

The Music and Performing Arts Programs of the Rockefeller Foundation

by Michael Uy

Harvard University



© 2021 by Michael Uy



Abstract

The Rockefeller Foundation had originally left out much grantmaking to the arts during the first decades of its operations, instead devoting greater resources to efforts such as the alleviation of global hunger, the expansion of access to public libraries, or the eradication of hookworm. Its support of music prior to the 1950s had totaled less than \$200,000 over four decades. After the Second World War, however, it began giving substantial funds to the arts and humanities. The Rockefeller Foundation funded projects in new music, like commissions made by the Louisville Orchestra, operas and ballets at New York’s City Center, and the work of the “creative associates” at the State University of New York at Buffalo. In total, between 1953 and 1976, the Rockefeller Foundation granted more than \$40 million (\$300 million in 2017) to the field of music alone.

The Music and Performing Arts Programs of the Rockefeller Foundation

In 1976, the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) celebrated the United States Bicentennial with a 100-record collection known as the Recorded Anthology of American Music. The editorial committee of the anthology noted that any attempt to memorialize the music of the United States, including its many different racial and ethnic communities, as well as its vast geographical diversity, would be an impossible task. Thus, the aim for the anthology was to be “comprehensive,” but not “exhaustive.” I take a similar approach with this report. The Rockefeller Foundation funded hundreds of programs annually, ranging from grants to institutions, to fellowships to individuals. They were as small as \$100, to as large as \$10 million.¹

Since there is not enough space to discuss every grant at length, I have chosen to focus on the largest grants and the largest programs. At times, however, I include smaller grants because of their symbolic importance. Nevertheless, there is a danger of overemphasizing any one grant, because some were given without much meaning or long-term significance. Instead, the biggest programs had guidelines which we can analyze -- they provide frameworks and strategies that we can compare over time. Overall, the goal of this report is to lay the groundwork to examine how the music divisions of this institution emerged and roughly what it covered.

In an effort to minimize numerical clutter, I provide only grant amounts in their original value. Readers can refer to Table 1.1 for present-day equivalencies (taken from www.measuringworth.com).

Table 1.1: Estimated Present-Day Dollar Values for 1955, 1965, and 1975

1955	2015	1965	2015	1975	2015
\$1,000	\$9,000	\$1,000	\$7,500	\$1,000	\$4,500
\$10,000	\$90,000	\$10,000	\$75,000	\$10,000	\$45,000
\$50,000	\$450,000	\$50,000	\$375,000	\$50,000	\$225,000
\$100,000	\$900,000	\$100,000	\$750,000	\$100,000	\$450,000
\$500,000	\$4,500,000	\$500,000	\$3,750,000	\$500,000	\$2,250,000
\$1,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$7,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,500,000
\$10,000,000	\$90,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$75,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$45,000,000
\$100,000,000	\$900,000,000	\$100,000,000	\$750,000,000	\$100,000,000	\$450,000,000
\$1,000,000,000	\$9,000,000,000	\$1,000,000,000	\$7,500,000,000	\$1,000,000,000	\$4,500,000,000

The Emergence of Grantmaking in Music and the Other Performing Arts

The Rockefeller Foundation formed its Humanities division and began its earliest grants to music in 1929. While most funding went toward academic scholarship - - for example, through a substantial grant to the American Council of Learned Societies -- the RF also offered two grants to the Playground and Recreation Association of America, for a study of community music (\$28,979) and to a program of introducing music into small towns (\$9,697). These one-off grants, however, hardly indicated any commitment to supporting large-scale music projects.

By the late 1930s and early 1940s, the Rockefeller Foundation began placing greater emphasis on its programs in “cultural development,” as evidenced in its annual reports. In 1937, the RF wrote, “from being aristocratic and exclusive, culture is becoming democratic and inclusive,” citing greater levels of literacy, improvements in education, the proliferation of public libraries and museums,

and the development of radio and television.² Trustees noted a greater concern for “leisure” and how one spent one’s free time. Two years later in 1939, the foundation gave \$60,000 for the establishment of the Berkshire Symphonic Festival music education center in Massachusetts under the direction of Serge Koussevitzky. In 1940, it appropriated \$20,000 to the New School for Social Research for experiments in music and film production under composer Hanns Eisler; and \$35,000 to Columbia University for studies in radio listening by sociologist Paul F. Lazarsfeld.

Not until 1953, however, was there a substantial push into music and the performing arts. That year, the Rockefeller Foundation gave two major grants to the Louisville Philharmonic Society in Kentucky and the City Center of Music and Drama in New York. They were part of “four emerging trends” in the foundation: greater focus on studies of recent history, assisting American studies in other countries, supporting creative writing, and “the initiation of major grants in music.”³ While the RF began supporting “creative work of high quality,” at the time, it was also cautious to acknowledge that it “neither can nor should take the place of other forms of private patronage of the arts, nor should it in general give direct aid to individual artists.”⁴ Instead, the foundation preferred to give indirect assistance through third-party organizations, like the Louisville Philharmonic Society or the City Center of Music and Drama.

The Rockefeller Foundation also saw its grant to Louisville, however, as an ambitious embarkation “upon a program which [was] virtually unique in the annals of music history.”⁵ It was unprecedented in scope and magnitude, especially for a philanthropic foundation. The foundation held the conviction that “public interest in contemporary music [was] far greater than generally realized.” The orchestra planned to commission, perform, and record no fewer than 46 works annually. Each piece was to be performed four times, assuring the repeated hearings of new music. The program was geared toward “mass engagement”: the officers argued that ticket prices were no higher than to a motion picture theatre; recordings were made on tapes for distribution to broadcasting stations; and LPs of the commissioned works were sold on a subscription basis. To these ends, the RF granted \$400,000 over four years.⁶

To the City Center of Music and Drama, the Rockefeller Foundation contributed \$200,000 over three years for its resident performance organizations, the New York City Ballet and the New York City Opera Company. The grant, in large part due to the strong influence of Managing Director Lincoln Kirstein, financed new productions, commissioned new scores, librettos, and choreography, and the design of stage sets and costumes.⁷ This funding helped produce nearly a dozen operas and ballets.

The Rockefeller Foundation continued its cautious exploration of grants to music groups with support to the American Symphony Orchestra League (ASOL) for conductor and music critics workshops (\$83,150), and to the Karamu House in Cleveland for its music building (\$100,000). Officers gave a small grant to the Bennington Composers' Conference (\$4,500) over three years, seeing it as a continuation of its grant to the Louisville Orchestra. The summer conference provided an opportunity for the performance and workshopping of new compositions, involving both professional and amateur performers, as well as older and younger composers.

The central Rockefeller Foundation officers in the Humanities division during this time were Director Charles B. Fahs, Associate Director John Marshall, Assistant Director (and later Associate Director) Chadbourne Gilpatric, and Associate Director Edward F. D'Arms (who later went to the Ford Foundation in 1957). They were largely responsible for the rather ad hoc programming of music and the arts in the early stages -- that is, before an official division with its own arts-based advisory committees was established. According to the RF's annual report in 1955, its grants were aimed toward "broader enjoyment of the arts."⁸

Rockefeller Foundation grants to ASOL, the Berkshire Music Center, and to Young Audiences, Inc. for concerts in schools were also seen as living up to an educational mission for the foundation. The RF contributed an additional \$125,000 to the Berkshire Music Center in 1955 for its scholarship fund, following up on its first grant to the center in 1940. Young Audiences, Inc. sponsored chamber music concerts "directed primarily toward the musical interest and experience of children."⁹ The program brought live music to a large number of

communities in the United States, while also supporting the musicians through employment. The foundation contributed \$75,000 over five years to expand the program. The same year, it also gave a “finishing grant” (a terminal grant) of \$100,000 to the Louisville Orchestra.

In 1956, the Rockefeller Foundation achieved a new peak in its overall budget, at \$30 million. The largest category was for the Humanities division (which oversaw the arts), at \$6 million. The trustees and officers evaluated grants to the humanities as they did grants in the science and social science divisions, realizing that the limited amount of money they could offer was not nearly enough to tackle the annual deficits of the major performing arts groups. They did not want to offer “palliative support”; rather, the goal was for “remedial and generative support” so that the arts could eventually become self-sufficient. “It would be unwise for the foundation,” the annual report noted, “merely to underwrite deficits or to subsidize a level of activity which could not be maintained.”¹⁰ Instead, the RF believed that if the arts were able to expand their base of support then they would be on a path toward self-sufficiency. “The foundation’s intention is not to provide long-term or continuous support, but to offer the short-term or initial aid which will lead to a new or higher level of achievement that can be maintained by other sources of support.” Furthermore, it saw its arts program as “experimental.” The Rockefeller Foundation wanted to “discover how the arts can best grow in quality and achieve prosperity in a democratic society.” Institutional funding for the arts during this time was unexplored territory. Its only precedent was a trial by the Carnegie Corporation to provide recordings to public schools in the 1930s.

Between 1957 and 1963, the Rockefeller Foundation continued to support individual artists and scholars through fellowships, as well as to initiate larger projects. It contributed an additional \$160,000 to ASOL for its workshops for conductors and music critics, bringing total RF assistance to more than \$300,000. The foundation’s annual budget continued to expand in 1957, reaching over \$40 million. A large share of this increase, however, was a \$7.5 million grant to the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, which required a \$20 million transfer in the foundation’s capital funds. In 1958, the Rockefeller Foundation made a significant foray into electronic music, supporting the Columbia-Princeton Electronic Music Center for \$175,000 over five years.¹¹ Initial

exploration in an emerging field of composition was done in 1955 with grants to professors Otto Luening and Vladimir Ussachevsky (\$9,955 total). This project sparked the joint venture between Columbia and Princeton (with Milton Babbitt). Almost half the budget was for the purchase of equipment, while the other half went to engineering, maintenance, and technical assistance to composers.

The Rockefeller Foundation played a further role in the support of individual artists and researchers. Grants included those to other Columbia University faculty composers: Chou Wen-Chung in 1955, for \$9,000 toward the adaptation of traditional Chinese drama; and Henry Cowell in 1956, for \$9,600 to “gain a direct acquaintance with music in the Orient” through travel.¹² In 1960, composer and musicologist Peggy Glanville-Hicks received \$4,000 to study “the relationships among musical forms in the West, the Middle East, and Asia.” A grant to composer Lukas Foss was also given for his program in ensemble musical improvisation. Finally, in 1961, the foundation awarded \$10,000 to Alan Lomax, in cooperation with Professor Conrad M. Arensberg, for the “development of descriptive techniques for evaluation of folk and primitive music.”¹³

The Rockefeller Foundation’s Music Advisory Committee and Support for Symphony Orchestras and Universities

The Rockefeller Foundation consolidated its Humanities and Social Sciences divisions in 1962, under Vice President Kenneth W. Thompson. Both he and Gerald Freund (associate director) had come from the Social Sciences division of the RF. Two music grants with a strong international focus were given to the Torcuato di Tella Institute in Buenos Aires, Argentina under the direction of Alberto Ginastera, and a related grant to the Center for Latin American Music at Indiana University, Bloomington.¹⁴ The following year, Thompson established the foundation’s first music advisory committee, which included composers Aaron Copland, Leonard Bernstein, and Lukas Foss, as well as critic Paul Hume and

musicologist Raymond Kendall. Under the guidance of these “wise men,” as Thompson referred to them, the foundation made its most concerted efforts in supporting symphony orchestras and university-based new music centers.

From 1963 to 1967, the Rockefeller Foundation supported 23 symphony orchestras to hold open rehearsals of American music at approximately 130 colleges and universities, with an appropriation of \$850,000 (initially \$250,000, supplemented twice with an additional \$500,000 and \$100,000). As the grant proposal indicated, the foundation’s music advisory committee chose as its top priority the “support of outstanding and creative young American composers of symphonic music through assistance to leading symphonic orchestras associated, where possible, with interested universities and colleges.”¹⁵ In total, orchestras in the program performed music by 286 composers, “many of whom were previously unknown and many of whom had never had their music performed by a full symphony orchestra before.”¹⁶

Table 1.2: Rockefeller Foundation University-Symphony Program, 1964

1964	
Dallas Symphony Orchestra	\$20,000
Utah Symphony	\$8,000
St. Louis Symphony	\$15,000
Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society	\$17,000
New Orleans Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra	\$16,000
Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra	\$18,500
Chicago Symphony Orchestra	\$15,000
Baltimore Symphony Orchestra	\$17,965
Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra	\$20,000
Seattle Symphony Orchestra	\$16,600
Total:	\$164,065

Table 1.3: Rockefeller Foundation University-Symphony Program, 1965

1965		
Dallas Symphony Orchestra		\$20,000
Baltimore Symphony Orchestra		\$19,500
Kansas City Philharmonic		\$21,945
Detroit Symphony Orchestra		\$20,000
Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society		\$20,000
Oakland Symphony Orchestra		\$17,514
Chicago Symphony Orchestra		\$20,000
Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra		\$18,185
Hartford Symphony Orchestra		\$10,500
Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra		\$20,000
Total:		\$187,644

Table 1.4: Rockefeller Foundation University-Symphony Program, 1966

1966		
Dallas Symphony Orchestra		\$10,125
Phoenix Symphony Orchestra		\$8,950
Baltimore Symphony Orchestra		\$19,500
Cleveland Orchestra		\$30,000
New Orleans Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra		\$19,250
Houston Symphony Orchestra		\$19,000
Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra		\$15,000
Seattle Symphony Orchestra		\$34,197
Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society		\$10,000
St. Louis Symphony Orchestra		\$20,000
Chicago Symphony Orchestra		\$20,000
Detroit Symphony Orchestra		\$10,000
San Francisco Symphony Orchestra		\$20,000
Total:		\$236,022

Table 1.5: Rockefeller Foundation University-Symphony Program, 1967

1967	
Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra	\$19,200
Oakland Symphony Orchestra Association	\$20,000
Atlanta Symphony Orchestra	\$12,500
Utah Symphony Orchestra	\$18,925
Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra	\$12,500
Chicago Symphony Orchestra	\$8,000
Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra	\$20,000
Detroit Symphony Orchestra	\$10,000
Total:	\$121,125

Table 1.6: Rockefeller Foundation University-Symphony Program, 1968

1968	
Dallas Symphony Orchestra	\$12,000
Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra	\$23,812
Denver Symphony Orchestra	\$20,000
Total:	\$55,812

*Highlighted orchestras indicate that they received more than one grant.

Examples of composers and works during the 1965 season included Karel Husa’s “Symphony” performed by the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra, and Roger Reynolds’s “Graffiti” by the Seattle Symphony Orchestra. In St. Louis and New Orleans, Latin American symphonic works were played, and in Los Angeles, works by Gunther Schuller and William Schuman received their West Coast premieres.

The composer-in-residence program was also part-and-parcel of the music advisory committee’s focus on supporting symphony orchestras. It began with an experiment in 1965, when Cornell University composer John Huggler was placed in residence at the Boston Symphony Orchestra. The underlying purpose of the trial, according to the officers, was to see if American orchestras:

could be strengthened as vital musical institutions by bringing into intimate contact with them and their musical directors [the] composers who had written in the symphonic form but whose further development was made difficult by lack of orchestral performances and by lack of contact with their chosen instruments of creative expression... [It was] an effort to restore the intimate relationship between composers and symphony orchestras which was usual in the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries.¹⁷

The Rockefeller Foundation assessed the program positively: Huggler’s career was “significantly advanced,” he gained new technical proficiency, he learned about orchestral management, and his works were performed under Erich Leinsdorf’s direction in Boston, New York, and Washington, DC. The foundation viewed its grant as “vitalizing significant creative cultural forces,” in contrast to the Ford Foundation’s contemporaneous grants, which were used to help with the rising salaries and benefits of orchestral musicians.

Table 1.7: Rockefeller Foundation Composer-in-Residence Program, 1965-1966

1965	\$13,000
Boston Symphony Orchestra	John Huggler
1966	\$33,800
New York Philharmonic	David Amram
Cleveland Orchestra	Russell Smith
Dallas Symphony Orchestra	Thomas Wirtel
Seattle Symphony Orchestra	Alan Hovhaness

Table 1.8: Rockefeller Foundation Composer-in-Residence Program, 1967-1968

1967	\$7,800
New York Philharmonic	Lester Trimble
1968	\$35,650
Atlanta Symphony Orchestra	Donald MacInnis
Dallas Symphony Orchestra	Donald Erb
Cleveland Orchestra	Jose Serebrier
New York Philharmonic	Fredric E. Myrow
Washington National Symphony	John Carter

Table 1.9: Rockefeller Foundation Composer-in-Residence Program, 1969-1970

1969	\$45,245
Atlanta Symphony Orchestra	T. J. Anderson
Cleveland Orchestra	Jose Serebrier
Washington National Symphony	John Carter
New Orleans Philharmonic Symphony	Russell Smith
Oakland Symphony Orchestra	Edward Applebaum
1970	\$7,736
Atlanta Symphony Orchestra	T. J. Anderson
Oakland Symphony Orchestra	Edward Applebaum

The Rockefeller Foundation also funded several new music centers during this period, based at universities and schools of music. Its interest in supporting contemporary music traced back to its initial grant to Bennington College in the 1950s. Among the smaller grants in 1964 and 1965 were those to the Marlboro School of Music in Vermont (\$9,950); Mills College in Oakland, California for the development of its chamber music ensemble in residence (\$15,000); and Columbia University toward the establishment of its Group for Contemporary Music (\$24,000) -- in addition to the support of the Columbia-Princeton Electronic Music Center.

More significantly, the Rockefeller Foundation started to invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in its largest grants, beginning with the State University of New York at Buffalo in 1964. That grant paid for a new Center of the Creative and Performing Arts under the joint direction of Lukas Foss, composer and director of the Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra, and Allen D. Sapp, Jr., chairman of the Department of Music.¹⁸ Fifteen “creative associates” received \$6,000 each for two years by the foundation, while the university supplied assistance with instruments and space, and funding for at least four more associates. RF officers considered Buffalo a “strong and independent regional center,” and that developing further locations was critical to the “future growth and strength of the musical scene in the United States.” The foundation extended the project for another two years through 1968 with a grant of \$150,000.¹⁹

The Rockefeller Foundation noted that the creative associates program was the “first instance in which an academic institution has given full-time support to a musical ensemble of this size with the sole task of performing -- with no teaching duties.”²⁰ The foundation believed that the group showed that “a contemporary ensemble, properly supported and scheduled to play mainly at academic centers, can win a loyal and engaged audience without compromising its high standards of programming.” Buffalo was an experiment which led to the establishment of comparable groups-in-residence at Rutgers, the University of Iowa, the University of Chicago, and Mills College.

Lastly, three other big grant programs in arts education and audience development deserve further mention. First, the Rockefeller Foundation developed at the University of Southern California a course to improve the level of music criticism in the United States (the initial grant in 1963 (\$296,000) and a supplement in 1967 (\$280,000)). Five to eight “carefully chosen young men” enrolled for one year in an intensive apprenticeship in musicology and critical writing.²¹ Second, the foundation granted \$315,000 in 1965 and \$170,000 in 1970 to Oberlin College over four years to implement summer workshops for public school music teachers. Finally, the RF gave \$335,000 in 1967 to the American Opera Center for Advanced Training at the Juilliard School of Music to develop

further the “professional skills of gifted young musicians” and to provide them with opportunities to perform.²²

The “Cultural Development Program” of the late 1960s and into the 1970s

The Rockefeller Foundation formalized its effort in the arts as the “Cultural Development Program” in 1968 -- previously under the category of “Aiding Our Cultural Development.” The RF maintained its focus on universities and public out-reach, and it codified many of the trends already present in previous Rockefeller programming. As noted in the 1968 RF annual report,

Since 1964, it [the program] has been carefully developed through the technique of making grants-in-aid to individuals and institutions, often followed by larger appropriations as the recipient demonstrates high quality and imagination. College, university, and community groups are the principal, but not the only, recipients of foundation support. Major emphasis is upon music, theatre, and dance, including both training and participant activities, along with audience development.²³

In its annual report, the Rockefeller Foundation continued to voice its support of the composer-in-residence program, hoping to underscore the value of “the symphony orchestra as a living and creative element in American music at a time when too many critics are ready to relegate it to museum status.”²⁴ Yet there was a perceptible shift in the number of grants going away from music, toward dance and theater. Moreover, the quantity of grants increased while the grant amounts decreased, compared to previous years, so that there were fewer grants in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, and more in the tens of thousands. For instance, the Cleveland Institute of Music received \$10,000 to establish its Mixed Media Center, Columbia University received \$15,000 for its Group for Contemporary Music, and the University of Michigan received \$25,000 toward its Project for the Performance of Contemporary Music.²⁵

The Rockefeller Foundation also set its sights on tackling the financial situation of six of the country’s major conservatories. It had begun doing so six years earlier in 1964, with a grant to Juilliard. In 1970, its report, titled “Plight of the Conservatories,” provided scholarship aid to students to the schools listed in Table 1.10.

Table 1.10: Rockefeller Foundation Plight of the Conservatories Program

Juilliard School of Music	\$265,000
New England	
Conservatory of Music	\$200,000
Peabody Institute	\$170,000
Manhattan School of	
Music	\$100,000
San Francisco	
Conservatory of Music	\$85,000
Cleveland Institute of	
Music	\$75,000
Total:	\$895,000

The RF noted that over the previous hundred years, conservatories had produced eminent concert artists, but few alumni had become wealthy enough to donate to conservatory endowments, as compared to colleges and universities. The biggest problem was the lack of scholarship aid to students in need. The grant to the Manhattan School of Music was specifically aimed at the training of students from predominantly low-income families.

Smaller grants in 1970 and 1971 went to Antioch College for its jazz workshops (\$25,000 -- one of the few grants the foundation gave to jazz); the Marlboro School of Music (\$50,000); the Appalachian Research and Defense Fund for its experimental series of workshops and festivals of Appalachian music (\$20,350, and supplemented in 1973 with an additional \$24,890 -- one of the RF’s few grants in folk music); and \$25,000 to Morehouse College to produce Scott

Joplin's unfinished opera, *Treemonisha*. Two large grants went to the Center for Music Experiment and Related Research at UC San Diego (\$400,000) to continue the Rockefeller Foundation's support of new experimental music, and to the music training program at the Brevard Music Center in North Carolina (\$100,000).

A period of soul searching continued at the RF through 1972, with the retirement of Director Norman Lloyd and the promotion of Howard Klein. The foundation's main grants to music were restricted to areas that it had previously expressed interest: conservatories and new music centers. Mills College received grants of \$75,000 and \$50,000 for its Center for Contemporary Music; UC San Diego was given grants of \$68,038 and \$75,000; and the Reich Music Foundation obtained \$5,200. Conservatories also received funding for projects on community music education and for the continued support of scholarships. The schools included the San Francisco Conservatory, Juilliard, New England Conservatory of Music, Manhattan School of Music, and the Cleveland Institute of Music.

The largest program that the Rockefeller Foundation ever established in the arts went to the Recorded Anthology of American Music (RAAM), a series of 100 LPs produced and given away for free to universities, libraries, and hospitals in celebration of the United States Bicentennial. In total, it cost almost \$5 million, which was more than the conservatory, university-symphony, and composers-in-residence programs combined. In connection with the grant and the growth of recording and study of American music, the RF also supported the newly established Institute for Studies in American Music (later renamed after H. Wiley Hitchcock, musicologist and its founder) at Brooklyn College, City University of New York. The institute received three grants from 1972 to 1975, totaling \$87,500. In 1975 and 1976, the foundation also awarded \$165,000 to the Center for Southern Folklore in Memphis, Tennessee toward the study and documentation of folk culture.

A low point in Rockefeller Foundation arts funding came in 1974, when it considered pulling out of the arts completely. One response was to convene a gathering of the foundations, organizations, and government agencies most involved in arts funding, including the Ford Foundation, the National

Endowment for the Arts (NEA), and the country's largest performing arts organizations. Eventually, the RF decided not to disband its program, but what came out was much smaller than when it first emerged in the 1950s. With more institutions supporting the arts, in addition to an erosion of its endowment and spending power, the foundation saw contraction as the only solution. Compared to the annual appropriations of the NEA and the New York Council on the Arts (NYCA), the Rockefeller Foundation's arts budget looked "almost miniscule," "positively submicroscopic!"²⁶ At \$3-4 million a year, it was about 5% of the NEA's and 10% of the NYCA's budgets. Furthermore, the Ford Foundation's study of 166 performing arts institutions had the sobering effect of quantifying the massive financial obstacles of opera companies, theatres, orchestras, and dance companies, and the limited impact a private foundation could make in tackling these operational deficits.

Ultimately, the Rockefeller Foundation's program in the arts emerged as a division in the Arts, Humanities, and Contemporary Values. It operated alongside the foundation's other programs in Population and Health, Conquest of Hunger, Education for Development, Conflict in International Relations, Equal Opportunity, and Quality of the Environment. The new program focused on awarding artist fellowships. "The Arts program is turning more and more to the entrepreneurial role and to fellowships, recognizing the potential for mobilizing new sources of support and the need for support for the creative artist."²⁷ Above all, it wanted to allow talented individuals the time "to concentrate on their work relatively free from outside pressures." Initial emphasis was on playwrights and ballet choreographers. It eventually expanded its fellowships to performers of contemporary American music, in cooperation with the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, DC. An appropriation of \$200,000 was approved in 1976 and the first awards were made in 1977.

¹ For further reference, see Michael Sy Uy, *Ask the Experts: How Ford, Rockefeller, and the NEA Changed American Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020).

² Rockefeller Foundation, "Annual Report 1937," 50.

³ Rockefeller Foundation, "Annual Report 1953," 279.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 283.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 307.

⁶ Also see Jeanne Marie Belfy, *The Commissioning Project of the Louisville Orchestra, 1948-1958: A Study of the History and Music* (Louisville: UMI Publishers, 1986); Belfy, Jeanne Marie, “Judith’ and the Louisville Orchestra: The Rest of the Story,” *College Music Society* 31 (1991): 36–48.

⁷ See also Lynn Garafola, “Dollars for Dance: Lincoln Kirstein, City Center, and the Rockefeller Foundation,” *Dance Chronicle* 25, no. 1 (2002): 101–14. Garafola notes that by 1959, the Ford Foundation filled in the gap that the Rockefeller Foundation left behind after it discontinued funding.

⁸ Rockefeller Foundation, “Annual Report 1955.”

⁹ *Ibid.*, 178.

¹⁰ Rockefeller Foundation, “Annual Report 1956,” 58-59.

¹¹ RF58223, Folder: Columbia University -- Electronic Music (Luening, Otto) (Ussachevsky, Vladimir) June-December 1958, Box 315, Subseries R, Series 200, Subgroup 2, Record Group 1 (RG1), Rockefeller Foundation (RF), Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York (RAC).

¹² Rockefeller Foundation, “Annual Report 1956,” 240.

¹³ Rockefeller Foundation, “Annual Report 1961,” 63.

¹⁴ Luis Eduardo Herrera, “The CLAEM and the Construction of Elite Art Worlds: Philanthropy, Latinamericanism and Avant-Garde Music” (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2013).

¹⁵ Folder: Symphony Orchestras -- Young Composers Program 1964-1969, Box 425, Subseries R, Series 200, Subgroup 2, RG1, RF, RAC.

¹⁶ Rockefeller Foundation, “Annual Report 1968,” 93.

¹⁷ RF65079, Folder: Cleveland Orchestra -- Composer-in-Residence (Smith, Russell) (Serebrier, Jose) 1968-1971, Box 312, Subseries R, Series 200, Subgroup 2, RG1, RF, RAC.

¹⁸ RF64017, Folder: University of Buffalo -- Creative Music Associates 1963-June 1964 (Lukas Foss, Alan D. Sapp), Box 432, Subseries R, Series 200, Subgroup 2, RG1, RF, RAC.

¹⁹ RF66059, Folder: University of Buffalo -- Creative Music Associates 1963-June 1964 (Lukas Foss, Alan D. Sapp), Box 432, Subseries R, Series 200, Subgroup 2, RG1, RF, RAC.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Rockefeller Foundation, “Annual Report 1963,” 24.

²² Rockefeller Foundation, “Annual Report 1967,” 74.

²³ Rockefeller Foundation, “Annual Report 1968,” xxii.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ The one exception was a \$150,000 grant to the Music Associates of Aspen toward the advanced teacher training program at the Aspen Music School.

²⁶ Rockefeller Foundation, “Annual Report 1974,” 9-10.

²⁷ Rockefeller Foundation, “Annual Report 1974,” 36.