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ABSTRACT

Max Neuhaus (1939–2009) was a pioneer in the creation of site-specific auditory works entailing social interaction, and today he is recognized as one of the first artists to extend sound as a medium into the world of contemporary art. The pieces he produced between 1966 and his recent death have been dubbed “sound art,” a term that covers a wide variety of work related to sound and aural perception, but one associated more closely with the realm of visual and performance art than with music. Yet Neuhaus, whose self-professed mission was to encourage listeners to “think about [sounds] in new and unexpected ways,” entered the world of contemporary art only after passing through the musical avant-garde of the 1960s, where he served as a leading interpreter of works for percussion. This thesis chronicles Neuhaus’s early career as a performing musician, arguing that his experiences within the musical avant-garde set the stage for his later work as a sound artist. Special attention is paid to the 1968 recording Electronics & Percussion: Five Realizations by Max Neuhaus, an LP that reveals Neuhaus as an artist exploring the boundaries separating the roles of performer, collaborator, and creator.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Max Neuhaus (1939–2009) was a pioneer in the creation of site-specific auditory works entailing social interaction, and today he is recognized as one of the first artists to extend sound as a medium into the world of contemporary art. The pieces he produced between 1966 and his recent death have been dubbed “sound art,” a term that covers a wide variety of work related to sound and aural perception, yet one associated more closely with the realm of visual and performance art than with music.¹ Problematically, however, this label implicitly excludes what many might consider to be the oldest of the “sound arts,” namely music. This categorical distinction appears to have shaped Neuhaus’s posthumous reception. He is celebrated today among the ranks of contemporary artists, not contemporary composers, and the bulk of the scholarship concerning his work has been produced by art critics and historians, not musicologists. Yet Neuhaus, whose self-professed mission was to encourage listeners to “think about [sounds] in new and unexpected ways,” entered the world of contemporary art only after passing through the musical avant-garde of the 1960s.² As a participant in that scene, he served as a leading interpreter of works for percussion and collaborated with the period’s most experimental composers.

These experiences played a formative role in his development as a sound artist, yet they have been largely ignored by scholars to date. Addressing this gap in the literature, this thesis argues that Neuhaus’s career in sound art emerged fluidly from his earlier work as a

¹ For a general reference work, see Alan Licht, Sound Art: Beyond Music, Between Categories, (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 2007). Critics and historians have assigned a variety of labels to Neuhaus and his methods, a few of which include: sound artist (John-Paul Stonard, Alan Licht), aural artist (Bruce Weber), environmental composer (John Rockwell), sound environmentalist (Kostelanetz), composer (New York Times), sound sculptor (Hugh Davies, John Rockwell) and audio artist (David Toop).

percussionist and musical collaborator within the rich and dynamic environment of the 1960s avant-garde. From a broad standpoint, this thesis aspires to enrich our awareness of the complex relationship between performers and composers of new music during Neuhaus’s life. Neuhaus was not the only experimental virtuoso who challenged the role of a performer, but he was one of very few who transitioned into a different artistic milieu and made a new reputation for himself. In addressing that subject, this thesis also aims to draws attention to unexamined links between the social worlds of music and visual art during the 1960s.

Following a literature review in the present chapter, chapter 2 will provide previously undocumented information about Neuhaus’s childhood and activities as a young musician, as well as a detailed timeline of his performance history. It draws heavily upon formerly unexamined primary sources, including archival correspondence, concert programs, and reviews from the Max Neuhaus Papers at Columbia University and the John Cage Papers at Northwestern University. Interviews were also conducted with members of Neuhaus’s family and his musical collaborators Joseph Byrd, Philip Corner, Malcolm Goldstein, and Jan Williams. These sources, especially the interviews, help to establish a timeline of his early career and to explain how Neuhaus earned a reputation among his peers as a leading interpreter of avant-garde percussion music.

Neuhaus’s 1968 recording *Electronics & Percussion: Five Realizations by Max Neuhaus*, examined in chapter 3, demonstrates his close interaction with the most influential composers of his time, including John Cage, Morton Feldman, and Karlheinz Stockhausen. This album, recorded at a pivotal point in his career, reveals Neuhaus as an artist exploring the boundaries that separate the roles of performer, collaborator, and creator. From the start, those distinctions were complicated by the album’s repertoire, with its emphasis on indeterminacy and
improvisation. Yet Neuhaus assumed a degree of creative agency in realizing these compositions that at times undermined the authority of the music’s composers. In assessing his work on the album, this chapter sets the stage for chapter four and considers how Neuhaus’s collaborative experiences prepared him for his subsequent career in sound art.

Chapter 4 examines Neuhaus’s earliest efforts in the field of sound art against the backdrop of Cage’s artistic philosophy, a framework of thought already established when Neuhaus began conceptualizing and creating these sound projects. In a telling quote, he reflected on the influence of Cage and other musical forebears:

As a percussionist I had been directly involved in the gradual insertion of everyday sound into the concert hall, from Russolo through Varèse and finally to Cage where live street sounds were brought directly into the hall. I saw these activities as a way of giving aesthetic credence to these sounds – something I was all for. I began to question the effectiveness of the methods, though. Most members of the audience seemed more impressed with the scandal than with the sounds, and few were able to carry the experience over into an appreciation of these sounds in their daily lives.  

Late in his life, Neuhaus divided his entire oeuvre, including his musical performances, into eight categories called “vectors:” performances, places, walks, inventions, networks, moments, passages, and sensations. For example, his broadcast works, such as Public Supply, were redefined as “networks” and his installations, such as Times Square, were redefined as “place works.” While chapters 2 and 3 focus on his performance career, chapter 4 focuses on his other vectors, such as walks, networks, places, and sensations.

Before addressing sources of information concerned specifically with Max Neuhaus, it is helpful to consider how the term “sound art” has been construed in academic literature and

---

5 Ibid.
popular media in recent decades. Today, as the medium of sound has come to the fore in many art installations, “sound art” is studied as a distinct field in academia. Yet the term remains shrouded in semantic ambiguity, a point acknowledged by Alan Licht in his book *Sound Art: Beyond Music, Between Categories*.⁶

By the mid-1960s sound had become an important influence on visual artists, but its roots in modernist art extend back much further, as demonstrated by the work of the Futurists, among others.⁷ The groundbreaking influence of John Cage and the Fluxus movement during the 1950s and early 1960s led to the creation of interdisciplinary initiatives, often rooted in unconventional techniques and notation. With these new movements came new ways of experiencing and interacting with art, both sonic and visual. Many musicians affiliated with the postwar avant-garde were open to using noises and everyday sounds, including the inaudible, in their practice. They sought to rethink the nature of musical sound and the meaning it could engender, and they were concerned with the impact of an audience on both.⁸

One of the important outcomes of these blended disciplines was “sound art,” and Licht describes three types:

1. An installed sound environment that is defined by the space (and/or acoustic space) rather than time and can be exhibited as a visual artwork should be.
2. A visual artwork that also has a sound-producing function, such as a sound sculpture.
3. Sound by visual artists that serve as an extension of the artist’s particular aesthetic, generally expressed in other media.⁹

---

⁶ Licht, 16. Organizations today have different definitions of the term, compounding the problem. In some cases, “sound art” is used in a manner unrelated to art installations and the like. For example, the Sound Art Foundation, founded by the composer William Hellermann and based in New York City, is an organization that seems to focus solely on promoting upcoming experimental and contemporary music concerts. Sound Art LA is an organization with a completely different mission, a program that strives to help minorities to learn about music.

⁷ Licht, 135.


⁹ Licht, 16–17.
A comparison of Licht’s terminology with that of another scholar, Simon Shaw-Miller, demonstrates the semantic difficulties associated with these genres of art. In rough accordance with Licht’s second category of sound art, Simon Shaw-Miller defines sound sculpture as the “sonic exploration of objects.” Yet when writing about the “sonic exploration of spaces and environment”—a pursuit seemingly in step with Licht’s first category of sound art, and one in keeping with Neuhaus’s late practice—Shaw-Miller uses the term “ambient music.”¹⁰ Much of Neuhaus’s late work therefore constitutes a type of sound art for Licht, a type of music for Shaw-Miller.

Artists have also commented on the difference between sound art and music. For example, Annea Lockwood suggests that sound art can refer to pieces made using electroacoustic resources intended to be presented in a gallery, museum, or other place where sound is perceived as a medium, without the cultural associations of the work “music”; similarly, a composition commissioned for a performance would not necessarily be considered “sound art” because the associated concepts are too different. She includes sound installations within the category of sound art.¹¹

During the second half of the twentieth century, some visual artists faced constraints in displaying their art in museums, whether for aesthetic or political reasons. As a result, many artists displayed their work outside of the museum or gallery, and in some cases outdoors, thereby raising questions about the authority of museums and the relationship of space to the perception of artworks.¹² Just as many artists associated with sound art explored their medium outside of the gallery or museum, some musicians began to perform their works outside of the

---

¹¹ Licht, 10.
¹² Artists associated with site specificity include Robert Smithson, Walter De Maria, Richard Serra, and many more.
concert hall. Among many others, these figures include John Cage, Karlheinz Stockhausen, Henry Brant, Pauline Oliveros, and, of course, Max Neuhaus.

The existing literature on Neuhaus has largely been the product of art critics and art historians. It includes exhibition catalogues, newspaper art reviews, statements by fellow artists, and one master’s thesis in the field of art history. These sources focus almost exclusively on his work as a sound artist, giving little attention to his career as a percussionist. A smaller amount of material on Neuhaus has appeared in music-oriented publications; these texts include performance reviews and the liner notes to recordings. In most cases, however, they are very brief and do not offer much substantive information.13

Dasha Dekleva’s master’s thesis in art history, titled “Max Neuhaus: Sound Vectors,” provides a wonderful overview of Neuhaus’s sound-art works and does not disregard Neuhaus’s musical career.14 Dekleva discusses Neuhaus’s transition away from his percussion career and makes reference to trends in twentieth-century experimental music, but neglects to provide a detailed and precise account of his concert days. The present project aims to address questions that lie beyond the scope of Dekleva’s thesis, questions that include the following: What works did Neuhaus perform and where did he perform them? With whom did he perform and collaborate? How did these experiences affect his transition into the sound art world? This project relies heavily on other primary source documents, including interviews, correspondence, and newspaper reviews and it aims to give a detailed timeline of Neuhaus’s performance career and an analysis of his pivotal LP of 1968. This thesis is oriented toward music history rather than

---

13 Many primary source documents, such as Neuhaus’s personal essays and artistic statements on his sound works, have been published. Letters from Neuhaus to John Cage are also available at The John Cage Collection at Northwestern University in Evanston, IL. Other primary documents are owned by the Max Neuhaus Estate and housed at Columbia University and the Dia Foundation in Beacon, New York.
art criticism, and it focuses primarily on Neuhaus’s performance career of the 1960s, while Deklava examines the entire oeuvre as it existed at the time of Neuhaus’s death.

Secondary musical sources pertaining to Max Neuhaus are few compared to those in art criticism. In his book *All American Music*, the music critic John Rockwell included a chapter called “Environmental Composers and Ambient Music.” Neuhaus, the focus of this chapter, is depicted by Rockwell as an experimentalist who had his music performed outside of the concert hall. Rockwell briefly discusses his works *Water Whistle*, *Radio Net*, *Times Square*, and others. Rockwell compares Neuhaus to Charlie Morrow, Maryanne Amacher, Christo, Liz Phillips, and Brian Eno while discussing trends of the 1960s and 1970s.

Brandon LaBelle devoted an entire chapter to Max Neuhaus and his site-specific sound works in the book *Background Noise: Perspectives on Sound Art*. This chapter, which makes specific reference to the works *Drive-In Music* and *Public Supply*, addresses Neuhaus’s concerns with listening and his thoughts about the public audience for his work. LaBelle suggests that Neuhaus’s transition into the sound art world was influenced by his interaction with Cage and shaped by his concerns with the extra-musical dimension of postwar avant-garde works. Although relevant to the present thesis, LaBelle’s work also neglects to provide much information regarding Neuhaus’s performance career.¹⁵

In the April 1977 volume of *The Musical Quarterly*, Christopher Ballantine gave a brief account of Neuhaus’s *Telephone Access* (1968) and *Public Supply* (1966), drawing attention to the role of audience participation in these works and highlighting the role of electronic media.

---

(especially the radio) in creating these new social possibilities. Decades later, Maja Trochimczyk addressed Neuhaus’s *Listen* series in the Winter 2001 volume of *Computer Music Journal*. She described these performance “walks” as pieces that transformed musical creations into “theatrical actions or acoustic explorations” that erased the division between performer and audience just as they eliminated the need for traditional notation. Moreover, these walks replaced the standard model of a concert piece with an unrepeatable process, allowing for a new understanding of what music could be, as well a broader understanding of its social context.

Although brief, the observations of Ballantine and Trochimczyk are descriptive of Neuhaus’s early works of sound art, as are the other sources discussed. Nevertheless, they provide little information about his percussion career. Neuhaus’s influential “second career” as a sound artist has been studied by scholars, yet no in depth research on his “first career” as a percussionist has been published. My project aims to fill this scholarly void.

---


CHAPTER 2: MAX NEUHAUS AS PERFORMER

Max Neuhaus was born on August 9, 1939 in Beaumont, Texas. He was named after his father, who was of German descent and born in Schulenburg, Texas in 1908. His father went to Rice University and later MIT, earning degrees in chemical engineering from both schools. Most members of Neuhaus’s paternal family were highly educated at various universities in science, engineering, or architecture. Neuhaus’s mother, Harriet Ocker, was born in Cleveland in 1911 and grew up in Troy, New York. Harriet came from a farming family that was very musical. She was an amateur pianist with perfect pitch.\(^1\) Neuhaus’s parents were living in Port Arthur, Texas while his father worked for the Texas Company (Texaco) when Neuhaus was born.\(^2\) His older sister of four years, Laura Neuhaus Hansen, described him as a “purposeful child” who liked sounds and percussive noises. Even as a toddler he took to banging on pots and anything he could get his hands on, demolishing his play pen, but his family noted that he always kept a repetitive rhythm or perfect beat when banging away.\(^3\)

When Neuhaus was just a few years old, the family moved to Pleasantville, New York. During sixth grade he was allowed to pick an instrument in school and wanted to play drums. In figure 2-1, a pre-adolescent Neuhaus is seen playing the drums. He saved up his money by setting bowling pins in a neighboring town, and with the help of his parents he soon got a drum set and later started a band.

---

\(^1\) Laura Hansen interviewed by Megan Murph, Cashiers, NC, June 11, 2012.
\(^2\) “Background” from the Max Neuhaus Estate Website, http://www.max-neuhaus.info/soundworks/vectors/performance/background (accessed September 20, 2012). Neuhaus noted it was interesting how his mother insisted on working in the neighboring town of Beaumont because Port Arthur was too small and dirty. He commented: “Little did she know that Bob Rauschenberg and Janis Joplin had been and would be born, respectively, back in Port Arthur.”
\(^3\) Laura Hansen interview.
During his first two years of high school, Neuhaus became fascinated by the acclaimed American jazz drummer and bandleader Gene Krupa (1909–1973) and particularly his drumming for the Benny Goodman recording of *Sing Sing Sing*. Neuhaus believed a drummer’s role in a big band like Krupa’s was important because the drummer was vital in “building the rhythmic framework the rest of the band rides on.” Inspired to become a famous jazz drummer, he auditioned and began taking weekly lessons in New York City from Krupa. Unfortunately Neuhaus was too nervous to even make it through his lessons. He recalled: “It turned out that I was too in awe of him to learn anything. For me, it was like sitting next to a god. All I could do was stare at him.”

---

4 Photograph courtesy of Laura Hansen.
5 “Background” from the Max Neuhaus Estate Website.
6 Ibid.
Eventually Neuhaus had to leave Krupa’s studio to start studying with another teacher, the black musician, Samuel “Sticks” Evans. Neuhaus turned out to be the only white student of Evans, and he had to be escorted by another student from the subway to Evans’s Harlem studio. Neuhaus later credited Evans for teaching him fine control and hand strength. \(^7\)

During these years Neuhaus also formed jazz bands with his teenage friends. These ensembles included his Blue Notes Orchestra, a group that performed at various events around town. A newspaper clipping from Pleasantville, New York titled “Sleuthing the Shops,” housed in the Max Neuhaus files at Columbia University, states:

> Beat out that rhythm on the drum! In an era when youth is constantly being criticized (and sometimes rightfully so) we are most happy to report real creative activity on the part of at least one talented young man…seventeen-year old Max Neuhaus, and also the members of his “Blue Notes Orchestra”…a group of teen-agers who are available for engagements to enliven any occasion that requires rhythm and good musicianship…Max has studied under the renowned Gene Krupa…The “Blue Notes Orchestra” is made up of seven talented young men, all intensely interested in making good, rhythmic music…\(^8\)

When asked about this clipping, Laura Hansen suggested Neuhaus could not have been seventeen years old because he would have been in Houston at that age; rather, he was probably fourteen or fifteen. The photographs in figure 2-2 show Neuhaus at the drums. Laura Hansen suggests it might be from the Blue Notes Orchestra initiatives, since he was in more formal clothing. The photograph in figure 2-3 also represents a headshot Neuhaus created for publicity purposes. The Jefferson Chemical Company, for which Neuhaus’s father was vice-president and director of research, moved their corporate headquarters from New York to Houston, and in 1955 the Neuhaus family followed the company to Texas. During the same year, Neuhaus’s father

---

\(^7\) Ibid. Samuel “Sticks” Evans (1924–1994) was a drummer, percussionist, teacher, arranger, and director who recorded with jazz, blues, and R&B musicians during the 1950s and 1960s. Such musicians include: Milt Buckner, Ornette Coleman, Bill Evans, Curtis Jones, Aretha Franklin, and others.

\(^8\) “Sleuthing the Shops,” Max Neuhaus Papers, box 5, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, New York, New York. Permission from Laura Hansen.
died from cancer. Neuhaus spent the last two years of high school in Houston at Lamar High School, still drumming and leading various jazz bands until he graduated in 1957.9

Figure 2-2. Neuhaus at drums, c. 1954.10

After high school graduation, Neuhaus wanted to play jazz, but his family insisted he go to college. They compromised by letting him enroll at the Manhattan School of Music, where he would pursue bachelor’s and master’s degrees in music, concentrating in percussion performance.11 At first Neuhaus struggled in school; he still wanted to be a jazz musician, and he viewed his conservatory education as a gesture meant only to satisfy his family. Later, however, he started to discover more areas within music.12

---

9 Laura Hansen interview.
11 “Background” from the Max Neuhaus Estate Website. Neuhaus stated that his family wanted him to go to Juilliard, but he felt Juilliard only produced orchestral musicians. He only wanted to go to Manhattan because Paul Price conducted the percussion ensemble.
12 Ibid.
Figure 2-3. Neuhaus headshot, c. 1955.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} Photograph courtesy of Laura Hansen.
Neuhaus began studying percussion with Paul Price and regularly performed with a variety of ensembles under his direction: the school’s percussion ensemble, Paul Price’s Percussion Ensemble, and the Paul Price Percussion Quartet. The percussion ensembles at the conservatory performed new music regularly, often premiering works by composers such as Lou Harrison, Henry Cowell, and others. Although Neuhaus entered the school in 1957, evidence suggest his first concert did not occur until March 17, 1959. His mother received an invitation to that concert and a dinner with a note attached:

Mr. Price tells me that Max has taken great steps forward these past few weeks. He finds that he is working wonderfully well—and has become completely reliable! He thinks he’ll turn out to be one of our best percussionists. He’ll be performing in this concert—wish you could hear it!14

The note to his mother suggests Neuhaus struggled during his early time at the school, which may have been why he did not begin performing until his fourth semester. Clearly, he improved greatly over the course of these semesters. Neuhaus began taking music much more seriously, even studying piano to acquire basic keyboard skills, as seen in the figure 2-4. The works performed on the March 17, 1959 concert were Malloy Miller’s Prelude for Percussion, Lou Harrison’s Canticle No. 3, Arthur Cohn’s Quotations in Percussion, Michael Colgrass’s Three Brothers, and Béla Bartók’s Sontata for Two Pianos and Percussion.15

The programs kept in the Max Neuhaus Papers at Columbia University show that Neuhaus was included in at least sixteen performances while studying at the Manhattan School of Music. He might have been included in other concerts, but from these particular performance programs we know Neuhaus was included in dozens of world, USA, and NYC premieres.

---

14 Postcard to Harriet Neuhaus, signed with the initials “J.C.W” in the Max Neuhaus Papers, box 5, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, New York, New York.
15 Ibid.
Table 2-1 provides a list of premieres Neuhaus participated in during his student years, while Appendix A contains an exhaustive list of Neuhaus’s student performances. The program of the January 16, 1961 concert was not available; therefore, concert reviews were used to obtain information included in the list. This appendix helps reveal Paul Price’s tendency to recycle repertoire from term to term as well as his habit of taking his students around the city or region in order to have them perform off campus. Neuhaus was involved with Price’s advanced quartet in collaborative performances involving the Pearl Lang Dance Company, Erick Hawkins

Figure 2-4. Neuhaus at the piano, c. 1957.  

16 Max Neuhaus Papers, box 5, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, New York, New York. Permission from Laura Hansen. A review of this concert was included in Time Magazine on March 30, 1959.  
Figure 2-5. Neuhaus with drum sticks, c. 1958-62. ¹⁸

¹⁸ Photograph courtesy of Laura Hansen.
Table 2-1. List of premiered works Neuhaus performed while at Manhattan School of Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World Premieres</th>
<th>USA/NYC Premieres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALLOY MILLER: Prelude for Percussion</td>
<td>FRANK BENCRISCUTTO: Rondeau for Percussion (NYC premiere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR COHN: Quotations in Percussion</td>
<td>JAMES SUTCLIFFE: Two Pictures for Percussion (NYC Premiere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL COLGRASS: Three Brothers</td>
<td>KEISUKE AJIRO: Three short dances (USA Premiere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARDNER READ: Los Dioses Aztecas</td>
<td>JOSE ARDEVOL: Suite (NYC Premiere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAPEY: Soliloquy (“To Be or Not to Be” – Shakespeare) for Narrator, String Quartet and Percussion</td>
<td>WALTER ANSLINGER: Suite for Percussion (NYC Premiere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAL SCHAEFER: Paramax for Percussion</td>
<td>HENRY COWELL: Vocalise (NYC Premiere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEISUKE AJIRO: Sextet No. 1</td>
<td>LOU HARRISON: Canticle No. 1 (NYC Premiere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL ROSENBERG: Two Moods for Percussion Quartet</td>
<td>LOU HARRISON: Labyrinth No. 3 (NYC Premiere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT MOEVES: Concerto for Pianoforte, Orchestra, and Percussion</td>
<td>ROBERT KELLY: Toccata for Marimba and Percussion (NYC Premiere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOU HARRISON: Concerto for the Violin with Percussion Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLAS FLAGELLO: Divertimento for Piano and Percussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and Dance Company, Andrew Heath with the Connecticut Symphony Orchestra, and Anahid Ajemian. He also participated in other ensembles unaffiliated with the Manhattan School of Music. On April 26, 1961 Neuhaus performed Carlos Franci’s *Concerto for Vibraphone and Orchestra* with the Manhattan School of Music Repertoire Orchestra for his Master’s recital.19

The percussion students at the Manhattan School of Music had the opportunity to meet many of the composers of the works being performed during workshops or rehearsals. Neuhaus specifically stated that he met Lou Harrison, Harry Partch (although we do not see any Partch works included in the programs available), and many others in this manner. Furthermore, his network began to expand beyond those composers whose works were performed by his school

---

19 “Background” from the Max Neuhaus Estate Website. At some point during his final term at Manhattan School of Music, which may or may not have been affiliated with master’s degree recital requirements, Neuhaus performed Karlheinz Stockhausen’s *Zyklus.*
ensembles. For example, he recalled meeting John Cage in 1958 and later meeting Morton Feldman and Earle Brown. It was during these years that Neuhaus claimed to have abandoned his wish to be a famous jazz drummer. He realized that experimental works existed for solo percussion, and he was determined to perform them.\(^{20}\)

Jan Williams recalled that younger percussionists at the Manhattan School of Music looked up to Neuhaus because he was “so committed to improving his playing and to learning new pieces.” Neuhaus was “constantly looking for new solo pieces to play” and was committed to playing them well:

Figure 2-6. Neuhaus rehearsing, c. 1962-64.\(^{21}\)

\(^{20}\) Ibid. It was during the same years when Cage began lecturing more on musical concepts and the theatrical avant-garde was on the rise that Neuhaus gained interest in experimentalism.

\(^{21}\) Max Neuhaus Papers, box 5, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, New York, New York. Permission from Laura Hansen. This photograph was probably taken just as Neuhaus was graduating or just after. He is in his early to mid-twenties and, based on instrumental setup, he appears to be rehearsing Zyklus.
I remember he would practice several hours every day, working on pieces. He even sprained his wrist working on a single passage from Milhaud’s *Sonatina for Marimba and Vibraphone* for five hours straight. He was almost manic in his practicing, working non-stop until he was satisfied.\(^{22}\)

Neuhaus graduated from the Manhattan School of Music in May 1962. Following graduation he attended the Darmstadt International Summer Courses for New Music from July 7–20, 1962. Teaching that year were Pierre Boulez, György Ligeti, Henri Pousseur, Karlheinz Stockhausen, Bruno Maderna, Stefan Wolpe, and many others. Neuhaus was able to attend lectures and rehearsals, interacting with these composers as well as other performers. We can surmise that he attended Stockhausen’s composition and interpretation course while at Darmstadt, for he performed in a concert given by the students of Stockhausen’s class. In this particular evening performance, which occurred on July 17, 1962, Neuhaus performed in Makoto Shinohara’s *Extrait de Alternance pour percussion*. This is the first performance seen in Appendix B, outlining Neuhaus’s professional percussion career. His repertoire list may be seen in table 2-2.\(^{23}\)

At Darmstadt, Neuhaus probably had the opportunity to speak with Stockhausen about *Zyklus for Percussion*, and it is likely that he performed the work for the composer. Several months after the summer courses, he toured with Stockhausen, and his performance of *Zyklus* was one of two renditions of the piece included on Stockhausen’s LP *Zyklus for Percussion and Klavierstück X*. This album also included an interpretation of *Zyklus* by Christoph Caskel, who had premiered the work at Darmstadt in 1959, as well as Frederic Rzewski’s interpretation of *Klavierstück X*.\(^{24}\)

\(^{22}\) Jan Williams interviewed by Megan Murph, Skype, November 19, 2012.


\(^{24}\) Karlheinz Stockhausen, *Zyklus for Percussion and Klavierstück X*, Mace MXX 9091 LP, 1960-1964. The album includes Christoph Caskel’s recording of *Zyklus* from October 1960 at WDR, Cologne; Max Neuhaus’s recording of *Zyklus* from February 1963 at Wergo Records, New York; and Frederic Rzewski’s recording of *Klavierstück X* from December 1964 at Tonstudio Airola, Berlin.
TABLE 2-2. NEUHAUS REPETOIRE LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOLO</th>
<th>ENSEMBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROWN: <em>Four Systems</em></td>
<td>BYRD: <em>Density II</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSSOTTI: <em>Sette fogli: Coeur–Positively Yes</em></td>
<td>CACIOPPO: <em>Time on Time in Miracles</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYRD: <em>Water Music</em></td>
<td>CAGE: <em>Atlas Eclipticalis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAGE: 27' 10.554''</td>
<td>CAGE: <em>Winter Music</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAGE: <em>Fontana Mix–Feed</em></td>
<td>HIGGINS: <em>Danger Music</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP CORNER: <em>Everything Max Has</em></td>
<td>KAGEL: <em>Transición II</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLO FRANCI: Concerto for Vibraphone and Orchestra</td>
<td>SATIE: <em>Vexations</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELDMAN: <em>Piano Piece 1952</em></td>
<td>SHINOHARA: <em>Extrait de Alternance pour percussion</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELDMAN: <em>King of Denmark</em></td>
<td>STOCKHAUSEN: <em>Refrain</em> for Three Players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES: Sonata for Three Non-chromatic Kettle Drums (1947)</td>
<td>STOCKHAUSEN: <em>Kontakte</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILHAUD: Concerto for Marimba and Vibraphone</td>
<td>STOCKHAUSEN: <em>Originale</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAN: <em>Ceremony</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NILSSON: <em>Reaktionen</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMAN HAUBENSTOCK-RAMATI: <em>Liasons</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKHAUSEN: <em>Zyklus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNEY: <em>Maximusic</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD THOMAS: piece derived from Stockhausen’s <em>Plus–Minus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Zyklus* became a staple of Neuhaus’s repertory; his sister, Laura, recalls his 1963 performance of the piece in Providence, Rhode Island: “It was truly an amazing piece of choreography. Arms flying, he was everywhere at once in a circular dance of sound.”

---

25 Laura Hansen interview.
Immediately following his time at Darmstadt, Neuhaus also had the opportunity to tour with the Pierre Boulez Contemporary Chamber Ensemble.\textsuperscript{26} Between his visit to Darmstadt, his tour with Pierre Boulez, and his recording sessions of February 1963, Neuhaus spent much time practicing and becoming involved with other initiatives in contemporary music. For example, on August 15, 1962, he was involved in the Fluxus Festival of New Music, showing his growing interest in American experimentalism.

During the fall of 1963, a series of six new music concerts at Judson Hall and three concerts at the Pocket Theater were presented by experimental musicians in order to raise money for the Foundation for Contemporary Performance Art.\textsuperscript{27} Neuhaus performed in two of these concerts, the first of which on August 26\textsuperscript{th} at the Pocket Theater. At this concert he premiered Joseph Byrd’s \textit{Water Music}, a piece for percussion and electronic tape dedicated to Neuhaus.\textsuperscript{28}

Joseph Byrd (b. 1937) is an American composer who studied with John Cage and got involved with Fluxus after he moved to New York City in 1959. His first Carnegie Hall composition recital was given in 1962 while he was working as a staff arranger for Capitol Records. Perhaps through mutual acquaintances or through participation in Fluxus events, Neuhaus eventually met Byrd in 1963. Byrd recalled: “It was Max who approached me. He was, as you know, doubtless, intense, articulate, and ambitious. I was all those myself, and we got along very well.”\textsuperscript{29}

Neuhaus had just bought a new set of cowbells, perhaps for \textit{Zyklus} performances, and asked Byrd to compose a work for percussion that would include these cowbells. Byrd recalled going to Neuhaus’s studio apartment to work on the electronic tape recording because Neuhaus

\textsuperscript{29} Joseph Byrd email correspondence with Megan Murph, July 21, 2012.
had a stereo Nagra reel-to-reel recorder, the percussion instruments, and other equipment in his apartment. The electronic tape was made by recording sounds from each of the instruments Neuhaus wanted to feature: cowbells, marimba, and gongs. These recordings were then slowed to half speed and collaged to fit a set time frame. The score is divided into three separate sections, with one of the instruments assigned to each section and characterized as follows: Section A/A1 “rumble” (gongs), Section B “tinkles” (marimba), Section C “clanks” (cowbells).30

During the beginning of August 1963, Byrd moved to California enroll in the music program at UCLA; as a result, he never had a chance to hear Neuhaus perform the work or to discuss any of the percussionist’s technical or musical concerns. For example, Byrd recalls composing a high C-sharp for the marimba, a note that does not actually exist on the instrument: “There's something curious about it: I wrote a high C-sharp for marimba, which turns out not to be on the instrument. I don't know how I could have made such an error, or why Max didn't tell me, or what he did instead, but I left for LA that summer, and it’s likely I just dropped off score and tape and we never had a chance to discuss it.”31

The original electronic tape from Water Music is housed at the Max Neuhaus Estate and has not been made available to the public. Alan Zimmerman, a percussionist from New York, recently commissioned Byrd to recreate the electronic tape and had a high C-sharp added to his instrument to perform and record the work. Just as Byrd did for the Neuhaus tape creation, he took sounds from each of the instruments Zimmerman was going to use, then collaged and slowed them down to half speed. Byrd claims Zimmerman’s reconstruction of Water Music is “easily the best performance of my early work” because the Neuhaus WBAI recording has

---

30 Joseph Byrd, Water Music held in Box 1, Folder 43, The Joseph Byrd Musical Works and Papers Collection, 64, Music Library Special Collections, University of California, Los Angeles. The original score says the duration of the piece should be 8:30-9:00 minutes, but Joseph Byrd wrote over with the time 12:30 minutes.
31 Joseph Byrd correspondence.
timing errors.\textsuperscript{32} Neuhaus’s performance is thirty seconds shorter than the score prescribes and has many other timing discrepancies, which may be seen in Table 2-3. Neuhaus took breaks before each section instead of allowing for tape breaks within each section during his performance. It is interesting to compare Neuhaus’s recording to Zimmerman’s recording, which was reconstructed nearly fifty years later. Zimmerman’s recording is true to the score’s indications and has a bright, crisp sound due to the use of recent technology, while the recording quality of Neuhaus’s performance is not true to the score’s indications and does not have such a polished sound.

\textbf{TABLE 2-3. TIMING DISCREPANCIES IN WATER MUSIC}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SCORE INDICATIONS</th>
<th>NEUHAUS’S TIMINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>A. “Rumble:” Tape and Gongs</td>
<td>A. “Rumble:” Tape and Gongs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>A1. Tape and Gongs (until 4:00)</td>
<td>A1. Tape and Gongs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>Tape breaks for 30 seconds while gong continues</td>
<td>Tape and Gong break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>B. “Tinkles:” Tape and Marimba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>B. “Tinkles:” Tape and Marimba</td>
<td>Tape and Marimba break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>Tape and Marimba break</td>
<td>B. “Tinkles:” Tape and Marimba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Tape and Marimba enter</td>
<td>Tape and Marimba break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. “Clanks:” Cowbells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tape and Cowbells break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:53</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tape and Cowbells enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>C. “Clanks:” Cowbells</td>
<td>Tape and Cowbells break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:14</td>
<td>Tape and Cowbells enter</td>
<td>Tape and Cowbells enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tape and Cowbells break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tape and Cowbells enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:53</td>
<td></td>
<td>End.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>End.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid. The author obtained the Zimmerman recording directly from Alan Zimmerman.
As the score notes suggest, texture is the most important consideration in *Water Music*. The piece is not virtuosic, but focuses on the blending of *concrète* sounds with live percussion sounds. Ross Parmenter reviewed the premiere of the work, dwelling on the sensitivity of Neuhaus’s performance:

Neuhaus reproduced, as the title suggests, the sounds of water. One heard waves roar and whitecaps rush in, in addition to fountains playing. The human and the nonhuman sounds were closely integrated, and it ended quietly with pleasant sounds tapped out on Swiss almglocken, which from the viewpoint of the spectator look like golden clam shells of various sizes.33

Also included in the August 26, 1963 performance at Pocket Theater was Byrd’s *Density II*, directed by Philip Corner. The performance featured Neuhaus on marimba along with Malcolm Goldstein on violin, Arthur Layzer on clarinet, and La Monte Young on soprano saxophone.34

The following month, on September 9, 1963, Neuhaus was included in the final concert of the series. This now-famous concert consisted of Erik Satie’s *Vexations*, a work that consists of thirty nine bars, but was played for twelve hours straight.35

Through his collaboration with Byrd, Neuhaus exerted considerable influence over the conception and realization of *Water Music*, foreshadowing what would become a theme of his later career. Through Byrd Neuhaus also initiated relationships with Malcolm Goldstein (b. 1936) and Philip Corner (b. 1933), both composers and performers affiliated with Judson Dance Theater and other avant-garde initiatives from the 1960s. When he spoke of collaborating with Neuhaus, Goldstein remarked on the tremendous reputation Neuhaus had earned within only a year of his graduation: “Max was the percussionist, such a fantastic percussionist in New York City in the 1960s… and he was the only percussionist, so if you needed a percussionist, you got

33 Parmenter, n.p.  
34 Ibid. Philip Corner’s *High Contrast* and Malcolm Goldstein’s *Ludlow Blues* were performed during the concert along with James Tenney’s *Ergodos II*.  
35 Ibid.
him.”36 The Tone Roads Ensemble, which was founded by Goldstein, Corner, and James Tenney, was a prominent chamber ensemble of this period that focused on twentieth-century American compositions. On December 20, 1963 Neuhaus was included in the Tone Roads performance of Charles Ives’ *Over the Pavements.*37 Over the next few years, Neuhaus would continue to collaborate with these musicians.

At the St. Sulpice Library in Montreal, Stockhausen, David Tudor, and Neuhaus gave a concert on January 28, 1964. All the works performed were by Stockhausen: Neuhaus performed *Zyklus,* David Tudor performed *Klavierstücke VII and VIII,* and the three musicians together performed *Refrain.*38 Following the Montreal concert, Neuhaus performed *Zyklus* again at the University Museum in Philadelphia on February 18, 1964, once more sharing a bill with Tudor and Stockhausen.39 It is interesting that Neuhaus performed alongside Tudor, a musician whose career reveals striking parallels to that of Neuhaus. Both rose to fame within the postwar avant-garde for their dedication to new music, and both would later step beyond the role of performer in order to create their own works through the use of electronics. Tudor also premiered Brown’s *Four Systems,* a work that Neuhaus later performed and recorded frequently.

Neuhaus was involved in two concerts that were protested by activists calling themselves Action Against Cultural Imperialism (AACI). On April 29, 1964 Neuhaus, along with Stockhausen and David Tudor, performed works by Stockhausen, Paul Hindemith, Hans Werner Henze, and others in a concert sponsored by the West German government at the Town Hall on West 43rd Street in New York. Outside the hall marched a group of protestors, including the artist-theorists and leaders of Fluxus, Henry Flynt and George Maciunas, who held signs bearing

---
36 Malcolm Goldstein phone interview.
37 Philip Corner correspondence.
slogans such as “Death to all fascist musical ideas.” Flynt also distributed a brochure that accused Stockhausen of bowing down to West German authorities in order to climb the social ladder.  

Later that year, on September 8–13, another protest took place at the first performance of Stockhausen’s theater piece *Originale*, which was the featured attraction at Charlotte Moorman’s Second Annual Avant-Garde Festival, held at the Judson Hall. The performance was directed by Allan Kaprow and included Neuhaus, Moorman, Allen Ginsberg, Dick Higgins, Nam June Paik, James Tenney, Alvin Lucier, Jackson Mac Low, as well as birds, dogs, fish, and a chimpanzee. The performers were to improvise together and perform various works by Stockhausen while poetry was recited and other activities were acted out. This time, the protest was accompanied by a brochure entitled “Stockhausen: Patrician ‘Theorist’ of White Supremacy: Go to Hell!” Ginsberg actually participated in the performance inside the hall as well as the AACI protest outside of the hall, which Flynt disliked greatly. Moorman claimed she joined in the protest as well. She felt that since Fluxus was picketing their performance “against Stockhausen,” she would “anti-picket the pickets.” Because many of the performers were also associated with Fluxus or participated in the protest themselves, the audience was confused about who was performing and who was protesting. Many thought the protest outside of the hall was supposed to be a part of the performance. At both AACI protests, Neuhaus was a part of the performance. He had a good professional relationship with Stockhausen and many of the other musicians, but he also had an interest in the American avant-garde, having participated in Fluxus events prior. Several years later, on a single sheet of paper, Neuhaus wrote: “I refuse to join the rat race and

---

41 Ibid, 141.
42 Ibid, 65.
make cultural fast food.” By participating in such events, he was ostensibly not making fast food, rather creating unique artistic experiences that would challenge fellow artists, listeners, critics, and scholars alike.

Between these performances protested by AACI, Neuhaus gave his first solo recital at Carnegie Hall on June 2, 1964. Featured was Bo Nilsson’s Reaktionen, Stockhausen’s Zyklus, Earle Brown’s Four Systems, and John Cage’s 27’10.554”. For each of these works, Neuhaus chose to incorporate a new element or determine aspects of the piece in some way. During Reaktionen, a piece composed in 1961 for up to four amplified percussionists in canon, Neuhaus had a previously recorded realization of the same piece played back during performance. This is unusual because the score requires each percussionist to begin at one of the four pages of the score, repeating the entire complex again until the performance’s duration reaches ten minutes. If at the ten minute mark a performer has not arrived at the end of the structure, he continues playing until he reaches the end. Neuhaus recorded himself to form an ensemble instead of including other musicians on the concert, thereby modifying aspects of Nilsson’s design. Following Reaktionen was the virtuosic Zyklus and then Four Systems, which Neuhaus performed with amplified cymbals, a standard way in which he would perform the work for several years. Zyklus and Four Systems, both of which require the performer to determine aspects of the composition during performance, will be discussed in full detail in chapter 3. Finally, Neuhaus ended with John Cage’s 27’10.554” of 1956, the first major work composed for solo

---

43 Max Neuhaus Papers, Box 5, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, New York, New York. This is among several writings in which Neuhaus reflects on the art world in general, probably in brainstorming for one of his essays.

44 Three reviews of this concert exist: William Bender, “Percussion Solo and a Matter of Choice,” N.Y. Herald Tribune (June 3, 1964); Malcolm Goldstein, “Neuhaus Realizations,” Village Voice (June 18, 1964); and Theodore Strongin, “Concert is Given By Percussionist: Neuhaus Rubs, Tickle and Pats Variety of Instruments,” New York Times (June 3, 1964). The Strongin review does not mention the Nilsson piece. The Bender review suggests there were two recordings being played back during the performance to create a “fugue,” while the Golstein review suggests there was only one recording made to be played back during performance.

percussion.\textsuperscript{46} The numbers in the title indicate the duration of the performance, while the score requires four general materials to be used during the performance: wood, metal, skin and a fourth that the performer chooses. Neuhaus chose to use a radio. This provided interesting fragments of sounds from election night debates and discussions occurring during the evening of the concert.\textsuperscript{47}

During the 1965 ONCE Festival held in Ann Arbor, Michigan, Neuhaus was a featured soloist and chamber musician. On February 12, 1965 he performed George Cacioppo’s \textit{Time on Time in Miracles} with the ONCE Chamber Ensemble, which was conducted by Robert Ashley.\textsuperscript{48} A photograph of Neuhaus performing Joseph Byrd’s \textit{Water Music} appears in the liner notes of the box set \textit{Music from the ONCE Festival 1961-1966}, suggesting Neuhaus also performed \textit{Water Music} at some point during the festival that year.

The day prior to the Cacioppo performance, Neuhaus performed Philip Corner’s \textit{Everything Max Has}. This piece encourages the audience to interpret the setting up or taking down of instruments for a performance as an actual component of the work at hand. It was inspired by Neuhaus’s prodigious assembly and disassembly of his concert equipment, which Corner saw as an artistic task within itself. Corner recalled:

\begin{quote}
As usual, [Neuhaus] had a whole stage full of instruments. For several pieces. No doubt Feldman’s \textit{King of Denmark} and maybe \textit{Zyklus}…If not everything he had, then a lot…He always complained about not getting to the after-concert parties. So I made it so he could. One has to pack up as fast and efficient as possible.\textsuperscript{49}
\end{quote}

The score requires a large number of instruments, particularly for a percussionist, to be set up or taken down as efficiently and quickly as possible. If the instruments are being dismantled, the work is considered an “Afterward” and may not have any artificial factors such as amplification.

\textsuperscript{46} James Pritchett, \textit{The Music of John Cage} (Cambridge University Press, 1993), 102. As Pritchett notes, this piece belongs to the composer’s “Ten Thousand Things” series.

\textsuperscript{47} Theodore Strongin,“Concert is Given By Percussionist: Neuhaus Rubs, Tickles and Pats Variety of Instruments.”


\textsuperscript{49} Philip Corner, interviewed by Megan Murph, via email, August 7, 2012.
If the instruments are being reassembled, the work is considered a “Beforehand.” The performance may include both the beforehand, the afterward, and/or an intermission. Depending on whether or not it is Neuhaus performing, the title of the piece may even be changed. Neuhaus’s ONCE Festival performance, entitled *Everything Max Has: as an “Afterward,”* included the disassembly and removal of all of his instruments, which normally took between two and three hours, in under eighteen minutes.

In 1965 Neuhaus was named a Young Concert Artist, allowing for the foundation to provide him with management services, publicity materials, and promotion. This gave Neuhaus networking opportunities and assistance in developing a national and international percussion career. According to the 1965 biographical statement he provided to Young Concert Artists, Inc., Neuhaus received a grant from the Martha Baird Rockefeller fund to support his use of electronic components as an artistic medium, and he received an Artist-in-Residence award at the University of Chicago in conjunction with a Rockefeller Foundation grant (1964-65). These grants financially assisted his recording projects and incorporation of electronics into live performances.

Over the course of three days in 1965, Neuhaus presented a series of events as part of a broader program. Within this program were two performances: “Part I” at Judson Church and “Part II” at Carnegie Hall. The multifaceted event revolved around Corner’s *Everything Max Has.* It included a “Beforehand,” which began at his home in Chicago on March 20, 1965 at 7:00 pm upon the packing of his instruments; an “Intermission,” which occurred between the Judson and Carnegie performances; and an “Afterwards,” which ended at his home in Chicago on March 23, 1965 upon the unpacking of his instruments. The “Intermission” was accompanied by a tape

Philip Corner, *Everything Max Has with Beforehand or Afterward,* Frog Peak Music.

Young Concert Artists Biography of Max Neuhaus, held at the Young Concert Artists, Inc., New York City. Document is available by request.
Neuhaus created called *Super Z*, discussed further below. Table 2-4 displays Neuhaus’s itinerary for the broad program. The public was welcomed to follow as much as the itinerary as it wished, particularly the concerts, assemblies, disassemblies, and the intermission.

**TABLE 2-4. ITINERARY OF MARCH 20-23 PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sat., March 20</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>Begin “Beforehand,” pack instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun., March 21</td>
<td>7:00 am</td>
<td>Load instruments onto truck (1100lbs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Truck arrives at O’Hare Field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:45 pm</td>
<td>Arrival of instruments on AA Flight 708, Kennedy Airport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:45 pm</td>
<td>Arrival of Max Neuhaus on AA Flight 80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>Load truck at AA Air Freight Terminal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
<td>Arrive to Judson Church, unlock truck and set-up instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 pm</td>
<td>Performance of Part I at Judson Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., March 22</td>
<td>7:45 am</td>
<td>Truck arrives at Carnegie Recital Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>Set-up and rehearse at Carnegie. (8am-11am tape played).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>Clear stage for another function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td>Reset stage for concert. (5pm-8pm tape played).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 pm</td>
<td>Performance of Part II at Carnegie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 pm</td>
<td>Begin “Afterwards.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues., March 23</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Load instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>Truck departs for Kennedy Airport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part I of the program occurred at Judson Church on March 21, 1965 with Neuhaus performing Haubenstock-Ramati’s *Liaisons*, Feldman’s *Piano Piece 1952*, and Byrd’s *Water Music*. For Feldman’s *Piano Piece 1952* he used the interior of the piano to pluck the strings instead of using the keyboard, departing from standard performance practice for the work. Also

---

52 “Max Neuhaus in a Concert of Contemporary Music,” Judson Memorial Church, New York City, March 21, 1965. Author obtained a copy of program from Philip Corner.

53 Ibid.

54 Theodore Strongin, “Artist Realizes Taped Music and Plays Piano from Inside,” *The New York Times* (March 23, 1965). Since Neuhaus performed this work inside the piano for the Carnegie performance, it is likely he performed it the same way for Judson.
on the program was a version of Corner’s *Everything Max Has* involving two gongs and a rubber ball, as well as a Jackson Mac Low piece in which the performer is directed to use a passage of text “in any way.” The Mac Low piece included a tape realized at the University of Illinois Experimental Studio by Neuhaus entitled “*Listen*” (*noun*), an interpretation of Mac Low’s directions. Neuhaus ended his Judson Church performance with the most important piece of his repertory, Stockhausen’s *Zyklus*, and then began the “Intermission.”

Part II of the program occurred at Carnegie Recital Hall on March 22, 1965, which was Neuhaus’s second solo Carnegie performance of his career. He performed Cage’s *27’10.554*; Morton Feldman’s *Piano Piece (to Philip Guston)*, for which Neuhaus again played the interior of the piano instead of the keyboard; Cage’s *Fontana Mix–Feed*; Sylvano Bussotti’s *Coeur* for percussion (No. 2 from *Sette fogli*)–*Positively Yes*; and Robert Moran’s *Ceremony*. It is interesting to note how Neuhaus’s role as performer continued to evolve from his first Carnegie solo recital to his second. He created renditions or realizations of many of these works, like his performance of *Ceremony*, which used a combination of electronic tape and live sounds. He even gave additional titles to some works to better express these realizations. For example, *Fontana Mix—Feed* is the name Neuhaus assigned to his combined realization of Cage’s piece *Fontana Mix* and his own work *Feed*, while “*Positively Yes*” is the name he gave to his interpretation of *Coeur* for percussion, both of which works will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3.

---

55 “Max Neuhaus in a Concert of Contemporary Music.”
It is highly probable Neuhaus was also involved in the Chicago Contemporary Chamber Player’s Tribute Concert to Edgard Varèse, which was held just a few days later at Carnegie Hall on March 24, 1965. Neuhaus is not mentioned in the concert review, but the review is housed in box 5 of the Max Neuhaus Collection at Columbia University along with many other reviews and programs. Neuhaus’s itinerary from the Judson/Carnegie solo recitals suggests his instruments were loaded and sent back to Chicago, but it does not mention Neuhaus’s flying back. Even if he had not physically performed with the group at Carnegie, he might have been active in their rehearsals. At the time of the Varèse concert, he was still affiliated with the University of Chicago Contemporary Chamber Players, having just spent a season performing with them while in residence at the University.58 Upon the end of his residency, Neuhaus returned to Chicago to give a solo recital on April 13, 1965 at the university’s recital hall. The concert consisted of Byrd’s Water Music, Roman Haubenstock-Ramati’s Liaisons, Stockhausen’s Zyklus, Cage’s 27’10.554”, and Cage’s Fontana Mix—Feed.59

During the following months, Young Concert Artists, Inc. supported Neuhaus’s solo concert tour of Europe; this followed his performance in the chamber music series at the summer Spoleto Festival.60 A few concert reviews from The New York Times concerning the 1965 Spoleto Festival are housed in Box 5 of the Neuhaus files at Columbia, but only one briefly mentions Neuhaus in regards to transporting his equipment to Europe:

Something of a curiosity at the festival is an intense young American named Max Neuhaus, known as a percussion soloist. He arrived in Spoleto after a trip across Europe punctuated by frequent arguments with customs officials who could be persuaded only with difficulty into believing that young Mr. Neuhaus actually needed to carry with him a full ton of percussion instruments.61

60 Young Concert Artists Biography of Max Neuhaus.
61 “Poets Applauded at Spoleto Fête,” special to New York Times (June 27, 1965).
This quote offers a glimpse into the daunting logistical difficulties Neuhaus’s tour entailed.\footnote{Philip Corner remembered how Neuhaus would jokingly remark that he gave up performing because he was tired of hauling around his equipment. There may have been an element of truth to this joke.}

Based upon his letters to John Cage, we know that Neuhaus performed and recorded in Europe for several months during the fall and winter of 1965, just after his participation at Spoleto. In a letter to Cage on April 9, 1965, Neuhaus provided a timeline of upcoming European performances, which included a “definite concert in Köln” during October 1965.\footnote{Max Neuhaus to John Cage, April 9, 1965, John Cage Collection, Northwestern University Music Library.} During the same month he recorded Brown’s \textit{Four Systems}, Stockhausen’s \textit{Zyklus}, and Cage’s \textit{Fontana Mix: Feed} at the Westdeutscher Rundfunk Studios in Cologne.\footnote{Max Neuhaus, \textit{Fontana Mix – Feed (Six Realizations of John Cage)}, Alga Marghen CD, 2003.} In the same letter to Cage, he mentions “a possible radio concert with Sudwestfunk” in Baden-Baden sometime during November of 1965.\footnote{Max Neuhaus to John Cage, April 9, 1965} Neuhaus made another recording during that month on November 2, 1965, this time at the BBC Studios in London; he recorded Feldman’s \textit{King of Denmark} and Cage’s 27’10.554”.\footnote{Max Neuhaus, \textit{The New York School: Nine Realizations of Cage, Feldman, and Brown}, Alga Marghen CD, 2004.} He also recorded his realization of Cage’s \textit{Fontana Mix} during a solo recital at the University of Madrid on November 27, 1965.\footnote{Max Neuhaus to John Cage, November 18, 1965, John Cage Collection, Northwestern University Music Library.} In a letter to Cage dated November 18, 1965 from Barcelona, Neuhaus described meeting George Brecht while he was in Rome during the weeks prior. He indicated his need for financial support, listing everyone he had contacted for funding perhaps as a means of indirectly asking Cage for advice or help.\footnote{Max Neuhaus, \textit{Fontana Mix – Feed (Six Realizations of John Cage)}. It is unknown what other works were performed on the recital.} At some point during his stay in Madrid, he participated in the Zaj Festival, performing \textit{Zyklus}. Neuhaus also mentioned in his April 9\textsuperscript{th} letter to Cage plans of giving a performance in collaboration with

\textsuperscript{62} Philip Corner remembered how Neuhaus would jokingly remark that he gave up performing because he was tired of hauling around his equipment. There may have been an element of truth to this joke.\
\textsuperscript{63} Max Neuhaus to John Cage, April 9, 1965, John Cage Collection, Northwestern University Music Library.\
\textsuperscript{64} Max Neuhaus, \textit{Fontana Mix – Feed (Six Realizations of John Cage)}, Alga Marghen CD, 2003.\
\textsuperscript{65} Max Neuhaus to John Cage, April 9, 1965.\
\textsuperscript{66} Max Neuhaus, \textit{The New York School: Nine Realizations of Cage, Feldman, and Brown}, Alga Marghen CD, 2004.\
\textsuperscript{67} Max Neuhaus, \textit{Fontana Mix – Feed (Six Realizations of John Cage)}. It is unknown what other works were performed on the recital.\
\textsuperscript{68} Max Neuhaus to John Cage, November 18, 1965, John Cage Collection, Northwestern University Music Library.
the San Francisco Tape Music Center upon his return to America in January 1966. Whether each of the planned concerts Neuhaus referred to in his correspondence with Cage actually transpired is unknown.

When Neuhaus returned to America, he was only involved with a few performances. On September 13, 1966 he performed with James Tenney and Jackson Mac Low at the Town Hall. According to a review by Theodore Strongin, the program consisted of predominately electronic experimental music, for which Neuhaus built a machine he called “Bi-Products.” This machine allowed for audience members to be able to take home “bits of paper tape with electronic drawings on them generated by the sounds of the concert.” Strongin continues in saying “but the machine was not working properly, and the drawings – like the sounds – faded away quickly.” On December 1, 1966 Neuhaus appeared in the Hartt Chamber Players’s Carnegie Hall recital where he gave a solo performance Feldman’s King of Denmark and his “Feed” score to Cage’s Fontana Mix. On New Year’s Eve, December 31, 1966, Neuhaus performed his realization of Cage’s Fontana Mix again at the Mall in Central Park. During the performance, the audience burst out singing “Auld Lange Syne” just as “Feed” reached its climax, “the voices drowning out the screeching amplifiers.” According to Thomas P. F. Hoving, Parks Commissioner and later Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the concert was held to

---

69 Max Neuhaus to John Cage, April 9, 1965.
70 James Tenney had just composed a piece dedicated to Neuhaus entitled Maximusic a few months prior, on June 16, 1965. It would not be surprising if Neuhaus performed or met with Tenney about this work at some point during this year.
71 In the Appendix A of Dasha Dekleva’s thesis, a list of Neuhaus’s sound works is provided. In the list, this work is spelled “By-Product.”
73 Ibid.
“show New Yorkers that there were other places besides Times Square where they could greet the New Year in.”

It was more than a year later when Neuhaus returned to the stage for a final solo recital at Carnegie Hall on January 8, 1968, a concert he entitled “Three Hours of Sound Construction.” Although no program was given out during the performance, the title suggests this concert consisted of sounds constructed by Neuhaus, possibly on equipment he had to finagle or even design in some way, allowing us to view him as the performer as well as the composer. According to reviews, Neuhaus’s concert started two and a half hours late because of technical difficulties in setting up his equipment, which consisted of a projector and a fourteen-speaker system. Despite these complications, the audience seemed interested and engaged in Neuhaus’s approach, some even standing back stage to watch him take down the equipment after the concert’s conclusion.

Months later, Neuhaus performed in Dick Higgin’s *Danger Music* on May 9, 1968. This performance was a part of the Tone Roads series and was organized by Goldstein, who remembers: “He performed in a realization of Dick Higgin’s *Danger Music*, where Alison Knowles cut off all of Max’s hair to baldness and I went berserk—I organized the program and a lot of the audience left.” Philip Corner also commented: “[Malcolm] was not so happy about that [Max’s hair being cut off]. I think there have been some photos floating around—but maybe

---

76 During the two years prior to his final Carnegie solo recital, Neuhaus focused on sound experiments and the creation of independent artworks, all of which will be discussed in chapter 4. These works include the *Listen* series (1966–76), *Public Supply* series (1966–70), *American Can* (1966–67), *By-Product* (1966–67), *Fan Music* (1967), and *Drive-in Music* (1967–68).
77 His Max-Feed machine had just been produced the following year with MassArt, which will be discussed more in chapter 3.
79 Perhaps this was out of curiosity or the audience remembering his extensions of Corner’s *Everything Max Has* with “Beforehand” and “Afterwards.”
80 Malcolm Goldstein phone interview.
only of when Alison K. shaved Dick Higgins.” Neuhaus was also involved in a film by Phill Niblock (b. 1933) entitled *Max* (1966–68). This film, which was edited by David Gearey, is an “image collage film/portrait of Max Neuhaus, with a collage sound track by Max Neuhaus.” The soundtrack uses “a mixture of sounds from *Super Z* (four simultaneous versions of Stockhausen’s *Zyklus*) and *Max-Feed*.” It is highly probable *Super Z* was the tape used in the “Intermission” of Neuhaus’s programs of March 1965; there it was called *Super 2*, more than likely a typo.

In 1968 Neuhaus began working on his Columbia Masterworks project produced by David Behrman, *Electronics & Percussion: Five Realizations by Max Neuhaus*, which will be the sole topic of chapter 3. Although many see Neuhaus’s Columbia LP as his last output as a performing percussionist, in reality his final gesture occurred in 1971 with the publication of his *Graded Exercise Readings for Four Mallets*. This book, which was one of the first exercise books published for four mallets, provides 128 exercises divided by level of difficulty into four groups of thirty-two exercises. Jan Williams described it in these terms:

> This book was very unique. He calculated mathematically just how far the mallets could be spread in each hand and proceeded to create a progressive method to develop these techniques. Ingenious, really. I think Max had the idea to do the book after struggling to develop his own four-mallet technique, so he went through the process of learning it himself before writing the book. He worked a long time on that. Of course Paul Price had the publishing company (Music for Percussion, Inc), and published Max’s book and many pieces by his students. At that point I was teaching in Buffalo and used his book in my teaching.

---

81 Philip Corner email interview.
82 Phill Niblock is a composer, filmmaker and current director of Experimental Intermedia. He lived in New York City during the same time as Neuhaus and was in acquaintance with many of the same musicians and artists.
84 Max Neuhaus, *Graded Reading Exercises for Four Mallets* (New York: Music For Percussion, Inc., 1971). The publication now owned by Colla Voce Music, Inc. of Indianapolis, IN.
85 Interview with Jan Williams.
Neuhaus must have created these exercises based on the challenges he himself faced in performing technically challenging music, as there is no indication that he ever taught percussion techniques to students.

Although Neuhaus performed an array of contemporary music, many of the compositions he recorded were becoming standard works for percussionists during this time. This was the case of 27’10.554”, first major work written for solo percussion, followed by Stockhausen’s Zyklus (1959) and Feldman’s King of Denmark (1964).\textsuperscript{86} Not only was Neuhaus among the first percussionists of the era to successfully study, rehearse, perform, and record these pieces, but he was an interpreter of the works. Incorporating his own innovations in each of his realizations, he put his stamp on these famous compositions just as they began to enter the percussion repertory. In some instances he even served as the music’s inspiration, such as in Byrd’s Water Music and Corner’s Everything Max Has. But perhaps the most striking feature of Neuhaus’s early career was his participation in the most prominent concerts, events, and festivals of his time. Goldstein’s aforementioned remark on his friend’s importance to the world of avant-garde music during the 1960s speaks volumes: “Max was the percussionist… so if you needed a percussionist, you got him.”\textsuperscript{87}

\textsuperscript{86} Steven Schick, \textit{The Percussionist’s Art: Same Bed, Different Dreams} (University of Rochester Press, 2006), 141. Schick discusses the standard repertoire for percussion music and points out that “for years a set-up for \textit{Zyklus} was kept in a special practice room in the percussion department at the University of Illinois.”

\textsuperscript{87} Malcolm Goldstein phone interview.
CHAPTER 3: NEUHAUS AS COLLABORATOR AND CO-CREATOR

Electronics & Percussion: Five Realizations by Max Neuhaus was released by Columbia Records in 1968 as part of the label’s “Music of Our Time” series.¹ The recording, which was produced by David Behrman, allowed Neuhaus to assume the role of veritable co-creator: he determined the sonic materials of each of the LP’s tracks by incorporating his own innovations, experimenting with amplified instruments, amplifying his own body, and projecting feedback. In chapter 2 we saw Neuhaus create a standard repertoire list. Although this recording was released in 1968, it is important to note that it includes the works he most frequently performed in the preceding years: Brown’s Four Systems (recorded in 1964 and performed with four amplified cymbals); Feldman’s The King of Denmark (recorded in 1964 and performed without sticks or mallets); Sylvano Bussotti’s Coeur–Positively Yes (recorded in 1965 and incorporating extraneous sounds picked up by the microphones), Stockhausen’s Zyklus (recorded in 1968 with the work’s indeterminate elements executed spontaneously); and John Cage’s Fontana Mix–Feed (recorded in 1965 and incorporating Neuhaus’s score Feed, which generated feedback using a special circuit designed by Neuhaus).

In the LP’s liner notes, Neuhaus provided information about each work represented on the record. He prefaced his explanations by stating:

I have always felt that the musical experience does not lie within the realm of technical questions, such as—what is the type of notation used? How much of what happens during a concert is the composer’s doing and how much is the performer’s? Does the performer make his decisions before playing the piece, or does he allow them to come about during the performance? In an attempt to keep people from using these questions as a basic criterion for listening, I have previously avoided the use of program notes. However, perhaps this only stimulates curiosity about the questions themselves...²

¹ Max Neuhaus, Electronics and Percussion: Five Realizations by Max Neuhaus, Stereo MS 7139, Columbia Records, LP, 1968. David Behrman (b. 1937) was involved in many avant-garde initiatives as an electronic composer and the producer of Columbia’s “Music of Our Time” series.
² Ibid.
We see from this preface that Neuhaus was concerned with the nature of his music’s reception, and he recognized that the tracks on his LP were likely to elicit certain responses from listeners. Despite the posture of ambivalence he adopts in these remarks, Neuhaus appears to acknowledge that the “technical questions” prompted by his repertoire—questions over the character of experimental notation, the difference between improvisation and composition, and the relationship between composers and performers—were indeed provocative and engaging. The following chapter takes these questions into consideration by examining each realization on the LP, drawing special attention to Neuhaus’s creative transformation of works composed by others.

**BROWN, FOUR SYSTEMS**

Brown’s *Four Systems* is the first track on Neuhaus’s LP. Earle Brown (1926–2002) was an American composer who first studied mathematics and engineering in college and later played trumpet in military orchestras and big bands during WWII. At the Schillinger House of Music in Boston (now the Berklee School of Music), he studied compositional techniques that included renaissance counterpoint and the twelve-tone method. In 1951, Brown met John Cage and was invited to work on an electronic music project with Cage and David Tudor in New York City. He subsequently became interested in the visual arts, a development that affected his

---

3 Bernard and Deena Rosenberg, *The Music Makers* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), 80–82. Brown described John Schillinger (1895-1943) as believing that “music was moving towards a completely mathematically plotted, machine-generated and –produced period.” Schillinger wrote a book called *The Mathematical Basis of Arts* that highly influenced Brown. He described the methods taught at the Schillinger school as “involving numerical and mathematical generation, construction, and distribution of materials; it’s a highly ‘structuralist’ approach.” Brown also took composition lessons privately with Roslyn Brogue Henning.
musical work. For many years, Brown made a living in the recording industry while composing on the side.⁴

*Four Systems* was composed on January 20, 1954 “for David Tudor on a birthday” (see ex. 3-1). Brown’s performance notes in the score state: “[The work] may be played in any sequence, either side up, at any tempo(i). The continuous lines from far left to far right define the outer limits of the keyboard. Thickness may indicate dynamics or clusters.”⁵ Expanding upon these instructions, the composer wrote: “‘outer limits’ may refer to the range extremities of any instrument, group of instruments, or other sound-producing media.” According to Brown, the word “keyboard” appeared in the instructions merely “by virtue of the dedication.”⁶ Although the work was originally performed by Tudor on piano, Neuhaus took advantage of Brown’s openness regarding instrumentation. Surprisingly, however, he chose to play the piece on cymbals, a non-pitched percussion instrument. He recalled that the score influenced his choice of reverberating cymbals: “The constant thickness of each individual line stimulated me to search for and find an interesting percussion sound with a constant dynamic nature—not the usual percussive sound, with its initial burst of the attack and sudden decay.”⁷

A skilled performer on mallet instruments, Neuhaus undoubtedly could have performed this piece on marimba or xylophone, the logical choice for a percussionist, but he chose not to do so. Nevertheless, by using cymbals of different sizes, he was able to create a wide range of sounds, revealing the multitude of pitches his supposedly “non-pitched instruments” could, in fact, produce. Neuhaus performed rolls on the cymbals to prolong the duration of each sound, but

---

⁶ *Four Systems* performance notes.
he also used amplification to achieve that goal. Electronics therefore served an artistic as well as a practice function, freeing Neuhaus from the limitations of his instruments and permitting a new type of creative control.\(^8\)

Brown’s performance instructions do not address the parameter of duration, but the work’s appearance on the page—along with its title—suggest that the “four systems” of music should be read left-to-right, with the lengths of individual lines corresponding to their duration. But Neuhaus did not interpret the score in this manner, instead choosing to take a more flexible approach: he allowed his “eye to pick out various combinations that seem interesting or relevant to that particular moment in the piece.” In his view, this approach produced “an improvisation, but one that has a very definite relationship to the score.”\(^9\)

**FELDMAN, THE KING OF DENMARK**

Morton Feldman’s *The King of Denmark* is the second track on the LP. Feldman (1926–1987), an American pioneer in the use of experimental notation, was a composer often associated with Cage, Brown, Tudor, and Christian Wolff, a group of composers referred to as the “New York School.” Feldman’s music was influenced by abstract-expressionist art, and his compositional style was based on instinctive relationships among gestures, timbres, and pitches.\(^10\) Feldman composed *The King of Denmark* in August of 1964 for Neuhaus to premiere at the New York Avant-Garde Festival.

---

\(^8\) A negative review of the recording in *High Fidelity* claimed the dynamic level remained “constant during any given duration (thus reflecting the ‘linear’ quality of the score). The result is a crashing bore.” *High Fidelity* review of Max Neuhaus’ *Electronics and Percussion: Five Realizations*. The magazine clipping was found amongst other reviews in the Max Neuhaus Papers, box 5, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, New York, New York. The author and date of the review are unknown.

\(^9\) Ibid.

Neuhaus recalled meeting with Feldman in his studio apartment on numerous occasions during that summer so that Feldman could “hear [his] instruments and explore techniques.”

What Feldman created after these sessions with Neuhaus was a work for percussion that used graphic notation (ex. 3-3). Each box along the horizontal plane occupies a unit of time equal to M.M. 66–92; the three strata of each system correspond to low, medium, and high sounds (from bottom to top). The numerals inside boxes indicate how many sounds should be played during each unit of time, with Arabic numerals designating separated sounds and roman numerals designating simultaneous sounds. The broken lines passing across individual boxes indicate sustained sounds. Unlike Four Systems, The King of Denmark calls for specific techniques executed upon specific instruments. These include vibraphone (played without motor) and other bell-like sounds, skin instruments, a cymbal, gong, and timpani.

In his notes for the piece, Feldman instructed the percussionist to play as softly as possible throughout. After listening to Neuhaus quietly rehearse, however, the composer insisted that he was still performing the piece too loudly, forcing him to reassess his technique. Neuhaus later recalled how he solved the problem of volume:

As percussion students, we used to practice our parts on stage just before a concert started. In order for the audience not to hear us, we used our fingers instead of sticks. I put down my sticks and started to play with just my fingers. Morty was dumbstruck, “that’s it, that’s it!” he yelled.

This example shows the degree of agency Neuhaus assumed in shaping the material on his recording. In fact, in this case, he even shaped the composition itself. Inspired by Neuhaus’s

---

approach to *The King of Denmark*, Feldman subsequently published the piece with the explicit instruction that the instruments were to be played “without sticks or mallets.”\textsuperscript{14}

In the liner notes to his LP, Neuhaus remarked upon the potential of audio recordings to transform the listener’s experience of exceptionally quiet works such as *The King of Denmark*. He wrote:

Much of Feldman’s music, because it is so soft, has the effect of putting a magnifying glass on that area of dynamic between pianissimo and piano—we find all sorts of things we never saw before. Because of the extremely quiet nature of this piece, much of it can only be heard (at least, in one sense of the word) on a recording.\textsuperscript{15}

Not all listeners were drawn into Feldman’s quiet aesthetic, however. The reviewer in *High Fidelity* magazine complimented Neuhaus’s soft approach in playing with his fingers (which created “some strikingly beautiful effects”), but he remarked that “it all seems terribly precious and quickly loses its interest once the listener becomes accustomed to the unusual timbral qualities.”\textsuperscript{16}

Due in part to the work’s soft dynamics, percussionist Steven Schick calls *The King of Denmark* an “antipercussion piece.”\textsuperscript{17} He describes it as anti-rhythmic, fluid, and strikingly different from works such as Stockhausen’s *Zyklus*, which is “loud, rhythmic, and formally forceful.”\textsuperscript{18} Yet the two works possess similarities, too: each piece requires a complex battery of percussion instruments and places substantial technical demands on the performer, and each offers the musician interpretive latitude through unconventional notation.

\textsuperscript{14} Performance notes from *The King of Denmark*.
\textsuperscript{15} Liner notes from *The New York School: Nine Realizations of Cage, Feldman, Brown*.
\textsuperscript{16} *High Fidelity* review of Max Neuhaus’s “Electronics and Percussion: Five Realizations,” n.p.
\textsuperscript{17} Steven Schick, *The Percussionist’s Art: Same Bed, Different Dreams*, (University of Rochester Press, 2006), 169.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 170.

**BUSSOTTI, COEUR–POSITIVELY YES**

Sylvano Bussotti’s “Coeur” for percussionist is the third track on the LP. Bussotti (b. 1931) grew up taking violin and counterpoint lessons in Florence until World War II broke out. After years of self-study in composition, he traveled in the 1950s to Paris in order to take lessons with Max Deutsch. He eventually met Boulez, who led him to Darmstadt in 1958; during that same year, Cage’s ideas permeated the summer courses and began to circulate widely among European avant-gardists. Bussotti returned to Darmstadt in 1959, taking composition lessons with Nono, Pousseur, and Stockhausen. He also met many of the avant-garde’s most famous performers: Christoph Caskel, Cathy Berberian, David Tudor, and, a few years later, Max Neuhaus. During Neuhaus’s time in Darmstadt, Bussotti became interested in the visual

---

19 “Sylvano Bussotti Biography,” http://www.sylvanobussotti.org/biografia.html (accessed April 25, 2012). Critics from the 1960s often compared Bussotti’s concepts to ideas from Cage, Boulez and even Puccini, as well as to his teachers at Darmstadt, Nono and Stockhausen.

aesthetics of graphic scores and in new approaches to composing for voice. The works he composed with particular performers in mind—for example, Tudor and Neuhaus—were cast in extremely ambiguous graphic notation and were considered controversial by his contemporaries, even in the context of the 1960s avant-garde. In 1964, for example, commentators linked Bussotti’s wild graphic scores with the “anti-constructionists and neo-beatniks” of new music. A year later, another author offered greater specificity in his criticism, remarking that “Bussotti's music owes [its] sounds, performance techniques and aleatoric conceptions” to the techniques of Cage. In the mid-1960s, Bussotti was affiliated with several avant-garde initiatives, including the Center of the Creative and Performing Arts at the State University of New York at Buffalo.

Bussotti’s percussion work “Coeur” is the third track on the LP and was recorded by Neuhaus in 1965. Dedicated to Max Neuhaus, the piece appears in Bussotti’s Sette Fogli as the second sheet of notation. This chamber collection, as seen in table 3-1, was composed between August and December of 1959, after Bussotti’s second visit to Darmstadt. It contains seven sheets of experimental music that may be played individually, as a complete set, or in different combinations. Each sheet explores the field of graphic notation through a variety of markings composed much for Tudor, Berberian, and Neuhaus. Berberian especially proved to be a great collaborator as Bussotti grew interested in theatrical and otherwise staged works. Christoph Caskel, a German percussionist who premiered Zyklus, may also have premiered “Coeur,” although the piece is dedicated to Neuhaus; see the website sylvanobussotti.org (accessed April 23, 2013).

---

21 “Sylvano Bussotti Biography.” His brother and uncle were painters, influencing his interest in graphic notation.
22 Ibid.
25 Levine Packer, 22.
26 The work was completed by December of 1959 and was published in 1963 with a dedication to Neuhaus. At some point during these four years, Bussotti and Neuhaus must have met and collaborated. It is unclear whether or not Bussotti had finished the piece prior to meeting Neuhaus, or if Neuhaus was an inspiration for the piece.
and symbols. According to the composer, the nomenclature runs the gamut from a notation that carries “definite musical meaning in terms of more or less recent tradition” to a notation that amounts to “freely invented markings whose musical meaning is yet unknown.”\(^{28}\) Bussotti originally provided performance notes for each sheet, but purposefully omitted these explanations from the publication in order to keep its “mechanism secret...to encourage re-creative ideas.” He also calls the set of seven drawings an “occult collection,” referring to this purposeful hiding of the pieces’ meaning. To Bussotti, the markings should be self-explanatory, or automatically “explained by virtue” for anyone realizing the work.\(^{29}\) David Osmond-Smith called the score “an almost unrealizable torrent of notes and gestures—that profoundly perplexed critics.”\(^{30}\)

**TABLE 3-1. PIECES FROM SETTE FOGLI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Composers/Performers</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><em>Couple</em>, for flute and piano</td>
<td>(to K. Boehmer)</td>
<td>composed 10 years before the other pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><em>Coeur</em>, for percussionist</td>
<td>(to M. Neuhaus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><em>Per tre</em>, on a piano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><em>Lettura di braibanti</em>, for solo voice</td>
<td>(to H. Pousseur)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><em>Mobile-stabile</em>, for guitars + voice and piano</td>
<td>(to C. Cardew)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><em>Manifesto per kalinowski</em>, for chamber orchestra</td>
<td>(to the Ensemble “Die Reihe”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><em>Sensitivo</em>, for one string instrument</td>
<td>(to F. Cerha)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in chapter 2, Neuhaus sometimes provided additional titles to the works he performed, marking them as products bearing his own creative input. In this case, *Positively Yes* is the name Neuhaus gave to his realization of Bussotti’s “Coeur.” The score for “Coeur” is interesting visually because the materials seem to continue beyond the page, suggesting that some of the music remains unseen. Neuhaus recalled the score looking “very much like a

\(^{28}\) Ibid.  
\(^{29}\) Ibid.  
\(^{30}\) David Osmond-Smith.
drawing to which the composer has added certain qualifying symbols for the type of attacks, duration, loudness, specific pitches, and direction of reading.”

He had four enlargements made from the score, one for each possible way of reading the music. Then, to create a performance score, he “divided each of these enlargements into systems by cutting them into strips and pasting them together in the order [he] wanted,” a predetermined layout that would still allow indeterminacy.

In performing the piece, Neuhaus subjected a set of cymbals and tam-tams to extreme amplification. He never struck these instruments directly, however, but rather positioned them among the rest of his battery so they would vibrate sympathetically, thereby “adding a special timbre” to the other instruments’ sounds. He also “amplified his body” during certain sections of the piece so that his movements and inadvertent vocal sounds would be heard during the performance.

The idea of amplifying one’s body was not new to the avant-garde. It was used the same year when John Cage performed his 0’00” at the Rose Art Museum of Brandeis University during May of 1965. The score to this work, composed in 1962, consists of a single requirement: “In a situation provided with maximum application (no feedback), perform a disciplined action.” The May 1965 performance of the work involved the extreme amplification of every movement Cage made while he sat in a “squeaky chair on a staircase landing between two floors of museum,” wrote letters on a typewriter, and sipped water. It is clear from this work that Cage’s idea of “music” had expanded even beyond his earlier sense of the term from the 1950s,
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32 Ibid. Neuhaus also described the process in correspondence; see Max Neuhaus, letter to John Cage, January 7, 1966, John Cage Collection, Northwestern University Music Library.
35 Ibid.
blending aspects of music and theater into an action that today would be regarded as “performance art.” In realizing Bussotti’s “Coeur,” Neuhaus may have drawn inspiration from Cage’s creative use of amplification and ambient sound.

**STOCKHAUSEN, ZYKLUS**

Karlheinz Stockhausen’s *Zyklus* is the fourth track on the LP. During the early 1960s, Neuhaus developed a professional relationship with Stockhausen (1928–2007). Neuhaus first saw the score to *Zyklus* in January of 1962, just six months prior to his introduction to Stockhausen in Darmstadt. Their professional relationship continued to develop in the years thereafter, as Neuhaus incorporated *Zyklus* into his performance repertoire and toured with Stockhausen in 1964. Although Cage’s 27’10.554” was the first major work written for a solo percussionist, *Zyklus*, composed in 1959, was the first work to specify details of instrumentation. As a result, the piece holds an important place within the percussion literature.

*Zyklus*, which means “cycle,” was described by Stockhausen as a “closed circular form.” The piece combines the techniques of total serialism and indeterminacy, allowing the performer to determine aspects of the work within carefully controlled musical parameters. A circle has no beginning or ending, and the piece’s design reflects this open-endedness. The score consists of sixteen pages that may be performed in any direction, with the percussionist starting at any point; the spiral bound pages aid in flipping the score over. The arrangement of skin, wood, and metal instruments on stage is circular, and the performer gradually works around the set-up until he or she comes around full circle. Neuhaus described the work as follows:

Example 3-3: Sylvano Bussotti “Coeur pour batteur (for M. Neuhaus)” from Sette fogli, una collezione occulta. Copyright © Casa Ricordi – Milano. All rights reserved. Reproduced by kind permission of MGB Hal Leonard.
All of the notes are written out specifically with respects to loudness (shown by one of the twelve sizes of notes), the instrument to be played (by a symbol for the instrument), the pitch on that instrument (by staff of some sort), and when the note occurs in time or rhythm (by correlating time with horizontal space on the page).  

Indeterminacy affects each realization of *Zyklus* to a considerable degree. In dealing with that dimension of the piece, Neuhaus developed two distinct approaches, or “versions”:

a. version where all decisions left up to the performer are predetermined & fixed.  
10 minutes  
b. version in which the performer’s decisions are made spontaneously during the course of the performance. Approx. 12 min. 30 seconds  

Each section in *Zyklus* affects how the next will play out. Steven Schick discusses the possibility of having dramatic high or low points within a performance of *Zyklus*, even though the piece is supposed to represent a circle of equal points. Within his own performance, he points out, he tends to naturally emphasize the snare drum sections more than other passages in the work simply because Stockhausen appears to assign a more important role to that instrument in the score.

Stockhausen refers to the page with two systems for snare drum and tom-tom rim shot as Period #1. Dynamics, duration, and instrumentation are specified in the score for this section, but as one moves away from this period, the music becomes more indeterminate. Most people, including Schick, use this section as the starting and ending point for their interpretations of *Zyklus*. Neuhaus and the percussionist who premiered the work, Christoph Caskel, also began
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40 Young Concert Artists Repertoire List for Max Neuhaus held at the Young Concert Artists, Inc., New York City. Document is available by request.  
41 Schick, 185.  
42 Schick, 186. Schick also notes that this section is the most compositional of sections in the work, beautifully allowing the performer to move from determined to undetermined sections and back. Schick even says the mid-point that he uses (Period #9) is the most indeterminate section of the work.
their performances at Period #1 (see ex. 3-4). The *High Fidelity* review of Neuhaus’s LP points out this and other similarities between Caskel’s and Neuhaus’s recordings:

There is another recorded version of this piece performed by Christoph Caskel…oddly enough Neuhaus not only plays the piece in the same direction as Caskel, he starts at almost exactly the same point in the score. Since the performer is given a choice as to tempo, the order of certain occurrences, etc., the two versions vary considerably; but it is nevertheless relatively easy, and in this case meaningful, to compare the two performances.

The reviewer questions why Neuhaus would go in the “same direction” as Caskel and continues by noting Caskel’s “better over-all technique” and asserting that his realization is superior because he is “more imaginative and more musical in his renderings of the indeterminate elements of the score, and he is more precise in his performance of the determined aspects.”

As discussed in chapter 2, Stockhausen favored Caskel’s recording over Neuhaus’s recording at the time the latter was made. Two decades later, his opinion had not changed.

Stockhausen wrote:

The only one [recording] of *Zyklus* I recommend is a very early recording of 1959 with Caskel (Wergo). It is relatively dry, but at least it is right. Whereas, in the others I have heard, there are a lot of mistakes in playing, or interpreting the score, and also mistakes in the choice of instruments. I am perfectly willing to make another recording with a percussion player if I see that he is very serious about this and has prepared himself enough.

Despite Stockhausen’s preference for Caskel’s recording, he still asked Neuhaus to tour with him in 1964 and supported Neuhaus’s performance of his works. Neuhaus’s professional dedication to this piece is apparent in many ways. For example, he built new instruments and equipment in order to perform it. Percussionist Jan Williams recalls:

---

44 *High Fidelity* review of Max Neuhaus’s “Electronics and Percussion: Five Realizations.”
45 Ibid.
46 Karlheinz Stockhausen, Interview by Michael Udow, *Percussive Notes Research Edition* (September 1985), 17. In 1968, during the same year of the LP release, Stockhausen became much more loose with his notation, contrasting to the rigidness of his earlier works.
He designed and built these special stands for *Zyklus* and he had special wood drums made by a violin maker in Switzerland. He even built a kind of metronome which used a very bright light instead of an audible click, so that he did not have to divert his attention from the score while practicing. I remember that that light lit up his whole studio when it flashed. Max spent a lot of time working on building his *Zyklus* instrument. He was truly committed to these pieces and we all benefited from his work.\(^{47}\)

Moreover, Neuhaus approached the work’s indeterminate elements with great care. Before allowing himself to perform a “spontaneous version” of *Zyklus*—that is, his “version b”—he created a fixed, preplanned version and mastered its performance. He wrote:

> After an analysis of the new techniques that an improvised version would entail, I found it necessary, in order to learn these techniques and to play the instrument itself, to first compose a fixed version and learn to play it….In order to avoid page turns I have glued several pages on one piece of cardboard. It will also be noticed that all the variable elements have been cut out and glued onto the time scale at the places where I chose to play them for this version. This was just my way of notating my decisions.\(^{48}\)

Despite the care he took in preparing this fixed version of *Zyklus*, Neuhaus nevertheless chose to record a spontaneously executed realization of the piece for his LP. Could this decision have been responsible for Stockhausen’s preference for Caskel’s version over Neuhaus’s recording? Neuhaus surely knew that his spontaneous realization was not as technically accurate as Caskel’s earlier recording, and presumably he could have chosen to record the piece using his fixed version in order to generate more stable results. His decision to sacrifice precision for the sake of spontaneity—especially when performing a work he valued as highly as *Zyklus*—speaks to Neuhaus’s valorization of his own creativity in the act of realizing the music of others, a theme pervading the whole of this LP.

---

\(^{47}\) Interview with Jan Williams.  
\(^{48}\) Max Neuhaus liner notes for *Zyklus for One Percussionist*, LP WER 60010, Baden-Baden: Wergo, 1963. Like *Zyklus*, Neuhaus created a homemade score for the aforementioned, “Coeur.” Although illustrations of such homemade scores are no longer available, one may see glimpses of the *Zyklus* score Neuhaus created throughout the Phill Niblock film, *Max*.  
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**CAGE, *FONTANA MIX–FEED***

*Fontana Mix*, a composition by John Cage (1912–1992), the leading figure in the American avant-garde, is the last track on Neuhaus’s LP. As discussed in chapter 2, the professional relationship between Cage and Neuhaus began while Neuhaus was still a student in Manhattan; Neuhaus did not begin performing Cage’s works regularly until 1964, however. *Fontana Mix* was composed in 1958 while Cage was on a three-month stay in Italy and was
named after his Milanese landlady, Signora Fontana.\(^49\) During his Italian residency, the composer Luciano Berio invited him to create a work for magnetic tape at the Studio di Fonologia of Italian Radio in Milan; Cage began by creating a flexible score that could help to generate a piece of electro-acoustic music. The score is based upon the graphic notation of his earlier *Concert for Piano and Orchestra* (1957–58).

The *Fontana Mix* score consists of ten transparency sheets containing randomly distributed points, a transparency sheet containing a grid, another containing a straight line, and ten drawings of curved lines on paper.\(^50\) The performer is expected to superimpose these materials by stacking the following items from bottom to top: a page with curved lines; a transparency with points; the grid transparency; and the transparency containing a straight line. What results is a piece of graphic notation whose various parameters are controlled by the relationships of lines and points within the template of a grid, with the horizontal axis corresponding to the passage of time. Several arrangements of the score’s materials are possible, introducing a new element of indeterminacy to Cage’s notational practice.

Although Cage’s notes to the score leave many aspects of interpretation to the performer, the instructions offer hints about how the graph could be used to generate electronic music. For example, the intersection of straight lines with the visual space of the graph can determine which sonic materials are used. Since the curved lines differ not only in shape but in thickness and continuity, a variety of parameters may be assigned to the different varieties of line: the types of prerecorded sounds, the methods of modifying the amplitude of sounds, the methods of modifying the frequency of sounds, the methods of modifying the timbre of sounds (such as


filtering), the methods of splicing, and the methods of controlling durations (including the use of loops).\textsuperscript{51}

*Fontana Mix* was Cage’s last major magnetic tape piece and was used to compose other works.\textsuperscript{52} Cage first realized a version of *Fontana Mix* in the Milan studio by blending noise sounds, outdoor sounds, recorded music, and electronic effects with silence, piecing these elements together through chance operations. With these sounds, he created four monophonic tracks of magnetic music, each requiring a separate interpretation of the score.\textsuperscript{53} He then recorded a version of the piece for two tapes that was 11’39” in duration.\textsuperscript{54} Although *Fontana Mix* was composed for use with tape music, the score may be used for instrumental, vocal, and theatrical performances; in fact, Cathy Berberian performed Aria with *Fontana Mix* and later, Cage used the score to assist in the creation of works for acoustic instruments. In keeping with this practice, Neuhaus used the score to create music for timpani. Yet he proceeded to transform this acoustic music through an electronic technique unconnected to Cage’s conception of the work.

On Neuhaus’s LP, Cage’s piece is referred to as *Fontana Mix–Feed*, the addition of “Feed” being Neuhaus’s own idea. In 1966 he created a special electronic circuit that was manufactured as the “Max-Feed,” a diagram of which may be seen in Example 3.5. To most, this diagram may simply look like an instrumental circuit layout, but it stands as a experimental gesture. The inclusion of this schema in John Cage’s *Notations* insinuates that Neuhaus wanted

\textsuperscript{51} Pritchett, 130. The classifications of sounds in *Fontana Mix* are based upon those seen in *Williams Mix*, Cage’s *musique concrète* work from 1952. These include city sounds, country sounds, electronic sounds, manually-produced sounds, wind-produced sounds, and “small” sounds requiring amplification. See also Thom Holmes, *Electronics and Experimental Music: Technology, Music, and Culture* (Routledge: 2008), 83. *Williams Mix* also relied heavily on tape splicing techniques as a compositional element.

\textsuperscript{52} Holmes, 88.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid, 135.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, 89.
to challenge others to think of it as a score instead of just as a layout. He used his “Max-Feed” during performances of *Fontana Mix* in order to create live electronic music feedback.

Neuhaus’s recording of *Fontana Mix* used contact mikes attached to the skins of two timpani, which were placed facing two large loudspeakers. He manipulated his amplifiers so that only the feedback of amplified sound was heard, not the initial sounds generated by the timpani. Along with the feedback, he incorporated other sounds caused by the sympathetic vibration of his instruments. According to Neuhaus, in each performance the projection of feedback would vary according to the acoustics of the performance space and the size and position of the audience.⁵⁵ He explained his method further:

> The piece is the interaction and mixture of feedback channels set up by resting contact microphones on various percussion instruments that stand in front of loudspeakers. Although the individual intensity of these channels is controlled from the score, the actual sounds that make up the piece are determined by the acoustics of the room and the position of the mikes in relation to the loudspeakers and the instruments at a specific moment. (The vibrations cause the mikes to move around.) In short, the factors here are so complex that even if the piece were to be performed twice in the same room with the same audience, the same instruments, and the same loudspeakers, it would have completely different sounds and structures each time.⁵⁶

Theodore Strongin’s review of the concert further clarifies:

> Contact microphones are rested on various percussion instruments standing in front of loudspeakers. Once the sound vibrations start, they are self-feeding, so to speak. Each sound causes the mikes to move around, creating more sounds and new relationships. Neuhaus controls their intensity by electronic means. They can get very, very intense, they become a searing, pealing shriek at times that feels a though it exists inside one’s own head rather than out in the real world.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Ibid, 100.
It is important to note that the sounds created by Neuhaus’s electronic circuit could not be controlled entirely; such unpredictability became a common feature of his later work, as discussed further in chapter 4.

Significantly, Neuhaus called Feed an original piece, and he took full ownership of the creation. This was not the case, however, in other instances where his creative input fundamentally altered a work’s conception as handed down by the composer. For example, earlier the same year, Neuhaus did an unusual rendition of Corner’s Everything Max Has with two gongs and a red rubber ball. Corner encouraged him to call the piece an original composition, but Neuhaus demurred. “‘I’m not a composer’ was always his attitude,” according to Corner.58 Neuhaus’s approach to Feed is also evident in his realization of Bussotti’s “Coeur,” which he titled Coeur–Positively Yes. In the case of that piece, the added title apparently designated Neuhaus’s unusual approach to realizing the work. Conversely, Neuhaus understood Feed as a work unto itself, and he viewed the schematic diagram of his circuit (the “Max-Feed”) as a sort of score for the work. Fontana Mix–Feed is therefore the realization of two works simultaneously.

By the time he wrote Fontana Mix, Cage believed that the respective realizations of any musical work should vary considerably from one to the next, and he designed his indeterminate scores to generate such diverse performances. Realizations of magnetic tape compositions were forever fixed as recorded artifacts, however, conflicting with Cage’s vision.59 By conceiving of Fontana Mix as a highly mutable graphic score capable of producing any number of disparate realizations on tape, he brought one aspect of electroacoustic musical practice into accord with his musical philosophy. Neuhaus took Cage’s conception of the work one step further, however,

---

58 Philip Corner correspondence with Megan Murph, August 7, 2012.
59 Holmes, 90.
by introducing an additional element of unpredictability into the piece’s real-time performance. Whether Cage approved of Neuhaus’s conjoining of *Feed* and *Fontana Mix* in unknown. It is perhaps telling, however, that Neuhaus’s design for the “Max-Feed” circuit was subsequently published in the book *Notations*, a collection of contemporary scores edited by Cage. If Neuhaus meant for his schematic to be seen as a recipe for music making—that is, as a type of score—then Cage, too, was apparently willing to acknowledge it as such.

---

Example 3-5. Max Neuhaus, “Max-Feed,” schema from John Cage’s *Notations*

---

Many elements connect the recordings featured on this LP. The most important, however, is Neuhaus’s exercise of an unusual degree of creative license in executing the works of a repertoire already distinguished by the amount of freedom it grants to musicians. Such license is evident in his use of amplified cymbals in performing Brown’s *Four Systems*; his abandonment of sticks and mallets in Feldman’s *The King of Denmark*; his use of a reconstructed score in Bussotti’s “Coeur;” his insistence upon a mode of spontaneity unendorsed by the composer in Stockhausen’s *Zyklus*; and his development of a performance technology that evidently demanded a new title, as in Cage’s *Fontana Mix–Feed*.

The title of Neuhaus’s LP, *Electronics & Percussion: Five Realizations by Max Neuhaus*, is revealing. First, it suggests that electronics serve as a type of instrumentation alongside percussion, sharing equal importance. Second, the words “realization by Max Neuhaus” imply that the music on the recording could not exist without Neuhaus’s creative rendering of the composer’s ideas. In music, one “realizes” jazz chord symbols or Baroque figured bass; such nomenclature specifies the harmonies but allows the performer to determine the final result by selecting the voicing and registration of the chords. Neuhaus was doing something similar by placing his own mark on the compositions he performed. A “realization by Max Neuhaus” is a step beyond a performance of a particular composer’s work because it emphasizes the musician’s creative role in generating the finished product. It strives for interactivity between composer and performer. Theodore Strongin’s review of the LP, titled “When Listener is Composer,” draws out this theme of interactivity, extending it to the listener, as well:
All this adds up to the word “realize.” Neuhaus is not just a performer. He has a larger role. He is a “realizer.” Where does this leave the listener? Is he hearing Brown’s work or Neuhaus’s, or a combination of both? Or is the listener expected to become a “realizer” too, in this kind of music, and choose to be aware of and make sense of only what he wishes or feels is relevant, just as Neuhaus did with Brown’s horizontal lines?61

Strongin continues:

If the listener accepts the responsibility of being a “realizer” of Neuhaus’s “realization” of Brown’s and the others’ scores, he may find strange things taking place. If he forgets about Mozart and Beethoven and about what music ought to be like, he will find fresh patterns and fresh associations forming in his mind…All five works when listened to with concentration did heighten my awareness not only of the sounds they made but of the surrounding sounds outside…but these are only my own “realizations.” To find out if the disk is worth hearing, the listener will have to provide his own.62

These are concerns Neuhaus faced during the years he spent preparing for his concerts and creating this album. Ultimately, that experience led him away from his life as a professional percussionist, pushed him towards the medium of electronic sound, and prompted the sort of critical questions that would underpin the works of sound art addressed in chapter 4. As a musician blurring the boundaries between the roles of performer, collaborator, and co-creator during the 1960s, he prepared himself for a second career as an artist who probed distinctions among artistic mediums while asking us to reconsider our own relationship with sound.

61 Theodore Strongin, “When the Listener is Composer.”
62 Ibid.
CHAPTER 4: MAX NEUHAUS AS SOUND ARTIST

A variety of factors caused Neuhaus to seek a new creative outlet during the mid-1960s. For one, he was tired of transporting 2,000 pounds of percussion equipment from one concert to the next, becoming especially frustrated during his European tour and Spoleto concerts. Jan Williams recalled:

I do think that at some point he became somewhat tired of schlepping percussion instruments around. His concerts always involved huge percussion setups, the biggest probably being for his piece Everything Max Has. His designing and building electronic instruments certainly involved a lot less schlepping.¹

Williams believes that Neuhaus’s interest in electronics also served as a catalyst for his departure from music:

After Max left the Manhattan School, he became more and more interested in electronic realizations, performing Cage’s Fontana Mix and designing and building his own “Max-Feed.” He became more involved in that world and less with the heavy percussion works. Gradually his career went in that direction, eventually putting all of his percussion instruments in storage in a friend’s basement in Brooklyn. He was self-taught in terms of electronic circuits. This is where his development as a composer of large site-specific works began.²

Perhaps most importantly, however, Neuhaus had grown restless with the larger set of assumptions and conventions surrounding musical performance. He sought to flee what Carter Ratcliffe called “the nostalgic hierarchy where he labored as a virtuoso,” ultimately leading him to embrace “the art world’s unstable, wide open spaces.”³ He seemed to have gotten bored with the traditional performance rituals of the concert hall, which, like the museum, “is a special precinct, with rules and conventions that define the conduct of those who enter it, and whose walls, so to speak, are like parentheses that bracket the experiences had within, and segregate

¹ Jan Williams, interviewed by Megan Murph, Skype, November 19, 2012.
² Jan Williams, interview.
those experiences from the flow of life.” Neuhaus also objected to what he termed the “onus of entertainment” in the musical world, and he disliked performing for a small fraction of society who were “deafened by over exposure to the music of the 18th and 19th centuries.” He wanted to cultivate a different relationship with the audience, and felt his percussion career was restraining his ability to do so.

Neuhaus began creating his own independent artworks as early as 1966, two years before his LP release. Although they were strongly oriented toward sound, these pieces challenged many conventions associated with classical music, including the avant-garde repertoire in which he specialized as a percussionist. One of the key features of his new work was audience interaction, something Neuhaus spoke about in 1990:

The first works of mine were about dealing with a public at large – a wish to remove myself from the confined public of contemporary music. It came from a deep belief that I could deal in a complex way with people in their everyday lives. Not making a simple piece for a simple public, but making something very special, accessible to anyone ready to pay attention.

This chapter will focus on Neuhaus’s first experiments in art entailing social interaction, his point of entry into the world of “sound art.” These pieces include Listen (1966–76), Public Supply (1966), Drive-In Music (1966–67), Water Whistle (1971–74), and Times Square (1977).

On the afternoon of March 27th, 1966, Neuhaus met a group of participants who had been invited by word-of-mouth to assemble at the corner of Avenue D and East 14th Street in New York City. They met to experience a “Concert of Traveled and Traveling Music given by Max Neuhaus.” Like many postwar avant-gardists influenced by Cage, Neuhaus supported the
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6 Max Neuhaus interviewed by Ulrich Loock in Elusive Sources and ‘Like’ Spaces (Galleria Giorgio Persano: Turin, 1990), 59.
7 Street names have since changed.
incorporation of everyday noises in the concert hall, at least in theory. In practice, however, he felt that few audience members truly appreciated the addition of these sounds to concert works, instead merely valuing the “scandal” of the gesture. Why not take the audience to the source of such noises itself, he wondered? Instead of bringing outside sounds into the concert hall, Neuhaus decided to take the audience to the sounds, leading them around various areas of the city to listen to their surrounding environment, hearing sounds from a rumbling power plant, highways, neighborhoods, and so on. The Sunday afternoon walk concluded at Neuhaus’s studio, where he performed many works of his standard repertoire: pieces by Cage, Bussotti, Feldman, Corner, Tenney, and himself. This afternoon concert was the start of Neuhaus’s *Listen* series, which he continued until 1976. He eventually began stamping the participants on the hand with the word “LISTEN” instead of providing them with a program or itinerary. Neuhaus saw *Listen* as his “first independent work as an artist.” The piece’s final realization was a “do-it-yourself” version. He published postcards printed with the word “LISTEN,” instructing that they be placed in locations selected by the cards’ recipients. This version required the audience to interact with the work, selecting locations where future listeners could experience sounds.

The same year in 1966, Neuhaus went to the WBAI radio station in New York for an interview. Instead of speaking, however, he wanted to create a live sound broadcast. The result was *Public Supply*, one of the earliest works of telematic music. He borrowed telephones and, with the help of a friend, constructed a machine that used levers to answer them. He then connected the telephones to amplifiers and speakers. People were allowed to call the station and

---

8 Dekleva, 45.
contribute any sound they wanted to be broadcast; acting as a moderator, Neuhaus mixed the results and incorporated feedback.\textsuperscript{11} He recalled:

\begin{quote}
I got everything from recitation to song to people playing instruments. My role was to sit at the control panel and moderate their input…music did become a process of communication, a loop, rather than a one-way message sent from performer to audience.\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

Through \textit{Public Supply}, Neuhaus was able to engage his audience in a brand new way, encouraging their participation and shaping the sonic products they generated.

After his performances of \textit{Fontana Mix–Feed}, Neuhaus began to incorporate the Max-Feed circuit into other projects. \textit{Bi-Product} (also spelled By-Product) was created by Neuhaus in June of 1966, over a year after he first began performing \textit{Fontana Mix–Feed}.\textsuperscript{13} The work requires that the sounds of a concert be “recorded, extracted from their context, and packaged” using the Max-Feed.\textsuperscript{14} Two of the recordings were then to be given to each member of the audience, with those audience members instructed to mail one of the recordings to someone who would like to hear it.\textsuperscript{15} It is unclear if these instructions are connected to one particular concert or applicable to any concert, as Neuhaus’s directions are somewhat ambiguous. The only known concert Neuhaus gave during June of 1966 was at the Spoleto Festival. No concert reviews or programs mention his \textit{Bi-Product} as part of that festival.

\textit{American Can} is another work employing the Max-Feed that was created during the same year. The piece required the use of a large number of canned products, which were specifically produced by the American Can company. These cans were placed on the floor and wired to


\textsuperscript{12} Ratcliffe, 156.

\textsuperscript{13} He performed \textit{Fontana Mix–Feed} on March 22, 1965 at Carnegie Recital Hall.

\textsuperscript{14} Dekleva, 10.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid. In the work’s instructions, Neuhaus also included postal rates and custom tags for the audience to use in order to mail the recording to a friend.
produce sounds; by moving the cans about, the audience produced sounds according to their wishes. Through pieces such as *American Can*, Neuhaus came to recognize that conventional percussion instruments were no longer necessary for him to create new works.

Neuhaus first applied the term “sound installation” to his work *Drive-In Music No. 1*, which was launched at the Albright-Knox Gallery in Buffalo, New York. It was the closing event of a week-long experimental art project called *In City, Buffalo, 1967*, which was led by Maryanne Amacher and hosted by the Center of the Creative and Performing Arts at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Neuhaus’s work called for people in automobiles to drive through a “sound topography” that began at the lakeside entrance to the Gallery and continued a half mile down Lincoln Parkway. Neuhaus placed low-power radio transmitters in the trees at intervals along the road; each of these transmitters broadcasted its own sonority over the area, overlapping with the sounds of other transmitters. He intended for the drivers to tune in with their car radios, allowing them to experience a combination of sounds and to “sense the aural shape of the site.” The piece was slated to last for six months, with dynamics of the sound topography changing according to the weather conditions and the drivers’ speeds. Given the variability of these elements, *Drive-In Music No. 1*, like an indeterminate musical score, could not be repeated the same way twice.
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16 Dekleva, 14.
17 Ratcliffe, 156.
18 Renee Levine Packer, *This Life of Sounds: Evenings for New Music in Buffalo*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 65. Maryanne Amacher was an American composer, performer, and installation/multimedia artist. Her *In City* projects, and in particular the project lasting a week in Buffalo, used a mixture of sounds picked up by microphones placed throughout a city, which were broadcasted in live performances or over the radio, creating a collage of sounds for the listener to experience. This may be compared to Neuhaus’s *Public Supply*, which was created a year before *In City*, and requires the listeners to submit their own sounds.
19 Ibid.
20 Dekleva, 39. The same year, Neuhaus created *Fan Music*, an “aural landscape” that reflected the passage of the day in the urban terrain of lower Manhattan.
Following the creation of these works, Neuhaus worked at Bell Labs in New Jersey from 1968 to 1969 in order to continue his experimentation with electronics, as the composer and colleague, James Tenney, had done earlier in the decade. By this point, Neuhaus had exited the world of contemporary music, even rejecting the then-conventional practice of composing works for tape. He went to Bell Labs not to make such works, he said, but rather to learn “how to construct electronic circuits that generated sound.”

After Neuhaus left Bell Labs, he spent almost a year living on a boat and sailing the eastern Atlantic seaway, from Hudson Bay to the Bahamas; his goal was to “uncomplicate [his] existence by living offshore.” He was inspired during his journeys to create another sound environment, Water Whistle, using hoses, whistles, connectors, pipes, and wrenches determined by the shape of a community center’s swimming pool. The systems of hoses were attached to whistles and placed in the swimming pool, requiring water to be pumped to create the sounds. Participants then submerged themselves in the water to experience the sounds. The first installation of Water Whistle took place in 1971 and continued until 1974. Through its “exploration of [a] new sound world” the work reconceived listeners’ spatial perception of sound and demanded the audience to interact with the art in a new way. It did not require traditional musical instruments or a conventional museum space; rather, it required Neuhaus to build and place underwater sound topographies into public swimming pools and have the audience listen by “lying in the water on their backs, ears submerged, nose and mouth out.”

Following his Water Whistle series, Neuhaus was selected in 1976 as one of four artists-in-
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21 Calvin Tomkins, “Hear,” *The New Yorker* 64 (October 24, 1988), 114.
22 Ratcliffe, 156.
24 Dekleva, 97.
25 Ibid.
residence to pursue cross-disciplinary research in music and technology at the Center of Creative and Performing Arts in Buffalo under a grant through the Rockefeller Foundation.\textsuperscript{26}

In 1977, speakers were installed underground in Times Square for what would become Neuhaus’s best known permanent installation, titled \textit{Times Square}. Sounds “resembling the after ring of large bells” emerge from the subway grille as one walks through the middle of the triangular pedestrian area at the intersection of Broadway and Seventh Avenue, between 46th and 45th streets.\textsuperscript{27} The sounds blend into the rich hustle and bustle of the hectic city, and many passers-by undoubtedly dismiss Neuhaus’s piece as the product of underground machinery (as I did when I walked through Times Square during my undergraduate years, unaware of Neuhaus, but noticing the strange drone). The original installation of the piece was in place until 1992, then reinstalled in 2002 under the supervision of the Dia Center for the Arts. Ulrich Loock, Director of the Kunsthalle in Bern, suggests that \textit{Times Square} is not related to music in a traditional sense, because Neuhaus separates sound from the dimension of time.\textsuperscript{28} Continuing day and night, the piece has little in common with a musical composition whose structure is articulated through time; instead, the formal boundaries that define \textit{Times Square} are essentially spatial ones, and the position of listeners upon the sidewalk shape their experience of the work to a considerable degree. Time, the most important foundation of music, is discarded. \textit{Times Square} also differs from most concert performances in its ambient nature, disappearing into the city’s soundscape for those pedestrians who do not recognize its existence. Even for those aware

\textsuperscript{26} Levine Packer, 154.  
\textsuperscript{27} Calvin, 116. It seems as though Neuhaus toyed with the \textit{Times Square} idea as early as 1972. In order to finance the project, he founded his own non-profit organized called Hear (Hybrid Energies for Acoustic Recourses), and was able to apply for funding through the Rockefeller Foundation, National Endowment for the Arts, and other private donors.  
\textsuperscript{28} Ulrich Loock, “Times Square: Max Neuhaus’s Sound Work in New York City,” \textit{Open} (No. 9, 2005), 83.
of Neuhaus’s work, the specific source of the continuous and unchanging sounds may remain a mystery.

Loock, while remarking upon the “radical break with musical thinking” apparent in the conception of works such as Times Square, nevertheless acknowledges that Neuhaus was influenced by earlier developments in experimental music. In particular, John Cage’s 4’33” is often cited as an influence on Neuhaus’s sound art due to its ambient character. As is the case in Times Square, in 4’33” listeners may find themselves engaged by environmental sounds they otherwise could have ignored. Yet 4’33” is precisely structured in time, with three movements of exactly defined length. The audience’s relationship to these respective works differs, too. With Times Square, Neuhaus has created a piece that did not announce its existence to the audience, thereby allowing listeners to apprehend the work or to ignore it without deliberate effort.

In its unobtrusiveness, Times Square is more aptly compared to the ambient works created by Brian Eno during the 1970s (including his Ambient 1: Music for Airports of 1978) or with Erik Satie’s much older notion of musique d’ameublement. In its use of public space—if not its ambient quality—the piece draws comparison to many performances by leading musicians of the 1960s avant-garde: Stockhausen’s famous 1969 event in the Giacometti courtyard of the Maeght Foundation’s museum in St. Paul de Vence; Cage’s performance of his 0’00” at the Rose Art Museum in 1965, addressed in chapter 3; and the many theatrical spectacles staged by members of Fluxus during that era. In its use of static electronic drones, the work draws

\[29\] Loock, 84.
\[30\] Ihor Holubizky, “Very Nice, Very Nice” from Sound by Artists, edited by Dan Lander and Micah Lexier (Toronto, Canada: Art Metropole, 1990), 244.
\[31\] Loock, 91.
\[32\] Calvin, 113. Neuhaus referred to an installation in the Whitney Museum and how the results did not please him, stating: “The problem was that it was the context of a museum exhibition, so most people went out and tried to hear it…very frustrating.”
comparison to the music of minimalist composers including La Monte Young, Phill Niblock, and others. In short, *Times Square*—like Neuhaus’s other works of sound art—does not lack for cousins in the realm of experimental music.

Yet some have argued that Neuhaus’s work should be discussed in the context of landscape or architecture. According to Loock, however, those disciplines are concerned with tangible objects, while Neuhaus’s work is largely intangible.\(^{33}\) Carter Ratcliffe claims Neuhaus “is not a visual artist, though he shapes space.”\(^{34}\) This view seems in keeping with Neuhaus’s own understanding of his work. He describes himself as an artist who shapes space through the introduction of sound:

> In terms of classification, I’d move the installations into the purview of the visual arts even though they have no visual component, because the visual arts, in a plastic sense, have dealt with space. Sculptors define and transform spaces, I create, transform, and change space by adding sound. That spatial concept is one which music cannot include.\(^{35}\)

He also commented on the nature of our perception of sound within space: “We still sense the size and nature of a space with our ears as well as our eyes. But our culture is so visual that we tend to forget about the aural side of things.”\(^{36}\) In *Times Square*, Neuhaus removed “sound from time” and set it, instead “in place.”\(^{37}\)

---

33. Loock, 84.
34. Ratcliffe, 160. Neuhaus is seen as more akin to sculptors, architects, landscape gardeners, and exterior decorators than painters, even though he was known to create formal drawings of his sound works that are often displayed in museum exhibitions.
CONCLUSION: LISTEN

Neuhaus’s sister, Laura Neuhaus Hansen, recalled their mother being a proud supporter of her brother’s musical activities, not only because she herself was musical, but because her scientist husband passed away before having the opportunity to appreciate his son’s concert career. Hansen believes that “just as [her] father was a chemist of the elements, Max was the chemist of sound.” Neuhaus obtained strengths from both of his parents, blending the musicality of his mother with the intellectual inventiveness of his father. His artistic direction is perhaps more easily understood in light of this mixture of influences. Arthur C. Danto wrote that “for reasons no doubt personal and conceptual, but also, given the spirit of those years, for reasons of what one might call political aesthetics, Neuhaus reconceived himself as a kind of visual artist who happens to use sounds rather than colors, but for whom shape is as central as it is for sculpture.”

Art critics and musicologists continue to grapple with the problems raised by interdisciplinary artworks such those by Neuhaus. In his discussion of these issues, Simon Shaw-Miller singles out Neuhaus’s work for its ability to draw our attention to the “points of similarity, difference, and contrast” between the visual and sonic dimensions of sensory perception. Critics and scholars have assigned a variety of labels to Neuhaus, often revealing much about their own backgrounds, areas of expertise, and artistic preferences. A few of these labels include sound artist (John-Paul Stonard, Alan Licht), aural artist (Bruce Weber), environmental composer (John Rockwell), sound environmentalist (Richard Kostelanetz), composer (the New York Times), sound sculptor (Hugh Davies, John Rockwell), and audio artist (David Toop). And

---

38 Laura Hansen Interview.
39 Danto, 161.
last, some writers have simply described Neuhaus’s sound installations as music, ignoring the
artist’s own rejection of that term.\footnote{For example, Thom Holmes writes that Neuhaus “provided continuously playing music within the context of public spaces.” Thom Holmes, \textit{Electronic and Experimental Music: Technology, Music, and Culture}, 3rd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2008), 398.} Whatever label one chooses, it cannot be ignored that
Neuhaus’s work raises fundamental questions about the boundaries often assumed to separate
artistic mediums.

When asked in an interview by Andrea Grover about the shift that caused Neuhaus to
think of sound as “a kind of plastic art, as spatial rather than time based,” Neuhaus responded:

This question is a little hard to answer because I have never functioned in a theoretical
way. I follow my nose. I was very fortunate to be successful at a very young age, and that
gave me perspective. I was 24, and I should have been 44 because it usually takes that
long to get where I was. To be that young and energetic in the middle of that career, to
have these other ideas about sound—and I didn’t question them, I just acted on them. At
one point it became clear that I couldn’t be both a percussion soloist and a sound artist, so

The percussionist Jan Williams conveyed a sense of regret that his friend made that choice:

I was always sorry that he gave up playing, I admired his abilities as percussionist very
much. But at the same time I was impressed by the way he moved from the role of
interpreter to that of a composer. He was incredibly creative, as a performer, composer,
writer, graphic artist and thinker.\footnote{Jan Williams interview.}

In a conversation with Dasha Dekleva in 2001, Neuhaus explained that there was no pivotal
moment or preconceived decision that led him to his late career.\footnote{Dekleva, 4.} Yet he recognized his 1968 LP
as something of a swan song to the musical world: “I had made this record of my percussion
repertoire for Columbia Masterworks. Instead of thinking of this as a career move, for me it was
a way out because I didn’t have to throw all of that away, it was preserved in the best way
possible.”

We know that Neuhaus felt restrained by the concert hall, and that he longed to create art beyond its confines. But is Carter Ratcliffe correct, therefore, to describe him as a “fugitive from the world of avant-garde music,” suggesting that he had been imprisoned by the likes of Cage and his musical colleagues? If so, he appears to have learned much from his captors.

The experience of creating his Columbia recording pushed Neuhaus towards the medium of electronic sound and encouraged him to probe many of the questions that subsequently underpinned his later works of sound art. By incorporating electronics as a means of instrumentation, amplifying his body, and introducing other innovations, he deviated from the strict instructions handed down by the works’ composers. In some cases, these changes produced sounds that he could not control with precision; in others, they encouraged the audience to appreciate noises within an artistic frame. In these aspects of his recording, we can see the origins of concerns that subsequently pervaded Neuhaus’s work as a sound artist. On a more conceptual level, however, it was his probing of boundaries in creating the LP that helped usher Neuhaus’s transformation. As a musician blurring the roles of performer, collaborator, and co-creator, he prepared himself for a second career as an artist who explored distinctions among artistic mediums.

Neuhaus may have stopped referring to his art as “music,” but his work remained grounded in the perception of sound by human auditors. Speaking of the centrality of listening to Neuhaus’s art, Ulrich Loock wrote that “listening [and] perceiving in Neuhaus’s work is an activity, a question of orientation, of differentiating, of exploring, of shifting and not so much a

---

45 Ibid. In contrast to this decision to document his activities as a percussionist through sound recording, Neuhaus did not choose to record the sonic components of his site-specific works, believing that the sounds were meaningless without their surroundings.

46 Ratcliffe, 154.
question of mood or contemplation." Perhaps Neuhaus provided an answer to many of the questions raised in this thesis with the single word he stamped onto the hands of his followers in 1966, a word that tersely connects his first career to his second one: LISTEN.

\footnote{Loock, 92.}
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APPENDIX A
MANHATTAN SCHOOL OF MUSIC PERFORMANCES INVOLVING NEUHAUS

**All information comes from programs housed in Box 5 of the Max Neuhaus Collection at Columbia University, NYC
**All works were performed by the Manhattan School of Music Percussion Ensemble unless otherwise noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>WORKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/17/1959</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Hubbard Auditorium</td>
<td>Malloy Miller: <em>Prelude for Percussion</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattan SOM</td>
<td>Lou Harrison: <em>Canticle No. 3</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur Cohn: <em>Quotations in Percussion</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Colgrass: <em>Three Brothers</em> (all world premieres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/20/1959</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Sheridan Square</td>
<td>Carlos Chavez: <em>Toccata for Percussion Instruments</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28/1959</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Manhattanville</td>
<td>Jack McKenzie: <em>Introduction and Allegro</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PIUS X HALL</td>
<td>Lou Harrison: <em>The Song of Queztecolt</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase, New York</td>
<td>Warren Benson: <em>Trio for Percussion</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Colgrass: <em>Percussion Music</em> [Paul Price Percussion Quartet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/1959</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Carnegie Hall</td>
<td>Lou Harrison: <em>Concerto for the Violin with Percussion</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Anahid Ajemian, violinist accompanied by the Paul Price Percussion Ensemble]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Premiere performance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/1960</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Hubbard Auditorium</td>
<td>Frank Bencriscutto: <em>Rondeau for Percussion</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/1960</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Caspary Hall</td>
<td>Michael Colgrass: <em>Chamber Music for Percussion Quintet</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ernst Krenek: <em>Marginal Sounds</em> (Premiere performance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Cowell: <em>Ostinato Pianissimo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Cowell: <em>Vocalise</em> (NYC premiere performance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lou Harrison: <em>Canticle No. 1</em> (first NYC performance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3/8/1960  Performance  Hubbard Auditorium  
Frank Benriscutto:  
*Rondeau for Percussion* (NYC premiere)  
Ernst Krenek:  
*Marginal Sounds*  
Michael Colgrass:  
*Chamber Music for Percussion Quintet*  
Henry Cowell:  
*Ostinato Pianissimo*  
Gardner Read:  
*Los Dioses Aztecas* (premiere performance)

4/10/1960  Performance  Kaufmann Hall  
Shapey:  
*Soliloquy* (”To Be or Not to Be”)  
for Narrator, String Quartet and Percussion  
(premiere performance)

4/25/1960  Performance  Hubbard Auditorium  
Glanville-Hicke:  
*Sonata for Piano and Percussion*

5/8/1960  Performance  Kent School, CT  
Jack McKenzie:  
*Introduction and Allegro*  
Gerald Strang:  
*Percussion Music*  
Lou Harrison:  
*The Song of Queztoectatl*  
Armand Russell:  
*Percussion Suite*  
Michael Colgrass:  
*Percussion Music*  
Harry Barlett:  
*Fourth of July*  
[The Paul Price Percussion Quartet]

12/6/1960  Performance  Central High School  
Malloy Miller:  
*Prelude for Percussion*  
Michael Colgrass:  
*Inventions on a Motive*  
Lou Harrison:  
*Canticle No. 1*  
Armand Russell:  
*Percussion Suite*  
Alan Hovhaness:  
*October Mountain*  
Cole Iverson:  
*Contrarhythmic Ostenato*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1/16/1961 | Review     | Town Hall      | Nicolas Flagello: *Divertimento for Piano and Percussion* (premiere performance)  
|          |            |                | Lou Harrison: *Labyrinth No. 3* (NYC premiere performance)  
|          |            |                | Robert Kelly: *Toccata for Marimba and Percussion* (NYC Premiere)  
|          |            |                | Jack Jarret: *The Congo* (NYC Premiere)  
|          |            |                | Amadeo Roldan: *Two Ritmicas*  
|          |            |                | Frank Bencriscutto: *Rondeau for Percussion*  
|          |            |                | Gardner Read: *Los Dioses Aztecas* |
|          |            |                | [Andrew Heath, piano with Connecticut Symphony Orchestra and Manhattan SOM Percussion]  
| 3/11/1961 | Performance | Harkaway Theater Bennett College (NY) | Malloy Miller: *Prelude for Percussion*  
|          |            |                | Michael Colgrass: *Inventions on a Motive*  
|          |            |                | Lou Harrison: *Canticle No. 1*  
|          |            |                | Armand Russell: *Percussion Suite*  
|          |            |                | Alan Hovhaness: *October Mountain*  
|          |            |                | Cole Iverson: *Contrarhythmic Ostenato*  
|          |            |                | [Erick Hawkins and Dance Company with Manhattan SOM Percussion Ens]  
|          |            |                | James Sutcliffe: *Two Pictures for Percussion* (NYC Premiere performance)  
|          |            |                | Zita Carno: *Sextet for Percussion* (USA Premiere performance)  
|          |            |                | Keisuke Ajiro: *Three Short Dances*  
|          |            |                | (NYC Premiere performance)  
|          |            |                | Jose Ardevol: *Suite*  
|          |            |                | (NYC Premiere performance)  


5/11/1961  Workshop  Hubbard Auditorium  Johanna Seyer: *March for Percussion*
Ronald Lopresti: *Sketch for Percussion*

5/11/1961  Performance  Hubbard Auditorium  Johanna Seyer: *March for Percussion*
Ronald Lopresti: *Sketch for Percussion*
James Hanna: *Fugue and Chorale*
Keisuke Ajiro: *Sextet No. 1*  (Premiere performance)
Michael Rosenberg: *Two Moods for Percussion Quartet*  (Premiere performance)
Walter Anslinger: *Suite for Percussion*  (NYC Premiere performance)

4/26/1962  Performance  Manhattan SOM  Carlos Franci: *Concerto for Vibraphone and Orchestra*
[MSOM Repertoire Orchestra and Max Neuhaus, vibes]

2/14/????  Performance  Hunter Playhouse  NYC  Works performed unknown
[Paul Lang Dance Company with Paul Price Percussion Ensemble and Theodore Saidenber]

Other Performances Involving Max Neuhaus Outside of Manhattan School of Music

**All information comes from programs housed in Box 5 of the Max Neuhaus Collection at Columbia University, NYC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>WORKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/19/1960</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Clinton Hill Symphony</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/1960</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Bronx Civic Opera</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/1961</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Opera Theatre</td>
<td>Puccini: <em>Tosca</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/14/1961</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Opera Theatre</td>
<td>Mozart: <em>The Marriage of Figaro</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/1961</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Broadway Symphony</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8/21/1961-on  Performance  Matunuck, Rhode Island  Sandy Wilson: *The Boy Friend*  
[The Rhode Island Theatre Company – Theatre by the Sea  
Max Neuhaus played drums]

4/27/1962  Performance  Hammond, Indiana  Haydn: *Creation*  
[Illiana A capella Choir]

Unknown  Performance  Hunter College  Beethoven: *Leonore Overture*  
Saint-Saens: *Violoncello Concerto in A Minor*  
Brahms: *Symphony No. 2 in D*  
[Young Men’s Symphony Orchestra]
### APPENDIX B

**NEUHAUS SOLO PERFORMANCE HISTORY**

*Information comes from Series 1 Correspondence from Max Neuhaus to John Cage at the John Cage Collection, Northwestern University Rare Music Library Materials

**Information comes from Carnegie Hall Artists Performance History Files on Max Neuhaus

***Other information comes from programs, recordings, books, concert reviews, or interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>WORKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/17/1962</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Darmstadt Institute Germany</td>
<td>Makoto Shinohara: Extrait de Alternance pour percussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/1962</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Fluxus Festival</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1963</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Wergo Records New York</td>
<td>Karlheinz Stockhausen: Zyklus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/1963</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Pocket Theatre NYC</td>
<td>Erik Satie: Vexations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/1963</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Tone Roads Series</td>
<td>Charles Ives: Over the Pavements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/1964</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>University Museum Philadelphia</td>
<td>Karlheinz Stockhausen: Zyklus Karlheinz Stockhausen: Kontakte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/29/1964</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Town Hall NYC</td>
<td>[“Gala Concert” included music by Stockhausen, Henze, Hindemith and others. Performers included Stockhausen, Neuhaus and Tudor, where Action Against Cultural Imperialism (AACI) protested]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1964</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Karlheinz Stockhausen: Zyklus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6/2/1964 Performance Carnegie Recital Hall Bo Nilsson: *Reaktionen*
Karlheinz Stockhausen: *Zyklus*
Earle Brown: *Four Systems*
John Cage: 27' 10.554"

9/4/1964 Performance Judson Hall NYC Morton Feldman: *The King of Denmark*

9/8-13/1964 Performance Judson Hall NYC Karlheinz Stockhausen: *Originale*
[Action Against Cultural Imperialism (AACI) protested performance]

1/2/1965 Performance 92nd St. YM-YWHA Kaufmann Hall Karlheinz Stockhausen: *Kontakte*
Mauricio Kagel: *Transicion II*
(NYC Premiere performance)
John Cage: *Atlas Eclipticalis* with *Winter Music*
[Max Neuhaus, James Tenney, and Philip Corner]

2/11-12/1965 Performance ONCE Festival Ann Arbor, Michigan George Cacioppo: *Time on Time in Miracles*
[Once Chamber Ensemble]
Joseph Byrd: *Water Music*
Philip Corner: *Everything Max Has*

3/21/1965 Performance Judson Church NYC Philip Corner: “*Beforehand*”
(Neuhaus’s instruments arrive)
Performance Part 1:
Roman Haubenstock-Ramati: * Liaisons*
Morton Feldman: * Piano Piece, 1952*
Joseph Byrd: * Water Music*
Philip Corner: * Everything Max Has*
(two-gong rubber ball version by Neuhaus)
Jackson Maclow:
“The text on the opposite page may be used in anyway, as a score for solo or group readings, musical or dramatic performances, looking, smelling anything else and/or nothing at all”
Max Neuhaus:
*with addition of a thought “Listen” (noun)*
Karlheinz Stockhausen: *Zyklus*

***Intermission until Performance Part 2 with accompaniment of “Super 2” by Max Neuhaus from 8-11am and 5-8pm***
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/22/1965</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Carnegie Hall</td>
<td>Performance Part 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Cage: <strong>27' 10.554''</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morton Feldman: <em>Piano Piece</em>, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Cage: <em>Fontana Mix–Feed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sylvano Bussotti: <em>Coeur Pour Batteur</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moran: <em>Ceremony</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/1965</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Carnegie Hall</td>
<td>[Chicago Contemporary Chamber Players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tribute to Varèse Concert]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/1965</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>U of Chicago</td>
<td>Joseph Byrd: <em>Water Music</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roman Haubenstock-Ramati: <em>Liaisons</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karlheinz Stockhausen: <em>Zyklus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Cage: <strong>27' 10.554''</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Cage: <em>Fontana Mix–Feed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7/1965*</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Spoleto, Italy</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1965*</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>West Deutsche Rundfunk Studios</td>
<td>Earle Brown: <em>Four Systems</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cologne, Germany</td>
<td>Karlheinz Stockhausen: <em>Zyklus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Cage: <em>Fontana Mix–Feed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/1965</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>BBC Studios London</td>
<td>Morton Feldman: <em>King of Denmark</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Cage: <em>Fontana Mix–Feed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1965*</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Sudwestfunk Radio Baden-Baden, Germany</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/1965</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>U of Madrid</td>
<td>John Cage: <em>Fontana Mix–Feed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965*</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Zaj Festival Madrid</td>
<td>Karlheinz Stockhausen: <em>Zyklus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1966*</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>San Francisco Tape Center</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27/1966</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>NYC</td>
<td>Max Neuhaus: <em>Listen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karlheinz Stockhausen: <em>Zyklus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[And other works by Cage, Bussotti, Feldman, Corner, and Tenney]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Artist(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2, 1966</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Spoleto Festival Italy</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/1966</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Town Hall NYC</td>
<td>[Music by James Tenney, Jackson Maclow, and Max Neuhaus]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/1966</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Carnegie Hall</td>
<td>Morton Feldman: <em>King of Denmark</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Cage: <em>Fontana Mix–Feed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Concert with Hart Chamber Players]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/1966</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Mall in Central Park</td>
<td>John Cage: <em>Fontana Mix–Feed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/1967</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Aspen Magazine NYC</td>
<td>Morton Feldman: <em>King of Denmark</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/1968</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Carnegie Hall</td>
<td>NO PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/1968</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Tone Roads Series</td>
<td>Dick Higgins: <em>Danger Music</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1968</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Columbia Records</td>
<td>Earle Brown: <em>Four Systems</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morton Feldman: <em>King of Denmark</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sylvano Bussotti: <em>Coeur Pour Batteur</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karlheinz Stockhausen: <em>Zyklus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Cage: <em>Fontana Mix–Feed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1968</td>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>Phill Niblock</td>
<td><em>Max</em> [seven minute, image collage film/portrait of Max Neuhaus, with a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>collage soundtrack by Neuhaus called “Super Z”]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: LETTERS OF PERMISSION FOR EXAMPLES

Schirmer

Music Sales West
C. Schirmer, Inc.
1247 Sixth Street
Santa Monica, CA 90401
United States of America
Telephone: +1 310.393.5900
Fax: +1 310.393.9925
Email: info@music-sales.com
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www.schirmer.com

March 18, 2013

Megan Marph
101 LSU Union Blvd.
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

RE: DECEMBER 1952 and FOUR SYSTEMS, by Earle Brown

Dear Megan,

This letter is to confirm our agreement for the nonexclusive right to reprint measures from the composition(s) referenced above for inclusion in your thesis/dissertation, subject to the following conditions:

1. The following copyright credit is to appear on each copy made:

DECEMBER 1952
By Earle Brown
Copyright © 1961 (Renewed) by Associated Music Publishers, Inc. (BMI)
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Reprinted by Permission.

FOUR SYSTEMS
By Earle Brown
Copyright © Associated Music Publishers, Inc. (BMI)
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Reprinted by permission.

2. Copies are for your personal use only in connection with your thesis/dissertation, and may not be sold or further duplicated without our written consent. This is no way is meant to prevent your depositing three copies in an interlibrary system, such as the microfilm collection of the university you attend, or with University Microfilms, Inc.

3. Permission is granted to University Microfilms, Inc. to make single copies of your thesis/dissertation, upon demand.
4. A one-time non-refundable permission fee of seventy-five ($75.00) dollars, to be paid by you within thirty (30) days from the date of this letter.

5. If your thesis/dissertation is accepted for commercial publication, further written permission must be sought.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kevin McGee
Print Licensing Manager
April 23, 2013

Megan Murphy
Master's Candidate
Louisiana State University
101 LSU Union Blvd. #16540
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

Dear Ms. Murphy,

Thank you for your e-mail correspondence requesting permission to include excerpts from Morton Feldman's *The King of Denmark* in your master's thesis at Louisiana State University.

We will grant you this permission, gratis. In your acknowledgements you must include the copyright dates and the credit notice, Copyright © (insert year) by C.F. Peters Corporation. Used by permission. All Rights Reserved.

Our permission extends to web search engines and to ProQuest/UMI to distribute copies of your dissertation upon request.

With all best wishes for success with your studies, I am

Sincerely,

C.F. PETERS CORPORATION

Héctor Colón
New Music and Rights Department
Dear Ms. Murph,
We grant you the authorization to reproduce the extract you require for the use you declared. Please do not forget to report our copy note.

Best regards,
Lucia Castellini

Dear Clara Ippolito,
My name is Megan Murph and I am a Master's candidate at Louisiana State University. I am writing to ask permission to use the following score excerpts from the MGB Hal Leonard's edition of Sylvano Bussotti's *Sette fogli, una collezione occulta* as examples in my thesis, titled "Max Neuhaus and the Musical Avant-Garde," which is presented as partial fulfillment of the Master's at Louisiana State University:

Sylvano Bussotti's *Coeur pour batteur* (for M. Neuhaus) from *Sette fogli, una collezione occulta*

Since this graphic score does not have page or measure numbers, attached is the specific excerpt I would like to include in my thesis. As required by the LSU Graduate School, the thesis will be published as an ETD online and become part of the Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations. No profit will be made from this thesis.

Thank you for your consideration,
Megan Murph
Dear Ms. Murph,
Thank you for your e-mail. We are pleased to grant you permission to reprint the attached page from Stockhausen in your Master’s thesis.

Our copyright-lines should read:
Karlheinz Stockhausen “Zyklus für einen Schlagzeuger Nr. 9”

Sylvano Bussotti’s works have been reverted to BMG, Ricordi. Please contact:
Clara Ippolito clara.ippolito@mgbhalleonard.com

Please send us a complimentary copy of your thesis.

With best regards,
Aygün Lausch
Copyright
lausch@universaledition.com
Universal Edition AG
Bösendorferstrasse 12
A - 1010 Wien

Mar 15, 2013 at 12:29 PM
To: office@universaledition.com

My name is Megan Murph and I am a Master's candidate at Louisiana State University. I am writing to ask permission to use the following score excerpts from the Universal Edition of Sylvano Bussotti's Sette fogli, una collezione occulta and Karlheinz Stockhausen's Zyklus as examples in my thesis, titled "Max Neuhaus and the Musical Avant-Garde," which is presented as partial fulfillment of the Master's at Louisiana State University:

Sylvano Bussotti’s Coeur pour batteur (for M. Neuhaus) from Sette fogli, una collezione occulta
Karlheinz Stockhausen’s Zyklus

Since these graphic scores do not have page or measure numbers, attached are the specific excerpts I would like to include in my thesis. As required by the LSU Graduate School, the thesis will be published as an ETD online and become part of the Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations. No profit will be made from this thesis.

Thank you for your consideration,
Megan Murph
VITA

Megan Murph was born in McBee, South Carolina and studied piano at the South Carolina Governor’s School for the Arts and Humanities where she graduated high school in 2005. She attended Brevard College in Brevard, North Carolina where she earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in 2009, majoring in music with a primary in piano and emphasis in music history and theory and graduating cum laude. Her undergraduate thesis, “Morton Feldman’s Music Involving Art: Connections to Jackson Pollock, Philip Guston, and Mark Rothko,” was advised by Dr. Laurie McDowell and presented at the Blue Ridge Undergraduate Research Conference in Columbia, Kentucky. In 2009 Megan entered the graduate program in musicology at Louisiana State University. During the summer of 2011 she had the opportunity to be an archive intern at the Library of Congress’ Acquisition and Processing Section of the Music Division. Professionally, Megan has presented at the American Musicological Society’s Southern Chapter meeting, Boston University’s Graduate Student Conference, LSU’s Music Forum, Brevard College’s Colloquium, and LSU’s Biennial Colloquium.