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Appendix A
Detailed schedule of case study questions

Interview issues - Beecham

Technique and Technology
- To what degree, if any, was Beecham’s conducting technique (and therefore his musical interpretation) constrained or extended by the requirements of 78rpm wax-bed recording technology?
- To what extent, if any, did the change in recording technology from the wax-bed 78 rpm process to tape recording and editing stimulate any change in Beecham’s conducting and interpretations, by allowing a less absolute approach to recording and performance?

Repertoire
- Who decided what Beecham and his orchestras were to record - Beecham, producers or other persons?
- How influential were producers such as Walter Legge and Victor Olof in determining the repertoire that Beecham recorded?

Education and interpretation
- To what extent, if any, was Beecham aware of (or even influenced by) contemporary or past performances that existed on records?
- To what extent, if any, was Beecham influenced by the conducting of contemporaries?
- Was performance for Beecham a continuing set of possibilities?

Finance
- Did Beecham’s orchestras receive royalties for recordings, and if so, what proportion of their overall income did recording royalties represent?
What proportion of the orchestras’ annual income did recording payments represent? (i.e. how critical were royalties to the orchestras’ existence as permanent organisations?)

How far (if at all) did income to Beecham’s orchestral musicians from recording, either through an inclusive flat weekly payment or through additional fees, differ from the norm for payment to orchestral musicians during the relevant periods for both the London Philharmonic Orchestra and for the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra?

Performance standards

To what extent were high calibre orchestral musicians attracted to Beecham’s orchestras because of the income from recording?

Were there other factors which were more decisive in attracting high calibre musicians to work for Beecham, such as his personality?

Career

Did his recordings enhance Beecham’s reputation in any way?

Did his recordings influence in any way the work which Beecham was offered, or was this entirely driven by his live performances?

Reputation management

Has the dearth of live recordings by Beecham been in any way a hindrance to the maintenance and development of his posthumous reputation (by contrast, for instance, with that of Furtwangler?)

‘Yes/No’ questions – Beecham (created at the request of Felix Aprahamian).

Finance

Did Beecham’s orchestras (LPO and RPO) receive royalties from the sales of their recordings?

If so, when did this form of payment commence?

If this form of payment was made, was the income from royalties a significant part of their income?

Did Beecham negotiate payment for his recordings in the form of royalties (as for instance did Melba and McCormack)?
If he did do so, when did this form of payment commence?

**Performance standards**
- Were high calibre orchestral musicians attracted to Beecham’s orchestras (LPO and RPO) because of the income from recordings?
- Did Beecham’s unique personality attract high calibre musicians to his orchestras (LPO and RPO)?

**Technique**
- Did the requirements of 78rpm recording constrain Beecham’s conducting and conducting technique?
- Did the introduction of tape recording and editing change Beecham’s conducting and conducting technique in any way?

**Repertoire**
- Was Beecham the only person who determined what he and his orchestras recorded?
- Were his producers, such as Legge and Olof, influential in this decision-making process?
- Did the influence, if any, depend upon the strength of personality of the producer involved (i.e. did it vary depending upon who was the producer)?

**Education and interpretation**
- Was Beecham aware of contemporary or past performers on record?
- Was Beecham influenced in any way by the conducting of his contemporaries?
- Did Beecham see his interpretation of a particular work as just one among many possibilities?
- Were his interpretations fixed (in so far as they can be) or were they continuously evolving?

**Career**
- Did recording enhance Beecham’s reputation?
Did his recordings influence the offers of work which were made to Beecham, for instance abroad, or was these stimulated by his work in the concert hall and opera house only?

Did the degree of influence created by his recordings, if any, change during his lifetime - for instance was it greater in the 1950s than the 1930s, if at all?

Reputation management

Has the dearth of live recordings by Beecham in any way influenced the maintenance of his posthumous reputation?

Live vs. recorded performances

Were Beecham’s live performances different to his recorded performances?

If they were different, in what ways were they so?

Interview issues - Solti

Finance

Payment by royalties

* Was this how Solti was paid?

* What were the annual volumes of sales for Solti’s recordings?

Performance standards

Did Solti view recording as a process that in any way assisted the development of performance standards (for instance while he was with the Royal Opera and/or the Chicago Symphony Orchestra)?

Technique

Did the contemporary recording process (the long playing record and stereophonic sound in particular) have any influence, if any, upon Solti’s conducting and interpretations?

Were the contemporary technological requirements in any way a constraint (or alternatively a release?)
Repertoire

- Who decided what Solti was to record - himself, producers, or other persons?
- Did the degree of influence change with the personalities involved (e.g. Victor Olof and John Culshaw)
- Did Solti increasingly determine the repertoire that he would record?
- Were there any other influences that he might take account of?
- What was his relationship with producers - dominant, equal, subservient?

Education and interpretation

- Was Solti to any extent aware of contemporary or past performances that existed on records?
- Was Solti in any way influenced by the conducting of contemporaries?
- Did Solti see his interpretation of a particular work as one among many possibilities?

Technology

- Did the current recording technologies, particularly tape recording and stereophonic sound, exert any influence upon Solti’s conducting style and interpretations?
- Did the development of recording technologies which allowed for longer ‘takes’ (such as digital recording) change in any way Solti’s performances in the studio?
- Was there any difference between Solti’s ‘live’ and recorded performances?

Career

- Did recording enhance in any way Solti’s reputation?
- Did his recordings influence in any way the work which Solti was offered, or was this entirely driven by his live performances?
- Was there any relationship (if any) between Solti’s Decca recordings and his appointments to the Royal Opera Company and the Chicago Symphony Orchestra?

Reputation management

- Are there any strategies in place for the management of his recordings posthumously?
How will his reputation (and so sales) be managed in the future?

Interview issues - Rattle

Finance

- Royalties:
  - does the CBSO receive royalties from its recordings?
  - if so, do they assist in maintaining and developing standards of musical performance, for instance through the payment of enhanced salaries, which in turn are attractive to high calibre players?

- Sales:
  - what are the volumes of annual sales for recordings by Rattle, in each of the formats LP, cassette, and CD (if available)?
  - what are the individual per title sales figures for each of his recordings by year (if available)?
  - in particular what are the annual sales figures for his recording of Mahler’s Tenth Symphony (released December 1980)?

Performance standards

- Can the use of recordings as a process through which performance standards may be raised be employed indefinitely?

Technique

- Does the development of recording technology to the point whereby the difference between live and studio recordings is non-existent in sound terms release the conductor from technical constraints?

Repertoire

- Does Rattle’s emphasis on contemporary repertoire diminish as a sales problem, the longer the works are in the catalogue?
- Who decides what Rattle records: Rattle, producers, or other persons?
Education and interpretation

- To what extent is Rattle aware of or influenced by the interpretations of other conductors, particularly those who are dead and whose performances now exist only through records?
- Does Rattle see his interpretation of a particular work as one among many possibilities?

Technology

- Are there any longer any constraining factors in the recording process as there have been in the past?
- Did the growth in sales generated by the advent of the CD create a demand for more recordings conducted by Rattle?

Career

- To what extent, if any, have recordings influenced career moves by Rattle (for instance Rattle’s Mahler recordings and the Vienna Philharmonic’s wish to find a replacement for Leonard Bernstein as a Mahler conductor).
- To what extent, if any, do recordings bolster reputation and what are the consequences of this?

Strategy

- Did or does EMI see having a long-term relationship with Rattle, taking into account his preferences for repertoire and his approach to recording, as providing any form of long-term competitive advantage?
- If there has been or is a long-term strategy, is it or has it been an effective trade-off against short-term pressures?

Interview issues -General

The role of the producer

- Was the producer the key determinant of artists and repertoire in the past, as seems to have been the case in a number of instances?
Has the role of the producer changed?
If the producer’s role has become less dominant, what are the reasons for this change, and when did they start to have an effect?
What were and are the pressures to which the producer has been or is subject, for instance the influence of marketing in theory and practice?

Orchestras
To what degree, if any, are the finances of symphony orchestras currently dependent upon income from recordings?

Career development
Is there a general relationship between career progression and recording?

Overview
Are the research propositions reasonable?
Do they relate to any other factors yet to be identified?
Are there other ways, in addition to those already identified, in which recording may have directly influenced musical activity?
## Appendix B

### List of proposed and actual interview subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Dropped</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amis</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andry</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aprahamian</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbirolli</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beecham</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brymer</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell-White</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowan</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fogel</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillinson</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haas</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keener</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolly</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.Kay</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.Kay</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Dropped</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lap</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebrecht</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legge</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallinson</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minshull</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohr</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moseley</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodier</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattle</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solti</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whelton</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willan</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: D = Dropped, B = Beecham, S = Solti, R = Rattle, P = Producers
Appendix C

Initial template and codes at the start of analysis

The initial template and codes established at the beginning of October 1999, when the process of data analysis started.

- Career
- Education (interpretation/repertoire)
- Finance
- Interpretation
- Performance standards
- Producer
- Repertoire
- Strategy
- Technique
- Technology
Appendix D

Template, codes and code sets after initial data analysis

The template, codes and code sets generated by the end of December 1999, prior to the drafting of individual case studies

Conductors

- Career
- Conductors
- Critics
- Leadership
- Listening
- Relationships with orchestras
- Reputation management

Finance

- Capital investment
- Finance
- Musical infrastructure
- Orchestras: formation and development
- Performance standards
- Records as documents
- Rehearsal
Market growth

- Back catalogue
- Historical perspective
- Market growth
- Marketing
- Media
- Records as documents

Organisation

- Record companies
- Record industry

Personal

- Beecham
- Rattle
- Solti

Repertoire

- Back catalogue
- Education
- Historical perspective
- Interpretations
- Repertoire

Technique

- Engineering
- Live vs studio performance
• Manipulation
• New forms of musical reality
• Producer
• Technique
Appendix E

Final template and codes

The final template and codes used to construct each case study, drawing from the information laid out in Appendix D

- The individual conductor
- Interaction with musicians
- Repertoire selection
- The act of recording
- Relationship with producers
- Use of records
- Performance and interpretation
- Relationship with record companies
Appendix F

Sir Thomas Beecham’s career and recording:
an outline

1. Introduction

The career of Sir Thomas Beecham can be divided into the following segments:

• youth and education
• the New Symphony Orchestra and the Beecham Symphony Orchestra, 1906-1914
• the years of the First World War and the 1920s
• the London Philharmonic Orchestra 1932-1939
• the years of the Second World War, the 1940s and beyond

2. Youth and education

Beecham was born into wealth and throughout his life assumed wealth and its trappings whether he had them or not. He summed up his philosophy of life succinctly: ‘I don’t give a damn for the necessities of life; all I’m interested in are the luxuries of life.’ (Schwarzkopf, 1982, p.167). He was well-placed to participate in the world of music as it existed at the beginning of this century: he was simply able to buy experience. For instance, it was the wealth and prestige of his father which enabled him to replace Hans Richter as the conductor of the Halle Orchestra’s concert in 1899 at St. Helen’s, given to mark his father’s mayoral year and paid for by him.

In addition he held no preconceptions: from his earliest youth he was familiar with the mechanical reproduction of music, not least through his father’s orchestrion, a giant music box made in Switzerland: ‘Here was a world at once real and ideal, diminishing care, augmenting pleasure, and shutting the door on the community...’
outside with its external load of problems which no-one seemed able to solve.’ (Beecham, 1944, p.19).

Beecham’s access to money through his father and his native musical enthusiasm enabled him to launch himself upon the musical world without too much concern for its formalities, despite his own lack of musical training. He did not follow in anybody’s footsteps because in England there were no footsteps to follow. He exploited the existing situation, using his resources and enthusiasm to lay the foundations for new forms of musical organisation and activity.

3. The New Symphony Orchestra and the Beecham Symphony Orchestra 1906-1914

Beecham’s decision to devote himself to conducting, following abortive efforts as a composer and as a pianist, was founded upon his work with the New Symphony Orchestra. Beecham formed this orchestra out of a smaller band of free-lance musicians which had been looking for a conductor for its Sunday afternoon concerts, given initially at the Coronet Theatre, Notting Hill Gate. Although his association with the orchestra only lasted two years, his experience as a conductor with it was formative. In addition the leader of the orchestra, John Saunders was also a vigorous proponent of the gramophone, then still in its infancy.

Following his rupture with the New Symphony Orchestra, Beecham formed the Beecham Symphony Orchestra in 1908. Several characteristics of the creation and operation of this orchestra were to be used in the future. Firstly its formation occurred rapidly, over a matter of weeks only. Secondly the players were predominantly young - their typical age was twenty-five. Thirdly Beecham took the orchestra on tour: it ventured into the provinces to give concerts in cities outside the immediate orbit of London. (It was nicknamed ‘The Fireworks Orchestra’ because of its habit of letting off fireworks at Crewe Junction, the hub of its travels.) The income from provincial touring was to be a key component for Beecham’s later orchestras, particularly the London Philharmonic Orchestra. Fourthly Beecham employed the orchestra to play in the opera seasons in London which his father
financed from 1910 to the outbreak of the First World War. Finally, the Beecham Symphony Orchestra made gramophone recordings, the first being excerpts from ‘Die Fledermaus’ and ‘The Tales of Hoffmann’, recorded for The Gramophone Company in July 1910.

Beecham was thus beginning to construct the building blocks which later would enable him to sustain, with varying degrees of security, a professional orchestra on a year-round basis, without the benefit of state subsidy.

This period was of decisive importance to Beecham as both man and musician: by the outbreak of the First World War the character which he was to be for the rest of his life as far as the public was concerned had been formed, and he had fully matured as a musician. Basil Hogarth, writing in ‘The Gramophone’ in 1934, quoted ‘an intimate friend’ of Beecham who described the change that took place between 1905 and 1910 thus: ‘I have lived to see changes in many men, but seldom have seen such a radical change as that which took place in Thomas Beecham during the space of five years. Out of a shy, groundward glancing little figure in a frock coat, brown boots and a pork pie hat and dark woollen gloves, there emerged a personality of such force and magnetism that the whole of the musical world was to feel its grandiose effects.’(Wimbush, 1973, p.142).

Beecham had set himself up as a conductor to be compared with the only major rivals active in England during this period: Richter, Nikisch and Wood. An indication of the improvements that he had achieved was the enthusiastic reception which Berlin - the home of Nikisch - gave to himself and his orchestra at a concert performed in 1912, whilst the orchestra was there to accompany performances by Diaghilev’s Russian Ballet. A local press critic wrote: ‘These Englishmen play with a sovereign authority all too rare nowadays anywhere.’(Blackwood, 1994, p.59).
4. The years of the First World War and the 1920s

Although Beecham was active during the First World War conducting opera and concerts throughout the country, the artistic standards achieved do not seem to have equalled those of the pre-war years. After the war he ceased to conduct between 1920 and 1923, whilst he sorted out the problems of the estate inherited from his father upon his death in 1916. The years following his return to conducting in 1923 were not ones of conspicuous success. By 1929 Beecham had reached the age of 50, and to many he appeared to be a spent force. Reid has described this period graphically: ‘They were a time of accidents, chronic ill-health and recurrent lameness; angry frustrations; running battles with claimants and creditors; busy professional schemings that came to nothing...As they watched him limp onto the platform, or conduct from an invalid chair, or heard of concerts cancelled on doctor’s orders, some must have wondered at times whether or not he was perhaps sick in mind as well as body.’ (Reid, 1961, p.196).

Beecham was surprisingly dismissive of the gramophone at the start of this period, reacting perhaps to the admittedly poor quality of orchestral sound achieved through the acoustic process, which continued up to 1925: ‘Improvement in the gramophone is so imperceptible that it will take quite 5,000 years to make it any good’ he maintained (Reid, 1961, p.196).

The replacement of the acoustic recording process by electrical recording in 1925 and the decision not only to re-record much of the acoustic repertoire but also to record those types of music, such as orchestral works, which the new process made feasible, and further to record this repertoire extensively, began to make the gramophone companies economic forces to be taken seriously. The extent of this change can be seen from the fact that in 1923 there was available only one complete recording of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony - and that had been recorded by Nikisch in 1913 - and selections from three others.

By the end of 1925 however, in the rush to demonstrate the superiority of the new recording technique, there were available twenty-three complete recordings of
Beethoven symphonies. In 1927 Columbia (UK) celebrated the centenary of Beethoven’s birth with new electrical recordings of all the symphonies and many of his other works. The first flush of enthusiasm for electrical recording produced rapid rates of growth in profits. From £266,000 in 1925, The Gramophone Company’s profits grew to over £1,100,000 in 1928, ‘a year when its rate of growth was an astonishing 55 per cent.’ (LeMahieu, 1982, p.382). (This profit was created almost certainly by popular and not classical music. Dealers would complain of the large number of unsold classical sets that lingered on their shelves.)

The potential of the gramophone would have been made apparent to Beecham not only through his involvement in the Beethoven project and a similar one in 1928 to celebrate Schubert’s centenary, both of which generated substantial international publicity, but also through his own large-scale recordings of this period. He conducted complete recordings of Handel’s ‘Messiah’ and of Gounod’s ‘Faust’ in 1927 and 1929 respectively for Columbia (UK), as well as recordings of Beethoven’s Symphony No. 2 in 1926 and Mozart’s Symphony No. 34 in 1928.

Beecham began to see recording at this time as one of the sources of plural funding which could be used to sustain an orchestra on a full-time basis. In 1928 he outlined his vision for a permanent orchestra, provisionally entitled the London Philharmonic Orchestra. ‘The players would be under contract at fees ranging from £500 a year for the rank-and-file to £1,200 for principals. During eleven months of the year they would give about 110 concerts at the Queen’s and Albert Halls, in the provinces, and in various London suburbs, as well as taking part in opera seasons at Covent garden.’ (Reid, 1961, p.196).

Thus three of Beecham’s pre-First World War building blocks were in place within this proposal: London concerts, provincial tours, and an opera season. Its weakness was that Beecham also sought subsidy, at about £25,000 a year from some source. Recording was shortly to fill part of this gap, at a time when the state, either through direct subsidy or fiscal policy, played no part in supporting the arts.
In the same year he made a not dissimilar proposal - probably a development of the first - to the Royal Philharmonic Society to form an orchestra using its name, and whose annual schedule would consist of twenty concerts at the Queen’s Hall, twenty at the Albert Hall, twenty in the London suburbs, thirty on tour in provincial towns, ten ‘celebrity’ concerts with distinguished soloists, and most significantly, forty recording sessions for Columbia (UK) (Elkin. 1946, p.116-117). The orchestra was to be managed by the BBC. In reality the BBC broke away from this proposal to form its own orchestra. Although this move negated Beecham’s immediate plan, his proposals formed the functional strategy driving the formation of both the London Philharmonic Orchestra in 1932 and, after the Second World War, the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra in 1946.

5. The London Philharmonic Orchestra 1932-1939

The formation of the London Philharmonic Orchestra by Beecham in September and October 1932 ended the artistically rather sterile period of the 1920s during which Beecham had lacked control of his own orchestra. Beecham needed an orchestra of his own to realise fully his artistic vision, as technically his direction was not always the clearest. He needed musicians around him who understood him and whom he could trust. Temple Savage, not always an admirer of Beecham, has written: ‘...he had difficulty in achieving results with orchestras other than his own where the players were hand-picked because they understood him and ‘did it his way’.’ (Temple Savage, 1988, p.56). Beecham created the LPO by grasping the opportunity put to him by Sir Malcolm Sargent to form an orchestra primarily for the Cortauld-Sargent concerts, and to be funded initially by a small consortium led by Sir Samuel Cortauld. In addition to this primary purpose, Beecham added to its activities elements with which he had become familiar over the previous twenty-five years, and, in addition, recording.

The first flute player of the LPO, Gerald Jackson, has succinctly described the opportunities and circumstances leading to the orchestra’s formation: ‘Beecham had tried to negotiate with the LSO unsuccessfully. At the same time the Cortauld-
Sargent concerts were proving a success but they possessed no regular orchestra; the gramophone industry had discovered electrical recording and was once more perpetuating performances for posterity according to the latest process; finally the effect of the new BBC, although Beecham would never admit it, was to stimulate further interest in orchestral music.’ (Jackson, 1968, p.53).

The idea of a recording contract as being part of the financing package for the orchestra had taken root and appears to have formed a significant element of the orchestra’s economy right from the start, to the extent that ‘some of the newcomers [to the orchestra] were auditioned at the Abbey Road Studios of The Gramophone Company with whom Beecham had already contracted to make a minimum number of recordings each year. The days were gone forever of his railings at the gramophone as a toy or parasite which could be written off for another 5000 years.’ (Reid, 1961, p.203).

The success of the orchestra following its first concert at the Queen’s Hall on 7 October 1932 was immediate. Beecham and the orchestra ‘were instantly projected into the very centre of British musical life...The orchestra was in demand everywhere. They were constantly in demand in the recording studio.’ (Blackwood, 1994, p.124). In effect Beecham had taken the initial financial backing offered for the Cortauld-Sargent concerts, and then added to this other elements: working as the pit orchestra at the Royal Opera House for the summer season of operas of which he was artistic director, provincial tours, and recording, in addition to the ‘heartland’ concerts in London. This combination of activities more or less sustained the orchestra up to 1939, although when it ceased operations under Beecham’s direct control, considerable debts existed.

The discographer of the orchestra, Philip Stuart, has noted that all the orchestra’s recordings from 1932 to 1945 were made for EMI, then the largest European recording company, with important reciprocal agreements with the American giant, RCA Victor. ‘From [its] inauspicious beginnings the orchestra was soon established as the natural choice for recordings by EMI’s leading artists. Weingartner and Elgar conducted it in 1933 and Koussevitsky the following year. Soloists included
Schnabel, Szigeti, Heifetz, Cortot, Piatogsky and Kreisler all within the first three years.’ (Stuart, 1997, p.2). Beecham had created, in reality if not in name, a recording orchestra for EMI, fifteen years before Walter Legge did the same with the Philharmonia Orchestra.

Recording was thus the new element in the financial equation when compared with the experience of the Beecham Symphony Orchestra prior to the First World War. The BBC’s formation of its own, excellent, orchestra under Sir Adrian Boult had demonstrated the feasibility and artistic benefits of the permanent orchestra, albeit funded entirely through a form of taxation - the broadcasting license. Beecham took the patchwork of opportunities which already existed - opera, touring, concerts - added recording to them and was able to sustain a first-class orchestra up to the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. At this point the jigsaw started to collapse. Recordings diminished, the opera season was discontinued, and Beecham accepted engagements abroad. Without these three elements the security of the orchestra was severely reduced, and its members followed the example of the LSO in 1904 and became a self-governing organisation, responsible for its own destiny.

6. The years of the Second World War, the 1940 and beyond

Beecham spent most of the Second World War in America. His recording activities during this period, 1940 to 1944, were restricted to a series of sessions for the American Columbia Company in 1942 with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra.

Following his return to the United Kingdom in 1944, he and the London Philharmonic attempted to pick up the reins together - the main vehicle for this rapprochement being a new contract for recordings between Beecham and the American company RCA Victor. Because of the Petrillo ban on recordings in the USA between 1942 and 1944, and because of RCA Victor’s ‘long-standing reciprocal matrix agreement with His Master’s Voice in Britain’ (Walker, 1998), an arrangement was concluded whereby the recording sessions took place in London in 1944 and 1945, but were paid for by RCA Victor. This cross-Atlantic funding was to
reappear again shortly as a key element in the formation of the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra.

Beecham’s relationship with the London Philharmonic ‘shrivelled slowly until by 1946 it was dead’ (Temple Savage, 1988, p.100), not helped by the highly collective management style of the secretary of the orchestra, Thomas Russell. This was many light years away from Beecham’s idiosyncratic brand of autocracy, but had been effective in keeping the orchestra together during the war.

Once again, as in the 1928-1932 period, it was the failure to participate in the plans for the formation of a new orchestra, this time the Philharmonia Orchestra in place of the BBC Symphony Orchestra, that stimulated Beecham to seek to form his own. In fact Beecham clearly outlined what was to be his strategy over lunch to the founder of the Philharmonia, Walter Legge, with whom he had worked extensively before the war. ‘I have access to all the money this venture will need. I am already well advanced in negotiations with the Royal Philharmonic Society to employ the name Royal Philharmonic Orchestra for which I shall remunerate that august body with a certain participation in the royalties earned by the recordings we, my dear boy, shall make together.’ (Schwarzkopf, 1982, p.93). Legge was not prepared to cede control of his orchestra so easily, and, amazingly found alternative initial finance from the Maharajah of Mysore, whose generosity kept the orchestra going until royalties from its recordings were sufficient to sustain it.

Once again in a flurry of activity, Beecham in 1946 set about creating his own orchestra. This time the corner-stone of its formation was the recording contract. The players’ representative on the orchestra’s board, the first flute Gerald Jackson, was later to write: ‘We discovered that the orchestra began with some help from the Delius Trust and a £3,000 advance on gramophone royalties.’ (Jackson, 1968, p.97). Beecham had formed the Delius Trust after the composer’s death in 1932. It received the royalties from the performances of the composer’s works. These in turn were used to promote further performances, and more importantly, recordings of Delius’s music. It was thus to be a ready source of finance for many of the early recordings of the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra (as well as those made earlier with the London
Philharmonic Orchestra), as well as securing for posterity performances of music in which Beecham was acknowledged as a supreme interpreter.

The first two years of the orchestra’s existence were rocky: by the end of 1948 it had accumulated debts of £30,000. However with Sir Thomas’s name, it proved not to be difficult to sell the orchestra, and ‘within ten years the books were again in balance, yet this would have been impossible without the willing sacrifice by Beecham of his fees, sometimes for months.’ (Jackson, 1968, p.109). Once again, one of Beecham’s financial building blocks reappeared: playing in the opera pit. The orchestra began to pick up regular work as the orchestra for the Glyndebourne Festival Opera, thus filling in the often fallow months of public concert giving during the summer. The orchestra commenced working for Glyndebourne in 1948 and this association was to continue and to grow without interruption until 1963 when it was replaced by the London Philharmonic Orchestra, whose Music Director, John Pritchard, held the same post at Glyndebourne. (It may be argued that the double blow of Beecham’s death and the loss of the Glyndebourne contract destabilised the orchestra to an extent from which it has never fully recovered.)

With the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra reasonably firmly established in this environment, and recording buoyed up firstly by the introduction of the long-playing record (UK: 1950), and then by the introduction of stereophonic sound (UK: 1955-1958), both of which presented ample opportunities for the re-recording of Beecham’s staple repertoire, the post-war years were more stable and productive for Sir Thomas than ever before. His recorded with the American Columbia Record Company throughout the early fifties, and in his last years with RCA and EMI. At the latter his associate Victor Olof (who had helped to form and manage the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra) had become head of the classical music division in 1956. Olof kept Beecham as busy as he wanted to be in the recording studio. Beecham re-married in 1958 for the third time aged 79, and died, still planning future performances, in 1961.
Appendix G

Sir Georg Solti’s career and recording: an outline

1. Career

Solti’s career as a conductor combined to a high degree the usual and the unusual. On the usual side, certain key aspects did not differ from the normal training of other conductors. Solti studied as a pianist at the Franz Liszt Academy of Music in Budapest, where his teachers included Bartok, Kodaly, and Leo Weiner. Here he developed his fidelity to the tempo, rhythm and dynamic of the written text, using these as the starting points of interpretation all his life. Secondly, having decided at an early age to be a conductor, Solti became a repetiteur at the Budapest Opera House where he worked in this position from 1931 to 1939. This apprenticeship is the traditional route to a conducting appointment in opera.

However during this period certain unusual, and highly formative, events took place. The first of these involved playing for the rehearsals of ‘The Magic Flute’ conducted by Toscanini at the Salzburg Festival of 1937. At this time Toscanini was one of the most renowned figures in the musical world, and his impact upon Solti was great, reinforcing his highly positive attitude to the written text, as well as to the ethic of continuous work and study.

The second event to have a direct impact upon Solti’s career was the spread of National Socialism across Europe. Having made his operatic debut as a conductor on March 11th 1938 at the Budapest Opera House leading ‘The Marriage of Figaro’, under normal circumstances Solti might have reasonably expected to see his conducting career develop. However this was not to be for sometime: March 11th 1938 was also the date of the anenschluss whereby Germany invaded Austria. Soon a
fascist regime was in place in Hungary and Solti was sacked by the Opera in Budapest.

In order to seek a recommendation to work in America Solti travelled to Switzerland in 1939 to visit Toscanini. The attempt to reach America came to nothing, and so in conducting terms, Solti’s career was stalled for six years while he stayed in Switzerland. Here, unable to conduct but wishing to do so, he developed great prowess as a pianist, winning the first prize in the piano section of the Swiss Music Competition in 1942.

As a result of this enforced delay to the continuation of his conducting career, Solti by the end of the war was desperate to conduct, and so was prepared to travel to Munich on the off-chance that a fellow ex-pupil from the Franz Liszt Academy, now a major in the American army, might be able to find him a conducting position. Because of the de-nazification procedures, there were no conductors of note able to work in this part of Germany, so Solti, following a successful debut in Stuttgart, was immediately offered the job of Music Director of the Bavarian State Opera. Thus in one bound, Solti found himself in a position which normally would be awarded only to a conductor with an extensive pedigree.

At this time Solti also made a key contact, through the Swiss tenor Max Lichtegg, with Maurice Rosengarten - responsible for classical music at Decca Records. By convincing Rosengarten that he was a conductor to watch - and aided by the Munich appointment - Solti commenced a relationship with Decca in 1947 which continued virtually without interruption for fifty years.

The essence of Solti’s career is ‘relationships’. A further unusual characteristic is his longevity in formal ‘command’ positions. Between 1946 and 1991, when he ended his tenure as Music Director of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Solti held only four appointments. These were:

- Music Director Bavarian State Opera Munich 1946-52
- Music Director Frankfurt Opera 1952-61
- Music Director Covent Garden (later Royal) Opera London 1961-71
These posts covered a period of forty-five years. They formed the bedrock against which a highly active programme of international guest engagements and recordings were built. Solti rose to a significant ‘command’ position after a delayed start, and remained in such positions for the rest of his career.

Solti’s second major set of unusual circumstances centred upon his relationship with John Culshaw. Culshaw first heard Solti conduct in 1949: a performance of ‘Der Rosenkavalier’ in Munich, and in that autumn Culshaw produced Solti’s first record with the London Philharmonic Orchestra, of Haydn’s Symphony No.103. The following year Culshaw heard Solti again in Munich, this time conducting ‘Die Walkure’, the second opera in ‘The Ring’ cycle. He was highly impressed, and Solti became the first choice of Culshaw after Knappertsbusch to conduct ‘The Ring’ on record.

The Decca connection enabled Solti and Culshaw to keep their relationship in play, and the 1957 recordings of ‘Arabella’ (with Solti substituting for Bohm) and of Act III of ‘Die Walkure’, made in the same year as Knappertsbusch’s recording of Act I of ‘Die Walkure’ (both with Kirsten Flagstad - the ‘star’ driving both recordings) demonstrated Solti to be both a Strauss and Wagner conductor of consequence, and a better conductor in the studio than Knappertsbusch. Thus the 1958 decision to record ‘Das Rheingold’ gave Solti the platform to leap into the international musical world, which the success of these recordings certainly achieved.

By 1959, the year of his Covent Garden debut and of the offer of the Music Directorship there, Solti had become established as a recording and opera conductor of the first rank. Throughout the 1960s Decca sustained and developed this reputation by recording Solti in three key repertoire strands - Wagner, Richard Strauss and Mahler. By the time he came to take over the Music Directorship of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra in 1969 he was firmly established, and by bringing together Decca and this orchestra he created a further relationship which ensured a
stream of mutually reinforcing recordings right up to and beyond his resignation of this Music Directorship in 1991.

From 1991 to his death in 1997, Sir Georg maintained a programme of guest conducting engagements throughout the world in both the opera house and the concert hall. His last public appearance was conducting at the Gala performance that marked the closure of the Royal Opera House, Covent Garden, in the summer of 1997, prior to its closure for renovation.

2. Recordings: performance, interpretation and relationship with orchestras

2.1. The earliest recordings

Apart from his earliest recordings for Decca, there exist three recordings not made for Decca which provide a good illustration Solti’s style as a conductor during the earliest years of his career within the German opera house system. The most significant of these is a complete recording of Act I of Wagner’s ‘Die Walkure’, taken from a live performance given at the Prinzregenten Theatre, Munich, during 1947, in the earliest phase of Solti’s period as the General Music Director of the Bavarian State Opera.

Gordon Parry* created a linkage between Solti and the pre-war Munich and Bayreuth tradition of performing Wagner when he commented that ‘of course George learned, or heard, his Wagner from Kna [Knappertsbusch]. And Kna treated him like a son…George said that Kna was ‘like a father to me.’ Given such a strong mentor, it is an indication of Solti’s own strength of musical character that it should be so different from that of Knappertsbusch. This was explained by Haas*: ‘The reason why the music sounds so hammered and so driven is because he was always in rebellion against the trend of sloppy romantic slush[y] music-making that was dominant at [the] time of his coming of age…He was always a representative of Toscanini’s strict discipline.’
Certainly in the 1947 excerpt from ‘Die Walkure’ there is a clarity and precision of rhythm and execution that was to be individual to Solti throughout his life, and is quite distinct from Knappertsbusch’s own performances, even if at this time some of Solti's tempi are slightly less swift than they were later to become, and his dynamism less pronounced. The difference between the Solti and the Knappertsbusch styles were clearly what attracted Culshaw. This recording therefore indicates the early formation and consolidation of ‘the Solti style’.

The other two early recordings were made in the studio. The first of these was of the ‘Hary Janos’ Suite by Kodaly, with Solti conducting the Bavarian State Opera Orchestra. It was recorded during 1948, and released in Germany on 78rpm records and subsequently in the USA on LP. The second studio recording, again with forces from the Bavarian State Opera, was recorded during 1949, and consisted of sizeable extracts from Richard Strauss’s opera ‘Elektra’. As before a part of this recording was released in Germany on a 78rpm disc. The full recording was subsequently released in both the USA and Europe on LP. Both these latter recordings were made for Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft, whose 78 label was Polydor.

The reason for highlighting the existence of these recordings is that, at a time when Decca was restricting Solti to operatic overtures, and to Haydn and early Beethoven symphonies, he was actually recording elements of the core repertoire with which he was to be closely associated throughout his life: the music of Hungary and Richard Strauss. These recordings therefore allow the listener to assess Solti’s conducting style early on in his career, and can be set aside his early Decca studio recordings for comparison. In the excerpts form ‘Elektra’ Solti directs very cleanly realised performances: the orchestral playing is precise, detailed and very clearly balance. The climax to the Elektra-Clytemnestra scene is powerfully constructed and when it breaks, Solti is not afraid to portray to full effect the psychological fury described in Strauss’s music. When these performances were eventually released in the United Kingdom, the critic in the EMG Monthly Newsletter wrote: ‘The orchestral playing is well disciplined and Solti has a firm grasp of the score – his reading only lacks a little breadth and expansiveness.’ (EMG Monthly Newsletter, 27, 2, February 1957, p.13).
2.2. The early recordings for Decca

An analysis of the critical reception of Solti’s recording for Decca up to ‘Das Rheingold’, undertaken as part of this research and using reviews published in ‘Gramophone’ and the EMG Monthly Newsletter, has shown that the essential characteristics of ‘the Solti style’ were present in his earliest recordings for Decca, as well as in those made for Deutsche Grammophon, and in his early live performances, such as the Munich Act I of ‘Die Walkure’.

Reviewing Solti’s Decca recording of Haydn’s Symphony No. 103, Ralph Hill in ‘Gramophone’ commented that the performance was ‘remarkable for rhythmic playing, richness of tone, and clarity of execution.’ (The Gramophone, XXVIII, 326, July 1950, p.26). Lionel Salter in considering the LP reissue of the same performance commented on the excellent shaping and brisk tempi, as well as the vital playing obtained for the London Philharmonic Orchestra (The Gramophone, XXVIII, 331, December 1950, p.141). Thus right at the start of his recording career, English critics were isolating some of Solti’s key characteristics as a musician: fast tempi, rhythmic exactness, precise articulation, rich orchestral tone, and clear musical and architectural shaping.

These characteristics were to reappear consistently in the reviews of subsequent recordings, with critics generally determining their appropriateness or otherwise to their own conceptions of the works being reviewed. Thus in terms of positive reception, Hubert Foss in ‘Gramophone’ described Solti’s 1951 recording of Suppe Overtures as ‘musical, intelligent and interested’ (The Gramophone, XXIX, 342, November 1951, p.131), and EMG commented that they ‘were played with great conviction and brilliance.’ (EMG Monthly Newsletter, 21, 10, October 1951, p.4). EMG noted in the 1952 recordings of Bartok’s ‘Dance Suite’ and Kodaly’s ‘Dances of Galanta’ the ‘both works are beautifully played with firm rhythmic attack.’ (EMG Monthly Newsletter, 23, 3, March 1953, p.2).

The 1954 recording of Mozart’s ‘Little’ G minor and ‘Prague’ Symphonies represented Solti at his best. Lionel Salter in ‘Gramophone’ preferred these
recordings to those by Beecham, Gui and Ansermet, commenting that ‘Solti, besides drawing out his phrases in fine lines, is dynamic without over-spicing the music, and has a fine rhythmic impulse. The gradations of tone are beautifully controlled.’ (*The Gramophone*, **XXXII**, 378, November 1954, p.248). Two Rossini opera overtures, to ‘The Barber of Seville’ and ‘The Italian Girl in Algiers’ both recorded in 1955 were similarly well received in ‘Gramophone. The critic Trevor Harvey wrote: ‘First rate, both of them, with every player on his toes…and the result is both charm and virtuosity.’ (*The Gramophone*, **XXXIII**, 392, December 1955, p.265).

1954 was also the year of Solti’s debut at the Salzburg Festival, conducting Mozart’s ‘The Magic Flute’, and a 1955 Hessian radio recording of him conducting the same work (Melodram–44) probably reflects accurately the style of the Salzburg performances.

To set against these favourable reviews, there were other recordings which fared less well and received mixed reviews. Hubert Foss felt the 1950 recording of Beethoven’s Fourth Symphony to be predictable, ‘a good average performance’ (*The Gramophone*, **XXVIII**, 336, May 1951, p.271), while for ‘The Record Guide’s 1952 supplement the performance was ‘in good straight forward style and for the most part finely executed.’ (Sackville-West, E. & Shawe-Taylor, D.,1952, p.40). Andrew Porter wrote that the 1952 recording of Mendelssohn’s Third Symphony, the ‘Scottish’, was ‘an acceptable, if not very distinguished performance.’ (*The Gramophone*, **XXX**, 358, March 1953, p.252). EMG found the December 1954 release of two Haydn Symphonies (No. 102 recorded in 1951 and No. 100 recorded in 1954) to be ‘not as sensitive as the music deserves…Solti’s tempi are on the quick side.’ (*EMG Monthly Newsletter*, **24**, 12, December 1954, p.3). Worse was to come in Roger Fiske’s review of Solti’s accompaniment to Mischa Elman’s interpretation of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto: ‘The orchestral playing is often inexpressive and the strict tempi the conductor adopts do not always coincide with the somewhat wayward rhythm of the soloist. Several better recordings are obtainable.’ (*The Gramophone*, **XXXIII**, 391, November 1955, p. 217).
Solti’s performance style was thus both consistent and apparent from his earliest recordings. In addition to the key characteristic of swift tempi, rhythmic precision, lush tone and careful orchestral balance, critics noted a tendency to rush and an inflexibility, both of which at times were felt to be inappropriate. Solti was most successful in performing Hungarian music of the twentieth century, and operatic music of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, extending to Richard Strauss. Beethoven and early romantic symphonies were less successful. With the major ‘proviso’ that Solti’s symphonic repertoire during the latter part of his career extended to include all the great late-romantic composers, his recordings up to ‘Das Rheingold’ act as a reasonable predictor of success both in the present and the future.

2.3. Relationship with orchestras

Solti’s style of performances was sited by Mallinson* as one of the major reasons for his success with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra: ‘His personality and his style of music making and that orchestra were perfectly matched.’ Like Solti the members of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra were highly professional and took pride in their work with Solti. Lady Solti* noted how ‘in Chicago they [the orchestral musicians] would all crowd into the recording room to hear what they had done…They were very virtuoso.’ The quest for accuracy which Solti shared with his musicians reached at times extreme levels. At one point a mistake was thought to have been detected in the percussion part in Bartok’s ‘Concerto for Orchestra’. As Lady Solti* recounted, a member of the Orchestra was despatched to ‘the Library of Congress and looked at the original.’ Thus the character of Solti, in terms of preparedness and dedication, ideally suited Chicago and its pride in its virtuoso professionalism. To quote Lady Solti*: ‘…you have got to have an ensemble who cares and has the time and wants to be thought of as a team.’

A not dissimilar point of view was expressed by a member of another orchestra, Harold Nash, who for many years was the principal trombonist of the Orchestra of the Royal Opera House. In an interview with Jon Tolansky, Nash recalled that ‘We had to work hard because the orchestra became a star with him [Solti]. Whatever was
going on, on stage, seemed to come second – the star was down there on the rostrum, and we were with him.’ (Tolansky, 1996, p. 48-49).

In addition to the essential characteristics already noted earlier, Michael Haas* strongly emphasised Solti’s ability to balance very effectively. He pointed out that in general disruption to orchestral balance was caused by a member of the orchestra playing too loudly, and therefore the need, in terms of balance, was to get them to play more softly: ‘…the trick was to find what was playing too loud and find a way to reduce it without loosing it, to a point where the other thing could play up to come through…He always asked for people to play down.’

Another example of Solti’s mastery of balance was given by Haas* in the way that Solti, in the performance of the Bruckner Symphonies would achieve a sense of pulse by getting the brass to play moving passages sforzando and diminuendo so quickly that ‘even though you could not hear the notes, the pitches…you could hear the images…the movement of the woodwind.’ Solti’s ability to balance to a fine degree was similar to that of Beecham. Haas* commented that ‘Solti and the word soft don’t often go hand in hand. But that is the way Solti was.’

Unlike Sir Thomas Beecham, for whom every day was different, and for whom musical performance was in a constant state of becoming, Solti had a very clear and fixed vision of the performance sought of the works which he conducted. His recordings generally captured both this vision and his style of achieving it. Furthermore, as the early live and studio recordings indicate, his style of conducting and interpretations changed little as his career progressed. In addition Solti’s studio recordings do not differ markedly from his live performances. In general they form a more fully achieved musical vision.

Thus Solti’s recordings are a reasonable reflection of his ideas and are in a way different therefore from either those of Beecham, who took greater care and less risks in his recordings than in his live performances, or of Furtwangler, whose studio recordings do not possess the incandescent sense of improvisation that he often brought to his concert performances. In terms of performance and interpretation,
Solti’s recordings are much more consistent, and a good indication of himself as a conductor in both the opera house and the concert hall. It may be pertinent to point out the observation already quoted from Lady Solti*, that Solti would often use the opportunity to perform a work in concert or in the broadcasting studio as preparation for a recording.

Solti’s consistency made him an ideal collaborator with a producer such as Culshaw. When working together Culshaw could anticipate with a reasonable sense of certitude how Solti would conduct the music to be recorded. At the same time, as the video ‘The Golden Ring’ shows, Solti was also open to suggestions for detailed changes of emphasis made by Culshaw (BBC TV, 1964).

It would be hard to suggest that with Solti’s performances and recordings one was likely to encounter the ‘rediscovery’ of a work. What one could be sure of getting was a well-studied and extremely well prepared and executed performance. Recording did not change his approach to performance in the studio as it did with Furtwangler and Beecham. At the same time this style was well suited to the mechanics and production of recording, being both predictable and predicated upon the consistent achievement of high standards. In this instance, recordings reflected reality, if in a more highly polished way, and so helped to build international awareness of Solti as a conductor, rather than exerted any palpable musical influence.
1. The orchestral career

Simon Rattle was born in 1955 in Liverpool, the second child of a highly musical couple. His father was a practising, but not professional, musician, and his mother ran a music shop, that sold gramophone records. An elder sister became a music librarian and soon introduced him to music scores, which he read ‘as other children read comics’ (Mills and Beadle, 1993, p.19). At first interested predominantly in playing percussion instruments, his ambition to conduct was triggered by hearing a performance of Mahler's Second Symphony when aged 11. Already organising amateur performances on Merseyside, which he conducted, he was accepted by the Royal Academy of Music in 1971 aged 16. In his penultimate year there, 1974, he won the John Player Conducting Competition, the prize of which was a two-year contract as assistant conductor to the Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra.

Rattle worked at Bournemouth for two seasons and then accepted another permanent conducting post, again for two years, with the BBC Scottish Symphony Orchestra. The contrast between these two posts was instructive: at Bournemouth he was constrained by the commercial requirements of a provincial orchestra to programme popular works almost exclusively. In Scotland by contrast, given the BBC's Reithian mission 'to educate and inform', he was able to programme a much wider range of music, normally beyond the reach of a non-broadcasting symphony orchestra.

During this period he also worked with three opera companies: the English Music Theatre in 1976, Glyndebourne Touring Opera in 1975 and the parent company Glyndebourne Festival Opera in 1977. In 1980 he was appointed Chief Conductor of
the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra: a key appointment which Rattle held for eighteen years until relinquishing it in the summer of 1998.

Throughout his period in Birmingham he accepted engagements abroad, for instance with the Rotterdam Philharmonic, and Los Angeles Philharmonic, with both of which he had permanent guest appointments, and purely guest engagements with other American orchestras such as the Cleveland and Boston Orchestras. From 1980 to 1985 he had a contract with the Philharmonia Orchestra to conduct them exclusively in London. In Europe his most significant debuts took place with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra in 1987 and the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra during the Orchestra’s 1993/94 season. His opera conducting continued at Glyndebourne, Covent Garden for one production in 1992, and abroad in Amsterdam and Paris at the Theatre Chatelet.

Rattle's career to date has been unusual in that he has maintained the directorship of a symphony orchestra for eighteen years, resisting offers to work permanently elsewhere. As he himself said in a TV documentary, by 1998 he was the longest serving Music Director of any orchestra in Europe (BBC TV, 1998). One of Rattle's over-riding priorities has been growth and change, and by staying put in Birmingham he has been able to use the leverage of his growing international fame to good effect. In 1986 the CBSO launched a development plan which increased its grants from the Arts Council and Birmingham City Council. This increase in the orchestra's income enabled it to pay its players more money and to increase their numbers: both factors in improving performance by attracting better players and by enlarging the orchestra's potential repertoire through increased size. And in 1991 Rattle and his orchestra opened a new concert hall in Birmingham, Symphony Hall, which was especially built for them and which is arguably the best building of its kind in the United Kingdom.

In June 1999, Rattle was appointed Chief Conductor and Artistic Director of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, the most important post in the field of orchestral music in Europe. His predecessors in this post have been: Artur Nikisch, Wilhelm Furtwangler, Sergiu Celibidache, Herbert von Karajan and Claudio Abbado.
2. The recording career

Rattle's recording career has run in parallel to his orchestral career. He made his first record aged 20 in 1975, for the Argo record company. Further recordings for Argo and Decca appeared in the next seven years, including his first disc for EMI, accompanying two piano concertos, in 1978. His 'breakthrough' recording appeared in December 1980, shortly after he had taken up his Birmingham appointment. This was a recording of Mahler's Tenth Symphony with the Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra. The combination of good reviews and good sales of this disc, and the position of conductor with the CBSO, with which EMI already had a long-standing relationship, resulted in a steady stream of recordings featuring the CBSO and Rattle appearing from 1982 onwards.

In 1983 a contract with EMI came into force to record exclusively with them, and he is now one of EMI's principal conductors. Between 1976 (the year of release of his first recording) and the beginning of 1999 eighty one recordings conducted by Rattle have been published, and a total of one hundred and six releases, including re-issues and compilations, have appeared. This represents an average of four and a half discs appearing each year. By any standards he is now a significant recording artist, particularly for a conductor aged only 45 (in 2001). Beecham's recording career did not effectively begin until he started to make electrical recordings in 1926 he was 47. Solti's first recording as a conductor was made in 1947, when he was aged 35.

3. Conducting style

In achieving performance Rattle’s conducting style has certain characteristics that are constant. His priorities have been described by Jeremy Beadle as clarity and precision (Mills and Beadle, 1993, p.22). The two in effect go hand in hand. The precision of Rattle’s conducting of Ravel gives it a clarity of texture that enhances the music.

At the same time Rattle does not eschew, as does another conductor noted for clarity and precision, Pierre Boulez, the lush orchestral textures which contemporary
orchestras can produce. His readings of the Second Viennese School combine clarity with orchestral richness. This combination relates the music to its major antecedent, the compositions of Gustav Mahler.

Beadle suggested that the quest for 'clarity of tone, texture and structure mean that he doesn’t quite let rip.' (Mills and Beadle, 1993, p.22). He cited the finale of Sibelius’s Second Symphony in the recording conducted by Rattle as an example of this. However he went on to stress the appropriateness of clarity to the performance of Janacek, and noted Rattle’s success in performing the music of this composer. In addition Beadle noted how the adoption of period performance practice had energised Rattle’s readings of Haydn and highlighted ‘the way in which brass and timpani become driving forces in the music’s forward movement.’ (Mills and Beadle, 1993, p.22).

Rattle’s quest for clarity and precision has led him to develop a concentration on detail. Seckerson described this as ‘God is in the detail. And it’s not just the notes, he’ll tell you, but the reasons for them – that’s where music-making really begins.’ (Seckerson, 1996).

Maintaining an attention to detail also requires the ability to communicate and Rattle achieves this with musicians extremely well. The ability to communicate clearly and directly was noted by one of his earliest teachers, John Streets, when Rattle was at the Royal Academy of Music: ‘…what he also had besides the technique was this marvellous thing of communication right to the back desk of the second fiddles. They always looked at him.’ (Kenyon, 1987, p.38). This high level of communication carries over into the concert, as two critics, Seckerson and the Dutch writer, Peter van der Lint, have each recognised. The former wrote ‘His gestures lead the ear as well as the eye’ (Seckerson, 1996), and the latter noted that ‘no conductor knows, conducting by heart, how to inspire his musicians during the concert as Rattle does.’ (Van der Lint, 2000).

Kenyon in an interview for the New York Times commented that, alongside his search for all the characteristics in performance already identified, Rattle also took
risks, and that these were not always successful – ‘the performances either work or they don’t. Some of them are incredibly exciting, but there isn’t a comfortable level of reliability’ (Oestreich, 2000).

At times players may disagree with Rattle’s interpretations, as is the case with all conductors. For instance, the leader of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, Reiner Kuchl, has mentioned occasions when he thought Rattle was not following the musical text with sufficient fidelity: ‘…we had long discussions over the Seventh [Symphony of Mahler]. Several of the tempos seemed excessive to us [the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra] and too many indications in the score were overlooked.’ (Chadwick, 1997, p.1326).

These comments reflect the element of risk which Rattle brings to his performances, which has been noted earlier.

4. Performance and interpretation

4.1. Preamble

Rattle’s philosophy is relativist: he recognises that each age creates and recreates music in its own eyes and through its concepts of tradition. The diversity of view that this philosophy throws up is relished by him. It contrasts strongly with the standardisation of interpretation that often flows from recordings and the critical apparatus associated with them.

Rattle’s preoccupation in performance is to achieve the appropriate style or ‘pronunciation’ of the period from which the music being performed is drawn. He recognises that these attempts will involve risk and that not all performances will be successful.

The key elements of his musical style have been defined as ‘clarity and precision’ (Mills and Beadle, 1993, p.22). He pays great attention to detail. He achieves high
levels of communication with fellow performers, and has the ability to inspire musicians to play at the peak of, and sometimes beyond, their normal level of capability.

The practical application of this philosophy is the pursuit of variety, which works strongly against the homogeneity of performance and interpretation which recording may encourage,

4.2. Rattle’s philosophy of performance

Rattle’s philosophy of performance and its relativist standpoint have been clearly laid out in several interviews. In 1996, in conversation with Joanna Pitman he said: ‘Every age recreates its great masterpieces in a different image…at the end of it all, one is performing for the 1990s. What I hate is the thought: ‘Oh, at last we’re getting it right. No one else ever gets it right.’’ No. That’s sales bullshit. That’s egos out of control.’ (Pitman, 1996, p.10). A year earlier in another interview, with Edward Seckerson, he located performance again very clearly in the context of the epoch in which it was actually taking place: ‘…it’s inevitable that we are still looking for things that confirm the way we feel at the end of the twentieth century. So we will tend to see more darkness than even Beethoven will have seen. Where people of his time will have heard only affirmation, we might now hear fragmentation and doubt.’ (Seckerson, 1995).

A corollary of each age interpreting music within the context of its own pre-occupations is the growth of a diversity of tradition. Since the end of the nineteenth century this diversity has increasingly been captured and retained for posterity, if it chooses to listen, by sound recording. Kenyon* pointed out in interview that ‘what a person like Simon goes for today is the maximum diversity of tradition.’ This conscious searching after the appropriate style sets him apart from his predecessors, and is different ‘from what a Furtwangler would have done, which is to have the style and tradition which formed everything he did…he did conduct Handel concertos…but when you listen to them, they sound like everything else he conducted.’ (Kenyon*). Conductors such as Furtwangler were essentially working
within the boundaries of a single musical style, and the same may be said of his successor at the Berlin Philharmonic orchestra, Herbert von Karajan.

Recording, through the expansion of repertoire that it has driven as part of its need for continuous renewal to maintain commercial vitality, has forced the boundaries of repertoire to expand. At the same time by extending the number of performances, especially of the same strands of repertoire, it has worked towards standardisation. Performers have either sought to emulate what they have heard before, often through recordings, or do not have the striving for original utterance. This is the province of relatively few musicians. Jolly* highlighted how this situation comes about: ‘they [musicians] say ‘well, you know my record company asked me to…I know that I’m only just going to be one of fifty recordings, but at this moment I feel that I have something to say.’” They all hedge their bets by sort of saying ‘I would not presume’…”

Rattle does not follow this stereotypical behaviour, and in fact consciously fights against it. In 1980 he told Andrew Keener: ‘Sometimes. I think, the greatest disservice the gramophone has done us is to provide performances that are almost indistinguishable. This excitement about finding different sides to a piece is, I’m sure, what interpretation used to be all about.’ (Keener, 1980). Different styles of performance form part of this process of continual discovery.

4.3. ‘Pronunciation’ and period performance

At the time Rattle was launching into his first complete cycle of the Beethoven Symphonies, he discussed in interview the importance of developing a detailed grammar of performance, appropriate to specific composers and styles. He defined this as ‘the idea of ‘pronouncing’’. An extract from the interview with Seckerson indicates the level of detail at which he was working: ‘Phrases must begin. It’s like words: you never say Beethoven – it’s ungrammatical. So that’s fundamental. Then there’s vibrato: I say, think of it as an effect, an adornment, not the norm; think of sforzandos as expressive and fortepianos as really sudden, and staccatos as not necessarily short.’ (Seckerson, 1995). Rattle suggested that this understanding should
be treated as the pronunciation of a vocabulary which in turn should ‘be taken and fashioned into sentences, paragraphs, chapters.’ (Seckerson, 1995).

As part of this process Rattle rejects the common argument of previous generations, and one put forward by Solti, that if Bach had for instance heard the contemporary orchestra, he would have approved of it (Anonymous, 1991). ‘The fact that Beethoven wanted something more than the instruments will do naturally does not necessarily stretch all the way to saying that he wanted what a symphony orchestra in the 1960s would have played.’ (Seckerson, 1995). The argument in favour of continuing to perform different repertoires in the current style reoccurs with surprising regularity during the first three quarters of the twentieth century.

A consequence of Rattle’s openness to different interpretive options has been his highly developed awareness of period performance practice. In addition to conducting orchestras such as the Orchestra of the Age of Enlightenment, he has actively approached experts in different styles of period performance, from whom he has sought to learn the appropriate methods of performance. Thus he has studied with William Christie in preparing to perform Rameau, in the same way that he sought instruction from conductors such as Berthold Goldschmidt and Rudolf Schwarz for performing Mahler.

At the time of Rattle’s debut with the Orchestra of the Age of Enlightenment, during the summer of 1987 for a concert performance of Mozart’s opera ‘Idomeneo’ Nicholas Kenyon commented: ‘In rehearsal far from being uncertain about the potential of the period instruments, Rattle displayed a detailed knowledge of their possibilities and invigorated the players with his quest for higher and higher standards.’ (Kenyon, 1987, p.161).

4.4. The application of period styles to the contemporary orchestra

Rather than bend Beethoven to the playing style of the contemporary symphony orchestra, as many predecessors have done, Rattle, along with other conductors such as Sir Roger Norrington, has sought to import the ‘pronunciation’ of period
performances into the playing of those symphony orchestras which he conducts. In this he has been successful. To quote Murray*: ‘Rattle is one of the few people who can make a modern symphony orchestra sound like a period instrument orchestra.’

Murray also pointed out that this approach has invigorated the use of contemporary instruments for period performance, such as the playing of Bach on the grand piano. In essence what has occurred here is a process of hybrid development. Contemporary instruments are used to perform music with a developed awareness of the appropriate performance styles.

This may not seem on consideration as bizarre as it might do at first sight. Given the impossibility of knowing without sound recording what a performance would have actually sounded like in, for instance, Beethoven’s day, and knowing, from recordings, how swiftly performance styles mutate, both performances on period and on modern instruments can only be approximations of the vaguest kind to the original performance. What Rattle is seeking is to get the varying grammar of performance known, accepted and understood in the appropriate repertoire.

A consequence of this has been in turn a considerable re-energisation of the symphony orchestra itself. Whereas at one point with the rise of period performance groups orchestras started to abandon the late classical repertoire of Haydn and Mozart, this has now been retrieved by orchestras, but in a way that is found to be critically acceptable. This is through the adoption of period performance styles.

Rattle is eloquent about the urgent need to develop orchestras: ‘We have to find a way to make sure that the best people play in orchestras, and that we keep them interested. ‘Carthorse’ is an anagram for ‘Orchestra’ and we can’t be that. We must offer a variegated life. An orchestra is no longer simply an institution that gives concerts, it’s many things: it’s a resource…The musician these days has to know a great deal more. That’s one of the reasons I’ve spent time studying the baroque with William Christie. Everybody is going to have to know the whole repertoire. We can’t be training our musicians narrowly any more.’ (Kimberley, 1999).
Rattle’s philosophy of extending the boundaries of repertoire through relishing diversity, has therefore significant, and beneficial, consequences for the modern symphony orchestra. By making it equally adept at performing the music of the late eighteenth century as that of the late twentieth century, he is encouraging it to extend its capability and also to change its shape in order to do this. The result is a more flexible and more skilled body better able to claim its place within contemporary music making. The ability to perform in a wider range of styles than was common in the past flows over into recorded repertoire and performance, as well as being influenced by these latter factors.

5. Conclusion

Rattle confronts and defies the homogeneity of performance that has partially been an influence of recording. He relishes diversity, acknowledging different repertoires, the more general knowledge of which has been a consequence, and therefore a further, different, influence, of recording. In addition he actively seeks to perform new and old repertoires with as much stylistic knowledge as possible, and uses both contemporary and period instruments groups to do this. Recording is again an influence in assisting awareness of different performance styles.

He is open to risk and in performance pushes the boundaries of possibilities, but does so using a musical and conducting style founded upon detail not generalisation. His powers as a communicator are considerable.

In this instance recording has been an influence in terms of assisting with the expansion of knowledge and indicating how boundaries might be extended, both in terms of repertoire and of performance style. The absorption and practical application of such influence has assisted the growth of the symphony orchestra as an institution.
Appendix I

Volumes of recording and theoretical estimates of earnings

1. Introduction

It has been suggested that one area of interest common to all three case study subjects is the volume of recording activity undertaken by each, expressed in terms of time spent in the studio and of the number of recordings so produced, and the projection of the personal earnings obtained from the sales of these recordings. This appendix therefore seeks to estimate this information from a theoretical perspective.

The general methodology used has been the creation of an appraisal of the time spent by each case study subject recording and of the number of discs published as a result. This information has been derived from the various discographies published in relation to each case study subject’s output as a recording artist. Where multiple disc issues are concerned, such as complete opera recordings, the full number of discs issued within each set has been included within the projection. From this information a very approximate estimate of income has been generated using a simple formula. This information is presented in tabular form for each of the case study subjects at the end of each section, and a commentary in each case is given below.

2. Sir Thomas Beecham: methodological issues

In the case of Sir Thomas Beecham, it is possible to project income with a modicum of accuracy for the period up until 1940, by computing the income per session with an assessment of the rate paid per session, which in some cases is known. It is less easy to reach an earnings figure for recordings made from 1944 onwards, when Beecham’s fees ceased to be a flat payment for each session and were calculated as a
royalty on the price of discs sold. From 1944 Beecham’s fees, from all the record companies to whom he was contracted, were paid at a rate of 5% of the current retail list price. Thus from 1944 onwards recording session data merely indicates the volume and extent of activity. Personal income can only be calculated from a detailed knowledge of the sales achieved annually by the recordings currently available to the public. This information is not made generally available to the public by Beecham’s record companies, nor by Decca in the case of Solti, nor EMI in the case of Rattle.

The issue of earnings is further complicated in the era of the long playing record (LP), when recordings by Beecham were issued internationally and were progressively repackaged with different combinations of works already issued, and at different price points. Furthermore, with the advent of budget labels from the late nineteen fifties onwards, a lower percentage point royalty was generally negotiated with artists.

Thus from 1944 onwards it is not possible without access to detailed international sales and production data to build up a comprehensive picture of personal income from the sale of recordings. To arrive at a starting point therefore, and to provide a comparison across the three case studies, income to Beecham has been projected on the basis of an initial sale of 2000 units, a figure generally used by EMI as the ‘break-even’ point for classical music recordings. This figure is applied to the first United Kingdom release for each of Beecham’s recordings, information which has been derived from Gray (1979).

Secondly, as with the calculation of income from pre-Second World War 78rpm recordings, no adjustments for changes in the value of currency have been made for the period from 1952 to 1959, when Beecham ceased to record. The royalty payable has been calculated on an average retail price of £2, which was the predominant figure charged for top-price recordings throughout the nineteen fifties. Actual earnings would increase from this figure as sales built up over time and as a result of international sales following upon the initial release of the individual recordings in the United Kingdom.
As far as time spent in the studio is concerned, this has been derived from the dates of recording given in Gray (1979). As this information does not distinguish between one, two or three sessions worked per day, the time spent recording has been estimated in days, not sessions. This again provides a common basis for comparison with the other case study subjects, where similar information is available for days worked, but not the detailed subdivision of days into sessions.

Table I.1. thus provides estimates of the number of days worked in the studio, an estimate of the number of recordings published as a result, and an estimate of income based on the rates at which payment was made to Beecham for his services. As is also the case with the corresponding tables for Solti and Rattle, these figures need to be treated with the greatest caution.

3. Beecham: commentary

Table I.1 (located at the end of this section) indicates that Beecham’s recording activity increased as technology advanced. In the era of acoustic recording, which did not favour orchestral performance, Beecham made only 14 single sided and 18 double sided records. He worked in the studio for only 18 days, spread over a period of 15 years. The figures for records issued do not take into account the considerable number of recordings which were rejected.

Following the introduction of electrical recording Beecham became considerably more active. For Columbia, prior to its merger with The Gramophone Company, he made 68 double sided records over 45 sessions between March 1926 and April 1932. Following the establishment of the London Philharmonic Orchestra and the negotiation of a contract for it to record for EMI, Beecham’s activity increased even more. Between 1932 and the end of 1939 161 discs were released as a result of 114 days in the studio. A further 22 discs were rapidly produced between December 1939 and April 1940 out of 11 days’ work for which Beecham probably took no fee, as the LPO veered towards bankruptcy and war created great economic uncertainty. For these recordings a low ‘all inclusive’ fee of £40 per recording session was negotiated with EMI.
The post-war period witnessed an even higher rate of productivity. Between 1944 and 1951, and immediately prior to the general adoption of the long playing record by EMI, approximately 225 78rpm discs were produced from 199 days in the studio, excluding recordings made in the USA. Arguably Beecham topped even this level of productivity following the introduction of the LP, producing 121 LPs (each equivalent to at least 4 78rpm discs), made up in many instances of numerous shorter pieces, and produced through approximately 274 days in the studio.

These figures therefore indicate firstly that recording constituted a significant and increasing part of Beecham’s musical activity, in terms of the days worked in the studio, estimated at approximately 667 days over his career as a whole. This level of activity resulted in a large number of recordings, which continue to grow as they are repackaged and reissued in different programmes and in different territories.

Secondly it is clear, even from the crude projections created, that the income to Beecham from recording was considerable. The estimated figure of £24,000 in royalties on initial release volumes for the period 1952 to 1959 indicates clearly that recording income, especially when calculated as a percentage of the retail price, rather than as a flat session fee, as was the case before the Second World War, could provide a handsome new source of income for the performing musician.

Beecham’s individual concert fee during this decade may be estimated to be in the region of approximately £200 per concert. Thus the average annual income over the period in question was £3000, equivalent to the fees for 15 concerts (to take a very rough average). As will be seen later, the relationship between recording fees and concert fees was to change significantly towards the end of the century, with concert fees increasing considerably, driven possibly by the greater availability of public subsidy, thus diminishing the relative value of income from recordings.

Finally, these detailed figures also add further weight to the suggestion that Beecham was obliged to switch record companies in 1949 (from RCA Victor and EMI to Columbia, USA) and in 1955 (from Columbia USA back to EMI) because neither company could sustain in commercial terms the high volume of recordings that
Beecham wished to continue to produce in order to provide an income stream for the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra. It was important to him to work with the company that could offer a large number of sessions on an on-going basis to the Orchestra both with himself conducting and with other conductors. This the EMI contract, effective from the end of 1955 provided: it allowed annually for 50 sessions for the Orchestra and Beecham and a further 25 for the Orchestra alone.

Thus, even given the approximation and crudity of these statistics, their relative volumes illustrate powerfully the degree to which recording became a significant activity in terms of time, publication and income within Beecham’s overall musical career.
Table Appendix I.1: Sir Thomas Beecham: summary of days spent recording, discs published, fees earned, with comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date / Period</th>
<th>Number of days recording</th>
<th>Number of discs issued</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/32 – 12/37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>105 D/S</td>
<td>?£60 p.s.</td>
<td>EMI contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/38 – 12/39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56 D/S</td>
<td>£100 p.s.</td>
<td>Known fee increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/39 – 4/40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22 D/S</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Outbreak of war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/42 – 6/42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 D/S 78</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>In USA with Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/44 – 10/49</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>192 D/S 78</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>RCA contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 D/S 78</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>In USA: Columbia contract (CRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/50 – 12/51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>c. 33 D/S 78</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>CRI contract: 78s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/52 – 11/55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>c. 51 LP</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>CRI contract: LPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/55 – 12/59</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>c. 70 LP</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>EMI contract: LPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal earnings projection:

1. Session income from 1910 to 1940: c. £12,840.
2. Re: 78s: 42 – 51 (excluding US issues): say average price 10/- x 225 discs x 2000 units x 5% = £11,250.
4. Sir Georg Solti: methodological issues

Many of the points already made in relation to the calculation of time spent, records published and the calculation of personal income for Sir Thomas Beecham apply also to the case of Sir Georg Solti. Time spent in the studio has been assessed in terms of days, as with Beecham, on the basis of the dates given in the most detailed Solti discography produced to date (Davey, 1992), as further information which might break these dates down into individual recording sessions worked is not available. The number of discs published from this work has been assessed again from Davey and in terms of initial releases only. Later compilations, international issues and repackagings have not been taken into account.

For the first ten years of Solti’s recording career the theoretical assumption has been made that he was paid a flat daily fee. From 1957 onwards it has been assumed that he was paid a royalty calculated on the basis of retail sales, as was the case with Beecham. Similar quantities have been used as for Beecham to reach theoretical projections of personal earnings from sales of discs.

In terms of time divisions, all recordings made from 1983 onwards, the year in which the Compact Disc (CD) was introduced commercially, are taken to be CDs, although in fact parallel issues on both LP and CD were produced until approximately 1988, with LP production ending in 1990. Figures for the period after the end of Solti’s relationship with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, 1991, have not been included as no detailed information, such as dates of recording, for Solti’s recordings after this date are currently available, and in addition his recording activity slowed down considerably between 1992 and 1997, the year of his death.

5. Sir Georg Solti: commentary

The analysis of activity and releases by Sir Georg Solti, given at Table I.2. (located at the end of this section), corroborates several key points made in the main body of the thesis. The first of these is that the promotion of John Culshaw into Victor Olof’s position as senior producer at Decca in 1956 gave Solti the opportunity to record extensively in the repertoire in which he excelled, thus enabling him to demonstrate
internationally his great ability as a conductor. In the ten years between 1947 and 1956, which included from 1950 to 1956 the first 7 years of the production of the long playing record by Decca, he made a total of 15 LPs, as well as a number of 78rpm recordings, from 43 days in the studio.

However in the 13 year period between 1957, the year in which Culshaw’s new plans started actually to happen, and the year 1969, the final year in which Solti recorded in Europe before starting to record in the USA with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra [CSO], of which he became Music Director in 1969, he made 92 discs (as opposed to issues – many of the issues were of operas constituting multiple numbers of discs) from 388 days in the studio.

This statistic also shows that the United Kingdom system of allowing a maximum of 16 minutes of recording achieved for each three hour session resulted in a relatively generous average statistic of approximately 1 LP produced for every 4 days in the studio.

In 1970 Solti began to record with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, under the American system of three hours of recording achieved within each four hour session. The result was a considerable increase in productivity. In another 13 year period, from 1970 to the end of 1982, immediately prior to the introduction of the CD, Solti actually appears to have spent less time in the studio, 266 days, out of which 136 LPs were produced, 44 more than in the previous period. Time spent recording was thus down by a third when compared to the previous period. These figures indicate an average of 1 LP produced for just under 2 days in the studio. Thus although American orchestral rates for recording may have been considerably higher than those paid in Europe, they allowed for approximately double the rate of productivity in terms of discs produced (again as opposed to issues: many of Solti’s Chicago recordings were published as multiple disc issues).

In 1983 the Compact Disc was introduced into the international market. During the period from 1983 to 1991, when Solti’s contract with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra ended, he spent 133 days in the studio, which resulted in approximately 64
individual CDs (again this figure takes into account the number of separate discs making up a multiple disc issue), or just over 2 days in the studio for each CD produced. Productivity is thus marginally less than in the previous period, reflecting perhaps the slightly longer running time expected by the public of the early CD at approximately 60 minutes when compared to the similar figure for the LP at approximately 50 minutes. But more broadly a figure of approximately two days in the studio for each individual disc, LP and CD, appears to be fairly constant from 1970 to 1991.

All these figures show clearly that once Solti was established as a leading artist with Decca, he was given the opportunity to become a prolific recording artist. Overall he appears to have spent approximately 830 days in the studio. This effort produced approximately 23 78rpm discs, 243 LPs and 64 CDs, assuming first issues only. In reality this figure should be increased considerably to take into account reissues based on lower prices and differently packaged programmes of existing recordings.

In terms of personal earnings, Solti’s increasing levels of productivity and the increasing unit price of the LP and then of the CD would have resulted in progressively enhanced earnings, as the projections in the table indicate. By the time of the final period with the CSO, which also saw the growth of global record sales as a result of the introduction of the CD, income from recording royalties would appear to have become approximately four times as great as they were in the pre-Chicago period, between 1957 and 1969. This factor also possibly indicates why Solti, together with other contemporary conductors, moved gradually to using live concerts as the basis for recordings. Between 1983 and 1991 he spent almost a third of the time in the studio that he had done during the period 1957 to 1969, but was possibly earning as much as four times in royalties. (A word of caution needs to be made here about the approximate nature of these figures and the fact that they have not been equalised to take into account the effects of inflation over the time of the sample period. Nonetheless the basic point of increased income for reduced activity would appear to remain valid.)
As with those for Beecham, these figures indicate over the period of Solti’s career a broad upward trajectory of productivity and income. Technological innovation in the form of stereophonic sound and the CD were important factors in supporting the growth of Solti’s activities as a recording conductor. And his appointment as the Music Director of one of the major American orchestras for a period of 22 years was also significant – throughout this time there was a continuous programme of recording.

Thus in the case of Solti, these statistics illustrate the points already made about the importance of the relationship with the producer, the influence of technological innovation, and the cumulative nature of continuing sales. The statistics given, which cease in 1991 at the end of Solti’s Chicago tenure, do not take into account activity (which was miscellaneous) after this time, nor the level of sales which would have been achieved internationally through reissues and repackaging. Nonetheless they clearly indicate the new factors of dissemination of knowledge and the growth of personal income that recording and the recording industry have made possible.
Table Appendix I.2: Sir Georg Solti: summary of days spent recording, discs published, fees earned, with comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date / Period</th>
<th>Number of days recording</th>
<th>Number of discs issued</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947 - 1956</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23 D/S 78, 15 LP</td>
<td>£100p.s.</td>
<td>Munich and Frankfurt / Olof at Decca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957 - 1969</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>92 LP</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Culshaw replaces Olof at Decca, mid 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 - 1982</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>136 LP</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>First recording with CSO: 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983 - 1991</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>64 CD</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>CD introduced 83. CSO contract expires 1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal earnings projection:**

1. Re: 78s and initial LPs: say fee of £100 per day in the studio = £4,300.
2. Re: LPs: 57 – 69 say average price £2 x 92 discs x 2000 units x 5% = £18,400.
   70 – 82 say average price £3 x 136 discs x 2000 units x 5% = £40,800.
3. Re: CDs: 83 –91 say average price £12 x 64 discs x 2000 units x 5% = £76,800.
6. Sir Simon Rattle: methodological issues

Table Appendix I.3, located at the end of this section, outlines Sir Simon Rattle’s recording activity to date. Whereas the information relating to Beecham and to Solti has been drawn from the detailed discographies prepared by Gray (1979) and Davey (1992), three separate sources have been used to gather similar information for Rattle. These are the discography in Kenyon (1987), which goes up to 1987, the discography prepared by Hunt (1997), which adds another ten years of information, and the individual reviews held in the internet archive of ‘Gramophone’ magazine, called ‘Gramofile’ (accessible at: http://www.gramofile.co.uk). While these sources provide good data as to issues, after 1987 data as to actual recording dates is patchy. Therefore a rule of thumb approach has been taken after this date as to the time required to record a normal length CD in the studio, and that is two days. All the other methodological procedures are the same as those adopted for Beecham and Solti.

7. Sir Simon Rattle: commentary

The detailed statistics for Rattle’s recording activity reinforce several of the points made earlier. Firstly he clearly benefited from advantageous timing. Just as Solti was fortunate with the combination of Culshaw’s rise to influence and Decca’s interest in technological innovation and hence the introduction of stereophonic sound in 1958, so Rattle benefited from EMI’s pre-existing relationship with the CBSO, in particular the arrangement for recording whereby the regional orchestras paid their members in time rather than cash, and so were able to offer their services to EMI at no cash cost, apart from that for conductors and soloists. This was an attractive arrangement to the record company. Secondly he benefited from the timing of the introduction of the CD in 1983. At this point he had been in command in Birmingham for three years, and was beginning to achieve significant results. The gradual growth in demand for recordings that the CD stimulated, together with Rattle’s capability and the helpful terms under which the Orchestra could be recorded, encouraged EMI to increase its recording commitment to the Orchestra, as the figures clearly demonstrate.
Between 1975 and 1980, prior to going to Birmingham, Rattle made 11 LPs for several labels, an average of just over 2 per year. The same average can be seen for the three year period from January 1981 to November 1982, during which he produced 7 discs. However during the fifteen year period, from 1983 to 1998, which also marked the end of his Birmingham contract, his productivity increased enormously: 81 CDs were issued either as first issue single CDs or as part of multiple CD sets. This gives an average of just under 5.5 CDs per annum. (The time rather than cash arrangement for recording English regional orchestras seems to have been replaced by cash payments at the end of the 1980s, and this change, taken in conjunction with the demonstrable high level of recording activity, further emphasises the attractiveness of Rattle and the CBSO to EMI from 1990 onwards.)

The increased productivity noted reinforces the point made in relation to Beecham and particularly Solti, and that is the importance for recording purposes of a conductor enjoying a permanent appointment with an orchestra. As with Solti, so with Rattle: once the appointment ends, recording activity becomes more miscellaneous and fragmented. Following Rattle’s resignation from the CBSO in 1998, EMI, with whom he has an exclusive recording contract, have published only 2 studio based recordings not involving the CBSO and 1 live recording – an average of only 1 CD per annum to date, excluding releases with the CBSO made prior to his departure in 1998.

A further conclusion of the main body of the thesis is reinforced by these statistics and that is the increasing importance of published recordings taken from live concerts. Between October 1990 and September 1999, 12 CDs were issued of 10 performances of specific works conducted by Rattle, and taken from a total of 18 concerts. In most cases two concerts consisting of the same programme formed the basis of the published recordings. Interestingly 7 of the performances on which these CDs were based took place between 1990 and 1995, with 3 taking place in 1995, 1997 and 1999, reflecting perhaps the gradual contraction of activity experienced during the middle and late 1990s by EMI.
Thus while it may be too much to deduce a definite trend from this data, these figures indicate the increasing importance of concert based recordings, as they did with Solti, and also the considerable increase in efficiency which they represent, a factor reinforced by the continuously improving quality of recorded sound that may be obtained from contemporary recording equipment used in public concert halls during live performances. Under studio conditions, 12 CDs would probably have required a minimum of 24 days in the studio, as opposed to 18 actual concerts, as here. Concerts are of course are a parallel, rather than dedicated, activity in relation to recording.

In terms of studio recordings and productivity, between 1980 and 1998 Rattle appears to have spent 206 days in the studio, producing 88 discs. The time taken to produce one CD was approximately 2.35 days, a figure not dissimilar to that experienced by Solti and Decca at an average of 2 days per CD, and perhaps reflecting a slightly more relaxed attitude to recording productivity on the part of EMI.

As far as the projections for individual earnings are concerned, once again the figures appear to tell a similar story to those for Beecham and Solti. And again a word of extreme caution needs to be voiced in relation to these figures, which are theoretically generated.

For LP issues an assumption has been made that Rattle was paid a flat fee of £500 equivalent to each day in the studio, producing an income of, in theory, £14,000 over 7 years. For comparative purposes once again a royalty fee of 5% is suggested for all CD issues, and a similar formula to that used for Beecham and Solti has been created: a quantity of 2000 units sold initially, representing a modest average ‘break-even’ figure, at an average retail selling price of £12. Clearly in some cases these figures will have been different, but they have been used to provided a basis for comparison. For the 95 CD discs issued, both as single and as part of multiple disc issues, this formula produces a total income of £114,000 generated over 18 years, a considerable increase over the projected flat fee income, as was also the case with Beecham and Solti.
This estimate is highly conservative and cautious, and almost certainly understates the real income position, as it does not take into account repackaged issues of existing performances and those instances where sales of over 2000 units per issue have been achieved. However in the absence of detailed sales data, which is not available from EMI, these figures do enable comparisons to be made.

A crude annual average income figure of approximately £6,300 is reached if the total income projected (£114,000) is divided by the relevant period of time, 18 years. Given that a conductor of Rattle’s eminence would probably be receiving between £3,000 and £5,000 per concert with the CBSO during the last three years of his contract with the Orchestra, from 1995 to 1998, and that currently he would probably be receiving between £5,000 and £10,000 per performance, this figure would indicate that income from recordings is not at present highly significant, in the way that it was for Beecham, whose concert fee for conducting was proportionately much less.

If this assumption is sustainable it would appear to indicate that recording’s current importance lies in assisting the dissemination of knowledge about an orchestra and conductor, rather than as a major source of additional income. It would also explain why increasing interest is focused upon using live performances as the basis for recordings: it is simply a more efficient use of time.

As many interviewees pointed out during the research process, recording is a significant ‘calling card’, assisting the development of further concert work. Only when a high volume of issues has been achieved after a lifetime of activity, as was the case with Beecham and Solti, are the benefits strongly felt in financial terms, especially when new formats, such as the CD, allow for the reissue of pre-existing recordings.

Thus in the case of Sir Simon Rattle’s recording activity, technological innovation and the consumer demand that followed boosted the level of recording activity beyond that which might normally have been expected, supported also by his permanent relationship with the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra. Royalty
income has yet to reach substantial levels, because the volume of Rattle’s catalogue of recordings, whilst extensive, is only about one third of the size of that achieved by Solti, for instance, and the period during which these recordings have been available is considerably less. In addition increasing concert fees have reduced the comparative value of recording income.
Table Appendix I.3: Sir Simon Rattle: summary of projections for days spent recording, discs issued, and fees earned, with comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date / Period (studio)</th>
<th>Number of days recording</th>
<th>Number of discs</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/80 – 11/82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7 LP</td>
<td>?£500 p.d.</td>
<td>First CBSO discs to end of LP era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/83 – 8/98</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>81 CD</td>
<td>?5%</td>
<td>To end of CBSO contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/98 – 8/01</td>
<td>e.6</td>
<td>2 CD</td>
<td>?5%</td>
<td>Indicates importance of permanent appointment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date / Period (live)</th>
<th>Number of concerts</th>
<th>Number of discs</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/90 – 9/99</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12 CD</td>
<td>?5%</td>
<td>Indicative of higher recording productivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>