

# LECTURES ON MUSIC

## I

### MUSIC AND THE INDIVIDUAL <sup>1</sup>

**O**F all manifestations of human consciousness music is the most universally admired and loved. All types of mankind are subject to its sway, from the highly trained intellectual with his ecstatic appreciation of Bach, Beethoven, and Brahms to the street arab whistling with equal ecstasy the latest jazz hit; from the reverent auditor at a Kreisler recital to the negro laborer shouting in the cotton fields. Its sway is equally irresistible in cosmopolitan centres of culture and in strongholds of primitive barbarism. Those that do not react to its influence are considered deficient, abnormal, even vicious. We all know Shakespeare's opinion of "the man who hath no music in his soul." The poets have sung its praises in glowing phrase. We all render it our homage, at least with lip-service. And yet how few of us if asked the direct question, "What is Music?" could give even an approximate definition. Unlike painting, sculpture, and architecture, its medium of manifestation, vibrations in the air, is intangible, elusive, and evanescent. This makes it well-nigh impossible, save to the deeply versed and highly trained, to subject music or the subjective reactions it arouses to a critical or logical analysis. And yet, in our present discussion, the purpose of which is to study the relationships of music to human beings, it is

<sup>1</sup> Lectures delivered by John Powell under the auspices of the Rice Institute Lectureship in Music, at the Palace Theatre of Houston, April 5 and 6, 1923.

primarily necessary to determine, in order that we may have a common point of departure, just what "music" is.

The dictionary offers little assistance. According to Webster, music is "Tone or tones, having any or all of the features of rhythm, melody, or consonance; melody or rhythm generally, as heard in nature or art; the science or art of placing expressively or intelligibly combinations of tones; the art of making such combinations, especially into compositions of tonal structure and significance, according to the laws of melody, harmony, or rhythm." This leaves us just where it found us. We knew already that music was composed of tones, which are a special kind of sounds. Mr. Webster, however, does not even attempt to explain why, how, and of what these tones are expressive. His use of the words "melody" and "harmony" is futile, as the definition of these words is dependent upon that of "music." Reference to encyclopædias brings us no nearer our goal. Here we find only abstruse and technical discussions of superficialities. Musicians, even those of great genius, are unable to help us. They are usually over-supplied with temperament and under-supplied with logical and scientific education, and consequently regard any such investigation as we are now undertaking as a sacrilege. The poets, however, are bolder and have given us many pseudo-definitions, such as "the Art of Arts", "the food of Love", "the language of the Soul", "Love in search of a word", and so on indefinitely. These phrases show remarkable intuition, but their sentimental and glamorous spirit can only hinder us in our present investigation. Let us forget them for the moment.

Any true concept of the nature and essence of music must be arrived at by induction and not by *a priori dicta*, no matter how poetic and flowery. Modern science has taught us

that not merely are physical organisms the result of evolution, but that customs, traditions, behavior, societal organizations, all modes of thought, feeling, and expression, are equally the result of developmental processes determined by fundamental biological law. No phenomenon of life can be truly understood unless its beginnings and the successive changes of its growth and unfolding be known. The facts of histology are inexplicable save in the light of ontogeny. And so, if we would grasp the essential character of music, we must first seek out its origin and follow the course of its evolution.

Let us proceed, then, after the scientific manner, from the obvious to the obscure. All music is sound—at least in its physical manifestation. But all sound is not music. To be sure, we do speak of the pealing of the thunder, the sougning of the pines, the tinkling of the rill, as music. However, it is apparent that this is merely a metaphorical use of the word and is employed only in connection with those sounds of nature which appeal strongly to our imagination or our emotions. The singing of frogs, the baying of hounds, the calls and songs of birds, approach much more nearly to music. In fact, the last instance often actually attains it. Whoever has heard the nightingale or the hermit-thrush can have no doubt of this. The bullfinch not only warbles his native strains, but learns and sings with manifest enjoyment human melodies. The gibbon ape vocalizes the tones of the diatonic scale and even uses some of the simpler combinations of them. But the mocking-bird is the finest musician of them all. In his improvisations he shows not merely a beautiful melodic sense, but a keen sense of rhythmic values as well, while his instinct for form and structure, his use of variety in unity, often raise

these improvisations to the plane of real musical compositions.

Illuminating inferences can be drawn from the above facts. In the first place, we see that only such sounds as have been simplified and refined into tones, that is, which are of relatively definite pitch, and arranged in definite tonal relationships, can be regarded as music. Such tones and relationships occur, in nature, only among animals. Hence, in our search for the source of music, we can at once limit our field of investigation by eliminating the inorganic and vegetable kingdoms. We furthermore see that music can be produced only by beings capable of volition and emotion, and that intelligence and reason are not indispensable to its production in nature. It is also interesting to note the intimate connection between this nature-music and the love-life of the music-makers, and to correlate it with other sounds these animals make under stress of other fundamental desires, emotions, and impulses. As examples, I might cite the purring of a cat when stroked, the plaintive peeping of hungry fledglings in the nest, the lowing of hungry kine, the bellowing of an angry bull, the contented whinny of the horse when fed, the angry growl of the dog, his whine and yelp under punishment, his bark of warning or of welcome. It is at once evident that all these sounds of animals, including their musical sounds, are expressions of emotional states or impulses, and their purpose is not primarily expressive, but communicative. For, as a rule, only animals which have attained an appreciable degree of family or societal organization use such sounds.

It is evident that the above observations are as important in their bearing on the evolution of speech as on the evolution of music. In fact, a strong presumption immediately arises that speech and music had a common origin in

the inarticulate sounds expressive and communicative of fundamental emotional states and impulses. This presumption is strengthened to a certainty by the study of the evolution of speech. It is a generally known fact that the more primitive a race is, the smaller its vocabulary, and the more dependent its members become on vocal inflection and intonation to express their meaning, the same sound-symbol being used to represent various objects or concepts. (Homonyms are by no means lacking in even the most highly developed languages.) And when we reach the lowest types of man we find speech so limited in vocabulary, consisting so largely of almost inarticulate vocal inflections and modulations, as to be scarcely distinguishable from animal noises.

Turning from the phylogeny to the ontogeny of speech, we find, as is to be expected, the same phenomena. The new-born babe calls attention to its needs and discomforts by crying; that is, by purely inarticulate vocal inflection. Soon, however, subtle differentiations begin to appear. It is not difficult to know whether a six-months-old baby is crying from pain, sorrow, or anger. But, ere this, the child has begun to enlarge its vocabulary of sounds. It coos to express pleasure or affection, and often this cooing approaches almost to melody. Soon a few articulate syllables are added to its lexicon, quickly followed by the first simple words. But, as we have seen in the case of the savage, the child still has to supplement his meagre vocabulary by vocal modulations. Often, I think I may say usually, the musical cooing has developed into the real singing of melody before the child achieves coherent sentence structure.

But not only does the child show the rudiments of musical expression at an early age, he equally manifests a love

and appreciation of the music he hears. Almost from the moment of his birth he is calmed and soothed and lulled to sleep by the singing of his mother or nurse. In an incredibly short time he takes and shows delight in musical toys. And often children, who in later life show no special aptitude for music, evince great interest and pleasure even in complex compositions. These facts show how universal is the musical instinct, and would incline us to the view that music exerted a relatively stronger influence than now on mankind in his earlier stages of development. This view is strengthened when we study the reactions of animals to music. The charming of serpents by music is a well known phenomenon. Birds are moved to emulative song on hearing music. Mice are often attracted and fascinated by it. When I was a child, I had personal experience of a mouse which, although unusually timid, would lose all fear of human beings on hearing certain music. It would leave its hole, gradually approach, and finally perch itself on the piano, oblivious of the people in the room. When the music would stop, it would sit for a moment as if dazed, then flee in terror to its refuge. This story may seem absurd, but I can vouch for its absolute verity. Dogs, too, show a remarkable sensitiveness to music. Many of them howl when moved by it. The explanation that the music hurts their ears is not satisfactory, for on closer observation these dogs show no evidence of displeasure or suffering. On the contrary, they make no attempt to escape from proximity to the music, as they assuredly would if it were painful. In my opinion, they howl because they are emotionally moved and are awed by the mystery of emotion for which they can see no objective cause. These howlers are dogs of unusual nervous sensibility, and are generally not of the most intelligent type. Men and women, similarly,

often shed tears on hearing beautiful music; tears, not of pain or suffering, but rather of poignant bliss. The most intelligent dogs, however, rarely howl at music even when evidencing greater sensitiveness to it. For many years I have conducted a series of musical experiments on animals with the most surprising results. While those with dogs have been the most successful, I have also observed reactions in cats, cows, horses, and even pigs. I will give one example which is typical.

Friends of mine in England owned a beautiful little Skye terrier, Nixie by name. Nixie was very fond of music. Whenever I would begin to play, she would immediately come into the room, jump upon me, licking me, and barking to show her pleasure. She would then settle herself comfortably on the rug before the hearth. If I would play a Chopin nocturne she would stretch herself on her side, closing her eyes in beatitude. When I played the "Funeral March" she would arise and stand, her head dejectedly hanging between her forepaws. At Mendelssohn's "Spring Song" she would begin to wag her tail, look around the room, nodding her head in animated pleasure. On hearing the Chopin "Minute Waltz", she would run delightedly around the room. But when I struck up the Schubert-Tausig "Marche Militaire," she would dash madly about, barking in an ecstasy of martial excitement. And, most remarkable of all, these pieces invariably called forth the same reactions.

Of course, animals only react to music expressive of the simplest, most basal emotions. However, the fact that the expression and appreciation of music are faculties shared with mankind by lower animals proves that music originated very early in the history of the race, most probably in the pre-human period.

We are now in a position to construct a convincing hypothesis. At one time in the history of man there was neither music nor speech. Individuals carried on their necessary, primitive communications by means of unarticulated vocal modulation, which furnished the basis equally of the later developed music and speech. With the growth of societal developments and the consequent rise of intelligence and reason, more exact and specialized media of communication became necessary. Articulate speech arose to meet the necessity for the expression of thought. Music arose as the language of mood and emotion.

I do not mean to imply, however, that speech is exclusively mental or music exclusively emotional. Having a common origin, their fields of activity naturally intersect to some extent. Music, being closer to the origin, is more definitely associated with the fundamental and ingrained faculties of feeling, and hence is more deeply rooted and of more basal importance in the human consciousness than is speech, which is the expression of more recently acquired faculties. The emotional values of speech are, however, still chiefly dependent upon vocal modulation and inflection. This fact has been clearly recognized and made use of by great creative musicians. Bach, Schumann, and Wagner, in setting to music the words of their oratorios, songs, and operas, consciously made the melodic line conform to the vocal inflection which would be used in speaking the words in the most expressive manner possible. The singing of words is thus seen to be essentially only a highly emotionalized form of declamation. But also, in their instrumental compositions, musicians have conformed to this same principle, and this is seen most clearly in those musical phrases which are most telling and poignant.

An amusing anecdote, strikingly illustrating this curious

inter-relationship between music and speech, was going the rounds in Vienna some years ago. Herr Kohn and Herr Rosenduft were regular attendants at the same coffee-house. They met together with their friends almost every night for a game of taroque. One night a squabble arose over the cards. Herr Rosenduft, believing that Herr Kohn had taken an unfair advantage in the game, protested vigorously, but to no avail. In vociferous indignation he went around to all the tables in the room proclaiming: "Kohn is a rascal; Kohn is a rascal!" Herr Kohn's sensibilities were so injured by this, that he determined to obtain satisfaction. Inherently of the non-duelling type, he instituted action for slander. The case came to a hearing; the evidence was submitted. The judge turned to Herr Rosenduft, saying: "You have heard the evidence. Is it true that you called Herr Kohn a rascal?" "Yes, I did," was the reply. "And he is one, too." "In that case," said the judge, "you will have to pay Herr Kohn fifty gulden." This touched Herr Rosenduft in his most vulnerable spot; he began to squirm and to ask if there were no way in which the penalty could be avoided. The judge replied: "Yes, if you will apologize to Herr Kohn and retract your charge before every one in whose presence you made it. You must go around to every table in the coffee-house and say: 'Kohn is no rascal.'" As painful as this condition was, Herr Rosenduft accepted it. The next night all of the acquaintances were assembled as usual at the coffee-house. Herr Rosenduft went around to all the tables, relating the circumstances of the trial, closing his narrative in each case with the words: "Kohn is no rascal?" But he gave these words an insidious rising inflection which disclosed with sufficient clarity his state of feeling towards Herr Kohn. The latter, more indignant than ever, renewed his legal

action. At the hearing, the judge said: "How's this! You agreed to apologize and retract, and here you have gone and repeated your slander." "Pardon, your honor," said Herr Rosenduft, "the words were agreed upon, but not the melody!"

But to return to the evolution of music: The steps in the development into music of these vocal inflections, embracing sighs, moans, shouts, cries of warning, love-calls, can be easily followed. In studying the folk-songs of primitive peoples, as we descend in the scale of humanity, we find that the corresponding folk-songs become less and less organic in their structure. In the lowest stage, melody disappears and we have only disjointed, exclamatory phrases which are improvised upon in accordance with the mood of the individual, and are almost never crystalized into set tunes. These phrases merge imperceptibly into the vocal inflections and animal sounds of the pre-human period. The steps in the development of folk-song into the complex and intricate art-forms of the present are too generally known to need special emphasis.

We thus see that music and speech are equally languages, having a common origin in remotest antiquity, speech being essentially a special adaptation to communicate thought; music, to communicate mood and feeling. And this musical language is in no degree less definite than speech. It is true that no two people, on hearing a musical composition, will express the feelings it inspires in the same words. This, however, only shows the extreme difficulty of expressing emotion in *speech*, and not that the music has carried a different message to the different individuals. Only the supreme literary genius can approach adequate emotional expression in speech, can seize and interpret the subtle values

of mood. And even then his effect falls far short of that of music.

Music must be listened to, not merely with the ear, not with the mind, but with the heart. Those to whom music only means a picture or a narrative are not truly musical. Such mental and imaginative activities can only distract from the reception of the music and are necessarily a hindrance to the emotional comprehension and enjoyment of it. The sentimentalities and affectations along these lines of many self-styled music-lovers have done the cause of the art incalculable injury. The true musician, for this reason, places absolute music far above programme music, which he regards relatively lightly, in the same manner in which Whistler regarded "literary" painting. I cannot stress too strongly the fact that the purpose of music is to communicate, rather than to express, feeling. This principle applies equally to all the other arts, and a general recognition of it would be most beneficial at this time of extreme artistic individualism and anarchy. To sum up, we have learned that the fundamental material of music is emotion and its primary purpose, the communication to others of the inner experiences of the human heart.

We are now in a position to relate this heart-language to individual human beings. But here again we immediately meet with a difficulty. For the very term "human individual" carries within itself a contradiction. For the fundamental basis of the concept "human" is social rather than individual. Aristotle wrote: "Man is by nature a political animal." By this he did not mean that all men were born politicians but rather that the distinguishing quality of humanity lay in the societal sense. For instance, suppose a baby, from the moment of its birth, could be isolated from all human companionship; suppose its life

were to be preserved and it had attained physical maturity. It is evident that this being would not be human, save, perhaps, in an anatomical sense. It would be in no wise superior to animals, but rather inferior, in some respects, to the more highly socialized animal forms. It would have no speech, hence no intellectual life. For thought is impossible, save in its embodiment in language. It would have no knowledge of human ties and relationships and their attendant mental and emotional reactions of attraction and repulsion. It would have no experience of filial love, or parental devotion. The romance and passion of erotic love would not exist for such a man. Altruism would be impossible to him. He would hunger and fear and eat and sleep. The satisfaction of these fundamental personal and animal impulses would contain the whole round of his life. We thus see that it is superior societal organization which has distinguished man from the lower animals and has given him his higher intellectual, æsthetic and spiritual development; and so, for our present purposes, it will be impossible for us to consider the individual as apart from his social environment. For the individual achieves his highest personal development in the acceptance and fulfillment of his societal responsibilities and obligations. If love be the very essence of divinity, it is the quintessence of humanity.

Our subject now naturally falls into two chief divisions, the relationship of music to the individual and the relationship of music to the community, and we now proceed to consider these reciprocal relationships, inquiring in turn what music can do for the individual, what the individual can do for music, what music can do for the community, and what the community can do for music.

The thing which music is most generally recognized as

doing for us is to give us pleasure. This aspect of the matter is so familiar that I will not dwell on it. Far more important, to my mind, is the enrichment of experience that may be derived from music. All the suffering and joy of humanity, its hope and despair, its courage and its fear, its longings, its aspirations, its passions, its love, its triumph, are embodied in the works of the great composers. Through their works we can enter into the most intimate personal relations with these men who, of all flesh, have felt most poignantly the experiences of the human heart. In their music, their very souls are bared and shared with the listener. The very throbbing of their hearts becomes as actual a reality as if the men themselves were living and present. What greater privilege has life to offer us than such personal intimacy with these great men? For these men wrote, not merely to make compositions, which might or might not bring them fame, but to pass on to you and me those treasures of life and beauty which were their inspiration. The great joy in their lives—and most of them were condemned to lead lives of bitter hardship and suffering—came from their generous hope that their fellow-men might eventually be partakers with them in the blessings of their creations.

Lanier, in his noble poem, "To Beethoven," gives touching expression to his feelings of reverence, joy, and gratitude:—

O Psalmist of the weak, the strong,  
 O Troubadour of love and strife,  
 Co-Litanist of right and wrong,  
 Sole Hymner of the whole of life.

I know not how, I care not why,—  
 Thy music sets my world at ease,  
 And melts my passion's mortal cry  
 In satisfying symphonies.

Yea, it forgives me all my sins,  
Fits life to love like rhyme to rhyme,  
And tunes the task each day begins  
By the last trumpet-note of Time.

Music was Lanier's chief inspiration. It was the tragedy of his life that he was not allowed to be a musician. In his poetry he was seeking an outlet for suppressed musical impulses. This is why his poems are the most highly emotionalized of all English poetry. The fact that he was primarily and innately a musician explains why it was possible for him to free his verse from the conventional shackles of rhyme and metre and imbue it with an elasticity, variety, and freedom achieved by the great melodists in music. His "Science of English Verse" is among the substantial logical contributions to the the science of English prosody. His use, in his poetry, of internal rhyme, characteristic vowel color, alliteration, and phonetic syzygy, endows his poems with extraordinary melodiousness; while his marvelous felicity in grasping and expressing mood and feeling raises him to a high place among the poets of this or any other age. For he succeeded in mastering those problems that Whitman could only propound. And if the *vers libre* scribblers of to-day were well informed enough to have read his works, the hopelessness and inanity of their attempts would become so apparent to them that they would take refuge in the versified doggerel to which their innate limitations should restrict them, or else keep silence altogether. It is high time that we in the South awakened to a realization and appreciation of this genius, our chiefest literary treasure.

But not only by enriching our emotional experience can music benefit us,—it lifts from us the burden of our cares and sorrows, soothes our palpitating nerves, salves our throbbing wounds, and imbues us with fresh hope and

courage. Any soldier can tell you how the fatigue of the march vanishes when the band strikes up. It is this quality in music that makes it so valuable as a therapeutical agency. It is being increasingly used for this purpose in hospitals, sanatoriums, and even insane asylums. Specialists tell us that most cases of insanity spring from exaggerated individualism, hypertrophy of the sense of ego. Music brings self-forgetfulness, the basis of all real enjoyment, usefulness, and happiness, and so helps to reestablish a true sense of proportion between self and environment. But the value of music is not confined to the amelioration of harmful and morbid states; it has positive and constructive value as well. It inspires nobility and generosity, not only of feeling, but also of action. For the mainspring of action lies not in the intellect, but in the emotions.

One of the most important uses to which music can be put is that of an emotional safety-valve or lightning-rod. The intricacies of civilization and societal organization impose restraints upon the impulses, desires, and passions of the individual. These inhibitions and suppressions are likely to cause physical and psychological eruptions which break out into the most amazing and unexpected manifestations. George Meredith stresses this principle in his "Ordeal of Richard Feverel." Music not only soothes these suppressed instincts, but can actually give them constructive and beneficial exercise.

The study of music, as well as the enjoyment of it, is of permanent value to the individual. The Greeks understood this when they gave to music a place in their educational system equal in importance to that of athletics and mathematics. It is interesting to observe that these three great forms of human activity are to this day still called by their Greek names. The acquirement of a musical

technique develops the mental faculties. It cultivates the powers of observation, sharpens the sense of proportion, enlarges the critical faculty, promotes the power of concentration, increases mental alertness, and gives control and balance to the nerves and muscles. Moral faculties are also developed: industry, patience, humility, and, above all, self-control. All these qualities are as valuable in life as in music. I have heard much testimony from school teachers and grateful parents bearing witness to improvement in children directly attributable to the study of music. Education along these lines would be equally beneficial to grown people.

Let us now briefly consider what the individual can do for music.

In the first place, he can recognize its value, its beauty and nobility, its important rôle in human development. He can use his influence to combat the absurd idea that the study and profession of music are unworthy. This silly prejudice has deterred thousands of talented boys from becoming musicians—and girls, too—to our incalculable cultural detriment. The individual can support the musical activities in his community, the choral societies, the symphony orchestras, the musical clubs. He can attend concerts. He can encourage students. But these activities must not be indiscriminating, else they will do more harm than good. The individual must insist on having the very best music and musicians in order that his own taste and that of his community may become more and more refined. He must be relentless towards the charlatantry and vulgarity that often disgrace the programmes of even fine artists. He can help on the development of a national music by demanding that American music and musicians be given the chance to be heard. But in this, he must avoid chauvinism.

Pampering would be the worst calamity that could befall American music. Above all, the individual must have the courage of his love and faith, and never be ashamed to proclaim them.

If the individual happens to be musically gifted, he can be of more service to music by developing his own talent. He should take an honourable pride in it, and demand due respect for it from others. The possession of this gift lays upon him a responsibility, an obligation which he may not ignore without a serious injury to himself. It is a trust to be administered for the benefit of his fellow-man. He should allow no considerations, whether social or financial, to deter him from devoting his life to this sacred duty.

We now come to the consideration of what music can do for the community, and what the community can do for music.

That music exerts an influence of refinement, socially and culturally, is so well recognized that it needs no emphasis from me. That it improves the societal spirit, increases good-will and good-fellowship, and furthers coöperation, every church-goer, every cheer leader, every community singer can attest. Nothing wins respect for a community more quickly and surely than musical activities. Boston would lose a large part of its prestige if the Boston Symphony were to go out of existence; Worcester would not be Worcester if it were not for its Choral Festival; the same is true of numerous other cities; while Bayreuth would never have been heard of save for its Opera. But I must protest against the use of musical activities as mere means of civic advertising. This practice is unworthy and contemptible, and can only bring disrepute upon the art without being of lasting benefit to the community.

The moral influence of music in a community is worthy

of serious consideration. A well-known leader of community singing recently said to me in this connection: "You can't hate a man when you are singing out of the same book with him." And social workers tell me that music is one of the most valuable aids in their activities; that not only "good will towards man" is fostered, but also honesty and, chiefly, sobriety. This arouses an interesting line of thought. Why do people get drunk? To escape from their sorrows, cares, and sufferings; to escape from the sordid pressure of life; to escape from themselves. The physical pleasure of alcohol is its least attraction. When a man is drunk, his words and actions are leniently regarded. He may say or do whatever occurs to him, follow his impulses, be free from the ordinary suppressions and restraints of the conventionalities. In other words, he can be himself. "*In vino veritas.*" It is evident that music can satisfy this desire in a normal and beneficial manner.

There is a great opportunity for music in the field of social and industrial unrest. This is apparent when we examine the fundamental cause of this phenomenon; for only a blind and partisan bigotry can see in these manifestations simply laziness and greed. They are not even merely protests against the physical hardships of poverty. Many of those most active in such agitation are well fed and well housed, and some of them even well educated. What these people want—and they are, themselves, unaware of this—is freedom from the relentless grind of existence, opportunity to enjoy the cultural and spiritual values of life. Music, as nothing else, can fulfill this natural and justifiable craving. This fact has been realized by some far-sighted and understanding employers; as, for instance, at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, where notable results have been achieved. Musical activities have not only helped to estab-

lish conditions of refinement and contentment among the laborers, but have even reached such a high artistic level that invitations to the annual Bach Festival are eagerly sought by musicians all over the country.

And now we come finally to the consideration of what the community can do for music.

Most of what I have said in connection with the individual is obviously equally applicable here. In addition, the community can carry on the already well-developed movement of providing musical education in the public schools. Good results have already been achieved in this field. More and more, it is being generally recognized that a knowledge and appreciation of music is as indispensable to a well rounded culture as is an adequate acquaintance with literature. Colleges and universities are inaugurating chairs of musical theory, appreciation, and history. I hope that the day is not far distant when every educational institution will follow this wise and beneficent lead. The National Federation of Music Clubs is doing a noble and unselfish work all over the country. Remarkable results have already been attained. In the last few years various civic communities have established symphony orchestras which, with incredible celerity, have attracted large clienteles. The city of Cleveland deserves especial praise. Community opera is springing up with increasing frequency. A bill has already been introduced in Congress providing for the establishment of a National Conservatory of Music. The community should support and increase these and other similar activities, for in serving music, the community is only serving its own best interests.

The dog has been called the friend of man. What the dog is among the animals, music is among the arts. Before Painting was, before Sculpture was, before Architecture

was, before Literature was, *Music is*. It nourished and solaced the heart of man in the infancy of the race, as it now enfolds with loving tenderness every child born into the world; and it is the one earthly treasure that we can take with us to that eternal abode "where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt and where thieves do not break through nor steal."