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ABSTRACT

BRITISH BRASS BAND CONTEST PIECES: A STUDY IN TRANSCRIPTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN WIND BAND REPERTOIRE

by Jonathan James Helmick

December 2014

This study tests the underlying beliefs and values motivating research and repertoire development as related to the American wind band. It seeks to examine the belief that a sizeable body of quality, original repertoire is the barometer for measuring the success of the American wind band movement. Preliminary research finds an overwhelming emphasis placed on quality original repertoire as the measure of validation for the American wind band. An absence of research on transcriptions and their relationship to the American wind band is evidenced. The utility of the study is related to the value judgment surrounding the musical integrity of transcriptions versus original compositions, as those values and beliefs shape the programming choices of conductors and, consequently, the development of the American wind band as a whole.

As a case study, Peter Graham’s Harrison’s Dream is examined. Harrison’s Dream is the recipient of the 2002 American Bandmasters Association Ostwald Award for wind band composition. This is a unique occurrence, as it is the first international award recipient, and the first transcription to receive the prestigious award since the award’s inception in 1956. Harrison’s Dream is contextualized by examining the historical development of the British Open Brass Band Championships and the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain as they relate to championship section test-
pieces. This is combined with original research in the form of interviews solicited from three people closely associated with the events surrounding the 2002 American Bandmasters Association Ostwald Award designation: Dr. Thomas Fraschillo, 2001-2002 American Bandmasters Association Ostwald Award committee member; Dr. William Moody, Secretary-Treasurer of the American Bandmasters Association; and Peter Graham, composer of the award winning piece, *Harrison’s Dream*. Each interview participant offers their perspective on the award designation, the opinion of *Harrison’s Dream* as a transcription, and their beliefs and values relevant to the original repertoire debate.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The American wind band in its modern form, whether with the expanded instrumentation of the concert band, or the reduced and flexible instrumentation of the wind ensemble, is young in comparison to established musical traditions such as the symphony orchestra or the string quartet. That youthfulness has led to an enduring debate over the legitimacy of the American wind band as a musical medium, a controversy focusing on the lack of a substantial body of original repertoire. Scholars in the field have historically focused on the topic of original repertoire written for the wind band, designating the amassing of original repertoire as its legitimizing instrument.¹ The lack of a substantial body of original works by composers during the Golden Age of Bands (circa 1865-1930) and, to a great extent in the 1950s, has led to the consuming issue that the quest for original repertoire should be a primary concern of professionals in the field. It has become the albatross of wind band conductors across the nation since the 1950s, the decade of the earliest recorded scholarly research into wind band repertoire and programming.² Noted conductor and wind band author, Frank Battisti, emphasizes that on the national level, “band instrumentation was high on the agendas of all band associations


at the mid-point of the century.”  

Richard K. Hansen, in his book detailing the history of the wind band, fervently encapsulates the passionate sentiment of encouraging continued development of original wind band music in his 2005 vision statement for wind band leaders:

A quest for original, high-quality music that advanced American wind band repertoire for nearly a century must be continually renewed with zeal and effective direction. Band musicians must achieve the complete aesthetic experience that is the honest performance of high-quality music. Wind bandleaders must awaken in musicians a curiosity about valuable music and inspire them to recreate precious icons of American culture. Conductors must commission composers to create substantial original works for the wind band and foster composers’ music with the highest standards of artistic integrity, musical commitment, and humanism.  

The driving forces behind research on new composers, new compositions for the wind band, and the development of literature through commissioning endeavors have proven fruitful. However, the underpinning motivation for this research may be presumptive for two reasons. Primarily, it holds that a substantial body of quality original literature should be the measure of validation. Consequently, this moves a considerable body of repertoire for the wind band to the periphery. This value judgment presupposes that arrangements and transcriptions are not legitimizing bodies of literature, since they were originally written by the composer for another medium, and later adapted for wind band by a third party. Throughout the 20th Century, the latter value judgment, often

---


6 Ibid., 27-28.
axiomatically placed into the profession, is both subtly and overtly evidenced. For example, in a 1960 paper delivered to the Conference of the College Band Directors National Association, Paul Creston discusses his view on transcriptions:

The problem is not merely in the demand but in the supply of original band music, though the latter could not exist without the former. This shortage is the second and most important obstacle to bringing the band to the concert stage. How do we alleviate it? The first step, of necessity, is transcriptions.⁷

Creston clarifies,

I am neither for nor against transcriptions in general, because there are certain types of music that sound equally well for various media. … But on the other hand, there is a type of music so indigenous to the instrument for which it was written that any transcription, no matter how clever, is a travesty, a desecration. To present the band in its true light, it must have its own, original, specifically created literature.⁸

Paul Creston’s 1960 perspective is a forecasting glimpse at the contentious role that transcriptions would play in the latter half of the 20th Century. Based on this first excerpt by Creston, it seems as though transcriptions are intended to serve as a means to an end. A revealing quotation, transcriptions as vehicles to developing an original body of repertoire should be contextualized in the era in which it was articulated. The wind band had just emerged, post-World War II, into a decade that saw a tremendous amount of growth in repertoire, compared to the fifty years leading up to the 1950s. Prior to this decade, the proportion of original literature written for the wind band to transcribed works for the medium strongly favored transcriptions.

Just six years following Creston’s paper, Keith Wilson offers a firsthand perspective on the trends of programming original music versus, not alongside, transcriptions:

⁷Ibid., 27.
⁸Ibid.
… A large segment of the entire music profession is now aware that band conductors want a literature of their own, and that modern band is a serious performing medium playing an increasingly important part in our musical life. Any informed band conductor can now make up interesting programs consisting primarily of original band music if he so desires, and some of our colleagues maintain we should play only such music, an assertion that would have been considered fantastic and impossible twenty-five years ago.9

The quotation highlights several tenets. First, original music is important, sought after, and an issue of the day. Second, the idea of the modern band as a serious performing ensemble is stated in the same breath as the emphasis upon original quality repertoire written for the ensemble – a value judgment. Third, contemporary conductors and bandleaders were urging that transcriptions be completely eliminated from programming choices. Admittedly, the extent to which contemporaries of Keith Wilson were calling for the elimination of the transcription is unknown based on the information from this and other related articles. However, as the 1960s drew to a conclusion, William A. Schaefer framed the debate neatly in his retrospective remarks:

The subject of transcriptions looms in the back of our minds during every consideration of literature. Should we once and for all eliminate all but original wind music from our repertoire? Can we afford to yet? What is the attitude of other musicians toward music performed in a medium other than that for which it was first conceived?10

This developing belief system held such importance that it was a motivational force that led to an entirely new approach to wind band instrumentation. This instrumentation concept emerged in the early 1950s as a result of the emphasis on new,

---


original repertoire and the concept of flexible instrumentation. Donald Hunsberger, conductor emeritus of the Eastman Wind Ensemble, in a 1994 article describing the details resulting in the development of Frederick Fennell’s wind ensemble instrumentation concept, an ensemble based on the principles of flexible instrumentation, writes:

Fennell’s manifesto put forth two main principles: (1) the development of an original repertoire, as opposed to a borrowed, arranged, or transcribed one, and (2) the idea of flexible instrumentation and personnel assignments for each work – established, whenever possible, by the composer. While many band directors may have shared his desire for an original repertoire, the second of his proposals directly conflicted with the then-common standardized instrumentation in which all players performed every composition…

Though transcriptions and the quest for an original body of repertoire were not the only motivating forces behind the departure from standardized instrumentation and the development of the wind ensemble concept, it was a factor. More importantly, the value judgment that was present at the time was an important contributing paradigm that led to an entirely novel concept of instrumentation.

The value judgments that underscore the profession have shaped and defined research and reflection on the wind band, its development, history, and repertoire since the decade of the 1950s. As a result, a vast body of noteworthy literature has been left relatively untouched by researchers and conductors programming for the wind band.

Purpose

This study utilizes William Schaefer’s inquiry as a point of departure. It seeks to examine the belief that a sizeable body of quality original repertoire is the barometer for measuring the success of the American Wind Band movement. The value judgment

---

surrounding the musical integrity of transcriptions versus original compositions shapes the programming choices of conductors and, consequently, the development of the American Wind Band as a whole. Professor Robert D. Jorgensen, of The University of Akron (1992), emphasizes this point when he states that the selection of repertoire is one of the most important responsibilities that a conductor must fulfill.\(^\text{12}\) The beliefs and values that scholars and conductors hold shape the research and repertoire of the profession.

The purpose and utility of the study is therefore multi-dimensional. It questions the aforementioned presumptions inherent in this value judgment via qualitative inquiry. It defines a grey area between original works for wind band and transcriptions by third-party transcribers, those works transcribed or arranged by the composer of origination. As a model for study, it examines a body of literature for the American wind band that has been overlooked by researchers – transcriptions. To focus the scope of the research, this study is narrowed to transcriptions of original British brass band contest pieces from 1913 to the present.\(^\text{13}\) Transcriptions of such works are used as the model of study because of the landmark relationship that one test piece, \textit{Harrison’s Dream}, has with one of the most prestigious American wind band composition contests – the American Bandmasters Association’s Ostwald Award. It adds to the small body of research on transcriptions for the wind band by exploring the view of composers regarding transcriptions of their original works.


\(^{13}\)1913 is the date of the first test piece originally written for brass band. Prior to this, test pieces consisted of transcriptions and arrangements.
Research Questions

Goals of this research involve qualitative inquiry, soliciting expert perspectives from scholar-conductors and practitioners in the wind band field. It examines the value judgments that have driven and currently drive the development of the evolving body of literature performed by the contemporary wind band. It serves as a meaningful discourse that brings transcriptions from the periphery of wind band research to the foreground.

These goals and ensuing research are guided by the following:

1. What artistic value and legitimacy do transcriptions offer to audiences, musicians, and the living body of literature of the American wind band?
2. What motivates a composer to self-transcribe from one medium to another?
3. How did the 2001-2002 American Bandmasters Association’s Ostwald Composition Award Contest Committee come to the landmark decision of awarding the prestigious award for composition to the transcribed work *Harrison's Dream*, by Peter Graham?
4. How has the role of transcriptions, actual or perceived, changed over the course of the history of the American wind band?

Procedure

First, the British brass band model of contesting (1913-present) is placed in a historical context. The innovations of the “Great Triumvirate,” J. H. Iles, and the establishment of the National Brass Band Championships will be highlighted via the work of Roy Newsome in *Brass Roots: A Hundred Years of Brass Bands and Their Music (1836-1936)* and Trevor Herbert’s text, *The British Brass Band: A Musical and Social History*. In particular, the establishment of standardized instrumentation for the
British brass band from the rules and regulations of contesting will be outlined. Further, the historical importance of contesting as a means of both developing the brass band movement and producing an extensive body of original repertoire by noted composers such as Gustav Holst, Percy Fletcher, Edward Elgar, John Ireland, Ralph Vaughan Williams, Malcolm Arnold, Elgar Howarth, Derek Bourgeois, Philip Sparke, Peter Graham, and others will be examined.\textsuperscript{14}

Second, interviews with Peter Graham, composer of the test piece for the 2000 National Brass Band Finals, \textit{Harrison’s Dream}, will be conducted. Peter Graham originally wrote \textit{Harrison’s Dream} for brass band but transcribed it himself for wind band. This composition is unique since it is the first work by a composer to be transcribed from an original source for wind band and win the coveted American Bandmasters Association’s Ostwald Award for original band composition.\textsuperscript{15} Further, it is the first award winning composition to originate from outside of North America.\textsuperscript{16} The legitimacy of this transcribed work will be explored from the composer’s perspective. The exploration will illuminate the debate concerning the artistic integrity of original works versus transcriptions. Further, by consulting members of the American Bandmasters Association’s Ostwald Award Committee, the rationale behind awarding the prize to a transcribed work may prove fruitful in exploring the validity of transcriptions as a body of literature worthy of study. Additionally, an interview with the composer will offer insight on why he chose to transcribe \textit{Harrison’s Dream} and points of considerations for


\textsuperscript{16}See Appendix K.
future researchers. Finally, guidelines under which Peter Graham wrote for brass band will be defined and explored.

Limitations

The study will focus solely on published literature transcribed from original works composed as contest pieces for national level British brass band competitions. These competitions will include only the following: the British Open, the National Brass Band Championship, and their predecessors such as the Belle Vue and Crystal Palace Contests. This body of literature is the focus for several reasons. First, the governing associations of both contest organizations have a history of nearly identical standardized instrumentation lists and processes of commissioning composers to write test pieces. Second, the body of literature contains multiple compositions transcribed by the composers of origin that are living and available for interview to ascertain intent, inspiration, and insight into the motivating forces behind transcribing for the American wind band. Third, the body of literature is large enough to present a valuable resource for current conductors while narrow enough to be considered a viable study.

Sources of Data

1. Interview with Peter Graham, composer of Harrison’s Dream, 2000 National Brass Band Test Piece and winner of the 2002 ABA/Ostwald Award
2. Interview with Dr. Thomas Fraschillo, member of the 2001-2002 ABA/Ostwald Award Selection Committee

---

17 Herbert, 320-321.

18 Examples include, but are not limited to the following: Harrison’s Dream – Peter Graham, Year of the Dragon – Philip Sparke, Extreme Makeover – Johan De Meij.
3. Interview with Dr. William J. Moody, Secretary-Treasurer of the American Bandmasters Association, Member of the Sousa/Ostwald Award Committee

4. Archives of the National Brass Band Championships and the British Open

6. Attached bibliography

Definitions

“American wind band” and “wind band,” for the purpose of this dissertation, are used interchangeably. The term encompasses ensembles with the instrumentation and label of symphonic band, symphony band, concert band, wind ensemble, wind orchestra, symphonic wind orchestra, and symphonic wind ensemble that are present in the United States. “Wind” is chosen as the modifier of “band” to distinguish it from “brass band.”

“British brass band” and “brass band” will also be used interchangeably for the purposes of this study. It is defined more globally by Jeremy Montagu as “an ensemble of brass instruments and percussion.”\(^{19}\) The instrumentation of this ensemble consists of twenty-five to twenty-six brass performers plus percussionists. Brass players are localized to the following instrumentation with the exception of minor modifications: Eb soprano cornet, Bb cornet, Bb flugel horn, Eb tenor horn, Bb baritone, Bb euphonium, Bb tenor trombone, Bb bass trombone, Eb and EEb bass, and Bb and BBb bass.

“Contest pieces” are compositions performed by brass bands at competitions that are adjudicated by a panel of judges. Also referred to as “test pieces,” these compositions may be prescribed by contest organizers or designated as an own selection work. If the latter is the case, bands may choose their own selection piece to perform for adjudication. It is common practice for compositions designated as own selection to be a well-known

test piece from previous contests. If the former is the rule set forth by competition organizers, then all competing brass bands must perform the same test piece for adjudication. In the history and development of brass band contesting, these pieces may consist of original and/or transcribed works for the brass band.

“Self-transcribed” denotes the transcription of music by the composer of origin. Therefore, music originally composed for a medium is transcribed by the original composer for a different instrumentation.

Abbreviations

ABA – The American Bandmasters Association

BOBBC – British Open Brass Band Championships or British Open

CBDNA – College Band Directors National Association

NBBC – National Brass Band Championships or National Championships

Ostwald Award – American Bandmasters Association Sousa/Ostwald Award for Original Band Composition.

---

20 Herbert, 9.
CHAPTER II

EVOLVING THE BRITISH BRASS BAND:
CONTESTING AND REPERTOIRE DEVELOPMENT

Though often framed as a middle class form of musical entertainment, the brass band has a dense history birthed in the mid 19th Century. The development of the brass band movement has its roots intertwined with the development of the industrial age, the rise of the middle-class, the preponderance of Victorian Era leisure activities, and time honored traditions developed from its own process of standardization and contesting. It is important to note that the latter notions of standardization and contesting have remained largely unbroken for over a century.21 It is through the inseparable and simultaneous evolution of standardization and contesting that the contextualization of the medium is best understood.

A Brief History of Contesting

Brass bands formalize in the 1840s and 1850s. It is during this time that advances in instrument making and industry begin to bear fruit, making instruments easier to play and more accessible. During the latter half of the 19th Century, brass banding becomes more commonplace as a result of these developments and the low cost of instruments available to middle-class musicians. By the conclusion of the 19th Century, the British brass band movement develops a standardized instrumentation to include the soprano cornet in Eb, Bb cornets, Bb flugelhorn, tenor horns in Eb, two baritones in Bb, two euphoniums in Bb, tenor and bass trombones in Bb, and basses in both Eb and Bb.22

21Herbert, 2.

22Ibid, 4.
Note the proportion of conical versus cylindrical instruments that comprise the ensemble. The British brass band sound is attributed to this emphasis on conical instrumentation, the exception being the inclusion of the trombone. However, developments leading to standardized instrumentation and the brass band identity are not relegated to ingenuity and industry. Trevor Herbert encapsulates it best:

… the shape and character of the brass band movement has been defined by processes, rules, values, spheres of influence, power structures, and performance practices which emanate from contesting.\(^\text{23}\)

Further, the key factor which caused brass bands to capture the public imagination and become a vital part of the new Victorian leisure industry was the advent of the brass band contest.\(^\text{24}\)

These contests have existed at local and national levels throughout the 19th and 20th Centuries. Contests, responsible for the popularization of brass bands, are also responsible for the instrumentation and development of the ensemble and its repertoire. Arguably, the origin of modern contesting can be traced to the efforts of Enderby Jackson.

Enderby Jackson, an entrepreneur and musician, is considered to be a controversial figure in the development of brass band contesting. The bulk of knowledge related to his contributions to the brass band movement is from his own pen. Some argue that his writings about the subject harbor a degree of self-interested bias. His own accounts, published in the 1896 articles entitled “Origin and Promotion of Brass Band Contests” in the Musical Opinion and Musical Trades Review, are alleged to exaggerate

\(^{23}\text{Ibid, 5.}\)

\(^{24}\text{Ibid.}\)
himself as the keystone figure responsible for the development of contests.\textsuperscript{25} It is known that his entrepreneurial flair and penchant for organization are responsible for his contest in 1856 being such a success. This event, held in his hometown of Hull, was the basis upon which he modeled his future contesting endeavors. He organized and developed Britain’s most significant contests: the Belle Vue Contests beginning in 1853 and the National Crystal Palace Contest from 1860-1863.\textsuperscript{26} The Crystals Palace Contest, though only held for four years, would later be restarted in 1900 by John Henry Iles, eventually becoming the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain. The Belle Vue contest would become the longest running event, developing into the British Open. The contest in 1853 was also organized by Enderby Jackson’s contemporaries James Melling and John Jennison, owner of Bell Vue. However, Jackson’s contest model of 1856 at Hull combined with his efforts at Belle Vue in Manchester would place him in a more significant role in the history of modern contesting. His contests evolved into the 20th Century, piloting rules that future contests would imitate. As a result, he is argued to have birthed modern contesting.

Contesting regulations served to ensure uniformity and fairness in competition. As contesting popularized, these rules set the standard for brass bands to aspire to throughout their development. Examples of rules span the gamut from being regulatory in function to governing instrumentation and performance practices. For example, rules of these early contests required contesting bands to declare the occupations of their performers and conductor in order to ensure fair competition between musicians that

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid, 6.

\textsuperscript{26}Ibid, 50.
were not professionals. Rules such as these served to balance the philosophy of maintaining brass band amateurism versus professional contesting, a serious issue at the time. In a well-known submission to the *Cornet* in 1893, Thomas Valentine wrote on behalf of the Besses o’ th’ Barn Band, the Wyke Temperance Band, and the Kingston Mills Band voicing concern over stricter rules being placed on contesting bands and the degree to which they were considered professional musicians. These proposed rules confined competing bands to membership in which none of the musicians competing were paid to perform. Successful management of competing philosophies of professionalism versus amateurism is culturally significant.

Outside of amateur versus professional membership, there were inherent issues of the time that surrounded standardized instrumentation. To illustrate, Jackson had contesting bands declare the pitch of instruments used in ensembles on contest entrance forms submitted by each band participating in the contest. Further, though nomenclature indicates otherwise, it was common for brass bands just a few decades prior to employ the use of clarinets versus cornets. This practice, beginning to decline by the origin of contests, was targeted in the rules of the Peel Park Grand Double Brass Band Contest of 1860. Rule three of the contest clearly states, “No Professional Musician allowed to play with or conduct a Band, and no Clarinets allowed [*sic*].”

As previously mentioned, on entry forms, bands were often required to declare the pitch of instruments used. The practice of declaring the pitch of instruments used by

---

27Ibid, 6.

28Ibid, 53.

29Ibid, 155.

30Ibid, 50.
contesting bands was necessitated due to the varying pitches at which instruments in the ensemble were available. As a common practice, at the conclusion of some contests, arrangements of popular pieces were written and distributed to contesting bands. These bands would form a mass ensemble and perform for spectators before the end of the contest was declared.\textsuperscript{31} So, there was a degree of utility on the part of contest organizers for the implementation of rules regarding the declaration of instrument pitch. These rules would later be modified to create strict standards for instrumentation.

Present contesting resembles these earlier models. Current contests separate bands into divisions based on skill and performance level, the highest of which is the championship section. Larger contests have regional qualifying competitions that determine eligibility to compete in national level events. Prior to contests, bands must register their groups and members. In the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century, bands were often permitted to select an own-choice test piece. In the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century, it was more commonplace for test pieces to be assigned by the contest organizers. On the day of contest, each band draws for their order of performance. Adjudication is blind, with judges behind screens or in tents without knowledge of the order of performance.\textsuperscript{32} Examples of contest rules from current national level contests, The British Open and the National Contest, are listed in Appendix I along with representative examples from their predecessors as early as 1860. These rules are included with this study to demonstrate both continuity and the development of the British brass band tradition. Furthermore, they provide insight to conductors studying transcriptions of contest pieces.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid, 6.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid, 7-8.
The British Open Brass Band Championships and
the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain

Brass band contests were plentiful in the 19th Century with two developing a
lasting national status: The British Open Contest and the National Contest or the National
Championship Contests of Great Britain. Each of these contests can trace their origin
through an evolution of contests originating in the 1850s and 1860s, respectively.

As previously mentioned, James Melling and John Jennison began the Belle Vue
gardens contest in Manchester in 1853 with Enderby Jackson. It is believed that
Jackson’s contests were inspired by his interest in and the success of agricultural contests
in the 1800s. During these agricultural contests, it was popular for participants to enter
their animals, sheep, goats, horses, etc. to be judged against one another. Audiences
would gather with great interest and attempt to guess which animals would be deemed
superior by the adjudicators of these contests. From this concept, Jackson piloted
several contests before his 1853 contest at Belle Vue. Current practices, such as bands
drawing for their performance order and placing judges behind screens or in tents to
preserve the integrity of the contests, stemmed from Jackson’s events. With the
exception of 1859, the Belle Vue Open Contest has been held annually since its inception
in 1853. In 1982, the venue moved to the free Trade Hall in Manchester where it
continued until 1996. In 1996, the Bridgewater Hall in Manchester hosted the event for
one year before it moved to Symphony Hall in Birmingham in 1997. It has developed

33Ibid, 50.
34Ibid, 52.
into the current British Open Brass Band Championships and has been held at Birmingham since 1997.

The Crystal Palace Contests in Sydenham were commissioned by the Crystal Palace Company and ran consecutively for four years from 1860-1863. The Crystal Palace Company solicited Enderby Jackson to organize these contests. Contest forms obtained from the 1860 Crystal Palace Contests reveal much about the membership of contesting bands. Conductors at this contest were required to indicate their professions to ensure that bands adhered to amateur status. At the 1860 event, thirteen conductors list their occupations as follows: innkeeper, lead-ore smelter, warp dresser, heald knitter, woolen spinner publican, manufacturer, tailor, schoolmaster, miner, cloth percher, blacksmith, carpet department [worker], joiner, cloth operative, and spade finisher. This working-class status of musicians will be explored later. However, this contest is significant for establishing these traditions in addition to receiving exceptional popularity. As Trevor Herbert explains,

The estimates given by newspapers for the number of people attending such contests need cautious treatment, but The Times estimated admissions of more than twenty-two thousand for the second day of the 1860 Crystal Palace Contest.

In 1900, the Crystal Palace Contests were restarted by businessman and brass band enthusiast John Henry Iles. In an effort to ensure the success and longevity of his brass band endeavors, Iles, a savvy businessman, purchased the weekly newspaper The

---

36 Ibid, 59.
37 Ibid, 64.
British Bandsman in addition to the music publisher, R. Smith & Co.\textsuperscript{38} During this year, dividing the contest into sections or classes based on performance level was introduced. In 1902, this system was expanded to include an additional three sections to the divisions.\textsuperscript{39} The current system of dividing the competition into championship section, first section, second section, third section, and fourth section, traces its beginnings to the Crystal Palace Contests of the 1900s. Under this system, bands are intended to compete against ensembles of similar proficiency and skill. The pieces required of each section are also differentiated and designed to be appropriate to the skill level of each division. To this day, the most important and popular section is the Championship division.

The National Contest of John Henry Iles, held from 1900 to 1935, moved to Alexandra Palace in 1936 after fire took the original site. The National Contest continued to take place at Alexandra Palace until, following World War II, it moved to its current location in Royal Albert Hall.\textsuperscript{40} It exists there in its modern form as the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain. The National Contests are historically significant for the above developments in contesting. Additionally, they are significant for successfully soliciting Percy Fletcher’s Labour of Love in 1913, the first originally composed contest piece for brass band.\textsuperscript{41}

Instrumentation

It was commonplace for brass bands in their early years to be orchestrated such that brass instruments would harmonize against a woodwind melody instrument, most
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notably the clarinet. Though slightly more expensive, by the 1830s, bands begun to integrate cornets to replace clarinet. The eventual outcome of this produces an all brass ensemble with percussion.\textsuperscript{42} Following the invention of the valve c. 1814, the timeline for this development is not unusual, as the cornet was not invented until the 1820s, pitched principally in Eb and Bb.\textsuperscript{43} Of course, keyed bugles could have replaced the clarinets to create brass bands of keyed bugles, horns, trombones, and ophecleides, but there is no substantiation of this happening. Due to advancements in technology such as the development of the valve system of 1814, it was soon possible to construct instruments with intermediate bore profiles, a combination of wide and large bore sizes. These advancements resulted in the development of cornets, horns, euphoniums, and basses similar to the ones used in brass bands throughout the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century.\textsuperscript{44} Thus, by the mid-1800s, the availability of modern instrumentation existed. By no coincidence, this time period parallels the events leading to the development of contesting and standardized instrumentation.

Developments in brass band instrumentation can accurately be accounted for due to the records that have been kept intact of contest registration forms submitted since the 1850s. Instrumentation and personnel were required submissions on forms. In fact, over eighty forms preserved from contests organized by Enderby Jackson are in the possession of Arnold Myers, noted scholar, Honorary Curator, Director, and Chairman of Edinburgh University Collection of Historic Musical Instruments.\textsuperscript{45} Myers suggests that these forms
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represent bands that would be more progressive in embracing modern instrumentation as they would need to be of the highest standard to compete at the level of national contests. Of the available contest forms in the collection, thirty-four are from the 1860 Crystal Palace Contest. From these contest forms, the average instrumentation of bands comprise eighteen members with the following distribution: 1-2 soprano cornets in Db with fewer in Eb, 5 cornets mostly in Ab with fewer in Bb, 0-1 alto saxhorns in Ab, 2-3 tenor saxhorns or alto horns in Db with fewer in Eb, 1-2 baritones in Ab with fewer in Bb, 1 tenor trombone in C with fewer in Bb, 1 bass trombone most often in G, 1-2 ophicleides in C with fewer in Bb, 1 Sax bass or euphonium mostly in Bb or Ab with some in C, and 2 contrabass saxhorns or bombardons mostly in Eb with fewer in Db. Some of the entry forms also list trumpets, clarinets, alto trombones, flugel horns, and more. Forms from the 1862 Crystal Palace Contest reveal a decline in the use of the ophicleide and a surge in the use of the flugel horn. Though in 1863, fewer forms are available for study, only one ophicleide is listed, and no trumpets are catalogued on the entrance forms of competing bands which indicates the completion of the push toward a full cornet section. As outlined, developments in valve technology combined with industrial techniques of mass production allowed for brass band instrumentation to change rapidly and relatively economically.

Modern instruments developed mid-century were becoming available and were utilized in the latter half of the 1800s. However, the catalyst for stricter instrumentation is believed to be pinpointed at the Belle Vue contest in 1873. As the Crystal Palace Contest
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had ended, the Belle Vue contest was relatively unchallenged as the most prestigious in the nation. In 1873, the euphonium player of the Black Dyke Brass Band performed trombone solos on a valve trombone. This sparked a more detailed examination and regulation of instruments that bands were allowed to use at contest. The contest eliminated the use of the valve trombone and outlined the following instrumentation:

1 soprano cornet in Eb  
8 cornets in Bb  
1 flugel horn in Bb  
3 tenor saxhorns in Eb (the tenor horn)  
2 baritones in Bb  
2 tenor trombones in Bb  
1 bass trombone  
2 euphoniums in Bb  
2 basses in Eb  
2 basses in Bb

Comparing this prescribed list to the entrance forms of 1860, many developments are apparent. In a thirteen year span of time, trumpets, ophicleides, clarinets, and a few other miscellaneous instruments had been removed from the prescribed instrumentation. Now, brass bands also had uniformity of key and sonority. With these developments, brass bands would have a more uniform sound and uniform idiosyncrasies. In other words, particular keys of compositions written for bands would now have the same technical difficulties across bands. Thirteen years prior, with the mixture of fundamental pitches for each brass instrument, there was little uniformity in the technical challenges that each piece underwent to realize a particular work. Finally, the instrumentation grew from a membership of eighteen to twenty-four total players.

Research indicates that, while instrumentation has been governed by contesting rules, the proportion of instruments in the ensemble have not been governed by these rules. Arnold Myers asserts,

The numbers of each kind of instrument have been determined by the repertoire of the test pieces rather than the contest rules. The body of published compositions and arrangements for brass band has both grown more rapidly and been musically more satisfactory as a result of being written for a standard combination.\(^{49}\)

In other words, the discussion of standardization of instrumentation to this point has largely focused on the instruments represented within the ensemble. Myers believes that not only has the standardization of instruments comprising the brass band benefitted its development but so has the proportions of the musicians used. According to him, these proportions have set the typical orchestration practices composers use to set music for brass band. Denis Wright outlines the general scoring with proportions as follows:

1  E flat Soprano Cornet
3-4 Solo Bb Cornets
1  Repiano Bb Cornet
1-2 Second Bb Cornets
1-2 Third Bb Cornets
1  Bb Flugel Horn
1  Solo Eb Tenor Horn
1  First Eb Tenor Horn
1  Second Eb Tenor Horn
1  First Bb Baritone
1  Second Bb Baritone
1-2 First Bb Tenor Trombones
1  Second Bb Tenor Trombone
1  G Bass Trombone
1-2 Bb Euphoniums
2  Eb Basses
2  Bb Basses
Drums\(^{50}\)

\(^{49}\)Ibid.

Within this instrumentation and proportions, there are variations in general scoring practices. For example, it is commonplace for the euphonium and bass parts to have divisi markings creating independence within the single parts. Furthermore, it is not uncommon for the repiano to share the flugel horn part or double the solo cornet line. The above is a general guideline to scoring practices.

During the decades immediately following these stricter instrumentation standards, the demand for instruments increased as brass banding became a staple of middle-class life. Instrument developers, such as Besson & Co., were known to develop instruments and give them to championship bands. Once donated, they would advertise that their instruments were associated with championship winning ensembles thus creating a demand for further production and innovation.\textsuperscript{51} Instrument making peaked at the conclusion of the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century with instrument makers producing over one hundred brass instruments per week. Production standards issued by Boosey & Co. required workers to manufacture an instrument in fewer than one hundred hours.\textsuperscript{52}

This push for more and improved instruments led to further innovations, innovations that influence performance practice decisions concerning the music before and after their implementation. For example, the tenor trombone until the 1950s utilized a considerably smaller bore size than current models. Arnold Myers believes that this is to provide a contrast in timbre against the euphonium line.\textsuperscript{53} Transcriptions of pieces from the pre-1950 adoption of larger bore trombones must be understood with this in mind.
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Smaller bore trombones would not only impact the timbre, but also warrant a change in articulation. The weight and crispness of articulation would have to be adjusted if modern conductors wished to honor the concept of sound and articulation that composers may have had in mind.

Other developments in instrumentation include the change in bore size of instruments during the middle of the 20th Century. Standard pitch in the 1900s rose as high as $A_4=452.5$ Hz in Britain for brass bands as well as orchestras. However, international pitch standards settled on $A_4=440$ Hz by mid-century. Due to domestic manufacturers competing in a global market, most manufacturers of brass instruments in Britain ceased production of higher pitch instruments for reasons of economy of production. This now opened the market to foreign imports of American and Japanese instruments which were now at the same tuning standard.\textsuperscript{54} When markets opened, the foreign import of medium and large bore instruments, specifically trombones, affected the overall sound of the brass band.

Regarding percussion, it was not until the 1969 Belle Vue contests that percussion was permitted to be used at a major contest. Prior to this point, percussion parts were written for brass band works. However, they were only used in concert performances, not contest performances. Composers commissioned to write contest pieces versus pieces intended for concert performances, such as Ralph Vaughan Williams’ \textit{Variations for Brass Band} in 1957, included percussion instruments such as celeste. Though commissioned for the National Contests, Vaughan Williams included a celeste part knowing that it would not be performed at the contest. \textit{Spectrum}, by Gilbert Vinter, was
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the first test piece at a national contest to have percussion as part of the performance. Percussion parts included bongos, claves, woodblock, tambourine, triangle, cymbal, side drum, and bass drum.\textsuperscript{55}

The aforementioned developments in instrumentation influenced the repertoire written for the ensemble. Multiple events such as industry, standardization, and ingenuity coincided to develop the brass band into an ensemble that was practical and attractive for composers to write. An original repertoire for the brass band follows a similar timeline as the development of instrumentation and is linked to the process of contesting.

**Repertoire Development**

Like the American wind band, brass band repertoire during its beginnings consisted of arrangements, transcriptions, and some original works in the form of marches, waltzes, and similar light music. It was not until the 1830s that published repertoire for brass band became available. By the 1840s, brass band journals had begun to circulate. These subscription journals, the first regularly published journal was likely produced by Wessel & Co., contained published music to be distributed to subscribers.\textsuperscript{56} Journals containing mainly printed music, often flexible in instrumentation, would distribute nearly twelve pieces per year. Instrumentation of these early publications, such as the Wessel & Co. Journal, could include solo cornet-à-pistons, two horns, three trombones, and an ophicleide. As instrumentation could vary from town band to town band based on the availability of instruments and their players, it was customary to
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supplement these journal parts with ad libitum parts for Db cornet-à-pistons, bugle, two horns, three trumpets, and kettle drums.\textsuperscript{57}

During this time, hand written part books were also produced locally and were unique to each band. Many of the bands originating during the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century that have continued to present day still have some of the original part books as part of their heritage collections. The Black Dyke Mills Band is one example of a band that still has part books available for study, though only a few parts remain. Generally, part books were often written by members of the ensemble, if not the director. Scoring practices reflect the instrumentation and personnel availability of each band. Their contents comprised dance music and lighter fare such as polkas and waltzes in addition to Italian opera transcriptions and other art-music.\textsuperscript{58} Dance music performed by bands was often literally danced to as bands were hired to perform at town gatherings, and audiences were catered to as events warranted. These functional tunes and patriotic selections were significant portions of the repertoire available to bands. In this way, repertoire into the 1850s catered toward the town band, its audience, and the availability of music from publishers providing for the needs of these somewhat diverse ensembles – a highly interconnected enterprise.

As has been discussed, with the popularity of contesting in the latter half of the 19th Century, rules regarding instrumentation were formulated. As a result, bands conforming to instrumentation guidelines became more commonplace, thus necessitating a repertoire reflecting these guidelines. Publishers embraced the instrumentation and
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began producing music for brass bands to follow suit. More importantly, repertoire underwent a shift from functional music to competition and more “absolute” music. Dance forms such as polkas and quadrilles lost their functional status and became vehicles for virtuosic performance. Soloists, such as Herman Koenig and the Distin family, began to develop virtuosic brass playing. It led to a standard of performance and technique to which amateur brass players would aspire. Simultaneously, virtuoso brass players began to develop the interest of middle-class audiences.

In the 1850s, contest promoters and organizers aimed toward developing audiences by encouraging the growth and performance of certain types of virtuosity. Trevor Herbert states it best:

> Any brass player knows that one of the most difficult types of music to play is that which requires very slow movement across wide pitch intervals at a very quiet dynamic, but this type of virtuosity does not draw gaps of admiration. Spectacular runs over scalic [sic] passages are much more immediately impressive.59

Music written for the brass band and the demands placed upon brass performers reflected these aims. These virtuosic performers, often from the same working-class as audience members, earned a hero status from their audiences and fellow bandsmen. By the turn of the century, the rising virtuosos from the ranks of brass bands would begin to hold a monopoly on many of the professional brass positions in major orchestras across Britain, taking their brass band heritage and performance practices with them.60

The annual Belle Vue Contest of 1855 required contestants to perform the first required contest piece. James Melling’s *Orynthia* was the first set test piece for a major
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This marks the beginning of the departure from the practice of performing strictly own-choice pieces. Own-choice pieces, often arrangements by the bandleaders of the contesting bands, were arranged based on the instrumentation needs of the ensemble and performer availability. Further, it marked a philosophical shift in contesting. It laid the ground work for the evolution of modern contesting rules and the development of the repertoire under Enderby Jackson’s leadership.

In 1913, fifty-eight years following the Belle Vue contest that called for a required test piece, the British brass band world had successfully solicited the first original contest piece, Percy Fletcher’s aptly named *Labour of Love*. Thirteen years after John Henry Iles revived the Crystal Palace contests of Enderby Jackson as the National Brass Band Championships, he and Herbert Whiteley, editor of his newly acquired paper *The British Bandsman*, realized the potential for developing an original brass band repertoire. Whiteley himself articulated the necessity for professional composers to take up the charge for developing the repertoire of the ensemble in a May article in the 1913 issue of *The British Bandsman*. He specifically targeted major composers of merit. More so, he stated:

> The first step in this direction will be made at the Crystal Palace contest next September, when a modern work, specially written… will be the test-piece in the Championship Section. In our opinion this will be the first serious attempt to lift brass band journals out of the rut…

Percy Fletcher’s tone poem, *Labour of Love*, was an original composition for the medium that matched this request. Very deliberately set, Fletcher had been familiar with brass
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band repertoire, contesting, and the preponderance of arrangements written. *Labour of

*Love*, though original, matched the expectations that audiences would have had when hearing orthodox contest arrangements. A composer of lighter music and theatrical pieces, he modeled the work after typical opera transcriptions. There is no shortage of characteristic aria and recitative sections. Additionally, he included a program with the plot emphasizing one man’s quest to find purpose.  

The National Contest at the Crystal Palace and subsequent sites continued to feature original works as contest pieces. Many composers such as Percy Fletcher, Cyril Jenkins, Hubert Barth, and Henry Geehl would continue to write and develop test pieces for the National Contest. Allegedly, the British Open contest at Belle Vue began employing the same National Contest standard due to the influence of John H. Iles. Recall that Iles had been responsible for reviving the Crystal Palace contests under the banner of the National Championships in 1900. In 1925, Iles began to expand his influence once again. Paul Hindmarsch writes:

> In 1925, Manchester’s Belle Vue was purchased by a business syndicate that included John Henry Iles, who became its managing director, thereby achieving a controlling interest in both flagship festivals of the brass band year. It was no coincidence that, in 1926, an originally composed work was played by the bands competing in the pleasure gardens of Manchester as well as London.

Paul Hindmarsch is correct in noting the relationship between the events of John Henry Iles taking control in 1925 and the beginning of the Belle Vue contests employing original test pieces. However, the year of the first original test piece for the British Open contest was 1925, the same year that Iles and his syndicate purchased the Belle Vue. The

---

64 See Appendix B.

65 Ibid, 253.
original work featured was Thomas Keighley’s *Macbeth*. Both the accounts of Dave Russell and contest lists from the contest verify these conclusions.66

The National and Belle Vue contests would continue commissioning and soliciting composers to write test pieces. In 1928, the National Contest succeeded in commissioning what is regarded as the first original brass band piece by a major composer, Holst’s three movement work entitled *A Moorside Suite*.67 Whitely had now been responsible for securing the first original test piece for brass band and Holst’s landmark composition. Holst’s suite allegedly opened the gates for more significant composers to embrace the voice of the brass band. As a result, significant compositions came at a more rapid pace. For example, Sir Edward Elgar in 1930 wrote *Severn Suite* (Op. 87) for the National Contest.68 This piece is considered to be another keystone in the repertoire with orchestrations provided by Henry Geehl, composer of several previous contest pieces including *Oliver Cromwell* and *On the Cornish Coast*.69 Aside from the piece being a welcome addition to the repertoire, there are discrepancies surrounding its commissioning. A subject for further research beyond this study, Paul Hindmarsh’s account credits Herbert Whiteley with successfully engendering the interest of Elgar.70 However, Roy Newsome credits John Henry Iles with the achievement of persuading the
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Master of the King’s Music.\footnote{Newsome, 198.} Regardless of solicitor, the solicitation proved fruitful in encouraging significant composers of merit to produce music for the brass band.

Two other works of the 1930s stand out amongst the rest as important contest pieces due to their serious treatment of the brass band. These works are John Ireland’s \textit{A Downland Suite} (1932) and his 1934 \textit{A Comedy Overture}.\footnote{Ibid, 203.} With the interest of significant composers in writing for the brass band beginning to pique by the mid-1930s, it is tempting to speculate what would have developed had the events of the Second World War not taken place.

Between 1939 and 1960, national contests, vehicles for the development of original repertoire, began to cancel. The National Contests did not occur between the years of 1939 and 1944. Original composition still occurred, but arrangements and repetition of previous years test pieces also supplemented the demand for the few contests that were open, the Open contests as an example.\footnote{Herbert, 341-342.} Perhaps the most significant work to emerge from this twenty year period was Ralph Vaughan Williams’ \textit{Variations for Brass Band} (1957). As Paul Hindmarsh notes, composing a theme and variations for the British brass band was a brilliant idea.\footnote{Ibid, 262.} Considering the historical importance of virtuosic display traditionally associated with the medium, Vaughan Williams’ \textit{Variations for Brass Band} was a natural and welcome step that served as a catalyst for future composers to write in the same vein. Two themes, one an ascending pentatonic structure,
and the second a descending figure, were both originally composed and employed by the composer.

Following the 1960s, interest in the brass band began to re-emerge. In 1975, Elgar Howarth had composed *Fireworks* for the Open Championships, a piece that required the percussion section to take on a more demanding role. This was a logical development following the 1969 admission of percussion to the Belle Vue contests. Future test pieces employed modern conventions such as jazz, aleatoric techniques, unconventional approaches to tonality. Test pieces during the period of the 1970s-2000s became landmark works in the brass banding tradition. Examples include, Edward Gregson’s *Connotations*, Joseph Horowitz’s *Ballet for Band*, Philip Sparke’s *Harmony Music*, and Philip Wilby’s *Paganini Variations*, to name a few. The brass band during these decades to the present established itself as a viable ensemble for musical development and expression.

Summary

To discuss the musical integrity of transcriptions for the American wind band, it is necessary to establish and understand the musical integrity of the original source material championship-section brass band test pieces. The development of the brass band into its modern form required the intersection of advancements in instrumentation, institutional organization, standardization, and entrepreneurial genius. Studies concerning the social movements surrounding the British brass band are numerous, cataloguing its developments in great detail. However, the music of the brass band has only recently begun to be examined with the same degree of critical analysis and investigation. What
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has emerged from this investigation is the pivotal role that contesting has played in developing brass band music, as well as the institution. This chapter highlights the importance of test pieces not only as critical to the development of the medium, but also as a body of repertoire that has been purposefully developed over decades. More importantly, it emphasizes the musical integrity of test pieces as the highest caliber works from the genre. As Trevor Herbert states:

The growth of the idiomatic brass band repertoire is almost exclusively a twentieth-century phenomenon, and because test pieces are so important, almost any brass band work of any significance started life as a championship-section test piece.\textsuperscript{76}
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CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to examine the underlying beliefs and values surrounding the repertoire of the American wind band. This research utilizes William Schaefer’s inquiry as a point of departure. It exposes a problem related to the beliefs and underlying value judgments influencing the actions that shape our profession. Namely, this investigation seeks to examine the belief that a sizeable body of quality original repertoire is the barometer for measuring the success of the American Wind Band movement. It identifies a sizeable lack of scholarly discussion of transcriptions for the American wind band. The end result will contribute to the current perspective on the development of a distinctive repertoire for the American wind band. Finally, it identifies a frontier of research and new repertoire development utilizing the contest pieces of championship British brass band competitions as a case study.

Preliminary Research

Chapter I identified and traced the historical value judgments regarding original repertoire versus transcribed works. It contextualized the development of research into repertoire and the philosophical principles that continue to drive said research and the efforts that shaped the body of literature currently available to the profession. Chapter I also identifies the anomaly that is *Harrison’s Dream*, a composition for British brass band that was adapted to fit the instrumentation of the American wind band. The significance of this work is framed around its relationship to the American Bandmasters Association Sousa/Ostwald award, an award bestowed to repertoire of outstanding quality and distinction by the most prestigious organization for bands in the United
States. Because *Harrison’s Dream* is adapted for wind band by the composer of origination, Peter Graham himself, this work is of particular significance in defining a grey area between original repertoire and third party transcriptions. In other words, *Harrison’s Dream* is an anomaly in that it is a transcription by a composer of origin that has received the endorsement of the American Bandmasters Association as a significant contribution to the body of repertoire available to the American wind band. Original qualitative research to be discussed will be combined with this preliminary research to investigate the beliefs and values surrounding the historical driving force shaping the repertoire of the profession.

Chapter II provides foundational knowledge of the development of the British brass band at-large as well as the system of contesting. Outlined is the development of instrumentation, the historical significance of the medium, the history of the two primary contests, and the significance of championship level contest pieces. This information is relevant to the original research to be discussed for two reasons. First, it frames the interviews and qualitative research around the medium. Second, the discussion of the musical integrity of a transcription must begin with the establishment of the musical integrity of the source material. Chapter II establishes that the championship level test pieces of The British Open Brass Band Championships and the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain are artistically significant and have evolved from a body of repertoire purposefully developed.

Critical examination of the “Report of 46th Annual A.B.A./Ostwald Composition Contest” assisted in formulating questions for interviewees. The report outlines the
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scope of the award and the selection process. One thousand six hundred solicitations for entry that year were sent to professional organizations and composers. By the November 15 deadline, ninety-one compositions were submitted to the award committee for consideration. Of those ninety-one, a screening committee narrowed the choices to thirty-six compositions. This screening committee was comprised of music faculty from the University of Illinois and the Illinois Bands staff. A sub-committee comprised of Stephen Steele, Bob Foster, Greg Bimm, Gary Smith, James Keene, Tom Caneva, Peter Griffin, and Robert Busan evaluated the remaining compositions, and seven finalists were selected. The final selection took place in Chicago, IL at the Midwest Clinic: An International Band and Orchestra Conference. The evaluation took place at the Hilton Hotel during a thirty-four hour period of availability where committee members had the opportunity to consider each piece. For the evaluation, five copies of each score and audio recording were available for evaluators. Once evaluators completed a certification form attesting that they had listened to each work, they were permitted to cast their vote by ballot for the composition of their choice. Voting was required to take place in person should there be a discrepancy or a need to break a tie. 78

Research Questions

Goals of this research involve qualitative inquiry, soliciting expert perspectives from scholar-conductors and practitioners in the wind band field. It examines the value judgments that have driven and currently drive the development of the evolving body of literature performed by the contemporary wind band. It serves as a meaningful discourse
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that brings transcriptions from the periphery of wind band research to the foreground. These goals and ensuing research are guided by the following:

1. What artistic value and legitimacy do transcriptions offer to audiences, musicians, and the living body of literature of the American wind band?
2. What motivates a composer to self-transcribe from one medium to another?
3. How did the 2001-2002 American Bandmasters Association’s Ostwald Composition Award Contest Committee come to the landmark decision of awarding the prestigious award for composition to the transcribed work *Harrison’s Dream*, by Peter Graham?
4. How has the role of transcriptions, actual or perceived, changed over the course of the history of the American wind band?

**Data Collection**

Qualitative research in the form of oral and written interviews was the primary means of data collection. The interview process solicited the responses of experts in the field either directly involved with the American Bandmasters Association Ostwald Award as members of the selection committee or as agents affiliated with the administration who were privy to information regarding its development. Additionally, the perspective of Peter Graham, composer of *Harrison’s Dream*, was solicited through the interview process to provide a holistic view of the role transcriptions have in relation to the significant body of repertoire available to the American wind band.

**Selection of Interview Participants**

In order to examine the values and beliefs surrounding wind band repertoire and provide a meaningful discourse regarding the selection of *Harrison’s Dream* as the 2001-
2002 winner of the American Bandmasters Association Ostwald Award, the researcher chose to solicit three interviews of subjects that met certain relevant criteria. In order to qualify, subjects of the interview had to be one or more of the following: (1) qualified professionals in the field with a significant amount of experience and specialized knowledge related to the repertoire of the American wind band, (2) members of the American Bandmasters Association during the year that *Harrison’s Dream* was selected, (3) members of the 2001-2002 A.B.A. Ostwald Composition Contest nomination committee, (4) officers in the organization, past or present, with firsthand knowledge of the development of the A.B.A. Ostwald Award, and/or (5) the composer of *Harrison’s Dream*. By selecting subjects from this population, a comparative analysis of participant responses is catalogued.

The researcher chose one member of the 2001-2002 American Bandmasters Association Ostwald Award Committee, one officer from the governing body, and the composer of *Harrison’s Dream*, Peter Graham, to interview in order to provide three separate but relevant perspectives for the study. A copy of the “Report of 46th Annual A.B.A./Ostwald Composition Contest” was first consulted. In addition to detailing the selection process for the award, the report lists twenty-three committee members involved in the process of selection in addition to a subcommittee of eight professionals responsible for narrowing the initial pool of initial nominations. From this list of committee members, Dr. Thomas Fraschillo was chosen. Dr. Thomas Fraschillo has intimate knowledge of the organization as Past President of the American Bandmasters Association. Further, with over forty-six years of experience in the wind band profession
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including serving as Director of Bands at The University of Southern Mississippi, Dr. Fraschillo served as national President of the National Band Association and as President of the College Band Directors National Association Southern Division, his perspective on the role of transcriptions to the development of wind band repertoire is of value.

The second interviewee was selected after consulting with Past Presidents of the American Bandmasters Association, Professor Robert D. Jorgensen and Dr. Thomas Fraschillo. Both recommended the perspective of Dr. William Moody, Secretary-Treasurer of the American Bandmasters Association. With sixty-two years of experience in the profession, Dr. Moody has been Director of Bands at both The University of Southern Mississippi and The University of Texas at Austin. He has also served as Director of the School of Music for The University of South Carolina. A Past President of the National Band Association, he has also served as Secretary-Treasurer of the American Bandmasters Association for over eleven years. Dr. Moody, having been familiar with the A.B.A. Ostwald Award all of his life, has an intimate relationship with the organization. His institutional memory of the American Bandmasters Association, A.B.A. Ostwald Award and his experience in the profession provide a unique perspective on the rationale for awarding a transcription the prize.

The third and final interviewee, Peter Graham, is the composer of the 2001-2002 recipient of the A.B.A. Ostwald Composition Contest award. The composer will be able to provide insight into his motive for adapting his work for a new medium. Dr. Graham has been involved with brass bands since his appointment to the position of music editor/staff arranger for the New York Staff Band of the Salvation Army in 1983. His
perspective on *Harrison’s Dream* is a valuable perspective on how composers of origin view adaptations of their work.

**Interview Procedures**

Interviewees were contacted via email to solicit participation in the study and schedule individual phone interviews. Prior to the interview, each interviewee was sent a copy of documents relevant to the Institutional Review Board compliance as well as the method of data collection and interview procedure.

The first document, the “Oral Presentation for Informed Consent,” outlined the purpose, description of study, benefits, risks, confidentiality, alternative procedures, and the participants’ assurance as dictated by the Institutional Review Board of The University of Southern Mississippi. The second document was “The University of Southern Mississippi Authorization to Participate in Research Project” form that each participant signed verifying their voluntary participation and reviewing the means of electronic data recording and storage. The third document was the list of questions to be covered during the phone interview. As the transcripts reflect, each participant had questions and follow-up questions tailored to their relationship with the A.B.A. Ostwald Award and their own experience in the profession. This focused the interview on each unique perspective that the interviewee could offer. It should be noted, however, that each set of questions was organized categorically into biographical questions, relationship to the award/composition, beliefs concerning the designation of a transcription as winner, and beliefs and values concerning transcriptions. Rationale for
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this organization was intended to first show the expertise of each interviewee on the
subject as well as to establish each person as a primary source to one or more facets of
the dialogue. Additionally, the “Report of 46th Annual A.B.A./Ostwald Composition
Contest” and Shawn Vondran’s doctoral essay entitled, “The Development of the
Ostwald Award,” provided much in the way of foundational knowledge relevant to the
award’s history, organization, and development. To augment this, interviewees directly
involved with the American Bandmasters Association were also asked questions to solicit
their perspective and recollection of the award’s history, organization, and development.

Following initial contact, interviews were scheduled and administered. Both Dr.
Thomas Fraschillo and Dr. William Moody agreed to interview via telephone. Each
interview began with the researcher reading the “Oral Presentation for Informed
Consent” before beginning the formal interview. Dr. Thomas Fraschillo’s interview was
administered on February 24, 2014 and lasted forty-two minutes and sixteen seconds
(42:16). Dr. William Moody’s interview was administered on March 3, 2014 and lasted
forty-four minutes and fifteen seconds (44:15). Both interviews were recorded via the
SONY PCM-D50 Linear PCM recorder. Both interviews were transcribed by the
researcher and sent to each interviewee by request to review and edit their responses. Per
the stipulations outlined in the signed document entitled “The University of Southern
Mississippi Authorization to Participate in Research Project,” audio files were stored on
the researcher’s computer and will remain in a password protected file for one year

82 See Appendix G.
83 See Appendix E.
following the date of interview transcription. Crosschecked editions of the transcript were then edited by the researcher for consistency of style and to conform to the writing guidelines for theses and dissertations at The University of Southern Mississippi.

Composer Peter Graham requested that his interview be administered via email. The researcher met this request by allowing Dr. Graham to respond to questions in a questionnaire format. The responses were received on April 8, 2014. The email response was then edited for consistency in style and to conform to the writing guidelines for theses and dissertations at The University of Southern Mississippi.

It should be noted that each interviewee was permitted to crosscheck and edit responses. In all cases, the researcher edited the final crosschecked transcript to conform to the style specifications of this document. In no instance did the researcher edit or alter content or context of subject responses by changing responses or the interview format order.

Verification of Institutional Review Board Compliance

As required by the Institutional Review Board of The University of Southern Mississippi, the researcher verifies that the method of data collection employed during this study conforms to the standards and stipulations of the Institutional Review Board. Furthermore, all research methods and organizations were approved and endorsed per review prior to the administration of the interviews. Per requirement, the Institutional
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Review Board Application Form and the Institutional Review Board Approval Letter are included in the appendixes of this document.  

86See Appendix C and Appendix D.
CHAPTER IV
INTERVIEW ANALYSIS

The purpose of these interviews was to offer contemporary qualitative data relevant to the discourse concerning the inherent underlying values and beliefs shaping repertoire development, repertoire choices, and research about the American Wind Band. Specifically, a case study of brass band transcriptions reveals a deviation dissonant with the articulated belief that a body of quality original repertoire should be the barometer of validation for the wind band medium. The anomaly is the designation of the British brass band contest piece transcription of *Harrison’s Dream* as 2001-2002 winner of the 46th Annual American Bandmasters Association Ostwald Award, an award traditionally given to works originally written for the American wind band. In existence since 1956, the American Bandmasters Association Ostwald Award, currently titled the Sousa/Ostwald Award, was founded to encourage composition of original repertoire by composers of merit for the American wind band. Throughout its history and development, the award has had at its heart the concept of encouraging and bringing notoriety to composers composing for band.

Interview participant selection was based on the principle of selecting qualified respondents able to offer contributions related to the development and administration of the American Bandmasters Association Ostwald Award, the 2001-2002 A.B.A/Ostwald Composition Contest Award Committee, and firsthand experience with that year’s award winning composition, *Harrison’s Dream*. Each interview begins with biographical information designed to highlight the integrity and qualifications of each primary source of information. Qualifications of the three interviewees, Dr. William Moody, Dr. Thomas
Fraschillo, and Dr. Peter Graham, are briefly summarized in Chapter III. The full transcripts of each interview may be found in the attached appendixes.

Committee Organization

The 2001-2002 A.B.A./Ostwald Award Committee consisted of a membership totaling twenty-three members including committee chairman, Professor James F. Keene.\textsuperscript{87} This committee was made up of some of the finest composers, university band conductors, and military band conductors in the United States. The committee organization is outlined in order to contextualize its integrity and understand the amalgamation of views responsible for rendering an informed evaluative consensus.

The award committee, according to both Dr. Fraschillo and Dr. Moody, was organized under a committee chair reporting to the American Bandmasters Association Board of Directors who nominated membership for the committee to be approved by the presidents of the American Bandmasters Association. Professor James F. Keene, then Director of Bands at the University of Illinois, served as committee chair for the 46\textsuperscript{th} Annual A.B.A./Ostwald Composition Contest Committee.\textsuperscript{88} It is customary for the president to name the membership of the committee after consulting with the acting chair regarding recommendations for nominations. Membership, thus determined, is not limited to specific terms according to Dr. William Moody. Members of the committee may serve multiple years as term limitations are not part of the committee organization.

The committee report stated that ninety-one entries were submitted by the deadline of November 15. Rules for submission were determined by the board of

\textsuperscript{87}See Appendix K.

\textsuperscript{88}Ibid.
directors. Entrants provided scores and recordings of each work submitted. According to both Dr. Fraschillo and the committee report, the process for evaluating and screening the submissions were as follows. First, submissions were assembled and evaluated by a committee composed of the band staff and music faculty at the University of Illinois. The initial screening left thirty-six entries remaining. Those remaining were then given to a sub-committee which included Steve Steele, Bob Foster, Greg Bimm, Gary Smith, James Keene, Tom Caneva, Peter Griffin, and Robert Busan. \(^{89}\) From these two preliminary evaluations, seven entries remained from the original ninety-one.

The final selection process for the award recipient took place during the Midwest Clinic at the Hilton Chicago, its location at that time in the history of the convention. For evaluations, each committee member had the opportunity to review the final pool of submissions. Five copies of each score and five copies of each recording of submissions were available for applicants during a thirty-four hour designated time of availability. Room monitors comprised of four University of Illinois graduate assistants kept the rooms open for committee members to complete their evaluation. According to the committee report, each evaluator was required to listen to all applicants and had to verify this by completing a certification form. Once certification forms were submitted, committee members were able to cast a ballot at an in-person meeting. All members of the committee were required to be present during voting in the event of a tie vote or a procedural issue. This final meeting of the committee was held on Friday, December 21, 2001 at 11:00 a.m. \(^{90}\) The award winning composition, *Harrison’s Dream*, was presented

\(^{89}\) Ibid.

\(^{90}\) Ibid.
to the membership of the American Bandmasters Association on Friday, March 8, 2002 at 8:00 P.M. during a live performance by the United States Air Force Band under the direction of Colonel Lowell E. Graham at the American Bandmasters Association Convention in Wichita, Kansas.  

Evaluation Process

According to Dr. Fraschillo, each submission was a blind entry. In other words, scores and recordings making it to the final adjudication were only identifiable by a number administered for the purpose of evaluation. Submissions had no title, composer, or information relevant to the identification of the composition or the composer of origin. During the evaluation process, each applicant was required to listen to each submission. Each entry featured a performance recording. No electronic renderings of the compositions evaluated were observed such as MIDI, Finale files, etc. Each score submitted was a full score; no reductions were present. Criteria for evaluation were not decided by the committee. Specifically, committee members were not given written evaluative criteria, nor were written adjudication sheets utilized as evaluative instruments. The twenty-three members of the committee were responsible for assessing each piece per their own personal criteria. Additionally, committee members would rank the compositions in order of priority with accompanying notes relevant to the support of their decision. These rankings and supporting information were presented by ballot at the final meeting of the committee. Prior to this meeting, there was no record of formal

---

91 The complete program from the event is shown in Appendix L.
deliberation between evaluators, nor was deliberation outside of the final meeting encouraged.\textsuperscript{92} 

As aforementioned, formal evaluative criteria was not dictated by the committee. However, Dr. Fraschillo offered insights into his personal evaluation of the compositions presented. Craftsmanship, or the quality of compositional technique and the integrity of the compositional process, was framed during his interview. The quantification of evaluative criteria is difficult in assessing whether a composition is of significant worth and value. Elements judged included the raw material of the composition such as the construction of the melody and the presence of a significant and interesting harmonic vocabulary. Furthermore, the development of these elements in terms of form, texture, and more are considered. Interestingly, the lack of cliché musical gimmicks is another point of consideration. The absence of devices used to stand out or fill the composition was an important criterion. Contrivance of percussion elements is one example of elements that Dr. Fraschillo offered as elements that he as a professional does not endorse.\textsuperscript{93}

**Award Purpose**

Both Dr. Fraschillo and Dr. Moody offer insight into the purpose of the Ostwald Award over the course of its history. Dr. Moody encapsulates it when he said:

The original thought was to try to encourage American composers to write music for the band. And so, they had this prestigious award given to an original composition for band. It did contribute, I think. It drew notice to composing for band and a lot of very fine composers have written for band since that time.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{92}See Appendix G.

\textsuperscript{93}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{94}See Appendix E.
From its beginnings, sponsored by the Ostwald Uniform Company, this prize was intended to support the composition of new music for bands in the United States. Furthermore, it drew notice to composers composing for band. This recognition is reflected in primary accounts from initial award winners. These accounts are part of a report submitted at the 1964 meeting of the American Bandmasters Association regarding the contest. At this meeting, A.B.A. President Paul Yoder requested a report be presented regarding the award and its effectiveness. As such, committee members, award organizers, and contest award recipients were given a survey regarding the contest.

Accounts from this survey include that of the first recipient Clifton Williams:

Williams wrote that he had greatly benefitted from winning the 1956 and 1957 Ostwald Awards. These benefits included the publication of all his works for band (even those written before *Fanfare and Allegro*), a promotion to a higher rank on the faculty of the University of Texas, demand for his services as a guest conductor, and “achieving national recognition for my work as a composer of band music.”

Current and past perspectives reflect consistency of the intent of the award.

With that said, elements of the award have changed over the course of its history. In fact, transcriptions, commissioned works, arrangements, and solos with band accompaniment were completely barred prior to 1974. However, the rules changed in 1974 to allow transcriptions if they were of a composer’s own work. This is of interest as the first transcription to win the award did not occur until 2002, almost thirty years later.
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An Award Winning Transcription

Designating *Harrison’s Dream* an award winner in 2002 was the first time in the award’s history that the designation had been given to a transcription since the rules changed in 1974 to allow transcriptions from the composers of origin. Both Dr. Fraschillo and Dr. Moody were asked if there was debate over whether or not a transcription should receive the award. In both of the interviewees responses, the answer was no. However, both acknowledge the change. Dr. Fraschillo elaborates on this by stating:

…when you transcribe a piece like that, that was written for brass band… when he wrote it for band, it becomes almost a new piece. That’s the way a lot of people see it. It is not like composers have not done that for centuries. You look at a lot of things that are written for piano that later became pieces for orchestra, or the Stokowski transcriptions of Bach. Those things take on a whole new life. There is nothing… if it takes on a whole new life as a piece, there is nothing wrong with it. At least, that is the way I have always looked at it.⁹⁷

Furthermore, when asked for his opinion of a transcription receiving this designation he offers the following:

I don’t have a problem with it. I think if it is a really, if it is a good piece of music… and that piece was a good piece of music, it had melody, it had good construct… I don’t see anything wrong with it at all…

I think that this piece for brass band, when you write it for band, full band with woodwinds, then it becomes a whole different piece. I think that my concept is, if somebody wrote a piece for woodwind quintet and then they wanted to write it for band, it’s a new piece. Is it not?⁹⁸

The value judgments present in this dialogue present a view of transcriptions of this type as a fresh body of work. Echoing the history of composition, that transcribing an original piece from one medium to another with careful consideration paid to the appropriateness of the transcription was common practice for centuries, Dr. Fraschillo reveals a
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perspective on the argument that advocates recognizing the best piece versus limiting qualification to music originally composed for band.

Dr. Moody resonates with Dr. Fraschillo’s comments:

If we change from original music for band to “best piece,” that would be quite a change in what we are supposed to look for. I can remember that, last year (2013) there were five concerts and out of all that literature, the most stunning piece was a transcription from the orchestral repertoire. You know, that was the piece that directors of fine bands would be most interested in.

Now, my view is that that piece should get the award, even though it’s a transcription.⁹⁹

Qualifying, he adds that transcriptions can be worthwhile or poorly formed. The understanding of the appropriateness of transcribing a piece for an alternative medium is a concern. However, a quality transcription should still be considered an award designee since the best piece is the best piece regardless of whether it was originally composed for band. In the case of *Harrison’s Dream*, he feels that the committee awarded the best piece of those considered that award year.

The Composer’s Perspective

Dr. Peter Graham’s email responses reveal both a perspective about his own composition and his view on transcriptions versus original material. He begins by offering some brief biographical information of interest to the case study of British brass band contest pieces as transcriptions. First, Dr. Graham has composed over twenty-three pieces utilized as test-pieces throughout the world at various section levels. Of these twenty-three, he considers seven to eight of these compositions to be of a championship section level. All of these compositions have been commissioned through various contests and ensembles. He began writing for brass bands and accepting commissions in
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1983 when he served as editor/staff arranger for the New York Staff Band of the Salvation Army. Dr. Graham emphasizes that he enjoys writing for brass band due to the challenges involved as well as the high performance standards of the ensembles performing his music.

When asked about his relationship to the American wind band movement, Dr. Graham admits that he has been encouraged by his Japanese distributor to transcribe his compositions for the Japanese commercial market. Elaborating, his contact with the American wind band market is minimal with only a few of his works performed in the United States. In fact, *Harrison’s Dream* was originally commissioned by the conductor of the Fodens Brass Band in celebration of their centenary in 2000. Unfortunately, before the work was finished, the commissioning conductor of the Fodens Band transferred to another ensemble. As a result, the commission was transferred before completion to Boosey & Hawkes, organizers of the National Contest at the time, for use as the test-piece.

When asked about the creative process surrounding *Harrison’s Dream*, the composer revealed that he was considering the wind band version while writing the brass band version. As a result, he explains that he does not consider *Harrison’s Dream* to be a true transcription. His motivations for writing the piece for wind band and his beliefs on the work being a transcription versus an original work are as follows:

Simply that it was commissioned from the USAF Band. They had requested a piece from me just as I was about to start work on HD - I explained that I did not have enough time to write two different pieces and they agreed to the idea that I produce two versions of the piece planned (i.e., HD). The only stipulation was the instrumentation and that they would like to use their full complement if possible (which included harp and a desk of cellos). I don't consider it to be a transcription since elements of both mediums found their way into the finished products (e.g., the brass band "version" includes high lines which have a flavour of woodwind
about them in my opinion and conversely there is some “brass band” white heat virtuosity in the brass writing for the wind band).\textsuperscript{100}

Though the composer does not consider this a true transcription, he does offer his perspective on the debate between original works versus transcriptions. The researcher asked Dr. Graham if leaders in the wind band profession should encourage and commission transcribed literature. His response was that, “I would encourage leaders to simply ask composers to produce whatever they feel appropriate and not limit them by using the word original.”\textsuperscript{101} After asked to respond to Paul Crestons’ 1960 quote in “The Bands Future Concert Repertoire,” he elaborates:

\ldots I don’t think there is an issue nowadays with composers translating their work across platforms. The only important factor to consider is does the resulting work convince player, conductor and audience?\textsuperscript{102}

When asked if there is value in encouraging composers to transcribe their original compositions for wind band, Dr. Graham offers the following:

\ldots I would encourage composers to produce effective music for winds regardless of the transcription/”original” debate. Bear in mind that the translation will often involve a complete rethinking of the primary source. I think this only becomes an issue if the recipient feels they are being short changed and receiving second hand goods! It is purely a matter of perception.\textsuperscript{103}

\textsuperscript{100}See Appendix I.

\textsuperscript{101}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{102}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{103}Ibid.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Four initial research questions were proposed to examine the underlying historical beliefs held in the wind band profession regarding transcriptions for the American wind band. As a case study, Peter Graham’s A.B.A./Ostwald Award Winning composition Harrison’s Dream was examined in relationship to the large body of quality repertoire developed as championship section test pieces for two of the most historically important British brass band contests, the British Open Brass Band Championships and the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain. By contextualizing the development of the British brass band, the researcher highlighted the integrity of the original source of literature being studied and transcribed for the instrumentation of the American wind band. Further, interviews of the composer of origin and two members of the American Bandmasters Association were solicited to augment the available research available on transcriptions and effectively answer the proposed research questions.

Research Questions

The first question presented was what artistic value and legitimacy do transcriptions offer to audiences, musicians, and the living body of literature of the American wind band?

After consulting the interviewees, each had remarkably similar perspectives. Responses touched on the integrity of a transcription as related to the appropriateness of transcribing the source material to new instrumentation. The historical perspective of composers writing original music and translating it to the instrumentation available was
also discussed. Interviewees emphasized that quality literature should be the ultimate goal in building a body of repertoire, as well as audience awareness.

The first point, integrity of the transcribed work, was encapsulated by the interview with Dr. William Moody when he says, “… the opportunity to play music by the finest composers is something that is fundamental, I think, in education.”

Relevant to transcriptions receiving a distinguished designation such as the A.B.A. Ostwald Award for composition, Dr. Moody states:

My view is that we should be playing what one would say is quality literature. If the literature was written for string quartet, I don’t know whether it would transcribe very well or could be arranged very well for band. But, if it was written for an orchestra it might be; it might make a very good transcription. So that again, is in the judgment of the composer and the conductors who select their pieces. Like I said earlier, composers might have written at the piano and then scored it for this and that and the other thing. And so, to score a piece for orchestra, that is their prerogative. If somebody should come along and transcribe that piece for band… that might have been what the composer would have done had bands been that important back when he or she was writing music. We do not know about that, see?

This also references transcriptions in a historical perspective. Additionally, it echoes the sentiment of Dr. Thomas Fraschillo as he draws associations between the development of the wind band repertoire and transcriptions.

If bands did not have transcriptions, they would not have had anything to play, Jonathan. I think the idea of transcriptions of orchestral works, of piano works, of Bach keyboard pieces, that was the original repertoire for band. The pieces that were written in the 19th Century for band, Ponchielli, Berlioz, those were basically orchestral pieces written for band.

Further,

---

104 See Appendix E.
105 Ibid.
106 See Appendix G.
If you look at the Fauchet Symphony, those early works for band, they are basically orchestral works written for band. I think they have played a significant part in our, in the history of the band movement in this country. Peter Graham’s assertion, that, although he does not consider *Harrison’s Dream* to be a true transcription, he does encourage leaders in the band field to broaden horizons. This can be accomplished by not limiting composers by confining their works through the use of the word “original.”

As discussed in the opening chapter, from the 1950s to today, quality original repertoire has been referenced as the principle means of validating the wind band as a performance force. Through these interviews, there is a unanimous trend of each interviewee suggesting that emphasis be redistributed to quality literature versus quality original literature. Important to observe, too, is the perspective of composer Peter Graham and Dr. Fraschillo on transcriptions taking on a life of their own as original works descending from an initial source.

Finally, both Dr. William Moody and Dr. Thomas Fraschillo articulate a value judgment counter to those presented in Chapter I. This value judgment being that the A.B.A. Ostwald Award Composition Contest should award a composition based on the idea of it being the best piece rather than the best “original” piece. This is an observable change in philosophy since the award’s inception. Furthermore, it may be indicative of the changing beliefs and value systems underpinning the profession at-large.

The second question, what motivates a composer to self-transcribe from one medium to another can best be understood from composer Peter Graham’s interview. Peter Graham has been transcribing many of his works for the wind band at the request of
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his Japanese distributor for the Japanese commercial market. Furthermore, many of his works are written on commission from brass bands and contest organizations.

In the case of *Harrison’s Dream*, the composition was a double commission. He had originally been commissioned to write the work for the centenary celebration of the Fodens Brass Band. However, the conductor of the band responsible for soliciting the commission transferred out of the band to another. As chance would have it, Boosey & Hawkes, the publishing organization responsible for organizing the National Championships of Great Britain that year had discovered that Dr. Graham was engaged in a commission. Boosey & Hawkes had the commission transferred to them for use as the championship section test-piece for that year’s contest. At the same time that Dr. Graham was writing *Harrison’s Dream*, he was contacted by the United States Air Force Band to compose a commission. Due to his obligations toward the original commission, he explained that he would not have the time available to write two separate works but could write *Harrison’s Dream* for the full instrumentation requested for the Air Force Band.

The third research question, how did the 2001-2002 American Bandmasters Association’s Ostwald Composition Award Contest Committee come to the landmark decision of awarding the prestigious award for composition to the transcribed work, *Harrison’s Dream*, by Peter Graham is outlined in detail in Chapter IV.

The final research question, how has the role of transcriptions, actual or perceived, changed over the course of the history of the American wind band is evident in the landmark decision of the 46th Annual A.B.A./Ostwald Award Committee and the views expressed in the interviews contained in this firsthand accounts of those associated
with the 2002 award decision. To evaluate this, each interview subject was asked the following quote from the 1967 article by William Schaefer:

> The subject of transcriptions looms in the back of our minds during every consideration of literature. Should we once and for all eliminate all but original wind music from our repertoire? Can we afford to yet? What is the attitude of other musicians toward music performed in a medium other than that for which it was first conceived?\(^{108}\)

Dr. Moody, knowing that William Schaefer did transcriptions himself, points out that Schaefer is intentional asking the question without answering it. According to Dr. Moody, the answer is a matter of personal judgment among composer, arranger, and director. From the perspective of a director, he emphasizes that value judgments in programming must take into account the audience listening to the program. With that in mind, literature performed should fall under the umbrella of quality literature in his opinion.

Dr. Fraschillo offers his opinion at first with respect to a historical and educational perspective. His view is congruous with that of Dr. Moody. Additionally, prior to being presented with the quote by William Schaefer, he states:

> I think that we should always play transcriptions to give students an idea of our origin. Plus, I am a music educator. I have always felt that in many situations in public schools, if students do not play transcriptions they really are never going to have the opportunity to understand those pieces.\(^ {109}\)

This quote frames the importance of transcriptions as historically relevant to the profession while also having the utility value of being a vehicle for a greater understanding of compositions written for ensembles other than the wind band. Dr. Fraschillo responds to the above quote by William Schaefer by saying, “Can we afford it
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yet? I don’t think any ensemble can ever afford to completely negate a part of its heritage, or any medium can completely do that. Why would you? Why would you want to?"110

It is the opinion of the researcher that both of these views evidence a departure, or at the very least an articulated value statement, contrary to the beliefs inherent in the quest for quality original repertoire. In fact, this is reinforced by both Dr. Moody and Dr. Fraschillo as they discuss the American Bandmasters Association Ostwald Award in the context of the award naming the best piece versus the best original piece. Peter Graham, though not considering *Harrison’s Dream* a true transcription, offers his perspective on the debate. He requests that leaders commissioning and encouraging the development of the wind band repertoire move from limiting composers to “original” literature and instead encourage “effective” music for the wind band. In effect, the core body of repertoire should consist of the highest quality music available regardless of whether or not the instrumentation is the primary source.

Presented in Chapter I, Richard K. Hanson’s quote modified by this philosophy might change from

A quest for original, high-quality music that advanced American wind band repertoire for nearly a century must be continually renewed with zeal and effective direction. Band musicians must achieve the complete aesthetic experience that is the honest performance of high-quality music. Wind bandleaders must awaken in musicians a curiosity about valuable music and inspire them to recreate precious icons of American culture. Conductors must commission composers to create substantial original works for the wind band and foster composers’ music with the highest standards of artistic integrity, musical commitment, and humanism.111

110Ibid.

111Hansen, 177.
to instead read as follows: a quest for original, high-quality music that advanced American wind band repertoire for nearly a century must be continually renewed with zeal and effective direction. Band musicians must achieve the complete aesthetic experience that is the honest performance of high-quality music. Wind bandleaders must awaken in musicians a curiosity about valuable music and inspire them to recreate precious icons of American culture. Conductors must commission composers to create substantial works for the wind band and foster composers’ music with the highest standards of artistic integrity, musical commitment, and humanism.\textsuperscript{112}

The elimination of the word “original” in the seventh line of the quotation is hardly noticeable but has had a tremendous impact on the profession for over sixty years. The word “original” has been responsible for motivating an entire profession to pursue repertoire and research of an original nature while neglecting a large part of the heritage of the wind band for over sixty years.

Further Research and Development

The research on transcriptions, methods of transcribing, and commissioning endeavors targeting composers and third party agents to transcribe quality literature for the wind band is minimal. General research into transcriptions is a broad and largely uncharted territory. The profession could benefit from studies of transcriptions to identify effective and innovative means of orchestration techniques. A guide to the history of transcribing for band would be a valuable resource for conductors interested in locating quality transcriptions to be programmed. Annotated guides listing established transcribers

\textsuperscript{112}Ibid. This quote is modified from its original source to reflect the change in paradigm from encouraging original repertoire to the expansion of repertoire development in all directions.
and arrangers alongside their works would be beneficial to conductors programming for the American wind band and composers developing their skill in writing for the medium.

Possibilities for continued research relevant to the case study of brass band contest pieces are numerous as well. Conductors could benefit from an annotated guide to championship level contest pieces transcribed for the wind band. This could be narrowed in focus to target major contests throughout the world. Consortiums could be developed to build the American wind band repertoire while developing relationships with composers closely associated with brass bands, encouraging them to develop their interest in writing for the American wind band. Recording projects dedicated to cataloguing these works would be a welcome addition to the resources currently available to conductors programming for their ensembles.

Closing Remarks

It is the hope of the researcher that this document will be a valuable voice to professionals desiring to fully understand the forces acting upon the evolution of the wind band repertoire. As the culture of the profession is carefully examined to determine how even the subtlest of values and beliefs affects the development of the American wind band, the researcher intends this to serve as a point of departure for further investigation and development of the wind band repertoire. By embracing the heritage of the wind band through transcriptions, the profession embraces a rich body of repertoire that offers musical works of interest to conductors, performers, and audience alike. What is discovered is an evolution of musical achievement and ambition in addition to great works of musical integrity and beauty.
APPENDIX A

CONTEST RULES

Grand Double Brass Band Contest, Peel Park, Bradford – September 1, 1860

1. Each Band intending to compete shall pay an entrance fee of ten shillings and sixpence on or before WEDNESDAY, [sic] the 22nd August, and shall forward to the Secretary the name and address of their Leader, and also the number of Performers.

2. No person shall play with more than one Band during the Contest, and no man shall be allowed to play in a Band who has not been a Member at least three months.

3. No Professional Musician allowed to play with or conduct [sic] any Band, and no Clarinets allowed.

4. The number of performers in each band shall be not less than thirteen, or more than eighteen.

5. No Professional or Military Bands allowed.

6. Each Band shall play from the town to the Park, and be in the Park punctually at Two o’clock. The Leaders shall then proceed to draw lots to decide the order in which the respective Bands shall play. The contest to commence at Three o’clock.

7. Each band shall play one piece of their own selection, the names of which, together with the name of the composer, shall be sent along with the entry.
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8. The whole of the Bands performing in this Contest shall play “Rule Britannia,” at the close; and all Bands performing in both Contests shall, unitedly, at the close of the second Contest, play the “National Anthem,” previous to the award of the Judges being made known.

9. Two Judges and an Umpire shall be appointed none of them to be resident within forty miles of Bradford. In the case of dispute between the Judges or the Bands, the Umpires decision to be final. Their names shall not be published until after their decision has been given.

10. The Judges shall decide on a first hearing, and no repetition of pieces be allowed except in cases of unavoidable accident.

11. The Prizes shall be paid to the respective Leaders, according to the decision of the Judges, before leaving the ground.

12. Any Band neglecting any of the above Regulations, or making false representations, shall forfeit their entrance fee, and lose all right to play in the Contest.

The Bands gaining the First and Second Prize in this contest shall be at the service of the committee until Nine o’clock; and all the bands engaged in the Contest will be under the superintendence and direction of Mr. Thomas Davy, both in the Town and Park.

N.B. The enclosed form to be filled up by the Bands and addressed to Mr. Fred Tuke, 12, Queensgate, Bradford.
Crystal Palace Band Contest, September 1902

1. This great Musical Festival and Contest is restricted to Amateur Brass Bands of not more than 24 players in each band. Any performer who, within six months of the date of close of the entries, has been engaged as a regular member of the bands of any theatre or other public place of amusement, or resort, will be considered professional, and therefore ineligible to compete. Any performer must be in a position to prove that he is in some business or profession from which he derives his chief income, apart from the playing of music.

2. The bands competing at this Festival will be divided into four sections:

   First Section – For the One Thousand Guinea Cup.
   Second Section – For bands wishing to be eligible to compete in the first section next year.
   Third Section – Limited to bands who have not won a cash prize exceeding £15. in value.
   Fourth Section – Limited to bands who have not won a cash prize exceeding £6. in value.

3. All the above sections are open to bands of Great Britain and the Colonies.

4. All the players must be bona fide members of the bands in which they are entered, and each player must have been enrolled as a member of such a band at least three months prior to the day of the contest. No member will be allowed to play with more than one band, and if found playing with two bands, both bands will be disqualified.
5. Every member of the bands must be resident in the town or within a distance of four miles, or thereabouts, of the town from which the band is entered. Special remark must be made, and special permission obtained from the Contest Director, at the time of entry, before any member, whose residence is more than four miles distant, will be allowed to play.

6. Each band must play the test piece selected which will be sent free to each band competing at least six clear weeks prior to the day of the Contest. No rearrangement of the music will be allowed.

7. No valve trombones or drums will be allowed.

8. Each band to send the name by which it is known, together with the names of every performer, instrument, conductor and secretary, accompanied by an entrance fee of £1 1s. for the first section and 10s/6d. for other sections. The entry fee and entry forms for first section bands containing the above particulars to be forwarded to the Contest Director, Crystal Palace, London S. E., not later than August 23, 3rd and 4th sections close on August 30.

   It is particularly requested that early application be made. No performer will be allowed to play during the contest except upon the instrument entered opposite his name in the entry form.

9. The order of playing to be balloted for in front of the Great Orchestra, Crystal Palace, at 11.30 o'clock. All bands will be balloted for whether present or not. Any band failing to be ready within five minutes to take its place as drawn will be disqualified. Representatives from each band will be expected to be present at the ballot and elect supervision committees for each section.
10. The Contest for first section bands will start sharp at 12 o'clock in the Concert Room as usual. The second, third and fourth sections will start playing at the same time, at stands provided at convenient places in the grounds (that is to say, in the open).

11. The Contest Director will have power to decide any dispute that may arise in connection with the Contest, and his decision will be absolutely final. The decision of the various Adjudicators to be final, and from such decisions there will be no appeal, except where a band is disqualified for an infringement of the rules. Where a prize is withheld for a breach of the rules, such prize will be given to the next in order of merit. All cash prizes will be paid on the day of the Contest.

12. If any band wish to lay an objection against another band the sum of one guinea must be deposited, at the same time such band must enter the protest in writing to the Contest Director, and such protest must be lodged in his hands or at the General Manager's Office within half-an-hour of the finish of the performance of the band objected to. Should the objection not be sustained the deposit will be entreated but it proved genuine the deposit money will be returned.

13. No objection will be entertained as to a performer being a professional or being otherwise ineligible (except in connection with the playing of the music on the day as provided in the Rules), unless full particulars are forwarded at least one week previous to the Contest.

14. Bands winning first prize in sections for which a Trophy is provided before receiving possession of the same must conform with the usual regulations which
have been provided by the Crystal Palace Company to ensure the safe custody and
return during the period of holdership by the band.

15. In order to ensure fairness to all, no band will be allowed to rehearse on the day of
the contest owing to the large number of bands competing. This rule will be
rigidly enforced. Any band infringing it will be disqualified.

16. A conductor, professional or amateur may act for more than one band, in either of
the first, third and fourth sections, but will not be allowed to play in any band. In
the second section only the resident bandmasters will be allowed to conduct, no
man conducting more than one band.

17. Each band of the first section must appear in uniform. For the other sections it is
optional.

18. Admission tickets to the Palace to the number of twenty-six will be forwarded to
each competing band, and on no account can a bandsman enter the grounds
without a ticket or payment of the usual entrance fee. Bands can obtain railway
tickets at special low rates from London to the Palace by applying to the Contest
Director.

19. Any band infringing any of these rules is liable to disqualification.

20. The Contest Director reserves the right to add to or amend either of these rules,
each band being advised of such alterations or additions, at least fourteen days
previous to the contest.

Belle Vue Contest, September 1907

1. In the event of any band winning first prize three years in succession, every man
will be awarded a gold medal and not allowed to compete the following year.
2. Every member of the band must be resident in the town, or within a distance of four miles, or thereabouts.

3. A player entered and playing at the July contest will not be allowed to play with another band at the September contest.

4. A professional may be engaged as conductor and may conduct more than one band, but will not be able to play in any band.

5. The number of competing bands will be limited to twenty.

6. The number of members in each band will be limited to twenty four.

7. No member will be allowed to play an instrument other than the one on which he is registered.

8. All players must have been members for more than three months.

9. Any member, who within six months of the date of the close of entries, has played regularly with a professional orchestra, will be considered a professional.

10. Every performer must be in a position to prove that he derives his chief income apart from playing music.

11. Preference will be given to bands who have gained a prize at the September Belle Vue contest in the past two years, or the July Contest this year.

12. The test piece must not be played in public prior to the contest.

13. Only slide trombones are allowed.

National Brass Band Championships or Great Britain, Rules issued January 1, 1989

Definitions

1. These rules regulate the National Brass Bands Championships of Great Britain.

2. In these Rules the expressions listed shall have the following meanings:
a. 'Boosey & Hawkes' means Boosey & Hawkes Band Festivals Limited, a limited company whose registered office is at 295 Regent Street, London W1R 8JH;
b. 'Championships' means the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain;
c. 'Contest Management' means Boosey & Hawkes in respect of the Finals and the Regional Committees in respect of the Regional Championships;
d. 'National Contesting Council' means the body made up and convened in accordance with Rule (5.) below.

Basic provisions

3. The title of 'National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain' is wholly owned by Boosey & Hawkes.

4. Boosey & Hawkes reserves the right to amend or replace these rules in accordance with Rule (5. b. iii.).

5. The National Contesting Council will be established as follows:

a. The Council will comprise one named representative from each of the Regional Committees, the Managing Director of Boosey & Hawkes and a chairman appointed by Boosey & Hawkes.

b. The functions of the Council will be to:

i. Recommend persons for inclusion in the approved list of adjudicators;

ii. Decide matters pertaining to the Regional Championships;

iii. Consider and formulate amendments to these Rules;
iv. Hear and decide appeals against the decisions of the Contest Management in accordance with Rule (30.);

v. Resolve any difficulties arising in connection with the Championships which are not otherwise provided for under these Rules.

Eligibility for Championships

6. a. Bands will be graded into championship, second, and third and fourth sections in accordance with the Grading Rules set out in Appendix I.

b. Bands must enter the section in which they are currently graded by the Regional Committee. A band which has not yet been graded will enter the fourth section or support its application to compete in the section of its choice by providing evidence of its status as required by the regional committee.

7. All players taking part in the Championships must be registered in accordance with the Rules of the British Brass Band Registry or an accredited registry.

8. The Championships are open to brass bands only which will be subject to the following:

a. They will, subject to Rule (10b) below, consist of a maximum of 25 players (plus percussionists) of recognised [sic] classification, namely: Eb soprano cornet, Bb cornet, Bb flugel horn, Eb tenor horn, Bb baritone, Bb euphonium, slide trombones, Eb and EEb bass, Bb and BBb bass (Eb trumpets are not permitted);

b. The maximum number of percussionists allowed will be three;
c. No brass player will be allowed to play more than one brass instrument. It will be permissible for a brass player to play a brass instrument and to assist on percussion if so required;
d. A professional conductor may be engaged to conduct a band or bands at a contest. A conductor must not play an instrument in the band he/she is conducting;
e. Bands must play in uniform, or in dress of a uniform nature, unless special exemption has been obtained in writing in advance from the Contest Management;
f. No band may rehearse on the day of the contest within hearing distance of the place of the contest;
g. A player in the process of transfer may not play with more than one band at the same Regional Championship.

9. Regional boundaries will be designated for the Regional Championships in accordance with the terms set out in Appendix II. Bands must take part in the Regional Championships in the region in which their bandroom is situated.

10. a. No player may take part in the youth section if by the date of the Regional Championship he/she has attained the age of 18 years. Players must, if required, produce their birth certificates to the Contest Management.

In the event of a band qualifying for the Finals, all players who competed with the band at the Regional Championships will be allowed to play with that same band at the Finals.
b. The maximum number of players in a band in the youth section shall not exceed 35, including percussionists.

11. Particular provisions for the Finals are as follows:

a. Entry forms for the Regional Championships will state the number of prize-winning bands that will qualify at the Regional Championships in each section for the Finals;

b. If a band which has qualified under Rule (11. a.) above is unable to compete in the Finals, the next band in order of merit may, at the discretion of the Contest Management, be invited to compete;

c. The first prize-winning band in each section at the Regional Championships will be Regional Champions for that section for the current contesting year;

d. The winners of the Championship and Youth Sections in the Finals for any contesting year (the Champion Band of Great Britain and the Champion Youth Band of Great Britain respectively) will qualify automatically for the following year's Finals and will not compete in the Regional Championships that same following year;

e. Any band having won the Championship Section in the Finals for three years in succession will not compete in the Finals in the fourth successive year, but will be invited to compete in the Finals in the following year (year five).

Contest Procedure

12. a. In order to enter the Regional Championships a band will properly complete and return to the Contest Management the entry form together with the
appropriate fee before the closing date for entries. The fee and closing date shall be as stated on the entry form. The fee is not refundable.

b. Whilst every effort will be made to publish the dates of the Regional Championships and to send out entry forms, it is the responsibility of the secretary of each band to obtain the entry form from the Contest Management to allow the band to enter the Regional Championships.

13. a. When the Contest Management has accepted an entry form, it will send a contest signatures form to the band secretary. The band secretary must arrange for the form to be properly completed and signed by all players who are eligible to play in the relevant contest. The secretary must return the form TOGETHER WITH THE PLAYERS’ REGISTRATION CARDS on or before the date stipulated by the Contest Management.

b. Any additions or amendments to the contest signatures form must be received by the Contest Management NOT LATER THAN FOUR WEEKS before the date of the contest and must be accompanied by the registration cards of the players concerned.

14. a. The signatures on the registration cards will be compared by the Contest Management with the signatures appearing on the contest signatures form. Provided the Contest Management is satisfied that the signatures on the registration cards match the signatures on the contest signatures form, it will return the registration cards to the band secretary to arrive no later than one week before the contest.
b. The responsibility shall rest with the band secretary to ensure that all players included in the personnel of the band on the day of the contest are registered members of that band.

15. A contest schedule will be prepared by the Contest Management and sent to all bands competing in the Championships.

16. If a substitute conductor is to be used on the day of a contest, the Contest Management should be informed of the details by the band secretary. It shall not be permissible for the original conductor to take over from the substitute conductor at any point after the band has commenced playing.

17. The order in which the bands in each section will play at a contest shall be decided by a ballot organised by the Contest Management. The ballot will take place on the day of the contest at the time and place stated by the Contest Management in the contest schedule. Bands must play in the order they are drawn.

18. a. Each band shall appoint a representative to attend the ballot and act on its behalf in all matters pertaining to the Rules. The representative must properly complete and present to the Contest Controller the card supplied by the Contest Management in order to establish his/her authority as the representative appointed to attend the ballot. Any queries regarding the Rules must be raised by the representative before the ballot takes place.

b. Should a representative fail to attend the ballot at the time and place stated, an official of the Contest Management will take his/her place for the purpose of the ballot, and the relevant band must accept the result.
19. a. Screened adjudication will be used for the Championships.

   b. The representatives appointed to attend the ballot will, immediately prior to the ballot taking place, elect a supervision committee of two of their members who will escort the adjudicator/s to the adjudicators’ box, inspect the box and report to the Contest Controller and the other representatives at the ballot that they are satisfied with the adequate screening of the adjudicator/s.

20. a. If a player is unable to compete due to personal illness or injury, the representative may, immediately prior to the ballot taking place, apply to the Contest Controller for a deputy player and support the application by providing documentary evidence (e.g. medical certificate. Self-certification forms will not be accepted.)

   Providing the Contest Controller is satisfied that the application is genuine, he/she will instruct the band drawn to play immediately before the band making the application, to supply the relevant deputy player, complete with instrument and band part. If the band making the application is drawn No 1, the band drawn last must supply the deputy player.

   b. The secretary of the band supplying the deputy player, or the representative attending the ballot, shall be held responsible for ensuring that the deputy player fulfills this commitment.

   A player acting as a deputy must not accept any payment for his services.

   c. Only one application for a deputy player per band will be considered.
21. The band drawn No. 1 must assemble at the registration table at least 15 minutes before the time stated by the Contest Management in the contest schedule for the section to commence.

22. a. Each player must present his/her registration card to the officials at the registration table for scrutiny and endorsement, and must sign his/her name on the contest signatures form.

b. Any discrepancy will be reported by the registration officials to the Contest Controller. In cases of doubt the Contest Controller must notify the band secretary, or the individual acting on his/her behalf, that the player concerned and the band may risk subsequent disciplinary action.

23. If any band is not ready to play within four minutes of the time stated for the section to commence, or of the preceding band leaving the platform, the band may be disqualified by the Contest Management.

24. The adjudicator/s will place the bands in order of merit for the announcement of prizes and awards. The awards will be presented at the conclusion of the contest. Cash prizes will be distributed in accordance with Rule (26.) below. The decision of the adjudicator/s shall be final.

25. a. Any objection at the time of the Championship concerning any alleged breach of the Rules must be presented in writing to the Contest Controller before the prizes and awards are announced.

The band or individual making the objection will deposit an amount of £20, which will be returned if the objection is sustained but not otherwise. No
deposit will be required when an objection is presented by an official of the Contest Management.

b. Any protest made after the prizes or awards have been announced concerning any alleged breach of the Rules or error in the results must be submitted in writing to the Contest Management within 14 days of the Championship.

The protest must be accompanied by an amount of £30, which will be returned if the protest is sustained but not otherwise.

c. Where the Contest Management finds that there has been a breach of the Rules or an error in the results, it will revise the list of prize and award winning bands and, where appropriate, order awards to be returned.

d. Where either the Contest Controller or the Contest Management finds that there has been a breach of the Rules, it may take disciplinary action under Rule (29.) below.

Objection and protest forms will be available from the Contest Controller on the day of a contest or from the Contest Management.

26. If at the expiration of 14 days from the date of a contest the Contest Management is satisfied that no breach of these Rules has occurred, the cash prizes will be sent by post to the band secretaries of the prize-winning bands.

27. Challenge awards will be competed for each year unless otherwise decided by the Contest Management.

A band winning an award must give an undertaking signed by two officials of the band to keep the award in good and safe condition and to protect
and insure it against loss or any damage whatsoever, and to return the award in
good condition upon instructions from the Contest Management.

Discipline and Appeals

28. Disciplinary action will be taken by the Contest Management against any player
who submits a false signature or who at any time improperly gives his/her
signature to documents for more than one band.

Disciplinary action will also be taken by the Contest Management against
any band secretary who submits a false registration or countenances a false
signature.

29. In the event of any player, official or conductor of a band being found guilty of a
breach of these Rules, or failing to comply with the conditions as may be set forth
in the contest signatures form and contest schedule, or who commits any act
which in the opinion of the Contest Management would be prejudicial to the
proper conduct or reputation of the Championships, the band may be subject to
disqualification and/or forfeiture of prizes and awards and/or suspension from
entering the Championships for such time as may be decided by the Contest
Management.

30. Any appeal against any decision made or disciplinary action taken by the Contest
Management must be submitted in writing to the Managing Director of Boosey &
Hawkes.

The National Contesting Council will hear and decide any appeal at its
next meeting and the following procedure will apply:
a. The individual or band making the appeal will be invited to put the case at the meeting. Where the appeal has been made by a band, its case will be put by the band secretary or other representative of the band appointed for that purpose.
b. The decision of the National Contesting Council will be communicated in writing to the appellant by the Managing Director of Boosey & Hawkes within seven days, giving the reasons for that decision;
c. The decision of the National Contesting Council shall be final and shall not be subject to any further appeal or any legal proceedings whatsoever.

Appendix I

Grading Rules\textsuperscript{114}

The National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain will apply the following grading system or an accredited grading system approved by the National Contesting Council.

a. Grading will be carried out annually immediately following the regional championships. New grading will become effective from 1st Jan. of the following year.
b. The Regional Secretary will maintain the grading register and grading will be based only on the results of the regional championships.
c. Bands affected by promotion or relegation will be notified by the Regional Secretary as soon as possible after the grading has been completed.
d. Any band given exemption from competing in a regional championship under Rules (11. d.) and (11. e.) will be positioned equal first for that year.

\textsuperscript{114}Ibid, 325-326.
e. The Champion Band of Great Britain of the second, third and fourth sections will be promoted automatically.

f. In the second, third and fourth sections, the bands with the two best aggregate placing over the previous three years will be promoted. In sections where there are ten bands or less on the grading register, only the band/s with the best aggregate placings will be promoted.

g. In the Championship, second and third sections, the bands with the two poorest aggregate placings over the previous three years will be relegated. In sections where there are ten bands or less on the grading register, only the band/s with the poorest aggregate placing will be relegated.

h. Any band entering a regional championship for the first time will on its first grading be given an average position for the previous two years for that section. The average position will be calculated by totaling the placings awarded and dividing by the number of bands competing in that year. The average position will be corrected to the nearest half number.

i. When two or more bands receive equal marks, each band will be given the same numerical placing. The next band will be placed the equivalent number of places below.

j. Any band failing to compete will be placed one position lower than any competing band in that section.

k. Any band failing to compete for two consecutive years will be relegated. The Regional Committee may waive this rule at its discretion. Any such relegation will be in addition to any action taken under rule (g.).
1. Any band failing to compete for three consecutive years will be removed from the grading register before compilation of the grading tables at the end of the third year. If such a band wishes to resume contesting, it will be treated as a first time entry in accordance with Rule (6. b.).

m. Bands promoted or relegated will, for grading purposes, be given an average position for the years prior to their promotion or relegation.

n. Any band, whether or not affected by promotion or relegation, which considers it has special reasons to be re-graded must, within four weeks of receiving notification of its grading, submit an appeal to the Regional Committee.

Appendix II

Regional Boundaries

1. Scotland

2. North of England Northumberland, Durham, Cleveland, Cumbria, North Yorkshire except the District of Selby

3. North West & Lancashire, Greater Manchester, Cheshire, Merseyside, North Wales

        Gwynedd, Clwyd

4. Yorkshire West Yorkshire, South Yorkshire, Humberside, the District of Selby

5. North Midlands Salop, Staffordshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire

115Ibid, 326.

7. Wales  Dyfed, Powys, Gwent, West Glamorgan, Mid-Glamorgan, South Glamorgan


9. West of England  Devon, Cornwall, Dorset, Somerset, Wiltshire, Avon, Gloucestershire

The British Open Brass Band Championship, Rules Issued January 1, 2013

1. In the following rules, the words ‘Contest Management’ shall relate to the Organizing Committee of the British Open Brass Band Championship Limited. Any reference to the masculine shall include the feminine, and the interpretation of the following Rules shall be decided by the Contest Management, such decisions to be final.

2. These Rules will apply to all Contests run under the auspices of the British Open Brass Band Championships.

3. Entries to the British Open, Grand Shield Senior Cup and Senior Trophy Contests shall be limited to Brass Bands from the British Isles and Countries from the Commonwealth i.e. Australia, New Zealand, and other countries as determined from time to time by the Contest Management.

4. Contests are open to Bands composed of standard Brass Band instruments, with a maximum of 25 brass players plus percussionists as required and a conductor. No
player shall play more than one brass instrument during the performance of the test piece. The conductor may not play an instrument with the Band they are conducting.

5. All Trophies won at any contest are to be returned at the end of twelve months, with the exception of certain Trophies marked clearly in the Contest programme ‘to be retained’.

6. The Contest Management reserves the right to change these Rules, the date or venue (with suitable notice given) and to limit the number of entries when necessary. Interested Bands will be notified of any changes.

7. The Contest Management cannot be held responsible for damage to, or loss of, any band / personal property nor for any personal injuries whilst attending any event. All venues used will carry insurance, to comply with statutory requirements.

8. The Contest Management shall issue invitations to any contest at least three months before the date of the relevant Contest, and acceptance forms must be returned to the Contest Management within three weeks, together with the required fee.

Invitations will be issued on the following basis;

a. THE BRITISH OPEN

The British Open list shall include all the Bands which competed at the previous year’s competition less two ‘demoted Bands’. These will be replaced by two ‘promoted Bands’ from the previous Grand Shield Qualifying Contest (Bands placed 1st 2nd).
Demotion from The British Open is defined by adding together the aggregate placing for the last two years.

The two Bands with highest aggregate will be demoted.

If after the aggregate has been collated more than one band shares the 2nd demotion place the band which is placed lowest in the current year’s contest will be deemed the one to be demoted.

b. **THE GRAND SHIELD QUALIFYING CONTEST** list shall include the two demoted Bands from the previous British Open Championship, plus the Bands which competed at the previous year’s competition less four demoted Bands. These will be replaced by four promoted Bands from the previous year’s Senior Cup Qualifying Contest (Bands placed 1st, 2nd, 3rd, & 4th).

Demotion from The Grand Shield is defined as the last four lowest placed bands in current year’s contest.

c. **THE SENIOR CUP QUALIFYING CONTEST** list shall include the four demoted Bands from the previous year’s Grand Shield Qualifying Contest plus the Bands which competed at the previous year’s competition, less four demoted Bands. These will be replaced by four promoted Bands from the previous year’s Senior Trophy Qualifying Contest (Bands placed 1st 2nd 3rd & 4th).

Demotion from The Senior Cup is defined as the last four lowest placed bands in current year’s contest.

d. **THE SENIOR TROPHY QUALIFYING CONTEST** list shall include the four demoted Bands from the previous Senior Cup Qualifying Contest plus the Bands
which competed at the previous year’s competition, less six demoted Bands. These will be replaced by six invited bands.

Demotion from The Senior Trophy is defined as the last six lowest placed bands. The six relegated Bands will be excluded from invitation for a period of 12 months. This gives the opportunity for six new bands to enter the series of competitions.

e. The Contest Management reserves the right to increase or decrease the numbers in each section as and when required. The Contest Management’s decision is final

9. Player eligibility

In order to register your players with us for all British Open Contests, individual player’s details must be entered correctly on the player information sheet provided. The sheet should be returned to the contest controller at least one week before the date of the contest. Any subsequent amendments, can be made prior to, and on the day of the contest.

For the purpose of the contest, the Contest Controller will agree directly with each band the legitimacy, within the contest rules, of all individual participants entered onto the player information sheet.

On the contest day, each player is kindly requested to bring with them a form of personal identification (driving licence or other form of photographic identification, third party registration cards are acceptable as a means of personal identification only). Playing members of current British Open Bands are prohibited from playing in the current Spring Festival. If this occurs, the player/s concerned will be excluded from playing at the British Open.
a. Players having competed in the British Open with band (a) and subsequently competed with band (b) at the following Spring festival will be prohibited from competing with band (a) at the following British Open.

10. Each Band must name their Musical Director on the Entry Form for inclusion in the programme and if a substitution is required the Contest Management must be informed as soon as possible.

11. The ‘Order of Play’ for the Contest shall be by ballot to be held at least one hour before the published starting time. Each Band shall be invited to send a representative to attend the Draw who will act on its behalf in all matters arising during the Draw. If a Band is not represented at the Draw an official shall be empowered to Draw for them.

a. Split Draw (Spring Festival Only)

   Newly promoted and demoted bands adopt a place within the split draw previously occupied by the band that they replace in the relevant contest. The first and second half bands rotate annually.

   Bands drawn 1 to 10 in that years draw will be allocated a draw in the second half of the following years Spring Festival for the contest for which the draw takes place.

   Bands drawn 11 up to 20 will be allocated a draw in the first half of the following years Spring Festival for the contest for which the draw takes place.

Promoted and relegated bands will take the allocated draw for the bands that they replace in the relevant contest.
With regard to the 6 new bands in the Senior Trophy, they will be allocated the draw position of the bands that they replace. This will be decided by using alphabetical order as determined by the Contest Management in the order of the placing of the replaced bands.

12. In the event of a Bandsman being unable to compete owing to family bereavement or illness or any other unforeseeable reason, a medical certificate or documentation as requested by the Contest Management must be produced covering these eventualities as soon as possible prior to the commencement of the contest. Providing that in the opinion of the Contest Management there is a bona fide reason for the request, an application may be made for a deputy Bandsman (same instrument) from the band Drawn to play immediately before the Band whose player is unable to appear. The Band playing before shall agree to provide this player, the instrument and music. If the Band making application is drawn No. 1 then the relevant player from the Band Drawn to play last shall provide this substitute. A bandsman acting as deputy must not make any request for payment for their service and no such payment may be made by any official concerned.

13. The Band Drawn number one shall assemble for registration no less than 15 minutes before the scheduled time for the commencement of the Contest. The Band will be informed of any ‘Registration Irregularities’ and will be advised of any consequence i.e. possible objections or possibility of disqualification. The same registration procedure will apply to subsequent Bands.

14. Bands may request to escort the Adjudicators to the “Box” to check that the arrangements for their complete seclusion are adequate.
15. The Band Drawn number one will commence the day’s proceedings by playing the first verse of the National Anthem. Each subsequent band will be required to commence its performance as soon as possible after the Adjudicators have indicated that they are ready.

16. The Adjudicators decision will be announced as soon as the Contest Officials have collated them.

   The Adjudicator’s decision is final.

17. Prize - money shall be dispatched 14 days after the Contest. Any protest regarding the infringement of these Rules must be made in writing to the Contest Management within 7 days from the Contest date. A deposit of £10.00 must accompany the letter. This will be refunded if the objection is upheld. The Contest Management reserves the right to adjudicate on any protest. Prize Money involved will be withheld until protest adjudication is concluded.

18. The Contest Management shall be authorized to withhold any awards where any member, official or conductor of a contesting Band has been involved in conduct considered prejudicial to the reputation of the Contest or to be in breach of these rules. Any person concerned will be subject to disqualification and / or suspension from entry into Contests held under these Rules for a period of time to be decided by the Contest Management.

19. Any matters arising at a contest which are not covered by the above rules shall be dealt with by the Contest Management whose decision will be final.

   These Rules & Conditions supersede any previously issued by the Contest Management and are effective from 1st January 2013.
National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain,

Rules Issued November 1, 2012

NATIONAL RULES

DEFINITIONS

_In these rules the expressions have the following meanings:_

Kapitol  Kapitol Promotions Ltd., P.O Box 53, Penarth, CF64 5XY.  
Owner of the title, National Brass Band Championships of  
Great Britain, and of the National Rules that apply to the  
eight Regional Championships and the National Finals of  
the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain,  
together with the Appeals Panel of the same.

Contest  The National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain  
comprising the eight Regional Championships and the  
National Finals.

Accredited Registries  Brass Band Players Ltd. for bands based in England, The  
Scottish Registry for bands based in Scotland and the  
Welsh Registry for band based in Wales.

Contest Management  Kapitol shall manage the National Finals and each Regional  
Committee shall manage the Regional Championship for  
their respective regions.

Regional Committees  The organizations elected, or appointed to, organise each of  
eight Regional Championships of the National Brass Band  
Championships of Great Britain.
Regional Championships  The Regional events to determine the bands that qualify for an invitation to the National Finals of The National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain and (subject to paragraph (d) of Appendix 1 - the Grading Rules) to provide results to determine the national grading of bands, in accordance with Rule 10(a).

National Finals  The one or more events organised and run by Kapitol each year to determine the National Champion Band of Great Britain for each section set out in Appendix 1.

National Rules  The Rules under which all contests in the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain (comprising the eight Regional Championships and the National Finals) operate.

Kapitol Forum  A body comprising of representatives from the eight Regional Committees, together with representatives of Kapitol Promotions Ltd.

Appeals Panel  A panel appointed by Kapitol, to hear and determine appeals, as per the Rules of the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain.

GENERAL

1. The title “National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain” is owned by Kapitol Promotions Ltd.

2. a. These Rules govern the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain and the Regional Championships.
b. Copyright of these Rules is owned by Kapitol Promotions Ltd. and it reserves the right to amend or replace them, subject to Rule 25.

c. Prior written consent must be obtained from Kapitol if any contest promoter or organization wishes to refer to, or to reproduce, any part or the whole of the Rules. Kapitol may take action against any reference to, or reproduction of, any or the whole of the Rules without prior consent.

d. If consent is granted, the appropriate acknowledgement must be given to Kapitol.

e. In these Rules, where the context so requires, the masculine shall include the feminine and the singular shall include the plural.

3. A further copy of these Rules may be obtained from the appropriate Regional Secretary.

4. In order to enter the Regional Championships, a band secretary must complete the official entry form and return it to the appropriate Regional Committee, together with the entry fee, before the stated closing date. The entry fee is not refundable in any circumstances.

5. When a Regional Committee has accepted a band’s entry into the Contest, an acknowledgement will be sent to that band’s Secretary. After the closing date, a schedule of the contest-day arrangements will be sent to the band secretary.

6. When the contest entry deadline has been reached, the Contest Management will send to the relevant Registry a full list of entered bands and will request a Registration Report for each band, dated ONE (1) Week prior to the Contest date.
THE CONTEST

7. The Contest is open to brass bands only, consisting of a maximum of 25 brass players plus percussionists, as required by the band. Brass instrumentation will be from the following list:

   Eb Soprano Cornet, Bb Cornet, Bb Flugel Horn, Eb Tenor Horn, Bb Baritone, Bb Euphonium, Slide Trombones, Eb and EEb Bass, Bb and BBb Bass.

   A brass player may only play ONE brass instrument, unless required by the score.

8.  a. All players taking part in the Contest must be registered with only ONE accredited Registry at least 7 days before the Friday of the contest weekend and may only compete with the band that holds their Registration. It is the responsibility of the band secretary to apply to the relevant registry for the necessary registration documentation and to comply with the Registry Rules and procedures.

   b. A player may play with only ONE (1) band in any ONE (1) series of Regional Championships, and with only ONE (1) band in any ONE (1) series of Finals’ Championships, except for the application of the provisions of Rule 16.

9.  a. For the purposes of the Contest and in accordance with the Grading Rules, every Regional Committee will grade the bands competing within its geographical boundaries, and in the Brass Band Championships of Great Britain, into one of five National sections:

   Championship, 1, 2, 3 and 4.

   b. A band must take part in the section in which it is graded in that particular year.
10. Each band entering the Contest must enter the Regional Championships in the region in which its bandroom is permanently located, in accordance with the boundaries set out in Appendix II.

11. a. For the Regional Championships, bands in each section must perform the set test-piece, as stated on the entry form and comply with any clauses listed by the Contest Management on the schedule.

b. For the Finals, bands in each section must perform the set test-piece, as stated on the ‘Finals’ schedule, and comply with any clauses listed by the Contest Management.

c. The provision of percussion instruments will be at the discretion of the Contest Management. Bands will be notified in advance of the details of this provision.

12. a. Closed adjudication will be used in the Contests.

b. Adjudicators will be appointed by the Contest Management.

c. Adjudicators will award band places only.

13. a. Qualification to the Finals

i. In respect of sections 1 – 4, qualification for an invitation will depend on the number of bands entered in the sections at the Regional Championships.

Up to 16 bands entered …………………………… 2 bands qualify

17 to 24 bands entered …………………………… 3 bands qualify

25 bands and over entered …………………………… 4 bands qualify
ii. In respect of the Championship Section, the first four placed bands in the previous year’s ‘Final’ will qualify for an invitation to the following year’s ‘Final’, subject to competing in their respective Regional Championships. Entry to the ‘Final’ of the National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain is at the sole discretion of ‘Kapitol’.

iii. In each of the Championship Section Regional Championships, the two highest placed bands will qualify for an invitation to the ‘Final’, in addition to those already invited under (ii.) above.

b. The awarding of prize monies will be in accordance with the limits and procedures set out in the entry form.

CONTEST DAY

14. a. The order in which a band will perform in a section will be decided by a draw. Contest Management has the right to apply discretion for matters that, or concern, the order of play.

b. A band must appoint a delegate to attend the draw and act on its behalf in all matters pertaining to the Rules. Any queries or requests regarding the Contest must be raised by the delegate before The Draw takes place.

c. If a band’s delegate fails to attend the draw, the Contest Management will draw on behalf of the band.

d. In the event of a section being subject to a split draw, bands will be notified by the Contest Management. The first stage of a split draw must be carried out at
least TWO (2) weeks before the contest date. Stage two of a split draw will take place on the contest day in accordance with a., b. and c. above.

15. a. In the event of a player being unable to compete due to personal or family illness, injury, bereavement or other emergency occurrence prior to the draw, the delegate may apply to the Contest Management for a deputy player, submitting documentary evidence in support of the application, either at the draw or within SEVEN (7) DAYS of the date of the Contest.

Providing the Contest Management is satisfied the application is genuine, the band drawn immediately before the band making the application must supply the relevant deputy with the band part and instrument, if applicable. In the event of the lending band not having such a player or instrument, the Contest Management may use discretion as to the next band required to supply the deputy player. If the band making the application is drawn first, the band drawn last must supply the deputy player. In the event of a split draw, this will mean the band drawn to play last in that group.

It is the responsibility of the lending band’s delegate to ensure that the deputy player fulfills this commitment. The player acting as deputy must not accept payment for his services.

b. Only ONE (1) application for a deputy player per band will be considered, or otherwise, at the discretion of the Contest Management.

c. In the event of an application being made for a deputy player after the draw has taken place, a substitution may be made at the discretion of the Contest Management and with the agreement of the lending band.
16. a. Bands must assemble at the registration point, as directed by the Contest Management.

b. Each player must present his registration card for endorsement.

c. Each player must sign the contest Registration Report form, if required by the Contest Management.

d. The registration officials will report any discrepancy to the Contest Management, which, in the case of doubt, will notify the band secretary that the player concerned and the band may be the subject of disciplinary action.

e. The Contest Management will refer any suspected breach of Registry Rules to the relevant Registry Management. The Registry will investigate to establish if a breach of the Registry Rules has occurred and report its decision to the Contest Management.

17. If any band is not ready to perform within FOUR (4) minutes of the time stated in the contest schedule, or of the preceding band vacating the stage, the band may be the subject of disciplinary action.

18. a. The decision of the adjudicator(s) is final.

b. Results will be announced and trophies presented, as stated in the Contest Schedule.

c. Prize monies will be distributed FOURTEEN (14) days after the Contest date, subject to 20{b}

19. a. A band winning a trophy must give an undertaking, signed by TWO (2) officials of the band, to keep the trophy and its protective case (where applicable) in good and safe condition, and must protect and insure the trophy and its case
(where applicable) against loss or damage. Proof of insurance cover must be provided, as required by the Contest Management.

b. It is the band’s responsibility to return the trophy and its protective case (where applicable) in good condition upon instructions from the Contest Management.

c. Contest Management shall have the right to seek compensation from any band for failure to comply fully with trophy return instructions issued by it.

DISCIPLINE AND APPEALS

20. a. Any objection concerning any alleged breach of the National Rules, or an error in the results, must be submitted to the Contest Controller within FOURTEEN (14) days of the Contest, together with a fee of £50.00, which will be returned only if the objection is upheld. Objections must be in writing on the official headed paper of the band concerned and signed by an official.

b. If the Contest Management decides that there has been a breach of the National Rules, or an error in the results, it will revise the list of placings.

21. Disciplinary action may be taken by the Contest Management for any of the following offences:-

a. Any breach of the Rules;

b. Failure to comply with the instructions set out in the contest schedule;

c. Any action that the Contest Management deems to be detrimental to the reputation of the Contest.

22. In the event of any player, official or band being found guilty of any of the above offences, the individual or band may be subject to one or more of the following penalties:-
a. Disqualification from the Contest
b. Forfeiture of the trophies and/or awards
c. Suspension from competing in the Contest for a period of time specified by the Contest Management.

23. a. If the band or individual is not satisfied with the decision of the Contest Controller on Contest Day it/they may appeal, in the first instance in writing to the Contest Management within FOURTEEN (14) days of the Contest for a personal hearing.

b. If the band or individual is not satisfied with the decision of the Contest Management, it/they may appeal to the Appeals Panel. The decision of this Panel is final. Your statutory rights are not affected.

c. In the event the Appeal is substantially successful, the costs of the Appeal Panel shall be paid by the Regional Committee concerned in the Appeal. In the event the Appeal is substantially unsuccessful, the costs of the Appeal Panel shall be paid by the player or band that has submitted the Appeal. Failure by a player or band to pay the costs will be deemed by the Appeal Panel to be detrimental to the reputation of the Contest contrary to Rule 23(c) and may result in the Appeal Panel imposing a sanction pursuant to Rule 23.

PROCEDURE FOR CHANGE OF RULES

24. Contest Management will liaise directly with Kapitol Forum if a change of Rules is requested. Proposed changes must be agreed with Kapitol and Kapitol Promotions Ltd., before they can be implemented.
APPENDIX I

GRADING RULES

The National Brass Band Championships of Great Britain will apply the following grading system.

In these Rules, the word placings means the position awarded at the Regional Championships, which appear as points in the Grading Tables.

a. Grading will be carried out annually following the Regional Championships, to take effect from 1st January the following year, with the exception of the Scottish Brass Band Association, which is allowed to operate its own grading table, for which the Contest Management is not responsible and for which it will not, under any circumstances, accept objections or hear appeals.

b. The Regional Committees will maintain the grading register. Grading will be based on the results of the Regional Championships only.

c. The bands will be notified of their gradings by the Regional Committees.

d. The winning bands of sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 in the ‘Finals’ will receive automatic promotion.

e. In the sections 1, 2, 3, 4, the bands with the two best aggregate placings over the previous three years will be promoted. In the case where two or more bands tie with equal first placing, then only these bands will be promoted. If two or more bands tie with equal second placing, then these bands, in addition to the first placed band, will be promoted.
f. In sections where there are ten bands or less on the grading register, only the band or bands with the best aggregate placings over the last three years will be promoted.

g. In the Championship, 1st, 2nd and 3rd sections, the two bands with the lowest aggregate placings over the last three years will be relegated. In the case where two or more bands tie with equal last placing, then only these bands will be relegated. If two or more bands tie with equal second to last placing, then these bands, in addition to the last placed band, will be relegated.

h. In sections where there are ten bands or less in the grading tables, only the band or bands with the lowest aggregate placing over the last three years will be relegated.

i. It will be the responsibility of Regional Committees to allocate a grading to any band entering the Regional Championships for the first time. Any Regional Committee receiving an application from a first-time entrant will assess the standard of the band in question by whatever means available, and this may include having the band assessed independently, at the bands expense.

j. A band entering the Grading Register for the first time will be given an average position for the previous two years in the section in which it has been graded. The average position will be calculated by totaling the placings awarded and dividing by the number of bands competing in that section that year. The average position table is shown under Appendix III.
k. Where two or more bands receive equal placings, each band will be given the 
same numerical placing. The next band will be placed the equivalent number of 
places below.

l. Any band failing to compete, or which is disqualified from the Contest in any 
particular year, will be given one place lower than the lowest placed competing 
band in that section.

m. Any band failing to compete for two consecutive years can be relegated, at 
the discretion of the Regional Committee, in addition to any action taken under 
Rule (g.).

n. Any band failing to compete for three consecutive years will be removed 
from the grading tables at the end of the third year, prior to the determination of 
promotion or relegation in that section. If such a band wishes to resume 
participation in the contest, it will be treated as a first time entry in accordance 
with Rule (i.).

o. Bands promoted or relegated will be given an average position for the years 
prior to promotion or relegation to that section.

p. Any band with a complaint about the way in which the Grading Rules have 
been applied to it can appeal to its relevant Regional Committee. This appeal to 
be made, in writing, within FOUR (4) weeks of receiving notification of grading. 
The decision of the Regional Committee is final in all matters concerned with 
grading.
APPENDIX II

REGIONAL BOUNDARIES

London & Southern

Bedfordshire, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire,
Cambridgeshire, Channel Islands, East Sussex, Essex,
Greater London, Hertfordshire, Kent, Norfolk, Oxfordshire,
Suffolk, Surrey, West Sussex.

Midlands

Derbyshire, Herefordshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire,
Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Rutland, Shropshire,
Staffordshire, Warwickshire, West Midlands,
Worcestershire.

North of England

Cleveland, Cumbria, Durham, * East Riding of Yorkshire
and North Lincolnshire, Northumberland, North Yorkshire,
Tyne & Wear.

North West

Cheshire, Greater Manchester, Isle of Man, Lancashire,
Merseyside, Northern Ireland.

Scotland

All Scottish bands.

Wales

All Welsh bands.

West of England

Bristol, Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Gloucestershire,
Hampshire, Isle of Wight, Somerset, Wiltshire.

Yorkshire

South Yorkshire, West Yorkshire.

* For the purposes of counties within Regional boundaries, the East Riding of Yorkshire
and North Lincolnshire includes all bands previously defined under the former
Humberside.
Note: Regional Boundaries for all bands, regardless of any change of county names, remain unchanged.
APPENDIX B

PROGRAM NOTES:

PERCY FLETCHER’S LABOUR OF LOVE

The Introduction (Andante Maestoso) typifies the state of mind of a man, who, having no love for his work, finds his surroundings oppressive, and fancies himself merely in the position of a down-trodden slave.

The Allegro Agitato represents him engaged in his daily task, blindly laboring on, using more muscular force, having no purpose in view.

The interlude Meno Mosso leads into the Andante patetico (euphonium solo), where his soul cries out in a lament of anguish and despair.

At the Allegro Drammatico, his restless mind is aroused to a state of rebellion, and with frenzied indignation he throws up his work, declaring (in the trombone recitative) that he will labour no longer under these conditions.

In the Andante e molto espressivo the cornet solo represents the “voice of love” - his wife appeals to him tenderly - urging that for her sake, and for their children, he should endeavour to look at things in a different light. She has her troubles, but she meets them with a smile. The horn solo interlude suggests his submissive resolve to yield to her entreaties, and her delight at his decision is expressed in the cornet cadenza.
With the Allegro Marziale he is back at work, but his state of mind is altered - he smiles at his troubles, and his heart swells with pride in his work - he throws himself with energy and determination into his task, resolved to improve his position by continued devotion to his employer’s interests. Manfully he labours, and the “voice of love” is now to him the “sword of might” with which his enemies depression and despair, are vanquished. He realizes he has a purpose in life, and his work is now to him a “Labour of Love.”
APPENDIX C

IRB DOCTORAL COMMITTEE LETTER OF APPROVAL

March 25, 2013

Dear Members of the Institutional Review Board:

It gives me great pleasure to inform you that the prospectus of Jonathan J. Helmick has been defended and approved by all members of his dissertation committee. His proposal, entitled "British Brass Band Contest Pieces: A Study in Transcriptions for the American Wind Band," was accepted on Monday, February 25, 2013. To complete the project, qualitative research in the form of interviews with composer Peter Graham and members of the 2001-2002 American Bandmasters Association/Ostwald Award Committee has been approved as source material for the study.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Mohamad Schuman, Jr.

Mohamad Schuman, Jr., D.M.A.
Associate Director of Bands
The University of Southern Mississippi
APPENDIX D

IRB NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001
Phone: 601.266.6820 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | www.usm.edu/irb

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the “Adverse Effect Report Form”.
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months. Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 13040801
PROJECT TITLE: British Brass Band Contest Pieces: A Study in Transcriptions for the American Wind Band Repertoire
PROJECT TYPE: Dissertation
RESEARCHER(S): Jonathan Helmick
COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Arts & Letters
DEPARTMENT: Band Department
FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: N/A
IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: Expedited Review Approval
PERIOD OF APPROVAL: 04/11/2013 to 04/10/2014

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board
The following transcript is from a phone interview with Dr. William Moody on March 3, 2014. The transcript begins following the narration of the “Oral Presentation for Informed Consent” as dictated by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Southern Mississippi. The “Oral Presentation for Informed Consent” may be referenced in Appendix M of this document as well as a copy of the signed document entitled, “The University of Southern Mississippi Authorization to Participate in Research Project” short form.

HELMICK: The first item I would like to discuss with you is a bit of biographical information so that the people who read this dissertation can understand the depth of involvement that you have with The American Bandmasters Association and your own expertise with regard to literature, more intimately with your relationship to the Ostwald Award (now called the Sousa/Ostwald Award), and ABA leadership.

MOODY: All right.

HELMICK: First, I am going to ask how long have you been active as a professional in the wind band field?

MOODY: Well, let’s see, my first job started in 1952. I was a school band director for three years in Indiana and then four years in Minnesota.

HELMICK: Okay. And you started in the high school, teaching public school at the high school level?

MOODY: Three years at all levels and four years at the high school level. Well, my dad was a high school band and orchestra director. In terms of being connected with the business, it goes way back.

HELMICK: Now, just for my own curiosity, did you grow up in your father’s band program?

MOODY: Oh yes.

HELMICK: Okay. From where did you receive your formal education in music, all of your degrees?
MOODY: The undergraduate degree was from the University of Minnesota at Duluth. My master’s degree was from the Jordan College of Music. It is part of Butler University in Indianapolis. My Ph.D. was from the University of Minnesota at Minneapolis.

HELMICK: And all three of those degrees including your undergraduate degree were in education?

MOODY: Music education, yes.

HELMICK: And then your master’s and doctorate?

MOODY: Music education.

HELMICK: Can you briefly tell me about your professional history with regard to the wind band?

MOODY: Well, I mentioned that I grew up in a home where my dad was the band director. I had seven years of public school experience. Then, I had the next five years as Director of Bands at The University of Southern Mississippi and seven years as the Director of Bands at The University of Texas at Austin. I was the Director of the School of Music here for seventeen years (the University of South Carolina). Later on in that, I co-founded the Palmetto Concert Band, a community band made up mostly of the outstanding graduates from our program at the University of South Carolina. Twice that band has played at Midwest (The Midwest Clinic International Band and Orchestra Conference).

HELMICK: That’s impressive.

MOODY: So, that is pretty much my experience.

HELMICK: Well that covers also my next question which was going to be, what ensembles have you had principal affiliation with? You said you co-founded the Palmetto Concert Band, correct, in addition to directing it?

MOODY: Co-founded, yes.

HELMICK: My next question is, what professional musical organizations have you been affiliated with and, in those organizations, what offices have you held and in what capacity have you served?

MOODY: Well, I have been a member of MENC from the time I started in the profession. And, I am a past president of the National Band Association.
Since 2003, I have been Secretary-Treasurer of the American Bandmasters Association.

HELMICK: Related to the ABA, how long have you been a member?

MOODY: I was elected in 1966.

HELMICK: What offices, appointments, and/or committees have you had experience with since becoming a member of the ABA?

(Pause)

Hello?

MOODY: Yes, I’m trying to think because I don’t keep track of the committee work.

HELMICK: But, you have been Secretary-Treasurer of The American Bandmasters Association for a while.

MOODY: Yes, since 2003.

HELMICK: Since 2003, okay. As Secretary-Treasurer, have you been associated with the journal?

MOODY: Actually, I edited the Journal of Band Research for fourteen years. (Laughter)

HELMICK: What knowledge or relationship do you have with The American Bandmasters Association Ostwald Award?

MOODY: Only that I have been around in the profession since it got started. And, I believe that it contributed quite a bit to the profession.

HELMICK: Certainly.

MOODY: It is something that I am still interested in…

HELMICK: And passionate about…

MOODY: Yes.

HELMICK: Regarding your involvement as Secretary-Treasurer, why did you choose to serve the ABA in the capacity of this office?

MOODY: Well, you have to be asked to do that. (Laughter)
Understand that The American Bandmasters Association is open only through invitation. So you have to earn a reputation as a band director in order to get invited. And, I’ve served in it as editor of the *Journal of Band Research*. And, I was asked if I would become the Secretary-Treasurer. I had already retired from my professional work, so I agreed to do that. It takes quite a bit of time and effort, you know.

HELMICK: Sure.

MOODY: But, I had the time. So, I said yes; I would do it. It is a service. For a good many years, I didn’t feel like I had the time to give much service to The American Bandmasters Association. When the opportunity came, I said yes.

HELMICK: That’s terrific. Out of curiosity, was it the President who asked you to serve on the Board?

MOODY: The ABA nominating committee (Past Presidents) takes its choice to the members who are at a convention for approval. The President would then approach the candidate.

HELMICK: How was or is membership on the ABA Ostwald Award Committee organized and chosen?

MOODY: It is chosen by the President. Every year there is a list of committees. The President names that committee.

HELMICK: Is there a particular, I guess you could say, a term of appointment to this committee? Is it every two years and then it changes, or…

MOODY: There is not a time limitation on it. Some people serve quite a few years. Some ask not to do that anymore and other people get the chance.

HELMICK: Specifically in the 2001-2002 year, other than James Keene serving as Chair during that year, the year that the piece *Harrison’s Dream* was designated an award winner, were there any other leadership positions or offices held on the committee that you know of?

MOODY: No, I would have to look back and see who was on the committee back then.

HELMICK: Okay.

HELMICK: How many times during a year, if you know, does that particular committee meet or is the committee charged to meet?
MOODY: You mean the Sousa/Ostwald Award committee?

HELMICK: Yes sir.

MOODY: There are two possibilities, really. And that is the Midwest and the convention, the ABA Convention. I think that they usually meet at the Midwest.

HELMICK: Okay.

MOODY: But those are the times that ABAers meet together. I think that the choice is made at the Midwest.

HELMICK: And, over the course of the evolution of this award, have decisions regarding the purpose of the award and the criteria for eligibility originated from within the committee, from the membership, or the board?

MOODY: No, it would be the Board that sets the requirements to win the award. But yes, it has changed. The original thought was to try to encourage American composers to write music for the band. And so, they had this prestigious award given to an original composition for band. It did contribute, I think. It drew notice to composing for band and a lot of very fine composers have written for band since that time.

Of late, of course, there isn’t that same need to try to encourage composition for band. This year, I hope that the Board procedures change (1) to allow for a composer to win the award as many times as his/her composition was the best, (2) transcriptions by the composer of his/her original work are considered, and (3) the selection process no longer requires anonymity because many members of the committee recognize the work when the judge it.

Understand that a few years ago we went from having an award every year from all categories of difficulty to selecting each year from different music categories; first in the one through four level of difficulty; then the next year, in the levels five and six. That was done because it turned out that when you are considering great music, too often the five or six categories were the only ones that would ever get the award. So it was decided by the Board again, that what we would do is make sure the grade level difficulty of one through four was considered. Then the next year it would be for five and six. So, what the committees are considering is music over a two year period. And the members chosen for the committee are familiar with music at the particular level of difficulty.
HELMICK: Rotating in a sense…

MOODY: Well, since the levels of difficulty rotate, you have to look at all of the new published music within a two-year span. That’s what they are doing now.

HELMICK: Okay.

MOODY: I think that this latest one is from one through four. So the next year, it will be grades five and six.

HELMICK: When did that go into effect? Do you know or approximately?

MOODY: Around three years ago, I believe.

HELMICK: Okay.

MOODY: But I do not know for sure. I can find out, but I don’t know for sure.

HELMICK: Well, there is a dissertation written regarding the changes that were made in the ABA/Ostwald Award. I think by a man named Vondran, Shawn Vondran.

MOODY: Yes.

HELMICK: He catalogues some of the changes. Originally there was, I believe, a length requirement or limitation. A piece could not go over fifteen minutes at the very beginning.

MOODY: I did not know that.

HELMICK: And then later on, that length requirement was… it was encouraged but it wasn’t required. It slowly disappeared and other things began to change as sponsorship for the award changed. It evolved over the years.

MOODY: Maybe a little. You understand that the reason it was called the Ostwald Award is that the financing to begin with was from the Ostwald Uniform manufacturer.

HELMICK: Yes.

MOODY: I don’t believe that they are even in the band uniform business anymore. But, since it went on so many years with the Ostwald title, the ABA Board kept it.
I think it is important to recognize that the John Philip Sousa Foundation is supporting that award, now. They provide half the money to support that award.

HELMICK: I see.

MOODY: So, that is why it was changed to Sousa/Ostwald. The decision was made to keep the Ostwald name because people associated the award with that name. Now, the John Philip Sousa Foundation and ABA Foundation share the expenses.

HELMICK: So the name of the founder was kept?

MOODY: Actually, the name of the company that provided the money.

HELMICK: Over the course of the history of the award, and you have touched on this a little bit with the two-year span and looking at grade one through four literature versus five through six literature, but over the course of the history of the award do you have any more perspective on how the vision of an award recipient has changed?

MOODY: I don’t think that the vision necessarily has changed. I think that the purpose has always been to award the finest piece.

Actually, for years, and I think it’s still in the procedures, a composer could not win more than twice. As mentioned before, I hope a change is made to name the best piece even when the composer has already won twice.

HELMICK: Sure.

MOODY: I do not think that that should be a requirement. And so, I am going to bring this up at our Board meeting. I think the requirement ought to be just the finest piece. And if somebody did the finest piece, then I don’t see what difference does it make, whether it is two, three, four, or five times? To me, it doesn’t make a difference.

Now, I don’t know what the Board will say. But two times has always been a requirement, so far as I know.

HELMICK: Okay. I did not know that. So, I am glad you mentioned that.

From your perspective, what are the competing visions of this award that have been vocalized over the course of its existence?
MOODY: Well, no different than what I just said: to find the best piece for the years being considered. And, I think that they have pretty much done that.

Now, one of the problems has been that band directors seem to want to play what their colleagues tell them is the best new piece. And, I think that these award-winning pieces probably should be part of the standard repertoire for bands because they were carefully considered in the first place; and, they won that designation of the Ostwald Award, now the Sousa/Ostwald Award.

However, it might be that some of those pieces along the way just aren’t good enough. You know, they were good enough at that time but it might be that the profession has moved past some of these pieces. I don’t know.

HELMICK: Yeah.

MOODY: But, I do feel like most if not all ought to be considered part of the standard repertoire.

HELMICK: Yeah. This award, when you go back and look through some of the literature… and I think, what you are touching on if I may rephrase… this award plays a hand in shaping the values of some of the literature in our profession or ideas regarding those values.

MOODY: Yes, perhaps. But, I don’t believe that the award, the people who are making the award, are looking at the music to see what they want to choose in order to somehow change how music is being written. I think they just listen to the entries and decide what they think is the best piece. And, that is the end of their input. Then they go on to the next year. Now of course, it is in two-year cycles. This time it was in the one to four category of difficulty. So, that won’t be considered again for two years. Next year, it will be the five and six categories that are considered.

HELMICK: Yeah.

MOODY: I think that the idea of being published, or at least being available, is a very important consideration. Why advertise the choice if band directors can’t get the piece?

It’s a lot more complicated now. During the early years of this award, the pieces were always published, I think. They were available from regular publishers. Well, now composers are publishing their own works. There are other ways now that people get music. So that makes it a little more
difficult than when there were a certain number of companies publishing music for bands.

HELMICK: Sure.

MOODY: If we change from original music for band to “best piece,” that would be quite a change in what we are supposed to look for. I can remember that, last year (2013) there were five concerts and out of all that literature, the most stunning piece was a transcription from the orchestral repertoire. You know, that was the piece that directors of fine bands would be most interested in.

Now, my view is that that piece should get the award, even though it’s a transcription. Although that’s my view, it’s not going to necessarily be the view of the Board, but I will bring it up. You know?

HELMICK: Sure.

A few of my next questions you have already answered regarding the purpose or the mission of the award. You have touched on how funds are generated, as well. But, one thing…

MOODY: Yes, half of the amount needed comes from the Sousa Foundation and the other half comes from the ABA Foundation. Together they provide the money. The award is five thousand dollars. But, the advertising for it, and then paying to get the winner to attend the convention when it is played, uses the rest of the budget.

So, right now the thought is that eight thousand dollars is what is needed in order to do this project. I hate to call it a competition because in a sense we are so used to competitions getting ratings and things. It is just an award, an award given to the most outstanding piece. I don’t believe that a composer writes for band in order to compete for the Sousa/Ostwald Award.

HELMICK: Right.

MOODY: It takes about eight thousand dollars a year to do this. The award designee, the composer, will get five thousand as his or her award.

HELMICK: To your knowledge, how has criteria for submission of nominations changed? Do composers get to submit their own works; do other ABA members submit works?

MOODY: Well, I think that the committee will consider anything that is submitted.
HELMICK: Sure.

MOODY: So, a composer could send it in, any member who really likes the piece could send it. A composer does not have to be a member of the ABA for his/her work to be considered.

HELMICK: My next question relates directly to Harrison’s Dream being chosen as an award recipient...

MOODY: Go ahead.

HELMICK: Do you know if there was any debate or reaction concerning awarding this prize to a transcription versus an original work written for the medium?

MOODY: I think that the transcription was done by the composer, wasn’t it?

HELMICK: That is correct, that is correct.

MOODY: Well that was a change (laughter), because a transcription wouldn’t have been allowed. So, that was a change to allow it. But again, the committee was sort of leaning… they wanted to name the best piece. You understand?

HELMICK: Yes, sir.

MOODY: So finally, I guess they did that in their view. Now remember, if a piece published in those two years does not get submitted, it could be the best piece and they don’t even consider it because it is not submitted. They can only consider what is put before them.

HELMICK: Right, they can only consider what they know, what has been placed in front of them.

What is, and I think I already know this based on our discussion thus far, but what is your opinion of a transcription, even a self-transcription like Harrison’s Dream receiving this prestigious designation?

MOODY: Well, I’m going to argue for, that we should go for the best piece.

HELMICK: Yes.

MOODY: In a sense, school bands are educational. But, the opportunity to play music by the finest composers is something that is fundamental, I think, in education.

HELMICK: Sure.
MOODY: A transcription, a quality transcription of a work is, to me... if that is the best piece in a two-year period then it should get the award. But again, like I told you, I’m going to bring that up now but I believe that transcriptions will only be judged if they are transcribed by the composer (which already has been the case.)

HELMICK: In the wind band’s history, there has been a common thread motivating research and development of the ensemble’s repertoire. The underlying theme has been that a substantial body of quality original literature, the key word being original, should be the barometer of the American wind band’s validation. Consequently, research on transcriptions in general has been minimal. What is your opinion on the role transcriptions have had or continue to have in the history of the wind band?

MOODY: Well, I think I mentioned it in the last thing I brought up. What your ensemble should do and what your audience should hear should be related to the quality of the literature. Band directors need to decide whether a composition for another medium was a good piece to transcribe.

For instance, if the orchestral colors are really essential to the piece, you aren’t going to have those in band.

HELMICK: Sure.

MOODY: You have to know something about the literature itself and whether it should be transcribed. If you know the history of, if you look back through the history of composition, you will find that composers write the music for its own sake and arrange it for the ensemble on hand.

HELMICK: Right.

MOODY: What they composed, they wanted to get heard. I don’t think transcriptions for band are a problem at all. You have to trust that the transcriber understands the work and is sure that that work should be transcribed. If they were thinking about impressionistic music, great care must be taken because tonal color is so much a part of the music itself. But, a good many compositions were written at the keyboard and the composers then set the works for the medium that was paying the bill.

HELMICK: Right.

MOODY: And then scored them for orchestra or scored them for band, or scored them for whatever.
HELMICK: That is an art in and of itself.

MOODY: Well, yes. The better you understand the medium that’s going to perform your music, the more likely your music will get performed well. And so, a composer has to think about some of those things. That’s why the difficulty of the music for school bands is something that the composer is very concerned about. Because, if you are writing music you want a middle school band to play, you have to be cognizant of what they are likely to be able to play well.

HELMICK: Right.

MOODY: So, musical judgment is part of that.

HELMICK: My last question which will bring this to a close is a bit of a summary. Part of the reason that I am writing this dissertation and discussing transcriptions of contest pieces from brass bands transcribed for the American wind band, is because there seems to be a lack of interest or research in the art of transcribing. In 1967, there was an article entitled, “The Emerging Band Repertoire,” where William A. Schaefer is quoted on the topic of transcriptions as follows: “The subject of transcriptions looms in the back of our minds during every consideration of literature. Should we once and for all eliminate all but original literature from our repertoire? Can we afford it yet? What is the attitude of other musicians toward music performed in a medium other than that for which it was first conceived?” That closes his quote. In your opinion, considering the decision of the 2001-2002 Ostwald Award Committee, how should we as a profession view the possibilities that exist in transcriptions – either new or old?

MOODY: My view is that we should be playing what one would say is quality literature. If the literature was written for string quartet, I don’t know whether it would transcribe very well or could be arranged very well for band. But, if it was written for an orchestra it might be; it might make a very good transcription. So that again, is in the judgment of the composer and the conductors who select their pieces. Like I said earlier, composers might have written at the piano and then scored it for this and that and the other thing. And so, to score a piece for orchestra, that is their prerogative. If somebody should come along and transcribe that piece for band… that might have been what the composer would have done had bands been that important back when he or she was writing music. We do not know about that, see?
HELMICK: Yes.

MOODY: I know little about transcriptions from brass band music. It seems to me that it would be harder to transcribe that music for concert band than it would be to transcribe an orchestral piece. But I am sure that some literature would transcribe well.

HELMICK: Sure.

MOODY: But, Schaefer did transcriptions. He was asking the question but not providing the answer.

HELMICK: Right.

MOODY: I suppose the answer is a matter of judgment by a composer or arranger. Then a director chooses the music for his ensemble and his audience. Finally, if you choose music to perform, you better have the audience in mind. Because otherwise, you can have something and work very hard on it only to find that it is just something that your audience does not want to hear. That’s a decision that only the conductor can make.

HELMICK: In the context of when they are making the decision and the time period…

MOODY: Yes, making the decision that we are going to play this music at this concert. Is it appropriate? For instance, if you choose a piece and your concert is going to be for band directors at a conference somewhere (CBDNA), that audience is probably interested in new music and music originally composed for band. They would be interested in a new transcription, also. But, that same concert might not be the right one to do in your hometown for your local audience.

HELMICK: Sure.

MOODY: The audience (laughter), the audience is part of that picture and should be considered by any conductor, in my view.

HELMICK: Well Dr. Moody, I appreciate you taking the time out of your day especially before the ABA Convention. Which, this is a timely interview, considering.

I want to say thank you very much. Dr. Fraschillo had recommended that I contact you because of your history with the organization, your in-depth knowledge, your institutional memory of the organization and the development of this award.
MOODY: Certainly, I have quite a long relationship to bands, you know? As far as the award is concerned, that is something I have been aware of all along. And I have long been impressed with Harrison’s Dream; it is one of the better pieces from that year.

All right, it is awfully hard to finish up on this because you’ll have a lot of revisions and you have some major professors to approve and all that. So, good luck with it.

HELMICK: Well, thank you very much. And, if you would like a copy of this transcript as well, once I finish that, I will be happy to email that to you.

MOODY: Yes. I would like to look at it.

HELMICK: Okay, terrific. If there are any edits or anything, you know… if you sleep on this and think, well I’d like to change this here or this there, you let me know and I’ll be more than happy to make those accommodations.

MOODY: All right. I won’t do that until next week because I will not be here after tomorrow morning.

HELMICK: That’s fine because I probably will not transcribe it until the middle of next week.

MOODY: Very good. Good luck with it!

HELMICK: Thank you very much and safe travels.

MOODY: Bye now.

HELMICK: Bye.
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HELMICK: I am going to start with some biographical information about yourself and your relationship to the Ostwald Award Committee. The First question is how long have you been active as a professional in the wind band field?

FRASCHILLO: Since 1968. I would say that’s probably forty-six years or forty-seven.

HELMICK: 1968?

FRASCHILLO: Yes. I started teaching in 1968.

HELMICK: And you started teaching in the public schools of Mississippi?

FRASCHILLO: Yes.

HELMICK: From where did you receive your formal education in music, each of your degrees?

FRASCHILLO: I have a bachelor’s and a master’s degree from The University of Southern Mississippi and a doctorate, a Doctorate of Musical Arts degree, from the University of South Carolina.

HELMICK: At those institutions, who did you primarily study with as far as band directors are concerned?

FRASCHILLO: My teachers at Southern Miss were Bill Moody, Raymond Young… those guys were the people who probably had more influence on me than anyone else. There was another man who was a band director there; his name was Alan Drake. He came the last couple of years while I was at Southern Miss. But, those other men were… were a much greater influence.
HELMICK: Sure. And that was at Southern Miss correct?

FRASCHILLO: Yes.

HELMICK: And, then …

FRASCHILLO: While working on my doctorate, probably Bill Moody again and Jim Copenhaver.

HELMICK: Bill Moody and Jim Copenhaver?

FRASCHILLO: Yes.

HELMICK: In addition to that, what ensembles have you had principal affiliation with either serving as director, performer, founder, etc.?

FRASCHILLO: Well, I started teaching you know, in 1968. I taught in middle school and then I taught in a very small school. The small school was probably 6-12, where I taught both middle school and high school bands. I taught both beginning bands, intermediate bands, and high school bands. And then I taught in Louisiana for a couple of years in big 5A high schools, what we would call the largest classification of schools. Then I came back to Mississippi and taught in Meridian, Mississippi. That was probably, I mean, the other groups were successful, I suppose you could say. But, the Meridian High School band was the one with which, I think, I had the longitude of success. It culminated in 1980. We played at the Midwest Band and Orchestra Clinic. We played at the M.E.N.C. Convention – the national convention in Atlanta back in the seventies. We did a lot of those kinds of performances. I think as a public school band director that was the most successful ensemble that I had and developed. And then, past that, I taught at The University of Southern Mississippi for 28 years with the top group, the wind ensemble.

HELMICK: And, you are currently involved with the program at Reinhardt College, as well?

FRASCHILLO: Yes, I am adjunct professor there. Yes. I do not do much with the band, but I am at Reinhardt.

HELMICK: Okay.

What professional musical organizations have you been affiliated with, and, of those organizations, can you provide highlights of offices that you have held, and in what capacity you served the organization?
FRASCHILLO: Now, what do you mean by professional organizations? The National Band Association? The College Band Directors…


FRASCHILLO: Okay. Let’s see. The National Band Association, I was the national president. With the American Bandmaster Association, I was the president of it. And, with C.B.D.N.A, I was president of the southern division of C.B.D.N.A.

HELMICK: And, how long ago were you president of the American Bandmasters Association, specifically?

FRASCHILLO: 2006. That was the year I was president.

HELMICK: With the A.B.A., did you serve on any other committees?

FRASCHILLO: Well, yes. But, they were convention committee, and those kinds of committees. They were not the kind of committees like the Ostwald Committee. They were organizational types of committees. Like, (laughter) where are you going to have to have the next convention committee.

HELMICK: (laughter) Okay.

FRASCHILLO: But basically, I was on the board a couple of times. You have to be on the board before you will ever be considered for president of that organization. I was on the board. And then once you are elected to first vice-president, then you have first vice-president, president elect, then you have president, then you have past president. So you serve basically four years. You have a big job to do for four years.

HELMICK: Sure.

FRASCHILLO: And, the N.B.A. is the same way.

HELMICK: Regarding the American Bandmasters Association and the Ostwald Committee in general, how long have you been a member of the American Bandmasters Association?

FRASCHILLO: I was elected in 1988. That’s 25 years ago, I suppose.

HELMICK: And that process, you are nominated by the membership, correct?

FRASCHILLO: You are nominated by someone.

HELMICK: I see.
FRASCHILLO: Then they collect recordings and resumes. And, you go in front of the elected… there’s a committee made up of the past presidents and the board. Board members are elected each year or every other year depending on the length of their term. People are elected according to that board of directors.

HELMICK: And the criteria for entrance into the organization, how would you characterize it and describe it?

FRASCHILLO: Well, you have to have a good band first. You know?

HELMICK: Sure.

FRACHILLO: If you don’t have a good band, you can forget it. There are a lot of people who have come before the membership committee who have good credentials. They have done this, they have done that, and they have done the other and you listen to the tape and the band is not good. So, if you don’t have a good band, you cannot be a member. It’s pretty simple.

HELMICK: Sure.

FRASCHILLO: There are various categories of good bands. There are some band directors in the organization that have been, or who are public school band directors who have been middle school band directors. So, you listen to their CDs in relation to that level of playing. You don’t expect a middle school band to play like a wind ensemble from a university that has a significant number of music majors and graduate students. So, if it is a bad middle school band they are not going to be in there. If it is a really good one, they will be. If it is a bad high school band, they will not. If it is a really good one, they will. There are not as many high school and middle school band directors in the organization as there are university people and professional people. That’s the way it is, the way it’s always been, and probably the way it is always going to be.

HELMICK: Regarding the Ostwald Committee, how did you become a member of the 2001-2002 A.B.A./Ostwald Award Committee when Harrison’s Dream was selected as the designated winner?

FRASCHILLO: Well, generally, Jim Keene named the people on the committee, the people whom he trusted to do the right thing. He would nominate
those people and then the president forms the committees. The president puts you on a committee.

(Pause)

FRASCHILLO: How long did I serve, did you ask me that?

HELMICK: Well, how did you become a member of the committee? But actually, now, how long have you served on the committee?

FRASCHILLO: I became a member because I was put on the committee by the president. And, subsequently, in those days, Jim would give the names of those people he felt should be on the committee. Then the president would nominate those people and those would be the people on the committee.

And, I served… I know Jonathan I served, though I don’t remember exactly, I’ll bet about ten years.

HELMICK: Okay.

FRASCHILLO: Every year at the Midwest I went in there and listened to those tapes.

HELMICK: Sure.

FRASCHILLO: And I think I served on it until the time I just got so busy doing like… when I was elected to the N.B.A. as first vice-president. I think that is when I had to leave it because I just did not have time. I couldn’t do both. It requires a significant amount of time.

HELMICK: Sure, a significant amount of time and a significant amount of responsibility.

FRASCHILLO: Right, at the Midwest. You had to go to the room, listen to those tapes, evaluate them, and look at the scores. It just took up too much time because the N.B.A. meetings took up three days, all day long. I just couldn’t continue.

HELMICK: Well, I’m glad that you mentioned that and went in depth because part of the reason I am asking you this question is to give people who read this dissertation an idea that your interview is particularly valuable because you have over a decade of intimate experience with this particular facet of the American Bandmasters Association. So that’s good.
FRASCHILLO: Yes.

HELMICK: When you were nominated, why exactly did you choose to serve the organization as a member of this committee?

FRASCHILLO: Well, again, in the A.B.A. you are not necessarily asked whether you want to do it or not. One time (laughter)

HELMICK: (Laughter)

FRASCHILLO: One time I had told somebody that I had been asked, elected to be president-elect of the A.B.A. They said, “Don’t you know how to say no?” And, well nobody says no to that! That is one of the highest offices in the profession that you can hold. So, there are things as a part of the organization that we do to serve because of the high honor that it is to be a part of it. It is an opportunity for us to do something for the profession.

At any rate, you generally try to serve on any committee that you are asked to serve on.

HELMICK: Sure.

FRASCHILLO: And that committee, that’s a good one to serve on because then you hear all new music, a lot of good music.

HELMICK: Sure.

That closes off the biographical portion of our interview. If you would like, we can move on to committee organization to give a better perspective for how this committee was structured. I will start with my first question which you had already begun to answer. Regarding how membership was organized on the committee, you said that the chair of the committee would nominate… and at that point in time it was Jim Keene…

FRASCHILLO: Yes.

HELMICK: He would nominate and then those nominations would go to the presidents for approval.

FRASCHILLO: Pretty much.

Now there are other presidents who have done it different ways, but generally, if you serve as the chair of that committee… that’s a big
job. So, often, that person is given the courtesy of naming the people with whom he is going to work. Which I think is only fair.

HELMICK: Absolutely.

FRASCHILLO: That’s the way that works.

HELMICK: Speaking of the size of that responsibility, other than James Keene serving as chair, were there any other leadership positions or offices held on the committee? If so, by whom?

FRASCHILLO: No, the committee is just a committee of the whole.

HELMICK: The committee would meet at the Midwest. Were there any other times that the committee would collaborate outside of email and a few phone conversations?

FRASCHILLO: No. Not really.

We met at the Midwest. Jim had already screened down the pieces to eight or ten of them. And, so, we listened to those.

HELMICK: Okay.

You had mentioned in a previous phone conversation with me that the committee chair, along with some other individuals that the committee chair works with, in this case the year that Harrison’s Dream won, part of the faculty at the University of Illinois…

FRASCHILLO: Yes.

HELMICK: They would narrow down the selections and then present to the committee a group of about seven to eight selections that they were supposed to decide on.

FRASCHILLO: Yes.

He would have his band staff and some members of the wind faculty listen to them. First of all, he and his band staff would narrow down probably… Jonathan, he could get as many as seventy-five or more applications. So, they would listen to them, he and his band staff would listen. Jim had two assistants, they would listen to those. To narrow it down even further, they would ask wind faculty to come in and listen. They would narrow it down further. They would bring those to the A.B.A./Ostwald committee.
HELMICK: Once presented with the finalists at the Midwest, as an evaluator can you describe the process you undertook to adjudicate what was given to you?

FRASCHILLO: Sure.

Basically, what we did, each person, what you were supposed to do was listen to each of the pieces and put them in your first, second, and third priority. When we got together, we had written our own notes. There was no selection sheet or anything like that…

HELMICK: I see.

FRASCHILLO: So we would listen. And then, what we would do next is go to the committee… Everybody had their own criteria. There was no judging sheet or any adjudication sheet. You just evaluated them according to your first, second, and third choice. Then we would get together. Our final meeting would be where we made the selection and everybody would put in their number one piece, everybody put in their number two, number three. Then we would see how many got the top number of votes.

Sometimes there was a tie. Then we would have to go back and narrow that down… It’s not always easy because you have some people set on what they want to hear… At any rate, that’s basically what happened.

HELMICK: Okay, that’s helpful.

You mentioned that the committee did not have a lot of concrete, necessarily like a sheet or anything like that, evaluative criteria…

FRASCHILLO: No.

HELMICK: Uh huh. Did they give you…

FRASCHILLO: Not while I was serving on it.

HELMICK: Okay. What evaluative criteria did you personally use to judge these finalists?

FRASCHILLO: I look for craftsmanship – the ability to, basically the good things that good music is made of, good compositional technique, not a lot of gimmicks. Which, one might say a lot of music is made up of gimmicks nowadays. Percussion gimmicks, one more cymbal crash
and whatever… You know what I am saying? I look for things that had significant, significant musical worth and value.

For instance, I will say the year that Donald Grantham’s piece won, the Gershwin Variations…

HELMICK: Yes.

FRASCHILLO: I thought that was one of the best pieces that I had ever heard done there. But then, several people did not like the piece because it did not have enough tricks in it. It wasn’t loud enough in (inaudible). The theme didn’t come back at the end. They thought that was bad. He should have put the theme at the beginning, those types of things.

HELMICK: I see.

FRASCHILLO: So, I look for a good solid musical work.

Now that is a hard thing to quantify. Does it have good melody? Is it developed well? Does it have a significant harmonic vocabulary or a harmonic vocabulary that is interesting? Is it… are there too many percussion gimmicks? I don’t gravitate to those kinds of pieces.

That is basically what I look at. I think my colleagues that are on the same side of the fence as I musically, like Jim Keene, looked at it that way.

HELMICK: Right.

With the seven finalists, were auditions blind or were you privy to any identifying information regarding the composition – the name, title?

FRASCHILLO: No, totally blind. We didn’t know the name, title, name of the composer, just the number.

HELMICK: Okay. So, each score was given a number? Did you get to look at the score?

FRASCHILLO: Yes. There were tapes and you could look at the scores. Generally, there were three or four tapes and three or four scores. So, people could listen and do what they needed. The room was open from approximately 8:00 AM to noon and then 1:00 PM to 5:00 PM. So people would come and go when they could. Do you know what I’m saying?
HELMICK: Sure.

FRASCHILLO: So, there were enough scores to go around and enough recordings to go around.

HELMICK: With the recordings, the ones that were submitted, did they consist of actual live ensembles, reductions?

FRASCHILLO: Yes, yes. There were no reductions. I think that might have been stipulated in the rules, though I am not sure about that. I could not say that for sure. But they were all live. You would not have a chance if you sent one in that was a synthesized…

HELMICK: Like a Finale file or…

FRASCHILLO: Yes, a non-performance.

HELMICK: Okay.

Do you know who… or, do the people submitting these to the award committee send their own recordings?

FRASCHILLO: It depends, a lot of the Donald Grantham’s compositions that were sent in were from the University of Texas because that is where he was, or he is. You know?

HELMICK: Yes.

FRASCHILLO: Most of the pieces that were sent in were pieces that somebody had given a performance of, most of them were live performances.

HELMICK: Regarding the deliberation of the final compositions, you already partially answered this question, was there an opportunity for discussion with committee members? Were you allowed to talk before that final meeting about the pieces?

FRASCHILLO: You know, I don’t think we did. Well, I’m sure some people did. I basically did not do that. I think most people just waited till the meeting and then we voted. … I do not think we were told to nor do I think many people did.

I think most people like to keep their opinions of those things to themselves. Then, when it comes to a vote, then those things will surface. There is such a diverse thought process in all of that,
Jonathan, too. A lot of people just have different concepts. So, no. When it came down to the voting, that is when it happened.

HELMICK: Regarding the purpose for the award and the award’s history, can you encapsulate the mission of this particular award and what its purpose is?

FRASCHILLO: Encapsulate what now?

HELMICK: The mission of the award.

FRASCHILLO: The mission of the Ostwald?

HELMICK: Yes.

FRASCHILLO: It was established at the foundation to support the composition of new music. And, the first winner was Clifton Williams.

HELMICK: Right, *Fanfare and Allegro*.

FRASCHILLO: And he was writing back in, what, 1952, 1956, I think. I can’t remember the date, but its sole purpose was that.

The foundation, the A.B.A. Foundation, supports the Ostwald Award. It was obviously named after the Ostwald uniform company which is long defunct. They gave money during part of the initial setup of the award. But now, the foundation, and I am not sure how much money is in the foundation now… when I was president you were automatically on the foundation board. There is a significant amount of money in there. It is not a huge amount, but there is enough to give a prize every year. There is enough for composers to get a prize that may be eight or ten thousand dollars. But, they also get the recognition.

HELMICK: Sure.

FRASCHILLO: And, that is important.

HELMICK: Research has shown that after Ostwald no longer sponsored it, they solicited sponsorship from Conn at one point in time. Then it evolved and they solicited additional sponsorship, eventually developing that into the foundation.

I’ll leave the award history portion, the next topic being the rationale for designating a transcription an award recipient

*Harrison’s Dream* was originally written for brass band.
FRACHILLO: Yes.

HELMICK: This award, it was not until a little bit later on in the life of the award that the rules changed and suddenly transcriptions or arrangements by the composer of origin were allowed to be submitted.

FRACHILLO: Yes.

HELMICK: Was there any debate concerning awarding this prize to a transcription versus an original work – before or after?

FRASCHILLO: No, not to my knowledge.

HELMICK: Not to your knowledge?

FRASCHILLO: No. Not to my knowledge in the least.

You know, when you transcribe a piece like that, that was written for brass band… when he wrote it for band, it becomes almost a new piece. That’s the way a lot of people see it. It is not like composers have not done that for centuries. You look at a lot of things that are written for piano that later became pieces for orchestra, or the Stokowski transcriptions of Bach. Those things take on a whole new life. There is nothing… if it takes on a whole new life as a piece, there is nothing wrong with it. At least, that is the way I have always looked at it.

HELMICK: That’s my next question. What is your opinion of a transcription receiving this prestigious designation?

FRASCHILLO: I don’t have a problem with it. I think if it is a really, if it is a good piece of music… and that piece was a good piece of music, it had melody, it had good construct… I don’t see anything wrong with it at all. In fact, Bill Moody is, Bill is a very good barometer of that. Bill has been in the A.B.A. for… since 1960… 1965, I think? I can’t remember. He is really on the side of the best piece. For instance, John Bourgeois, Bill was really interested in a piece that he transcribed. The dances that I like to do, Dances from Oprichnik, John transcribed that. Bill always said that that should be entered into the Ostwald prize.

I think that this piece for brass band, when you write it for band, full band with woodwinds, then it becomes a whole different piece. I think that my concept is, if somebody wrote a piece for woodwind quintet and then they wanted to write it for band, it’s a new piece. Is it not?
HELMICK: Right.

FRASCHILLO: I don’t have a problem with it, basically.

HELMICK: My next question:

In the wind band’s history, there has been a common thread motivating research and development of the ensemble’s repertoire. The underlying theme has been that a substantial body of quality original literature should be the barometer of the American wind band’s validation. Consequently, research on transcriptions has been somewhat minimal. What is your opinion on the role of transcriptions in the history of the wind band?

FRASCHILLO: If transcriptions had not existed in the early stages of the band as we know it in America ... when you are talking about that you are talking about the development of the band in America?

HELMICK: Correct.

FRASCHILLO: If bands did not have transcriptions, they would not have had anything to play, Jonathan. I think the idea of transcriptions of orchestral works, of piano works, of Bach keyboard pieces, that was the original repertoire for band. The pieces that were written in the 19th Century for band, Ponchielli, Berlioz, those were basically orchestral pieces written for band.

HELMICK: Sure.

FRASCHILLO: If you look at the Fauchet Symphony, those early works for band, they are basically orchestral works written for band. I think they have played a significant part in our, in the history of the band movement in this country.

In Europe, they are always going to play a significant part because it is part of the heritage there. Bands are considered rather middle class, as they are in this country as well.

That said, I do not think that we should forget from where we come. I think that we should always play transcriptions to give students an idea of our origin. Plus, I am a music educator. I have always felt that in many situations in public schools, if students do not play transcriptions they really are never going to have the opportunity to understand those pieces. In universities, if students do not play transcriptions and they
are going to be band directors, then they really do not know that whole segment of the literature. Plus, saxophone players and euphonium players, those non-orchestral instruments, are never going to play that literature – never, ever, ever.

There are better transcriptions than others and there are better pieces to play than others.

HELMICK: Sure.

FRASCHILLO: I think it’s an important part of our repertoire. I think if you jump in there and play nothing but new music, new music, new music, constantly, students get tired of that. I have empirical data. I have students who actually told me that, students whom have come from universities where they do not do anything but pieces where the ink is not dry.

HELMICK: I see.

FRASCHILLO: So, I do not think there is anything wrong with playing transcriptions, obviously. I mean you ask about transcriptions, how about the march?

HELMICK: Right.

FRASCHILLO: There are people who look negatively upon the march, as well. But the march is an integral part of our heritage. John Philip Sousa made a living off of the march, Karl King, Russell Alexander. In Europe, look at the British marches, where would we be without marches. They are part of our heritage, part of our culture at large.

So, you can say, I am a wind ensemble person or a wind band person and I’m not going to play marches. Well, don’t.

HELMICK: (Laughter)

FRASCHILLO: Well, you know what I mean? (Laughter)

So you are negating a whole part of your profession. The march and the transcription were the onset of the popularity of this medium. Only in the last, since the second World War… and really since the 1950s, did the concert idea of the band being on the same level as the symphony orchestra playing new and cutting-edge music come about.
HELMICK: Since your pubic school experience starting in 1968 till now, can you describe not only how the role of the transcription has changed, but how the perceived role of the transcription has changed?

FRASCHILLO: Well, let me say that it depends on the school from which you come.

HELMIK: Yes.

FRASCHILLO: There are schools that tend to put more emphasis on the conservatory idea, the performance idea. They want kids to play in orchestra and they want them to experience orchestral literature in orchestra. They want them to experience band literature in band, i.e. new wind ensemble pieces only written for wind ensemble. Well, if you only play pieces that were only written for wind ensemble, Jonathan, there is not... you are going to run out of music in a few years. That is, if you are playing good literature. Now you can play lesser quality.

HELMIK: Yes.

FRASCHILLO: But, if you are playing good stuff, you are going to run out of music in a couple of years. Plus, everything written for wind ensemble is not good music. Some contemporary music is not of substance, it is long and it is loud. Then again, so is Bruckner, but everything that Bruckner wrote is not necessarily good music either.

I have always played a lot of music written for band. A lot of it was didactic in my early years. Then when I started in those big schools in Lake Charles, we played things like An Original Suite, Dello Joio’s Fantasies on a Theme by Haydn. In those days, those were cutting-edge pieces.

Later on, when I came to Southern Miss, we played the newest literature every year that was coming out, basically. We were looking for new pieces, cutting-edge pieces, and we commissioned several pieces. Then at the same time, I felt that since it was primarily a music education school that students needed to have a good understanding of what marches were and what transcriptions were. So, I tried to do that as well.

People, audiences get tired of bands if they don’t hear anything that has a melody every now and then. I think you have to decide on that. You look at the people that are supporting you, that are paying the bills. If you go to A.S.O. [Atlanta Symphony Orchestra], you hear a lot
of standard repertoire. But, every now and then they will throw in a contemporary piece that is reasonably written because they want to introduce the audience to something new, some twenty-first century piece. Then they will play Beethoven, or Brahms, or Mozart, Respighi, more traditional literature. Those are the pieces that are going to sell the tickets. Ultimately, I think the pieces that are going to sell the tickets are pieces that have been lasting, that kids enjoy playing the melody on, that they enjoy experiencing a musical phrase.

When you look at certain pieces that I have played by certain composers in the last five or six years that were the hot composers, you look down in the lower parts and it is as if they were composed at the piano. Everything is in first inversion and the third trombone will have an E flat or an E natural for forty-five bars [playing a standard syncopated rhythm]. That is just not very interesting music.

HELMICK: Right.

FRASCHILLO: Look at the craftsmanship. Is it well written? Is there [inaudible]... In the emerging... I read your last question about the emerging band repertoire...

HELMICK: The quote by William Schaefer?

FRASCHILLO: The emerging band repertoire, yes. I read that quote. Can we afford it yet? I don’t think any ensemble can ever afford to completely negate a part of its heritage, or any medium can completely do that. Why would you? Why would you want to?

HELMICK: I could not have said it any better.

Dr. Fraschillo, thank you so much for your time and preparation for this interview. I really appreciate it. As said before, I will transcribe today’s interview and provide you with a copy to approve prior to publication. If there is anything that you think about in the meantime before I send that copy, let me know and I will be happy to accommodate.

FRASCHILLO: Okay.

HELMICK: You have a great evening, Dr. Fraschillo. Good-bye.

FRASCHILLO: Good-bye.
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INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT:

DR. PETER GRAHAM

The following is a transcript of an email interview with composer Peter Graham. At the request of the composer, the interview was administered via email and completed on April 8, 2014. To comply with Institutional Review Board regulations, Peter Graham was sent the “Oral Presentation for Informed Consent” as dictated by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Southern Mississippi. The “Oral Presentation for Informed Consent” may be referenced in Appendix M of this document as well as a copy of the signed document entitled, “The University of Southern Mississippi Authorization to Participate in Research Project” short form. I. Biographical Information

HELMICK: From where did you receive your formal education in music?


HELMICK: Who are your principal instructors of composition and arranging?

GRAHAM: Edward Gregson for composition at Goldsmiths'. Self-taught as an arranger.

HELMICK: How long have you been active as a professional?

GRAHAM: I was appointed music editor/staff arranger to the New York Staff Band of the SA [Salvation Army] in 1983. I also started accepting professional commissions at that time.

HELMICK: What is your relationship to the British style brass bands of the United Kingdom?

GRAHAM: I am a former player and nowadays guest conduct various bands.

HELMICK: How many of your compositions have been used as Championship section, national level test-pieces? Have you been commissioned to write for these ensembles, submitted compositions to brass band contests, or have your compositions been nominated as test-pieces?

GRAHAM: According to www.brassbandresults.co.uk 23 have been used as test pieces for various levels worldwide. Of those I would consider around
7-8 to be championship section level. All were commissioned for contests or ensembles. Once in the repertoire they may be selected for subsequent contests (e.g. My 1997 work On Alderley Edge has been set for the British Open Grand Shield and the New Zealand National Contest this year.)

HELMICK: Though not all of your efforts have been focused on the British style brass band as a medium, why do you choose to write for this particular instrumentation?

GRAHAM: a) I have established a reputation in the medium over the years so tend to get asked

b) I still enjoy the challenges of writing for the medium. Also, performance standards are high and therefore rewarding.

HELMICK: Briefly tell me about your professional history with regard to the American wind band.

GRAHAM: Ironically I was encouraged to transcribe my BB material for wind band by my Japanese distributor, primarily for the Japanese commercial market. I do not really have much contact with bands in the USA and only a handful of my pieces are performed there to my knowledge.

HELMICK: From where is your inspiration drawn when you compose?

GRAHAM: Fear and deadlines!

HELMICK: Did you write Harrison’s Dream with the intent that it be used as a test-piece for the 2000 National Championships of Great Britain? If so, why (commission, colleague encouragement)?

GRAHAM: Initially it was planned as a commission from the Fodens Band to celebrate their centenary in 2000, however, the conductor who commissioned it moved to a different band and somehow Boosey & Hawkes heard about the proposed work and asked if the commission could be transferred to them for the National Contest (they were the organizers at that time).

HELMICK: How do you balance the technical demands of a test-piece with the creation of a musical product that is unique to itself?

GRAHAM: I consider the writing of a test-piece to be a very specific type of task which has to fulfill certain criteria. In that sense I would draw parallels
with the work of film composers, in that you do the best you can whilst ensuring that the primary function of the piece satisfies the parameters of the commission.

HELMICK: Did you write for both ensembles (brass band and wind band) simultaneously? In other words, while you wrote for brass band, were you considering the wind band version?

GRAHAM: Yes - so it is unusual in that respect in that for once I did not transcribe the work for the other medium.

HELMICK: What self-imposed and externally imposed guidelines were present when you composed Harrison’s Dream (instrumentation, length, form, solos, performer demands, etc.)?

GRAHAM: I organised the work according to Golden Section principles. This dictated both length and structure. The choice of instruments for lines etc. was simply to ensure balance and contrast.

HELMICK: What was your motivation for writing the transcription of Harrison’s Dream (artistry or industry)? As a composer, do you believe that the composition for wind band is a transcription or an original piece? Is there a grey area? Why or why not?

GRAHAM: Simply that it was commissioned from the USAF Band. They had requested a piece from me just as I was about to start work on HD - I explained that I did not have enough time to write two different pieces and they agreed to the idea that I produce two versions of the piece planned (i.e. HD). The only stipulation was the instrumentation and that they would like to use their full complement if possible (which included harp and a desk of cellos). I don't consider it to be a transcription since elements of both mediums found their way into the finished products (e.g. the brass band "version" includes high lines which have a flavour of woodwind about them in my opinion and conversely there is some "brass band" white heat virtuosity in the brass writing for the wind band).

HELMICK: Did the stipulations of the commission from the United States Air Force Band ask that you transcribe Harrison’s Dream for wind band or did they commission a piece in a more general way (i.e. was transcribing your decision)? What were the specific details of the commissioning endeavor?
GRAHAM: See above.

HELMICK: In a 1967 article entitled, “The Emerging Band Repertoire,” William A. Schaefer is quoted on the topic of transcriptions as follows: “The subject of transcriptions looms in the back of our minds during every consideration of literature. Should we once and for all eliminate all but original literature from our repertoire? Can we afford it yet? What is the attitude of other musicians toward music performed in a medium other than that for which it was first conceived?” As a composer who transcribed his own work from one medium to another, what is your opinion on the legitimacy of transcribed repertoire? What is your attitude toward music performed in a medium other than that for which it was first written?

GRAHAM: Setting HD aside (since I don't consider it a true transcription) I have transcribed much of my BB work for wind band and have no concerns whatsoever. That said, I do think carefully about which works will translate successfully - some I avoid.

HELMICK: What models did you use when transcribing your work from the original brass band instrumentation to that of the American wind band?

GRAHAM: Really I don't and never have used models. I rely on advice that Stephen Bulla once gave me regarding where to place the instrumental groups and how they mostly work across platforms. For example, most of the lower brass (and obviously percussion) can be "pasted" over. Brass Band Baritones and Tenor Horns can be moved to Horns and Saxes, Cornets to Clarinets/Trumpets etc. Clearly scoring has to be more subtle than this but I find it works pretty much. I believe Steve also found it a successful policy during his long tenure as Staff Arranger to the US Marine Band!

HELMICK: Why did you choose these models?

See above

HELMICK: How did you approach the difficult task of re-orchestrating for the wind band?

GRAHAM: See above

HELMICK: Were there any particular rules or consistently applied principles that you followed?
GRAHAM: See above

HELMICK: In your opinion, was there anything gained or lost through the process of transcription?

GRAHAM: See above

HELMICK: In addition to the commissioning endeavors that the wind band profession has undergone to encourage composers to pen original literature for the medium, would you encourage leaders in the profession to commission transcribed literature for the wind band? Why or why not? Is there something that could be gained?

GRAHAM: I would encourage leaders to simply ask composers to produce whatever they feel appropriate and not limit them by using the word "original".

HELMICK: Harrison’s Dream was the first international composition to win the prize. Additionally, it was the first transcribed work to be given the distinction. A 1960 article by Paul Creston entitled, “The Band’s Future Concert Repertoire,” captures the debate in that decade concerning the music that the wind band performed and contemporary issues of the day. In it, Paul Creston is quoted as saying, “The band’s future repertoire should consist principally, and perhaps most completely, of music written originally and specifically for the band.” Though a very different time, do you as an internationally acclaimed composer, musician, and teacher feel that the distinction between original and transcribed literature is a necessary one?

GRAHAM: I wonder if this refers to the practice (as was the case in the Brass Band community in the early years) of transcribing "the classics" for wind? I don't think there is an issue nowadays with composers translating their work across platforms. The only important factor to consider is does the resulting work convince player, conductor and audience?

HELMICK: Is there a value in encouraging composers to transcribe their compositions for the wind band in addition to producing original music? If so, what is that value?

GRAHAM: See comments above - I would encourage composers to produce effective music for winds regardless of the transcription/"original" debate. Bear in mind that the translation will often involve a complete
rethinking of the primary source. I think this only becomes an issue if the recipient feels they are being short changed and receiving second hand goods! It is purely a matter of perception.
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REPORT OF 46th ANNUAL
A.B.A./OSTWALD COMPOSITION CONTEST

The 46th Annual A.B.A. Ostwald Composition Contest was held in 2001. Over 1600 brochure/applications were mailed with labels from the following organizations a) A.B.A. membership mailing list, b) C.B.D.N.A. list, c) composition departments of all member institutions of College Music Society, d) individual composers listed in C.M.S. Directory, e) all composers who submitted entries to contest of the previous biennium and f) inquiries that requested brochure/applications.

Ninety-one entries were submitted by the November 15 deadline. It should be noted that again this year, there was a significant increase in foreign entries. This is most likely due to the A.B.A. website. A screening committee made up of Illinois Bands staff and other School of Music faculty did an initial screening and brought forward 36 entries.

On December 8 a sub-committee made up of Steve Steele, Bob Foster, Greg Bimm, Gary Smith, James Keene, Tom Caneva, Peter Griffin (University of Illinois Assistant Director of Bands), and Robert Busan (visiting faculty from Sydney Conservatory (Australia) selected seven finalists for the selection process to be held during Mid-West International Band and Orchestra Clinic in Chicago.

Five (5) copies of each score and tape (of the 7 finalists) were duplicated and brought to the Hilton Hotel along with six cassette players with earphones. These were set up in a room that was supervised by four University of Illinois graduate assistants, who alternated as “room monitors” for a period of 34 hours of room availability.

Members of the A.B.A. Ostwald Committee were required to complete a certification form, verifying that they had listened to all finalists in their entirety. This certification was required in order to cast a ballot. In addition, attendance was required in order to submit a ballot, in case of a need to break ties or to deal with potential controversy or procedural discrepancies.
On Friday, December 21 at 11:00 a.m., final voting took place with the committee choosing “Harrison's Dream” by Peter Graham, from Cheshire, England, as the winning composition. This is the first winning composition from outside North America. The United States Air Force Band will perform “Harrison's Dream” at the A.B.A. Convention in Wichita, Kansas on Saturday, March 8, 2002. Mr. Graham will be in attendance and will receive the $8,000 prize at that time.

Respectfully submitted,

James F. Keene, Chairman
A.B.A. Ostwald Composition Contest
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THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE CONCERT BAND PROGRAM
AT THE AMERICAN BANDMASTERS ASSOCIATION CONVENTION
MARCH 8, 2002
WICHITA, KANSAS

Friday, March 8 • 8:00 p.m.
Century II Concert Hall, Downtown Wichita

The United States Air Force Concert Band
Colonel Lowell E. Graham, Commander/Conductor

O Canada
Calixa Lavallée, Adolphe Basile Routhier
trans. Robert Stanley Weir

Star Spangled Banner
John Stafford Smith, Francis Scott Key
arr. Cmgts (Ret.) Floyd E. Werle

Mr. Don Wilcox, conductor
Director of Bands, West Virginia University

Nabucco Overture
Giuseppe Verdi
trans. Kenneth Singleton

Dr. Kenneth Singleton, conductor
Director of Bands, University of Northern Colorado

The Carnival of Venice
Joseph John-Baptiste Arban
arr. Richard Dornak

TSgt Brian Sands, tuba soloist
Colonel Gary F. Lamb, conductor
Commander, United States Army Band

Shield of Liberty
Mr. Donald Slupe, conductor
Director of Bands, Libertyville Illinois High School

To the Airborne
Dr. John R. Locke, conductor
Director of Bands, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Harrison's Dream
ABA/Ostwald Award Winning Composition
Colonel Lowell E. Graham, conductor
Commander/Conductor, The United States Air Force Band

Peter Graham
Intermission

Fanfare for West Point from *Three Symphonic Fanfares*
Lieutenant Colonel David H. Deirick, conductor
Commander/Conductor, The United States Military Academy Band

Escapade
Dr. Jack Stamp, conductor
Director of Bands, Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Scootin' on Hardrock
(Three Short Scat-Jazzy Dances)
Thomas G. Leslie, conductor
Director of Bands, University of Nevada at Las Vegas

The Strategic Air Command Band
John Thomson, conductor
Director of Bands, New Trier Illinois High School

Be Glad Then America from *New England Triptych*
Mr. Dennis Zeisler, conductor
Director of Bands, Old Dominion University

Oh Danny Boy
Salvatore Cardillo
arr. CMSgt (Ret.) Floyd E. Werle

The Last Full Measure of Devotion
Larry Grossman, Buz Kohn
arr. Ian Fraser
trans. CMSgt (Ret.) Michael Davis
TSgt. Ryan Carson, Vocal Soloist
Dr. Stanley F. Michalski, Jr., conductor
Professor of Music and Director of Bands Emeritus, Clarion University of Pennsylvania

America the Beautiful
Samuel Augustus Ward
arr. Carmen Dragon
Mr. Edward S. Lisk, conductor
Director of Bands and Music Supervisor, Retired, Oswego New York City School District

Stars and Stripes Forever
Mr. James Keene, conductor
Director of Bands, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

John Philip Sousa
APPENDIX M

ORAL PRESENTATION FOR INFORMED CONSENT

Oral Presentation for Informed Consent:

“British Brass Band Contest Pieces: A Study in Transcriptions for the American Wind Band”
by Jonathan Helmick

1. Purpose: “The voluntary study in which you are being invited to participate involves research in the form of interviews that will be published in the dissertation entitled “British Brass Band Contest Pieces: A Study in Transcriptions for the American Wind Band.”

The purpose of the study is to examine the opinion of experts in the wind band field on the role of transcriptions in the repertoire of the American wind band. It defines a grey area bridging the gap between original compositions and third party transcriptions, namely transcriptions by the composers of origin. As a model for study, it examines a body of literature for the American wind band that has been largely overlooked by researchers – transcriptions of original brass band contest pieces. The piece Harrison’s Dream by Peter Graham will receive focused attention as part of the study. Finally, it will provide a resource for wind band conductors on transcriptions of Brass Band Championship Section contest pieces and on the views of current composers and conductors regarding the role of transcriptions in the repertoire of the American wind band.”

2. Description of Study: “The study is qualitative and includes interviews with Peter Graham and members of the 2001-2002 American Bandmasters Association/Ostwald Award committee. Total number of participants will range between two and twenty five.

Interviews will require a minimum of 30 minutes of time and will not exceed one hour in length to answer all questions. Interviews will take place via telephone, videoconference, or live where possible. Follow-up and clarifying questions may be necessary following the interviews. If mutually agreed upon, those questions will be submitted to the interviewee either via email or an additional telephone conference, not to exceed 15 minutes in length.

All interviews will be audio-recorded, transcribed, and published as part of the study.

Due to the nature of the study, names of interviewees will be published as part of the final product. However, any responses or information that an interviewee requests to be deemed off the record will not be included in the final transcription nor in the analysis of compiled responses.
3. Benefits: "The beliefs and values held by conductors and scholars shape the research and repertoire selection of the profession. This study will benefit the wind band profession by examining the belief that a sizeable body of quality, original repertoire is the barometer for measuring the success of the wind band movement. It will solicit the opinions of experts in the field regarding this value judgment and the place transcriptions hold in our literature. Further, it will highlight the perspective of a composer who transcribed his own work for another medium. Qualitative information gleaned from interviews of both constituencies is invaluable to the exploration of the debate concerning the artistic integrity of original works versus transcriptions. Finally, this study will aid conductors in repertoire selection by including an annotated guide to British brass band contest pieces transcribed for the American wind band."

4. Risks: "In addition to names, interviewees will have minimal biographical information published with the transcription of interviews. This is necessary for establishing expertise related to the subject matter and the opinions of distinguished professionals in the field.

To minimize risks associated with the publication of identifying information of those providing their expertise and first-hand experiences, several precautions will be taken. Participation in the interviews is voluntary. Participants wishing not to be identified in the final publication will be afforded this option; however, information relative to the study, excluding the identifying information of the interviewee, will be used and published. Names and titles will be published unless you request otherwise. Additionally, if there is a question and/or response that you would prefer be kept off of the record, I will not include it in publication."

5. Confidentiality: "To maintain confidentiality, electronic and recorded data will be stored on my personal computer, password protected to maintain security.

Hard copies of data will be stored in file cabinets and made available only to me. As I said before, any information that you would like to be kept off of the record will be omitted from analysis and deleted from all copies.

All interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed. Audio recordings will be catalogued and archived by me for a period not to exceed one calendar year following the date of transcription. This will be done in order to back up data acquired. After one calendar year, the audio recording of the interview will be erased and the electronic audio storage of the interview will be scrubbed and reinitialized. If you would like to have verification that I completed this process or if you would like the recordings erased sooner than one calendar year after transcription, please let me know and I will be happy to accommodate."

6. Alternative Procedures: Not Applicable
7. Participant's Assurance: "This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820."

______________________________
Signature of Person Giving Oral Presentation

______________________________
Date

______________________________
Signature of Witness to Oral Presentation

______________________________
Date
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