



**OXFORD JOURNALS**  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

---

Arnold Schoenberg in Los Angeles

Author(s): Dorothy Lamb Crawford

Source: *The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 86, No. 1 (Spring, 2002), pp. 6-48

Published by: [Oxford University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3601001>

Accessed: 21/06/2013 09:59

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Oxford University Press* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Musical Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# Arnold Schoenberg in Los Angeles

Dorothy Lamb Crawford

I only teach the whole of the art. . . . As a composer I must believe in inspiration rather than in mechanics.

—Arnold Schoenberg

Arnold Schoenberg had just turned sixty when he made the sudden decision in mid-September 1934 to leave the East Coast for California. He had held the most prestigious post in his field in Germany, but he wrote his friends that in Los Angeles he faced “a completely blank page, so far as my music is concerned.”<sup>1</sup> The previous October he had been abruptly notified by the German government that his lifetime contract and salary in Berlin were terminated. With no other alternative, he had accepted a low salary to teach at the brand-new Malkin Conservatory in Boston, with adjunct teaching in Manhattan. Strenuous commuting in the harsh winter climate had severely damaged his health, and he had gone to the summer home of the Juilliard School of Music in Chautauqua, New York, to recover. Owing to the depression, all his efforts to obtain an adequate teaching salary at an established institution on the East Coast had come to nothing. Carl Engel, president of G. Schirmer (his American music publisher), had sent letters recommending Schoenberg as a lecturer to forty-seven institutions, but the results were meager.<sup>2</sup> Prospects for the financial security he wanted looked so bleak that Schoenberg had even contacted Hanns Eisler and the conductor Fritz Stiedry about making connections for him in the Soviet Union. On 12 September, the day before his birthday, he wrote to Stiedry (still working in the USSR), “We are going to California for the climate and because it is cheaper.”<sup>3</sup> After he was temporarily settled in a rented Hollywood house with his wife, Gertrud, and toddler, Nuria, he expressed (in a letter to Anton Webern) his initial enthusiasm for the beauty of his surroundings: “It is Switzerland, the Riviera, the Vienna woods, the desert, the Salzkammergut, Spain, Italy—everything in one place. And along with that scarcely a day, apparently even in winter, without sun.”<sup>4</sup> He recovered his health and energy and could indulge his intense desire to play tennis. By 1935, Leonard Stein (who would be his teaching assistant from 1939 to 1942)

recalled, Schoenberg was “fit and roly-poly,” springy, full of vitality, and tanned a dark bronze.<sup>5</sup>

However, the resistance to modern music in Los Angeles that had driven Henry Cowell’s New Music Society to San Francisco gave Schoenberg major problems. Upon his arrival in New York a year earlier, his first American employer, Joseph Malkin, had arranged extensive publicity, which led to several receptions and performances. In Los Angeles there was no such greeting. His primacy as a cultural leader in Europe had been enhanced by a devoted circle of disciples—both students and performers—who, following the tradition of master-apprentice training, in many ways insulated him from mundane chores. This had enabled him to carry out his often utopian organizational plans in an authoritarian manner. From the first years in California, memories of past repudiations and his sense of his own importance as a composer made him hypersensitive to any slight, even if imagined. While he was acutely aware of his music’s need for “propaganda,” as he called it, he had little ease in the new American art of public relations.<sup>6</sup> Starting over at his age in the haphazard environment of Los Angeles—at first with no institutional backing—his assumptions and expectations were often frustrated, and his relationships were frequently difficult as he struggled to make a living for his much younger wife and their growing family.

Otto Klemperer’s position with the Los Angeles Philharmonic undoubtedly counted as an advantage to Schoenberg. Yet the month after his arrival he refused an invitation to a banquet honoring Klemperer, for he felt that the organizers of the event owed him greater recognition than a “walk-on” part.<sup>7</sup> At first he took some pains to entertain the society matriarchs dominating Los Angeles’s music, but in November 1935 his approach to the manager of the Philharmonic, Bessie Bartlett Fraenkl, was peremptory in tone. He invited her to attend a class of his at the University of Southern California (USC), because, he wrote, “I know what I am doing there is of the greatest importance for everybody who is interested in music. . . . There will certainly be in perhaps twenty years a chapter in the musical history of Los Angeles: ‘What Schoenberg has achieved in Los Angeles’; and perhaps there will be another chapter, asking: ‘What have the people and the society of Los Angeles taken of the advantage offered by Schoenberg?’”<sup>8</sup>

Schoenberg assumed that he would conduct his own works in Los Angeles. (His European royalties had diminished to nothing, and he needed the fees.) Klemperer offered him a guest program with the Philharmonic in March 1935, after himself achieving the previous December an extraordinarily enthusiastic response to Schoenberg’s 1917 orchestration of *Verklärte Nacht*. In his own program Schoenberg repeated that

work, offered his Bach transcriptions in celebration of the 250th anniversary of Bach's birth, and conducted Brahms's Third Symphony. His performance of the Brahms was severely criticized for its leisurely tempo (which "irritated and baffled the players"), and although the audience applauded the composer warmly, one critic hoped that "we should have much more Schoenberg to hear—with Klemperer conducting."<sup>9</sup> The following December Schoenberg again met with disaster conducting the Philharmonic, this time in an all-Schoenberg program that included the full orchestral arrangement (made in April 1935) of his Chamber Symphony no. 1, op. 9 (1906). Peter Yates remembered the musicians in rehearsal deliberately sabotaging the music (which they dubbed the *Jammersymphonie*) by playing wrong notes and "horsing around."<sup>10</sup> Leonard Stein suspected the players were tipsy from Christmas holiday revels and found Schoenberg's patient efforts to educate the orchestra heartbreaking.<sup>11</sup>

Schoenberg took on no further conducting with the Philharmonic. In his helpful and strongly worded plea for a 1936 Philharmonic fundraising drive, he expressed what bothered him about American culture: "As the materialism of our time seems to endanger the whole sphere of spiritual culture, I believe it is the duty of every man to fight for the existence of one of the most vital symbols of man's higher life."<sup>12</sup> He conducted the Federal Symphony Orchestra, the government's effort to employ out-of-work musicians during the depression. This must not have helped him financially, for the concerts were free, but many of the programs offered new music. Studio musicians, eager for challenging musical experiences, invited him to conduct a reading orchestra organized in Hollywood. Critical response to his conducting remained poor,<sup>13</sup> while critical acceptance of Klemperer's performances of his music with the Philharmonic emphasized "the Schoenberg luminosity and romanticism."<sup>14</sup>

It soon became clear to Schoenberg that his twelve-tone music would not fare well in musically unsophisticated Los Angeles. In November 1934 he confided (in his new and struggling English) to Carl Engel in New York: "Have I now to appear as only the composer of the *Verklärte Nacht* . . . or as the devil in person, the atonalist, the constructor, the musical mathematician etc.? I hate this kind to consider a composer only from the view-point of history instead to enjoy (or not) what he says. I would like to learn your opinion about this matters."<sup>15</sup> The Third String Quartet (1927), played in March 1935 by the local Abas Quartet, received a newspaper notice only. Leonard Stein, who was at that time beginning his lifelong devotion to new music, found it "the strangest music I'd ever heard."<sup>16</sup> In January 1938, Schoenberg's 1933 Concerto (after Handel) for String Quartet and Orchestra (in Klem-

perer's performance with the Philharmonic and the Kolisch Quartet) struck the critic Isabel Morse Jones as a "derangement" of Handel. She wrote, "It was interesting chiefly as evidence of the progress of Schoenberg's remarkable theories and it had moments of fleeting beauty. As a musico-intellectual demonstration of Schoenberg's powers it was a work to study and to marvel at rather than to revel in."<sup>17</sup>

Practically none of Schoenberg's music was available in libraries or music stores in Los Angeles. In 1937 Engel helped propagandize for Schoenberg by having Schirmer's publish a collection of writings by and about Schoenberg, edited by the Los Angeles impresario Merle Armitage. With this information, Jones attempted a more probing discussion of Schoenberg's musical ideas in the *Los Angeles Times*. Her October 1938 report on the premiere (by members of the Fox Studio Orchestra) of Schoenberg's recently completed *Kol Nidre*, op. 39, expressed her new attitude: "We are indeed on the threshold of a profound change in musical art. . . . Schoenberg, like Einstein, is essentially a simple man of truth."<sup>18</sup> In his own writings excerpted for the Armitage book, Schoenberg articulated his philosophy of composing:

All I want to do is to express my thoughts and get the most possible content in the least possible space. . . . If a composer doesn't write from the heart, he simply can't produce good music. . . . I have never had a theory in my life. . . . I write what I feel in my heart—and what finally comes on paper is what first coursed through every fibre of my body. It is for this reason I cannot tell anyone what the style of my next composition will be. . . . What can be constructed with these twelve tones depends on one's inventive faculty. The basic tones will not invent for you. Expression is limited only by the composer's creativeness and his personality. . . . In the time of the [Chamber Symphony no. 1, 1906], I understood better what I had written and I had more personal pleasure with that, than with the music which followed. Then to compose was a great pleasure. In a later time it was a duty against myself. It was not a question of pleasure. I have a mission—a task. . . . I am but the loudspeaker of an idea. . . . All music, in so far as it is the product of a truly creative mind, is *new*. . . . It is no use to rail at new music because it contains too many ideas. Music without ideas is un-thinkable, and people who are not willing to use their brains to understand music which cannot be fully grasped at the first hearing, are simply lazy-minded. Every true work of art to be understood has to be thought about; otherwise it has no inherent life. . . . The artist is content with aspiration, whereas the mediocre must have beauty. And yet the artist attains beauty without willing it, for he is only striving after truthfulness.<sup>19</sup>

The same book included an interview by the Los Angeles critic José Rodríguez in which Schoenberg discussed his reliance on instinct. When queried about feeling versus intellect in his music, he replied:

It might astonish some critics that I am somewhat the creature of inspiration. I compose and paint instinctively. . . . I see the work as a whole first. Then I compose the details. In working out, I always lose something. This cannot be avoided. There is always some loss when we materialize. . . . I am somewhat sad that people talk so much of atonality, of twelve-tone systems, of technical methods when it comes to my music. . . . I wish that my music should be considered as an honest and intelligent person who comes to us saying something he feels deeply and which is of significance to all of us.<sup>20</sup>

Schoenberg tried for the remainder of his life to convince a wider public that this was his true intent as a composer.<sup>21</sup> He wrote succinctly to the composer Roger Sessions, “That I write in this or that style or method is my private affair and is no concern to any listener—but I want my message to be understood and accepted.” However, his relative isolation in Los Angeles (and Klemperer’s illness and subsequent resignation from his Philharmonic post) hindered informed and sympathetic performances of his orchestral works.<sup>22</sup> He lacked the performing skills that enabled such composers as Bela Bartók, Paul Hindemith, Ernst Krenek, Igor Stravinsky, and Ernst Toch—as concert performers—to promote their works in person to American audiences. With the exception of his own recording of *Pierrot lunaire* in Los Angeles for Columbia (in 1940),<sup>23</sup> Schoenberg’s works were not taken up by major American recording companies until after his death. Although he received prestigious and well-paid commissions from Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge, the Koussevitzky foundation, and Harvard University, all based in the East Coast, obtaining commissions on the West Coast was difficult and unrewarding in terms of fees and publicity, and he managed to get only four.

The first came in 1938, when Schoenberg contacted Los Angeles’s most influential Jewish leader, Rabbi Jakob Sonderling. Schoenberg had received desperate pleas for help from friends and relatives trapped in Austria and Germany. While he wrote many testimonials for these supplicants, he was unable to meet requirements to guarantee their financial stability in the United States, and hoped to interest wealthy members of Rabbi Sonderling’s congregation at the Fairfax Temple in providing the necessary affidavits.<sup>24</sup> To support this effort, his *Kol nidre*, op. 39, was commissioned by the rabbi (who collaborated with Schoenberg on the text) for performance in a Yom Kippur service that fall, a month before the disasters of *Kristallnacht*.<sup>25</sup> Schoenberg’s free treatment of its cantus firmus chant prevented its first performance in a synagogue, and so the service, narrated by Sonderling, took place in the Coconut Grove nightclub at the Ambassador Hotel.<sup>26</sup> G. Schirmer rejected it for publication in 1941. The second commission, for the Piano Concerto, op. 42 (1942),



was originally to have been a “piano piece” for which Schoenberg’s pupil, the pianist Oscar Levant, put up \$100. When the work grew into a concerto, Levant got cold feet over Schoenberg’s fee and performance requirements and withdrew.<sup>27</sup> The fee was paid by a wealthy University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), student of Schoenberg’s, Henry Clay Shriver. Another pupil, Nathaniel Shilkret, who had been a member of Schoenberg’s Malkin Conservatory-sponsored Manhattan class in 1933–34, provided a third commission in 1945. He had come to Hollywood in the mid-1930s and composed for several film studios, and was associated with Victor Records. He commissioned the émigré composers Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco, Darius Milhaud, Stravinsky, Alexandre Tansman, Toch, and Schoenberg to each write a single movement for a suite for narrator, chorus, and orchestra on sections of the Book of Genesis. The work was recorded by Victor Red Seal Records after its November 1945 performance.<sup>28</sup> Shilkret’s own movement, “Creation,” followed Schoenberg’s five-minute Prelude for textless chorus and full orchestra.<sup>29</sup> The composers each received \$300—except Stravinsky, who held out for \$1,000.<sup>30</sup> The *Phantasy for Violin*, op. 47 (1949), was commissioned by the Canadian violinist Adolf Koldofsky. A friend of Rudolf Kolisch, he came to Los Angeles in 1944, and played the first West Coast performance of Schoenberg’s String Trio in May 1948 at “Evenings on the Roof.”

This Los Angeles concert series did the most of any American musical organization to promote Schoenberg’s music in a sustained way during his California years. Peter Yates, the founder of and catalyst for this enterprise, gathered performers and audiences willing to venture outside the standard repertory. Yates had been inspired in part by Schoenberg’s Society for Private Musical Performances. He was particularly interested in undervalued genius and celebrated Schoenberg’s residence in Los Angeles from the first season of his concerts in 1939–40. Yates programmed most of Schoenberg’s chamber works, some several times.<sup>31</sup> His articles on Schoenberg, whose difficult personality he relished and endeavored to understand, appeared beginning in 1940 in the California periodical *Arts and Architecture*, and from 1949 on in national publications. Yates’s belief in his audience’s ability to understand Schoenberg’s music gradually encouraged other performances in Los Angeles.

In Yates’s first discussion (in 1939) with Schoenberg about his works, the composer declared that his newly published Violin Concerto could not be performed by anyone living, as Jascha Heifetz had said he could not play it.<sup>32</sup> José Rodríguez had reported to Schoenberg that “a virtuoso” had told him the concerto would be unplayable until violinists could grow a new fourth finger. Rodríguez described Schoenberg “laughing

like a pleased child” at this remark and continuing, “Yes, yes. That will be fine. The concerto is extremely difficult, just as much for the head as for the hands. I am delighted to add another *unplayable* work to the repertoire. I want the concerto to be difficult and I want the little finger to become longer. I can wait.”<sup>33</sup> Undaunted by this information, Yates convinced a Hollywood Bowl Young Artists’ Audition winner to learn the concerto with his wife, the experienced (and European-trained) pianist Frances Mullen. When they took two movements to Schoenberg (on 10 February 1940), the composer was pleased enough with their work that he arranged for them to perform one movement on NBC radio. He wrote kindly on the young violinist’s score, “Now I heard this for the first time and I am satisfied, about you and the composition too.”<sup>34</sup>

These extremely contradictory responses illustrate both Schoenberg’s concern for students and his anger toward those who crossed or belittled him. The pianist Leonard Stein remembered that “Schoenberg never made a fuss about how well one performed his works. He realized performers were doing their best. He’d be glad if you came to him beforehand to practice. He wouldn’t have much to say. He wasn’t going to spend his time goading the performers.”<sup>35</sup> However, Stein also remembered Schoenberg bearing such a grudge against Heifetz that even in the impecunious last years of his life he refused the violinist’s financial help.<sup>36</sup> Such paradoxes in Schoenberg’s attitudes were basic to the complexity and intensity of his mind. While studying with him, Dika Newlin recorded in her diaries many instances of the “unresolvable contradictions” in his character.<sup>37</sup> His daughter, Nuria, offers her analysis: “He was gentle and he was severe, and he was angry and he was sweet, and he was happy and he was sad, and I think he was all of the things that everyone else is, to a much more intensified degree. . . . When he was angry, he was much angrier than anyone else was. And when he was happy, he was much happier.”<sup>38</sup> Carl Engel found that there was no one more *herzlich* or cordial than Schoenberg. Yet even Engel, along with other New York publishers, critics, radio, and recording companies, received doses of Schoenberg’s frequently paranoid outbursts of spleen.<sup>39</sup> In Los Angeles, Europeans in the growing émigré community often were treated frostily by Schoenberg, who felt that they, more than Americans who lacked a sophisticated musical background, should certainly pay respect to his stature.<sup>40</sup> Anyone whom Schoenberg suspected of acting presumptuously toward him felt his anger, which could be spiked with irony and wit. In 1948, at the beginning of his bitter altercation with Thomas Mann over the author’s “pirating” of twelve-tone theory in the novel *Doctor Faustus*, Schoenberg sent Mann an invented “1988” encyclopedia article (by a musicologist named “Hugo Triebtsamen”) which



recorded that Thomas Mann, the composer, was the real inventor of the twelve-tone system, but having become a writer he had allowed its appropriation by the thievish composer Schoenberg.<sup>41</sup> (Mann had indeed pumped Schoenberg for material on music and the life of a composer when he began writing the novel in May 1943.<sup>42</sup>) Schoenberg was not only enraged about the book's possible impact on his musical stature, but also particularly insulted that the composer in the novel was afflicted with syphilis. Marta Feuchtwanger remembered Schoenberg in the Brentwood Market, shouting to her his denial of the disease. She was taken aback but glad that he was speaking in German.<sup>43</sup>

Mann's major source for his novel's information about Schoenberg's twelve-tone method was Theodor Adorno, a near neighbor of both Mann and Schoenberg in the 1940s. Although Adorno felt he was elevating Schoenberg's reputation in his polemic *The Philosophy of Modern Music*,<sup>44</sup> Schoenberg avoided him. Mann, who used Adorno's essay in his novel, remembered that "much as [Adorno] revered Schoenberg he had no intercourse with him."<sup>45</sup> Schoenberg (who persisted in calling Adorno "Wiesengrund," Adorno's Jewish father's name) vented his feelings against Adorno in a personal memo titled "Wgr." This began, "I never could bear him," and criticized the bombast, pathos, and grandiosity of Adorno's writing. An unbridgeable chasm between himself and Adorno lay in the fact that in his book Adorno discusses Schoenberg's dodecaphonic "system," whereas Schoenberg himself declared that "mine is no system but only a method. . . . One follows the row, but composes on the whole as before."<sup>46</sup> Schoenberg wrote to his European student Josef Rufer, "Naturally [Adorno] knows all about twelve-tone music, but he has no idea of the creative process. . . . The book will give many of my enemies a handle, especially because it is so scientifically done."<sup>47</sup> In his 1950 will listing possible advisors to his wife on the disposition of his legacy, Schoenberg demanded that "Wiesengrund should be excluded altogether."<sup>48</sup>

On the other hand, Hanns Eisler, whose loyalty to his teacher had resumed in the 1930s, was a frequent guest of the Schoenbergs after his 1942 move to Los Angeles. Schoenberg had corresponded with Eisler about creating a music school in the Soviet Union just prior to his move to California and demonstrated his interest in Eisler's family by using money confiscated in Germany to order Eisler's father's book on philosophy soon after settling in Los Angeles.<sup>49</sup> As a tribute for his teacher's seventieth birthday, Eisler dedicated his favorite chamber work, *Fourteen Ways to Describe Rain*, op. 70, to Schoenberg, who was very pleased with it. A week after Eisler's reunion with Bertolt Brecht in Hollywood, Brecht commented in his journal on Eisler's relationship with Schoenberg:

“schönberg is an old tyrant and eisler . . . trembles and worries about his tie being straight or arriving 10 minutes early.”<sup>50</sup> On 29 July 1942 Eisler took Brecht—about whom Schoenberg knew little—to hear Schoenberg lecture at UCLA on modern composition. They were invited afterward to the Schoenberg home. Before the occasion Eisler warned Brecht, who was known for his uncompromising rudeness, that if Brecht lost control and made any malicious comments to Schoenberg he, Eisler, would break off all relations with his longtime collaborator. Brecht was deeply impressed by the keenness of Schoenberg’s intellect and so charmed by his dry, sharp wit that he sent Schoenberg a poem in gratitude for the visit, during which Schoenberg had told a story of how he learned from a donkey the easiest way to climb a hill.<sup>51</sup>

Eisler felt that Schoenberg’s home life with his second, very young family was “a twelve-tone hell” and a “mess of disorganization.”<sup>52</sup> But when young Ronald Schoenberg needed an emergency appendectomy at the age of five, Eisler, who was earning a comfortable living at the time for his film scores, offered to lend Schoenberg the necessary money. He only managed to get Schoenberg to accept this gesture by saying that repayment would not be necessary if Schoenberg would give Eisler some lessons instead, to which Schoenberg replied (with relentless logic), “If you still haven’t learned it I can’t teach you.”<sup>53</sup> Schoenberg helped Eisler get a teaching position at USC and recommended him for several other academic appointments, but he became very nervous over Eisler’s politics.<sup>54</sup> In 1944, when the witch hunt for leftists was already underway in Hollywood, Schoenberg publicly stated that politics was a dangerous game best left to politicians, and that artists who dabbled in politics should be treated like immature children.<sup>55</sup> When it became clear in late 1947 that Eisler would be deported, Schoenberg wrote Josef Rufer, “If I had any say in the matter I’d turn him over my knee like a silly boy and give him twenty-five of the best and make him promise never to open his mouth again but to stick to scribbling music. That he has a gift for, and the rest he should leave to others. If he wants to appear ‘important,’ let him compose important music.”<sup>56</sup> After Eisler’s deportation in 1948 Schoenberg again wrote Rufer, “We who live in *music* have no place in politics and must regard them as something essentially alien to us.”<sup>57</sup> Eisler maintained his respect—even reverence—for Schoenberg and soon after his deportation gave a lecture in Prague in which, while he criticized Schoenberg’s “petty-bourgeois attitudes,” he remarked:

One could almost say that the characteristic feature of Schoenberg’s music is fear. . . . He is the lyric composer of the gas chambers of Auschwitz, of Dachau concentration camp, of the complete despair of the man in the

street under the heel of fascism. That is his humanity. It is proof of Schoenberg's genius and instinct that he gave expression to all these emotions at a time when the world seemed safe for the ordinary man in the street. Whatever one may say against him, he never lied.<sup>58</sup>

Upon learning of Schoenberg's death in 1951, Eisler expressed an ambivalence echoed by several of the closest of Schoenberg's students: "Schoenberg's death shook me most profoundly. I have learned from him everything I know. . . . It was difficult to stand up to such a master."<sup>59</sup>

## 1

It was Schoenberg's own awareness of his mastery as a teacher that originally convinced him he could support his family in Los Angeles. However, he had no contacts with the two major universities, UCLA and USC, and the music divisions of both institutions were in a weak condition, both financially and academically, because of the depression. His initial idea was to teach film composers, for film was the one industry that was flourishing financially. He may have also had creative motives partly in mind, for in Europe Schoenberg had long been seriously attracted to film as an aspect of *Gesamtkunstwerk*. In particular, the staging difficulties in his one-act opera *Die glückliche Hand* had led him in 1913 to suggest a filmed version, designed by Oskar Kokoschka, Wassily Kandinsky, or Alfred Roller (Mahler's favored designer at the Vienna Opera).<sup>60</sup> During the early development of sound in film, Schoenberg composed his *Accompaniment Music to a Film Scene*, op. 34 (1929–30) and, at Klemperer's suggestion, considered creating a film for it with the Bauhaus artist and designer László Moholy-Nagy. However, now that economic survival was uppermost in his mind, it was his confidence and interest in teaching that he leaned upon, and these strengths determined his life in America.

He knew, from his year with the Malkin Conservatory, that in comparison to his European pupils American music students were ill prepared. He hoped film composers would be better equipped to make use of his teaching and better able to pay him a comfortable living. This turned out to be partly true. Soon after his arrival in October 1934 he began advertising himself in local newspapers as a teacher. He gave public lectures in Hollywood<sup>61</sup> and soon developed a heavy schedule of private teaching, which remained lucrative until a 1937 strike in the film studios. Many of his private students were film composers, some of whom must have been told, as was David Raksin (a self-taught musician who came to Hollywood in his twenties to arrange music for Chaplin's

*Modern Times*), “First you must learn something about music.”<sup>62</sup> Gerald Strang, Schoenberg’s teaching assistant from 1935 to 1939, commented on Schoenberg’s work with film composers:

He was very much respected among musicians. . . . Right from the beginning there was a steady stream of people from the motion picture industry who took private lessons from him. . . . He more or less charged what the traffic would bear with the motion picture people in order to make a living. And in part, this enabled him then to take as well talented young people who couldn’t afford to pay his prices. So a lot of young Americans, whom he did not charge at all, or charged a pittance, benefitted indirectly.

Strang knew of no occasion when Schoenberg helped a composer with a film score, but he commented that the film composers who sought lessons with Schoenberg were anxious to be recognized in the concert world and “were always working on a symphony, a string quartet, an overture, or a concerto.”<sup>63</sup>

Oscar Levant studied with Schoenberg from April 1935 through 1937.<sup>64</sup> Levant, a prodigy on the brink of popular success as an impudent musical know-it-all on the radio show “Information Please” and of his subsequent career as the highest-paid concert pianist in America, paid tribute to Schoenberg in a characteristically American manner:

To my mind, Schoenberg is the greatest teacher in the world. The very contact with such a person either brings out something that is in you or lets you see that there is nothing to be brought out. Either way, it is helpful to know where you stand. Schoenberg not only permits each of his pupils to be completely himself, he insists on it. Father of the atonal system, he is passionate in his reverence for the classics and classic form. From him I learned that modernism is not merely a matter of hitting the keys with your elbow and seeing what happens; it is logical, and formed with an utterly logical if unconventional development. No one has to like modern music, but every serious musician owes it to himself to keep his ears open and listen to what is going on.

Schoenberg set Levant, who thought musically in terms of the piano, to studying the language of strings in the quartets of Mozart and Brahms. The piano trios of Schubert, on the other hand, were studied for thematic development. Schoenberg, Levant said, “taught me to write piano music for the piano, chamber music for chamber groups, orchestral music directly for the orchestra.”<sup>65</sup>

Levant’s close friend George Gershwin met Schoenberg after he moved from New York to Beverly Hills in the summer of 1936. Their love of tennis and painting cemented a friendship between the two mu-

sicians. Gershwin can hardly be categorized as a student of Schoenberg's, but he was working on a string quartet at the time and may have brought it to Schoenberg on 28 May 1937.<sup>66</sup> On 12 July, the day after Gershwin's tragic sudden death from a brain tumor, Schoenberg expressed his respect for Gershwin's music in a radio eulogy, which began:

George Gershwin was one of the rare musicians for whom music was not a matter of greater or lesser ability. Music for him was the air he breathed, food that nourished him, drink that refreshed him. Music was that which he felt, and music was the feeling that he received. Originality of this sort is only granted to the great, and without doubt he was a great composer.<sup>67</sup>

Alfred Newman, who was at Twentieth Century–Fox from 1935 and was its music director from 1939 to 1959, studied with Schoenberg from 1936 through 1938 and thereafter maintained a social relationship with him (including frequent tennis dates) through 1940. Newman was a key Hollywood figure for Schoenberg; he talked Samuel Goldwyn into allowing the Kolisch Quartet to record the four Schoenberg string quartets on a United Artists sound stage in 1937<sup>68</sup> and provided the Twentieth Century–Fox orchestra to perform the premiere of *Kol Nidre* in 1938.<sup>69</sup> In 1938 Newman even asked Schoenberg to present the Oscar for best film score along with a short speech at the Academy Awards ceremony.<sup>70</sup> Others from the film capital who studied briefly with Schoenberg were Hugo Friedhofer, who attended a seminar at USC in 1935; Edward Powell and David Raksin, who met Schoenberg through Levant and had lessons between 1935 and 1937; Leonard Rosenman, who later composed the first twelve-tone film score;<sup>71</sup> and Franz Waxman, who began lessons in August 1945, although Schoenberg then became very ill and could not continue. Two members of Paramount's music department, the songwriter Ralph Rainger and the lyricist Leo Robin studied more extensively with Schoenberg between 1936 and 1939.<sup>72</sup>

Schoenberg—like Hindemith and Stravinsky—was tempted to investigate the kind of salary a film composer could command, and in Los Angeles his students were very often the key to composing possibilities. Robin and Rainger may have arranged an introduction to Boris Morros, head of the music department at Paramount Studios, where Schoenberg had appointments in 1936, 1937, and 1938.<sup>73</sup> Another contact came through the pianist Edward Steuermann's sister, Salka Viertel, who was then writing scripts for Greta Garbo at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. In January 1936 an appointment was made for Schoenberg to meet with MGM's Irving Thalberg, who was producing a filmed version of *The Good Earth*, Pearl S. Buck's best-selling novel about Chinese peasants. Salka Viertel wrote about the encounter:

A lot of protocol went on before the meeting was arranged and a studio car sent for the Schoenbergs. . . . At 3:30 there was still no sign of the Schoenbergs. . . . Schoenberg had found it perfectly reasonable that he should be shown around the studio before deciding to work there. We sat down in front of Thalberg's desk, Schoenberg refusing to part with his umbrella. . . . I still see him before me, leaning forward in his chair, both hands clasped over the handle of the umbrella, his burning, genius's eyes on Thalberg, who, standing behind his desk, was explaining why he wanted a great composer for the scoring of *The Good Earth*. When he came to: "Last Sunday when I heard the lovely music [*Verklärte Nacht*] you have written . . ." Schoenberg interrupted sharply: "I don't write 'lovely' music." . . . Schoenberg had read *The Good Earth* and he would not undertake the assignment unless he was given complete control over the sound, including the spoken words.<sup>74</sup>

Thalberg proposed a \$30,000 salary, but Schoenberg's demand for such artistic control naturally caused a delay in the discussion, during which Gertrud Schoenberg suggested the (then) unheard-of fee of \$50,000, which ended the negotiation.<sup>75</sup> Gertrud wrote her brother, the violinist Rudolf Kolisch, that they were pretty sure composing for the film studio was not for Arnold,<sup>76</sup> and Schoenberg wrote to Alma Mahler-Werfel, "It would have been the end of me." He regretted the loss of the money, since had he managed to win it, such a sum would have allowed him to complete his opera *Moses und Aron*, the oratorio *Die Jakobsleiter*, and some theoretical works he had begun.<sup>77</sup> However, he was interested enough in the film project to make sketches for it in two notebooks.<sup>78</sup> In July of the same year, the director William Dieterle approached Schoenberg about collaborating in a film biography of Beethoven. Schoenberg replied that he could not join the project because "it would not be in keeping with what people are entitled to demand of me, namely that I should create *out of my own being*."<sup>79</sup> Schoenberg's true feelings about the Hollywood film industry were published in an April 1940 article in *Arts and Architecture* titled "Art and the Moving Pictures." It effectively ended the possibility that he would have any further appointments with film studios. In it he recalled having expected from the advent of sound in film a renaissance of the arts, dealing with the highest problems of mankind. He had in mind for this exciting new medium audiences who could recite by heart whole pages of Shakespeare, Schiller, Goethe, and Wagner. He did not expect the "vulgarity, sentimentality, and mere playing for the gallery" that followed. Moving pictures had now become a mere "industry, mercilessly suppressing every dangerous trait of art." Films were "cut down to that zero point which allows for a happy ending," intended only for "ordinary people." He concluded that ways must



be found to satisfy the demands of the more highly educated, as well as the demands of art itself.<sup>80</sup>

After the publication of this article, Schoenberg's interactions with the film industry dwindled. Yet Schoenberg urged Kolisch to find work playing in studio orchestras during difficult times in his brother-in-law's career, and Gertrud Schoenberg attempted to sell a movie script, when they faced lean years themselves in the 1940s.<sup>81</sup> Both Schoenbergs maintained friendly social contact with the Dieterles, Salka Viertel, and the Korngolds, who arrived in Hollywood the same month as the Schoenberg family. Gertrud Schoenberg had been a close friend of Erich Wolfgang Korngold when they were teenagers in Vienna, and their children became friends in Los Angeles.<sup>82</sup> Even the icy relationship between Schoenberg and Erich's father, the former Viennese critic and enemy to musical modernism Julius Korngold, melted. The elder Korngold wrote that in California "Schoenberg behaved more like a bourgeois husband and tender father than a musical revolutionary. He could be very amiable. . . . He seemed to have grown tolerant, very tolerant, and tolerance is not one of the characteristics of a real revolutionary."<sup>83</sup>

In May 1936, the prospect of a faculty appointment at UCLA encouraged the Schoenbergs to buy their own home nearby in Brentwood, where they employed domestic help and began holding Sunday afternoon gatherings that were known for excellent coffee and Viennese pastries. Klemperer, who studied privately with Schoenberg in California beginning in April 1936, was a frequent guest. When in town, members of the Kolisch Quartet would be there, joining the visiting pianists Edward Steuermann, Artur Schnabel, and Richard Buhlig, who was performing Schoenberg's piano music in his recitals in California and New York at the time. Krenek, whose desire to live in California brought him for late-summer visits, frequently paid homage to Schoenberg with a visit on his birthday.<sup>84</sup> Adolph Weiss, a fine bassoonist and Schoenberg's first American student in Berlin, was a member of Schoenberg's circle after 1938. The composers Edgard Varèse, Joseph Achron, and Louis Gruenberg came for frequent social engagements.<sup>85</sup> Among many others occasionally entertained by the Schoenbergs were Ernst Toch and his wife, Lily; the architect Richard Neutra and his wife, Dione; Thomas and Katia Mann; Vicki Baum and her husband, the conductor Richard Lert; Max Reinhardt's son, Gottfried; Franz Werfel and Alma Mahler-Werfel; the actors Harpo Marx and Peter Lorre; and an old friend from Schoenberg's early music-making days in Vienna, Hugo Riesenfeld. Once Schoenberg began teaching at UCLA, members of the music department and the administration of the university were invited to the Sunday afternoons in Brentwood. Schoenberg also proudly hosted

formal celebrations of his UCLA students' compositional achievements. Their music would be performed, and they would have the opportunity to mingle with a select group of Schoenberg's distinguished musician friends over the Viennese refreshments.<sup>86</sup>

Many comments from Schoenberg's American students echo Oscar Levant's praise for Schoenberg as "the greatest teacher in the world,"<sup>87</sup> one who invested extraordinary care and energy in his work and whose methods were unique. But because he recognized that the ability to compose is inborn and cannot be taught, Schoenberg's attitude was paradoxical. He frequently made this comment about his own teaching:

I always called it one of my greatest merits to have discouraged the greatest majority of my pupils from composing. There remain, from the many hundreds of pupils, only 6–8 who compose. I find such who need encouragement must be discouraged, because only such should compose to whom creation is a "must," a necessity, a passion, such as would not stop composing if they were discouraged a thousand times.<sup>88</sup>

Rather than encouraging his pupils, he showed them that "I did not think too much of their creative ability. . . . All my pupils differ from one another extremely. . . . They all had to find their way alone, for themselves."<sup>89</sup> He did not attempt to teach a style or to give his students "tricks." Gerald Strang described the acute analytical ability that lay behind the way in which Schoenberg was a "destructive rather than a constructive critic" for his students: "He had the knack . . . of putting his finger on the reason why something went wrong. . . . Schoenberg recognized that nine times out of ten the weakness was a result of something that happened earlier, and could go back and say [why]. This must have had some influence on the criticism and self-criticism of the people who worked with him."<sup>90</sup>

John Cage, at age twenty-two, was among a group of three private students, who, joining together to save on their fees, studied at the Schoenberg home on Canyon Cove in Hollywood in the fall of 1934. In spite of the harsh criticism he received, Cage believed that "Schoenberg was a magnificent teacher," one who put his students in touch with musical principles.

I studied counterpoint at his home and attended all his classes at USC and later at UCLA when he moved there. I also took his course in harmony, for which I had no gift. . . . He told me that without a feeling for harmony I would always encounter an obstacle, a wall through which I wouldn't be able to pass. My reply was that in that case I would devote my life to beating my head against that wall—and maybe that is what I've

been doing ever since. In all the time I studied with Schoenberg, he never once led me to believe that my work was distinguished in any way. He never praised my compositions, and when I commented on other students' work in class he held my comments up to ridicule. And yet I worshipped him like a god.<sup>91</sup>

Peter Yates later passed on to Cage Schoenberg's recollection of Cage as "an inventor of genius. Not a composer, no, not a composer, but an inventor. A great mind."<sup>92</sup> Bernice Abrahms Geiringer, a member with Cage and George Tremblay of the initial threesome, remembered that Cage's relationship with Schoenberg was "affable." Cage was very verbal, she recalled, precise in his counterpoint exercises, and analytical; he "had one of the clearest minds, and he came unencumbered. He just went his way." Like Tremblay (who was already well trained as a musician) and Cage, she continued to study with Schoenberg at USC, then at UCLA. She discovered that "Schoenberg did not teach composition. . . . You had to *really know* what preceded you. You just didn't start with yourself. You had to have the most disciplined background. . . . What he was really focusing on was a foundation." She was one among several who testified that—contrary to the impressions of those who did not know him—Schoenberg was a very emotional person and extraordinarily perceptive. She had been encouraged by her piano teacher to compose, yet her family situation was difficult. She remembered Schoenberg advising her, "Miss Abrahms, you're not made of glass."<sup>93</sup>

Pauline Alderman, a member of USC's music faculty who was one of Schoenberg's first private students in Hollywood, arranged his invitation to teach in USC's summer school in 1935.<sup>94</sup> Because the president of USC, Rufus von KleinSmid, ruled the university like an "absolute monarch" and strongly disapproved of modern music,<sup>95</sup> the summer appointment led only to a part-time position (the Alchin Chair in Composition) in the academic year 1935–36, and another summer appointment the following summer. In 1936 UCLA, which, thanks to its state support, was a much richer institution than USC, a private institution, "discovered" Schoenberg, and with Klemperer's recommendation offered him a tenured appointment as professor of composition at a beginning salary of \$4,800.<sup>96</sup>

The USC summer teaching gave Schoenberg a great deal of trouble, for he found himself teaching a class of thirty to forty public school and college teachers, middle-aged and older, who were in the class to earn a few credits that would improve their salary schedules.<sup>97</sup> Strang, who came to study with Schoenberg on scholarship from the San Francisco Bay area, where he had worked for Cowell's New Music Society,

felt that Schoenberg was “completely at a loss” in that situation. “He had no idea what grades meant, or what kind of expectations he could ask of his students.” His English was not adequate to a class situation, and Strang volunteered to sit beside him and supply necessary words. Schoenberg got Strang another scholarship (with funds from Samuel Goldwyn) for the fall semester. Leonard Stein enrolled on the advice of his piano teacher, Richard Buhlig, and volunteered to play musical examples from Beethoven piano sonatas. Both Stein and Strang went to UCLA in 1936 to continue with Schoenberg, Strang as Schoenberg’s teaching assistant. Stein took on that role at UCLA from 1939 to 1942. Both Strang and Stein helped Schoenberg write his textbooks until his death in 1951 and in many ways supplied the aid Schoenberg’s European students had undertaken earlier. Beside correcting students’ papers, Strang said, he helped resolve Schoenberg’s personal problems, advised him on the purchase of his house, and acted as a chauffeur. This role of amanuensis enabled Strang to see Schoenberg’s difficulties and adjustments in his new situation:

It was in many ways a very frustrating period for him and for everybody else. He had come to us with the reputation of being extraordinarily difficult to get along with, being very autocratic, very domineering and intolerant. But the effect of being so completely dislocated and having to find these ways through an educational system which was so completely foreign to all the European models that he had been accustomed to, apparently made him much less domineering than he had been. I never saw any of that. He was sensitive. [His] feelings were easily hurt. He was constantly misunderstanding people’s motives. He was resentful, for instance, if someone on one of the faculties on which he taught gave a party and didn’t invite him and Mrs. Schoenberg. . . . If he saw somebody on campus [who] didn’t come and shake hands with him, he thought he had done something to offend them. Or—vice versa—perhaps they were intending to offend him. All this kind of personal sensitivity made it very difficult for him, but somebody had to act as a buffer and a bridge. That was my role for the first two-and-a-half to three years he was in Southern California.<sup>98</sup>

Strang and Stein both commented that neither USC nor UCLA allowed Schoenberg the influence he deserved. Although Schoenberg never reached the salary he hoped for at UCLA, his new position helped him withstand the reduction in his private teaching in 1937, when (because of a “little catastrophe in Hollywood”) his film students stopped their lessons owing to cancellation of their film contracts.<sup>99</sup>

In the 1930s UCLA was converting from its past as a school of teacher education and becoming a real university. Strang felt that UCLA had hired Schoenberg as an outstanding and controversial inter-

national figure who would enhance the reputation of the newly emerging academic institution. At first Schoenberg was given hope that he would be allowed to develop (and be director of) the theory and composition program of the music department. With the same force and zeal he had fruitlessly applied to the rescue of European Jewry, he drew up memos and plans. His July 1937 plan for graduate students in the UCLA music department outlined Schoenberg's principles of artistic commitment: a devotion "only comparable to that to religion or to the fatherland"; and a respect for laws of morality, which are stricter than those of everyday life. He deeply believed that "[a]rtists have to be models for ordinary everyday citizens and have to behave accordingly. It has to be one of the foremost task[s] of every school of art to develop the character of the students. . . . [Artists] belong to the leaders of mankind."<sup>100</sup>

From the start Schoenberg's classes were overlarge. In 1937, teaching twenty-five students in composition, twenty-five in analysis, and sixty in counterpoint, he petitioned Robert G. Sproul, the president of UCLA, for salaries for teaching assistants and also requested funds to build a library of scores for students in analysis and composition.<sup>101</sup> With prodigious energy, intellect, and self-assurance, Schoenberg envisioned new educational structures. He proposed a conservatorylike domain within the music department, which he called a "Music Club."<sup>102</sup> It would contain a number of divisions he called "schools": an orchestra school, a school for conducting, and a school of orchestration, whose pupils would orchestrate pieces for the conductors and the chamber orchestra and would attend rehearsals of the Philharmonic and the Federal Symphony Orchestra. There would also be a choir school and a school for copyists. There would be a fixed time when students would listen to recorded works while following scores. These same works would be performed in concerts by prominent local artists of Schoenberg's choice,<sup>103</sup> in which the choir and the orchestra would also perform.

Schoenberg also attempted to elevate the university's musical training to a European level. His projected "Curriculum for Composers" (1941–42) was intended to "sharpen prerequisites" in order to separate the more talented students from those aiming only to fulfill average requirements: "It seems to me that a great number of talented students to be found in this community could be stimulated to take a more serious attitude towards art if they were forced to," he wrote. His suggested plan for this process involved progression through six undergraduate courses in harmony, counterpoint, and analysis, to the seventh, "Composition for Composers" (with the consent of the instructor). Graduate classes for composers would be in different aspects of composition.<sup>104</sup> Following the precepts of the great Viennese musicologist Guido Adler, Schoenberg

wanted to require of graduate students a thorough knowledge of specific works. He recommended that students be informed of what they must study for their oral examinations and what they should expect to be asked.<sup>105</sup> The committee for such an examination should consist of not only three members of the music faculty, but also one member from the art department and one from philosophy or physics. The theory or composition student should undertake a thesis on a problem of composition, including analysis, comparison of two or more works in regard to the problem, and an independent investigation, idea, or theory, with illustrations.<sup>106</sup> Schoenberg often expressed his opinion that to be a composer one should study intensively for a minimum of five—sometimes he demanded eight—years.

Another radical vision Schoenberg developed for UCLA in 1940 was a faculty forum of the arts and aesthetics. He hoped to engage teaching colleagues from the sciences and the humanities in regular discussions as to what effect recent changes in technology, sociology, and economics might be having on the arts and aesthetics. He foresaw culture-altering changes overtaking a society that neglected full communication between arts and sciences. Among the problems he predicted and sought the help of his colleagues to solve was the possible “end of art,” caused by the erosion of a class structure and the consequent inability of artists to resist the temptation to satisfy the demands of the broad masses.<sup>107</sup>

None of these plans were realized during Schoenberg’s tenure at UCLA. Instead, the hiring emphasis in the music department turned toward musicologists, and staff positions were not developed to achieve the graduate program in composition Schoenberg had in mind. “The situation at UCLA was always very frustrating to him,” said Strang; Schoenberg did not “fit” in at UCLA. But he “had an active, wiry mind which was constantly grabbing hold of and tussling with something. If it was something which he couldn’t resolve . . . his tendency was to push it aside and concentrate on something else.”<sup>108</sup>

Although Schoenberg was unable to convert to his views the administrations of either university in Los Angeles, his influence on his students was considerable and long-lasting. He saw clearly that he needed to adapt his expectations to American levels of musical background. He found talent, inventive ability, and originality in American students, but it was his opinion that the general level of their music education was “superficial and external.”<sup>109</sup> In a 1938 article Schoenberg found his students’ musical experience akin to “Swiss cheese—almost more holes than cheese.”<sup>110</sup> Because of this, he wrote, “I had to change many of my ideas which I developed within almost forty years of teach-



ing.”<sup>111</sup> His curriculum at UCLA covered harmony and basic analysis for beginners (taught by his assistant), composition for beginners, counterpoint for beginners, structural functions of harmony, analysis of larger forms, and orchestration. He asked beginning students in composition to write complete rondos, which he presented at his home with formality and pride in carefully planned celebrations. Using approved radio broadcasts of concert music, he also assigned student listening reports. For these he worked out, in careful detail, rigorous and comprehensive questionnaires.

Leonard Stein found that while Schoenberg’s musical examples and exercises remained in many ways similar to those he had used for his European pupils,<sup>112</sup> his teaching and his theory texts written in America, while maintaining his basic principles, were adjusted toward the needs of “beginners.” Schoenberg grew proud of his ability to teach noncomposers and even boasted to Stein that he could teach composing to tables and chairs.<sup>113</sup> Stein said, “I was appalled at the poor sort of material that students would turn in . . . and Schoenberg would always try to turn them around into something, patch them up. . . . He worked his head off.” Schoenberg would give each student a separate exam and would usually change the grade Stein gave on an exam to something better. “He countenanced mediocrity. He knew what to expect from these students.”<sup>114</sup> Indeed, in perhaps the most surprising of his paradoxical attitudes, Schoenberg declared several times the worthiness of support for the artist who might not achieve great creative mastery. By 1939 he had developed his idea of “ear training through composing” to help beginners in the understanding of music: “Just as almost anyone can be trained to draw, paint, write an essay or deliver a lecture, it must also be possible to make people with even less than mediocre gifts use the means of musical composition in a sensitive manner. . . . Every good musician should submit to such training.”<sup>115</sup> In a 1940 edition of *Music and Dance in California*, he published an article, titled “Encourage the Mediocre,” that was aimed at “the protectors, the patrons, [and] the customers of the arts.” In it he pointed out that “[i]t is the mediocre artist on whom a rapid expansion of cultural goods depends, more than on the genius who gives the impulse and produces momentum and acceleration.” He noted that while people of moderate means are willing to buy landscapes or order portraits from second-ranking painters, too few care to pay to hear concerts or acquire recordings of works by contemporary composers. “Is there no way to do justice to sincere artists?” he asked.<sup>116</sup>

It was his view that musical study must be based on the works of the masters. His teaching dealt with the profundity with which great composers of the past carried out their ideas and inquired into the many

ways they handled musical problems. Stein felt that Schoenberg's ideas were continuing to evolve. The manner in which he taught harmony considered the ambiguity and multiple meanings of chords. "Instead of modulating from key to key, he is considering [the structural functions of harmony] in terms of regions of one key: monotonicity," Stein explained. "This [process of discovery] occupied him as much as his composition did: How and why. Principles of composition. A kind of middle ground between practice and theory, which is not easy to explain. . . . He wasn't interested in pure theory, but in the explanation of why certain things happened in composition. He always started in a very intuitive way; through the writing itself."<sup>117</sup>

His students were stunned by Schoenberg's "improvisations" on a given problem, written at tremendous speed on the blackboard in the style of Beethoven, Haydn, Mozart, or Brahms. The composer Leon Kirchner remembers feeling so awed by this that at first he thought it hopeless to become a composer. The students' exercises were to be done in these styles; Schoenberg never drew on his own music. "One had to master the past, and the forms out of which the present came. . . . What was terrifying was his acute analysis of a student's weakness. He would correct, immediately, in whatever personal style the student was using. . . . It took me years to really understand deeply what Schoenberg taught. At the time I would think I understood, but there was such depth to it, it took a long time to realize its implications."<sup>118</sup> Although he studied with Schoenberg for only two years at UCLA (1937–38 and 1940–41), Kirchner felt that Schoenberg's influence was formative for him. Schoenberg's command of musical tradition and his music's connection to the past encouraged Kirchner to follow his own individual line of thinking regardless of musical fashions and trends; as a composer he ultimately chose not to be a serialist. "Although Schoenberg was extremely systematic, he defied and denied system," Kirchner says. He remembered Schoenberg being annoyed at the phrase "the twelve-tone 'system'." "He somehow, inherently or intuitively, realized that there was no system in which there could be a final formula. . . . The [twelve-tone technique] is only one parameter in his work: something which I respect very much. But beyond that there are the other qualities [such as] his immense musicality. . . . Behind that twelve-tone row is a giant musical mind."<sup>119</sup>

Schoenberg believed that modernism, like composing, "cannot and ought not to be taught. But it might come in a natural way, by itself, to him who proceeds gradually by absorbing the cultural achievements of his predecessors."<sup>120</sup> Although he was persuaded by his first students at USC to give an in-class analysis, and UCLA asked him to give a public lecture on the "Method of Composing with Twelve Tones" in March

1941, he avoided the subject in class. From the time of his arrival in America he had been tormented by those inquisitive about his “trade-marks”: the twelve-tone composer, the atonalist.<sup>121</sup> Dika Newlin, studying with Schoenberg in the same period as Kirchner, remembered Schoenberg’s irritation when students approached him with their own twelve-tone efforts. He confessed that he could not teach or correct others’ work in this method, for it “seemed to be a matter so personal to him . . . which he himself had been able to attain only after profound thought and deep inward struggle.” For Schoenberg it was a bone of contention that in 1940 his publisher, G. Schirmer, published Krenek’s *Studies in Counterpoint*, “a slender volume . . . in which certain twelve-tone principles are set forth in a rather schematic manner.”<sup>122</sup> In a 1939 letter to Krenek about teaching, Schoenberg had remarked, “American young people’s intelligence is certainly remarkable. I am endeavoring to direct this intelligence into the right channels. They are extremely good at getting hold of principles, but then want to apply them too much ‘on principle.’ And in art that’s wrong.”<sup>123</sup>

Lou Harrison was one Los Angeles pupil who did obtain Schoenberg’s help in composing a twelve-tone work. He studied privately with Schoenberg in 1941–42, supporting himself by playing the piano at Lester Horton’s dance studio. He had heard a performance by the pianist Frances Mullen of Schoenberg’s Piano Suite, op. 25, and was determined to compose and dedicate to her his own twelve-tone Piano Suite. He reached a point of blockage in his work and nerved himself to ask for Schoenberg’s help. Peter Yates recorded Harrison’s description of the lesson:

I played the Prelude. There was a rather long moment of silence, and then he asked thoughtfully, “Is it twelve-tone?” I simply said, “Yes.” He reached for the page, saying, “It is good! It is good!” . . . By the time I had played to the point of blockage in Movement III, he plunged directly in, already aware of my structure, and, with splendid illuminating instructions, permanently disposed of not only that particular difficulty but also any of the kind that I might ever encounter.

Yates reported that Harrison followed Schoenberg’s instruction that the tone-row is not a composing formula.<sup>124</sup> Harrison later told Vivian Perlis that Schoenberg was a very great influence on him, “in some ways more of an influence [than his mentor Charles Ives] because Schoenberg represents the more fundamental control. . . . It was this sense of order that I needed from Schoenberg.”<sup>125</sup>

In informal ways those with relatively easy access to Schoenberg learned from him by taking opportunities to inquire about his composing.

Leonard Stein asked whether there was a definite extramusical program in the First String Quartet. Dika Newlin recorded Schoenberg's reply, which was "Oh yes, very definite—but private!"<sup>126</sup> Strang also noted that "Schoenberg was certainly devoted to the idea that music expresses the feelings and attitudes of the composer."<sup>127</sup> In her diary, Newlin recorded Schoenberg asking, "How can you compose without writing your own life?"<sup>128</sup> Stein was working closely with Schoenberg at the time of the composer's near-fatal heart attack in the summer of 1946. When he returned to work on his String Trio a month after his illness, Schoenberg told Stein about reflections of his experiences of "death and restoration" in that work. Stein came to the conclusion that Schoenberg had "a very programmatic mind."<sup>129</sup> Both Strang and Stein were closely involved with the writing of Schoenberg's *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*, in which he encourages the student to keep in mind a special character, a poem, a story, or even a moving picture to stimulate the expression of definite moods while composing even the smallest exercises.<sup>130</sup> On the other side of the coin, Pauline Alderman remembered Schoenberg remarking that a composer needs to be able to write a canon as easily as he would write a letter; following Brahms's example, he wrote one every morning, to keep in practice.<sup>131</sup> At a social occasion the young Viennese composer Eric Zeisl asked why Schoenberg kept up the practice of writing complex double canons which no one would ever hear. Schoenberg said, "That is for the satisfaction of the inner logic." Inspiration from this single remark helped Zeisl's mastery of large forms, which had been a struggle for him as a composer.<sup>132</sup>

## 2

The challenges of teaching occupied Schoenberg until the end of his life, as he set down his principles (with the help of Strang and Stein) in texts for students. The preface to his *Structural Functions of Harmony* recorded his "dissatisfaction with the knowledge of harmony of my students of composition at the University of California, Los Angeles."<sup>133</sup> The four books he worked on in California (the others were "Preliminary Exercises in Counterpoint," "Fundamentals of Musical Composition," and "Models for Beginners in Composition") were all intended for the average American university student. They gave him many years of trouble but were clearly important enough to the legacy he intended to leave that he was willing to sacrifice much time from his own composition.

A part of his effort to educate was his concern about the climate for the arts in America: How, he asked, would music students be able to

make a living? His opinions about music in America (expressed in radio and newspaper interviews on the West Coast and in several essays unpublished in his lifetime) went largely unnoticed by the musical establishment in New York. In 1934 he pointed out that high concert and opera ticket prices and the emphasis on box-office returns narrowed both the class of concertgoers and the compass of musical repertory available to music students in the United States.<sup>134</sup> In his letters Schoenberg often expressed his feelings about the American “commercial racket.”<sup>135</sup> In 1945, after he had retired from UCLA, his comments sharpened: “No serious composer in this country is capable of living from his *art*. Only popular composers earn enough to support oneself and one’s family, and then it is *not art*”;<sup>136</sup> and “If it is art it is not for the masses. And if it is for the masses it is not art.”<sup>137</sup> The all-pervasive American art of advertising provoked Schoenberg’s remark in a 1946 letter to his old friend Oskar Kokoschka that he was living in a “world in which I nearly die of disgust.”<sup>138</sup> In a 1948 article for the newsletter of the League of Composers, he challenged the morality of the marketplace. Why was it the aim of composers, artists, and writers to produce something similar to the last success on the stage, the movies, the radio, novels, and music?

Has originality lost its appreciation? Does it interfere too much with the commercial success? One can understand that fear for one’s life may cause a man to bow to dictatorship . . . but must one tolerate the moral and mental baseness of people who bow to the mere temptation of profits? . . . Is it aesthetically and morally admissible to accommodate to the listener’s mentality and preference? If so, is there not a limit how far such accommodation is allowed to go? Does such accommodation promote the artistic culture of a nation? Does it promote morality? Is it not more healthy to give a nation a chance to admire its heroes than to applaud the fleeting success of an ephemeron?<sup>139</sup>

Such remarks were a part of his duty as a teacher, Schoenberg felt. This calling demanded the highest ethical standard. He had always tried to convince his students “that there is such a thing as artistic morality and why one must never cease to cultivate it and, conversely, to oppose as forcefully as possible anyone who commits an offense against it.”<sup>140</sup>

### 3

The tremendous energy Schoenberg gave to teaching “the whole of the art”<sup>141</sup> took a toll on his health to which he had difficulty admitting. In her student diary Dika Newlin noted many occasions when he would

continue teaching although he was in no condition to do so. Nuria Schoenberg Nono felt that her father's great interest in teaching was "what really saved him and kept him strong and alive during all of the time he was here in the States. . . . Retirement [in 1944, at the age of seventy] was one of the worst things that happened to him."<sup>142</sup> Beyond losing the activity of teaching and university contacts, the pension he had accrued in only eight years on the UCLA faculty was \$38 per month, at a time when the children of his second family were thirteen, eight, and four.<sup>143</sup> He continued to hold classes in his home, but the state of his health and the relative poverty the family found themselves in prevented him from going out to events or concerts. During that period of undistinguished leadership of the Los Angeles Philharmonic, he remembered Mahler and lost interest in the orchestra.<sup>144</sup> The deaths of his close friends and students in Europe burdened him. Carl Engel's death in 1944 ended a relationship he had come to depend upon and severed his lifeline to the New York musical establishment. The rejection of his application for a Guggenheim fellowship in 1945, combined with his complaint that he had been systematically excluded (by those who ran the Philharmonic and the Hollywood Bowl) from Los Angeles's public musical life, contributed to his withdrawal into bitterness.<sup>145</sup> Nuria Schoenberg Nono remembers when the Sunday afternoon gatherings, rather than drawing him out, reinforced his intellectual loneliness.

After a while my father realized that these people were coming here to meet each other and not to talk with him. . . . Daddy would be sitting . . . maybe completely alone, not talking to anyone, and so he decided one time that we weren't going to do this any more. . . . For a long time on Sunday afternoons at two o'clock . . . we would get in the car and drive around the block . . . while these people came and found no one at home and went away.<sup>146</sup>

After his recovery from a serious heart attack in the summer of 1946, Schoenberg's spirits rallied. He continued teaching privately and, in spite of a long catalog of serious health problems, recovered his "gusto."<sup>147</sup> In response to an award of \$1,000 from the National Institute of Arts and Letters, he gave the credit for his accomplishments to his opponents, saying that while he never understood it, it was their enmity that helped him to continue swimming against the tide without giving up.<sup>148</sup> The critic Virgil Thomson printed Schoenberg's speech in his column in the *New York Herald Tribune*, adding, "[The statement] shows indeed, through its passionate and disjointed phraseology, how deeply touched the great man is by the belated recognition of his professional colleagues, not one of whom he considers his musical equal. . . . Coming



from the conqueror at the end of a long aesthetic civil war, it is a sort of Gettysburg Address.”<sup>149</sup> The Los Angeles music critic Lawrence Morton took it upon himself to call on Schoenberg in Brentwood in order to show him the Thomson article, which had not been forwarded from New York to Schoenberg. Morton later wrote Thomson:

Since his eyes are not too strong—he must save them for his writing and composing—he asked me, in his very gentle and polite manner, to read it to him. I must tell you that the old gentleman was touched, very deeply moved; so much so that I did not dare look at him while I read, for fear of losing my own voice, in the emotion of seeing the tears well up in his eyes. . . . I think you should know how much joy your column brought to a man who has known much less joy than his genius should have earned him.<sup>150</sup>

Los Angeles’s celebration of the composer’s seventy-fifth birthday in 1949 emphasized a growth of understanding and appreciation for Schoenberg’s music. After programs of his work presented by Yates’s (by then well-established) “Evenings on the Roof” and the newly formed local branch of the International Society for Contemporary Music (under the chairmanship of Krenek, who had settled in Los Angeles), Morton wrote in a review that

[Los Angeles was] given the opportunity of reviewing within a few short weeks almost the whole scope of Schoenberg’s art, except for his dramatic and choral music, from a song of Opus 1 to the violin *Phantasy* composed this year for Adolph Koldofsky. . . . The repertoire might have been selected to illustrate a formal critical analysis of the development of Schoenberg’s art. . . . There were no cries of anguish and no anti-modernist demonstrations. On the contrary, there was real enthusiasm. . . . History will record us as the audience that applauded, however belatedly.<sup>151</sup>

Albert Goldberg noted in the *Los Angeles Times*, “There is a large and willing public for [Schoenberg’s] music in our town. . . . There were more people on hand and more enthusiasm over what they heard than the most sanguine prophet would have dared to predict.”<sup>152</sup>

Orchestral works were offered by the newly formed Los Angeles Chamber Symphony Orchestra (which presented Schoenberg’s Chamber Symphony no. 1) under the German émigré conductor Harold Byrns<sup>153</sup> and by the Los Angeles Philharmonic under a Los Angeles native, Alfred Wallenstein, who had succeeded Klemperer as music director after a series of interim guest conductors. The “Lied der Waldtaube” from the *Gurrelieder* was the only Schoenberg work Wallenstein attempted in his thirteen-year tenure (1943–56). This neglect by the Philharmonic added

to Schoenberg's bitterness, expressed in a letter of gratitude to his many well-wishers, both European and American, which began, "To become recognized only after one's death——!" He recognized that he could not hope for "plain and loving understanding" of his work in his lifetime, as he had felt "commanded to express certain ideas, unpopular ones at that, it seems, but ideas which had to be presented."<sup>154</sup>

## 4

As Schoenberg found European interest in his compositions growing in the postwar period, he wrote, "There is nothing I long for more intensely . . . than that people should know my tunes and whistle them."<sup>155</sup> What happened was the opposite. Leonard Stein comments, "Schoenberg was not responsible for the twelve-tone concept taking over. People like [René] Leibowitz [whose *Schoenberg et son école* was published in 1947] would come in the late forties and explain his music to him!"<sup>156</sup> At the time Leibowitz was reinterpreting Schoenberg's serialism for young European composers who had been deprived of modernism for the duration of the war. In 1948 Leibowitz encouraged Adorno to complete the manuscript on Schoenberg's method that had provided so much material for Thomas Mann's *Doctor Faustus*.<sup>157</sup> In 1949 Adorno published his *Philosophie der neuen Musik* in Germany. The same year, on a visit sponsored by the U.S. Department of State, the German critic Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt told the *Los Angeles Times* that Schoenberg's twelve-tone system was being widely adopted by young composers in bombed-out Germany "because it gives them a sense of order."<sup>158</sup> Gertrud Schoenberg told Milton Babbitt that by the time of his death in 1951 Schoenberg was again baffled by the accusations that he was a "mathematical composer. . . . My husband didn't know any mathematics, and didn't even know of what they were accusing him."<sup>159</sup> Schoenberg himself had said in 1949, "I am still more a composer than a theorist. When I compose, I try to forget all theories and I continue composing only after having freed my mind of them. It seems to me urgent to warn my friends against orthodoxy."<sup>160</sup>

The irony of America's perception that Schoenberg was the influence behind postwar composers' conformity to serialism is that this was a development he did not ultimately intend. While his Violin and Piano Concertos, the Fourth String Quartet, the Genesis prelude, the String Trio, the Phantasy, and *A Survivor from Warsaw* are serial works, in his California period Schoenberg also composed a number of works in which he yielded to his "longing to return to the older style," which included tonality. (Schoenberg listed the Suite for String Orchestra; the

Second Chamber Symphony, op. 38; the Theme and Variations for Band, op. 43; and “several others” as his tonal works.<sup>161</sup> “Others” could include *Kol Nidre*, op. 39; Variations on a Recitative for Organ, op. 40; and Three Folksongs, op. 49, for mixed chorus.) The intensity of his teaching, which took more hours of his life than it had in Europe, and the depth of his homage to and analysis of the works of earlier masters in response to the needs of his American students might seem to have influenced this change. However, in replying to questions on the subject from Josef Rufer, whom he particularly trusted, Schoenberg wrote that for him composing had always meant “obeying an inner urge,” even when that meant changing styles to accommodate his “upsurge of a desire for tonality.”<sup>162</sup> This was but another dimension to his creative work, which was always developing in surprising ways. There is a notable easing of serial restrictions in Schoenberg’s American twelve-tone works. He also used tonal vocabulary in serial works when he felt the meaning demanded it (in the *Ode to Napoleon*, op. 41, his protest against dictatorial tyranny; and in the Piano Concerto, op. 42, the program of which outlines the emotions of being uprooted from one’s homeland). In his texted works (approximately half of those composed in Los Angeles) Schoenberg continued exploring new expressive uses of *Sprechstimme* and narration to project his meaning, right up to his last work, the fragment titled “Modern Psalm no. 1,” op. 50c, a setting of his own words for chorus with speaker and orchestra.<sup>163</sup>

In his last public lecture, presented 29 November 1949 at UCLA, Schoenberg discussed his “evolution,” not his revolution. He paid tribute to those who educated him musically, from his early musician friends to his compositional mentors Brahms, Bruckner, Liszt, Mahler, Richard Strauss, Wagner, and Hugo Wolf. Lacking a basis in traditional theory, he had learned to rely on “the miraculous contributions of the subconscious . . . the power behind the human mind, which produces miracles for which we do not deserve credit.” This evolved into a belief that seems (if we look beneath all Schoenberg’s paradoxes and complexity) deeply consistent throughout much of his life: “What I believe, in fact, is that if one has done his duty with the utmost sincerity and has worked out everything as near to perfection as he is capable of doing, then the Almighty presents him with a gift, with additional features of beauty such as he never could have produced by his talents alone.”<sup>164</sup> Beauty in Schoenberg’s music comes to the ears of the American public only as performers gradually grow to be at ease with its accompanying challenges. It does not come to the ear through systematic analysis, but through awareness of the intuitive expressivity—the implicit romanticism—in his musical ideas and language.

## 5

An important aspect of Schoenberg's character remained essentially European. He was an elitist, who believed in fighting for "spiritual culture," mankind's "higher life," the spiritual and intellectual realm of *Geistigkeit*. The American idea of market forces—which necessarily lower the aspirations of the individual in order to satisfy the greatest number of consumers—remained alien to him, as was the Southern California culture of entertainment and hedonism. In 1950 Albert Goldberg asked Los Angeles's émigré composers how separation from their homeland had affected the character and quality of their work. By then, suspecting that he would not live to complete his spiritual testament in *Moses und Aron* and *Die Jakobsleiter*, Schoenberg had withdrawn to compose his last choral psalms, works reflecting the tender acceptance foreshadowed at the close of the work based on his earlier brush with death, the String Trio. Stravinsky, who had so often been transplanted, gave Goldberg the brief response, "I do not think that this subject is really worth a column of your pen." Schoenberg, thinking back over his efforts to continue composing while giving so much of himself to teaching, replied with some resignation—but added a final fighting gesture:

If immigration to America has changed me—I am not aware of it. Maybe I would have finished the third act of *Moses and Aaron* earlier. Maybe I would have written more when remaining in Europe, but I think: nothing comes out, what was not in. And two times two equals four in every climate. Maybe I had four times four times harder to work for a living. But I made no concessions to the market.<sup>165</sup>

## Notes

1. Schoenberg, "Circular to My Friends on My Sixtieth Birthday," in *Style and Idea: Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg*, ed. Leonard Stein, trans. Leo Black (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 28. This circular was written in November 1934.
2. Engel, also a composer, had come to the United States in 1905. Schoenberg met him through Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge.
3. Schoenberg to Fritz Stiedry, 12 Sept. 1934, quoted in *Arnold Schoenberg, 1874–1951: Lebensgeschichte in Begegnungen*, ed. Nuria Schoenberg Nono (Klagenfurt: Ritter, 1992), 311.
4. Schoenberg Nono, 310. The house was at 5860 Canyon Cove, between Griffith Park and the Hollywood Bowl.
5. Leonard Stein, interview by Vivian Perlis, Los Angeles, 28 June 1975, Oral History, American Music, Yale University.

6. "Propaganda" occurs frequently in Schoenberg's correspondence with Engel. He even refers to "a Goebbels in your firm" who should be able to undertake "propaganda" for one of his projects. Schoenberg to Carl Engel, 19 Oct. 1943, Engel Correspondence, Schönberg Center, Vienna. Schoenberg's unpublished letters, diaries, and papers were consulted while the Schoenberg archive was housed at the Arnold Schoenberg Institute in Los Angeles.
7. Schoenberg to Klemperer, 8 Nov. 1934, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, ed. Erwin Stein, trans. Eithne Wilkins and Ernst Kaiser (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 192. For a while Schoenberg maintained several grudges against Klemperer for slights in Berlin; in this letter he remarked, "I have no reason to show you more respect than you have shown me." But by 1936 he decided Klemperer was behaving admirably by obtaining much-needed conducting fees from the Philharmonic for him and by recommending his appointment to UCLA.
8. Schoenberg to Bessie Bartlett Fraenkl, 26 Nov. 1935, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 195–96.
9. Miguel de Reul, *Los Angeles Daily News*, 22 Mar. 1935.
10. Peter Yates, *Evenings on the Roof, 1939–1954*, interview by Adelaide Tusler, Jan. 1967 (Los Angeles: Oral History Program, University of California, 1972), 66; and Leonard Stein on Schoenberg as teacher, panel, "Schoenberg in Hollywood," Bard Music Festival, "Schoenberg and His World," 22 Aug. 1999. The program, presented in Bovard Auditorium on the USC campus, was sponsored by the college music fraternity.
11. "[H]e was indeed *used* to that [bad behavior on the part of orchestral players] . . . it happened [in Europe] *all* the time," commented Rudolf Kolisch. Leonard Stein and Richard Hoffman, "Reminiscences: A Schoenberg Centennial Symposium at Oberlin College (March 2, 1974)," *Journal of the Arnold Schoenberg Institute* (hereafter *JASI*) 8, no. 1 (1984): 71–72; also Stein, Bard Music Festival, 22 Aug. 1999.
12. *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*, 15 Apr. 1936.
13. "As a conductor, Dr. [sic] Schoenberg is a first rate composer." Richard Saunders, *Hollywood Citizen News*, 15 Apr. 1937, after a Federal Symphony Orchestra concert. In "Reminiscences of Schoenberg as Conductor," *JASI* 2, no. 2 (1978): 109, the violist Marcel Dick describes Schoenberg's conducting in the 1920s in Vienna: "Eyes cautiously glued to the score, his head was so bent down that his arms were level with his head. His hand motions were meticulous but dry. His hands communicated nothing but the tempo—not even the downbeat and upbeat. There was no eye contact with the players and certainly no expressive choreography." Leonard Stein felt Schoenberg's baton technique in Los Angeles was good and that he was a methodical conductor; Bard Music Festival, 22 Aug. 1999.
14. Isabel Morse Jones, review of Emanuel Feuermann's performance of Schoenberg's Concerto for Cello and Orchestra after M. G. Monn (1933), *Los Angeles Times*, 2 Mar. 1936. Jones also reported, regarding a performance of the "Song of the Wood Dove" from the *Gurrelieder*, that the audience was visibly moved by the "haunting melody and the marvels of the Schoenberg orchestration, rich in color and poetic content"; *Los Angeles Times*, 23 Sept. 1936. Klemperer conducted the Philharmonic in both these performances.
15. Schoenberg to Engel, 7 Nov. 1934, Schönberg Center, Vienna.

16. Leonard Stein, talk for the Schoenberg seminars, 10 Dec. 1987, Arnold Schoenberg Institute, Los Angeles. The performance was in a program at the University of Southern California.
17. Isabel Morse Jones, *Los Angeles Times*, 9 Jan. 1938.
18. Isabel Morse Jones, *Los Angeles Times*, 9 Oct. 1938. Schoenberg had compared himself to Einstein in *Schoenberg*, ed. Merle Armitage (New York: G. Schirmer, 1937), 249.
19. Armitage, *Schoenberg*, 249–57. Schoenberg's essay "How One Becomes Lonely" (11 Oct. 1937), expresses some similar ideas: "I knew I had the duty of developing my ideas for the sake of progress in music, whether I liked it or not; but I also had to realize that the great majority of the public did not like it. However I remembered that all my music had been found to be ugly at first; and yet . . . there might be a sunrise such as is depicted in the final chorus of my *Gurrelieder*. There might come the promise of a new day of sunlight in music such as I would like to offer to the world." Schoenberg, *Style and Idea*, 53.
20. Armitage, *Schoenberg*, 144–55. José Rodríguez held the position of music critic for *Script*, a Beverly Hills publication that modeled itself on the *New Yorker*.
21. Schoenberg to Roger Sessions, 3 Dec. 1944, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 223. Among numerous other interviews and writings on this point, see "Heart and Brain in Music" (1946), in *Style and Idea*, 53–76.
22. Schoenberg was annoyed that in Los Angeles Klemperer performed only his tonal works: *Verklärte Nacht*, the Suite for String Orchestra, parts of *Gurrelieder*, the arrangement of Brahms's Quartet in G minor (which Klemperer suggested to Schoenberg), the Handel Concerto, the Cello Concerto, and the Second Chamber Symphony. Klemperer's choices were conditioned by the limitations of the Philharmonic audience. For New Yorkers he planned to conduct the Violin Concerto and *Pierrot lunaire* in 1940, but his illness prevented it. He admired the String Trio but found "no point of contact" with the Piano Concerto and the *Ode to Napoleon*. See Otto Klemperer, *Minor Recollections*, trans. J. Maxwell Brownjohn (London: Dennis Dobson, 1964), 46.
23. Schoenberg conducted; it was the only work he recorded in America. He was persuaded by the more experienced conductor, his friend Fritz Stiedry, to take slower tempi than he thought right. Schoenberg to Moses Smith, director of Columbia Masterworks, 30 Sept. 1940, quoted in *Schoenberg Nono*, 370. The performers were Stiedry's wife, Erika Stiedry-Wagner (recitation), Rudolf Kolisch (violin and viola), Stefan Auber (cello), Edward Steuermann (piano), Leonard Posella (flute and piccolo), and Kalman Bloch (clarinet and bass clarinet).
24. Walter H. Rubsamen, "Schoenberg in America," *Musical Quarterly* 37 (Oct. 1951): 476.
25. At approximately the time of this performance in October 1938, Schoenberg wrote his final political document, the "Four Point Program for Jewry," in which he summed up his arguments against the boycott of Germany (as counterproductive) and for the transportation of 7,000,000 European Jews out of Europe, the creation of a United Jewish Party, and the foundation of an independent Jewish state in a territory other than Palestine. He sent the article to Thomas Mann (in Princeton, N.J.) for advice on publication, but the article remained unpublished. See Alexander L. Ringer, *Arnold Schoenberg: The*



- Composer as Jew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990); and E. Randol Schoenberg, "Arnold Schoenberg and Albert Einstein: Their Relationship and Views on Zionism," *JASI* 10, no. 2 (1987): 149.
26. The time and the place from Stein, Bard Music Festival, 22 Aug. 1999. Stein remembers being asked to coach the rabbi for his entrances. Schoenberg wrote Paul Dessau on 22 Nov. 1941 about choosing the melody from ancient fragmentary phrases and expressed his desire that it should not be sentimental in mood. See Josef Rufer, *Das Werk Arnold Schönbergs* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1959), 48.
  27. Schoenberg Nono, 385.
  28. The performance and the recording were by Werner Janssen's Symphony Orchestra.
  29. Castelnuovo-Tedesco, who harbored no love for Schoenberg's music, enjoyed the fact that Schoenberg's prelude was intended to describe chaos. Castelnuovo-Tedesco, "Una vita di musica," part 2, 94–95. I am grateful to Lorenzo Tedesco for providing portions of this unpublished manuscript to me.
  30. Stravinsky to Hugo Winter (AMP), 5 Mar. 1944, in Stravinsky, *Selected Correspondence*, vol. 3, ed. Robert Craft (New York: Knopf, 1985), 291.
  31. There were nine all-Schoenberg "Roof" programs between 1940 and 1954; on this series several works were given West Coast premieres, and one a world premiere. See "Peter Yates and the Musical Modernists," in Dorothy L. Crawford, *Evenings On and Off the Roof: Pioneering Concerts in Los Angeles, 1939–1971* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Crawford, "Peter Yates and the Performance of Schoenberg Chamber Music at 'Evenings on the Roof,'" *JASI* 12, no. 2 (1989): 175–201.
  32. Peter Yates to Peyton Houston, 15 Apr. 1939, Peter Yates Archive, Special Collections, Mandeville Library, University of California, San Diego.
  33. José Rodríguez, interview in Armitage, *Schoenberg*, 149.
  34. The radio performance (by Helen Swaby Rice and Frances Mullen) took place in early 1940, before Louis Krasner's world premiere of the concerto with Leopold Stokowski and the Philadelphia Orchestra. For a fuller account, see Crawford, "Peter Yates and Schoenberg."
  35. Leonard Stein, interview by author, 7 July 1988.
  36. Stein found Schoenberg's pride in the case of Heifetz (and others) embarrassing; the refusal of Heifetz's help occurred in 1948–49. Stein, interview, 28 June 1975.
  37. See Dika Newlin, *Schoenberg Remembered: Diaries and Recollections, 1938–76* (New York: Pendragon, 1980), 108.
  38. Nuria Schoenberg Nono, interview by Vivian Perlis, Los Angeles, 21 Feb. 1977, Oral History, American Music, Yale University.
  39. Schoenberg's letter to Engel (6 Feb. 1941) insults Engel and claims that his publisher believes in his future but has no concern for his "present." Engel Correspondence, Schönberg Center, Vienna. For other instances, see Paul S. Hesselink, "Variations on a Recitative for Organ, Op. 40: Correspondence from the Schoenberg Legacy" *JASI* 7, no. 2 (1983): 141–96, on negotiations about the Variations for Organ, op. 40; Thomas McGeary, "The Publishing History of *Style and Idea*," *JASI* 9, no. 2 (1986): 181–203, on negotiations with the publisher Philosophical Library about *Style and Idea*; David E.

Smyth, "Schoenberg and Dial Records: The Composer's Correspondence with Ross Russell," *JASI* 12, no. 1 (1989): 68–73, on dealings with Dial Records. Also see *Arnold Schoenberg Correspondence: A Collection of Translated and Annotated Letters Exchanged with Guido Adler, Pablo Casals, Emanuel Feuermann, and Olin Downes*, ed. Egbert M. Ennulat (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1991) on controversies with the *New York Times* critic Olin Downes; Schoenberg's bitterness about the "suppression" of his works by the conductors Arturo Toscanini, Serge Koussevitzky, and Bruno Walter; and his tangle with Aaron Copland, which includes complaints about CBS and G. Schirmer. Schoenberg's correspondence with Rudolf Kolisch in the Houghton Library at Harvard University includes other grievances.

40. Gerhard Albersheim, a German-born pianist with a doctorate in musicology from the University of Vienna, remembered Schoenberg's hosting meetings of the American Musicological Society at his Brentwood home in 1942 and characterized him as an "unhappy, inharmonic, and frustrated personality." Albersheim, interview by Clare Rayner, Basel, Switzerland, 5 Aug. 1975, Special Collections, California State University, Long Beach. Paul Pisk, Schoenberg's student for twenty years and (at the recommendation of Carl Engel) teaching at the nearby University of Redlands (Calif.) from 1937, saw little of his former mentor. Some of his (guarded) comments in an interview were: "Schoenberg had a tendency to be so . . . absolute. . . . In personal matters he wanted so much adoring. . . . [He] was very demanding . . . I learned everything I know from him." Pisk, interview by Rayner, Hollywood, 23 Jan. 1975, Special Collections, California State University, Long Beach.

41. Schoenberg, "A Text from the Third Millennium" (Feb. 1948), reproduced in H. H. Stuckenschmidt, *Arnold Schoenberg: His Life, World, and Work*, trans. Humphrey Searle (New York: Schirmer, 1978), 547–48. See also *Letters of Thomas Mann, 1889–1955*, trans. Richard Winston and Clara Winston (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 396. The name Hugo Triebsamen was derived from the names of two musicologists Schoenberg resented, Hugo Riemann and Walter Rubsamen. Mann responded to Schoenberg's article on 17 Feb. 1948. The affair escalated with the appearance of Schoenberg's indignant letter to the editors of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, published on 1 Jan. 1949, protesting Mann's appropriation of his intellectual property. A year later Schoenberg declared "an intermediate stage of neutrality," but Mann and Schoenberg, who had previously enjoyed friendly relations, never saw each other again. See *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 354–55, 278; and Thomas Mann's letter to Stuckenschmidt dated 19 Oct. 1951; quoted in Stuckenschmidt, 523.

42. See Thomas Mann, *The Story of a Novel: The Genesis of Dr. Faustus*, trans. Richard Winston and Clara Winston (New York: Knopf, 1961); the original German version was published in Amsterdam in 1949. Mann also took every opportunity to consult other musical émigrés, such as Stravinsky, Krenek, Toch, Eisler, Klemperer, and his old friend, Bruno Walter, on musical matters in his novel.

43. Marta Feuchtwanger, *An Emigre Life: Munich, Berlin, Sanary, Pacific Palisades*, interview by Lawrence Weschler (Los Angeles: Oral History Program University of California, 1976), 1068. Paul Pisk commented that Schoenberg was a puritan who could not understand such depravity. Pisk, interview, 23 Jan. 1975.

44. Adorno's original essay on Schoenberg was written in the early 1940s. In a letter to Rudolf Kolisch dated 18 June 1948, Adorno discusses his alterations of the text and his decision to write a "relatively negative" essay on Stravinsky, thereby expanding the work

to a book, which was published in Germany in 1949. Rudolf Kolisch Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

45. Mann, *Story of a Novel*, 103.
46. Schoenberg memo, dated Dec. 1950, Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna. See Jan Maegaard, "Schönberg hat Adorno nie leiden können," *Melos* 41 (Oct. 1974): 262–64. In the 1920s Schoenberg had asked Adorno to join him in writing a lexicon of notions of composition theory. Adorno had declined, claiming that he was no musician but a philosopher. It annoyed Schoenberg that Adorno, the "nonmusician," insisted on having his compositions analyzed by Schoenberg during the family's Sunday afternoon social gatherings in Brentwood, where Adorno also lived from 1941 to 1948.
47. Schoenberg to Josef Rufer, 5 Dec. 1949; quoted in Stuckenschmidt, 508. On 8 Feb. 1949 Schoenberg sent a postcard to Nicolas Slonimsky, whose *Thesaurus of Scales and Melodic Patterns* had been published in 1947: "I look[ed] through your whole book and was very interested to find that you might in all probability [have] organized every possible succession of tones. This is an admirable feat of mental gymnastic[s]. As a composer I must believe in inspiration rather than in mechanics." Slonimsky Collection, Music Division, Library of Congress.
48. Stuckenschmidt, 513.
49. Stuckenschmidt, 413.
50. Bertolt Brecht, *Journals*, ed. John Willet, trans. Hugo Rorrison (New York: Routledge, 1993), entry for 27 Apr. 1942.
51. Schoenberg Nono, 387. See also Brecht's entry for 29 July 1942, in *Journals*, and Eisler, interview by Hans Bunge, 5 May 1958, in *Hanns Eisler: A Miscellany*, ed. David Blake (Edinburgh: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1995), 413–15; Eisler, "Bertolt Brecht and Music" (1957), in *Hanns Eisler: A Rebel in Music*, ed. Manfred Grabs, trans. John Peet (Berlin: Seven Seas, 1978), 172–73.
52. Eisler, interview, in *Hanns Eisler: A Miscellany*, 414.
53. Brecht, 29 July 1942.
54. Schoenberg refused Lion Feuchtwanger's request to help Eisler after his grueling three-day interrogation and threatened prosecution by the House Un-American Activities Committee in September 1947. During the period of Eisler's subsequent arrest and deportation in March 1948, Schoenberg did not join in sponsoring the farewell concerts for him.
55. Arnold Schoenberg, "A Dangerous Game," *Modern Music* 22, no. 1 (Nov.–Dec. 1944): 3–5. As early as 1934 Schoenberg spoke publicly about his wish to abstain from politics: "I did not come in [sic] this marvelous country to speak from terrors, but only to forget them"; "Driven into Paradise," speech for a reception in Los Angeles, 9 Oct. 1934, quoted in Sabine Feisst, "Schoenberg and America," in *Schoenberg and His World*, ed. Walter Frisch (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 297.
56. Schoenberg to Rufer, 18 Dec. 1947, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 252.
57. Letter to Rufer, 25 May 1948, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 255.
58. Eisler, lecture for the Second International Congress of Composers and Music Critics in Prague, May 1948, in *Hanns Eisler: A Miscellany*, 160–61.

59. From Eisler's notes for his opera, *Dr. Faustus*, which Eisler completed the day Schoenberg died; in *Hanns Eisler: A Miscellany*, 255.
60. Letter to Emil Hertzka, autumn 1913, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 43.
61. The series of three lectures, which was held on Monday evenings in Hollywood, covered J. S. Bach's *Art of Fugue*, *The Well-Tempered Clavier*, and his own Third String Quartet. At \$250 for the series, these were too expensive for Peter Yates, who was teaching in a Civilian Conservation Corps camp in the San Bernardino mountains but at the same time learning everything he could about Schoenberg's activities and ideas. Spurred by this new interest he began his own study of *The Art of Fugue* and obtained Schoenberg's piano pieces, opp. 25 and 33, for Frances Mullen to learn. Yates, letter to Peyton Houston, 26 Mar. 1935, Peter Yates Collection, Special Collection, Mandeville Library, University of California, San Diego.
62. David Raksin, interview by author, 14 Jan. 1997, Van Nuys, Calif.
63. Gerald Strang, interview by William Weber, 22 July 1975, Special Collections, California State University, Long Beach.
64. Levant had come to Hollywood from New York in 1929 and worked sporadically for RKO as a songwriter in those years, making frequent trips back to New York for stage and concert engagements. His Nocturne was played on Schoenberg's program by the Works Progress Administration orchestra in 1937 and published in Henry Cowell's *New Music* orchestra series.
65. Rose Heylbut, "The Odyssey of Oscar Levant" [interview with Levant upon the publication of his first book, *A Smattering of Ignorance*], *Etude* (12 Dec. 1940): 316. In 1939 Levant facilitated Schoenberg's presentation for membership in the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers (ASCAP), which gathers performance royalties for its members.
66. Schoenberg's date book notes a single hour-long meeting on that date with Gershwin at 3 P.M. between lessons for Levant and Robin. In 1933 Gershwin had contributed student scholarship funds for study with Schoenberg at the Malkin Conservatory in Boston.
67. Quoted in Schoenberg Nono, 340. In 1938 Schoenberg wrote another tribute in a memorial book for Gershwin: "An artist is to me like an apple tree: When his time comes, whether he wants it or not, he bursts into bloom and starts to produce apples. And as an apple tree neither knows nor asks about the value experts of the market will attribute to its product, so a real composer does not ask whether his products will please the experts of serious arts. He only feels he has to say something: and says it. . . . [Gershwin] expressed musical ideas; and they were new—as is the way in which he expressed them." *George Gershwin*, ed. Merle Armitage (London and New York: Longman's, Green, 1938), 98.
68. David Raksin remembered that this took place on sound stage number seven, and that George Gershwin paid the musicians. Panel, "Schoenberg in Hollywood," Bard Music Festival, "Schoenberg and His World," 22 Aug. 1999. Schoenberg's date book has an entry for an appointment with Newman at United Artists' studio, Wednesday, 3 Jan. 1937, at 10 A.M. during the period when the Kolisch Quartet was performing programs of the late Beethoven quartets combined with the four Schoenberg quartets at Royce Hall, UCLA.

69. The concertmaster of Newman's Fox orchestra at this time was Schoenberg's friend the composer Joseph Achron.
70. Schoenberg was unable to attend the ceremony but sent his speech, in which he expressed a hope (similar to Eisler's) that "there will soon come a time, when the severe conditions and laws of modernistic music will be no hindrance any more toward a reconciliation with the necessities of the moving picture industry." Quoted in Frisch, *Schoenberg and His World*, 302.
71. *Cobweb*, Rosenman's second film score (after *East of Eden*) for MGM, in 1955. In 1947 Rosenman came to California from New York especially to study in a private class at Schoenberg's home. He was very critical of what he was taught, for he felt Schoenberg was teaching sixteenth-century counterpoint without using the rules as they were used in the sixteenth century. He found commuting to Brentwood from Hollywood difficult and soon dropped the class. Like others, Rosenman commented that "Schoenberg did not teach composition." Leonard Rosenman, interview by author, 25 Jan. 1997, Los Angeles; also at Bard Music Festival Symposium, "Schoenberg and His Legacy," Lincoln Center, New York, 20 Nov. 1999.
72. Rainger (who also spelled his name Ranger) studied in 1936–37; Robin studied for a longer period, 1936–39. In the Schoenberg date books Robin's first name is not given, but David Raksin and Leonard Stein assume this was the lyricist favored at Paramount by Ernst Lubitsch, who paired him with Ralph Rainger. (Leo Robin wrote the lyrics to the song "Thanks for the Memories.") In 1940 Schoenberg attended a performance of a work by Robin, possibly the result of lessons with Schoenberg.
73. Schoenberg's date books show that the first was an appointment at Paramount on 25 June 1936. Schoenberg canceled a March 1937 appointment at Paramount but may have kept a date at the studio a year later. With his European musical training and experience, Boris Morros was more aware than other studio music directors of Schoenberg's importance, and put out rumors or direct publicity about films Schoenberg was supposedly contracted to score. The composer George Antheil, who moved to Hollywood in late summer of 1936 and was himself scoring a Cecil B. DeMille picture at Paramount, wrote in "On the Hollywood Front," *Modern Music* 14, no. 2 (Jan.–Feb. 1937): 105–8, that "Schoenberg is engaged by Paramount to score *Souls at Sea*." The project, like others, never materialized.
74. Salka Viertel, *The Kindness of Strangers* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969), 207–8.
75. Rubsamen, 472.
76. Gertrud Schoenberg to Kolisch, 11 Jan. 1935 (a probable misdate), Rudolf Kolisch Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University. According to other reports the year was 1936.
77. Gertrud Schoenberg to Kolisch, 11 Jan. 1936; and Arnold Schoenberg to Alma Mahler-Werfel, 23 Jan. 1936, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 197.
78. In the Schönberg Archive at the Arnold Schönberg Center in Vienna. One page is reproduced in Rufer, *Das Werk Arnold Schönbergs*, facsimile 24.
79. Italics Schoenberg's. Alternatively, Schoenberg suggested Klemperec as musical director, with himself as musical advisor for the project, but the film was not made. Schoenberg to Charlotte Dieterle, 30 July 1936, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 198–99.

The Dieterles filed affidavits guaranteeing the finances of the Schoenbergs when they applied for U.S. citizenship in November 1935. Dieterle, who had been trained by Max Reinhardt, directed high-minded biographical films for Warner Brothers: *The Story of Louis Pasteur* (1936), *The Life of Emile Zola* (1936), and *Juarez* (1939). In 1939 he directed *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* for RKO, providing Charles Laughton with one of his strongest roles. Like Schoenberg, he published his criticism of the film industry in 1940 and was gradually dropped by the studios.

80. This essay is reprinted in *Style and Idea*, 153–60.

81. Letters from Arnold and Gertrud Schoenberg to Kolisch, 16 Jan. 1939; 21 Aug. 1943; 2 June 1950; Rudolf Kolisch Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

82. Erich Korngold's wife, Luzi, records that when the Schoenbergs and the Korngolds first saw each other at a social affair for the Philharmonic, Gertrud insisted they drop the familiar "du" they had all used in adolescence, in favor of the formal "Sie." In Vienna, Julius Korngold had introduced Schoenberg to the Kolisch family by recommending Rudolf Kolisch to him as a student. See Luzi Korngold, *Erich Wolfgang Korngold: Ein Lebensbild* (Vienna: Elisabeth Lafite, 1967), 69, 71.

83. Julius Korngold, *The Hollywood Musician*, Nov. 1946; quoted in Brendon Carroll, *The Last Prodigy: A Biography of Erich Wolfgang Korngold* (Portland, Ore.: Amadeus Press, 1997), 292.

84. Krenek, interview by Clare Rayner, Palm Springs, 11 Feb. 1975, Special Collections, California State University, Long Beach.

85. The Russian-born Louis Gruenberg had conducted the 1923 American premiere of *Pierrot lunaire* in New York. Schoenberg had become acquainted with Gruenberg when he was a student of Ferruccio Busoni in Berlin. In 1936, after Gruenberg's opera *The Emperor Jones*, based on the play by Eugene O'Neill, had been successfully produced at the Metropolitan Opera, he moved to California to compose for films, winning Oscars for at least two of his scores. (Schoenberg's date books record appointments with Gruenberg in 1937–38.) Edgar Varèse, who had also given important New York performances of Schoenberg's works in 1914 and 1925 and was living in Hollywood, came in 1938–39 for several afternoon appointments with Schoenberg and a dinner engagement. The Polish-born Joseph Achron had a distinguished career in Russia as a concert violinist until he immigrated to America in 1925. He moved to Hollywood in 1934, performed in studio orchestras, and continued his composing and concert careers. He premiered his Second and Third Violin Concertos with the Los Angeles Philharmonic in 1936 and 1939. Schoenberg formed a committee to promote Achron's compositions (with Gruenberg, Eisler, Toch, and Weiss) soon after Achron's premature death in 1943 at the age of fifty-seven.

86. Newlin, *Schoenberg Remembered*, 173–83.

87. Among them, Leonard Stein, Bard Music Festival Symposium, 20 Nov. 1999; also Leon Kirchner, in conversations with the author, Cambridge, Mass.

88. Schoenberg remark appended to a letter from Alfred Leonard, president of the Los Angeles Music Guild, 9 July 1945, in which the guild promotes the objective that "composers might be encouraged." Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna. In his essay "The Young and I" (1923), he made the same remark about his European teaching; in "The Blessing of the Dressing" (1948), on a similar theme, he adds two Americans, Gerald



Strang and Adolph Weiss, to his very short list of pupils who became composers. See *Style and Idea*, 386.

89. "The Blessing of the Dressing," 385.
90. Strang interview, 22 July 1975.
91. Jeff Goldberg, "John Cage Interviewed," *Transatlantic Review* (May 1970): 55–56; quoted in *Conversing with Cage*, ed. Richard Kostelanetz (New York: Limelight, 1988), 8–9. Cage first heard Schoenberg's music in Berlin in 1930 and subsequently began composing works with twenty-five-note rows. In 1931, while preparing a lecture on Schoenberg for Santa Monica housewives, he consulted the pianist Richard Buhlig, who ultimately "was more enthusiastic about my music than [the art collectors Galka Scheyer and Walter Arensberg] were about my painting." He studied composition for about a year with Buhlig (his *Sonata for Clarinet*, published by Peters, was composed during his study with Buhlig). Buhlig introduced him to Henry Cowell, who advised him to study with Schoenberg but in preparation to work with Schoenberg's first American pupil in Europe, Adolph Weiss. Weiss's tutelage in harmony (in New York in 1933) did not inspire Cage. His turn to percussion music was a way of freeing himself from harmony. John Cage, interview by author, Pomona College, Calif., 12 Dec. 1988.
92. Yates to Cage, 8 Aug. 1953, Cage Archive, Music Library, Northwestern University.
93. Bernice Abrahms Geiringer, interview by Andrea Castillo-Herreshoff, Santa Monica, Calif., 29 Nov. 1993, Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna. Mrs. Geiringer became a concert pianist. Karl Geiringer, the Viennese-born musicologist whom she married in 1987, began study with Schoenberg, but they did not like each other and came to a parting of the ways.
94. Pauline Alderman, *We Build a School of Music* (Los Angeles, privately printed, 1989), 125–33. An inaccuracy reports Schoenberg teaching at USC during the entire academic year of 1934–35, rather than 1935–36.
95. Alderman, *We Build a School of Music*, 84 and 113.
96. At the time, Schoenberg's royalties had shrunk to \$13, according to Maurice Zam, "How Schoenberg Came to UCLA," *JASI* 3, no. 2 (1979): 223. Schoenberg hoped to be able to earn a salary of around \$10,000. His UCLA salary increased over the years to \$5,400.
97. Pauline Alderman estimated a class of fifteen to twenty-five. She remembered the class analyzing string quartets, composing string quartet movements, and then assembling a composite class quartet, which was performed. Alderman, "I Remember Arnold Schoenberg," in *Facets* (Los Angeles: University of Southern California newsletter, 1976), 49–58.
98. Strang, interview, 22 July 1975.
99. Schoenberg to Engel, 27 Mar. 1938, Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna. In June Schoenberg warned his son-in-law away from Hollywood, saying that his earnings were presently "two-fifths of what I was earning about fifteen months ago." Letter to Felix Greissle, 7 June 1938, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 205.
100. "Plan for the organization of a Music Department MD [doctorate] at UCLA," dated 1 July 1937; quoted in Schoenberg Nono, 364.

101. Schoenberg to President Robert G. Sproul, 2 Oct. 1937, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 202–3.
102. Memos and letters concerning UCLA, Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna.
103. Among them the pianists Steuermann, Buhlig, and Olga Steeb, and the violinists Achron and Louis Kaufmann. Johanna Klemperer, the wife of Otto Klemperer, was among his choice of sopranos.
104. Schoenberg, memo, “Curriculum for Composers,” Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna.
105. Schoenberg, memo to Walter Rubsamen (5 Mar. 1941) discussing oral examinations in the music department; Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna.
106. Schoenberg, memo on requirements for a master’s degree at UCLA; Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna.
107. Documents, including a letter from Schoenberg to UCLA faculty colleagues, 14 Mar. 1940, in the Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna. There are lists of faculty and departments, a “Prospectus for Conferences on Esthetics” [sic], and a memo outlining Schoenberg’s purpose.
108. Strang, interview, 22 July 1975.
109. Schoenberg, “Why No Great American Music” (28 June 1934), in *Style and Idea*, 176.
110. Schoenberg, “Teaching and Modern Trends in Music,” in *Style and Idea*, 376.
111. “I have realized that the greatest difficulty for the students is to find out how they could compose without being inspired. . . . It seems to me the only way to help is if one shows that there are many possibilities of solving problems.” Schoenberg to Douglas Moore at Columbia University, 16 Apr. 1938; quoted by Stein, Bard Music Festival Symposium, 20 Nov. 1999.
112. See Leonard Stein, “Schoenberg’s Pupils,” foreword to *JASI* 8, no. 1 (1984): 3; Rosemary Hilmar, “Alban Berg’s Studies with Schoenberg,” *JASI* 8, no. 1 (1984): 8–9.
113. Stein, Bard Music Festival Symposium, 20 Nov. 1999. In another discussion on Schoenberg in Hollywood (Bard Music Festival, Bard College, 22 Aug. 1999), the image Stein quoted was “a fork and a knife.”
114. Stein, interview, 28 June 1975.
115. Schoenberg, “Eartraining through Composing” (1939), in *Style and Idea*, 379.
116. Schoenberg, “Encourage the Mediocre,” in *Music and Dance in California*, ed. José Rodríguez (Hollywood: Bureau of Musical Research, 1940), 9–13.
117. Stein, interview by author, Hollywood, Calif., 22 Jan. 1997.
118. Leon Kirchner, interview by author, 11 Apr. 1997.
119. Leon Kirchner, Bard Music Festival Symposium, Lincoln Center, New York, 20 Nov. 1999.
120. Schoenberg, “Teaching and Modern Trends in Music” (30 June 1938), in *Style and Idea*, 377.

121. Schoenberg, "Protest on Trademark," *New York Times*, 15 Jan. 1950; reprinted in Frisch, 307–8.
122. Dika Newlin, "Schoenberg in America, 1933–1948," *Music Survey* 1, no. 5 (1949): 131. In her student diary, on 11 Dec. 1940, Newlin recorded Schoenberg's saying about himself "that he can't teach twelve-tone writing at all. . . . He writes it instinctively and not theoretically, and could not help himself if he made a mistake, let alone helping someone else." Newlin, *Schoenberg Remembered*, 290.
123. Schoenberg to Krenek, 1–12 Dec. 1939, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 210.
124. Yates, papers on Lou Harrison, Peter Yates Collection, University of California, San Diego.
125. Lou Harrison, interview by Vivian Perlis, Aptos, Calif., 24 Mar. 1970, Oral History, American Music, Yale University.
126. Newlin, *Schoenberg Remembered*, 193. The date of her entry was 6 Mar. 1940.
127. Strang, interview, 22 July 1975.
128. Newlin, *Schoenberg Remembered*, 286, 2 Dec. 1940. The remark was made in connection with Schoenberg's preparations to conduct the volunteer orchestra of studio musicians in a reading of his tone poem *Pelleas und Melisande* on 22 December.
129. Stein, Bard Music Festival Symposium, 22 Nov. 1999. Further testimony to this aspect in Schoenberg's teaching is recorded by Lovina May Knight, "Classes With Schoenberg: January through June 1934," *JASI* 12, no. 2 (1989): 137–63.
130. Schoenberg, *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*, ed. Gerald Strang and Leonard Stein (London: Faber and Faber, rev. ed. 1983), 95.
131. Alderman, 49–58.
132. Gertrude S. Zeisl, *Eric Zeisl: His Life and Music* (Los Angeles: Oral History, University of California, 1959; interview by Malcolm S. Cole), 356. Zeisl wanted to study privately with Schoenberg in Los Angeles but felt he could not afford the fees. Zeisl's daughter Barbara later married Schoenberg's son Ronald.
133. The book resulted from the new class he developed to follow a course in "conventional" harmony teaching. Schoenberg, *Structural Functions of Harmony*, ed. Leonard Stein (New York: Norton, rev. ed. 1969), vii.
134. Schoenberg, "First California Broadcast, Fall 1934"; quoted in Frisch, 299.
135. Schoenberg to Kolisch, 12 Apr. 1949, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 270.
136. Schoenberg to Henry Allen Moe, 22 Feb. 1945, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 233.
137. Schoenberg to William Schlamm, 1 July 1945; quoted in Stuckenschmidt, 472.
138. Schoenberg to Oskar Kokoschka, 3 July 1946, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 242.
139. "Music and Morality," *The Composer's News-Record* 7–8 (Fall–Winter 1948–49); reprinted in Frisch, 306.
140. The full quote: "I was always an impassioned teacher. I have always felt the urge to find out what is most helpful to beginners, how to imbue them with a sense of the technical, intellectual and ethical prerequisites of our art; how to convey to them that there is such a thing as artistic morality and why one must never cease to cultivate it

and, conversely, to oppose as forcefully as possible anyone who commits an offense against it." Schoenberg to O. Partosh, accepting an appointment as Honorary President of the Israel Academy of Music, 26 Apr. 1951; quoted in Ringer, 245.

141. "I am not one of those who can teach . . . a number of effective tricks in a short time. I only teach the whole of the art." Schoenberg to Leonard Meyer, 5 Dec. 1940, Arnold Schoenberg Collection, Library of Congress.

142. Schoenberg Nono, interview, 21 Feb. 1977.

143. Schoenberg letter applying to Henry Moe for a Guggenheim fellowship, 22 Jan. 1945, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 231. In his original negotiations with the university, Schoenberg was apparently not fully aware of the basis of his pension.

144. Schoenberg Nono, interview, 21 Feb. 1977.

145. Schoenberg to Leopold Stokowski, 2 July 1945; quoted in Leonard Stein, "Stokowski and the *Gurrelieder* Fanfare: Further Correspondence," *JASI* 3, no. 2 (1979): 220.

146. Schoenberg Nono, interview, 21 Feb. 1977.

147. Schoenberg wrote to the *New York Times* critic Olin Downes (in a remarkable letter expressing his fury at Downes's dismissive remarks about Mahler's Seventh Symphony) that he himself always depended on his "personal gusto" to support his own judgment. Letter to Downes, Dec. 1948, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 260. His health problems included failing eyesight, asthma, heart disease, possible kidney disease, and diabetes, which brought on dizziness and fainting spells. See Richard Hoffman, "Schoenberg est vivant," *JASI* 1, no. 2 (1977): 65–67; Richard Hoffman was Gertrude Schoenberg's young relative (and Arnold Schoenberg's last private pupil) from New Zealand; he helped with Schoenberg's care from 1947 to 1951.

148. "I had the feeling as if I had fallen into an ocean of boiling water. . . . I have perhaps only one merit: I never give up. . . . These were not bad men who felt this way—though, of course I never understood what I had done to them to make them as malicious, as furious, as cursing, as aggressive." Schoenberg's recorded message to the National Institute of Arts and Letters, 22 May 1947, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 245.

149. Virgil Thomson, "Historic Remarks," *New York Herald Tribune*, 1 June 1947. Two years later, on 11 Sep. 1949 in the *Herald Tribune*, Thomson took up Schoenberg's angry comments (in a series of four Los Angeles broadcasts in celebration of his seventy-fifth birthday) about the "suppression" of his works by conductors. He quoted Schoenberg's remarks: "You cannot change the natural evolution of the arts by a command; . . . you cannot force real artists to descend to the lowest possible standard . . . to avoid presentation of new ideas. Even Stalin cannot succeed and Aaron Copland even less." This statement was a misjudgment on Schoenberg's part, provoked perhaps by Eisler's recent deportation by the Justice Department, and certainly by Stalin's demand that music be simple. Also festering beneath this comment was Schoenberg's long-held opinion that Nadia Boulanger's "reactionary" teaching—which had long influenced so many Americans beginning with Copland—was so harmful to American music that the damage would take a generation of teaching to repair. See Schoenberg correspondence in Ennulat, 259–71; also Schoenberg to G. F. Stegmann, 26 Jan. 1949, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 267; also "The Blessing of the Dressing," 385–86, and "A Text from the Third Millennium," in Stuckenschmidt, 548, in which Schoenberg refers to "Budia Nalanger."

150. Lawrence Morton to Virgil Thomson, 15 June 1947, Morton Collection, Charles E. Young Research Library Special Collections, University of California, Los Angeles.
151. Lawrence Morton, "Music," *Arts and Architecture*, Jan. 1950. Morton went on in this article to give his own analysis of Schoenberg's rhythm. Schoenberg wrote him politely that the article was very pleasant and satisfied him that Morton was a musician with unusually thorough knowledge, but that he had never occupied himself with the question of rhythm in the manner Morton's analysis suggested. Schoenberg to Morton, 15 Feb. 1950, Morton Collection, University of California, Los Angeles. In addition to the premiere of the *Phantasy*, the ISCM program also included the String Trio, the *Ode to Napoleon*, and early songs, and the mayor of Los Angeles sent a letter of recognition and congratulation to Schoenberg. The "Roof" program included *Pierrot lunaire* (in English), the Second String Quartet, *Verklärte Nacht*, and a piano arrangement of the Monn Cello Concerto.
152. *Los Angeles Times*, 20 Sep. 1949.
153. Harold Byrns, born in Hanover in 1903, studied at the Berlin Hochschule and the Stern Conservatory and served as an assistant at the Berlin Staatsoper before taking conducting positions in several German cities. He emigrated in 1936.
154. Schoenberg, "Erst nach dem Tode anerkannt werden," 16 Sep. 1949, Peter Yates Collection, University of California, San Diego. On the back of the copy sent to Peter Yates, Schoenberg expressed his appreciation for Yates's two "excellent" articles in the *New York Times* and *Art and Architecture*.
155. Schoenberg to Hans Rosbaud, 12 May 1947, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 243.
156. Stein, interview, 22 Jan. 1997.
157. Adorno to Kolisch, 18 June 1948, Rudolf Kolisch Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University.
158. Albert Goldberg, "The Sounding Board," *Los Angeles Times*, 24 Apr. 1949.
159. Milton Babbitt, "Celebrate Speech" (1974), in *JASI* 1, no. 1 (1976): 10. Babbitt added, "I then did not know and still do not know whether she was admonishing me or ministering to me." Babbitt was instrumental in interpreting Schoenberg's work in mathematical terms to Americans. Bryan R. Simms writes that Babbitt "looks for an explanation of musical forms within the elements and operations of the system itself, rather than within traditional music." Simms, "Schoenberg: The Analyst and the Analyzed," in *The Arnold Schoenberg Companion*, ed. Walter Bailey (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1998), 244.
160. "My Evolution" (Schoenberg's last public lecture, presented on 29 Nov. 1949 at UCLA), in *Style and Idea*, 91–92. In the summer of 1949 Schoenberg had been invited to teach at Darmstadt but was recovering from pneumonia and was unable to travel. In his stead, Leibowitz taught a course on twelve-tone composition, using Schoenberg's works.
161. Schoenberg, "On revient toujours" (1948), in *Style and Idea*, 109.
162. Schoenberg to Rufer, 25 May 1948, *Arnold Schoenberg Letters*, 255.
163. Schoenberg's text is a fervently personal prayer: "Who am I that I should believe my / Prayer a necessity? . . . Yet I pray because I do not want to lose / The sublime feeling

of unity, / Of union with you. / Oh you, my Lord, your mercy has granted us / Our prayer, as a bond, / A sublime bond between us. As a / Bliss that gives us more than any fulfillment." Translation from Pierre Boulez, cond., (Sony Classical, S2K44571). Schönberg: *Das Chorwerk*, with the BBC Orchestra, Singers, and Chorus. Although the text was completed, the music remained a fragment; Rudolf Kolisch transcribed it into full score. It ends as the chorus sings, "Yet I pray. . . ."

164. Schoenberg, "My Evolution," in *Style and Idea*, 86.

165. Albert Goldberg, "The Transplanted Composer," *Los Angeles Times*, 14 May 1950.