CHAPTER III

Advisory Committees

The FMP Manual of October 1935 stated that a National Advisory Committee had been organized to formulate standards for examinations and give advice on methods to be pursued in achieving the aims of the Federal Music Project. The Manual further stated that local advisory committees should be established to assist local projects, to help set and maintain high standards of musicianship and to help create cooperating sponsors. The latter objective established a conflict in itself. Since the cooperating sponsor usually had a financial investment in the operation of the project, he was inclined to consider himself as the legitimate project advisor. Given an active cooperating sponsor who was working to develop private support for continuing the activities of the Federal Music Project, there was little if any justification for an advisory committee which represented groups not actively participating in the development of project operations.

Suggested membership of the local advisory committee included:

(1) Representatives from the National Federation of Music Clubs
(2) Representatives of the Musicians Union
(3) Representatives of the Music Teacher's Association
(4) Leading conductor, organist, singer or Instrumentalist
(5) Interested patron
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Representatives of the Musicians Union were always in frequent consultation with project officials and needed no invitation to act as advisors. Representatives of the Federation of Music Clubs made few constructive contributions at the local level although their national support was significant. The leading conductor in the average community, if not already the supervisor of the music project, often was indifferent to the project unless he was invited to appear as guest conductor with some regularity. In the case of the "interested patron", he was usually interested in some existing local musical organization and considered that Federal funds were being used to compete with local enterprise.

From time to time the Washington staff of the Federal Music Project attempted to stimulate the development of Local advisory committees but these efforts seldom bore fruit. The subject of state and local advisory committees was discussed by a group of State Directors of Music Projects at a Regional Conference in Boston, June 22, 23, 24, 1938. (See Exhibit "4" Transcript of Meetings at Boston Conference, June 23, 24, 1938.) A typical comment follows:

William Haddon (Massachusetts) - "I inherited my Advisory Board. To be perfectly frank that Board is not interested in the Federal Music Project although it includes some of the most prominent musicians in Massachusetts. I feel that as far as Massachusetts is concerned, the good will of the project is not from the Advisory Board but what does exist is from our sponsors through our paid (admission) concerts and from the mayors of various cities".
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Connecticut reported that its advisory committee did not function and New York State gave the same answer. The one New England State which had an active advisory committee was Vermont. This committee included Governor George D. Aiken, Otto Luening, Dorothy Canfield Fisher and other persons who, regardless of politics, were interested in the greater social use of music.

From the beginning of the Federal Music Project two patterns of advisory committees were maintained - State and local. The State advisory committee seldom was more than a nominal group. The local committee could be effective if the project continued to perform the same services, year after year, with no attempt to achieve permanence through the development of local financial support. But where real efforts toward perpetuation were involved the advisory committee often was a fifth wheel.

The groups and leaders which furthered the aims of the Federal Music Project were usually those who had never before associated themselves with musical promotion. They were not the past presidents of anything. They were not guarantors of the annual visit of the Metropolitan Opera. They were Commanders of American Legion Posts, Grangers, Labor leaders, Junior Chambers of Commerce, rural school superintendents, volunteer fire departments, fraternal orders and mayors.
In fairness to the local advisory committees which existed prior to 1939 it should be stated that some of these groups were particularly effective. This was true in the field of Music Education. Here there was seldom any question of financial sponsorship and there was a definite need for determining the educational needs of the community and thereafter establishing free music education classes according to procedures which would prevent competition with the private teacher. The representative of the local music teachers association was able to present the case for the private teachers in reaching agreements which would be satisfactory to all. In the few cases where complaints of competition arose, it was generally true that the local advisory committee, if one existed, had not thoroughly discussed the problem.

One of the amusing by-products of the local advisory committee occurred in a northern New England State where the State Advisory Committee was purely an endorse body which never met, but which included all of the prominent musical and political figures in the State. It was the habit of the State Supervisor of the Federal Music Project to appoint to the Committee the Governor, his Council, and the congressional delegation. Under this system the State Supervisor suffered a
biennial period of mental anguish during which he tried
to figure out how to get rid of those members of the
Advisory Committee who had been defeated in the General
Election. (See Exhibit "5" Local Advisory Committees
for lists of representative local committees). The
National Advisory Committee of the Federal Music Project
which was first mentioned in the FMP Manual consisted
of the following distinguished persons:

Dr. Walter Damrosch - Conductor
Mr. Clun Downes - Music Critic, New York Times
Mr. William Earhart - Supervisor, Public School Music
Mr. Carl Engel - Publisher
Mr. Rudolph Gans - President, Chicago Musical College
Mr. George Gershwin - Composer
Mr. Wallace Goodrich, Director, New England Conservatory of Music
Miss Dorothy Gordon - Educator
Dr. Howard Hanson - Director, Eastman School of Music,
University of Rochester
Mr. Alfred Hertz - Conductor
Mr. Edward Johnson - Director General, Metropolitan
Opera Company
Dr. Hans Kindler - Conductor
Mr. A. Walter Kramer - Publishers
Mrs. Vincent Hillis Gher - President, National
Federation of Music Clubs
Mr. John Powell - Composer
Mr. Carleton Sprague Smith - Director, Music Division,
New York Public Library
Mrs. Frederick Steinway - Patroness
Mr. Frederick Stock - Conductor
Mr. Leopold Stokowski - Conductor
Mrs. Olga Samaroff Stokowski - Pianist
Mr. Lawrence Tibbett - Metropolitan Opera
Mr. Joseph N. Weber - President American Federation of
Musicians
Mr. Paul Whitman - Conductor
Mr. Augustus D. Zanzig - Recreational Music Consultant

As far as is known no meeting of this eminent group was
ever held. Any evidence of advice contributed by a
member is impossible to find. In later years several members of this Committee expressed surprise and regret that after having been requested to serve and having accepted the responsibility, they were ignored.

Several individuals on this Committee were accustomed to being used on letter-heads without further participation but others were eager to serve in this great national experiment and felt that the formation of initial policies for so great and unprecedented a venture should be enhanced by a meeting of these minds.

After 1936, the National Advisory Committee was forgotten and its existence seldom referred to.

After the appointment of Dr. Earl V. Moore as Director of the WPA Music Program, the entire subject of advisory committees, State, National and local, was revived. Dr. Moore believed very strongly that advisory boards should exist throughout the entire structure of the Music Program; that these committees should serve as trustees of WPA music and that they should be responsible for assisting the Music Program in formulating policies and thereafter defending these policies before the critics of the program. Dr. Moore further believed that these committees should be in an advisory capacity to the officials who were administratively responsible for the music projects rather than to the technical
director of the projects. Thus in a State the advisory committee would be appointed by and responsible to the State Administrator or the Director of the Division of Professional and Service Projects. This relationship had one particular advantage beyond the strict observance of administrative lines of responsibility. It brought the advisory committee in close contact with the complicated mechanism of a government agency and through this contact the committee members came to realise why many procedures, which might seem needless to the purely technical person, simply had to be. Furthermore, the advisory committee in making its recommendations to the administrative authority was in a position to strengthen and protect the director of the music program at the State or National level. In the years which followed Dr. Moore's appointment there were occasions when a State Supervisor of a Music Project was saved from the wrath of an intolerant State Administrator by a frank and firm expression of confidence by the Advisory Committee. There were other instances when a previous expression of opinion by an advisory committee checked an erroneous policy before it had been effected. The State Administrator who knew that his advisory committee was solidly behind the Music Project and its Supervisor, enjoyed a degree of mental ease which was usually reflected in his attitude toward the Project.
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The first of the new advisory committees which conformed to the revised concept was organized in New York City in response to a request from Lieutenant Colonel Brehon B. Somervell (later Lieutenant General), Work Projects Administrator for New York City. The appointment of this committee followed the appointment of Horace Johnson as Director of the New York City Music Project. It was Colonel Somervell's wish that a technical committee be appointed to advise him on the progress of the New York City Music Project and to make suggestions on planning project activities. This committee was selected by Dr. Moore and was appointed by Colonel Somervell. The background for Colonel Somervell's decision was a series of complaints from music teachers in New York City concerning allegedly competitive practices by the Music Education Division of the Music Project. The New York Committee was formed during the fall of 1939 - 1940 after careful consideration of the local musical interests which should be represented as will be seen in the following letter from Brehon Somervell to the Commissioner of Work Projects, October 3, 1939.

COPY

WPA - New York City
October 3, 1939

The Commissioner of Work Projects
Work Projects Administration
Washington

SUBJECT: New York Council of Music Teachers Ass'ns.
(Advisory Committees)

Sir:

In answer to your letter of September 29, for the attention of Mr. Horace Johnson, concerning the problems of the New York Council of Music Teachers Associations, I should be happy to have this particular matter brought to the attention of the Advisory Committee of the New York City WPA Music Project when it meets.

This committee is in the process of being formed, and to date acceptances have been received from Dr. Sigmund Spaeth, Mrs. Herbert Witherspoon, A. Walter Kramer, Gene Buck, Edwin Hughes, Mrs. E. H. Cahill, Arthur Judson and Jack Rosenberg. Acceptances from Dr. George Garlant and Olin Downes have not as yet been received. I have received regrets from Miss Geraldine Farrar and Dr. Walter Damrosch. As soon as I have had replies from Dr. Garlant and Mr. Downes, I will endeavor to arrange the first meeting of this committee and will advise Dr. Earl Vincent Moore of the date, with the hope that he may be present.

At that time it will be possible for the Advisory Committee to discuss the problems arising out of the activities of Music Education in New York City, and probably arrange for a meeting while Dr. Moore is in New York, with delegates from the New York Council of Music Teachers Associations and Mr. Johnson, with Dr. Moore present.

Very truly yours,

BREHOON SOMERVILLE
Administrator

B-9347

Although the New York City Advisory Committee did not have an active career over a long period, it served well in its initial stages of existence. It assisted in revising project policies and then helped to stem the criticism which had developed from vague
local policies. Furthermore it aided greatly in allaying the suspicions of the Administrator and gave him a feeling of confidence toward his technical staff.

The next and most important step in the development of the advisory committee structure was the organisation of the National Advisory Committee. Since the Federal Music Project had expired on August 31, 1939, Dr. Moore assumed that the old Advisory Committee had been dissolved therewith. From the start it was recognized by Dr. Moore that a representative national committee could not be formed and asked to meet with any regularity unless funds were provided to cover the travel expenses of the members. The administrative funds of the WPA Music Program were not sufficient to cover such expense. Accordingly, funds were sought from the Carnegie Corporation to finance the costs of committee meetings and the publication of the minutes of these meetings. There follows correspondence on this subject.

November 7, 1939

Mr. Frederik P. Keppel, President
Carnegie Corporation of New York
522 Fifth Avenue
New York City

Dear Mr. Keppel:

During a conversation with Mrs. Dorothy Fredenhagen, Assistant Director of the WPA Music Program, on October 20, 1939, Mr. Robert Lester
suggested that a concise statement of proposed plans of the Music Program be submitted for your consideration.

In view of the changes in the administration of the WPA Music Program required under the Relief Act of 1939, and the appointment of a new National Director, it seems an appropriate time to undertake a review of the past activities of the Federal Music Project and to secure an objective evaluation of its policies and its future opportunities under the new control of the projects by the several states. Although there has existed on paper since the beginning of the Federal Music Project a National Advisory Committee, it did not serve in an active capacity.

Dr. Earl V. Moore, our new Director, desires to have an active vigorous committee of approximately a dozen leaders in the field of music who can meet two or three times each year with the members of the staff of the Music Program in Washington for advice and counsel. Opportunities exist at this time for expansion of the activities of the project that were not possible under Federal control; on the other hand certain responsibilities and controls have been lost in the transfer to State Administration. It is to guide the destinies of the new program with the wisdom and perspective that such a group of musicians could give that the proposal for an Advisory Committee of this type is presented.

The following names are suggested — though the list is not to be considered as final — as evidence of the types of individuals and representation of fields who should be named for membership on this committee. The selections were made with the thought of ease of assembling with a minimum of travel time:

Howard Hanson — Eastman School of Music, Administrator, Composer, Conductor

Albert Stoessel — New York City — Conductor, Composer

Rudolph Gans — Chicago — Pianist, Conductor, Educator
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Harl McDonald - Philadelphia - Manager, Composer

Peter Dykema - New York City - Educator and Recreationist

Augustus D. Zansig - Boston - Educator and Recreationist

Edwin Hughes - New York City - Teacher and Education

Karl Gehrkens - Oberlin - Educator and Writer on Music Education

Harold Spivacke - Washington, D. C. - Librarian and Scholar

Wallace Goodrich - Boston - Director, New England Conservatory of Music

Osbourne McConathy - Glen Ridge, New Jersey - Writer, Educator

George E. Judd - Manager, Boston Symphony Orchestra

Demas Taylor - New York City - Composer and Commentator

Glin Downes - New York City - Music Critic

Eric Clarke - New York - Music Educator

David Bruno Ussher - Los Angeles - Music Critic

It is proposed that for certain specific discussions this committee be divided into groups according to their interests to consider problems in broad fields of performance and music education. The results of these discussions should be printed and sent to all State Supervisors of the Music Program in order that they may receive the benefit of these conferences. It is also proposed that the members of this committee visit various types of projects so that they may have first-hand knowledge of the work that is being done by the WPA Music Program to aid in the discussions in the
conferences. Should the members themselves not be able to make inspection trips beyond their local areas, they might desire to appoint an investigator to gather data in the field.

Since administrative funds have been so greatly reduced, it is quite impossible for the Work Projects Administration to finance this plan and it is felt that in all fairness to the members of the committee they should not be asked to pay their expenses while attending meetings or visiting projects since they will be expected to serve without remuneration. May I respectfully request that the Carnegie Corporation consider a grant of $10,000 to the WPA Music Program for the purposes stated above.

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE KERR
Assistant Commissioner
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Carnegie Corporation
522 Fifth Avenue
New York
December 26, 1939

Dear Mrs. Kerr:

I have now had a chance to discuss your proposal of November 7 with my associates and advisers. We are interested in the proposed Advisory Committee for the Music Program of the WPA, but it is the sort of thing which I should rather handle administratively than through a formal appropriation. We are advised that the most important part of what you have in mind, i.e., bringing the Committee together, could be done within the limits of my small discretionary fund, particularly if the meetings could be held in New York.

Would you be willing to go ahead with the plan of assembling the Committee on the understanding that the Corporation would honor the
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expense accounts of the members for two or three meetings during 1940? At this time next year we could take stock of the situation and decide whether this arrangement should be continued for another year.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK P. KEPPEL, President Carnegie Corporation of New York

The request for Carnegie funds was approved but later developments restricted the funds to an extent which prevented the appointment of a committee member from the Pacific Coast and the printing of the minutes of committee meetings.

The National Advisory Committee of the WPA Music Program as selected by Dr. Moore and appointed by Mrs. Florence S. Kerr was as follows:

Eric Clarke, New York City
American Association of Colleges

Eric Delamarter, New York City
Former Associate Conductor, Chicago Symphony Orchestra; Composer and Music Critic

Peter Dykema, New York City
Professor of Music Education, Teacher's College, Columbia University; Extensive experience in community music

Rudolph Ganz, Chicago
President, Chicago Musical College
Conductor, Composer, performer and teacher

Edwin Franko Goldman, New York City
Conductor of the Goldman Band

Wallace Goodrich, Boston
Director, New England Conservatory of Music
(Advisory Committees)

Howard Hanson, Rochester, New York  
Director, Eastman School of Music  
Composer, Conductor, Educator and  
President of the National Association  
of Music

Arthur Judson, New York City  
Concert Manager with nation-wide contacts.  
Manager, New York Philharmonic-Symphony  
Orchestra

Edwin Hughes, New York City  
Pianist, Educator, President, National  
Music Council

Leonard Liebling, New York City  
Enter, Musical Courier

Harold Spivacke, Washington, D. C.  
Chief, Music Division, Library of  
Congress, Musicologist

Augustus Zanzig, Boston, Massachusetts  
Field Representative, National  
Recreation Association, Author and  
authority on community and recrea- 
tional music.

This was a strong committee to perform the functions  
for which it was organized. It represented a wide variety of  
musical interests compatible with the widened scope of WPA music  
services which had been brought about in 1939. Several of the  
Committee members had interests which were vitally affected by  
WPA policies. Arthur Judson could be affected by the possible  
competition of free and low-cost concerts operated by the Work  
Projects Administration. Edwin Hughes, representing the music  
teaching profession, had a strong interest in the policies of  
the Music Program relating to competition with private music  
teachers. The strength of the Committee was in the eminence  
of its members and the variety of their interests. The
weakness of the committee was in its geographic limitations and the absence of a representative from the American Federation of Musicians. The fact that the committee included no members from West of Chicago was due to the limited funds provided for travel expenses. The absence of a representative of the Federation of Musicians may have been due to a fear that such a representative might clash with other members' interests outside the realm of WPA policies. However, subsequent meetings of a special committee which included a Federation member, failed to substantiate this fear. In view of the substantial support which the Federation gave to the Music Program from 1935 to 1943, it is believed that representation should have been secured.

The National Advisory Committee, WPA Music Program, was convened by Mrs. Florence Kerr, Assistant Commissioner, Work Projects Administration on Monday, April 29, 1940, at 10:00 A.M. Morning and afternoon sessions continued through April 30th. The meeting was held in the Whittle Pavilion of the Library of Congress. In addition to the Advisory Committee, members of Mrs. Kerr's staff, and the Central Office staff of the WPA Music Program, the following members of the Music Program field staff were in attendance:

George Foster, Technical Consultant, Region I
Thaddeus Rich, Technical Consultant, Region II
Albert Goldberg, State Supervisor, Illinois
This cross-section of field supervision was brought into the conference to provide the Advisory Committee with a first hand account of conditions of operation in the States and Regions.

As has been and will be found true of all conferences where laymen are asked to participate in the formation of governmental policies, the first meeting of the Advisory Committee accomplished nothing beyond the orientation of the Committee members to the WPA Music Program, the organization of the agency structure, the legal restrictions upon the operation of projects, and the complexity of Federal procedure. However, to have accomplished this in one meeting of four sessions was in itself success. The committee made no suggestions which might be put to practical use but it left Washington with an understanding of the objectives of the Work Projects Administration, the part which the Music Program represented in the whole, and a working knowledge of the Music Program nationally. This enabled the members to go home, prepared to return at a later date with policy recommendations which would be practicable within a Federal agency. All members of the Committee were present at this initial...
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meeting excepting Howard Hanson and Wallace Goodrich.
(See National Advisory Committee, WPA Music Program, Digest of Meetings, Mimeograph No. A1540, and green folder 29-30, 1941, Exhibit "16"). Upon the adjournment of the Washington meeting it was agreed to hold a subsequent conference at an early date in New York City.

The second meeting of the National Advisory Committee was held at 70 Columbus Avenue, New York City, May 14-15, 1940. Following the example of the first meeting it was agreed to bring in several Regional and State officials of the Music Program and to precede the Advisory Committee meeting with a conference of Music Program Personnel. The field staff at attendance at the conference included:

George Foster, Technical Consultant, Region I
Thaddeus Rich, Technical Consultant, Region II
John Becker, State Supervisor, Minnesota
Reginald Benning, State Supervisor, Maine
William Haddon, State Supervisor, Massachusetts
Theodore Hahn, Jr., State Supervisor, Ohio
Edward Hinkelken, State Supervisor, New York State
Horace Johnson, Supervisor, New York City
Paul Pelton, State Supervisor, Vermont
Frederick Rucke, State Supervisor, New Jersey
Ruth Tripp, State Supervisor, Rhode Island
Harry G. Whitemore, State Supervisor, New Hampshire

Members of the Advisory Committee who were absent were,
Wallace Goodrich, Howard Hanson, Leonard Liebling, and Harold Spivacke. Members of the Regional Staff and the
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New York City WPA were:

R. C. Tranton, Regional Director
Agnes S. Cronin, Chief Regional Supervisor,
Division of Professional and Service Projects
Lieutenant Colonel Brehon B. Somervell, New York
City Administrator
Mary C. Tinney, Director, Professional and Service
Projects, New York City

At the New York City meeting the members of the Committee showed that they had developed a working knowledge of the WPA Music Program and carefully questioned the State Supervisors as to the effect of WPA policies in their States. As would be expected these questions reflected the individual interests of the several committee members.

At the conclusion of the conference each member of the Committee submitted a statement of recommendations in his own field and the Committee collectively submitted a general statement of recommendations. It is observed that this general statement was of an innocuous nature, less specific than the individual statements, which indicated that the Advisory Committee was as yet unwilling to take the bit in its teeth. However, the discussion of WPA Music Program problems with the members in committee sessions brought forth a gratifying quantity of sound advice which was of greater value than anything which appears in the record. (For the record of the New York City meeting see Exhibit "16").

The third meeting of the National Advisory Committee was held in New York City, December 9–10, 1940,
at 70 Columbus Avenue. The procedure of the May meeting was followed in convening a number of State Music Supervisors in advance of the Advisory Committee Meeting. As an added feature, a number of State Directors of Professional and Service Projects, and State Chiefs of Community Service Programs were invited. There were two purposes in this step: (1) to bring State administrative persons to realize that a distinguished group of musicians was participating in the Music Program; (2) to bring the Advisory Committee in close contact with the State Administrations. Delegations from the States included:

**West Virginia**
- Irene Fallon Gillooly, Director, Professional and Service Projects
- Verna C. Blackburn, State Supervisor, Music Project

**Michigan**
- Dorothy Kemp Roosevelt, State Supervisor, Music Project

**Missouri**
- Elmer Schwartsbeck, State Supervisor, Music Project

**Florida**
- Rolla A. Southworth, Director, Professional and Service Projects
- James R. Black, State Supervisor, Music Project

**Louisiana**
- Rene Salamon, State Supervisor, Music Project

**Texas**
- Lucille Lyons, State Supervisor, Music Project

**Utah**
- Gail Martin, Coordinator of Arts Projects
  - Reginald Beales, State Supervisor, Music Project
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Northern California
Nathan Abas, State Supervisor, Music Project

Southern California
Karl Hecker, State Supervisor, Music Project

Massachusetts
Harold G. Dunney, Director, Professional and Service Projects
Margaret D. Wallace, Community Service Programs
William Haddox, State Supervisor, Music Project

New York City
Joseph L. Gimniff, Acting Director, Professional and Service Projects
V. Roger Wood, Community Service Programs
Horace Johnson, Supervisor, Music Project

It will be noted that in each successive conference the geographical distribution of States represented was altered in order to bring the National Advisory Committee in contact with representatives from every section of the country.

At the conclusion of the New York Conference the Advisory Committee submitted its first complete report to Mrs. Kerr. In this report definite recommendations were made bearing upon future activities and policies of the Music Program. These recommendations were supplemented by a series of recommendations by individual Committee members in their own field of activity.

The Committee expressed concern over certain administrative procedures which it considered as dangerous to the development of the Music Program. It recommended the exploration of possible legislation to operate the more worthwhile activities of the Music Program on a grant-in-aid basis. It recommended the operation of
Government music services as a work program rather than a relief program. It criticized the WPA policy of subjecting Arts Projects to the procedures drafted for construction projects and pointed out that such practices were unnecessary. Particularly the operation of Music Projects under the existing system of district administration in the States came in for severe attacks. The Committee criticized the duplication of Federal music activities pointing out that the National Youth Administration was duplicating and competing with the work of the Work Projects Administration in many communities.

For the first time in its career the National Advisory Committee felt sufficiently well informed to probe into the administrative organization of the WPA and come up with definite recommendations on administrative policy, technical plans, and recommendations for future legislation. Unfortunately this was the last full meeting of the Advisory Committee. At the time when this group had become sufficiently well acquainted with the organization of the Work Projects Administration and the conditions of operation of the Music Program to work constructively, the funds which had been provided by the Carnegie Corporation came to an end. With the approach of war, Carnegie funds were being diverted to defense agencies.
Committee Report see Folder "National Advisory Committee Meeting, December 9-10, 1940, New York City - Exhibit "17"").

Faced with the necessity of devising some new procedure for obtaining the services of the Committee members and particularly those who had been most active in their participation, it was decided that, for the time, small groups of Committee members would be brought to Washington as special consultants to work out specific problems. Subsequently, a meeting was held in Washington on January 3, 1941 which was attended by Dr. Earl V. Moore, Special Consultant, WPA Music Program, George Foster, Deputy Director, WPA Music Program, Dorothy Fredenhagen, Assistant Director, WPA Music Program, and the following members of the Advisory Committee: Arthur Judson, Eric Delamarter and Peter Dykema. (See Memorandum from Earl V. Moore to Mrs. Kerr, January 10, 1941, transmitting the Inter-Committee Memorandum of January 9, 1941 included in Folder marked National Advisory Committee meeting, New York City, December 9-10, 1940, Exhibit "17").

On November 3-4, 1941, a Special Advisory Committee on the Arts was convened by Mrs. Kerr for the purpose of developing plans for the future of the WPA Arts Program. The Committee was composed of 15 eminent personalities in the fields of art, music and letters. The scope of the discussions were not confined to the limits of emergency
relief legislation and the field was open to free consideration of various plans by which the activities of the Arts Programs might be continued under government sponsorship.

The Music Panel of the Special Advisory Committee included:

Leo Cluesman - American Federation of Musicians, representing James C. Petrillo, President

Roy Harris - Composer and member of the Music Department, Cornell University

Arthur Judson - Concert Manager

Eric Delamarter - Composer, Educator, Conductor

Howard Hanson - Director, Eastman School of Music

This committee was the most effective group which was ever called together in an advisory capacity in the history of the Music Program. It emphasized the fact that the old National Advisory Committee would have been much more effective if, after the initial orientation, an executive committee had been formed to meet more frequently than the larger group, and if other sub-committees with special interests had been called together as needed. This committee also dispelled all fear that dissension might arise if representation from the American Federation of Musicians was included. Mr. Cluesman made valuable contributions to the meetings and carried information back to the national officials of the Federation which aided materially in
maintaining the confidence of that office.

The Music Panel approached its task more fearlessly than any other advisory group which had been convened heretofore for music discussions. It emphasized the opinion that a music program under any Federal agency should be national in scope and control. In facing the administrative problems of a Federal music program it recognized that (1) the movement of workers from crowded centers of unemployment to communities where services were needed must be solved; (2) that the "means test" of the Work Projects Administration must be supplanted by a need for work; (3) that the control and direction of a music program must remain in the hands of a Director, aided by a small board of technical experts and that the appointment of key personnel must be the responsibility of the Director. (See Report of the Music Panel in the Folder "WPA Arts Programs Committee - Music Panel" November 3–4, 1941 - Exhibit "13").

In addition to the task of future planning, the Music Panel addressed itself to the stint of drafting recommendations for the operation of the Music Program under the existing legislation. This set of recommendations endorsed the principle of local sponsorship as a guard against the superimposing of a Federal program. It criticized the separation of central technical authority from the operating programs in the States, labelling the existing
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separation as a dangerous lack of Federal responsibility for the large sums of money spent upon a music program.

(See Exhibit "13" - Recommendations Relative to the Operation of Music Projects Under the Present Emergency Relief Appropriation Act in folder marked "WPA Arts Committee - Music Panel" November 3 - 4, 1941.)

The National Advisory Committee actually rendered a much broader service than appears in the minutes of the several meetings. The members of the Committee were kept closely informed of developments in the Music Program, and materials were constantly routed to the individual members on subjects dealing with their particular interests. For instance, narrative reports from States containing information on bands were excerpted for the information of Dr. Goldman. References to recreational and community music activities were routed to Dr. Zangig. After the initial meetings Mrs. Margaret Kerr of the Central Office staff was designated as Secretary to the Advisory Committee and it was her function to scan all reports and correspondence for items which would serve to keep each member of the Committee in close touch with every recent development in project operations. Individual members of the Central Office staff made it a general rule to meet with members of the Advisory Committee when in the field and this practice provided another opportunity for utilising Advisory Committee services.
As was the case with the National Advisory Committee, the local committees took a turn for the better after 1939. The acceptance of responsibility by revived local committees brought immediate evidence of improved public relations and program interpretation. The appointment of Karl Wecker as State Supervisor of the Southern California Music Project brought with it the selection of an Advisory Committee which supported the program throughout the remainder of its career and defended the music project at a time when it was the object of some local controversy. In Minnesota a strong committee proved to be of invaluable support to the State Supervisor and included the public school music supervisor, a local music critic, the President of the musicians union, the head of the State University music department, a symphony orchestra conductor, and an amateur musician - a doctor - who was chairman of the committee.

The Philadelphia committee included less musical talent but was strong in interested citizens who supported and promoted public concert series presented by the project symphony orchestra. Florida strengthened its music education program by a broad network of local committees which completed preliminary arrangements in the several communities for establishing music teaching units.

In several States such as New Hampshire the old pattern of State advisory committee remained in effect.
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However this type of committee had its usefulness. Many State committees which accomplished nothing as entities and usually never met except upon a sheet of paper, did good work in representing the interests of the program in the home communities of the individual members. In States where committees operated in this manner, it was usual to appoint members from the standpoint of geographical location. Other States which had this type of committee organization were New York State, Wisconsin, Florida, Vermont and Texas.

Recommendations

A National music program should include a strong, active advisory committee of at least ten members. It should include personages in the musical profession whose interests are broad and whose sympathies are in accord with the objectives of the National program. The committee should include sufficient eminence to command the respect of the musical world but should not sacrifice an understanding of the needs of all sections of the country and the social uses of music for eminence alone. The National Advisory Committee should represent the Nation geographically and should represent a wide range of musical interests. If several of these interests can be combined in one person the size of the committee may thereby be reduced. It should not be necessary to have a committee of over fifteen persons and a larger
number would increase the cost of national meetings to a prohibitive figure.

The following phases of the musical profession should be represented:

- Concert management
- Music Teachers National Association
- National Association of Music Schools
- American Federation of Musicians
- Conductors
- Bandmasters
- Musicology
- Eminent instrumentalists
- American Society of Authors, Composers and Publishers

The national advisory committee should be formed after the parent administration of the Music Program has interpreted the legislation under which it operates and has set the operating limitations of the Program. The committee should be appointed by and responsible to the administrative head of the Division of which the Music Program is a part. It should advise the administrative head in forming the broad policies under which the Music Program will operate. From time to time the committee should report to the administrative head upon the progress and current status of the Music Program and should make recommendations for future operation.

From the Advisory Committee should be chosen a group of not less than three nor more than five members to form a body which could be called together at regular intervals and at more frequent intervals if conditions
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necessitate. This group should fulfill several functions as follows:

1. To act as an executive committee for the whole advisory committee.

2. To meet upon short notice to advise the administrative head of the Division when there is not sufficient time to call the entire committee.

3. To act as a technical consultant body to the National Director of the Program with which the Director may meet frequently and correspond regularly. All reports and Program materials should be made available to the Executive Committee and it should be completely and currently informed of all major developments in the Program. Thus, the Executive Committee would be in a position to interpret the actions of the Director to the full Committee and to the public and would share with the Director the responsibility for the major policies of the National Program. Neither the National Committee nor the Executive Committee should be given responsibilities which will cause them to impede the action of the Director in carrying out the policies of the Program once they have been approved administratively and while they are a part of the broad professional policies as developed by the Committee. However, the Director should be in a position to rely upon the Executive Committee to share responsibility when a quick decision must be made.
(Advisory Committees)

Before the appointment of the National Advisory Committee, the source of funds to provide for the adequate functioning of the committee should be determined. Previous experience indicates that privately endowed foundations cannot be depended upon for this purpose over a long period. The effectiveness of an advisory committee depends upon its ability to meet with sufficient regularity to be intelligently informed regarding the subject upon which it advises. A committee which cannot meet regularly is a paper committee which provides window dressing. Therefore, an administrative budget for a National Music Program or its parent administrative Division should include funds for travel and per diem subsistence in an amount to cover at least two meetings of two days each per year. During the first year of operation at least one more meeting would be necessary than in subsequent years. The executive committee should be included in the administrative budget to provide travel, subsistence and consultant fees as necessary to fulfill its defined functions.

The organization of the National Advisory Committee need not be rigid. Its chairman may be appointed by the administrative head of the parent Division or elected by the committee membership. The Committee may operate without a chairman using the National Director as a
(Advisory Committees)

presiding officer or a member of the Executive Committee may be designated as chairman. Since it is impossible to predict the active interest of committee members before at least three national meetings have been held, it would be better to utilize the National Director as a chairman pro tempore during this period. In any event chairmen should be chosen for a definitely limited period.

The organization of the Executive Committee need not be formalized. There is no particular need for a chairman. The membership of this committee should be fluid and changeable to suit the immediate needs of the Program. Features which are essential to the membership of the Executive Committee are: available time to devote to committee duties, workable knowledge of the administrative structure of the Agency, patience with the administrative complications of a government agency and general sympathy with the objectives of the Program and its National Director.

The National Advisory Committee should have the services of a permanent secretary. The secretary may be chosen from the staff of the National Director and may be a person with normal administrative or secretarial duties to which the functions of "Secretary to the Committee" may be added without unreasonable burden. The duties of Secretary to the National Advisory Committee should include the following:
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1. To review national reports and forward to committee members those items which are of interest to the whole or to individual members.

2. To answer the requests of committee members for special information.

3. To prepare periodic reports for the Committee on the current status of the Program.

4. To prepare informational materials, agendas, exhibits, etc. for Committee Meetings.

5. To prepare travel vouchers, and process payroll documents for Committee Members.

6. To make a transcript of meetings and compile the minutes of such meetings for future distribution.

The regular meetings of the full Committee should be attended by the Director and his staff and by representative State and Regional officials of the Program and the parent Agency. As has been demonstrated in the history of the TPA Music Program, this practice insures that the Committee will be provided with first hand information on the problems of operation at local levels. The attendance of State and Regional officials should be so arranged as to provide a cross-section of national operation.

The full benefit can be obtained from a National Advisory Committee only when the full facilities of the membership are obtainable. In establishing the National Committee it should be understood that irregular attendance
at meetings should constitute an obligation to resign
making way for more actively interested members of the
music profession.

All meetings of the full Committee should be
conducted within a carefully prepared agenda and, in
order that the intent of the meetings may be fulfilled,
this agenda should be very strictly adhered to. Any
subject of discussion not included on the agenda should
be considered unofficial business and carefully deleted
from regular sessions. The agenda should set the limits
of discussions and actions. Recommendations of the Com-
mittee should be confined to the limits of authority of
the person to which the recommendations are addressed.
For example, it is a waste of time for a committee which
advises the administrative head of a division to carry
out actions which are beyond the authority of the divi-
sion head or even beyond the legislative limits of the
Agency. However a committee may transmit a request to
its administrative parent that certain recommendations
be forwarded to the appropriate authority. It should
be appropriate for the administrative head of the parent
division to request that the National Advisory Committee
submit annual recommendations for future legislation to
continue the parent agency.

Since the Advisory Committee would be expected
to submit at regular intervals a list of specific recommendations
concerning the policies under which the Music Program would operate, the Advisory Committee should receive a periodic report of the action taken upon Committee recommendations with appropriate comments on those recommendations which could not be placed in effect.

An ideal advisory committee will be composed of only those persons who are sufficiently interested in the Program to fully exert their ingenuity and draw upon their experience to make it work. Such a committee will first make a careful study of the structure within which the Music Program is a part. With this understanding the committee will be prepared to extract maximum opportunities for action and improvement within the legislation creating the agency and will avoid making recommendations which are beyond the limits of such legislation. A committee which thoroughly understands the legislation under which the Program operates will be able to make recommendations as to administrative changes which the Division heads may have overlooked and may be able to secure interpretations of the legislation which will be beneficial to the Program.

Below the national level advisory Committees generally will be most effective at the community rather than the State level. Except in rural States where there are few communities with enough professional persons to
form committees, the appointment of State committees will only repeat the experiences of the Federal Music Project in this field. Local committees should have great latitude in membership and need not be confined to professional persons. In large cities the membership of the Advisory Committee should follow the national pattern and include:

The American Federation of Musicians

The Music Teachers Association

A Music Critic

A representative of the local symphony orchestra association

The Public School Music Supervisor

Director of the local Music School

A person interested in amateur community music groups

A representative of the oratorio society

Representatives from nationalistic and racial musical groups

A person from the allied arts such as the director of the local art museum

The musical director of a radio station

A member of the recreation commission

Advisory committees in smaller communities will be aided by going outside the music profession for membership. For example, an advisory committee in a community of 10,000 inhabitants might well include:

The Public School Music Supervisor
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A prominent music teacher
A church organist
A representative of the Women’s Club
The Commander of the American Legion Post
A representative of a service organization such as the Lions, Kiwanis, Rotary.

In larger communities the advisory committee should be appointed by and responsible to the administrative officer in charge of the section or division within which the Music Program operates. However, in smaller communities where local administrative offices of the agency are not present or where administrative officials of the agency do not exert direct control over the Music Program Supervisor, the advisory committee should be appointed by and responsible to the Supervisor of the Music Program.

In cases where it is feasible to organize a State advisory committee the pattern of the national committee should be followed in responsibility, geographical and professional representation and organization. The chief difficulty in following the national pattern will be the probable absence of any administrative funds for travel or per diem subsistence. This obstacle will tend to limit the frequency of meetings and possibly render impractical the formation of an executive sub-committee. It is this difficulty which is likely to make the appointment of a State advisory committee impractical since unless the committee can meet with sufficient frequency to become
thoroughly acquainted with the administrative organization of the agency, it will be able to make only a slight contribution.

The suggested membership of a State advisory committee is as follows:

The Governor or his designated representative
The State Supervisor of Public School Music
The Chairman of the Music Department of the State University.
The President of the State Council of the American Federation of Musicians
A representative of the State Planning or Conservation Board
President of the State Federation of Music Clubs
President of the State Music Teachers Association
A representative from a prominent symphony orchestra organization within the State

After reviewing the organization of advisory committees at the several levels of operation the essential elements of such committees may be summed up in the following attributes:

Interest
Knowledge
Responsibility
CHAPTER IV

Organization

During the life of the Federal Music Project, the National Director of the FM was responsible to the Assistant Administrator in charge of the Division of Professional and Service Projects through the Executive Assistant charged with the administration of Federal Project No. 1. The Executive Assistant to the Assistant Administrator was Lawrence S. Morris who filled that position from 1936 to 1939. Mr. Morris proved a very fortunate choice for this position. His complete sympathy with the programs which he administered was of inestimable aid and support to the Directors of the Federal Projects. The Administrative offices of Federal Project No. 1 also included a finance office, headed by Julius Davidson; a correspondence unit, a business office, directed by Mrs. Alice Dalby; a travel unit, mail room, files and supply room. For organizational and functional charts of the Administrative Offices of Federal Project No. 1, see Exhibit "19".

The organization of the national office of the Federal Music Project included Mr. Nikolai Sokoloff, National Director; Assistants to the Director, William C. Mayfairth (later Deputy Director), Dorothy R. Fredenhagen, A. Sandra Munsell, Elizabeth Calhoun and Ruth Haller Ottaway. Charles Seeger was later added as an Assistant to the Director. An Information Service unit was headed by Harry L. Hewes and included a staff of analysts, stenographers and file clerks, totalling about ten employees. The
Regional Staff also was attached to the Washington office although stationed in the field. This staff varied from time to time but regularly included Dr. Thaddeus Rich of Philadelphia, Theodore Hahn of Cincinnati, and George Foster of New York City (in 1938 the Region I office was moved to Boston). During the early days of the Program, Mr. Guy Maier was Regional Director for the Middle West before the appointment of Mr. Hahn. Also in the first year of the FWP Mr. Lamar Stringfield served as Regional Director for the South. During most of the FWP history the South and the Pacific Coast operated without Regional Directors although the absence of such supervision was keenly felt.

Below the supervisory level of the Regional Directors were the State Directors of the FWP. These officers were charged to the music project payroll of their States. The State Directors, although administratively responsible to the State Directors of the Division of Professional and Service Projects, actually were guided by the instructions of the National Director of the FWP. These instructions usually were transmitted through the Regional Directors but at all times there was a free flow of correspondence between the national office and the States. The Washington office promulgated instructions through the use of form letters and later, technical mimeographed releases. Regional Directors sometimes maintained memoranda series for transmitting instructions within their territories.
The relationships between the Regional Directors of the Federal Music Project and the Regional Staff of the Division of Professional and Service Projects varied according to the awareness of the FMP Regional Director of good administrative practices. Actually no official relationship existed at this level since, theoretically, the FMP Regional Director was a member of the Washington Staff of the Music Project while the Professional and Service Regional Staff was an extension of the Assistant Administrator's office. However, the FMP Regional Director who wished to tread a smooth path and who wished to have administrative support available when such support was badly needed, always maintained close contact with the Regional Office of the Division of Professional and Service Projects.

The status of the State Director in the Federal Music Project organization was quite anomalous. Technically he was responsible to the Director of the Federal Music Project through the FMP Regional Director. Administratively he was responsible to the State Works Progress Administrator through the Director of the Division of Professional and Service Projects. However these State relationships were poorly defined. The State Administrator had no responsibility for the appointment of the State FMP Director and therefore the Administrator was not inclined to accept responsibility for the acts of the Director. Furthermore, the Administrator had no control over the employment quota or the
allocation of funds to the music project. In other words the State Administrator could be held responsible for all of the mistakes of the State P&W Director but he had little authority over him. The Administrator had responsibility without authority.

In 1939 the pendulum swung to the extreme opposite. Actually the State administration could do little beyond servicing the music projects - seeing to it that men were paid, personnel assigned and necessary materials procured. Occasionally there was a clash of administrative and technical authority. However, these inconveniences did not occur with the frequency that characterized conditions after 1940 when District offices assumed increasing authority in some States. As in the case of the Regional Directors, the State Director operated most successfully who maintained a close and cooperative relationship with his State P&W Director.

Below the level of State Directors were the District Directors of the Federal Music Project. These officers generally worked directly under the administrative and technical direction of the State P&W Director and seldom maintained any other relationships unless with the District finance officer. Under the District Director came the basic level of P&W supervision, the Unit Supervisor. This officer was at times a personnel manager of an orchestra and in some cases the office was combined with that of Conductor. In larger projects it was deemed best to separate the positions of Unit Supervisor and Conductor in order to relieve the Conductor from any
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administrative or personnel functions and to protect the men from an emotionally unstable conductor who might allow his professional tastes to influence his administrative actions.

The typical organization of a large State Music Project under the FWP included a State Director and two Assistant State Directors, one for performing units and one for music education; a Chief Business-Manager Agent Cashier, a Chief of Information and Promotion including a staff of bookers; a property man; a Chief Timekeeper and staff; a Supervisor of music copyists; and a staff of Field Supervisors who devoted their time to the inspection of project units. A small State staff, choosing New Hampshire as an example, included a State Director; an Assistant State Director for Music Education; an Assistant State Director for promotion and booking; a combination clerk and Agent Cashier and two stenographers. The most elaborate project organizations, of course, were in the metropolitan centers such as New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

The New York City organization at a typical period in FWP history included a Director, an Assistant Director of the Concert Division, a Senior Project Supervisor in charge of booking, a Senior Personnel Supervisor, a Supply Officer, a Finance Officer, a Chief Agent–Cashier, a Project Supervisor for Program Planning, a Chief Librarian, a Senior Unit Supervisor, a Project Supervisor in charge of transportation, a Supervisor in charge of surveying concert sites, a Supervisor in charge of radio activities and a Project Supervisor in charge of promotion and publicity. Last this be compared with other
State organizations it should be added that most of the supervisors listed above maintained a staff, sometimes as large as a moderately sized state staff. In addition to the above, which outlines only the organization of the Concert Division, the Assistant Director of the Music Education Division maintained a staff somewhat larger.

While it is easily understood that a large and highly professional program, as was operated in New York City, required a large staff, it should be remembered that the New York City Music Project was not the largest music project in the country and Massachusetts which had a considerably higher music project employment, operated with a much simpler organization and at least with equal success.

Because of the size of the Federal Projects in the metropolitan areas, an organizational pattern was developed in New York City and Los Angeles which set up a separate administrative structure for the Federal Projects similar to that maintained in Washington. The most elaborate of these organizations was in New York City. The thinking behind this plan was to remove from the Works Progress Administrator the partial responsibility which he had for the Federal Projects and place the entire responsibility in an Administrator for Federal Project No. 1 who would draw his authority from the National Administrator of the Works Progress Administration and from the Assistant Administrator, Division of Professional and Service Projects.

The establishment of an administrative office for Federal Project No. 1 also provided an opportunity to consolidate certain
functions and offices. The Agent-cashier organization for the 
FNP and the Federal Theatre Project was combined as were the 
finance offices, supply offices, guards, and publicity. The 
latter consolidation was unfortunate. Although it is granted 
that previous to the consolidation, the New York City Music Project 
maintained a publicity staff large in proportion to the results it 
produced, the consolidation of publicity staffs caused only delay 
in releases and did not eliminate the need for handling of the 
services of specialists.

All considered, it is believed that the local consolida-
tion of many functions of the Administrative Office for Federal 
Project No. 1 in New York City did not constitute a notable 
economy. As always, there was the tendency to duplicate rather 
than consolidate work. As in the case of publicity, it was 
found that after a central office had been created to consolidate 
a service, the diversified nature of the technical projects 
required that specialists at the project level continue to do the 
actual work, with the result that two offices were established 
where one existed before.

There were advantages in the appointment of an Administra-
tor for Federal Project No. 1. Most important, it freed the New 
York City Federal Projects from local administrative decisions which 
were invariably intended for construction projects and then applied 
to the arts programs. The segregation of administrative functions 
for the Federal Projects simplified the process of assigning
workers to projects. It meant that Chief Timekeepers and finance men dealt with homogenous problems and became accustomed to these problems. It eliminated the type of construction project timekeeper who did not want to pay the harpist because she did not play a note on one particular program. It developed supply officers who became thoroughly acquainted with the property needs of the Arts Projects. Also, the New York Federal Projects were interpreted to the Washington Administration by a man whose sole job was to understand those projects rather than by an Administrator who might wish to minimize their importance in relation to other projects under his control.

Modifications of the New York City Administration for Federal Project No. 1 were effected in other States with large Federal Projects. The most common variation was that developed in Massachusetts where a Coordinator for Federal Projects was appointed by the State Works Progress Administrator to handle their administrative affairs, thereby separating them from the administrative control of the Director of Professional and Service Projects. The fundamental difference between this organizational plan and that adopted in New York City was that the Federal Projects remained under the control of the State Administrator but outside the Division of Professional and Service Projects. The Coordinator of Federal Projects was appointed by, and responsible to the State Administrator. Under the "Massachusetts Plan" certain administrative functions were consolidated but not as extensively as
in New York. Agent-cashier and finance functions were consolidated but neither employment nor publicity. The Massachusetts plan worked well in that it combined those administrative functions which were most likely to be expedited by consolidation. It left divided those functions which needed program control and, most important, it left the final responsibility with the State Administrator, linking his interests to the Federal Projects. It is not intended to imply that either of these two consolidation plans were superior and each worked best in the States in which it was applied. It is safe to say that for numerous reasons, the administrative problems of the Federal Projects in Massachusetts were much simpler than those in New York City. For an organization chart of the Federal Projects including the New York City Administrator for Federal Project No. 1, see Exhibit "19".

The Emergency Relief Appropriations Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940 (passed in July, 1939) terminated abruptly the organization of Federal Project No. 1. The old organizational structure survived for about a month while the Division of Professional and Service Projects could be reorganized to conform to the Act. Also the Federal No. 1 family was reduced by the liquidation of the Federal Theatre Project, legislated out of existence by the Act. At the same time the personnel of the national music staff went through several changes. With the resignations of Dr. Sokoloff and Mr. Mayfarth, the Washington office of the new WPA Music Program was in the charge of George Foster and his staff consisted of
Dorothy Fredenhagen, who was now Assistant Director, Harry L. Hewes, continuing in charge of the information service, and Charles Seager, whose immediate function was to develop a series of technical circulars necessitated by the termination of direct relationships between the Washington office of the Music Program and the State music projects. Mr. Foster's position was temporary and in August Dr. Earl V. Moore was appointed Director of the WPA Music Program. The position of Deputy Director was left vacant and Mrs. Fredenhagen continued as Assistant Director.

The reorganization of the Division of Professional and Service Projects developed three major groupings of projects into subdivisions designated as Welfare Projects, Research and Records Projects and Community Service Projects. The Music Program, which was included in the latter Subdivision, had as its colleagues Adult Education, Recreation, Art, Library Assistance, Writers, and Workers' Service. The Community Service Subdivision was headed by Clayton L. Triggs, Director, and Lawrence S. Norris, Assistant Director. The only member of old Federal No. 1 which was not included in the Community Service Subdivision was the Historical Records Survey Project which became a Program within the Research and Records Subdivision. For organization charts of the Division of Professional and Service Projects and the Community Service Projects Subdivision as of October 1939, see Exhibit "19". The same pattern of organization of the Division of Professional and Service Projects was adopted in the States. However, in some of the
smaller States the State Director of the Division of Professional and Service Projects also assumed directorship of one or all of the Subdivisions. With the transition of July 1939 there was an accompanying reduction in administrative personnel with the result that the national Program Directors were forced to give up their regional representatives. In the Music Program Dr. Rich and Mr. Foster were temporarily assigned to State project pay rolls but continued to function regionally as technicians.

The reorganization effected one complete and drastic change in the structure of WPA music. The national staff was completely divorced from the State music projects. Although the officers of the Program carried the titles of National Director, Deputy Director, etc., they were in effect consultants to the Director of the Division of Professional and Service Projects. Their actual authority extended no further than the stenographers in their office. The responsibility for the quality of the national Program remained with the Program Director but he was divested of any authority to enforce the standards which he established. With the reorganization of the Division, the rules governing correspondence with the States were revised with the result that all letters of a general nature were signed by the Director of the Subdivision while only letters of the most technical nature could be signed -

*Clayton E. Triggs*
Director
Community Service Projects

By
*Dr. Earl V. Moore*
Director
WPA Music Program
Furthermore, no letters might be addressed directly to the State Supervisor of the Music Project nor even to the Director of Professional and Service Projects. All correspondence was addressed to the State Work Projects Administrator, Attention the State Director of the Division of Professional and Service Projects. Therefore the National Director of the WPA Music Program, returning from a field trip, and wishing to convey in writing to the State Supervisor of a Music Project that, upon his recent visit, the second oboe played out of tune, addressed his advice somewhat as follows:

Mr. Lester W. Hersog
State Work Projects Administrator
Old Post Office Building
Albany, New York

Attention: Mr. James Gaynor
State Director
Division of Professional and Service Projects

Dear Mr. Hersog:

Dr. Earl V. Moore, Director of the WPA Music Program, who recently visited your State, has reported to me that during his discussion with Mr. Edward Hinkelso, State Supervisor of the New York State Music Project, Dr. Moore mentioned the mediocrity of the second oboe player in the WPA Symphony Orchestra. Dr. Moore has suggested to me that I request that you convey to Mr. Gaynor the suggestion that the Director of the Community Service Subdivision advise Mr. Hinkelso of Dr. Moore's wish that another second oboe player be found for the subject orchestra.

Sincerely yours,
Not only was the national office of the WPA Music Program cut off from the States in relation to outgoing correspondence, it was also divorced from the States as concerned incoming information. The Monthly Narrative Report which had been the basis for all information compiled in the Washington office of the Federal Music Project, was discontinued. Although the subject of reporting is treated in another Chapter, the revision of the reporting system in 1939 was a reflection of the change in the organizational structure. The argument used in favor of discontinuing the narrative report was that the preparation of statistical reports for the Washington office was the responsibility of the State Statistician. The responsibility for submitting narrative reports was the responsibility of the State Director of the Division of Professional and Service Projects. Since the Director of the P&S Division signed all of the mail prepared by the State Supervisor of the Music Project, the Narrative Report would have to be submitted in the name of the P&S Director and since she did not prepare narrative reports for all of the other P&S projects, she would be showing undue partiality to affix her signature to the Monthly Narrative Report of the State Music Supervisor.

The same selflessness which was enforced in correspondence regulations with the States, was injected into the field relationships between the Washington officials of the Music Program and the State Supervisors. A member of the national office of the WPA Music Program now left Washington as a representative of the
Assistant Commissioner, Division of Professional and Service Projects. In the States his status was that of a temporary member of the Regional staff, generally travelling with the Chief Regional Supervisor of Professional and Service Projects. Officially, he had no relationship with the State Supervisor of the State Music Project. If he followed official procedure to the letter he would not meet with the State Music Project Supervisor, but would receive him in the office of the Professional and Service Division in the company of the State Director and the Chief Regional Supervisor. After hearing the testimony of the State Music Supervisor he would go into executive session with the State Director and the Chief Regional Supervisor for the purpose of advising the State Director upon what she should do about the Music Project. Needless to say, this procedure was seldom followed and there were few State Directors who would have wished it to be followed. However, this was the organizational pattern and compliance with it could be demanded.

One of the effects of the new pattern upon field work by national officials of the Music Program was to collect large coteries of officials wherever the national staff member travelled in a State. It was not infrequent for the National Director visiting a music project orchestra or a sponsor to be accompanied by the Chief Regional Supervisor; the State Director; Division of Professional and Service Projects; the Director of Community Service Projects; the District Director of Professional and Service Projects; the District Director of Community Service Projects; the State Supervisor of the Music Project; the District Supervisor of the
Music Project and, on special occasions, the Deputy State Administrator and the District Manager. With this official encouragement it was hardly possible to observe project operations under normal conditions and certainly there was little opportunity for the national staff member and the State Supervisor to have a quiet discussion as to how the conductor of the unit visited might achieve better bowing in his viola section.

Another effect of the new organization upon field work was to place limitations upon the freedom of movement by members of the WPA Music Program staff. The State Directors of the Division of Professional and Service Projects occasionally found themselves overburdened by the visits of the Washington consultants. Regional Supervisors began to complain that the States were being overrun with Washington officials. The complaints of the Chief Regional Supervisors led to restrictions upon travel by the Program Directors and their staffs. It was required that travel schedules of all consultants be coordinated so as to prevent a number of consultants arriving in a State at the same time. This was a normal development which might have been adopted earlier since its adoption assured the visiting consultant adequate time with the State officials to discuss administrative problems. However, there developed a tendency to allow consultants to visit States only when invited by those States. The consequences of this policy were that those States which operated the best programs would regularly invite consultants in order to show off their
accomplishments, whereas, the States with the less efficient programs would seldom invite a consultant to assist them in correcting their faults. Another unfortunate tendency in scheduling field travel in accordance with invitations from the States was an expressed partiality on the part of certain State Directors toward some consultants. Such partiality, expressed in invitations, would seriously dislocate the planned schedules of the Program Director.

With the ascendancy of the District organizations in WPA, the field relationships of the travelling consultant became even more difficult. After leaving the State office for a swing around the State, the same protocol which developed in the State office was copied and magnified in the District offices. The writer of this report has found on occasion that it required much more time and ceremony to gain an audience with a District Director of Service Projects than to obtain an appointment with the Assistant Commissioner in Washington.

The organizational transition of 1939 in the States was generally happy after the first few months of adaptation. State Directors of the Division of Professional and Service Projects immediately won the respect and admiration of the State Music Project Supervisors by their untiring efforts in obtaining the necessary sponsors and in expediting the submission of the new State-wide project applications. In a few States the administrators took the attitude that they would "make those former Federals to the mark". Fortunately, this spirit was rare and generally the State Administrators welcomed the prestige which the former
Federals enjoyed. The State administrations, now vested with authority over, as well as responsibility for the arts programs, took a new interest in their activities and aided greatly in their promotion. If the State Supervisors of Music Projects were separated from their technical directors, they were compensated to a considerable extent by the proximity of their administrative superiors. Decisions came faster, requisitions were processed faster and relationships with the Divisions of Employment and Finance were closer.

As an integral part of the State Work Projects Administrations, the State Music Supervisors enjoyed a degree of protection from "heat" which they had not received under Federal Project No. 1. The new correspondence regulations might have been irksome in one sense but it was easier for the State Supervisor to use direct, hard words over the State Administrator's signature than over his own. It was more binding to send a memorandum to the District Supervisors in the name of the Director of Professional and Service Projects than in the name of the State Music Supervisor. While, from the personal correspondence received from former State Directors of the Federal Music Project, it was obvious that the reorganization was generally regretted at first, these same persons as State Supervisors of Music Projects soon were devoted in their loyalty to their State Administrations.

In June, 1940, George Foster was brought to Washington from Region I and appointed Deputy Director of the WPA Music Program.
in the Chicago Region with the Federal Theatre Project and with Welfare Programs. In Washington he had directed the organisation and promotion of "This Work Pays Your Community Week".

Mr. Kiplinger's appointment was fortunate for the Music Program since his promotional and theatrical experience made him sensitive to its needs. The Deputy Director of Public Activities Programs under Mr. Kiplinger was Wilfred de St. Aubin, former Chief of the Project Review Section. Mr. St. Aubin did much to smooth out organizational problems and to facilitate administrative routine.

As a whole the project structure in the States did not vary greatly from that of the Federal Music Project. Successive reductions in congressional appropriations reduced employment quotas and thereby decreased the amount of supervisory personnel but, with minor shifts to meet changing program emphases, the organisational pattern of the music projects remained the same.

During the late months of 1940 and the beginning of 1941, a trend in State administrative organizational patterns began to affect the organisation and administration of music projects. This pattern had been in existence for some time but its enforcement had not been so complete as to have influenced the operation of music project activities. This probably was due to the fact that State administrations, having taken over the Federal Projects only a year before, were hesitant to break down the strong State control which had superseded strong Federal control. However, since the music projects had been "broken to the harness" of State administration
it was now believed time to apply the check-rein of District control. In WPA at the time, and from that time to the end, the District Manager was practically a little State Administrator. He held the authority to initiate and terminate projects, to set the employment quotas on individual work projects, to appoint certain administrative and supervisory personnel - in other words, to administer the business of the Work Projects Administration in his District.

This structural pattern had its birth in the early days of WPA when by far the greatest proportion of WPA projects were of the construction type, employing unskilled labor and operating on a local basis. The local project was best administered by the District office. Usually it was a short time job — laying a sewer, repairing a road, improving a playground, building an annex to a school, or laying a runway for an airport. All of these projects were best operated on the local basis. Only a local sponsor was necessary. Local workers were used. There were no public or sponsor relations to be maintained outside the community. Everything could be operated under the close surveillance of the District Manager and his staff.

Furthermore, since the road repair job would be completed in two weeks, where would the laborers be assigned after close of the project? Another project had to be planned, approved and ready to go into action or these workers from the road job would have to return to the local relief rolls. Who in the State office could control effectively all of these details? It was obviously the rightful function of the District office to do this work. The District
Manager would know where a job was needed to absorb the men from
the road project. He knew his District well enough to have at
all times a backlog of projects, planned and approved, which
would render unnecessary the constant termination and reassignment
of workers. Furthermore, there was no one better qualified than
the District Director and his engineers to determine the amount
and classifications of labor needed, and when this labor could be
shifted from one project to another.

With the appointment of Mrs. Florence Kerr to the post
of Assistant Commissioner, Division of Professional and Service
Projects, in January 1939, an immediate drive was made to improve
the standards of many P&SS projects. It was believed by Mrs. Kerr
that one of the best means of raising program standards was to
operate projects on a State-wide basis. State-wide operation
assured one State standard of operation which could be more easily
tied to a national standard. Gradually but steadily all service
projects began the swing-over to State-wide operation. With the
end of Federal Project No. 1, all of the arts programs operated as
State-wide projects by authority of General Letter #278. However,
while there occurred a major and very important transition in the
organization of Professional and Service projects, no change in the
organization of the State Administrations followed. Therefore, in
1939 there were two prevalent situations. The non-Federal Pro-
fessional and Service projects which had operated as local or
District-wide projects became State-wide in name but not completely
in fact, while the former Federal Projects now became state-wide in fact. As has been indicated briefly, in 1940 the embankments of the state-wide music projects began to erode inwardly and the silt from this erosion began to rise up as reefs of district lines. This action was hard to discern at first and most officials of the music program did not believe that it would reach such proportions as to threaten the technical supervision in the state offices.

The first intimation of the seriousness of the situation came when regional administrative officials began to ask arts program personnel what they thought the effect would be if more control were given to the districts over state project operations. To those experienced in government techniques, the asking as to what one thought about an administrative change usually meant that the change was already decided upon. These questions were usually documented with the admonition "You all remember the Federal Project days when the state administrations had no control over the arts projects and now you can see how you are benefiting from their interest and cooperation. Well, now just think, if you let the district offices assume some control over your project activities these interests and benefits will be multiplied by the number of districts". It was argued by the directors of the art, writers, and music programs that a state-wide project and district control was absolutely incompatible. However, in some states the districts fell back upon their perogatives as outlined in the fundamental
procedures of the Work Projects Administration and gradually the supervisory structure of the music projects in these States began to be pulled apart.

Fortunately there were a considerable number of States in which the State Administrators and State Directors of Community Service Programs absolutely refused to permit District interference in the operation of music projects. In the Spring of 1940, at a Regional conference in New York City, Mr. Harold Dunney, Director of Community Service Programs in Massachusetts, announced that the District offices would never interfere with the affairs of technical projects in his State. Of course, many States were too small in area as to have Districts. Other States only granted modified jurisdiction to the Districts but unfortunately the States in which District control was supreme included some of the largest and best music projects in the country.

Let it be thoroughly understood what real District operation signified to a State-wide music project. In the first place, the State Supervisor, who was charged with the responsibility for the technical standards of the program and who was expected to plan and direct that program, was relegated to the position of a program consultant with authority over scarcely anyone but his stenographer. He could not predict how many workers he would have
(Organization)

in any District until the District Manager had decided for him. He could not even travel into the District unless the Manager invited him. He could not appoint his own District Supervisors or control the purchases of music or technical equipment. He could not move an orchestra on tour over a District line. He could not write a letter over his own signature to his own District Music Supervisor. The State Administrator may have granted an exemption of 10% for non-certified personnel on the Music Project but this exemption would count for naught if a District Manager did not wish the exemption to apply within his jurisdiction.

Unfortunately, in several States, the Districts had a tendency to copy in their own limited bailiwicks, the entire administrative structure and procedure of the Washington office. All of the protocol, correspondence regulations, procedural releases, field report practices, and travel etiquette were duplicated to the minutest detail in the District offices of such States.

Texas was the one exception where it appeared essential to operate a State music project on a District basis. In a State of such great distances it was impossible for the State Supervisor to visit project units with sufficient frequency to justify direct control over their operations. In Texas a State Supervisor could work only in the capacity of a Regional Supervisor giving the Districts as much autonomy as possible and seeing to it that they planned and operated their activities in accordance with national program policies.
(Organization)

However, using Texas as an exception to the statement that a State-wide project could not operate with maximum efficiency along District lines, the reasons why Texas operated well on this basis was one of the reasons why the other States did not. Texas chose District Music Supervisors who had the professional qualifications of State Supervisors and paid them salaries comparable to those paid State Supervisors of moderately sized projects. The reverse was true in the other States which tried District rule. Supervisory salary scales were invariably low at the State level. It was rare for a State music project supervisor with as many as 1500 musicians under his direction to receive over $3600 per annum. Naturally, this created the problem of obtaining a musician of sufficient experience and ability to accept such responsibility. Salaries at the District level were correspondingly lower. A large District in the Music Program might pay its supervisor as high as $175 per month but District salaries were more commonly in the bracket ranging from $125 to $135 per month. Herein lay one of the paradoxes of District operation. This organizational pattern placed the most responsibility at the District level thereby requiring the most ability and experience in its supervision. Yet the salaries were not high enough to attract anyone capable of assuming these responsibilities. If the States had consistently followed their theories of District rule they would have increased the salaries of District music supervisors to the amounts paid State supervisors. They would have eliminated
filling the vacancy caused by the resignation of William C. Haylarth in July 1939. The position of Deputy Director had not been filled since that time. In August, 1940, Dr. Moore resigned as National Director of the WPA Music Program because his leave of absence from the University of Michigan had expired. This left Mr. Foster as Deputy and Acting Director. During this period a reduction in the administrative budget forced the termination of the Information Service Unit and brought about the resignation of Mr. Harry L. Hewes. Mrs. Margaret Kerr and Miss Jessie MacBride remained in the Program office to maintain such records as still filtered through to the Washington office and for the purpose of selecting and circulating program materials to the States. The Washington office staff of the WPA Music Program now consisted of George Foster, Deputy Director; Mrs. Dorothy R. Predenhagen, Assistant Director; Miss Jessie MacBride and Mrs. Margaret Kerr, with a clerical staff of three persons. Dr. Moore served as a Special Consultant on a per diem basis.

In the meantime, on the recommendation of the National Advisory Committee to the Division of Professional and Service Projects, the Division adopted the name of the Subdivision and became the Division of Community Service Programs. The Subdivision adopted the name of Public Activities Programs. Also in the Fall of 1940, Clayton E. Triggs resigned as Director of Public Activities Programs to become Deputy Administrator of the Southern California Work Projects Administration. Mr. Triggs was succeeded by Walter M. Kiplinger. Mr. Kiplinger had done significant work
State Supervisors entirely and hired special consultants for occasional reviews of activities and suggestions for future operations. However, the States which favored District operation, did not go the whole way but compromised, thereby doing two injustices instead of one. They vested all operating authority in the Districts but would not pay salaries sufficient to obtain supervisors capable of shouldering such responsibility. They retained the State Supervisor with his salary but denied him the authority to fulfill his responsibilities.

That Music Projects were able to operate successfully in some of the States which upheld District rule is creditable to the ingenuity and the courage of the State music supervisors who had sufficient pride in their profession and devotion to the cause of music to keep up a never ending struggle for sound operation.

The next important change in organizational patterns did not occur until after Pearl Harbor. During the calendar year 1941 large numbers of persons were leaving the WPA rolls for private employment in defense industries. Also congressional appropriations had fallen to a level which required frequent quota reductions in the States. Consequently by the Fall of 1941 there were a number of States where the combined employment of the Public Activities Programs did not number over 500. With employment spread so thin over seven or eight State-wide projects in the Public Activities Programs, it was rapidly becoming impossible to maintain adequate technical supervision and keep man-month-costs within reasonable
limits. Therefore, discussions were held concerning the advisability of combining the several state-wide projects into a consolidated State-wide Public Activities Project. It was set forth that such consolidation would not affect the identity or the integrity of the professional programs but would pool administrative functions and expenses, thereby saving enough in administrative costs to preserve adequate technical supervision. This consolidation was opposed by several of the Directors of the highly technical programs in the first stages of discussion. However, it was soon agreed that only by such means could professional programs be maintained in the smaller States. In the late fall of 1941 Ohio submitted the first formal proposal for a consolidated State-wide Public Activities Project. The proposal was studied carefully and it was planned that this project should be perfected and used as a model. Between discussion and operation came Pearl Harbor. The immediate effect upon the services of the Work Projects Administration are discussed in Chapter I.

The impact of the declaration of War upon the Division of Community Service Programs was reflected in the early months of 1942 when a realignment of programs was effected. The Public Activities Subdivision became the War Services Subdivision including the former Research and Records Subdivision.

One of the immediate realignments created within the War Services Subdivision was to combine the Art, Music, Historical Records,
(Organization)

and Writers Programs into one program called the War Services Cultural Program. This Program was short lived and operated as an entity for only a few weeks. Its creation was based on the fallacy that the cultural programs had common problems as well as common interests. The interests of the cultural programs may have been common but their administrative problems were not. In fact they were far apart. It would have been much easier to have included such programs as Education, Music and Recreation in one administrative unit than to combine Music and Art programs. Historical Records had no place in the Cultural Program other than the historical fact that it had once been a part of Federal Project No. 1. The brief consolidation of the cultural programs satisfied no one and may have been responsible for the resignation of one Program Director.

In April, 1942, a drastic reduction was made in the administrative staff of all programs at the Washington level. For the most part, War Services programs were allowed only the Section Chief, as the Director was now called. The only remaining technical staff member of the WPA Music Program was Mr. Foster who also served as Assistant Director of the War Services Subdivision.

At the time of this reduction and reorganization in the Washington office, the subject of consolidated State-wide projects was revived. Although, the War Services Sections in the States were, by the inclusion of Research and Records projects, much
larger than the former Public Activities Section, the very rapid depletion of the WPA rolls foretold a great reduction in War Services employment. Furthermore, the revised criteria for the eligibility of project activities immediately following the declaration of war was eliminating many activities.

Service Letters Nos. 1, 2 and 3 established procedures for the organization, planning, project submission and eligible services of the War Services Program. These Letters were dated successively March 12, April 17 and 18. Service Letter No. 3 which established the eligible activities for War Services Programs was a document which should have been typed and reproduced in double-space since what it actually told the States was invisibly written between the lines. In reading Service Letter No. 3 it was not so important to study those activities which were declared eligible as it was to check those activities which were not declared ineligible. For instance music services were not declared eligible in any form. However, the only music services specifically declared ineligible were creative music activities, music research, music in occupational therapy and one or two other items. None of the activities declared ineligible had been operating for a year.

The compression of individual State-wide projects into consolidated War Services Projects was accomplished during the Summer and early Fall of 1942. The Emergency Relief Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943 foretold the end of the Work Projects Administration and reduced employment to a point
where the consolidation of projects was an absolute necessity. However, it was agreed by all concerned that this consolidation of highly technical projects was desirable only because of wartime necessity and was totally undesirable in a normal work program. Gradually the staff of the War Services Subdivision in the Washington office was reduced. Nearly all remaining consultants were given some administrative responsibilities in addition to their technical functions. The Director of the Music Program also served as Deputy Director of the War Services Subdivision from August 1942.

In the States the organization of the new War Services Projects varied considerably. It was common to organize three programs within the project. For a definition of the term "program" as used in War Services Projects see Service Letter No. 2, April 17, 1942. A common grouping included Clerical Services (formerly Research and Records), Educational Services formed another program and music was often combined with Recreation Services in a third. Another grouping was Clerical Services, Education and Recreation, and Cultural Services (including art, music and writing). In operation the groupings proved to be less important than the fact that activities were grouped, and administrative costs lessened. Through this action the technical services were able to retain sufficient technical supervision until the end.
The final reorganization of all Service Division projects came in October, 1942. This reorganization was occasioned partly by the exigencies of wartime operation and partly by the new functions acquired by the Division of Service Projects (formerly the Division of Community Service Programs). Mrs. Florence S. Kerr, Assistant Commissioner, had been appointed Assistant to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, holding both positions concomitantly.

At the same time the Division of Service Projects was charged with the responsibility of administering for the Federal Works Agency the funds provided by the Lanham Act for War Public Services. Therefore, the staff of the Service Division (WPA) now had two functions—Lanham Act functions and WPA functions. The reorganization of the Division of Service Projects was designed to reflect this dual role.

From October the Division of Service Projects, as such, devoted its efforts to Lanham functions. The War Services Subdivision was eliminated and all WPA functions of the Service Division were consolidated in the Division of Program Operations. This new Division was headed by Mrs. Mildred T. Law, formerly Director of the Defense, Health and Welfare Subdivision. Mrs. Law had come to Washington from the St. Paul Regional Office of the Work Projects Administration where she had given splendid support and impetus to the arts projects. The direction of such music activities as remained continued to be exercised by George Foster who, from January, 1943, also served as Assistant Director of the Division of Program Operations. And so ended the Division of Service Projects in 1943.
In the preceding pages of this chapter some hard words have been used in connection with administrative restrictions and organization which adversely affected the WPA Music Program after 1939. Let these statements be interpreted as a reflection upon the wisdom or judgment of the persons who were responsible for administering the affairs of the Work Projects Administration or the Division of Service Projects; certain facts should be taken into consideration without minimizing in the least the difficulties under which the Music Program operated.

The Works Progress Administration was not created primarily to prosecute projects of a cultural nature or even of a white-collar category. WPA in 1935, '39 and '43 meant "construction" to the man in the street and to most of the men in Congress. Only after Pearl Harbor, when the voracity of war industry had employed every male skilled laborer, did the employment of Service Division Projects even approach the numbers employed on construction projects. Of the total employment of the Service Division, the Music Program probably never exceeded 2%. Of the total employment of the Work Projects Administration it was a very infinitesimal part to be found only behind a decimal point. Since Congress legislated for construction projects only and let the chips fall where they might, it is readily understandable that the Commissioner or State Administrator who attempted to fit such legislation to a Music Program had a difficult task indeed. The "18 months clause", "25% sponsors contributions" and similar legislative provisions were
designed by Congress for construction projects where they did little damage. It would have been easy in 1939 and thereafter for the late Colonel Harrington and Mrs. Kerr to have made the decision that the operation of cultural programs under existing legislation was impractical. These two officials could have ruled, with considerable justification, that Congress had not intended that cultural projects be continued after 1939. However, let it be remembered by all who remember the cultural projects, that after July 31, 1939, the continuation of a Music Program was motivated only by the determination and sympathy of Mrs. Florence S. Kerr. It would have been easy to have given up in '39. She chose the hard way.

Just as legislation was drafted by Congress for construction projects, disregarding the effect upon white-collar operations, so were the regulations and procedures of the Work Projects Administration designed primarily for those projects which represented the great proportion of WPA employment. To Mrs. Kerr, as Assistant Commissioner, fell the lot of obtaining the maximum consideration for projects of the service type but, in many instances, the best she could hope for was a compromise or a special exception for some particular activities. It should be injected here that the constant requesting of exemptions for any program was a practice avoided as consistently as possible. The admission of the fact that any program needed unusual exceptions always raised the question of whether that program should be operated with relief labor under a relief act.
Consequently, every program strained to the utmost to fit its operations to existing regulations.

Much of this chapter has been devoted to the adverse effects of District rule upon music projects. It would be a grave omission to leave the impression that only music projects were so affected. Practically every type of project in the Service Division suffered from this type of organizational pattern and therefore Mrs. Kerr was doubtless the last person in the Administration to favor it. However, the fact remained that District operation was well suited to construction projects. The State Administrators, for the most part, were construction-minded. They wanted District operation. In the last resort Mrs. Kerr was in the same position as the National Program Director only with a problem twenty times as great. To be constantly arguing that the rules of the game would not fit service projects was to beg the question "did they belong in the game". Mrs. Kerr accepted the rules of the game and maintained technical programs of high standards under these rules.

Many other statements can be included in this report testifying to the constant support and sympathy which Mrs. Kerr extended to the WPA Music Program. Those included in this chapter are confined to the subject of Organization.
Recommendations

Recommendations on the organization of a music program of the future, operated with Federal funds, are the most difficult of all the subjects to treat in this Report without having a framework of legislation within which to work. Three types of government music programs are possible within a Federal work program which require entirely different types of organizational patterns. The three types of music programs are (1) Federal operation, (2) State operation within the administrative structure of a Federal agency, (3) State or local operation under a grant-in-aid system.

The first two organizational patterns both involve operation by a Federal agency. Therefore, while there are three types of organizational pattern there are two types of operation: Federal operation, and State or local operation through a grant-in-aid system. The two operational systems are desirable according to the objectives of the Federal agency which controls the funds. Operation by a Federal agency is desirable if time is a factor and if the reduction of unemployment or the cushioning of an economic depression is the primary objective. If the objective is the stimulation of private employment through the encouragement of the Arts, the grant-in-aid system is preferable. Consequently this section of the Chapter on organization will deal with organizational patterns designed to fit these two operational systems.

In a system of Federal operation a combination of the organizational patterns of the Federal Music Project and the
Recommendations

subsequent WPA Music Program is desirable. Nearly every Chapter
in this Report has touched upon the strength and the weakness of
both types of operation and it is obvious that neither was
perfect and both were extremes. The Federal Music Project
represented complete national control reaching into every level
of State operation and binding the initiative of the State Director
to some extent. Insufficient latitude was allowed the State in
exercising judgment. Too many decisions had to be referred to
Washington before action could be taken. Under the organizational
pattern which administered the WPA Music Program, insufficient
control over the appointment of key personnel, lack of expeditious
and direct communications with the State music staff and the lack
of checks upon program operations in the field hampered the
efficient operation of the Program. The Federal Project ignored the
community too frequently. The WPA Music Program was tied to the
community but in creating this tie it became enmeshed in the
administrative minutiae of the District offices.

Under a system of Federal operation a Music Program
should be headed by a National Director, responsible to the head
of the parent agency or a Division thereof. The Director should be
assisted by a Deputy Director and such assistants or consultants as
the size of the Program requires. All of these positions should be
filled by musicians with sound administrative experience. There
(Recommendations)

should be an adequate staff of clerical and statistical aides. In order that the nation may be adequately informed on the accomplishments of the Program, the staff should include an Assistant charged with the responsibility for preparing press releases and reports.

Attached to the Director's staff there should be at least four Regional Directors. The number and actual titles of these Regional Directors would conform to the Regional structure of the parent agency. The Regional Director of the Music Program, although attached to the Washington staff, should have his official station in the Regional office of the parent agency or at a strategic point in the area.

The State staff of the Music Program should be headed by a State Director and an adequate staff comparable in its functions to that of the Washington office of the Program. It might be necessary to maintain District representatives in the larger States but these officers should be attached to the staff of the State Director, with their official stations in locations dictated by the best interests of the Program.

Regional Directors and State Directors should be appointed by the National Director of the Program. District supervisors and conductors of performing units of over forty players should be appointed by the State Director with the approval of the National
(Recommendations)

Director. Below the level of the Washington staff the Director would normally act upon nominations made by the Regional Directors.

The chain of administrative authority in the parent agency need not be the concern of the National Director. In view of the policies of most Federal agencies, it is assumed that the administrative responsibility of the National Director would not be great. However, his technical authority should be beyond question and the instruments for enforcing such authority should be at hand. Technically, the line of authority should run directly from the National Director to the State Director, with the Regional Director acting as a representative of the National Program office. Technical correspondence should be direct with sufficient copies distributed to advise administrative officials of the actions taken or the advice given.

All releases governing the policy of the Program should receive necessary administrative approval before being released directly from the Washington Program office to the State Program Director. Technical procedural releases should not require administrative clearance. It should be the responsibility of the Director or his representatives to draft all operating procedures for the Program and these procedures should receive necessary administrative clearance.

There need not be any relationship between the Regional Directors of the Program and the Regional officials of the parent
agency and there should be no administrative relationship. The Regional Director of the Program should have no responsibility other than to the National Program Director. The regional position is of such importance that if a choice is required between full regional representation and a smaller Washington staff, the latter should be the choice. The Regional Director should not be the Director of a State Program except in brief emergency periods.

The State Director of the Program should be administratively responsible to the head of the parent agency in the State (or region if State administrative offices are not maintained). He should receive his technical authority from the National Director of the Program. No State Program officials below the level of the State Director should have any administrative relationships with officers of the parent agency. The State Program Director should transmit all technical correspondence direct to the National Director or through the Regional Director. Likewise, all reports of a technical nature should be transmitted direct to the Washington Program office with copies distributed to the State administrative staff and the Regional Director.

The responsibility of the State Program Director to the administrative head of the parent agency should be to see that all administrative regulations promulgated by the administrator are carried out on the Program, to accept and follow the regulations issued by the Director of Finance of the parent agency, to see that all procedures governing the employment of personnel are followed.
(Recommendations)

The State Director should report regularly to the proper administrative officer on all Program developments and should prepare such statistical and financial summaries as may be necessary.

All relations with Programs in other States should be carried on through the Regional Director. Such relationships might include touring orchestras, the exchange or transfer of personnel, the coordination of music libraries and the acquisition of technical supervisory personnel.

As has been discussed in the Chapters on Sponsorship and Project Applications and Proposals, initial demonstration programs may be instigated by the National Program Director. However, under normal conditions of operations, project applications should be approved administratively and transmitted to Washington by the head of the parent agency in the State. Such applications and proposals should receive technical approval by the Regional and National Program Directors and should not receive administrative approval until technical approval has been obtained.

The release and control of funds both to the States and to the Programs in the States is an administrative function which should be vested in administrative officers after technical approval of project applications has been granted. However, in no case should the release of funds exceed the amount which has been approved by the Program Director. In the States the control of Program employment...
(Recommendations)

quotas should be vested in the administrative head of the agency with the understanding that the maximum employment cannot exceed the amount approved in the project application. It is most essential that proper administrative coordination exist between the administrative officers at the State and national levels in order that employment quotas may be established and fixed over a period of time sufficient to permit proper program planning and the fulfillment of program commitments. This was a serious defect in the Work Projects Administration occasioned by the constantly shifting unemployment load and the effect of seasonal unemployment in various industries.

The organizational pattern of a music staff for a grant-in-aid program should be radically different from that of a Federally operated program. Under the grant-in-aid system the need for a State program staff does not exist. A substantial field staff is necessary but this staff would act as an extension of the Washington office and not as an operating staff.

The chief functions of the national office would be to review and act upon applications, maintain a check upon operations, and service the needs of the operating programs. To fulfill these functions the following top positions are necessary: a Director, a Deputy Director, an Assistant Director in charge of project review, an Assistant Director in charge of finance and statistics. Further staff may be added to these key positions depending upon
(Recommendations)

the size of the national Program.

Compressed job descriptions for the above listed essential positions are as follows:

**Director**

To assume the responsibility and attendant authority for planning and directing the national Program; for developing the policies of the Program in accordance with the policies of the parent agency; for directing and supervising the work of the national Program staff and the Program field staff; for interpreting the policies and accomplishments of the Program to the general public; for reporting to the parent agency such statistical and technical information as may be required; for submitting annual reports for transmission to Congress; for maintaining the professional standards of the Program; for the appointment of such personnel as the procedures of the parent agency may require; for assisting the operating units in the field by directing the release of technical materials and by field visits; for approving project applications for funds and recommending allotments.

**Deputy Director**

The Deputy Director will act for the Director in his absence and may assume such functions of the Director as may be delegated by him. The particular responsibility of the Deputy Director will be the immediate supervision of the field staff and he will maintain close contact with the field staff by means of reports, correspondence and field trips. The Deputy Director will also assume responsibility for
(Recommendations)

The Administrative Unit of the national Program office. This staff shall be headed by a Senior Clerk and shall process personnel actions, pay rolls and travel vouchers for the national and field Program staffs.

Assistant Director - Project Review

The Assistant Director, Project Review Section shall be charged with the responsibility for drafting procedures and forms necessary for the submission of project applications including documentation; for conducting such training as may be necessary to prepare the field and national Program staffs for the submission and review of applications for funds; for scheduling the review of applications; for preparing recommendations and other action documents for the use of the Director and administrative officials of the parent agency; for the organization and supervision of the reviewing staff in the national Program office; for advising the field staff and applicants concerning the action taken on applications; for maintaining proper controls and flow charts to expedite the processing of applications; for maintaining adequate records and files of the action taken on applications; for providing necessary information to the Assistant Director, Finance and Statistics; for providing the Director with necessary information for Program reports; and for coordinating project review activities with the functions of the other Sections of the Program. All of these functions shall be performed under the supervision of the Director.
(Recommendations)

**Assistant Director - Program Planning and Promotion**

The Assistant Director, Program Planning and Promotion Section, shall be charged with the responsibility for the preparation and release of all Program operating procedures and technical procedures unless otherwise specified by the Director; for conducting surveys of the necessity for various types of procedures and program materials; for the circulation of materials developed in the States or regions and by other Federal and non-Federal agencies; for assisting in the technical review of project applications; for assisting the Director and the Deputy Director in planning program activities and policies; for directing and supervising the activities of the Program Materials Unit; for directing and supervising the activities of the Information Unit; for assisting the Director in developing information and publicity policies; for developing promotional policies and techniques for the use of the operating units in the field; for conducting conferences, institutes and other training sessions in the field toward the improvement of promotion techniques; to supervise the work of such special consultants as may be assigned to duties in this Section; for reviewing such narrative and statistical reports as may be necessary to the efficient operation of the Section; for assisting the Deputy Director in maintaining field contacts relative to program planning; for conducting such surveys as may be necessary for program planning; for recommending to the Finance and Statistics Section such items of information as may be essential in Program reports; and for assisting the Director in interpreting the Program
(Recommendations)

to the public. All of these functions shall be performed under the supervision of the Director.

**Assistant Director - Finance and Statistics**

The Assistant Director, Finance and Statistics Section, shall be charged with the responsibility for developing a procedure for the allotment of funds to community operating programs after project applications have been approved; for supervising the allotment of funds to community operating programs; for establishing control budgets for community programs with the advice of the technical staff; for maintaining adequate financial controls over the status of funds earmarked for program operation; to prepare the budget of the national Program for the approval of the Director; for maintaining adequate records of allotments and expenditures; to collaborate with the Deputy Director and the Administrative Unit in establishing budgets and controls and records suitable to the needs of the national Program office; for establishing accounting procedures and practices to provide for field or central accounting of community program accounts; for directing the Accounting Unit in the national Program office and such accounting as may be performed in the field; for developing a system of statistical reporting and record keeping to be maintained by the Analytical Unit; for directing the activities of the Analytical Unit; for developing a system of basic records and reports for the use of community programs; for assisting in the review of project applications; for preparing reports and statistical
(Recommendations)

summaries for the use of the Director; for providing the field offices and community programs with such advice as may be necessary in improving financial practices; for such field inspection as may be necessary; for cooperating with the Assistant Director, Program Planning and Promotion Section, in coordinating the submission of narrative and statistical information in reports, and for providing the Program Planning and Promotion Section with such statistical information as may be necessary for its effective operation.

In case some of the functions herein assigned to the Assistant Director, Finance and Statistics Section, are combined in a finance office designed to serve several Programs operating on a grant-in-aid system, the statistical and analytical functions should be retained in the national Music Program organization and placed under an administrative assistant responsible to the Deputy Director.

The field staff of the Music Program operating through grants-in-aid to communities must be larger than that utilized in Federal operation. Although a music program will probably have to fit its field organization to the regional geography of the parent agency, two alternatives must be chosen. Either the Music Program must have a sufficient number of regional offices conforming generally to the musical geography of the nation or a considerable number of sub-regional staffs must be maintained. For ideal Program operation the following regional alignment is suggested: Region I - Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts -
Regional Office, Boston; Region II - New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey - Regional Office, Philadelphia; Region III - Maryland, Delaware, District of Columbia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida - Regional Office, Raleigh, North Carolina; Region IV - West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana - Regional Office, Jackson, Mississippi; Region V - Oklahoma, Texas - Regional Office, Dallas; Region VI - Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico - Regional Office, Santa Fe, New Mexico; Region VII - California, Nevada - Regional Office, San Francisco; Region VIII - Washington, Wyoming, Montana, Oregon, Idaho, Alaska - Regional Office, Portland, Oregon; Region IX - Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri - Regional Office, Omaha; Region X - North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Upper Peninsula of Michigan - Regional Office, St. Paul; Region XI - Michigan (except the upper Peninsula), Illinois, Indiana, Ohio - Regional Office, Chicago.

For the eleven regions organized according to the above pattern, sub-regional offices might be stationed in the following cities: Buffalo, N.Y.; Atlanta, Ga.; Nashville, Tenn.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Diego, California; Boise, Idaho; St. Louis, Mo.; Indianapolis, Ind. If a program of sufficient size is operated it will be necessary to maintain a representative of the Regional Office in the capital cities of the larger States which are not serviced by sub-regional offices.
(Recommendations)

The organization of regional and sub-regional offices under this type of program will vary according to the functions delegated by the national Program office. However, certain functions must be assigned to the regional organization and certain relationships between the regional staff and the Washington office must be established for efficient operation. The regional staffs and all field representatives should be on the payroll of the Washington office and should be considered representatives of the Director.

The first officer of the Program at the Regional level will be the Regional Director. This title may be changed in case it duplicates that of the regional head of the parent agency. The Regional Director of the Music Program will be responsible to the Director of the Program in Washington through the Deputy Director. The Regional Director will be responsible to no other officials. The Regional Director should be supplied with adequate clerical assistance including a stenographer and if possible a clerk capable of compiling reports and maintaining such records as may be required at the regional level. In large regions where there are no sub-regional offices the Regional Director should have a Regional Assistant who will assist in field work and to whom may be delegated some functions of the Regional Director.

The Sub-Regional office of the Music Program should be in the charge of a Field Representative who should be directly responsible to the Regional Director and should maintain no direct contact with the Washington office. To the Field Representative
(Recommendations)

The Regional Director should delegate sufficient responsibility to encourage initiative and to permit independence of action. The Field Representative need not have more staff than one stenographer and few records should be maintained in his office. Representatives stationed at State capitals should also bear the same title and responsibility as the Field Representative in the Sub-Regional office. Their contact should be with the Regional Director and not through the Sub-Regional office.

The job descriptions for members of the field staff of the Music Program may be as follows:

**Regional Director**

The duties of the Regional Director of the Music Program will be to act as the representative of the Director within the limits of the Region; to direct and supervise the activities of the regional staff including the Regional Assistant, the Field Representatives and the clerical staff of the regional office; to render assistance to communities in the preparation of applications for funds for program operations; to acquaint communities with the objectives of the program and the activities eligible under its legislation; to review project applications and make action recommendations to the Director; to inform the applicant of the action taken upon his application; to assist communities in organizing the program and placing it in operation; to inform communities of their responsibilities in the receipt and expenditure of Federal funds; to provide communities with working materials and suggestions toward the most efficient operation
(Recommendations)

of the Program; to make regular inspections of program operations; to maintain records of the status of funds on operating projects; to review and transmit the periodic reports prepared by the community programs for the Washington office; to prepare and transmit such narrative and statistical reports as may be required by the national Program office; to maintain close relations with the local and State officials of the American Federation of Musicians; to represent the Director in interpreting the Program to the public; to relay suggestions and recommendations for program operation to the Director; to supervise the training and instruction of Regional Assistants, Field Representatives and clerical staff; to travel outside the Region when so authorized by the Director and to participate in national and sectional conferences when authorized by the Director.

Regional Assistant, Field Representative

The duties of the Regional Assistant and the Field Representative will be to represent the Regional Director; to maintain liaison between the Regional Director and the community programs; to maintain a regular schedule of field inspection trips; and to perform such other functions as may be delegated or assigned by the Regional Director providing such functions are within his defined responsibilities.

For the purpose of enjoying an exchange of ideas and program suggestions and to maintain well-knit staff relationships, the Regional
(Recommendations)

Director should hold staff meetings of all regional technical personnel not less frequently than once monthly. National meetings of Regional Directors and the Washington staff should be held at least twice annually and, unless the Director can hold sectional meetings of several regions, the national meetings should be scheduled quarterly.