolve of Frederick Fennell and the commissioning power of the EWE that fueled the revitalization of wind music in the 1950s. This rebirth of the genre was also due to other groups like the American Wind Symphony Orchestra (hereafter referred to as the AWSO) and its founder and conductor, Robert Austin Boudreau. In addition to the commissioning and performance work of the EWE and the AWSO, without the cult of personality that followed John Philip Sousa, and the compositional work of

[1] http://www.ncbf.info/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=13&Itemid=6, Accessed May 20, 2012.

Grainger and his counterparts, wind music would not have become the large artistic body of work that it has become today.

Fennell and the other conductors and pedagogues who he knew and worked with are important because their attempts to standardize, legitimize, and proselytize wind music into something that could stand next to any other genre and be held in the same artistic standard was a groundbreaking and new idea. To do this, Fennell had to revolutionize what wind music was and could be, while simultaneously creating an entirely new repertoire that could be played by a new Wind Ensemble. This forced a break in traditional wind music by veering it from its much broader genre of low brow and vernacular to the much less travelled path of high brow and high art music canon. To be seen as a genre that could be considered high art, there needed to be a switch in how winds were used. The only way Fennell could envision this as an effective change was to rethink the standardization and repertoire of wind music. Fennell believed that the creation of an independent repertoire would bridge the gaps between the competing factions of wind music, ie. vernacular and cultivated.

Through Fennell's influence, and the influence of several other American conductors, there has been an ongoing series of role reversals in the wind community and the relationship with their audiences. With the continuing legitimization of wind music, this specialized genre has been gaining a foothold in the larger music community as a professional and high art genre, while simultaneously clinging to its more vernacular past. This reversal is perhaps seen best in the concerts of the EWE and the AWSO. The AWSO's mandate has always been to commission orchestral style wind works from across the world, and bring them to audiences outside the

concert hall. The group travels on a barge through the waterways of the United States, playing concerts in parks and inlets for local audiences. The EWE, on the other hand, has performed in the most prestigious concert halls in North America and Asia, performing high art wind music for audiences much more accustom to orchestral music. The radical change in instrumentation, as redefined by Fennell in 1952, was the main catalyst for the explosion of interest in performing and writing pieces for wind ensembles.

In the years after the creation of Fennell's Wind Ensemble, there still exists a duality in wind bands. Ensembles like marching bands, military bands and concert bands still project a utilitarian and low art persona to the rest of the music community. This duality is seen mostly in terminology and repertoire as well as in the audience and the players themselves. A wind orchestra fights to be on par with a symphonic orchestra in both an educational and professional setting, while community concert bands, marching bands, and military bands continue to perform mostly for an audience of the musically uneducated. An in-depth discussion of nomenclature occurs later in the thesis.

Preliminary Note on Wind Group Instrumentation

The following charts are an attempt to clarify instrumentation, and ensemble names. The differences are very small, but they are important to the clarity of discussion of wind music and ensembles. The ensemble instrumentations and definitions are in no way agreed upon by wind musicians or the greater wind music community, and more often than not, several terms are considered interchangeable. However, if an academic discussion of these ensembles is to happen, some attempt to differentiate them must be made.

| Ensemble | Instrumentation | Additions and Variations |
|---|---|---|
| **Symphonic Band/Concert Band**<br><br>* The instrumentation of the Symphonic Band is very similar to the Wind Ensemble. The crucial difference is that there are multiple people playing each part. The model of the Symphonic band is that of the military band. | 1 - Piccolo<br>2-3 - Flutes<br>1-2 - Oboes<br>1 - E-flat Clarinet<br>3 - B-flat Clarinets<br>1 - Bass Clarinet<br>1 - Bassoon<br>2 - Alto Saxophones<br>1 - Tenor Saxophone<br>1 - Baritone Saxophone<br>4 - Horns in F<br>3 - Tenor Trombones<br>1 - Bass Trombone<br>4 - Trumpets<br>1 - Euphonium<br>1 - Tuba<br>Percussion | English Horn is less common in standard Symphonic Band instrumentation.<br><br>String Bass is a common addition to the Symphonic Band, but is not part of the standard instrumentation.<br><br>Piano and Harp are rarely part of the instrumentation, but they will be included when required. |

| Ensemble | Instrumentation | Additions and Variations |
|---|---|---|
| **The Sousa Band**<br><br>* The Sousa Band has a few very specific features to it, though essentially it was a Concert Band. | 3 - Flutes (one doubling on Piccolo)<br>2 - Oboes (one doubling on English Horn)<br>1 - Bassoon<br>9 - B-flat Clarinets (1-2 doubling on E-flat Clarinet)<br>1 - Bass Clarinet<br>4 - Saxophones<br>4 - Horns in F<br>6 - Cornets<br>2 - Trumpets<br>3 - Trombones<br>2 - Euphoniums<br>3 - Tubas (Sousaphones)<br>3 – Percussionists | The main differences are in the number of clarinets and tubas.<br><br>The Sousa band also always toured with a soprano soloist. This made and ensemble of 44 including the soprano.<br><br>Sousa did not include string bass, but would occasionally include a pianist or harpist when needed. |
| **Symphonic Winds/Wind Symphony**<br><br>* A Wind Symphony is perhaps the ensemble with the name closest to its instrumentation. This ensemble tends to adhere fairly closely to a true and literal doubled orchestral wind section. It is better suited to more chamber style pieces than larger-scale works. It rarely includes instruments not from the orchestral wind and percussion section. In recent years, saxophones have been included in some Wind Symphonies. | 1-2 - Piccolos<br>4 - Flutes<br>2-4 - Oboes<br>1 - E-flat Clarinet<br>3-4 - B-flat Clarinets<br>2 - Bass Clarinet<br>2 - Bassoon<br>6-8 - Horns in F<br>3 - Tenor Trombones<br>1 - Bass Trombone<br>6-8 - Trumpets<br>1 - Tuba<br>Percussion | Contra-bass clarinet, and contra-bassoon are normal additions to the ensemble.<br><br>English horns are also a common addition, but are usually doubled on by oboists. |

| Ensemble | Instrumentation | Additions and Variations |
|---|---|---|
| **Wind Ensemble**<br><br>* The Wind Ensemble is a one-to-a-part ensemble that features variable and flexible instrumentation. This allows composers the freedom to write for any instrumentation they desire. | 1 - Piccolo<br>2-3 - Flutes<br>1-2 - Oboes<br>1 - English Horn<br>1 - E-flat Clarinet<br>3 - B-flat Clarinets<br>1 - Bass Clarinet<br>1 - Bassoon<br>2 - Alto Saxophones<br>1 - Tenor Saxophone<br>1 - Baritone Saxophone<br>4 - Horns in F<br>3 - Tenor Trombones<br>1 - Bass Trombone<br>4 - Trumpets<br>1 - Euphonium<br>1 - Tuba<br>1 - String Bass<br>Percussion | There are normally saxophones in this ensemble.<br><br>String bass and euphonium are common additions. |
| **Wind Orchestra**<br><br>* The extreme range in instrumentation lies in the flexibility of the ensemble. The concept of a Wind Orchestra is to double a traditional wind section from a symphony orchestra. However, as the terms and standards for a wind orchestra are even less defined than other ensemble types, there is more room for variation within this instrumentation. | 2 - Piccolos<br>4-6 - Flutes<br>2-4 - Oboes<br>1-2 - E-flat Clarinets<br>6 - B-flat Clarinets<br>2 - Bass Clarinets<br>1-2 - Contra-Bass Clarinets<br>2-4 - Bassoons<br>1-2 - Contra Bassoons<br>4-8 - Trumpets<br>4-8 - Horns in F<br>3-5 - Tenor Trombones<br>1-2 - Bass Trombones<br>1-2 - Tubas<br>Percussion | One may double on English Horn.<br><br>Saxophones, Euphonium and String Bass are rarely included.<br><br>Addition of specialty instruments like saxophone are generally only included as solo instruments. The standard instrumentation does not include them.<br><br>Piano and harp are common additions to the ensemble. |

Literature Review

In recent years there has been a surge in interest in writing about wind music and wind repertoire. Essential to the complete understanding of how wind music has evolved over the past 700 years is David Whitwell's *A Concise History of the Wind Band*. The book travels through each European country and chronologically explains the history and presence of winds in each place. When North America becomes a topic of discussion, Whitwell explains chronologically the presence of winds in the British colonies.[2] This is an essential addition to general American music history, as wind music is all but left out of most history texts. Whitwell provides historical context to wind music and has written eighteen books on various aspects of wind music - each one of them is a wealth of knowledge. As the most comprehensive series of books on wind music, Whitwell's books are a natural departure point for any discussion of wind music. Along with several other authors to be discussed, Whitwell has set up a historical dichotomy in wind music scholarship. This divide of the genre into two parts falls under the broad categories of "High-Brow" and "Vernacular."[3] Richard Hansen's *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History*, discusses these differing views, saying that there are two directions that wind music has evolved from over its history - Low brow (vernacular) and high brow (cultivated).

Whitwell's books outline that wind instruments evolved from the ancient flutes and hunting horns of prehistory, into more refined instruments like the shawm, sackbut, recorder, and

---

2 David, Whitwell. *A Concise History of the Wind Band*. Winds Publications, USA, 1985.

3 Richard K. Hansen. *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History.* (GIA Publications, Chicago, Illinois, 2005). pg. 179

even bagpipe.[4] Through Whitwell's writings and the work of other wind scholars like Battisti[5] and Frederick Fennell, it is clear that the divide between the two distinctions of wind music has stemmed from repertoire and functionality rather than instrumentation. A recorder could not hold the same practical purpose of a trumpet when used in the street or large hall to herald a monarch. So, through the technicalities and timbres of an instrument, the repertoire then separated the wind groupings into low and high class genres. Flutes became high-brow instruments because the technicalities of playing flute dictated that it be in a quieter, indoor space. Trumpets were often too loud and overwhelming to be played indoors until much later in their history when trumpet building technology allowed players to control dynamics and tuning better through valves. This indoor status allowed the repertoire for flutes to evolve into a repertoire of more refined, less direct and utilitarian music. It was also how this instrumentation was used in repertoire, that defined an ensemble's purpose. Through the centuries, it was the separation in repertoire that allowed for wind music to disconnect not only from its string, keyboard, vocal and orchestral counterparts but also from itself along the lines of utilitarianism and high art.

As a more specific look at the repertoire of the wind ensemble across the world, H Robert Reynolds provides detailed discussions on the topic in his book *The Wind Ensemble Literature*. Although outdated, as the book was written in 1975, it does not specifically list twentieth-century works or even American works, but it is still a good reference to understand

---

4 David Whitwell. *A Concise History of Wind Bands*.

5 Frank Battisti *The winds of Change: the Evolution of the Contemporary American Wind Band/Ensemble and its Conductor*. (Meredith Music, Galesville, 2002).

wind repertoire in the larger sense.[6] The Author is undoubtedly one of the most prolific and varied researchers on wind music, but he is also a conductor and pedagogue whose insights into the performance of wind music are informative even to the researcher. His perspectives on repertoire also provide a good backdrop to understanding why Fennell's views on instrumentation and repertoire were so different from the norm. Richard Hansen's *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History* attempts to outline the effects of what the wind band has done for American culture. The book begins in the early nineteenth century and is a broad overview of American wind music up to the late twentieth century. It includes an in depth discussion of Sousa, but its topics are broader than just including information on Sousa's ensembles and other turn of the century groups.[7] The Author includes chapters on his ideas on the function of a score, bands from the eras of every American war, and lists of further reading on each topic. Frank Battisti (founder and conductor of the New England Conservatory wind ensemble and past president of the College Band Directors National Association) has written two books on the way wind bands have evolved during the twentieth century. They are mainly written from the point of view of a conductor and focus on the reasons and factors involved in the changing idiom of the wind band. They are very informative however when discussing repertoire, instrumentation and the evolution of thought behind wind bands and the commission of works for wind instruments in the twentieth century.[8]

---

6 H. Robert Reynolds. *The Wind Ensemble Literature.*(University of Wisconsin Bands Press, Wisconsin, 1975).

7 Richard K Hansen. *The American Wind Band: a Cultural History. (*GIA Publications, Chicago, 2005).

8 Frank Battisti. *The 20th Century American Wind Band/Ensemble*. Meredith Music, Galesville, 1995. Frank Battisti. *The winds of Change: the Evolution of the Contemporary American Wind Band/Ensemble and its Conductor*. Meredith Music, Galesville, 2002.

The small body of scholarly literature written on the EWE is heavily centered around the initial years of the group. As the group has diligently preserved their own records and encouraged students of the School to write on the ensemble, there are several key books to understanding the group. Donald Hunsberger and Frank Cipolla compiled a book which includes the concert programs, liner notes and commissions of the EWE from 1932 - 1992.[9] These liner notes, concert programs and information about commissions, formed the main source of data for appendix A and B. In addition to the raw data provided in Hunsberger and Cipolla's book, there are many essays by other authors that deal with wind music in America and the evolution of the repertoire before and after Fennell began his revitalization project. The EWE has also been greatly discussed in the collected papers presented at the CBDNA conferences over the past 50 years. There are two books that collect selected papers given at CBDNA conferences. The first by Eric Ostling and David Whitwell[10] and the second by Michael Votta.[11] The papers collected in these books discuss a very wide variety of topics by a wide variety of authors. They introduce a range of themes that cover historical topics concerned with the evolution of wind music, to in-depth discussions on the nature of repertoire and its use as an educational tool. The CBDNA conferences have been the largest gathering of wind musicians and scholars for over 60 years, so naturally the papers presented at such a conference vary greatly in topic and scope. Literature concerning the AWSO and other wind groups formed in the

---

9 Frank Cippola and Donald Hunsberger, ed., *The Wind Ensemble and its Repertoire: the Complete Repertoire and Discography of the Eastman Wind Ensemble and Eastman Symphony Band 1932-1992. (*University of Rochester Press, Rochester, 1994).

10 Eric Acton Ostling, and David Whitwell ed., *The College and University Band: and Anthology of Papers from the Conferences of the College Band Directors National Association Conference from 1941-1975.* (Music Educators National Conference Publishing, USA, 1977).

11 Michael Votta. *The Wind Band and its Repertoire: Two Decades of Research as Published in the College Band Directors Nationals Association Journal.* (Alfred Music Publishing, New York, 2003).

1930s-1950s is less developed. Jeffery Renshaw has compiled a list of what he identifies as the complete commissions of the AWSO from 1957-1991[12], yet in his dissertation on the history of the AWSO, Dale Orfert mentions numerous pieces not included in Renshaw's lists.[13] Furthermore there are several pieces mentioned in the self-published picture book and brief history of the AWSO that are neither in Orfert's dissertation or Renshaw's book.[14] Katherine Murdock briefly discusses the AWSO in her dissertation on the *Pittsburgh Overture* by Penderecki.[15] By discussing the work of Robert Austin Boudreau and other wind groups that were formed at the same time as the EWE, it becomes easier to compare them to Fennell's groups, and see why the EWE was different in ideology to other groups at the time. The repertoire lists of Renshaw and Orfert also serve as a comparative chart to the repertoire lists of the EWE and Eastman Symphony Band (ESB). By looking at the styles and scope of works commissioned by the differing groups, a better picture of each ensemble's ideology becomes apparent.

Varying degrees of modernity in repertoire creates a common thread between the different ensembles of the 1950s, while also separating themselves from the antiquated views of the previous generation. To fully understand why Fennell's EWE was a group in reaction to the existing repertoires and ideas in wind music, one must look at the overriding influence of the previous generation. John Philip Sousa was undoubtedly the most influential figure in American

---

12 Jeffery Renshaw. *The American Wind Symphony Commissioning Project: 1957-1991, A History and Descriptive Catalog of Published Editions*. (Greenwood Press, Westport, 1991).

13 Warren Dale Orfert. "The Development of a Wind Repertoire: A History of the American Wind Symphony Orchestra." Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, 1992.

14 Kathleen Boudreau. *One More Time.* Unpublished. Pittsburgh, 2008.

15 Katherine Anne Murdock. "The Pittsburgh Overture by Krzysztof Penderecki." Ph.D. Dissertation, Eastman School of Music, 1986.

wind music in the first half of the twentieth century. Fennell's obsessive love of all things Sousa was countered by his need to separate his new ideas on repertoire and instrumentation from the previous generations. Much of Fennell's early musical life can be connected to Sousa through performance experience or repertoire and to not discuss Sousa and his effect on American wind music or Fennell himself would be to leave out an integral part of Fennell's musical life.

There is a large amount of material written on Sousa, and as this thesis will only discuss him in passing, I have merely highlighted a few of the more helpful Sousa resources. In Paul Bierley's book, entitled *John Philip Sousa: American Phenomenon,* the author not only includes a biography of Sousa, but also outlines Sousa's personal philosophies on music, specifically: instrumentation, conducting, and the future of American music.[16] By comparing Sousa's ideologies on topics like instrumentation and American music making, the views of more iconoclastic conductors like Fennell become sharper and more reactionary to the views of conductors from previous generations. A book of collected stories and anecdotes on the works of Sousa is *Perspectives on John Philip Sousa*, edited by Jon Newsom and is a collection of essays and picture essays on Sousa. This book displays many facets of the man and how his ensembles took form, as well as providing many score examples and private letters.[17] This book includes some of the only sources for photographs of Sousa's time at interlochen as well as many photographs of the traveling ensembles of Sousa, and contemporaries of Sousa like Edwin Franko Goldman and Patrick Gilmore. The book is important because the photographs provide physical evidence of the popularity of wind music and these traveling ensembles prior to the rebirth of 1952, by

---

16 Paul E Bierley. *John Philip Sousa: American Phenomenon.* (Meredith Corporation, New York, 1973).

17 Jon Newsom. ed. *Perspectives on John Philip Sousa. (*Library of Congress, Washington D.C., 1983).

showing thousands of spectators watching concerts. These photographs of concerts are important resources to observe the demographics of audiences and the places the concerts were held, ie. not a concert hall. Sousa also wrote an autobiography, which contains anecdotes and stories from his touring life and work with the American military. It is insightful and essential to understanding Sousa as a man behind the public image.[18] The Sousa section of the literature provides a context for what was happening in the American wind music scene during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

There are several books that discuss Americanism in twentieth-century music, but from an array of perspectives. A collection of essays edited by Michael Saffle[19], a history of American classical music by Barrymore Lawrence Scherer[20] and a book on western art music's role in America by John Warthen Struble[21] all discuss the state of American music in America in the first half of the twentieth century. Although they do not focus specifically on wind music, they serve as a good resource for the discussion of American modernity in music both in the orchestral community and the greater compositional and commissioning community during the early 1900s. Struble's book on American Classical Music discusses the modernity trends in the orchestral community and how the American ideas on modernity evolved from their former heavy connection to the European traditions to their more independent and unique American compositional voice with composers like Copland, Barber and Randall Thompson. The

---

[18] John Philip Sousa. *Marching Along.* (Integrity Press, Ohio, 1994).

[19] Michael Saffle. ed. *Perspectives on American Music 1900-1950.* (Garland Publishing, New York, 2000).

[20] Barrymore Lawrence Scherer. *A History of American Classical Music*. (Soucebooks, Illinois, 2007).

[21] John Warthen Struble. *The History of American Classical Music.* (Facts on File, New York, 1995).

evolution outlined by Struble is analogous to the evolution of Fennell's own ideas on modernity and repertoire.

Although these books provide a picture of Americanism in twentieth-century musical culture, they lack any connection to wind music. By combining sources and archival research on wind music in the 1950s, a much more transparent view of the evolution of wind music appears. The rise of modernism in America arrived in mainstream culture, and even mainstream musical culture, far before it was seen in wind music. It is as though the rapid growth in American modernism in the first half of the twentieth century had little to no effect on the wind band idiom. Composer-conductor John Philip Sousa almost single handedly influenced the style of wind music in America, and it was not until his death in 1932 that wind music could begin to catch up to the rest of the music community. It was Frederick Fennell and his contemporaries that brought wind music into the twentieth century with the rest of the music community. By understanding the history of American wind music, as well as the progression of modernism in non wind music in America, the process Fennell took to break the conventional mold of wind music is more defined.

A detailed biography of the life and work of Fennell illustrates when and where his ideas on repertoire and instrumentation in wind music were formed. It is through this study of Fennell as a person and individual that we can better understand his work as a pedagogue and pioneer of the wind music genre.

## Chapter 2

### Fennell Biography and Chronology

By piecing together a more coherent narrative of Fennell's life than has previously been written, we are able to understand more completely where and how he had the ideas for the musical innovations he enacted through his work with Eastman, the Interlochen Center for the Arts, and various educational organizations and facilities. By looking closely at his relationships with other musicians and conductors we can gain insight into where his influences were gained. Who was he influenced by in the years prior to the formation of the EWE? Where and when did he decide to make such a radical change in his views on wind music? To what extent did the Eastman School itself as an organization influence the aesthetic of music that Fennell was interested in? The answers to these questions lie in an analysis of his life and relationships in conjunction with an analysis of the repertoire he programmed and how he went about programming it.

Frederick Fennell was born into a musical family on July 2, 1914. Raised in Cleveland, he did not hail from a family of professional musicians, but it was nonetheless one that embraced music and which spent a great deal of time playing music together and for each other. Fennell had many memories of evenings where his extended family would gather at his house; his aunts, uncles, cousins, mother, and father would all be at a piano, strumming a guitar, or picking a banjo. Many of the conductor's early memories of family were intertwined with music. It is also from this early period in his life that he gained an appreciation and love for Civil War songs. As well as being avid amateur musicians, the men in his family were extremely fond of Civil War

reenactments and playing the music of that period. His uncle, Charles Putnam, was the founder of a local Civil War Encampment[22]; in reminiscing about this encampment, Fennell recalled how his father owned a book of civil war songs. During these reenactment weekends, they would play through the songs with young Fred singing and his father or an uncle playing the piano. Later in life, Fennell would record dozens of these songs with a variety of groups. One of these recordings (this series of songs was recorded with Mercury) became a highlight of Fennell's life when it was featured as the soundtrack to an eleven-hour PBS special on the civil war. The reviews of this recording were extremely favorable and noted Fennell's attention to period performance and accuracy. There can be thus little doubt that Fennell's early infatuation with the music of the Civil War was nurtured by his family and these reenactments. A recently released DVD video-biography contains a section in which Fennell lovingly speaks about his period instrument collection that was employed for these recordings, a collection that included the very bugle that announced the end of the Civil War.[23]

At the age of ten, Fennell was taken to a Sousa concert by his father. The concert took place in his home town of Cleveland, and it was Fennell's first introduction to the marches of Sousa. Fennell recalls the march "*Black Horse Troop"* and how Sousa had two black horses join the band on stage at the Cleveland Public Hall before the march started.[24] He considered the spectacle such an influential one that the *"Black Horse Troop"* march became one of Fennell's most recorded pieces of any genre or era. He played the piece eight times with the EWE, and two

---

22 *Frederick Fennell: A Life of Joyful Discovery.* Orange Coast Production, Costa Mesa, California, 2004.

23 *Ibid*

24 *Ibid*

times with the ESB - more than any other march.[25] This experience with Sousa and his music would be augmented by Fennell's time at Interlochen just a few short years later.

By the time Fennell entered junior high school in the late 1920s, he had become involved in school bands as a percussionist. However, his real love of percussion and music began when he entered John Adams High School in Cleveland located in south east Cleveland's Union-Miles Park area. It was here that his passion for the march form was nourished. He became the school's drum major, and embraced the march to the point that he ended a relationship with a girl because of her lack of enthusiasm for Sousa's *El Capitan*.

When he was eighteen years old, he attended the Interlochen music camp (called the National Music Camp until 1960) for the first time. At the time there was only a large outdoor bandshell stage, several residence buildings and a mess hall. Just ten years later, the camp would boast half a dozen large rehearsal halls and performance spaces, as well as equipped dorm style buildings for the campers. The Interlochen Arts Camp was first opened in 1927 under the name given to it by its founder Joseph Maddy - The National Music Camp. Located in Interlochen Michigan, the camp boasts an impressive list of alumni and perhaps and even more impressive list of current and former faculty. The camp has become a summer haven for musicians, dancers, visual artist, actors, sculptors and writers. Although it initially was focussed on music, over the past eighty-three years the camp has grown to include the top specialists in many art forms and the Interlochen Academy has become one of the most prestigious arts schools in America. Many of the most well known names in twentieth-century music have either attended the camps in their

[25] See Appendix A and B.

youth, or instructed there in adulthood. Lorin Maazel, Howard Hansen, Aaron Copland, Clyde Roller, Harvey "Van" Cliburn and Eugene Ormandy were all frequent personalities on the grounds. The camp was also a favorite stopping place for J.F. Kennedy and his wife as well as Betty Ford.[26]

In 1932, Intrelochen was in need of percussionists and Fennell had heard about the upstart music camp from his father who urged him to attend. He had also heard recordings of the National Music Camp Orchestra in radio performances of Tchaikovsky's *Romeo and Juliet*, and between his own enthusiasm after hearing the concert and his father's encouragement, he was determined to be a student there.[27] It was at this camp that Fennell met almost every person who would later have a profound influence on his life. In his first year at Interlochen, Fennell met Bill Ludwig (whose son would remain Fennell's best friend through to old age), Joe Maddy (founder of the Interlochen Music Camp), Howard Hanson and of course, Fennell's all-time idol, John Philip Sousa. Bill Ludwig was on percussion faculty at the camp when Fennell arrived in 1932. He was also founder and owner of Ludwig Drums. As a percussionist, Fennell took fondly to the man and their relationship would be a mutually beneficial one throughout Fennell's life. Joseph Maddy was the camp's founder and one of its conductors. As well as his work with Interlochen, Maddy was a very influential member of the Music Educator's National Conference, and the College Band Director's National Association. Perhaps the person he met at Interlochen who would have the most influence on Fennell's life was Howard Hanson. Hanson was the director of the

---

[26] *National Music Camp: The First Fifty Years*.

[27] *Frederick Fennell: A Life of Joyful Discovery.* Orange Coast Productions.

Eastman School of Music in Rochester New York. Not only would Hanson become Fennell's professor and mentor, he would also become his friend, confidant, and employer.

In his first year at Interlochen in 1932, the young and enthusiastic Fennell was given the opportunity by Bill Ludwig to play timpani for the Interlochen premiere of Howard Hanson's *Symphony 2 - Romantic*. This was also the year that Fennell was given the opportunity to play in an Interlochen ensemble conducted by John Philip Sousa. The final concert of the Interlochen Camp of 1932, which was attended by well over ten thousand people, included the premiere of Sousa's *Northern Pines* march as well as Howard Hanson's symphony.[28] Photos of the event show thousands of people sitting on the forest floor among trees and bushes, a testimony to the primitive architecture the camp possessed at this time.[29] It was this opportunity to play for Sousa, and the chance to work with some of the best-known wind pedagogues in America that sparked Fennell's interest and desire to pursue music. His budding relationships with Hanson, Maddy and Ludwig would shape much of his early career, and it was the Interlochen Music Camp that created the environment for Fennell to meet these distinguished musicians and form a bond with them. Perhaps most significant was his work with Sousa.

Fennell's life would be deeply impacted by his interaction with Sousa at Interlochen. He was among the percussionists, far back from the podium and sitting eagerly at the timpani. At just eighteen, it is this opportunity to play for Sousa that would define much of Frederick Fennell's life. Sousa's influence was not only felt by Fennell. His contributions to the camp and the lives of

---

[28] Dean Boal. *Interlochen: A Home for the Arts.* (The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbour, 1998). pg. 50.

[29] *National Music Camp: The First Fifty Years*.

everyone involved was extensive. Sousa was by far one of the biggest celebrities to work at the camp, but it did not come by surprise. Not only did Sousa respect Joseph Maddy a great deal, in his later years Sousa was also very fond of giving back to the band community and helping outstanding high school bands and music camps across the country. His musical relationship with Interlochen was one of his last, yet most fondly remembered ones by the attendees of the Interlochen Camp.

While at Interlochen, Fennell would have had the opportunity to hear Sousa perform many of his own marches (in the form of encores, as was his style) and dozens of other works for orchestra and band. As one of the most well-known names in the country, and with a reputation as the gold standard of wind music across the world, Sousa's presence at the National Music Camp would certainly prove influential on Fennell as well as many other Interlochen students. Although he did not live long enough to become a regular at the camp, the fact that Sousa was part of the very beginning years created a musical level that other big name composers and conductors felt they could contribute to. Sousa's love of romantic composers was clear in his repertoire choices for his own Sousa band and his bands at Interlochen; Sousa performed many works by Wagner, Liszt and even Beethoven. It was his celebrity and his showmanship however that brought financial and media recognition to the camp. As Sousa was associated with the camp almost from the very beginning, composers, conductors and performers were all very eager to attend and add their voice to the Interlochen system in the years after Sousa's death. It is quite likely that Fennell's deep respect for the work of Sousa and the repertoire he performed molded Fennell's own repertory ideas. It is reasonable to assume that Fennell was emulating the repertory standards of Sousa when he began his own ensemble conducting in 1933 at Eastman. Sousa's

heavy reliance on romantic transcriptions was a feature that Fennell did not disregard until 1952. Fennell also took his early views on showmanship and performing from Sousa. His first performance leading the marching band at Eastman in 1932 ended with Fennell theatrically throwing his baton over the goal posts. Although Fennell may have been more theatrical in his ways than Sousa, there is no doubt that Fennell would have looked to Sousa's showmanship for inspiration.[30]

It was also at Interlochen that Fennell would meet Percy Grainger. Grainger was a mainstay at every summer camp from the first years of its existence until his death in 1961. He taught piano and composition as well as occasionally conducting an ensemble through his own works.The relationships that composers like Grainger formed while working at the camp often dictated portions of what they composed. It is doubtful that Grainger's acquaintance with the young Frederick Fennell while at Interlochen did not have some effect on their later friendship and performing relationship. The two formed a bond that lasted until Grainger's death. In the Frederick Fennell archives held at Eastman's Sibley Library, there are letters between the two men that show familiarity and comfort with one another. The letters discuss future concerts, compositions, family, work and performances of Grainger's works by the EWE. The scores of Grainger's *Linconshire Posy* are filled with hand written comments from both Fennell and Grainger as they had sent the score back and forth between one another prior to recording the piece with the Mercury label. The annotations and comments include variations and ideas on phrasing, dynamics, articulation and style. There are not only annotations to the score, but also handwritten comments in the margins about concert and recording dates.

---

30 *Frederick Fennell: A Life of Joyful Discovery.*

Perhaps the most significant part of Fennell's experience at Interlochen was the opportunity to play in Howard Hanson's new work. This allowed Fennell the chance to talk to Hanson about the possibility of him attending the Eastman School of Music in the future. Hanson's *Symphony 2 "Romantic"* (1930) was a work that was commissioned by Sergei Koussevitsky for the Boston Symphony Orchestra. The orchestral work has since become the "theme song" of the Interlochen camp and the "Interlochen Theme" of the first movement is played at the end of all concerts at the camp. Perhaps it was through playing pieces like Hanson's *Symphony 2* at Interlochen that Fennell formed his early ideas on what a wind group should sound like, though in the back of his mind he heard the clarity and cleanness of a Sousa march.

Although *Symphony 2* was commissioned and conducted by Koussevitsky and the BSO, the conductor was not present at Interlochen in 1932. It is interesting that Fennell would very soon form a mentorship with the conductor at the Tanglewood Summer Camp. Fennell's friendship with Hanson as well as Koussevitsky's connection to Hanson very well may have served as a stepping stone to create the mentorship between the young Fennell and the older Koussevitsky. Fennell's ideas on repertoire would certainly have been influenced by both Hanson and Koussevitsky. These two men provided Fennell with some of his earliest ideas on repertoire. Although both Koussevitsky and Hanson were advocates of new and modern music, both men were of a generation old enough to still have a heavy repertory reliance on the orchestral powerhouses of the nineteenth century. Brahms, Wagner, Tchaikovsky, and Elgar were all well represented in their concert programs. Perhaps it was the influence of these two men, as well as other advocates of nineteenth-century orchestral music (Sousa), that formed Fennell's earliest

ideas on repertoire and how the "band" could best interpret them. The concert programs of the ESB support Fennell's orchestral influences.[31]

After Fennell's enriching experiences at Interlochen, he decided to pursue a career as a percussionist and conductor. In 1932, the Eastman School of Music was one of the only schools in the United States that offered a Bachelor of Music in Percussion and Theory degree and Fennell wanted to take advantage of this opportunity. In that same year, Howard Hanson admitted him to the Eastman School of Music, thus beginning Fennell's almost 70-year relationship with the school.

Fennell as a Student at Eastman

The first few years at Eastman marked another exciting period of Fennell's life. During his first year as a percussionist, he formed the first Eastman marching band. Fennell was shocked to learn that there was no wind band of any sort at Eastman at the time. He had approached the head of the football department in hopes of joining the marching band, and when he learned of the schools lack of a band, he immediately offered to form one.[32] The ensemble was made up of enthusiastic wind players assembled by Fennell to play at the school's football games. The vast majority of the repertoire the group played consisted of marches by Sousa. Fennell was fond of these marches and knew them very well. When Hanson heard the group play at a game in 1935, he insisted that Fennell give a concert in the main hall at the end of the year. From 1935 onward

---

31 See Appendix A

32 *Frederick Fennell: A Life of Joyful Discovery.*

the foundations of wind music and Fennell's love of marches became an integral part of the school's musical identity. In the marching band's second full year as an ensemble (1934), the school began to finance the group so that it could purchase music and pay for transportation to and from games and concerts. Named the Eastman Symphony Band in 1935, it started Fennell's conducting career at Eastman. It was this ensemble that almost twently years later became breeding ground for Fennell's thoughts on wind music and repertoire, thus giving life to the Eastman Wind Ensemble.

As a result of Fennell's success with the Eastman Marching Band/Eastman Symphony Band, the conductor of the Rochester Philharmonic asked him to fill in during rehearsal times when he was away, or when the conductor (Eugene Goossens) wanted to go out into the hall to hear how the ensemble sounded from any row. Fennell's time with the Rochester Philharmonic functioned as an unacknowledged mentorship and training program. It was not formal, but his time with the group and the lessons he learned there would catapult him into his professional career some years later. The information regarding Fennell's work with the Rochester Philharmonic is gathered solely from fragments of information in the Fennell Archive at Eastman. Though he discusses conducting in several rehearsals and providing insight for Maestro Goossens from the hall, Fennell does not write many specifics about his relationship with the Rochester Philharmonic or Maestro Goossens. Presumably he would have at some point conducted the group in concert, and he certainly maintained a relationship with the orchestra once he was an established conductor living in Rochester. Although there are no specific references to the repertoire of the group, it can be assumed that the repertoire of the philharmonic would have been made up of the orchestral standards played by any other

American Orchestra at the time. A heavy reliance on nineteenth-century repertory can be expected as this was standard among every orchestra in the United States at the time. Perhaps it is from these early interactions as a conductor that Fennell's initial interest in romantic music was again nurtured. The vast majority of his early career was concerned with conducting transcriptions of romantic orchestral works.

Fennell graduated from Eastman with a Masters in Music Theory degree in 1939 with a thesis on the orchestral development of the kettledrum from Purcell through Beethoven.[33] That same year he was also asked to join both the faculty of Eastman and the Interlochen Music Camp. At 25, Fennell was already the occasional substitute conductor of the Rochester Philharmonic. Happily married to Dorothy Codner, a conductor at the National Music Camp, Fennell also had several successful guest conductor positions and was now on a faculty member of the Eastman School of Music.

In 1942, Fennell began studying with Sergei Koussevitsky at the Tanglewood Summer Institute. At Tanglewood, he met other young conductors like Leonard Bernstein and Lukas Foss. His time at Tanglewood with Koussevitsky was the most formative of his young adult life. He established a deep bond with the conductor and for the rest of Koussevitsky's life, Fennell was constantly turning to the aging Russian for advice, recommendations and opportunities. The letters between "Koussey" (as he was known to his pupils) and Fennell, show how deeply the young conductor admired and unabashedly adored the older man. In each letter Fennell praises the maestro for his brilliance and his conviction of style in his music. Fennell often signed the

---

[33] Frederick Fennell. "Orchestral Development of the Kettledrum from Purcell through Beethoven." PhD diss. University of Rochester, 1939.

letters with an affectionate "Ever Faithfully Yours, Frederick." In the Fennell Archive, there are seventeen letters between the two men. Though it is obvious that there were correspondences between the two that are not held in this archive, and that they were meeting in person sporadically for a number of years after Fennell's initial training with "Koussey," the letters span about ten years. The first letter (sent March 24, 1942), simply tells the conductor how happy he had been to work with him at Tanglewood the previous summer. The last letter was sent in 1949, just over a year before Koussevitsky's death. The bulk of the letters were sent between 1943 and 1945.[34]

Although he and his conducting mentor parted ways over the next several years, Fennell began to blossom as a conductor and educator. He spent a couple of years in military service during the war, working with the army. He rose through the musical ranks to become a bandmaster on the base in Southern California where he was stationed and was named National Music Advisor for the North West with the United Service Organization.[35]

A few years before the war, Fennell became heavily involved with the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA). The CBDNA was originally a committee of the Music Educators National Conference, but under the leadership of William D. Revelli, the group became its own entity in 1938.[36] The group's mandate was to provide a place for college band directors to meet and discuss ensembles, repertoire, ideas, and for directors to network and connect with one another. Many of the faculty of the Interlochen Camp were also members of

---

[34] Held at the Eastman Fennell Archives. Box. 157, folder. 1.

[35] *Frederick Fennell: A Life of Joyful Discovery.*

[36] http://www.cbdna.org/cgi-bin/about3.pl

the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), an organization founded prior to the National Music Camp. MENC eventually became known as the National Association for Music Education and later formed the core of the College Band Directors National Association. Both MENC and the CBDNA were at times led and presided by Frederick Fennell. Although its activities began outside the confines of the Interlochen camp in 1907, MENC nonetheless played an important role in the formation of the Interlochen camps and Interlochen served as a convenient summer meeting place for many of the members. Several times during the history of the camp, the Interlochen grounds also served as the MENC conference site. The ideas brought forth by Sousa regarding the music education of youth and his passion for teaching were carried forward at Interlochen and through the work of Fennell and organizations like MENC. Just months before his death, Fennell was filmed for a series of interviews that would become his video biography.[37] In the film he outlines his philosophy on making music and conducting. It was a philosophy that he very well may have learned and adapted from Sousa's own philosophy on teaching music, but it was a philosophy that he practiced his whole musical life.

> "Your business is to make music with the people in front of you. It doesn't matter who they are, it's the people in front of you that you make music with. It might be the Cleveland Orchestra, it might be a Junior High School that has only been together for three months. You make music with the people in front of you. That's been my philosophy."[38]

Fennell was associated with many musical education entities; he no doubt spread his philosophy to as many music educators as he could.

---

[37] *Frederick Fennell: A Life of Joyful Discovery*

[38] Ibid

It may not have been until his later years, but Sousa seemed to advocate a similar approach in the years just prior to his death. Not only was Sousa an advocate and active participant in summer camps like Interlochen, but he was also a tireless clinician for Junior High, High School, and university-level bands across the United States. This type of work is something that Fennell wholeheartedly embraced from the time he was very young until his death.

Fennell as an Orchestral Conductor

When reading the letters and documents in the Frederick Fennell Collection, a clear image of the private persona of Fennell begins to form. It becomes obvious what he was trying to achieve as a musician, and how he planned to go about doing it. Through his letters with his conducting mentor Sergei Koussevitsky (regardless of how briefly they actually worked together), it is evident that Fennell was trying to break into not only the orchestral world, but also the top echelon of conductors that made up the pantheon of orchestral conducting during the 1950s and 1960s. As an acquaintance and former colleague of Leonard Bernstein, Fennell repeatedly expressed his happiness for "Lenny's" success, but also his desire to be active in the same circles. It was not truly jealousy that Fennell wrote about in these letters between himself and Koussevitsky, but rather a longing to be acknowledged as an equal to Bernstein.[39] On August 19, 1944, he wrote to Koussevitsky to tell him that he was proud of Lenny's meteoric rise. Fennel continued "If in all ways I continue to work hard, perhaps that chance will come. It must."[40]

---

[39] Koussevitsky was also a mentor for Bernstein. In fact, it was under Koussevitsky's baton that the two young conductors met. It was in the percussion section of a Tanglewood performance of Shostakovich's Seventh Symphony, while Bernstein was playing bass drum, that the two nicknamed the old conductor "Koussey." - Handwritten note by Fennell in the Eastman Fennell Archive. Dated November, 1989.

[40] Telegraph note between Koussevitsky and Fennell. Dated August 19, 1944. Held at the Eastman Fennell Archives. Box. 157, folder. 1.

It was not for lack of initiative that Fennell never gained such a prestigious foothold in the orchestral conducting world. Between 1942 and 1949, he requested close to a dozen recommendations letters from Koussevitsky for guest conducting positions, assistant conducting positions, and principal conductor positions at a very wide variety of B level American orchestras. New Orleans, Houston, and Salt Lake City all turned him down. Fennell even attempted to work his way into the Houston Symphony by having Howard Hanson's father-in-law talk to the board of directors there given his influence via Gulf Oil, which at the time had a large stake in the finances of the Houston orchestra .[41] Fennell's most important position with Houston, however, was a short tenure as guest conductor during the 1948 season.

Fennell's time at Tanglewood with Koussevitsky did produce one intermittent job for the young man. Arthur Fiedler, Koussevitsky, and the Boston Symphony had put on a waltz conducting contest/concert one night as a fun evening activity at Tanglewood. "Lenny" and Lukas Foss won the contest, but the BSO was impressed by Fennell's conducting and asked if he would like to conduct the Boston Pops, resulting in Fennell occasionally conducting the Boston Pops until Fiedler's retirement in 1980.[42]

Despite these few promising professional opportunities, by 1947 Fennell's relationship with Koussevitsky and the larger orchestral community was already becoming strained. Fennell was not gaining the reputation he desperately wanted through association with America's major orchestras and he was left in limbo as a conductor. In 1947, at age 33, he had accomplished more

---

[41] Handwitten note between Koussevitsky and Fennell. Dated May 10, 1947. Held at the Eastman Fennell Archives. Box. 157, folder. 1.

[42] *Frederick Fennell: A Life of Joyful Discovery.*

than most young conductors, but his professional trajectory had stalled. He had worked with the Rochester Philharmonic before he turned 30. He had also begun teaching at both Eastman and Interlochen while gaining a great deal of renown as a conductor and connoisseur of Sousa and wind music (with his work with the USO bands and Tanglewood *On Parade* Band started under Koussevitsky's encouragement, being chief among these accolades), but what he was clearly trying to gain respect for was his orchestral conducting. Time and time again he was declined for positions at orchestras across the country. While reading the correspondences between the young conductor and his mentor, an awkward and often one-sided narrative begins to form.

Fennell wrote long and adoring letters to his 'master,' only to get one-sentence replies in return. In 1946, Fennell asked Koussevitsky if he could return to Tanglewood for the summer to study with him, to which Koussevitsky replied "...[T]here is nothing really for you to do here."[43] After 1952, Fennell rarely decided to write to the conductor himself and often chose to write to his wife Olga to inform her of future concerts and recordings in hopes that she will pass the information on to her husband. The letters and relationship between Koussevitsky and Fennell are a microcosm for his relationship with the orchestral community in general. Fennell, it seemed, was ever the outsider knocking on the window trying to get the attention of the people inside to let him into the party. He never truly gained the level of renown that he clearly was trying to achieve in his youth. This is as evident in the number of high profile conducting jobs for which he applied but was often not even considered.

---

[43] Telegram note between Koussevitsky and Fennell. Dated Jan. 4, 1946. Held at the Eastman Fennell Archives. Box. 157, folder. 1.

Fennell and the CBDNA

In 1951, Fennell parted ways with the founders of the CBDNA with whom he had had such a close relationship. At this point in his development, he began to dream of an entirely new ensemble that could function as a catalyst for composers to create a new genre of wind music. In the early 1950s he was disappointed with the direction the CBDNA was taking in regards to the promotion of wind music. Although the members of the CBDNA were close friends and colleagues, many of whom he had met and formed relationships with in his youth, he believed that they were not supportive enough of American wind music outside the genre of marches and transcriptions of both orchestral works and American folk tunes set for band. When he brought his concerns to the CBDNA conference, they argued that composers were not writing for band because no one could understand the specifics of writing for *band* groups. The lack of defined instrumentation and functional use of *bands* was indeed a mystery to even the founders of the CBDNA. The debate over the standardization of what a *band* was and was meant to be is essentially the question of whether a band is utilitarian or if it is a vehicle for high art. It is the difference between a marching band which only plays on the field for the entertainment of the football fans and a wind ensemble which does not perform on the field, but rather in a hall. In the minds of the 1950s CBDNA council, the purpose and placement of bands within the larger whole of American music had yet to be defined. The constant use of concert hall bands on the football field playing fight songs and marches did little to ease confusion. It was also not helpful for composers to write pieces when each ensemble had a different idea of instrumentation and size. For what venue were they to write? For what instrumentation? Were the parts being doubled or was it to be one to a part? Were they to write in an orchestral style for winds, or in a military

band style? When these questions were posed to Fennell by the other members of the CBDNA, Fennell replied "Who the hell knows!" Frederick Fennell proposed that wind music did not need to be utilitarian in function. He argued that wind music was lacking the clarity that standardization could bring. Standardization in instrumentation and function was essential to the wind ensemble. Without it, there was no way for the genre to grow and gain recognition.

The CBDNA board included some of the most distinguished wind conductors of Fennell's day, but they were (unlike Fennell), older and more set in their ways. William D Revelli was one of these distinguished conductors. He was the director of bands at the University of Michigan beginning in 1935. Not only was he a past president of the CBDNA and ever prevalent figure, Raymond Dvorak and Mark Hindsley were both still present and active in the group. These conductors formed the older generation of the CBDNA that would be replaced in the coming years by younger and more forward thinking members. This group included presidents like Fennell (1956-1958), but also his star pupil Donald Hunsberger (1985-1987), Frank Battisti (1979-1981), David Whitwell (1975-1977), Craig Kirchhoff (1993-1995), and H. Robert Reynolds (1983-1985) (who inherited the University of Michigan bands after Revelli's retirement).[44]

The Formation of the EWE

It was at this point that Fennell created the Eastman Wind Ensemble. In September 1952, he held the first rehearsal for the new group, which was made up entirely of students specifically

[44] http://www.cbdna.org/cgi-bin/about24.pl, accessed June 14. 2012.

asked to be in the ensemble. In Fennell's ten years as principal conductor of the group, he only auditioned for three positions, and he made sure that every player understood that an invitation to play in the ensemble was not based on seniority in any way. The group of invited individuals made up a revolutionary ensemble, a "one-to-a-part" ensemble of winds and percussion. The instrumentation would be varied dependent on repertoire, and the instrumentation would be tailored to fit every situation. Fennell sent out dozens of invitations to composers across the world inviting them to write for this new ensemble. He gave a blank slate to composers to write for whatever combination of winds and percussion they desired, but asked them to keep it to one to a part. Fennell believed that many of the problems in the repertoire for band were rooted in the established notion that a band was to have multiples of every part being played. This created an often clumsy and cumbersome sound. Fennell's ideal was to create an ensemble that was able to have moments of deep rich sound, followed by light and soloistic playing not possible when each part has five or six people playing it. As I highlight in the following chapter, unlike the EWE, the repertoire of the Eastman Symphony Band conserved the tradition of playing works written for the tripling and quadrupling of instruments on parts. As can be seen in Appendix A, the repertoire of the ESB was focussed on transcriptions of the great Romantic composers. When playing a transcription of Wagner, this number of instrumental doublings lends itself well to creating the perception of strings in the timbre of the ensemble, even though it does not help create a light and soloistic sound. The EWE was a revolution in the soundscape of wind bands and the difference in sonorities between the large, cumbersome ESB and the light, agile EWE was extraordinary.

After the first year of the EWE, the group gained recognition within the wind world. Conductors across America took note of the radically different ideological, and therefore aesthetic, evolution happening at Eastman. Fennell only invited performers to the ensemble who could be held up as soloists in any other venue. In Fennell's mind he was creating a "supergroup" of soloists coming together to play as an ensemble. Over the next five years, the EWE became the model for most of the university bands across America. The face of Fennell and the EWE became the face of Eastman, leading Howard Hanson to believe that the EWE made Eastman the name it became in years to come. The rigorous recording schedule of the group and the cross-country touring made the Eastman school less insular and confined to Rochester. The record deal struck between the school and Mercury records in the early 1950s made the EWE a well-known name in every band room in North America.

EWE Mercury Recordings

The record deal with Eastman and Mercury Records was finalized in 1951. Though the record deal was with the Eastman School and not Fennell or the EWE, Fennell's personal relationship with the head of classical recordings at Mercury flourished. The record deal was originally for 21 recordings of Eastman School of Music ensembles, but it was up to Howard Hanson to decide the percentage of these recordings that would go to the EWE. David Hall, head of classical records at Mercury, was himself a great lover of wind music and an avid wind musician himself. After he left Mercury, Hall published many of his own articles on wind music in well-known music education journals. He also published a series of articles in the "Music

Educators Journal" in the mid to late 1960s, on various topics relating to the recording industry.[45] Hall also wrote extensive journal articles on recording technology for *Notes* after he retired from Mercury's classical division in the mid-1960s. As a lover of the genre, it is natural that Fennell and Hall formed such a deep bond. Hall had a huge amount of influence at Mercury, and he used this in several ways and contributed to creating what became to be known as the Mercury sound and image. This ranged from repertoire choices to editing and engineering. Not only did Hall argue for the majority of the contract recordings with Eastman to be allotted to the EWE, but he had great sway over Fennell in terms of the pieces they were to record with the group. Fennell and Hall had friends in different publishing companies both in Europe and America. The two men would constantly receive scores from these companies hoping to profile new works by that company's composer. There are over a dozen letters exchanged between Hall and Fennell in the early 1950s that outline the decisions concerning which pieces were to be recorded. More often than not, those pieces which were not part of the pre-existing wind music canon were chosen because the publisher had been pushing to have it recorded. In a series of letters from 1954, Hall and Fennell discuss recording the brass music of Wallingford Reigger. The problem with recording it lay in that another unnamed recording company was also being pushed by the publishers to record Reigger's brass music. The letters show that Mercury decided to record Howard Hanson's *Chorale and Alleluia* - an equally significant repertoire choice given Hanson's position as head of Eastman and who no doubt thought the inclusion of his work would be a good addition to the publicity of the school.[46]

---

[45] *The Music Educators Journal* was published by MENC. These connections between MENC, the recording industry, other committees like the CBDNA and conductors like Fennell are important to remember when piecing together the influences on one another. It is no wonder that Fennell was originally seen as a wind band iconoclast, when every other arm of the wind music community was interconnected to one another.

[46] Telegraph notes between Hall and Fennell. Dated 1954. Held at the Eastman Fennell Archives. Box. 153, folder. 1

The formula for the first several of Fennell's Mercury recordings was a simple one. The repertoire was decided by theme. The first recordings by the EWE were thematically focussed on either composer or a genre. The EWE recorded an album of Sousa marches, followed by an album of British band classics, in which each record was carefully put together by Hall and Fennell to express a very specific area of the wind music repertoire. The various repertoire choices and how they came about are further explained later in the chapter. Several times, it should be noted, a piece was discarded based solely on its length and if it was too short, there would be extra room; if it were too long it would not fit on the record. Of course, this editing of repertoire was not done without careful thought and consideration for the direction in which the recordings of the EWE were headed. Each decision was thoughtfully decided upon, but occasionally the deciding factor had little to do with an artistic choice and more to do with practicalities of the recording industry at the time. Long play records were still fairly new technology in the beginning years of the Mercury EWE recordings - having been introduced in late 1948.

In his 1982 dissertation on the development of the wind ensemble in the United States, David Allen Milburn at times chastises Fennell and the EWE for their disconnect between what Fennell was programming in the concert hall and what they were recording. He accuses Fennell of not having as clear an ideology about repertoire as he claimed to have.[47] The early recordings with the EWE are indeed more focussed on the repertoire that military bands, British brass bands and concert bands had been playing for decades, but the reason for this disconnect had far less to do with Fennell and Eastman and much more to do with Mercury and David Hall. Six different

---

[47] David Allen Milburn. *The Development of the Wind Ensemble In The United States (1952-1981)*,PhD. Diss. (The Catholic University of America, Washington D.C, 1982). Pg. 116.

letters sent between Fennell and Hall between September 1953 and July of 1954 discuss repertoire choices for the records. Each one of these correspondences ends with Fennell and Hall deciding on repertoire purely on a marketability basis and not an artistic one. Both men are very aware that, although they were given the funding to produce whichever records they would like, the recording company, publishing company, and Howard Hanson disagreed with the repertoire choices of the concert hall EWE being recorded as the outward representation of the group.

In letters dated September 1953, Fennell and Hall decided that they should not include a Sousa march on the upcoming record because Fennell was aware of five other records that had been released in the last year that contained a Sousa march.[48] In subsequent letters the two decided to comply with the opinions of the publishing and recording companies and include a selection of Reigger's brass music. The piece was later dropped because an entirely new program was created later in 1954 for the album that eventually was released as *Hindemith - Schoenberg - Stravinsky*, a record that featured a major wind work by each of the three composers.[49]

Although Fennell never became friendly with Sousa, and indeed only met him a handful of times as a youth at the Interlochen camps, Fennell's recording legacy was notheless in part defined by Sousa and his music. One only needs to look through the Mercury catalogue of Fennell recordings with the Eastman Wind Ensemble to realize that a very large portion of everything Fennell recorded was written by Sousa. In Roger E. Rickson's study of Fennell, a complete list of Fennell recordings is provided along with the repertoire, liner notes and specifics

---

[48] Letters between Frederick Fennell and David Hall. Dated September 19, 1953 through July 1954 held in the Eastman Fennell Archive. Box 153, folder 1.

[49] Roger E Rickson. *Ffortissimo: A Bio-Discography of Frederick Fennell.* (Cleveland, Ohio, Ludwig Publishing Company. 1993). pg. 24.

of the recording of each album.[50] When cross referencing this catalogue with Frank Cipolla and Donald Hunsberger's book *The Wind Ensemble and its Repertoire* which lists the first ten years of EWE concert programs, Fennell's obsession with Sousa becomes clear.[51] The bio-discography provides letters to and from Fennell between pages of recordings that are occasionally connected to specific recordings.

In a letter to David Hall in September 1953[52], Fennell raised the question of Sousa. As a good friend of Fennell's, Hall believed it was necessary to ask why Fennell had insisted on recording Sousa marches so many times. In fact over Fennell's career, he released fourteen different Sousa albums that often had significantly overlapping track lists. Hall questioned why the repetition was needed, to which Fennell replied that it was because they were never perfect. Fennell told Hall that he is the only one concerned enough with the material itself to try and record it as perfectly as possible. He further explains that the vast majority of conductors do not consider the marches of Sousa as anything but simple marches. There is an idea that Sousa marches are simple and almost frivolous. Fennell saw deeper into the music of the surface simplicity of a Sousa march and searched for the musicality held underneath the thin facade of how most ensembles across America played these pieces. He believed that there was a purity in Sousa's writing and the continuous recording of the marches was an attempt to find that cleanliness of sound he was after. Through the recording techniques of Mercury (as they were some of the early pioneers of digital recordings), and the extreme attention to detail of sound in

---

50 Idem.

51 Frank Cipolla and Donald Hunsberger ed. *The Wind Ensemble and its Repertoire: Essays on the Fortieth Anniversary of the Eastman Wind Ensemble.* pg 230.

52 Letter between Frederick Fennell and David Hall, Dated September 19, 1953. Held at the Eastman Fennell Archives. Box. 153, folder. 1.

which Fennell was unwavering, the EWE began to form its own unique soundscape. It was possibly Fennell's obsessive love of all things Sousa, and his lifetime of reading and research on marches that allowed him to have a greater insight into the musicality of these marches than anybody else. The technology itself undoubtedly played a large part in helping Fennell achieve his desired soundscape for the EWE. At the same time that Fennell was attempting to refine the sound of the cumbersome old style "band," recording technology was allowing for finer nuance in sound and recording. David Hall was a pioneer in the field, and was a huge asset to Fennell as a second pair of ears. With the help of Hall and the new digital technologies he worked with, the clean and clear sounds Fennell was attempting to create were successful.[53] Between Fennell's new instrumentation and focus on true wind ensemble repertoire, and Hall's recording technology innovations, the records became shining examples of clarity and precision.

As a great lover of Sousa, in the first three years of the EWE, Fennell performed seventeen Sousa pieces in concert. In comparison, the next two most frequent composers in Fennell's concert programs are Morton Gould and J.S Bach (Gould with seven compositions in three years and Bach with six).[54] In terms of repertoire style, thirty-seven marches were played in the first three years of concerts, as well as twenty-nine transcriptions of classical works and pieces written for harmoniemusik ensemble or chamber winds. The rest of the compositions performed were wind ensemble standards such as of *Suite of Old American Dances* and *Toccata Marziale.*[55] The lists in Appendix A and B, in combination with the Mercury Records recording catalogue portray

---

53 David Hall. "The Non-available Recording" *Music Educator's Journal, vol. 50, no. 1, 1963.* pg. 136-138.

54 Frank Cipolla and Donald Hunsberger ed. *The Wind Ensemble and its Repertoire.* pg 230-232.

55 Ibid. pg 230-232.

a distinct bias towards marches and march music, with a considerable portion of those marches being Sousa marches.

It is important to note that in the forward to *The Wind Ensemble and its Repertoire*, the authors confirm that the first two years of recording with Mercury did not include transcriptions or pieces of variable instrumentation. At the national level, with advice coming from groups like MENC and the CBDNA, band directors were being told to advocate standardized band instrumentation and repertoire, and Fennell's idea of the variable instrumentation and repertoire of a wind ensemble was not easy to accept. This explains why the first several years of concerts at Eastman featured transcriptions and variable instrumentation which allowed for performances of Mozart's *Serenade in B-flat* and several Gabrielli Canzonas while the recordings of the EWE and Fennell were much more heavily focussed on standard *band* repertoire and marches. In essence, although Fennell was free to be experimental with his repertoire choices for live EWE concerts in Rochester, either the Eastman School or Mercury Records was initially hesitant when it came to recording the international and increasingly public image of the Eastman School which was fast becoming the flagship ensemble for wind music everywhere.

Mercury Records often had their own ideas of which pieces to include based on length, the popularity of a composer, new commissions versus older commissions, whether or not a composer's works were being recorded by other labels or even whether or not a composer's works were being recorded on the same label by another ensemble. In the many letters between Fennell and Hall held at Sibley Library, it becomes clear that repertoire choices for Mercury Records were dictated by these factors. Several times in discussions between Fennell and Hall the issue of

composition and composer comes up. To include another piece by Grainger on a record would be carefully considered based on the lists of recent recordings and releases of the other Mercury classical ensembles. Mercury's classical label was also recording Detroit, Chicago, and Minneapolis Orchestras as well as the Rochester Philharmonic.[56]

By analyzing the early recordings of the EWE, and comparing them with the concert programs of the EWE, the personal writings of Fennell and the correspondences between the record label and Fennell, it is clear that although Fennell had in many ways made a distinct and radical shift in repertoire and instrumentation, his ideas were still in formation. Mercury and the Eastman School still had a great deal of influence over the recordings made by the EWE, yet, Fennell's concert hall choices were almost entirely his own. The combination paints a picture of Fennell as a person not yet steadfast in his beliefs - at least not in the very first years of the EWE. Milburn's criticism of Fennell's repertoire choices is not an attempt to undermine the high level thought process that Fennell put into his work with the first years of the EWE, rather it is a statement to show that perhaps his views and ideas were not formed in as small a microcosm as the other literature would have one believe.

Fennell as an Author

In 1954, Fennell published the first of his three books on wind music. This first book, entitled *Time and the Winds* was written over the summer of 1953 in a cabin at Interlochen between conducting ensembles. The book outlined a brief history of wind music across

[56] Letter between Frederick Fennell and David Hall, dated July 28th 1954. Held at the Eastman Fennell Archives. Box. 153, folder. 1.

continents and through the several hundred years of wind music performance - from the Renaissance to present day. The book began the difficult process of demystifying wind music and its history. As one of the first modern books dedicated to the history of wind music, written by a wind musician, *Time and the Winds* paved the way for later, more prolific authors/conductors like David Whitwell to write similar histories. The other books Fennell would write were to be more practical and pragmatic in the world of winds. His book, entitled *A Conductor's Interpretive Analysis of Masterworks for Band,* focussed on score study and his various techniques employed delve into the meaning of the score. It is to this day often on the reading lists of both orchestral and wind conducting programs. He was also a prolific article writer for the *Instrumentalist* journal. He wrote periodically on topics like the Holst Suites, Sousa, band repertory, the Civil War, conducting, and percussion related topics. The last of these was published just a few years before his death. He also published writings for other periodicals and journals on wind music, music education, conducting and historical practice. He was a very prolific writer despite his extremely rigorous conducting and teaching schedule.

One of Fennell's most lasting and important writings were his liner notes to the albums that he recorded with the EWE and the Tokyo Kosei Wind Orchestra. The tracks on these albums often included little known, and rarely written about pieces. The liner notes written by Fennell provide insight into these compositions that is hard to find elsewhere. At the very least it was information not easily found in the 1950s. Fennell's notes and thoughts on the programs he recorded (with the help of David Hall at Mercury) are held in the *Ffortissimo* album information

book.[57] These liner notes are extensive and provide information about the compositions, composers, circumstances for composition and interesting details.

Fennell Leaves Eastman

In 1962, Fennell's ambitions to be an orchestral conductor were rewarded, if only for a short while. He decided to leave Eastman and accept a position as the assistant conductor for the Minneapolis Orchestra under Stanislaw Skrowaczewski who was Music Director at the time. It was not an easy decision for the man who had spent close to 30 years attached to the School as either a student or professor. When Fennell sent his letter of resignation to Howard Hanson (who was still the director of the School), Hanson responded that Fennell could name his price and the School would pay it. Unfortunately for Eastman, Minneapolis was offering $18 000 for just thirty weeks of work.[58] The School could not match this, and it is likely that even if they could, Fennell would have taken the other position anyway. Fennell took this opportunity to become the conductor he had wanted to be. A year into the position however, he found himself mostly conducting pops concerts and rarely taking the role of conducting the more standard repertoire that Skrowaczewski was able to conduct. The relationship between Skrowaczewski and Fennell was also not overly friendly. Fennell often felt that he was looked at by the main conductor as an assistant in charge of menial tasks and not truly as a conductor and equal.[59] It did not help the

---

[57] Rickson. *Ffortissimo: A bio-discography of Frederick Fennell.*

[58] Contract between Minneapolis Symphony and Frederick Fennell held in the Eastman Fennell Archives. Box 157, folder 10.

[59] A document in Fennell's hand not addressed to anyone describes his frustration with Skrowaczewski and his position at Minneapolis. He expresses his anger that Skrowaczewski's picture is larger in programs and that Skrowaczewski thinks of him with distaste. Dated December 1962. Held in the Eastman Fennell Archives. Box. 157, folder 10.

dynamic that Skrowaczewski was almost ten years younger than Fennell. Skrowaczewski had studied with Nadia Boulanger, George Szell, and had worked with the Krakow and Warsaw Symphonies. This was again a relationship in Fennell's life where he had cause to be jealous.

Fennell was only with the Minneapolis Symphony for two years. He left the job in 1964 to work for the University of Miami. While there he founded their wind program and occasionally conducted with the Miami Orchestra. He then had his one real opportunity at orchestral conducting with the Minneapolis Symphony and when that failed he spent most of the rest of his life accepting his status as a wind musician and conductor that occasionally was given the opportunity to conduct a professional orchestra.

By 1970, Fennell was the occasional conductor of the Miami Philharmonic and had a job as head of bands at the University of Miami. He had also divorced his first wife Dorothy in 1970, and married Lynn Doherty from Pleasantville, New York, also in 1970. Fennell would have this marriage annulled eleven years later. Between 1975-1985, Fennell became a world wide name in wind conducting, leading ensembles like the Dallas Winds and the Tokyo Kosei Wind Orchestra. The latter of these two groups would become his second brainchild after the EWE. His time with the TKWO left as much an impression on them as it did him. By the time of his death in 2004, he had become very attached to both the TKWO and Japan itself and he spent a great deal of his time living there. A great number of correspondences held in the Eastman Fennell Archive were routed through Japan by Fennell's secretaries in the States. In 1986, Fennell married his third wife Elizabeth Ludwig. She was a music publisher, and they were married until Fennell's death in 2004. Elizabeth Ludwig-Fennell Passed away in 2007.

In the chronology of Fennell's life, it is easiest to think of him first as a young man trying to establish himself as an orchestral conductor while conducting wind bands to support himself artistically and financially. This gave way to him throwing himself into the wind genre completely in 1952 with the formation of the EWE. Fennell was trying to legitimize his musical existence through his attempts at orchestral conducting fame. Wind music at the time was not considered remotely on the same artistic level as orchestral and if he had any hope of making a name for himself as a conductor, the only accepted path was through the orchestra. Although he would not realize it for years after the fact, by creating the EWE and its model, Fennell chose the path to fame that he did not know existed.

## Chapter 3

### Fennell and the Eastman Symphony Band and the Eastman Wind Ensemble

The EWE was created by Fennell during the most prosperous and inventive period of his life. The ensemble represented his changing views on music, and he tailored the ensemble's instrumentation, players, and repertoire to highlight the new sound of winds in America. He began to see the old forms of wind bands as antiquated, cumbersome and out of touch with the rest of musical culture in America and abroad. He took it upon himself to update and revolutionize the purpose of wind music. Although Fennell absolutely revered Sousa, he also realized that the traditionalism that the latter represented was impeding progress. Fennell wrote that Sousa,

> ...created the image of bands as purveyors of less than serious music to audiences that came primarily to be entertained rather than aesthetically uplifted. Due in part to the tradition begun by Sousa, the band has come to be known as an unartistic, utilitarian, and entertaining music organization, still hidebound with traditionalism, even to the point of wearing military uniforms on the concert stage and often still obliged to conform to the programmatic tradition conceived and nurtured by Sousa during the era of vaudeville.[60]

Although he had been conducting band at Eastman since 1933, Fennell's greatest contribution to wind music began in 1952 with the formation of the Eastman Wind Ensemble. Fennell's idea for the ensemble came to him as he lay in a hospital bed recovering from Hepatitis in 1951. He wrote to an unnamed friend in the mid 1980s, thirty years after the group's formation, that he had dreamt of a clean and clear sound that was made up of an ensemble one

---

[60] Frederick Fennell. "Hardy Perennial: Bands in the Open." *Musical America. Vol. 81. July 1961.* Pg. 17.

to a part.[61] He dreamt of an entirely different set of repertoire being performed and a new audience. He believed this new repertoire and new instrumentation would change the way people viewed wind music and he believed that it would gain a reputation among the more *classical* and established music scenes as a legitimate high art form. Even in 1964 (twelve years after Fennell began the EWE), the CBDNA council was still discussing the possibility of a concert of wind music without transcriptions or adaptations. The CBDNA could not fully grasp a concert of music written expressly for a large ensemble of winds without having to fill the concert with transcriptions of orchestral works.[62] Though Fennell's ideas on instrumentation and repertoire grew rapidly in his mind while recovering in the hospital, I will show that the drastic shift in his thinking about winds and wind music was born in his earlier repertoire choices with other ensembles at the Eastman School prior to his starting the EWE in 1952.

Fennell's Ideology on Repertoire and Sound

To say that Frederick Fennell viewed the creation of the wind ensemble as a step in the modernization of wind music, consciously trying to distance itself from the dense and weighted sonorities of the pre-WWII classical music scene, is evident in his repertoire choices for the EWE. Although modernism was a well established artistic idea by the 1950s when Fennell created the EWE, it was an ideology that had not yet truly been encountered in the wind music community or in ensembles that played wind music. The Sousian model of ensemble had never really been challenged and by 1952 it was the dominant (if not only) model of wind group that existed in

[61] Handwritten document in the Eastman Fennell Archives. Not addressed and date assumed to be mid 1980s based on other documents in the folder being dated between 1983-1987. Box. 158, folder 6.

[62] David Allen Milburn. *The Development of the Wind Ensemble In The United States (1952-1981).* pg. 59.

both the university systems and the traveling wind bands that still occasionally toured the United States. Of course the Sousa band itself stopped touring as its original incarnation after Sousa's death in 1932, but fractured groups and rival wind bands like the Goldman and Gilmour bands were still relatively popular. They consisted of several players to a part, included saxophones and euphoniums, and played a repertoire of vastly military based music (ie. marches), orchestral transcriptions and transcriptions of American standards of the day.

In contrast to Fennell's idea of a wind ensemble, these ensembles would routinely grow to numbers of a hundred or more. The repertoire they played was also geared toward this large and dense ensemble. The programs from the University of Michigan Concert Band concerts in the 1930s and 1940s show a heavy reliance on marches (both Sousa and otherwise), transcriptions of large-scale orchestral works (Wagner and Beethoven for example), and relatively contemporary military band music (Holst Suites). These programs are very similar to the ESB prior to 1952.[63]

Fennell was not necessarily trying to do something grander and deeper than simply creating an ensemble of players that he felt were capable of playing the highest level music possible. Though, considering the intensity with which he made his ideological shift, it may very well have been an attempt to be the catalyst for wind music's legitimization in the larger music community. As Fennell himself was somewhat of a crossover in terms of involvement with the orchestral community and his deity like status in the wind community, there is evidence to show that Fennell was hoping to have the repertoire of the wind world acknowledged by his orchestral counterparts. In later years, once the genre began to grow both in recognition and status, this

---

[63] See Appendix A for ESB repertoire prior to 1952.

trend toward legitimacy would be shadowed by Fennell's choices in commissioned composers. Appendix B (the performed repertoire of the EWE) shows much larger numbers of *modern* style composers than either Appendix A (the performed repertoire of the ESB), or the repertoire lists of other university ensembles contemporary to the EWE.

What becomes clear is that the shift, for Fennell, was not only felt in repertoire choice, and instrumentation, but also in the sound and style of the ensemble itself. Through repertoire, he was creating a distinct and recognizable *sound* for his new ensemble. The EWE sound became a brand, and a sound that was known across the world as unique. Fennell himself relates an anecdote about his arrival in Tokyo to conduct the TKWO for the first time. During the rehearsal, he was shocked to hear that the ensemble was already playing in his unique sound and style. When he asked how that was possible before he had even had the opportunity to work with them, the ensemble managers replied that they had studied his recordings and works intensely to re-create the specific sound.[64]

By limiting the number of people playing each part, Fennell was redefining the sound of winds - something that had been unchallenged since long before Sousa's time. Of course there is the distinct bright, clear sound that was created and produced by the Mercury label and David Hall, but the Stravinskian clarity of line was an invention of Fennell. The recording style of David Hall and the engineers he worked with at Mercury enhanced his instrumentational and repertoire choices to create recordings that were within his vision for the ensemble. The new digital technology that Mercury was working with during the 1950s allowed Fennell to not only

---

[64] *Frederick Fennell: A Life of Joyful Discovery.*.

hear the clarity he was looking for in his ensemble of players and their new instrumentation, but also in the recordings they made. The clarity Fennell was attempting to find was a clarity that the larger and dense cumbersome bands of the first half of the twentieth-century lacked. This clarity was defined not only by using only one player per part, but also in adjusting the blend of the ensemble to create a clear and bright sound. The technology of recording the EWE was as much part of the creation of Fennell's new ideas on sound as any other factor. Traditionally the repertoire that Fennell was recording with Mercury (ie. Stravinsky Symphony for Winds, Mozart's Serenades, Harmoniemusik repertoire), was the domain of the orchestra wind section. They were commonly performed between two larger-scale works to allow string players to rest and have time to reconfigure the stage set up. Presumably they were considered more of an intermezzo than a legitimate work to stand beside the symphonies that bookended the pieces. Again, under Fennell's initiative, to record and perform them in a setting different from the norm, was to elevate them and legitimize them as equal to any orchestral work.

By analyzing the repertory chosen for the performances of the Eastman Symphony Band 1935-1952 (Appendix A) and the Eastman Wind Ensemble 1952-1962 (Appendix B), I was able to track a number of key points - numbers of transcriptions, dates of composition, and styles. These variations are representative of Fennell's ideas on repertoire and by analyzing the variations in data from the concert programs we gain a better understanding of the gradual changes in his views. The appendices show that Fennell began a slow change in his ideologies on repertoire beginning in the mid 1940s. This change was an attempt (whether initially conscious or not) to standardize and modernize the instrumentation and repertoire of wind groups. It was with the formation of the EWE that Fennell chose to all but leave transcriptions of orchestral

works behind. The concert programs are taken from Frank Cippola and Donald Hunsberger's collection of essays and a complete list of repertoire on the EWE.[65] These repertoire lists created for each ensemble show how Fennell's repertoire choices began to influence the instrumentation of the ensembles themselves. The two ensembles have strikingly differing repertoire lists, and it is in these lists where the development of the idea of one to a part instrumentation may be viewed. The ESB programmed a very high number of transcriptions, whereas the mandate of the EWE was to perform new and original wind works. It was during the last years of the ESB and just before the creation of the EWE that Fennell began to introduce original, one-to-a-part, wind works for the ESB. The number of these distinctive pieces grew in number and scope as he began to contemplate the creation of the EWE itself. The following discussion attempts to make clear that the changes in Fennell's views on repertoire and instrumentation were gradual and influenced by other musicians in his life. The charts show that contrary to popular belief, Fennell's views were not changed as abruptly as has in the past been argued.

One of many striking differences between the Eastman Symphony Band and the Eastman Wind Ensemble is the number of transcriptions that were played by the ESB versus the EWE. These transcriptions were all originally orchestral works that Fennell would have become comfortable with during his mentorship with Koussevitsky and Howard Hanson. John Philip Sousa also heavily featured these pieces. These transcriptions were also standard repertoire for every band in America. As seen in the ESB repertoire chart, the group performed 278 different pieces between 1935-1952. These 278 pieces made up 487 separate performance events. That is to say that the number of times certain pieces were repeated makes the total number of pieces

---

65 Frank Cipolla and Donald Hunsberger ed. *The Wind Ensemble and its Repertoire.*

performed over 1.7 times the number of different pieces of repertoire. Of these 278 different works, 154 of them were transcriptions and/or arrangements of works from outside the wind band canon. It is interesting to notice Fennell's predilection for certain transcribers; during this period the ESB performed 14 transcriptions by William Winterbottom, 13 by Erik Leidzen, 14 by Dan Godfrey, and 9 by Lucien Cailliet. Together the number of transcriptions makes up 70% of the performed pieces.[66] This small pool of transcribers may represent a strong relationship between conductor and arranger, or it may represent the fact that there were comparatively few people transcribing music for winds. Fennell's choices may be more pragmatism than anything else. He was a less active arranger when compared to his counterparts at other universities, such as William D Revelli, who would arrange almost everything themselves. In the following list of performed pieces, note that not one of the top seven performed pieces were original wind works. The Burnet Tuthill *Symphony for Band*, received four performances, but even still, all of the other pieces that were played four times were transcriptions. The seven most performed pieces in the repertoire of the ESB, were:

1) Carl Maria Von Weber, *Overture to Euryanthe, (1923 trans. date.)* Trans. (presumed) Dan Godfrey, Performed 6 times.
2) Jaromir Weinberger, *Polka and Fugue from Schwanda the Bagpiper, (1926)* Trans. Glenn Bainum, Performed 6 times.
3) J.S Bach, *Fugue et la Gigue (BWV 577)*, Trans. Gustav Holst, Performed 5 times.
4) Ludwig Von Beethoven, *Egmont Overture,* (1810) Trans. William Winterbottom, Performed 5 times.
5) Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov, *The Procession of the Nobles* from *Mlada, (1890)*Trans. Erik Leidzen, Performed 5 times.
6) Richard Wagner, *Overture to Reinzi,(1842)* Trans. Victor Grabel, Performed 5 times.
7) Richard Wagner, *Prelude to Act III Der Meistersinger, (1868)*Trans. William Winterbottom, Performed 5 times.

[66] See Appendix A

Five of these seven most played pieces are drawn from the works of nineteenth-century composers. After analyzing Appendix A outlining the repertoire of the ESB, it is clear that this roughly 60-70% ratio is not only present in the top seven most-played selections, but also throughout the Cipolla and Hunsberger repertoire list as a whole. With the EWE, Fennell would begin to draw far more heavily on the composers of his own era as opposed to those of the nineteenth century. As shown in Appendix A, it is clear that this change was gradual.

Although the change was gradual, there were a small number of exclusively wind works that Fennell programmed. The total number of works explicitly written for wind ensembles that the ESB performed between 1935-1952 was only 124 (44%), and the vast majority of those were performances of marches by a very wide variety of composers. Four of these marches were Fennell compositions. He wrote *The Spirit of Youth, Hail Sinfonia, Palestra,* and *Tally-Ho*, which were collectively performed a total of seven times with *Palestra* claiming three of those seven performances. The only other wind works of note that were performed with the ESB are Schoenberg's *Theme and Variations op. 43* and Ralph Vaughan Williams *Toccata Marziale* and *English Folk Song Suite.*

The dependency on nineteenth-century transcriptions played an incredibly large role in the repertoire of the ESB, yet in some ways it should not be surprising. Every other wind band model before 1952, used a similar transcription percentage (60-70%). The Sousa band would far more often than not, only perform Sousa marches and other wind works as encores and interludes to opera and orchestral transcriptions. A similar repertoire list, like the one I created for the EWE, with the help of Cipolla and Hunsberger in Appendix B, does not exist for the

Sousa band, however, it is clear through first-hand descriptions of Sousa concerts that the vast majority of the concerts were transcriptions with intermittent marches and Sousa originals.[67] It is this tradition of marches as encores that brought rise to the tradition of announcing the encores with placards placed at the side of the stage. The specific quirks of a Sousian performance are of course interesting, but the repertoire Sousa was programming aside from the encores was more or less standard. All of the traveling wind bands of the late 19th and early 20th centuries gathered the bulk of their programmed repertoire from transcribing orchestral and operatic pieces. It is no wonder then why the Sousa band always travelled with soprano and violin soloists[68]. Sousa, however, believed that the spirit in which his transcriptions were presented was different than that of his orchestral counterparts. He argued that Theodore Thomas (who was conductor of the Chicago Symphony from 1890-1905),

> ... gave Wagner, Liszt and Tchaikovsky in the belief that he was educating his public; I gave Wagner, Liszt and Tchaikovsky with the hope that I was entertaining my public...entertainment is of more real value to the world than technical education in music appreciation, I would not accept the symphonic orchestra as my medium.[69]

The opera and orchestral repertoire was standard across the board for all ensembles, whether it was written for them or not. Therefore, it is not surprising that the number of Sousa marches (as works of original wind music, though they are of a very different style to the rest of the repertoire) performed by the ESB between 1935-1952 consisted of only twelve marches performed twenty-one times to make 4% of the repertoire. Especially considering Fennell's deep love for Sousa's music and his later reliance on the works with the EWE, as well as the origins of

---

[67] Paul E Bierley. *John Philip Sousa: American Phenomenon.* (Meredith Corporation, New York, 1973).

[68] Ibid.

[69] David Whitwell. *Forgotten Wind Music* (1966). http://www.whitwellessays.com/ accessed September 13, 2011.

the ESB being a marching band that played almost exclusively Sousa marches, this is a fairly low percentage of the ESB's repertoire. The EWE maintained a 14% Sousa repertoire list after 1952.

The period and style of the orchestral transcriptions chosen by Fennell is particularly noteworthy. Aside from a heavy (though not abnormal) reliance on Bach transcriptions, the composers most frequently performed by the ESB included Berlioz, Wagner, Rossini, Strauss, Tchaikovsky and Weber. The number of predominantly orchestral nineteenth-century, or early twentieth-century composers outweigh the more wind-centric, mid twentieth-century composers by a strong margin. Rachmaninoff, Prokofiev, Respighi, Rimsky-Korsakov, Saint-Saens, Elgar and Mussorgsky were also well represented composers in the repertoire, while Grainger, Holst, and Vaughan Williams make up a very small percentage. It very well may be that Fennell sought to move away from this heavy and romantic sound in the later years of the ESB, between 1945 and 1952; the Holst *First Suite* was first performed by the ESB in 1947 while the Stravinsky *Symphony of Wind Instruments* was first performed by the ESB in 1951.

The date with which each standard wind work appeared in Fennell's repertoire rotation is also striking. The moment when he first programmed and performed Holst's *Suites*, Hindemith's *Symphony in B-flat*, and Stravinsky's *Symphony of Wind Instruments* reveal a shift in his conception and reveal at what point in his development he truly began to require the clean and transparent sound of the wind ensemble. Holst's *First Suite in E-flat*, written in 1909, was first performed by Fennell in 1947. Fennell then played the piece three times before 1952. In 1949, Fennell programmed Holst's *Second Suite in F,* and performed it only once before 1952. Stravinsky's *Symphony of Wind Instruments* was only played once with the ESB, a performance that

took place in 1951. Finally, Hindemith's *Symphony in B-flat* was given one performance in 1952, just months before the formal creation of the EWE in September of the same year. Beginning in 1947, with his first performance of Holst's *First Suite*, Fennell was likely already forming an idea of the sound world he was looking for (even if subconsciously).

The Holst *Suite* is important and influential for several reasons. The one-to-a-part instrumentation of the work is primarily the interesting factor, but the work also represents a stylistic change for Fennell. Each movement of the work is a study in clarity of phrase for each instrument. Although the work has sections of dense chordal passages and moments where the harmonies become intertwined and overlapped, through the instrumentation and the style of writing, the instruments do not blend together the same way a string section would. Each instrument maintains its own sound identity, as a soloist would. The instruments retain their unique timbres and sounds even when combined into thick instrumentation. This style of composition that has each instrument acting as both wind soloist and ensemble member simultaneously exemplifies Fennell's views on instrumentation. Indeed, it was this sentiment of soloistic playing that he argued formed the basis for his ideas on the EWE.

Eastman Wind Ensemble Repertoire

The repertoire of the ESB contrasts with that of the EWE from 1952-1962. Two hundred and forty two works make up 440 performed pieces in total over ten years. The number of times certain pieces were repeated makes the total number of works performed over 1.8 times the number of different pieces of repertoire. This time, of the 242 pieces, only twenty-six of them were transcriptions or arrangements, making up 10% of the repertoire, although many of

the transcribers used by the EWE were the same as used by the ESB. Sometimes, the EWE even played the exact same transcriptions as the ESB (see Appendix A and B to compare). The EWE and the ESB existed together for a number of years, though once the EWE was created the mission of the two groups stayed very separate. The nine most performed pieces for the EWE between 1952-1962, which differed greatly from those of the ESB, included:

1) Percy Grainger, *Lincolnshire Posy, (1937)* Performed 8 times.
2) Morton Gould, *Ballad for Band,(1946)* Performed 8 times.
3) Gustav Holst, *First Suite in E-flat,(1909)* Performed 8 times.
4) John Philip Sousa, *Black Horse Troop, (1924)* Performed 8 times.
5) Ralph Vaughan Williams, *Toccata Marziale, (1924)* Performed 8 times.
6) Robert Russell Bennett, *Suite of Old American Dances,(1949)* Performed 7 times.
7) Howard Hanson, *Chorale and Alleluia, (1954)* Performed 7 times.
8) Gordon Jacob, *William Byrd Suite,(1924)* Performed 7 times.
9) Vincent Persichetti, *Divertimento for Band, (1950)* Performed 7 times.

These nine works are today some of the most important pieces in the wind band repertory. Other pieces to have had several performances with the EWE include Stravinsky's *Symphony of Wind Instruments* (performed six times) and Hindemith's *Symphony in B-flat*, (performed four times). Almost all of the transcribed works were only performed once, although *Valdres* by Howard Hansen as transcribed by Bainum was performed five times. The march is however a wind band standard and the transcription by Bainum is more of an arrangement and instrumentation. Of course, Hanson's relationship with Fennell and the ensemble undoubtedly also influenced the frequency with which this work was performed. These nine most commonly performed pieces also span a wide range of styles. The common thread that links the works together is their similar approach to questions of instrumentation.

*Lincolnshire Posy* is a six movement, one-to-a-part work by Grainger that draws its melodic inspiration from folk songs from the Lincolnshire County in North-East England. Written for

Piccolo, 2 flutes, 2 oboes, English Horn, 2 Bassoons, Contrabassoon, Eb Clarinet, 3 Bb Clarinets, Alto Clarinet, Bass Clarinet, 6 Saxophones, 3 Cornets or Trumpets, 4 horns, 3 Trombones, Baritone, Euphonium, Tuba, String Bass, and a range of percussion, it is as close to the exact instrumentation of the EWE as Fennell could have hoped.[70] The one-to-a-part instrumentation links this piece to the other eight, but also to Fennell's overall ideology. Each movement is named after the folk song from which it takes its melody - *Lisbon*, *Horkstow Grange*, *Rufford Park Poachers*, *The Brisk Young Sailor*, *Lord Melbourne*, and *Lost Lady Found*. Grainger's use of poly tonality in *Rufford Park Poachers* and his free metered beginning to *Lord Melbourne* make for an adventurous work. There are moments of fast and agile playing in *The Brisk Young Sailor,* and sections of *Horkstow Grange* that have slow rhythmic passages where chords are built and stacked to create very deep and resonant sounds from the winds. As a piece that combines unique instrumental timbres with independent soloistic playing, *Lincolnshire Posy* is perhaps the archetypal Wind Ensemble piece for which Fennell was advocating. *Posy* is a piece that bridges the gap between modernist and traditionalist. Although the melodies are taken directly from traditional British folk songs, the treatment of them was extremely modern and inventive for an original wind piece written in 1937.

Morton Gould's *Ballad for Band* is a one movement piece written for the same instrumentation as *Lincolnshire Posy* with the addition of two more trumpet/cornet parts.[71] Musically it is closer in style to what one may now consider "concert band repertoire" than something more advanced and adventurous as *Lincolnshire Posy*. There are polytonal harmonies and a range of tempos and styles that the piece winds its way through, though the work is not on

---

[70] http://www.windrep.org/Main_Page, Accessed January 15th, 2012.

[71] Ibid

as large a scale as some of the other pieces on the EWE top nine list, both in scope or duration. The style of writing in Gould's *Ballad for Band* is also interesting to note. Each instrument functions as a soloist. Cascading passages are frequent throughout the whole piece. The effect is created by having each instrument act as momentary soloist. The piece is more of a series of melodies that coincide to make a whole than it is melody with accompaniment. This feature of writing may not be revolutionary when discussing the general composition techniques of 1946, but prior to pieces like *Ballad for Band*, band pieces were more often than not in the Sousian model of melody line with accompaniment. The style of writing and the instrumentation of Gould's piece was undoubtedly attractive to Fennell as it was very close to his own changing ideas on repertoire for band.

*The First Suite in E-flat*, is perhaps the best known work on the list. Written by Gustav Holst in 1909, it is one of the most played wind works of all time. It is the only work on the EWE list, aside from the Sousa march, that originated in the military band world prior to it becoming a standard in the wind band community. The style of this work is almost entirely diatonic in its structure and although several of the themes are taken from folk melodies, Holst's treatment of them is to mold them to the *Suite* and make them sound less like a melody taken from another place and more like one that he had written himself. In contrast, in *Lincolnshire Posy* Grainger chose to perserve the melodies as true as he could, and arrange an accompaniment to go with them that followed the melodies rhythmic structure as closely as possible. Grainger's accompaniment for *Lincolnshire Posy* is thus as idiosyncratic as the melodies. As a result of Grainger's need to stay as true to the originals as he could, the melodies in *Lincolnshire Posy* are free flowing and multi-metered to account for the variations of the initial melody he heard while

listening to locals sing the melodies. This was not an uncommon practice at the time, and composers like Bartók were also active in the folk song recording movement. In contrast, the melodies in Holst's *The First Suite* are accompanied by beautiful chords and relatively standard harmonies. The instrumentation for Holst's work is slightly more pared down than the works by Gould or Grainger. There are fewer saxophones and trumpets than in larger works like *Lincolnshire Posy*.[72] Each of the three movements is in a different style (Chaconne, Intermezzo and March).

John Philip Sousa's *Black Horse Troop* is an unsurprising addition to the list of Fennell's most played pieces. As we have seen, Fennell was a lover of Sousa from the time he was a boy, and throughout his life, he would program Sousa marches at many of his hundreds of concerts. He believed that there was more to playing a Sousa march than met the eye and he felt that there was always a better performance of them to be reached. *Black Horse Troop* was not only popular with Fennell and the EWE, but with every group he conducted. The ESB performed the piece, as did most groups that Fennell was engaged with as a guest conductor . The instrumentation for these marches is the same as that found in the Holst *Suites*.[73]

The fifth most played piece by the EWE was Ralph Vaughan Williams' *Toccata Marziale.* Written for the same instrumentation as the Holst and Sousa pieces,[74] it is essentially a march in 3/4 time, but rhythmically it is extremely complex. It contains a very dense canonic structure with superimposed instrumental parts. The piece is in one movement and it stays in one style

---

[72] Ibid

[73] Ibid

[74] Ibid

throughout, but the resultant harmonies and rhythms are constantly changing and expanding. It is unlike any of the other pieces in style - again, only truly linked by instrumentation. *Toccata Marziale* is also very different from almost anything else Vaughan Williams ever wrote. As a composer known for lush harmonies and a traditional English orchestral style similar to Elgar, *Toccata Marziale* marked a striking difference in compositional technique for the composer. As a one-to-a-part, intensely rhythmic piece, the toccata is much more in line with a true wind piece that Fennell was eager to popularize. Each instrument functions almost completely independently from the rest of the ensemble - very soloistic playing from each member of the ensemble. The harmonies unfold when melodies occasionally converge and intersect with another instrument's melody.

Robert Russell Bennett's *Suite of Old American Dances*, is yet again a stylistic deviation from the other eight pieces. This piece draws the majority of its melodic content from early American Jazz and the harmonies and rhythms found in it. This includes many seventh chords, unresolved cadnaces and complex rhythms. The piece sounds very similar to any Gershwin rag and has an almost *Rhapsody in Blue* feel to the work. Many of the harmonic structures are similar to those used in Gershwin's writing. The piece is in five short movements: *Cakewalk, Schottische, Western One-Step, Wallflower Waltz,* and *Rag*. It does not include english horn, contrabassoon, or contrabass clarinet, but it does have a considerably larger percussion section than the other eight pieces.[75] It is also one of the later composed works on the list, having been written just a few years before the EWE was formed. Stylistically, the work often emulates a traditional American jazz feel, again, not unlike Gershwin. Like the other pieces, the way the composer writes the instrumental lines

[75] Ibid

allows each player to be distinctly heard even while the full ensemble is playing. Fennell was an avid supporter of Robert Russell Bennett's work and chose to include a similar work (*Symphonic Songs for Band*) on the Mercury album "British and American Band Classics."[76] The instrumentation and style of Bennett's writing was something that Fennell would advocate for his whole career.

*Chorale and Alleluia* by Howard Hanson is written for the full instrumentation of the Wind Ensemble. It includes english horn, contrabassoon and saxophone parts.[77] This one-movement work is the most continually diatonic and harmonically straightforward of the pieces on the list. It is far less technically challenging than any other piece, but the beautiful and non-dissonant harmonies made it a standard even within the first years of its premiere. It is worth noting that the piece was most likely performed as much as it was due to the relationship between Howard Hanson and Fennell, as well as the Eastman School. Stylistically, the piece is much more reserved than the other works on the EWE's nine most performed pieces. The piece was also Howard Hanson's first work for a wind group. Hanson only wrote a handful of works for the idiom, but as a whole, his other pieces for winds are very similarly structured.

Gordon Jacob's *William Byrd Suite* is a six-movement work inspired by the melodies and style of Elizabethan composer William Byrd and is an arrangement of pieces by William Byrd for a Wind Band. The composer made few stylistic changes apart from updating the instrumentation, writing it for exactly the same instrumentation as the Holst *Suite*.[78] The only

---

[76] Roger E Rickson. *Ffortissimo: A bio-discography of Frederick Fennell.*

[77] Ibid

[78] Ibid

percussion included in the piece are Bass Drum, Cymbal and Snare Drum. In this case, the connection between Jacob's work and the other nine pieces is in the style of writing for winds in tandem with its instrumentation. By re-scoring the pieces, Jacob was able to create an arrangement that stayed true to the harmonic and melodic structure of the original works, but also provided new and interesting timbres to the music. The piece is orchestrated far more sparsely than the other works being discussed.

Vincent Persichetti's *Divertimento for Band* is the most adventurous and experimental of the pieces on the list. The instrumentation is the same one-to-a-part structure as *Lincolnshire Posy*. Throughout the work's six movements (*Prologue, Song, Dance, Burlesque, Soliloquy,* and *March*), Persichetti creates the most polytonal music on the list.[79] The work is much more impulsive and less melody driven than the other pieces on the list, yet it is harmonically stunning and filled with moments of beauty and clarity while still creating avant-garde music. The composer acheives this by truly using the individual timbres of each instrument to create a soundscape that is unlike the other works mentioned. He incorporates purposefully diverse sounds into a cohesive sounding instrumental blend. Persichetti also wrote another wind band standard - *Symphony 6 for Band.* Of this piece, Fennell describes the work as

> [the] fourth in an extended line of distinguished works that have so deeply enriched music literature and particularly that of the wind band… It is music of glowing substance enriched by the craft of a master; none in this field may avoid it short of clear negligence in dimensions of basic knowledge that certify the art of the conductor. But it is its extraordinary experience as music that brings the ultimate reward to those who listen, play, or conduct.[80]

---

[79] Ibid

[80] http://windbandlit.wordpress.com/2011/05/03/persichetti-symphony-for-band. Accessed August 20th, 2012.

Fennell's love of Persichetti and his style of writing for winds is understandable. Since each of the fourteen wind works written by Persichetti between 1953 and 1984 are exactly the type of modernist wind music repertory Fennell was popularizing and advocating for during his time at Eastman.

The nine pieces examined in the previous paragraphs are stylistically different from each other, yet the instrumentation is almost entirely in line with the new ideology Fennell had come to embrace by 1952, ie. one-to-a-part with variation in the instruments used. There are only small differences in the ensemble instrumentation between each piece. The style is wildly variable, but the sound of the ensemble timbre was always the same. The conformity in the sound of the ensemble, regardless of the style of the piece, is due to the instrumentation of the pieces being almost identical and the players themselves with which Fennell chose to populate his ensemble. Here again, Fennell was able to refine and create a new sound for winds that was not reliant on the doubled parts and thick sounds of previous ensembles.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, to accompany Fennell's drastic changes in repertoire for the EWE, there was also a marked difference in the number of Sousa pieces performed by the EWE in its first ten years. Thirty-five Sousa marches were performed sixty-five times making them 14% of the total repertoire. Granted, by the time the EWE came to be, they were programming entire concerts of Sousa marches in what became known as the Annual Concert of Marches. Even with entire concerts dedicated to marches, there were several Sousa marches that were performed only four or even five times in ten years. Fennell also chose to no longer program his own compositions, even in those march concerts.

The inclusion of chamber pieces into the EWE's repertoire is also significant as these were the only times when the instrumentation of the ensemble changed. The chamber wind works and harmoniemusik of Strauss, Mozart, Gabrielli, Riegger, and Stravinsky were much more prevalent in this ensemble than in the ESB. This was a feature that Fennell worked into the design of the group. He wanted to be able to move players around and perform a wide variety of pieces. Flexibility in instrumentation and colour was a large part of his dream for the EWE. This flexibility in repertoire allowed Fennell to have 89% original music for winds - 216 of the 242 pieces were pieces intended for winds. The increased reliance on these chamber works led to more diverse and expansive repertoire choices. Fennell performed Stravinsky's *Symphony of Wind Instruments,* but also his *Octet for Wind Instruments, Concerto for Piano and Wind Instruments* and the *Circus Polka.* Schoenberg, Persichetti, Khachaturian, Grundman and Grainger were EWE repertoire regulars by 1960.

The EWE did play several orchestral transcriptions during the first ten years of the group's formation. Of the transcriptions that remained in the repertoire, they were primarily the same type of repertoire that had existed with the ESB. Bach was chosen most often by Fennell to be played in transcription. Of the twenty-six orchestral transcriptions performed by Fennell and the EWE, eight of them were Bach. Each one of these eight pieces was only performed once. While the ESB had focussed its transcriptions on the Romantics, only brief interludes of Wagner, Weber and Rimsky-Korsakov were kept in the transcription repertory of the EWE. It becomes fairly obvious that Fennell was gradually drifting away from the nineteenth and early twentieth century romantic wind band sound (as influenced by the orchestra and its repertory) and

embracing the almost neo-classical sound of his new instrumentation. The Stravinsky and Grainger selections show his new appreciation for the timbral clarity and cleanliness of modern wind music and the sounds it had the ability to create. It is more in the instrumentation and sounds the EWE was able to utilize than in the repertoire that the parameters of the newly formed EWE were defined.

By analyzing the repertoire in this way, it becomes clear that Fennell was trying to create a standard model for not only instrumentation, but also repertoire. As Fennell left behind the transcriptions and the works of the major romantic composers, he was therefore embracing the works of lesser known composers that were writing specifically (or at least as close as could be expected) for the new high art version of wind music that was being fostered in the 1950s. He was creating the genre through the repertoire and instrumentation. It was this new found need for a standardized repertoire and sound that drove him to create the EWE in 1952, and it was this same need that drove him to expand the genre and create a standard that would become the model for wind bands in much of the world. By recreating what the genre of wind music could be, Fennell was trying to have wind music recognized by the general music community as something more than *band music* and marches. To bring wind music into the concert hall was to legitimize it.

Contemporary Ensembles to the EWE and their Repertoires

In contrast to Fennell's EWE, there were ensembles that were formed in the late first half of the twentieth century that were both much more traditionalist than the EWE and much more

experimental than the EWE. The EWE had several groundbreaking modernist and iconoclastic tendencies, while other influential wind groups chose more experimental and avant-garde directions for their ensembles. Other ensembles clung steadfast to the past and refused to evolve or even acknowledge the evolution that was happening around them. Case studies looking closely at two of the other most influential, and yet strikingly different wind groups of the1950s, will highlight the innovation and modernism of the EWE while showing the extremes to which repertoire and instrumentation could be taken. The University of Michigan Symphony Band and The American Wind Symphony Orchestra are both important ensembles in the evolution of a legitimate repertoire for winds, but by comparing their histories and conductors to Fennell and the EWE, we can see how the EWE was the natural flagship for modern wind music.

University of Michigan Bands

The Eastman Symphony Band and the University of Michigan Symphony Band both began in the second quarter of the twentiethth century. The ESB began in 1935 while Michigan had already established a small wind music program by 1927 (although the Michigan program was not truly on its feet until the podium was taken by William D. Revelli in 1935). Between 1935 and 1952 the two ensembles followed an almost identical path in terms of repertory. However, under Revelli the Michigan Band maintained a much heavier reliance on marching - something that the ESB stopped doing by 1935 when they began to perform in the concert halls of Eastman. They became the two most prominent ensembles for wind music in the country as evidenced by Revelli and Fennell's constant involvement in the most important wind music associations. Revelli had a hand in founding the CDBNA (College Band Director's National

Association) and was a past president of MENC (Music Educators National Conference). However, when the EWE was formed in 1952, the Michigan Symphony Band stayed true to the path they had originally taken. They continued to program a traditional repertory of transcriptions and marches and continued to populate the ensemble with multiple players per part, to the point where they often included more than one hundred musicians in the ensemble. The two ensembles were evolving in very different ways.

Revelli's approach to conducting was very similar to that of Sousa and his repertoire choices and the instrumentation of his ensemble showed more interest in the vernacular than his contemporaries. Revelli was far less of a modernist than Fennell. Revelli was a task master and he ran his ensembles with military precision and formality, believing the past and future of wind music was owed to the military and the marching band. As a military man himself, Revelli was a staunch supporter of the discipline and regimen of a military style marching band. Recognizing that the marching band is intrinsically connected to the military - as young men returning from WWI were very proficient at marching, it makes sense that Revelli was at the height of his influence over the ideological direction wind band was taking during years between WWI and WWII. This ideology also meant that funding was much more readily available as his ensembles were connected to the growth of the athletic side of colleges and universities in the United States. According to Milburn, the university system in America increased by 1000% in the years after WWI, and with it came heightened interest in athletics and thus marching bands.[81] Revelli's connection to military bands was also an obvious connection to the repertoire of these groups.

---

[81] David Allen Milburn. *The Development of the Wind Ensemble In The United States (1952-1981)*. pg. 40

In his dissertation on Revelli, Gregory Talford paints a picture of the conductor that is both harsh, brutal and unyielding, and is yet caring, passionate and of a man far more talented than many would believe. Talford explains that when Revelli arrived at the University of Michigan, the bands were populated by poorly trained, noncommittal players who would arrive late for concerts or play incorrect notes. Revelli and the other ex-military members of the athletic sector, created and ran an ensemble that became skilled, disciplined and sounded as good as any professional ensemble one would find outside of a university. This was achieved through work and military precision. Revelli had a well-deserved reputation for being a stern and exacting conductor, but under his leadership, the University of Michigan wind band system grew from an eight to ten person marching band in 1932 to a program that boasted fourteen large ensembles of high-level-juggernauts that saw thousands of musicians come through its doors during Revelli's 36-year tenure as director of winds.[82]

In the early years when Revelli was first hired, he was not only the conductor of the marching bands, but he was also the instrumental teacher for all wind instruments on campus. This meant that he taught nearly fifty hours a week in lessons alone, and then conducted the bands, all on a salary of less than he was making at the Hobart School prior to his accepting the position at Michigan.[83] His personal resolve and his field-marshal-like control over his surroundings ensured that what he achieved the goals he thought best for his ensembles. His personality also played a large part in his ideas on instrumentation and repertoire. His traditionalism in both areas led him to believe that a band was meant to have a heavy woodwind

---

[82] Gregory Talford. *William D. Revelli an Introspective Study.* Central Michigan University, PhD. Diss. Mount Pleasant Michigan.. pg. 130.

[83] Ibid, Pg 85.

sound, with considerably less brass than perhaps many ensembles featured at the time. He also believed in adhering to the old systems of instrumentation to the point where he was not an advocate of trumpets, preferring the old cornets. In 1981, he told a large group of school band directors that

> I blame you for not having cornets. You didn't have the guts to tell the student, who came in to you with a trumpet, that he wasn't going to play it in your band -- I did that. I did that in Hobart with Sammy McClosky. He came in with a brand new trumpet that his father bought him for Christmas. He came to me and said 'See what I got for Christmas?' I said, 'That's beautiful, where you gonna play it?' 'Why in the band,' he said ... I said 'What band? ... We already have two trumpets. Now if you can beat either one of them out, that's ok with me. But that's what you're going to have to do, because the instrumentation of this band is two trumpets; it's not three, it's not one, it's two. It's six cornets and we have six cornets. If you leave that cornet section, we only have five. Now, that's up to you.[84]

Revelli clearly did not believe in variable instrumentation. Rather he was a staunch advocate for the rigidity of ensemble instrumentation regardless of repertoire. He believed that repertoire would be formed to the instrumentation of the ensemble and not the other way around. It was with these steadfast but antiquated ideals that Revelli kept the University of Michigan Ensembles from progressing forward into modernism in repertoire and instrumentation. Believing that the military model for bands was the one that would prevail only hampered the progress of his ensembles.

As an older man than Fennell, it is perhaps not surprising that he retained a more traditional and vernacular view of wind music. Decidedly not modernist, his influence over the CBDNA and MENC as well as the University of Michigan was felt for many years after he

---

[84] From a recorded interview: Ann Arbour, Michigan. June 23 1981. Gregory Talford. *William D. Revelli an Introspective Study.* Central Michigan University, PhD. Diss. Mount Pleasant Michigan. page 234.

formally left each association. The music Revelli created with his ensembles was starkly contrasted to Fennell's more modernist repertoire choices and style. The main audience for Revelli's ensembles were football fans. Where Fennell cultivated an audience of educated musicians from as many musical backgrounds as possible, Revelli was left with an audience looking to be entertained in a much more vaudeville style - not unlike Fennell's views on Sousa's vaudeville type performances in the early 1900s.

The Michigan marching bands were certainly performing at a high level with Revelli, but the repertoire simply could not be expanded past the *vernacular* for fear of alienating the football audience. It was not until the bands were brought into the concert hall (during the early 1960s) without any marching duties to perform that the Michigan ensembles began to be more adventurous in their repertoire choices. This essentially left them tailing behind the more forward thinking ensembles like the EWE.

The American Wind Symphony Orchestra

The AWSO was formed in 1957 by Robert Austin Boudreau and has thrived over the past 55 years. As an ensemble that travels the United States (and occasionally abroad) on a floating concert stage built from a repurposed barge, the AWSO performs almost exclusively for a *vernacular* audience. As they have no home concert hall or a constant audience of music lovers, the group's audience has become an ever changing one. However, the AWSO operates under several seemingly unique contradictions. Although their audience is often *vernacular* and ever changing, the music they commission and perform is as *cultivated* and experimental as one can imagine. Unfortunately there are very few records of concert programs readily available on the AWSO,

but judging from what Katherine Boudreau has written, it seems that the formula for concerts with the group would have been to play an established wind standard (like Robert Russell Bennett's *Suite of Old American Dances*) or two, and then continue the rest of the concert with chamber works, new commissions and varied instrumentation pieces.[85] If there is an ideological idea that Boudreau took from Fennell it was this idea of the fluid instrumentation of an ensemble. Although the instrumentation was different, and the repertoire was unrecognizable, the philosophy of only using the required musicians for a piece and not doubling parts was one the two men shared.

Some of the composers featured in Robert Austin Boudreau's list of commissioned composers include: Samual Adler, Ned Rorem, Blas Atehortua, Jacques Casterede, Wen-Chung Chou, Halim El-Dabh, Alan Hovhannes, Ivana Loudova, Krzysztof Penderecki, and Heitor Villa-Lobos. They were often given nothing more than spare change to write the pieces they wrote, but the idea of writing for an entirely new and variable ensemble was hard to pass up for many of them. Of the hundreds of wind compositions played by the EWE and the AWSO, there is a remarkable lack of cross-over in terms of repertory. Only a small handful of composers and pieces were played by both ensembles. Robert Russell Bennet appears on the programs of both groups. He was not only played by both groups, in the same time period, but he was also American and a wind-centric composer. Aside from Bennett, the only real cross over were the two group's performances of Handel's *Water Music* and *Royal Fireworks Music,* though the editions played by the AWSO were done by Boudreau himself.

---

[85] Katherine Boudreau. *One More Time*. Unpublished. Pittsburgh. 2008.

As stated, the vast majority of music played and commissioned by Boudreau was experimental and often atonal. Alexander Tcherepnin wrote two pieces for the group before his death in 1977. *Concerto for Oboe, Brass, Winds, Percussion and Harp* and *Statue* were both written in his late phase where much of his music took a more daring line than his early more tonal works. The concerto is about as adventurous as his music ever was, yet even this was considered tame by the standards of the Penderecki *Pittsburgh Overture* or Ton de Leeuw *Symphony of Winds (An Homage to Igor Stravinsky).* Both of these pieces conform to the musical aesthetics of Boudreau well. *Pittsburgh Overture* is written in a proportional and graphic style and often requires players to use extended techniques and make musical judgments for themselves. *Symphony of Winds( An Homage to Igor Stravinsky)* asks the players to listen and tune dense and atonal sonorities while playing virtuosic passages in extreme ranges.

Boudreau's methods for finding composers to commission was surprisingly similar to Fennell's. Fennell says that he simply made a list of the first couple hundred composers that he would ideally like a commission from and wrote them a letter telling them that although there was little money to be passed out, composers would be given free reign over the style and instrumentation of their piece. He also promised that the pieces would be performed with all the professionalism and enthusiasm of any other work performed by the ensemble, be it transcription or original wind work.[86] Boudreau decided to do much the same thing and in 1956, he wrote letters to hundreds of little known composers from across the world asking them to write pieces for his new Wind Orchestra. He reached out to artists on every continent, and received many positive answers back. As both Fennell and Boudreau cast an extremely wide net, the result was

---

86 *Frederick Fennell: A Life of Joyful Discovery.*

dozens of new pieces from composers from every corner of the earth. The AWSO repertoire list boasts composers from France, Sweden, Holland, China, Nigeria, Egypt, Cuba, Mexico, Chile and Israel.

Fennell was more of a traditionalist than Boudreau. Where Fennell had initiated and developed a radical shift in instrumentation and repertoire, Boudreau took the ideas on the legitimization and expansion of wind repertoire several steps further. Not only did the AWSO not continue the repertory and scoring traditions set forth by the Sousian standard, but they also did not follow in the footsteps of the EWE. The group has always been a true wind orchestra. The repertoire the AWSO chose during its first ten years (1957-1967) defined it as an extremely forward thinking group. The composers the AWSO commissioned were purposefully avant-garde and from outside the traditional wind world. The music they created and continue to create today is arguably as far removed from the wind music tradition (either the Susian, or Fenellian) as it is from the orchestral. As seen in Appendix A (the repertoire of the ESB) and Appendix B (the repertoire of the EWE), the music chosen by Fennell, the EWE, the ESB and Revelli in Michigan was vastly tonal, often transcribed, Romantic or Neo-classical (dependent on the year and the group), and often taken from increasingly standard lists of wind music and marches. The music commissioned and performed by Boudreau was often atonal, experimental, variable, filled with extended techniques and utilized non-conventional instruments, sounds and performance practices.

By creating a similar appendix for the AWSO that I did for the EWE and ESB (Appendices A and B), a different picture of the repertoire is presented. Appendix C shows an

almost complete reliance on newly commissioned works, atonal and avant-garde works and pieces by composers that remain relatively unknown in North America (75% of the composers were not American). Of the 175 AWSO commissions (1957-1990) I was able to find, only 61 of them were by American composers, and of those 61 pieces, there were only 21 composers. In the commissions of Fennell and the EWE, there is a tendency to commission American composers and the AWSO had a much higher number of foreign composers add to the commissioning project. There is no true equivalent of *The Wind Ensemble and its Repertoire* for the AWSO. Appendix C is therefore created using a number of different sources. No one source is exhaustive, but in tandem with other sources, a more complete list of commissions is available.[87] Jeffery Renshaw's book[88] encompasses a great deal of repertoire, but when cross referenced with Warren Olfert's dissertation on the American Wind Symphony Orchestra[89], there are a large number of pieces mentioned that are not included in Renshaw's list, but have listing of performances and commissioning details. The commissions of the AWSO show an extremely different stream of repertoire choices. The AWSO did not perform wind standards like Holst or Stravinsky nearly as often as the EWE and they would more often play a newly commissioned work by one of these European or South-American composers.

The differences in repertoire and ideology between the EWE, AWSO, and Michigan Bands program highlight three unique perspectives on the wind-band idiom. The EWE, being the more centrist of the three ensembles, made the natural choice of ensemble to best suit the

---

[87] See Appendix C

[88] Jeffery Renshaw. *The American Wind Symphony Commissioning Project: 1957-1991, A History and Descriptive Catalog of Published Editions*. (Greenwood Press, Westport, 1991).

[89] Warren Dale Orfert. "The Development of a Wind Repertoire: a history of the American Wind Symphony Orchestra." (Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, 1992).

needs of wind groups across America. The EWE became the most marketable blend of traditionalism and modernism that appealed to most of the general wind music population.

Vernacular and Cultivated Wind Music

This difference in ideology between the traditional views of Revelli and the more revolutionary views of Fennell are in stark contrast to the equally groundbreaking but radical musical views of Boudreau. When discussing much of the history of American music, modern scholars have often attempted to force frequently conflicting and inaccurate terms to the music produced, written and performed in 20th-century America. The terms *vernacular* and *cultivated* have been, for many scholars, words to define not only the type of music written, but also the audience and purpose it was intended for. In Richard Hansen's book *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History*, he argues that these terms do not accurately or even sufficiently describe American wind music despite the countless authors who have adopted them and attempted to describe and force wind music into a mold too simple for the situation.[90] Indeed, the history of wind music in America is much more complex than one thinks at first glance and although there always need be terms to describe a topic, *vernacular* and *cultivated* hold too many connotative meanings and too much baggage to be useful.

---

90 Richard K. Hansen. *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History.* (GIA Publications, Chicago, Illinois, 2005). pg. 179.

Hansen provides a useful chart to illustrate the common belief among scholars and outsiders alike.

| *Vernacular Traditions* | *Cultivated Traditions* |
|---|---|
| Lowbrow Society | Highbrow Society |
| Common, Everyday Language | Elevated Refined Speech |
| Utilitarian Music | Aesthetic, "music for music's sake" |
| Popular Music | Classical Music |
| Entertainment Music | Edifying Music |
| Community Music | Meditation Music |
| Folksong | Art Song and Aria |
| March | Symphony |
| "Taps" | Contemplative Tone Poem |
| "The Star Spangled Banner" | Griffes' *The White Peacock* |

Through Fennell's interviews and personal writings, I may confidently argue that Fennell was an advocate of *Common, Everyday Language.* He was also a proponent of *Community, Folksong and Marches.* From the *cultivated* side of Hansen's chart, Fennell embodied *Classical Music, Symphony, and Aesthetic.* Fennell's interest in community is evident in his work with children, clinics and creating healthy musical space for people playing for him. His repertoire choices show an obvious bias toward march, folksong as well as classical music and the symphony. However, it was for highbrow audiences and educated listeners that Fennell primarily performed. Fennell's unique combination of words shows a man bridging a gap between two different worlds. Even the choice in name for his ensemble reflects this. By choosing *Wind Ensemble* as a title, it allows for open instrumentation by not referencing an existing ensemble type (like a symphony orchestra), while also allowing him to program any repertoire he chose.

It is no secret in the wind music community that nomenclature has been a constant issue since the birth of the wind music renaissance at the turn of the 19th century. Even the Sousa era ensembles struggled with naming their groups appropriately for the instruments they contained

and the music they performed. Brian Cardany believes that the root of wind band's inability to define itself comes from its inability to define its purpose in culture and society as well as the larger music scene in America and elsewhere.[91] Indeed, there are as many creation stories for wind bands as there are wind bands. Some are started out of necessity for an ensemble to play military drills, while others are created as entertainment for football games. Some are created to perform the music of the great composers of the 18th and 19th centuries in transcription, while others are formed to create and perform original wind works. There are also professional wind bands, and university associated wind bands as well as some that bridge the gap between both (like the EWE).

Each ensemble name and instrumentation comes with certain connotative meanings among the wind community. Wind Ensembles are often perceived as elite and above the level of a Symphonic Band. A Concert Band is viewed as a more amateur incarnation of a Symphonic Band, and a Wind Orchestra (in its truest instrumentation incarnation) is viewed as an orchestral offshoot that has little heritage to a Wind Ensemble or a Band of any sort. Symphonic Bands and Concert Bands are thought of almost entirely as educational ensembles and as they rarely exist outside of a high school or university setting; the repertoire most often associated with them is educational. The instrumentation (and thus repertoire) has a deep connection to this unacknowledged ranking system and how each ensemble is viewed.[92] This is very evident when one looks at the repertoire lists from a sample group of each type of ensemble. There is, for

---

91 Brian M. Cardany. *Attitudes Toward Repertoire and the Band Experience Among Participants in Elite University Wind Band Programs*. (Arizona State University, Arizona, 2006). pg. 1.

92 Eric L. Hinton. *Conducting the Wind Orchestra* (Cambria Press, NewYork,2008). pg. 27.

example, almost no crossover between the repertoire of the AWSO and the EWE, but there is a sizable amount between the ESB and the Michigan Symphonic Band.

Eric Hinton believes that wind music in America is derived almost solely from the traditions of harmoniemusik brought by the European settlers to the colonies. He interprets these ensembles as harmoniemusik in instrumentation, but military in function. He cites that the United States Marine Band, in 1801 consisted of 2 oboes, 2 clarinets, 2 horns, a bassoon, and a drum - a typical harmoniemusik instrumentation with an added percussionist.[93] Hinton's theory of *cultivated* ensemble structures providing a *utilitarian* purpose displays an interesting parallel to Fennell and the EWE, but also to the AWSO. If Fennell and his beliefs on instrumentation and repertory are of two contradictory minds, Hinton's theory may serve to bridge the gap. The instrumentation of the first American wind bands were orchestral in instrumentation, training of players and repertory. However, they served as military bands, even if they were only in name *military.* They were not a band that led troops into battle, yet they were governed by military officials and rules. This is not unlike the AWSO and their mandate to provide a *vernacular* audience with high art *cultivated* music.

Most importantly though, these ensembles were one to a part and versatile in playing style. By the late 1800's this model had given way to the more familiar wind band instrumentation of Gilmour and Sousa. It was with Gilmour that parts were doubled, tripled and even quadrupled. The instrumentation of these mid 19th-century bands often had a 2:1 ratio of

---

[93] Ibid. pg. 29.

clarinets to the rest of the woodwinds and a ratio of 2:1 woodwinds to brass.[94] Gilmour's band, not unlike Sousa's, was also a primarily transcription playing ensemble. In 1938, instrumentation of wind bands had grown to astronomical sizes. Albert Austin Harding (who had been one of Fennell's mentors at Interlochen just a few years before), boasted an enormous ensemble of: 10 flutes and piccolos, 4 oboes, 2 English horns, 1 baritone oboe, 1 hecklephone, 1 tenor sarussophone, 5 bassoons, 1 contrabassoon, 24 B-flat clarinets, 5 alto clarinets, 1 basset horn, 5 bass clarinets, 3 contrabass clarinets, 3 alto saxophones, 2 tenor saxophones, 1 baritone saxophone, 7 cornets, 2 flugel horns, 4 trumpets, 10 horns, 5 tenor trombones, 2 bass trombones, 3 euphoniums, 2 baritones, 1 E-flat tuba, 5 BB-flat tubas, 1 EE-flat tuba, 1 harp, 2 marimbas, 2 kettledrums, 4 percussion, and 2 string basses.[95] That is a staggering 122-person ensemble. To perform the repertoire of the EWE with an ensemble of that size is impossible.

Although the revolution in instrumentation was Fennell's idea in 1952, Hinton provides evidence that the Goldman Band was performing entire concerts of original wind music at least four years before Fennell created the EWE. He also argues that Goldman was commissioning composers to write works for winds before Fennell. Grainger did indeed premiere several works with the Goldman band even in the early 1940s.[96] Hinton believes that Fennell's genius is in his theory of variable instrumentation, and agrees with Fennell's sentiment that composers should not be told for how many instruments they were to write.

---

[94] Ibid. pg. 32

[95] Ibid. pg. 38

[96] Ibid. pg 34.

Beyond the issues of *cultivated* and *vernacular*, educational and professional, high art and low-brow, transcription and original music, there is the issue of elitism and a ranking of ensembles and repertoire into categories of perceived worthiness. The actions and repertoire of each ensemble also creates questions of funding and title.[97] Does the funding for a marching band come from a school of music or an athletics department? Which body governs the actions of the ensemble and its conductor in choosing repertoire, personnel and other such important questions?

In a series of questionnaires put forth by the CBDNA in the 1980's, these questions are addressed. The questionnaire asked band directors from across the United States to discuss the pros and cons of having a wind ensemble system that ran in conjunction with a symphonic band and/or marching band system. The main issue that arose on the negative side of the debate was one of status and where musical allegiances laid. Conductors argued that it was unfair to rob a symphonic band or marching band of its best players in favour of having them drafted into an elite wind ensemble that required the players to play at a higher level without the support of others playing the same part. They also belived that it created a divide between the two groups and that there was then a rivalry that was not needed, helpful or useful to the music system as a whole. They did however recognize that the benefits of better repertoire to play and competition between students created an ever more positive standard of musicianship.[98] This issue of funding and governance was one of Fennell's first issues when he created the Eastman marching band (later to become the ESB) in 1933.

---

[97] David Allen Milburn. *The Development of the Wind Ensemble In The United States (1952-1981)*. pg. 120.

[98] Ibid. Pg. 121.

Although some of this perceived rift between ensembles has dissipated since the 1980s, it is still a very real issue among wind programs that have more than one ensemble. The hierarchy of ensembles among a wind music system is not something that has a parallel in the educational orchestral world. This is because the status of the ensemble is created by the instrumentation of the repertoire it plays. By way comparing wind music with orchestral - a large school like University of Michigan has fourteen different wind band incarnations that range from highly competitive, intensive rehearsal ensembles to ensembles for non music majors. The orchestral ensembles department has two highly screened ensembles, a contemporary ensemble and two smaller orchestras for non music majors.[99] It is simply the diverse range of repertoire and instrumentation that still breeds wind bands into systems far larger than their orchestral counterparts, but the resultant hierarchy is a large issue.

It is with Frederick Fennell in 1952 that this list of *vernacular* and *cultivated* traits truly break down and they are no longer as effective to describe an ensemble like the Sousa band or a university marching band. Fennell and the EWE was a ideologically mid-line ensemble, and when comparing the repertoire choices of Fennell's EWE[100] to Hansen's list of traits, there are many contradictions. Fennell would often program marches, but they were not played for the *normal* audiences; rather, they were played for the musical elite at the Eastman School - one of America's most prestigious music schools. Fennell was also a proponent of new music written for variable instrumentation. This was something no other wind group at the time could claim as a

---

[99] http://www.music.umich.edu/current_students/perf_opps/orchestras.htm. Accessed May 20th. 2012.

[100] See Appendix B

trait, yet orchestras had been practicing this commissioning habit for many years. The confusion over Fennell's new genre of wind group was formed in this reversal of roles for what a wind group should play, who they played for, and what constituted the instrumentation of the ensemble.

Frederick Fennell travelled through many different musical styles over the course of his life, as well as changing his ideas on wind instrumentation and repertory. By the time he left the EWE in 1960, it is clear that he was performing high art, well written, *cultivated* wind music. He was performing this repertoire for an audience of people who knew and understood not only music, but wind music. His audience was a trained, university educated one. He worked mostly in the private world of universities, unlike Boudreau. Boudreau's audience, to this day, is not one that should be demographically listening to high art classical wind music, but it is an audience that he has cultivated over the last 57 years. The AWSO is an anomaly in terms of expected audiences, but their mandate has not changed. They commission and perform new, avant-garde and exploratory works for winds with an instrumentation that consists of a doubled orchestral wind section. The AWSO is as close to a wind music ideal as anyone could get. However, Fennell's work with the EWE and the Tokyo Kosei Wind Orchestra (TKWO) is recognized and respected by the wind music community as well as the music community as a whole.

By 1954, the EWE had begun in earnest the process of commissioning composers to write for the new fledgling ensemble and its innovative instrumentation. Fennell sent out literally hundreds of letters to composers across the globe inviting them to write for the EWE. Over the following decades, dozens of composers responded to Fennell's invitation and they began to write

for the Wind Ensemble. It was at this time (the late 1950s) that the other most prolific commissioning projects for winds was started. The American Wind Symphony Orchestra began in 1957 to commission dozens of composers for their slightly different instrumentation. Donald Hunsberger (a former conductor of the Eastman Wind Ensemble), has said of the AWSO that

> The American Wind Symphony Editions have largely been ignored by the majority of the wind band world, due partly to misconceptions concerning the instrumentation of the works (Boudreau has made a goal of seeking composers from Europe, Central and South America who are unknown by name to many in the United States), and also because of the fact that the performance parts are all on rental.[101]

None-the-less, the EWE and the AWSO make up the vast majority of commissioned wind music in the twentieth century. Between them the AWSO and the EWE have attempted to create a new repertoire for the new ensemble models. Fennell believed, as does Robert Austin Boudreau, that for the new ensembles to survive, there needed to be a repertoire all its own. It would be shortsighted to have these groups only play music that was not written for them. The only way to bring wind music groups to the forefront of new music was to create a canon of works that future ensembles could play.

---

[101] Cipolla, Frank and Donald Hunsberger ed. *The Wind Ensemble and its Repertoire: Essays on the Fortieth Anniversary of the Eastman Wind Ensemble.* pg 17.

## Conclusion

This thesis has attempted to show the progression and evolution of Fennell's ideas on instrumentation and repertoire. It also discussed how his early childhood experiences shaped his thoughts on instrumentation and repertory as well as stylistic choices that he began to make for the EWE and later ensembles. Fennell's childhood exposure to both Sousa and orchestral repertoire created a stylistic dichotomy that would later be exemplified in the differences between the ESB and the EWE.

As a young conductor Fennell was determined to be an orchestral conductor and conduct the standard repertoire of the American Orchestra circa 1930. This consisted of a great deal of Romantic and Classical composers. In his first years conducting, he was actively trying to win positions with the major American orchestras. When this ultimately failed, he began to implement that romantic style of repertoire onto the ESB. This meant that he performed a great number of orchestral transcriptions of the Romantic and Classical composers. This style of wind band was one that was overwhelmingly popular between the 1880s and 1950s. The model for these bands was taken from the Sousa touring group that defined the wind band for decades.

In 1952, Fennell decided that the only way to grow and nurture the genre of the wind band was to provide an ensemble that composers felt comfortable writing for. This ensemble became the EWE and it consisted of a one-to-a-part ensemble of winds that could be varied by the composer. Fennell believed that the lack of original wind works by high art composers was due to the confusion over instrumentation and over the cultural history of the wind band. Essentially, Fennell provided composers with an ensemble that guaranteed that their music would

be played for an educated and passionate audience, and that the ensemble was a group of capable musicians, trained at one of the best music schools in the United States.

This shift in the wind band community created a rift between ensembles, conductors, repertoire, and instrumentations that were either part of the *cultivated* or *vernacular* traditions, or somewhere between the two. This shift in ensemble culture led to a renaissance of wind music that is still growing across the world. The freedom for composers to create any sound they can imagine, for a variable ensemble, is a freedom that has seen some of the greatest composers of the 20th and 21st century write for winds. Verese, Janacek, Vaughan Williams, Grainger, Copland, Stravinsky and Milhaud all turned to the pure and variable sound of winds to create pieces that would not be possible in the orchestral community.

As a result of this shift in repertory ideology, the wind community has become a haven for experimental music. With groups like the AWSO, composers are free to experiment and create music that would be unheard of to perform in a regular orchestra's season. As wind bands become an essential part of the American (and increasingly Canadian) university music system, the commissioning power and financial strength of marching and wind music groups easily surpasses their orchestral counterparts. Wind music is getting more and more exposure in the classical music scene as wind groups populated by professional orchestral players become popular, and as more renowned and prolific composers begin to write for the groups. Eric Whitacre, John Adams, Johan deMeij, and John Mackey have all written pieces for wind groups in the past decade. This trend in music would not have come about without the influence of Fennell and

contemporaries like Boudreau, Battisti and the conductors of the traveling wind groups like Sousa, Gilmour and Goldman.

The wind genre has evolved more in the past 100 years than it had in the previous 400. The gradual shift from *vernacular* to *cultivated* has been a larger change to the wind music genre than any stylistic period change ever has been. Although the compositions of the Renaissance are obviously extremely different from those of the classical, they held the same cultural purpose as well as the same standing in the larger music community. They also maintained an almost identical instrumentation structure for generations. It was not until the 20th century that these ensemble's instrumentation and position in the music community would be challenged. The function of the wind ensemble is what was changed with Fennell and other wind music pioneers. It was the intent with which wind music was written and performed that saw its revolution in the 1950s.

Though it took Fennell's charisma and initiative to change the repertoire of the ensembles in 1952, the instrumentation and nomenclature of wind groups has been in constant flux since Sousa began touring in the 1880s. Although Fennell was certainly the pioneer behind the radical changes of the 1950s, his thoughts on instrumentation and repertoire were not without influence from his surroundings, friends, colleagues, and mentors. Fennell's musical influences from the orchestral world and his mentors like Sergei Koussevitsky, in conjunction with his orchestral background at summer institutes like Interlochen and Tanglewood, had a lasting impression on his musical taste that would not change until the conductor was well into middle age.

## Appendix A - The Eastman Symphony Band

| **Years Included** | 1935-1952 | Percentages from Performances | Percentages from Pieces |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Number of Pieces** | 278 | | |
| **Total Number of Performed Pieces** | 487 | | |
| **Number of Transcribers/Arrangers** | 154 | | 55% |
| **Number of Wind Band Standards** | 124 | | 44% |
| **Number of Wind Band Standard Performances** | 226 | 46% | |
| **Number of Orchestral Transcriptions** | 154 | | 55% |
| **Number of Orchestral trans. Performances** | 344 | 70% | |
| **Number of Sousa Marches** | 12 | | 4% |
| **Number of Sousa Performances** | 21 | 4% | |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A** | **Alessandro** | Sinfonietta for Wind Instruments | 1 | |
| | **Alford** | The Purple Carnival | 4 | |
| | | Colonel Bogey | 2 | |
| | | Glory of Gridiron | 3 | |
| | | The Skyliner | 1 | |
| | | The Voice of the Guns March | 1 | |
| | | The Vanished Army | 1 | |
| | | Dunedin March | 1 | |
| **B** | **Bach, J.S** | We all believe in One God | 2 | Godfrey |
| | | Fugue et la Gigue | 5 | Holst |
| | | Fugue in G Minor (Lesser) | 1 | Quarels |
| | | Fugue in G Minor | 1 | Cailliet |
| | | Come Sweet Death | 4 | Leidzen |
| | | Chorale, Prelude and Fugue in G Minor | 2 | Abert |
| | | Chorale, Prelude and Fugue in G Minor | 2 | Godfrey |
| | | Fugue in G Minor (Lesser) | 2 | Lyon |
| | | Fantasia in G Major | 2 | Quarels |
| | | Chorale Prelude in G Minor | 2 | Gillette |
| | | Fugue in C Minor | 1 | Lyon |
| | | Christ Lay in the Bonds of Death | 3 | Whybrew |
| | | Christ Lay in the Bonds of Death | 1 | Mairs |
| | | Fervent is my Longing | 2 | Wright |
| | | Passacaglia and Fugue in C Minor | 2 | Falcone |
| | | Chorale Prelude, Herzlich Thut Mich verlangen | 4 | Wright |
| | | Toccata and Fugue in D Minor | 3 | Wright |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Toccata and Fugue in D Minor | 1 | Leidzen |
| | | Wir Glauben all en einen Gott | 1 | Gillette |
| | **Bagley** | National Emblem | 3 | |
| | **Barat** | Andante and Scherzo for Solo Trumpet and Band | 2 | Mear |
| | **Barber** | Commando March | 2 | |
| | **Barrow** | A Suite of Variations | 2 | |
| | **Belsterling** | March of the Steel Man | 2 | |
| | **Bendel** | Sunday Morning at Glion from By the Lake at Geneva | 1 | Watson |
| | **Bennett** | Suite of Old American Dances | 1 | |
| | **Berlioz** | Roman Carnival Overture | 1 | Safranek |
| | | Roman Carnival Overture | 1 | Godfrey |
| | | Symphonie fantastique Mvt. 2 and 4 | 2 | Foulds/Brown |
| | | Grand Symphony for Band | 1 | Goldman |
| | **Beethoven** | Egmont Overture | 5 | Winterbottom |
| | | Three Equali for Four Trombones | 1 | |
| | | Lenore Overture No. 3 | 1 | Godfrey |
| | | Turkish March from the Ruins of Athens | 1 | |
| | **Bigelow** | Our Director | 1 | |
| | **Bizet** | L'Arlessiene Suite No. 1 | 2 | Laurendeau |
| | | March of the Smugglers from Carmen | 1 | |
| | | Selections from Carmen | 1 | Falcone |
| | **Borodin** | Overture to Prince Igor | 2 | Glazunov/ Duthoit |
| | **Bottesini** | Grand Duo Concertante | 1 | Zimmerman |
| | **Brahms** | Variations on a Theme by Haydn | 3 | Duthoit |
| | **Britten** | Soirées musicales on Themes of Giaccomo Rossini | 2 | Brown |
| | **Bruckner** | Symphony No. 7 in E-flat. Adagio | 1 | Falcone |
| | **Byrd** | Earl of Oxford March | 1 | Jacob |
| **C** | **Cailliet** | Variations on Pop Goes the Weasel | 2 | |
| | **Cazden** | Elegy Before Dawn | 1 | |
| | **Cimarosa** | Overture to the Secret Marriage | 1 | Winter |
| | **Chambrier** | March joyeuse | 1 | Miller |
| | **Clark** | Suite of Classic Dances (Couperin, Krebs, Gluck,Gretry, Mattheson, Rameau) | 4 | Clark |
| | | Euphonium Solo - Debutante | 1 | |
| | **Cline** | Valour and Victory March | 3 | |
| | | Cowboy lament | 1 | |
| | **Copland** | El Salon Mexico | 1 | Haldane |
| | **Cowell** | Shoonthree | 2 | |
| **D** | **Davies** | Royal Air Force March | 1 | |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Debussy** | Golliwogs Cakewalk | 1 | Weiss |
| | | The Girl With the Flaxen Hair | 1 | Weiss |
| | | Petite suite | 3 | Winterbottom |
| | | Petite suite | 1 | Weiss |
| | **DeFalla** | Spanish Dance from Vida Breve | 1 | Goldberg |
| | **DeNardis** | Nocturne and Procession from Abruzzesi | 2 | Caravaglios |
| | **De Sarasate** | Zigeunerweisen | 1 | Cailliet |
| | **Di Lasso** | Motet- Tui Sunt Coeli | 1 | |
| | **Dukas** | The Sorcerer's Apprentice | 4 | Winterbottom |
| | **Dvorak** | Slavonic Dance No. 2 | 1 | Ertl |
| | | Slavonic Dance No. 4 | 1 | Unknown |
| | | Slavonic Dance No. 3 | 1 | Unknown |
| **E** | **Effinger** | Prelude and Fugue | 1 | |
| | **Elgar** | Suite from the Bavarian Highlands | 1 | Godfrey |
| | | Pomp and Circumstance. March No. 2 | 1 | Evans |
| | **Enesco** | Rumanian Rhapsody No. 1 | 2 | |
| | **End** | Floor Show | 2 | |
| **F** | **Fauchet** | Symphony in B-flat. Mvt 1 | 1 | Gillette |
| | **Fennell** | The Spirit of Youth | 2 | |
| | | Hail Sinfonia | 1 | |
| | | Palestra | 3 | |
| | | Tally-Ho | 1 | |
| | **Fillmore** | The Klaxon March | 1 | |
| | **Franchetti** | Symphony in E Minor | 2 | |
| | **Franck** | Redemption from Morceau symphonique | 1 | Godfrey |
| | | Symphony in D Minor | 2 | Gillette |
| | **Gabrielli** | Sonata Pian'e Forte | 1 | |
| | | Canzon noni toni a 12 | 1 | |
| **G** | **Ganne** | Marche Lorraine | 1 | |
| | **Gershwin** | Three Songs from Porgy and Bess | 2 | End |
| | | Selections from Porgy and Bess | 1 | Bennett |
| | **Gillette** | Vistas Sinfonetta in Olden Style | 1 | |
| | **Gliere** | Russian Soldiers Dance | 3 | Leidzen |
| | | Russian Soldiers Dance | 1 | Dvorak |
| | **Glinka** | Overture to Rousslan and Ludmilla | 3 | Winterbottom |
| | **Goldman** | University Grand March | 2 | |
| | | Interlochen Bowl | 2 | |
| | | On the Mall | 1 | |
| | | Cheerio | 2 | |
| | **Goldmark** | Scherzo from the "Rustic Wedding" Symphony | 1 | Armbruster |
| | | Sakuntala Overture | 1 | Faulwetter |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Gould** | Pavanne | 1 | Yoder |
| | | Jericho Rhapsody | 1 | |
| | | Cowboy Rhapsody | 2 | |
| | | American Salute | 1 | |
| | **Gounod** | Funeral March of a Marionette | 1 | Lake |
| | **Grainger** | The Immovable Do | 1 | |
| | | The Lads of Wamphray | 2 | |
| | **Grieg** | Piano Concerto in A Minor | 1 | Falcone |
| | | The Last Spring | 1 | Holvik |
| | **Grofe** | On the Trail from Grand Canyon Suite | 1 | Leidzen |
| **H** | **Hadley** | Youth Triumphant Overture | 2 | |
| | **Handel** | Royal Fireworks Music | 3 | Santorius |
| | | Suite - The Gods go a Begging | 3 | Beecham/ Duthoit |
| | | Suite from the Water Music | 2 | Lyon |
| | | Slow March from Scipio | 1 | Leidzen |
| | | March from Judas Maccabeus | 3 | Goldman |
| | **Hanson** | Nordic Symphony. Mvt. 2 | 2 | Maddy |
| | | Symphony No. 2 Mvt. 1 | 1 | Goldberg |
| | | Festive Fanfare | 1 | |
| | | March Carillon | 2 | Leidzen |
| | | Suite from Merry Mount | 3 | Garland |
| | **Hanson, E.** | Little Norwegian Suite | 1 | |
| | **Harris** | Cimmaron Overture | 1 | |
| | | Symphonic Fantasy, The Fruit of Gold | 1 | |
| | **Hindemith** | Symphony in B-flat (First Performance 1952) | 1 | |
| | **Holst** | Mars from the Planets | 3 | Smith |
| | | First Suite in E-flat (FIRST PERFORMANCE 1947) | 3 | |
| | | Second Suite in F (1st Performance 1949) | 1 | |
| | **Humperdinck** | Prayer and Dream Pantomime from Hansel and Gretel | 3 | Maddy |
| | | Suite from the Miracle | 1 | Winterbottom |
| **I** | | | | |
| **J** | **Jacob** | An Original Suite | 2 | |
| | | William Byrd Suite | 3 | |
| | | Music for a Festival | 1 | |
| | **Jeanjean** | Au clair de la lune | 1 | End |
| | **Jenkins/Neff** | Pieces of Eight | 3 | |
| **K** | **Keller** | Suite | 3 | |
| | **Ketelby** | The Clock and the Dresden Figures | 2 | |
| | | Cockney Suite | 2 | Amers |
| | **Kern** | Selections from Showboat | 1 | Jones |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Key** | The Star Spangled Banner | 3 | |
| | **King** | Pride of the Illini | 1 | |
| | **Kohs** | Life with Uncle Sam | 1 | |
| **L** | **Liszt** | Hungarian Fantasie | 1 | Falcone |
| | **Lithgow** | Invercargil | 2 | |
| | **Lyon** | Chorale for Two Brass Choirs | 1 | |
| **M** | **MacDowell** | Woodland Sketches | 1 | Winterbottom |
| | **Mason** | Divertimento for Band | 3 | Simmons |
| | **McKay** | Burlesque March | 4 | |
| | | Symphonic Prelude in American Idiom (For Brass Alone) | 1 | |
| | | Bravura Prelude | 2 | |
| | | Sonata for Clarinet | 1 | |
| | **Meacham** | American Patrol | 1 | |
| | **Mendelssohn** | Overture to Midsummer Nights Dream | 1 | Meyer |
| | | Wedding March from A Midsummer Nights Dream | 1 | Laurendeau |
| | **Meyer-Helmund** | Serenade Rococo | 1 | |
| | **Miaskovsky** | Symphony in E-flat for band | 1 | |
| | **Milhaud** | Suite française | 2 | |
| | **Morgenstern** | Quartet for Horns | 1 | |
| | **Morris** | The Kilties March | 1 | |
| | **Mozart** | Minuet in E-flat | 1 | Garland |
| | | Overture to The Marriage of Figaro | 3 | Duthoit |
| | | Minuet from Symphony No. 39 | 1 | Garland |
| | | Serenade No. 10 Bb for Wind Instruments | 1 | |
| | **Mussorgsky** | Pictures at an Exhibition | 3 | Leidzen/Fennell |
| | | Coronation Scene from Boris Gudounov | 1 | Leidzen |
| **N** | | | | |
| **O** | | | | |
| **P** | **Paganini** | Perpetual Motion | 1 | Falcone |
| | **Palestrina** | Adoramus Te and Santus | 1 | Harvey |
| | **Petersen** | Our Commander | 1 | |
| | **Persichetti** | Divertimento for Band | 3 | |
| | **Pezel** | Suite No. 2 for brass Instruments | 1 | |
| | **Pierne** | March of the Little Lead Soldiers | 2 | Beeler |
| | | | | |
| | **Prokofiev** | Scherzo and March from the Love of Three Oranges | 4 | Duthoit |
| | | Triumphal March from Peter and the Wolf | 1 | Goldman |
| | **Pryor** | Fantasie on the Air The Blue Bells of Scotland | 1 | |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Purcell** | Trumpet Voluntary | 1 | Garland |
| **Q** | | | | |
| **R** | **Rachmaninoff** | Italian Polka | 2 | Leidzen |
| | **Read** | Prayers of Steel | 3 | Grabel |
| | **Respighi** | Ballad for Band Huntingtontower | 1 | |
| | | Pines of the Appian from Pines of Rome | 1 | Leidzen |
| | **Rimsky-Korsakov** | The Procession of the Nobles from Mlada | 5 | Leidzen |
| | | Wedding March and Death of King Dodon from Le Coq d'or | 2 | Luckhardt |
| | **Riegger** | Passacaglia and Fugue | 1 | |
| | | Music for Brass Choir | 1 | |
| | | Processional | 1 | |
| | **Rossini** | Danse cosaque | 1 | Respighi |
| | | Overture to Semiramide | 3 | Rollinson |
| | | Overture to the Barber of Seville | 4 | Duthoit |
| | | La boutique fantasque | 1 | Respighi/ Godfrey/Leidzen |
| | **Roussel** | A Glorious Day | 1 | |
| | **Ruggles** | Angels from Men and Angels | 1 | |
| **S** | **Saint Saens** | French Military March | 1 | |
| | **Sanders** | Symphony in B-flat for Band | 1 | |
| | **San Juan** | Yoruba Song | 1 | |
| | **Sarasate** | Zigeunerweisen | 1 | Cailliet |
| | **Scheidt** | Cazon XXVI for Five Instruments | 1 | |
| | **Schoenberg** | Theme and Variations in G minor | 3 | |
| | **Shostakovich** | Prelude in E-flat Minor | 1 | Dike |
| | | Symphony 5, Mvt. 2 and 4 | 3 | Woolston |
| | **Schubert** | Ballet Music from Rosemunde | 1 | Safranek |
| | | Symphony 8 "Unfinished" Andante con Moto | 2 | Cailliet |
| | | Marche militaire française No. 1 | 2 | Laurendeau |
| | **Schuman** | newsreel In five shot | 2 | |
| | **Seitz** | Grandioso | 1 | |
| | **Sibelius** | Finlandia | 1 | Cailliet |
| | **Smetana** | Suite from the Battered Bride | 1 | Lotter |
| | | Symphonic Poem - Vltava | 1 | Winterbottom |
| | | Symphonic Poem - The Moldau | 2 | Winterbottom |
| | **Sousa** | Sempre Fidelis | 3 | |
| | | The Liberty bell | 2 | |
| | | Manhattan Beach | 3 | |
| | | High School Cadets | 2 | |
| | | Black Horse Troop | 2 | |
| | | Northern Pines | 1 | |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Hands Across the Sea | 1 | |
| | | Sabre and Spurs | 1 | |
| | | The Invincible Eagle | 1 | |
| | | Washington Post | 1 | |
| | | Corcoran Cadets | 3 | |
| | | Stars and Stripes Forever | 1 | |
| | **Strauss** | Overture to Die Fledermaus | 2 | Godfrey |
| | | Waltzes from Der Rosenkavelier | 2 | Cailliet |
| | | Waltzes from Die Fledermaus | 1 | Godfrey |
| | | Serenade in E-flat for 13 Instruments | 1 | |
| | | Solemn Entry of the Knights of St. John | 1 | |
| | | Emperor Waltz | 2 | Brown |
| | **Stravinsky** | Berceuse and Finale from The Firebird | 3 | Quarels |
| | | Circus Polka | 2 | |
| | | Symphony of Wind Instruments (1st Performed 1951) | 1 | |
| **T** | **Tchaikovsky** | Suite from Swan Lake | 2 | Godfrey |
| | | Overture Fantasy from Romeo and Juliet | 3 | Westphal |
| | | Theme and Variations from Suite No. 3 | 2 | Winterbottom |
| | | 1812 Overture | 1 | Brown |
| | | Concerto in B-flat for Piano and Orchestra | 1 | Woldt |
| | | March Slav | 1 | Laurendeau |
| | **Texidor** | Amparito Roca | 3 | Winter |
| | **Thomson** | A Solemn Music | 1 | |
| | **Turina** | Danzas Fantasticas, no. 1. Exaltacion | 1 | Boyd |
| | **Turlit** | Le Regiment de Sambre-et-meuse | | |
| | | French National Defile | 1 | |
| | **Tuthill** | Overture for Symphonic Band | 4 | |
| | | Suite for Band | 2 | |
| | | Rowdy Dance | 1 | |
| **U** | | | | |
| **V** | **Vaughan Williams** | Toccata Marziale | 3 | |
| | | English Folk Song Suite | 3 | |
| | **Verdi** | Grand March from Aida | 2 | Seredy |
| **W** | **Wagner** | Overture to Reinzi | 5 | Grabel |
| | | Siegfried's Rhine Journey from Gotterdammerung | 2 | Cailliet |
| | | Siegfried's Rhine Journey from Gotterdammerung | 1 | Winterbottom |
| | | Wotans farewell and Magic Fire Music | 2 | Winterbottom |
| | | Prelude and Love Death from Tristan und Isolde | 3 | Godfrey |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Prelude to Act III from Der Meistersinger | 5 | Winterbottom |
| | | Elsa's Procession to the Cathedral from Lohingrin | 3 | Cailliet |
| | | Siegfried's Funeral March from Twilight of the Gods | 2 | Winterbottom |
| | | Entry of the Gods into Valhalla From Das Rheingold | 2 | Godfrey |
| | | A Faust Overture | 1 | Godfrey |
| | | Overture to the Flying Dutchman | 2 | Seidel |
| | | Trauersinfonie, Funeral Music on Themes from Weber's Euryanthe | 2 | Leidzen |
| | | Nachtgesang, Prelude to Act III Tristand Und Isolde | 1 | Fennell |
| | | Symphonic Synthesis of the Music from Parsifal | 2 | Winterbottom |
| | | Closing Scene from Act III Die Valkyrie | 1 | Unknown |
| | **Walton** | Crown Imperial March | 2 | Duthoit |
| | **Weber** | Overture to Euryanthe | 6 | Godfrey |
| | | Concerto for Clarinet | 3 | Lake |
| | | Overture to Oberon | 1 | Gready |
| | **Weinberger** | Polka and Fugue from Schwanda, the Bagpiper | 6 | Bainum |
| | **White** | Five Minatures | 2 | |
| | | Overture to Youth | 2 | Lyon |
| | | College Caprice | 1 | Fennell |
| | **Wilkins** | The Genesee | 2 | Woolston |
| | **Willaert** | Ricercare for Wind Instruments | 1 | |
| **Y** | | | | |
| **Z** | | | | |

## Appendix B - The Eastman Wind Ensemble

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Years Included** | 1952-1962 | Percentages from Performances | Percentages from Pieces |
| **Number of Pieces** | 242 | | |
| **Total Number of Performed Pieces** | 440 | | |
| **Number of Transcribers/Arrangers** | 26 | | 10% |
| **Number of Wind Band Standards** | 216 | | 89% |
| **Number of Wind Band Standard Performances** | 406 | 92% | |
| **Number of Orchestral Transcriptions** | 26 | | 10% |
| **Number of Orchestral trans. Performances** | 34 | 7% | |
| **Number of Sousa Marches** | 35 | | 14% |
| **Number of Sousa Performances** | 65 | 14% | |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A** | **Alford** | Glory of Gridiron | 2 | |
| | | Colonel Bogey | 1 | |
| | | Mad Major | 1 | |
| | | Law and Order | 1 | |
| | **Anderson** | The Irish Suite | 1 | |
| | | Suite of Carols | 1 | |
| **B** | **Bach** | Chorale - Jesus Who in Sorrow Dying | 1 | Lake |
| | | Come Sweet Death | 1 | Leidzen |
| | | If Thou Be Near | 1 | Moehlmann |
| | | Prelude and Fugue in G minor | 1 | Cailliet |
| | | Thou Prince of Life, O Christ, O Lord | 1 | Lake |
| | | Sheep May Safely Graze | 1 | Richardson |
| | | Chorale and Fugue in G Minor | 1 | Abert/Weiss |
| | | Fugue in F Major | 1 | Unknown |
| | **Bagley** | National Emblem | 6 | |
| | **Barber** | Commando March | 2 | |
| | **Barlow** | Intrada, Fugue, and Postlude for Brass | 1 | |
| | **Bassett** | Symphonic Sketch | 1 | |
| | **Beethoven** | Egmont Overture | 1 | Winterbottom |
| | **Bennett** | Suite of Old American Dances | 7 | |
| | | Symphonic Songs | 3 | |
| | **Berger** | Rondo Ostinato | 1 | |
| | **Beversdorf** | Symphony for Band and Percussion | 1 | |
| | | Serenade | 1 | |
| | **Bigelow** | Our Director | 1 | |
| | **Bizet** | Agnus Dei | 1 | |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Blackwood** | Chamber Symphony for Fourteen Winds | 1 | |
| | **Bottje** | Symphonic Allegro | 1 | |
| | | Contrasts | 1 | |
| | | Symphony No. 4 | 1 | |
| | | Concerto for Trumpet, Trombone, and Winds | 1 | |
| | | Theme and Variations | 1 | |
| | **Breydert** | Suite in E-flat | 1 | |
| | **Bruckner** | Mass in E Minor | 1 | |
| **C** | **Casella** | Introduction, Chorale, and March | 1 | |
| | **Chambers** | The Chicago Tribune | 1 | |
| | **Chambrier** | Espana | 1 | |
| | **Coates** | Knightsbridge March | 2 | |
| | **Copland** | Fanfare for the Common Man | 1 | |
| | **Cowell** | Shoonthree | 1 | |
| | **Crane** | Five Baroque Choral Preludes | 1 | |
| | **Creston** | Celebration Overture | 2 | |
| **D** | **Delle Cese** | Inglisina | 5 | |
| | **DeLone** | Symphony No. 1 | 1 | |
| | **Di Lasso** | Motet - Tui Sunt Coeli | 1 | |
| | **Dvorak** | Serenade in D Minor | 1 | |
| **E** | **End** | Portrait by a Wind Ensemble | 1 | |
| | | Variations in the Style of Sauter | 1 | |
| | | Blues for a Killed Cat | 1 | |
| | **Erickson** | Time and the Winds | 1 | |
| **F** | **Fauchet** | Nocturne from Symphony in B-flat | 1 | Campbell-Watson |
| | **Fillmore** | His Honor | 1 | |
| | | Americans We | 1 | |
| | | Men of Ohio | 1 | |
| | **Fiorillo** | South American Holiday | 1 | |
| | **Frankenpohl** | Variations | 1 | |
| | | Overture Giocoso | 2 | |
| | **Fuerstner** | Overture | 1 | |
| **G** | **Gabrieli** | Aria Della Battaglia | 1 | |
| | **Gabrielli** | Sonata Pian’e Forte | 1 | |
| | | Canzon Noni Toni a 12 | 1 | |
| | | Two Motets | 1 | |
| | **Ganne** | Father of Victory | 2 | |
| | **Gauldin** | Variations on a Theme by Bartok for Wind Ensemble | 2 | |
| | | Three Symphonic Sketches | 1 | |
| | **Gluck** | Dance of the Blessed Spirits from Orpheus | 1 | |
| | **Grainger** | Irish Tune from a County Derry | 1 | |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Hill Song No. 2 | 4 | |
| | | Linconshire Posy (First Performance 1956) | 8 | |
| | **Grieg** | Ase's Death from Peer Gynt Suite No. 1 | 1 | Holmes |
| | **Grundman** | American Folk Rhapsody | 1 | |
| | | Two moods Overture | 1 | |
| | | Blue Tail Fly | 1 | |
| | **Goldman** | Cheerio | 4 | |
| | | On the Mall | 1 | |
| | | Illinois March | 2 | |
| | | Boy Scouts of America | 1 | |
| | | Onward-Upward | 1 | |
| | | Children's March | 1 | |
| | | Interlochen Bowl | 1 | |
| | | Bugles and Drums | 1 | |
| | **Gould** | Ballad for Band | 8 | |
| | | Symphony for Band | 1 | |
| | | West Point Symphony | 1 | |
| **H** | **Hadley** | Youth Triumphant Overture | 2 | |
| | **Hall** | Officer of the Day | 1 | |
| | **Handel** | March and Chorus from Judas Maccabaeus | 1 | Goldman |
| | | The Gods go a Begging | 1 | Beecham |
| | **Hanson** | Little Norwegian Suite | 1 | Brown |
| | | Andante from Symphony 1 - Nordic | 1 | Maddy |
| | | March Carillon | 2 | |
| | | Chorale and Alleluia | 7 | |
| | **Hanssen** | Valdres | 5 | Bainum |
| | **Hart** | Song and Celebration | 1 | |
| | **Hartley** | Concerto for 23 Wind Instruments | 3 | |
| | | Rondo for Winds and Percussion | 1 | |
| | **Harris** | Symphony for Band | 1 | |
| | **Headley** | Chorale and Passacaglia | 1 | |
| | **Heed** | In Storm and Sunshine | 2 | |
| | **Hindemith** | Symphony in B-flat for Band | 4 | |
| | **Hodkinson** | Litigo | 1 | |
| | **Holst** | First Suite in E-flat | 8 | |
| | | Second Suite in F | 2 | |
| | | Hammersmith | 3 | |
| | **Humel** | Five Quotations from a Czech Fairy Tale | 1 | |
| | **Humperdinck** | Prayer and Dream Pantomime from Hansel and Gretel | 2 | Maddy |
| **I** | **Ibert** | Concerto for Violoncello and Wind Instruments | 1 | |
| **J** | **Jacob** | William Byrd Suite | 7 | |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Jenkins/Neff** | Pieces of Eight | 5 | |
| | **Jenkins** | An American Overture | 1 | |
| **K** | **Key** | The Star Spangled Banner | 1 | |
| | **Khachaturian** | Armenian Dances | 1 | |
| | **King** | Pride of Illini | 1 | |
| | | Barnum and Bailey's Favorite | 2 | |
| | **Klohr** | The Billboard | 1 | |
| | **Kraehenbuehl** | Ritual | 1 | |
| | **Krenek** | Symphony for Wind Instruments and Percussion | 1 | |
| | **Kurka** | Suite from The Good Soldier Schweik | 1 | |
| **L** | **LaGassey** | Sequoia | 1 | |
| | **Latham** | Three Choral Preludes | 1 | |
| | **Lewis** | Excerpt From The Comedy | 1 | |
| | **Locke** | Music for King Charles II | 1 | |
| | **Lo Presti** | Pageant | 1 | |
| **M** | **Mailman** | Partita | 1 | |
| | **McBride** | Lonely Landscape | 1 | |
| | **McCarthy** | Ballade for band | 1 | |
| | | Ballata | 1 | |
| | **McCoy** | Lights Out | 1 | |
| | **McKay** | Three Street Corner Sketches | 1 | |
| | **Meacham** | American Patrol | 1 | |
| | **Mellers** | Samson Agonists | 1 | |
| | **Mennin** | Canzona | 2 | |
| | **Miaskovsky** | Symphony No. 19 for Wind Orchestra | 1 | |
| | **Milhaud** | Suite Francaise | 5 | |
| | **Mozart** | Serenade in B-flat No. 10 | 5 | |
| | | Serenade in C Minor No. 12 | 2 | |
| | | Serenade in E-flat Major No. 11 | 2 | |
| **N** | | | | |
| **O** | | | | |
| **P** | **Palestrina** | Adoramus te and Santus | 1 | |
| | **Perkins** | Fandango | 1 | |
| | **Persichetti** | Divertimento for Band | 7 | |
| | | Psalm for band | 3 | |
| | | Symphony No. 6 | 5 | |
| | **Pezel** | Suite No. 2 for Brass Instruments | 1 | |
| | **Piston** | Tunbridge Fair | 1 | |
| | **Prokofiev** | March Op. 99 | 4 | |
| | **Pyle** | Edged Night | 1 | |
| **Q** | | | | |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **R** | **Reed** | Spiritual | 1 | |
| | | La Fiesta Mexicana | 4 | |
| | **Reeves** | Second Regiment Connecticut National Guard | 1 | |
| | **Reynolds** | Serenade for Thirteen Winds | 1 | |
| | **Riegger** | Nonet for Brass | 1 | |
| | | Introduction and Fugue for Cello and Symphonic Winds | 2 | |
| | **Rimsky-Korsakov** | Procession of the Nobles from Mlada | 1 | Leidzen |
| | **Resseger** | Metamorphosis on a March | 1 | |
| | **Rogers** | Three Japanese Dances | 4 | |
| | | Guadalcanal March | 1 | |
| | | The Musicians of Bremen | 1 | |
| | **Rota** | Legend of the Glass Mountain | 1 | Dawson |
| | **Rusch** | Menominee Sketches | 1 | |
| | **Russell** | Suite Concertante for Tuba | 1 | |
| **S** | **San Miguel** | The Golden Ear | 2 | |
| | **Schmitt** | Lied and Scherzo for Double Wind Quintet and Solo Horn | 1 | |
| | | Dionysiaques | 1 | |
| | **Scianni** | Court Square: An Impression | 1 | |
| | **Schoenberg** | Theme and Variations | 5 | |
| | **Schuman** | George Washington Bridge | 3 | |
| | | Chester | 1 | |
| | | When Jesus Wept | 1 | |
| | **Seitz** | Grandioso | 1 | |
| | | University of Pennsylvania Band March | 1 | |
| | **Shahan** | Leipzig Towers for Brass and Percussion | 1 | |
| | | Spring Festival in Five Scenes | 1 | |
| | **Shanley** | Concertino | 1 | |
| | **Sousa** | Corcaran Cadets | 5 | |
| | | Rifle Regiment | 3 | |
| | | Daughters of Texas | 1 | |
| | | Fairest of the Fair | 1 | |
| | | The Black Horse Troop | 8 | |
| | | Hands Across the Sea | 3 | |
| | | Manhattan Beach | 3 | |
| | | Sempre Fidelis | 1 | |
| | | The US Field Artillery | 1 | |
| | | King Cotton | 1 | |
| | | The Thunderer | 1 | |
| | | El Capitain | 1 | |
| | | High School Cadets | 2 | |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | The Picadore | 2 | |
| | | The Belle of Chicago | 2 | |
| | | Bullets and Bayonets | 2 | |
| | | Nobles of the Mystic Shrine | 2 | |
| | | The Gallant Seventh | 2 | |
| | | The Legionnaires | 2 | |
| | | The Invincible Eagle | 2 | |
| | | Sound Off | 2 | |
| | | Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company | 1 | |
| | | Sesqui-Centennial Exposition March | 1 | |
| | | Golden Jubilee March | 1 | |
| | | The National Game | 1 | |
| | | The Kansas Wildcats | 1 | |
| | | The Pride of The Wolverines | 1 | |
| | | The Glory of the Yankee Navy | 1 | |
| | | The Gridiron Club | 1 | |
| | | New Mexico march | 1 | |
| | | Sabre and Spurs | 2 | |
| | | Solid Men to the Front | 2 | |
| | | The Liberty Bell | 2 | |
| | | Riders for the Flag | 2 | |
| | | Stars and Stripes Forever | 1 | |
| | **Stevens** | Adagio and Fugue | 1 | |
| | **Still** | From the Delta | 1 | |
| | **Strauss, J** | Radetzky March | 1 | |
| | **Strauss, R** | Symphony for Wind Instruments (1st American Performance) | 1 | |
| | | Excerpt from Death and Transfiguration | 1 | Harding |
| | | Serenade in E-flat Major | 4 | |
| | | Serenade Op. 7 | 1 | |
| | | Suite in B-flat | 3 | |
| | **Stravinsky** | Symphony of Wind Instruments | 6 | |
| | | Octet for Wind Instruments | 1 | |
| | | Concerto for Piano and Wind Instruments | 1 | |
| | | Circus Polka | 1 | |
| | **Sullivan** | Pineapple Poll | 3 | MacKerras/ Duthoit |
| **T** | **Teike** | Old Comrades | 2 | |
| | **Thomson** | A Solemn Music | 2 | |
| | **Toch** | Spiel fur Blasorchester | 1 | |
| | **Tomasi** | Fanfares Liturgiques | 1 | |
| **U** | | | | |
| **V** | **Varese** | Integrales | 1 | |

| Letter | Composer | Name of Work | Number of Times Performed | Transcribers Name - if any |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Vaughan Williams** | Toccata Marziale | 8 | |
| | | English Folk Song Suite | 4 | |
| | | Scherzo alla Marcia | 1 | |
| **W** | **Wagner** | Trauersinfonie | 1 | Leidzen |
| | | Entry of the Gods into Valhalla-Das Rheingold | 1 | Godfrey |
| | **Walton** | Crown Imperial | 2 | Duthoit |
| | **Weber** | Euryanthe Overture | 1 | Godfrey |
| | **Weinberger** | Polka and Fugue from Schwanda the Bagpiper | 1 | Bainum |
| | **Wilder** | An Entertainment | 2 | |
| | **Whitney** | Thendara Overture | 1 | |
| | **Williams** | Fanfare and Allegro | 3 | |
| | | Symphonic Suite | 1 | |
| | **Word** | Variations on a Western Tune | 1 | |
| | **Work** | Autumn Walk | 2 | |
| **X** | | | | |
| **Y** | **Yoder** | Sleepytime | 1 | |
| **Z** | | | | |

## Appendix C - The American Wind Symphony Orchestra

| Composer | Title of Work | Year Performed | Nationality of Composer |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Adler, Samual** | Symphony No. 3 (Diptych) | 1985 | United States |
| **Akpabot, Samuel** | Ofala Festival | 1963 | Nigeria |
| **Aldana, Mario Kuri** | Four Bacabs (Revised 1980) | 1960 | Mexico |
| | Mascaras (Concerto for Marimba) | 1960 | Mexico |
| **Amram, David** | Concerto for Horn Solo and Wind Orchestra | 1967 | United States |
| | King Lear Variations | 1967 | United States |
| **Anderson, Thomas Jefferson** | Fanfare for Solo Trumpet and Four Mini-Bands | 1976 | United States |
| **Arutiunian, Alexandre** | Rhapsody for Trumpet and Wind Orchestra | 1991 | Armenia |
| **Atehortua, Blas** | Chorale and Ostinato Fantastico | | Columbia |
| | Concerto for Oboe | 1980 | Columbia |
| | Concerto for Bass Trombone and Wind Orchestra | | Columbia |
| | Fantasia Concertante, Op. 103 | 1981 | Columbia |
| **Auric, George** | Divertimento | 1967 | France |
| **Avni, Tsvi** | Mashav (for Xylophone Solo and 10 Wind Instruments)<br>[USA 1988] | 1985 | Isreal |
| **Bach, Johann Sebastian (Badings)** | Concerto for Harpsichord in A Major | 1986 | German |
| **Bach, Johann Sebastian (Sapietevski)** | Jesu, Joy of Man's Desiring | 593/596 | German |
| **Badings Henk** | American Folksong Suite (Concerto for English Horn) | 1975 | Dutch |
| **Badings, Henk** | Armageddon | 1968 | Dutch |
| | Chaconne for B-flat Trumpet and Electronics | | Dutch |
| | Concerto for Cello (Cello Concerto III) | 1985 | Dutch |
| | Concerto for Clarinet | 1979 | Dutch |
| | Concerto for Flute | 1963 | Dutch |
| | Concerto for Harp | 1967 | Dutch |
| | Concerto for Three Horns | 1970 | Dutch |
| | Concerto for Trombone | 1086 | Dutch |
| | Concert Piece for Clarinet and Wind Orchestra | 1950 | Dutch |
| | Contata No. 8 | 1973 | Dutch |
| | Double Concerto for Bassoon and ContraBassoon | 1964 | Dutch |
| | Greensleeves | 1970 | Dutch |
| | Pittsburgh Concerto for Winds, Percussion and Tape | 1965 | Dutch |
| | Ragtime for Two Groups of Brass and Percussion | 998/999 | Dutch |
| | Symphony in C | 1966 | Dutch |
| | Three Apparitions of a Hymn | 1984 | Dutch |
| | Tower Music | 1969 | Dutch |
| **Bankole, Ayo** | Overture and Variations on a Yaruba Story Song | 1963 | Nigeria |

| Composer | Title of Work | Year Performed | Nationality of Composer |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Bennett, Robert Russell** | Christmas Overture | 196? | United States |
| | Ohio River Suite | 1959 | United States |
| | Overture to Ty, Tris and Willis | 1977 | United States |
| | Concerto Grosso for Woodwind Quintet and Wind Orchestra | 1959 | United States |
| | Fanfare for the American Wind Symphony | 1981 | United States |
| | Kentucky (from Life) | 196? | United States |
| | Three Humoresques | 1977 | United States |
| | Twain and the River | 1968 | United States |
| | Scherzo (woodwind Quintet) | | United States |
| | West Virginian Epic | 1977 | United States |
| | Zimmer's American Greeting | 1975 | United States |
| **Benson, Warren** | Symphony for Drums and Wind Orchestra | 1963 | United States |
| **Bernstein, Elmer** | A Pennsylvania Overture | 1966 | United States |
| **Bolcom, William** | Liberty Enlightening the World | 1985 | American |
| **Bortz, Daniel** | Concerto for Bassoon and Wind Instruments, Percussion, Celeste and Harp | 1979 | Sweden |
| **Bortz, Daniel** | Concerto Grosso No. 2 | 1981 | Sweden |
| **Bozza, Eugene** | Children's Overtures | 1964 | France |
| **Brant, Henry** | An American Requiem | 1973 | United States |
| **Brouwer, Leo** | Cancion de Gesta | 1979 | Cuba |
| **Casterede, Jaques** | Air Varie (Music for the Oboe Family) | 1968 | France |
| | Concert on a Boat | 1983 | France |
| | Divertissement d'été (Summer Passtimes) | 1965 | France |
| | Fanfare for Lafayette | 1977 | France |
| | Hymn | 1973 | France |
| | Jusqu' à mon dernier souffle | 1986 | France |
| | Music for a Tale of Edgar Allen Poe | 1984 | France |
| **Chobanian, Loris** | Voyages (Concerto for Trombone) | 1982 | Iraq/America |
| **Chou, Wen-Chung** | Metaphores (Four Seasons) | 1961 | China |
| **Chou, Wen-Chung** | Riding the Wind | 1964 | China |
| **Coolidge, Peggy Stuart** | American Mosaic | 1979 | United States |
| **Coyner, Lou** | Dawnstone: A Concerto for solo Tuba and Wind Orchestra | 1980 | United States |

| Composer | Title of Work | Year Performed | Nationality of Composer |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Creston, Paul** | Square Dance Op. 105 | 1975 | United States |
| **Drake, James** | A Joplin Suite | 1980 | United States |
| | Down By the Riverside | 1969 | United States |
| | Up a Lazy River Mood Indigo | | United States |
| **Echezona, Wilberforce** | Egwu Ibo Op. 10. No. 2 | 1963 | Nigeria |
| **El- Dabh, Halim** | Nomadic Waves | 1962 | Egypt |
| **Euba, Akin** | Dance to the Rising Sun | 1963 | Nigeria |
| **Farnon, Robert** | Blow the Wind Southerly | 1985 | Canada |
| **Fiser, Lubos** | Centaures | 1983 | Egypt |
| | Report | 1971 | Czechoslovakia |
| **Francaix, Jean** | Ode à la liberté | 1985 | France |
| **Gabrielli, Giovanni (Boudreau)** | Canzona Noni Toni a 12 | 1962 | Italy |
| **Galindo, Blas** | Concerrto for Flute and Wind Orchestra | 1979 | Mexico |
| | Concerto for Guitar and Wind Orchestra | 1988 | Mexoco |
| **Ginistera, Alberto** | Doce Preludios Americanos | | Argentina |
| **Goebs, Roger** | Encomium | 1961 | American |
| **Guarnieri, M. Camargo** | Homenagem a Villa Lobos | 1966 | Brazil |
| **Handel, George Frederic (Badings)** | Concerto No. 12. Op. 7 #6 | 1963 | England |
| **Handel, George Frederic (Boudreau)** | Music for the Royal Fireworks | 1959 | England |
| **Handel, George Frederic (Boudreau)** | Water Music | 1963 | England |
| **Haydn, Franz Joseph** | Divertimento No.1 in B-flat (Choral St. Anton) | 1960 | Germany |
| **Hoddinot, Alun** | Welch Dances (Suite No. 4) | 1990 | Wales |
| **Holman, Willis** | Festival Prologue | 1967 | United States |
| **Horvit, Michael** | Concerto for Percussion and Wind Symphony | 1985 | United States |
| **Hovhannes, Alan** | Return and Rebuild the Desolate Places | 1964 | United States |
| | Requiem and Resurrection | 1969 | United States |
| | Symphony #4 op. 165 | 1958 | United States |
| | Symphony #7 op. 178 (Nanga Parvat) | 1960 | United States |
| | Symphony #14 op. 194 (Ararat) | 1961 | United States |
| **Humel, Gerard** | concerto for Wind Orchestra | 1988 | United States |
| **Kay, Ulysses** | Trigon | 1961 | United States |
| **Kleinsinger, George** | Symphony of Winds (with Narrator) | 1958 | United States |
| **Kolman, Peter** | Movement | 1971 | Slovak |
| **Johnson, J.J** | Diversions | 1961 | United States |
| **Lang, Philip** | American Tribute | | United States |
| | Battle Hymn of the Republic | | United States |
| | A Stephen Foster Suite | 1980 | United States |

| Composer | Title of Work | Year Performed | Nationality of Composer |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Revival | 1974 | United States |
| **Lapatnikoff, Nikolai** | Concerto Op. 43 | 1963 | Soviet Union |
| **Larson ----** | Clockworks (Brass Quintet, 2 Pianos, Solo Timpani | | |
| **Leeuw, Ton de** | Symphonies of Winds (Homage to Igor Stranvinsky) | 1963 | Dutch |
| **Lloyd, Norman** | An American Sampler | 1974 | United States |
| | Rememories (Celebration, Heartsong, Hymn) | 1976 | United States |
| **Loudova, Ivana** | Chorale | 1971 | Czechoslovakia |
| | Concerto for Organ, Percussion and Wind Orchestra | 1976 | Czechoslovakia |
| | Dramatic Concerto | 1981 | Czechoslovakia |
| | Hymnos | 1975 | Czechoslovakia |
| | Luminous Voice (Concerto for English Horn) | 1986 | Czechoslovakia |
| | Magic Concerto | 1976 | Czechoslovakia |
| **Mata, Eduardo** | Symphony No. 3 | 1967 | Mexico |
| **Mayuzumi, Toshiro** | Concerto for Percussion | 1965 | Japan |
| | Fireworks | 1963 | Japan |
| | Music with Sculpture | 1961 | Japan |
| | Ritual Overture | 1964 | Japan |
| | Texture | 1962 | Japan |
| **McBride, Robert** | County Music Fantasy | 1964 | United States |
| | Hill County Symphony | 1963 | United States |
| | Sunday in Mexico | 1960 | United States |
| **McPhee, Colin** | Concerto for Wind Orchestra | 1960 | United States |
| **Mitchell, Lyndol** | Battle Hymn of the Republic | 1959 | United States |
| | When Johnny Comes Marching Home | 1962 | United States |
| **Miyoshi ----** | Concerto for Timpani and Wind Orchestra | | |
| **Morel, Francois** | Le Mythe de la Roche Percee | 1977 | Canada |
| **Mouret, Jean Joseph** | Suite Des Symphonies (Fanfares) | 1977 | United States |
| **Nelson, Oliver** | Complex City | 1977 | United States |
| | Concerto for Xylophone, Marimba, Vibraphone and Wind Orchestra | 1967 | United States |
| **Nelson, Oliver** | Fugue and Bossa | 1973 | United States |
| **Nilsson, Bo** | Eurhythmical Voyage | 1970 | Sweden |
| | Quartets | 1969 | Sweden |
| **Nordheim, Arne** | Recall and Signals | 1986 | Norway |
| **Orgad, Ben-Zion** | Elul - 1990 (p) | 1985 | Isreal |
| | Sheva - 1990 (p) | 1985 | Isreal |
| **Orrega-Sales, Juan** | Concerto Op. 53 | 1963 | Chile |
| | Psalms Op. 51 | 1962 | Chile |
| **Penderecki, Krzysztof** | Pittsburgh Overture | 1967 | Poland |
| **Penn, William** | Fanfare for the AWS | 1975 | United States |
| **Petrov, Andrei** | Russian Capriccio | 1989 | Soviet Union |
| **Porter, Quincy** | Concerto for Wind Orchestra | 1959 | United States |

| Composer | Title of Work | Year Performed | Nationality of Composer |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Rodrigo, Joaquin** | Adagio | 1966 | Spain |
| **Rogers, Bernard** | Pictures from the Tale of Aladdin | 1965 | United States |
| **Rorem, Ned** | Sinfonia for 15 wind instruments | 1957 | United States |
| **Rudajev, Alexandre** | Concerto for Harp Solo | 1967 | Dutch |
| **Santos, Enrique** | Concerto for Harpsichord | 1988 | Mexico |
| **Santos, Enrique** | Piezo di Concierto | 1983 | Mexico |
| **Sapieyevski, Jerzy** | Concerto for trumpet and Wind Orchestra (“Mercury”) | 1978 | Poland |
| **Sapieyevski, Jerzy** | Morpheus | 1974 | Poland |
| **Sapieyevski, Jerzy** | Games, Concerto for Percussion | 1981 | Poland |
| **Schifrin, Lalo** | Concerto for Trumpet, Percussion and Wind Orchestra | 1967 | United States |
| **Serebrier, Jose** | Doce Par Doce (Twelve plus Twelve) | 1969 | Uraguay |
| **Sigmeister, Elie** | The Mermaid in Lock #7 | 1558 | United States |
| **Smith, ---** | Abide with Me | | |
| **Somers, Harry** | Symphony for Woodwinds, Brass and Percussion | 1961 | Canada |
| **Stock, David** | Evensong (Concerto for English Horn) | 1985 | United States |
| **Stoeltzel, Gottfried H. (Rogers)** | Concerto Grosso A Quattro Cori | 131/132 | Germany |
| **Surinach, Carlos** | Paens and Dances of Heathen Iberia | 1959 | Spain |
| **Tcherepnin, Ivan** | Concerto for Oboe, Brass, Winds, Percussion and Harp | 1980 | United States |
| **Tcherepnin, Ivan** | Statue | 1982 | United States |
| **Tuur, ---** | In the Memory of Clear Water | | |
| **Valera, Roberto** | Movimiento Concertante | 1987 | Cuba |
| **Velazquez, Leonardo** | Choral and Variations | 1962 | Mexico |
| **Velazquez, Leonardo** | Cuahtemoc, Poem for Narrator and Wind Orchestra | 1960 | Mexico |
| **Villa-Lobos, Heitor** | Concerto Grosso | 1959 | Brazil |
| **Villa-Lobos, Heitor** | Fantasy in Three Movements in the form of a Choros | 1959 | Brazil |
| **Vivaldi, Antonio (Rogers)** | Concerto for Oboe, Op. 39 #1 | 1964 | Italy |
| **Vivaldi, Antonio (Rogers)** | Concerto for two Trumpets | 1964 | Italy |
| **Weinsweig, John** | Divertamento for Trumpet Trombone and Wind Orchestra | 1961 | Canada |
| **Williams, Joan Franks** | Gulliver’s Travels | 1985 | United States |
| **Zuk, Patrick** | Scherzo | 1989 | Ireland |

Composers with “---” in place of last name indicates that a last name was not listed in sources and cannot be found.

## Works Cited


Battisti, Frank. *The 20th-Century American Wind Band/Ensemble*. Meredith Music, Galesville, 1995.

---------- *The winds of Change: the Evolution of the Contemporary American Wind Band/Ensemble and its Conductor*. Meredith Music, Galesville, 2002.

Bierley, Paul E. *John Philip Sousa: American Phenomenon.* Meredith Corporation, New York, 1973.

Boal, Dean. *Interlochen: A home for the Arts.* The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbour, 1998.

Boudreau, Katherine. *One More Time.* Unpublished. Pittsburgh, 2008.

Cardany, Brian M. *Attitudes Toward Repertoire and the Band Experience Among Participants in Elite University Wind Band Programs*. Arizona State University, PhD. Diss. Arizona, 2006.

Cipolla, Frank and Donald Hunsberger ed. *The Wind Ensemble and its Repertoire: Essays on the Fortieth Anniversary of the Eastman Wind Ensemble.* Rochester, New York, University of Rochester Press. 1994.

Eastman Fennell Archives. Sibley Library, Rochester, New York. Box numbers: 153, 154, 157, 158.

Fennell, Frederick. "Orchestral Development of the Kettledrum from Purcell Through Beethoven." University of Rochester. PhD diss. Rochester, New York, 1939.

*Frederick Fennell: A Life of Joyful Discovery.* Orange Coast Production, Costa Mesa, California, 2004. DVD.

Hansen, Richard K. *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History.* GIA Publications, Chicago, Illinois, 2005.

Hinton Eric L., *Conducting the Wind Orchestra.* Cambria Press, NewYork, 2008.

Kramer, Lawrence. "Music and the Politics of Memory: Charles Ives's *A Holiday Symphony :New England Holidays.*" *Journal of the Society for American Music*, 2/4, 2008.

Mauskapf, Michael. "The American Orchestra as Patron and Presenter" *Notes, Vol. 66, No. 2. 2009.* pg. 381-393.

Milburn, David Allen. *The Development of the Wind Ensemble In The United States (1952-1981)*, The Catholic University of America, PhD. Diss. Washington D.C, 1982.

Murdock, Katherine Anne. "The Pittsburgh Overture by Krzysztof Penderecki." Ph.D. Dissertation, Eastman School of Music, 1986.

*National Music Camp: The First Fifty Years*. Interlochen Center for the Arts. Interlochen Michigan. 1978.

Newsom, Jon. ed. *Perspectives on John Philip Sousa.* Library of Congress, Washington D.C., 1983.

Orfert, Warren Dale. "The Development of a Wind Repertoire: a History of the American Wind Symphony Orchestra." Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, 1992.

Ostling, Eric Acton and David Whitwell ed., *The College and University Band: An Anthology of Papers from the Conferences of the College Band Directors National Association Conference from 1941-1975*. Music Educators National Conference Publishing, USA, 1977.

Newsom, John. *Perpectives on John Philip Sousa*. Library of Congress. Washington D.C., 1983.

Renshaw, Jeffery. *The American Wind Symphony Commissioning Project: 1957-1991, A History and Descriptive Catalog of Published Editions*. Greenwood Press, Westport, 1991.

Reynolds, H. Robert. *The Wind Ensemble Literature.* University of Wisconsin Bands Press, Wisconsin, 1975.

Rickson, Roger E. *Ffortissimo: A Bio-Discography of Frederick Fennell*. Cleveland, Ohio, Ludwig Publishing Company, 1993.

Saffle, Michael. ed. *Perspectives on American Music 1900-1950.* Garland Publishing, New York, 2000.

Scherer, Barrymore Lawrence. *A History of American Classical Music*. Soucebooks, Illinois, 2007.

Sousa, John Philip. *Marching Along.* Integrity Press, Ohio, 1994.

Struble, John Warthen. *The History of American Classical Music.* Facts on File, New York, 1995.

Talford, Gregory. *William D Revelli an Introspective Study.* Central Michigan University, PhD. Diss. Mount Pleasant Michigan, 1985.

Votta, Michael. *The Wind Band and its Repertoire: Two Decades of Research as Published in the College Band Directors Nationals Association Journal.* Alfred Music Publishing, New York, 2003.

Warfield, Patrick. "Making the Band: The Formation of John Philip Sousa's Ensemble" *American Music, Vol. 24, No. 1, 2006.*

Whitwell, David. *A Concise History of Wind Bands*. Whitwell Publishing, Austin Texas, 2010.

Zuck, Barbara A. *A History of Musical Americanism.* UMI Research Press, Michigan, 1980.

**Websites**

"College Band Director's National Association Website" - http://www.cbdna.org/cgi-bin/about3.pl, Accessed June 14. 2012.

"University of Michigan Wind Band Information Website" http://www.music.umich.edu/china/UMSymphonyBand.htm, Accessed May. 20 2012.

"University of Michigan Orchestra Information Website" http://www.music.umich.edu/current_students/perf_opps/orchestras.htm, Accessed May 20. 2012.

"National Concert Band Festival Repertoire List" http://www.ncbf.info/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=13&Itemid=6, Accessed May 20. 2012.

"Persichetti Symphony For Band" http://windbandlit.wordpress.com/2011/05/03/persichetti-symphony-for-band/, Accessed August 20. 2012.

"David Whitwell. *Forgotten Wind Music* (1966"). http://www.whitwellessays.com/ accessed September 13. 2011.

"Wind Music Directory" http://www.windrep.org/Main_Page, Accessed January 15. 2012.

## **Bibliography**


Adorno, Theodor W. *Introduction to the Sociology of Music.* The Seabury Press, New York, 1976.

Battisti, Frank. *The 20th-Century American Wind Band/Ensemble*. Meredith Music, Galesville, 1995.

---------- *The Winds of Change: the Evolution of the Contemporary American Wind Band/Ensemble and its Conductor*. Meredith Music, Galesville, 2002.

Bierley, Paul E. *John Philip Sousa: American Phenomenon.* Meredith Corporation, New York, 1973.

Boal, Dean. *Interlochen: A Home for the Arts.* The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbour, 1998.

Boudreau, Kathleen. *One More Time.* Unpublished, Pittsburgh, 2008.

Campo, David. *Original Music for the Wind Band in the Latter half of the 1950's.* VDM Verlag, Germany, 2008.

Cardany, Brian M. *Attitudes Toward Repertoire and the Band Experience Among Participants in Elite University Wind Band Programs*. Arizona State University, PhD. Diss. Arizona, 2006.

Carroll, Mark. *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

Cippola, Frank and Donald Hunsberger, ed., *The Wind Ensemble and its Repertoire: the Complete Repertoire and Discography of the Eastman Wind Ensemble and Eastman Symphony Band 1932-1992.* University of Rochester Press, Rochester, 1994.

---------- *The Wind Band in and Around New York Ca. 1830-1950.* Alfred Music Publishing, USA, 2006.

Edmunds, Neil. *Soviet Music and Society Under Lenin and Stalin: the Baton and the Sickle.* Routledge Press, New York, 2004.

Fennell, Frederick. "Orchestral Development of the Kettledrum from Purcell Through Beethoven." University of Rochester. PhD diss. Rochester, New York, 1939.

---------- *A Conductor's Interpretive Analysis of Masterworks for Band*. Meredith Publishing, United States, 2008.

---------- *Time and the winds: A Short History of the Use of Wind Instruments in the Orchestra, Band and the Wind Ensemble.* G. LeBlanc Publishing, Minnesota, 1954.

---------- "The American Musical Heritage." *Music Educators Journal*, vol. 43, no. 4, 1957.

*Frederick Fennell: A Life of Joyful Discovery.* Orange Coast Production, Costa Mesa, California, 2004. DVD.

Hansen, Richard K. *The American Wind Band: a Cultural History.* GIA Publications, Chicago, 2005.

Heintze, James R. ed,. *Perspectives on American Music Since 1950*. Garland Publications, USA, 1999.

Hinton, Eric L. *Conducting the Wind Orchestra: Meaning, Gesture and Expressive Potential.* Cambria Press, Amherst NY, 2008.

Jacobson, Bernard. *A Polish Renaissance.* Phaidon Publications, USA, 1996.

Kramer, Lawrence. "Music and the Politics of Memory: Charles Ives's *A Holiday Symphony : New England Holidays*." *Journal of the Society for American Music*, vol. 2, no. 4, 2008.

Milburn, David Allen. *The Development of the Wind Ensemble In The United States (1952-1981)*, The Catholic University of America, PhD. Diss. Washington D.C, 1982.

Murdock, Katherine Anne. "The Pittsburgh Overture by Krzysztof Penderecki." Eastman School of Music, Ph.D. Diss. Rochester, New York, 1986.

*National Music Camp: The First Fifty Years*. (Interlochen Center for the Arts, Interlochen Michigan.1978).

Newsom, Jon. ed. *Perspectives on John Philip Sousa.* Library of Congress, Washington D.C., 1983.

Nicholls, David. *The Cambridge History of American Music.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

Orfert, Warren Dale. "The Development of a Wind Repertoire: a history of the American Wind Symphony Orchestra." Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, 1992.

Ostling, Eric Acton and David Whitwell ed., *The College and University Band: An Anthology of Papers from the Conferences of the College Band Directors National Association Conference from 1941-1975*. Music Educators National Conference Publishing, USA, 1977.

Rapp, Will. *The Wind Band Masterworks of Holst, Vaughan Williams and Grainger.* Meredith Music Publications, USA, 2005.

Renshaw, Jeffery. *The American Wind Symphony Commissioning Project: 1957-1991, A History and Descriptive Catalog of Published Editions*. Greenwood Press, Westport, 1991.

Reynolds, H. Robert. *The Wind Ensemble Literature.* University of Wisconsin Bands Press, Wisconsin, 1975.

Rickson, Roger E. *Ffortissimo: A Bio-Discography of Frederick Fennell.* Cleveland, Ohio, Ludwig Publishing Company. 1993.

Saffle, Michael. ed. *Perspectives on American Music 1900-1950.* Garland Publishing, New York, 2000.

Scherer, Barrymore Lawrence. *A History of American Classical Music*. Soucebooks, Illinois, 2007.

Schmelz, Peter J. *Such Freedom, if only Music: Unofficial Soviet Music during the Thaw.* Oxford University Press US, USA, 2009.

Schuller, Gunther. *Musings: The Musical Worlds of Gunther Schuller.* Da Capo Press, USA, 1999.

Silbermann, Alphons. *The Sociology of Music.* Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1963.

Slonimsky, Nicolas. ed., Electra Yourke. *Writtings on Music, Russian and Soviet Music and Composers.* Routledge Press, New York, 2004.

Sousa, John Philip. *Marching Along.* Integrity Press, Ohio, 1994.

Struble, John Warthen. *The History of American Classical Music.* Facts on File, New York, 1995.

Sutkowski, Stefan. *The History of Music in Poland: The Contemporary Era. 1939-1974.* Sutkowski Edition, Warsaw, 2001.

Talford, Gregory. *William D Revelli an Introspective Study.* Central Michigan University, PhD. Diss. Mount Pleasant Michigan, 1985.

Thomas, Adrian. *Polish Music since Szymanowski*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.

Tsenova, Valeria. *Underground Music from the Former USSR.* Routledge Press, New York, 1997.

Tyra, Thomas Norman. "The Analysis of Three Twentieth Century Compositions for Wind Ensemble." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971.

Votta, Michael. *The Wind Band and its Repertoire: Two Decades of Research as Published in the College Band Directors Nationals Association Journal.* Alfred Music Publishing, New York, 2003.

Warfield, Patrick. "John Philip Sousa and The Menace of Mechanical Music" *Journal of the Society for American Music*, 3/4, 2009.

---------- "Making the Band: The Formation of John Philip Sousa's Ensemble." *The Journal of American Music*, 24/1, 2006.

Whitwell, David. *A Concise History of the Wind Band*. Winds Publications, USA, 1985.

Winther, Rodney. *An Annotated Guide to Wind Chamber Music: for Six to Eighteen players.* Warner Bros. Press, Miami, 2004.

Zuck, Barbara A. *A History of Musical Americanism.* UMI Research Press, Michigan, 1980.

## Websites

"College Band Director's National Association Website"

http://www.cbdna.org/cgi-bin/about3.pl, Accessed June 14. 2012.

"University of Michigan Wind Band Information Website"

http://www.music.umich.edu/china/UMSymphonyBand.htm, Accessed May. 20. 2012.

"University of Michigan Orchestra Information Website"

http://www.music.umich.edu/current_students/perf_opps/orchestras.htm, Accessed May 20. 2012.

"National Concert Band Festival Repertoire List"

http://www.ncbf.info/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=13&Itemid=6, Accessed May 20. 2012.

"Persichetti Symphony For Band"

http://windbandlit.wordpress.com/2011/05/03/persichetti-symphony-for-band/, Accessed August 20. 2012.

"David Whitwell. *Forgotten Wind Music* (1966"). http://www.whitwellessays.com, Accessed September 13. 2011.

"Wind Music Directory" http://www.windrep.org/Main_Page, Accessed January 15. 2012.