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Abstract

This thesis examines the working culture of the Decca Record Company, and how group interaction and individual agency have made an impact on the production of music recordings. Founded in London in 1929, Decca built a global reputation as a pioneer of sound recording with access to the world’s leading musicians. With its roots in manufacturing and experimental wartime engineering, the company developed a peerless classical music catalogue that showcased technological innovation alongside artistic accomplishment. This investigation focuses specifically on the contribution of the recording producer at Decca in creating this legacy, as can be illustrated by the career of Christopher Raeburn, the company’s most prolific producer and specialist in opera and vocal repertoire. It is the first study to examine Raeburn’s archive, and is supported with unpublished memoirs, private papers and recorded interviews with colleagues, collaborators and artists. Using these sources, the thesis considers the history and functions of the staff producer within Decca’s wider operational structure in parallel with the personal aspirations of the individual in exerting control, choice and authority on the process and product of recording.

Having been recruited to Decca by John Culshaw in 1957, Raeburn’s fifty-year career spanned seminal moments of the company’s artistic and commercial lifecycle: from assisting in exploiting the dramatic potential of stereo technology in Culshaw’s Ring during the 1960s to his serving as audio producer for the 1990 The Three Tenors Concert international phenomenon. The thesis discusses the significance of Raeburn’s connections and background influences in his long career path, while a series of case studies drawn from his archive, illustrating exceptional examples of recording practice and artist cultivation, aim to identify his production ethos in the context of company recording policy and subject to the challenges of a rapidly-evolving industry.
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List of abbreviations and notes on translations and archiving

List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>Academy of Ancient Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTT</td>
<td>Association of Cinematograph, Television and Allied Technicians union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;R</td>
<td>Artists and Repertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM</td>
<td>Assistant Stage Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL/RA</td>
<td>British Library, Raeburn Archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC</td>
<td>Oxford Experimental Theatre Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ffrr</td>
<td>Full-frequency range recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ffss</td>
<td>Full-frequency stereo sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIP</td>
<td>Historically-informed performance (movement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPO</td>
<td>London Philharmonic Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSO</td>
<td>London Symphony Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF</td>
<td>Österreichische Rundfunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUDS</td>
<td>Oxford University Dramatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROH</td>
<td>Royal Opera House, Covent Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPO</td>
<td>Royal Philharmonic Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Timecode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNA</td>
<td>The National Archives, Kew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPO</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation note

The use of English or German/Austrian names follows the format in Decca company documents within the archive of Christopher Raeburn at the British Library. Therefore, reference is made to the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra rather than the Wiener Philharmoniker. However, Decca’s recording locations in Vienna are referred to in the German form, reflecting the use in common company parlance, hence:

*Sofiensäle*, Decca’s recording base in Vienna until 1985. This refers to the entire building, which comprised a number of spaces suitable for recording. *Sofiensaal*, the main hall used for recording within the *Sofiensäle* complex. *Blauersaal*, a further space used for recording within the *Sofiensäle* complex.

All translations are my own, unless otherwise stated.
**Archiving note**

References to papers from the archive of Christopher Raeburn at the British Library are denoted by the abbreviation BL/RA and do not include further foliation detail or box numbers. At the time of writing, the archive, finding aid and inventory prepared concurrently with this thesis are awaiting input into the British Library’s resource cataloguing system.
Introduction

Introduction and methodology

In 1957, British Pathé produced a newsreel depicting the Duke of Edinburgh taking a guided tour of Decca’s factories in New Malden, Surrey. The film is a showcase of the breadth of the company’s development and manufacturing might in recording, technology and engineering. The royal party watches as vast rolls of poly vinyl acetate are prepared for pressing into long playing records; metal stampers being grown in chemical baths; detailed inspections with microscopes; the web of hydraulic cables leading to the pressing machines; rejected discs being smashed with brio by a contented employee, sans eye protection, while pieces shear off in all directions. The camera moves to the record-packing room where the finished products are boxed: Debussy’s Children’s Corner, Delibes’ Coppelia, military marches from the Trooping of the Colour played by the Grenadier Guards. Decca’s chairman, Edward Lewis, leads the party on to the radar assembly production line and testing laboratories, displays of radar antennae, and hundreds of industrious employees engaged in jobs that are large-scale, physical and yet precise. Lewis is satisfied by what he sees, this hive of activity over which he presides. He smiles, shakes the Prince’s hand, and a car sweeps them away.¹

The newsreel serves as a reminder of the industrial background of Decca as a producer of music, and from its earliest days, experimental technology was the driver for its development as a recording company. As a manufacturer of recording and reproduction equipment, and a pioneer of communications engineering, Decca was a relative latecomer to classical music recording on an extensive scale. The company’s research and development department overlapped with its recording engineering team: it had a fixed purpose and an unquestionable authority to develop or modify equipment suitable for their own defined standards, and to operate the equipment under the conditions of a recording session. In the early 1930s, Decca’s head of engineering, Norman Angier, set out the terms under which engineers were employed: in offering a young record sales assistant and would-be pianist Arthur Lilley an apprenticeship, Angier was keen to emphasise that Lilley ‘would have to learn about electricity, as music [was] not enough.’² Angier’s successor as

² Frank Lee, British Library Oral History interview, 1984. Angier resigned from Decca to take a role in World War II weapons research and development, becoming assistant director of MD1, (see Stuart
head of engineering, Arthur Haddy, who was also a session recordist, echoed these sentiments in selecting his staff, and demanded absolute dedication to the objective properties and intentions of recording, otherwise:

His concentration drifted away from his mod meters and mixing desk to the performance. This was absolutely deadly. The Germans originally always used a frustrated conductor as a tonmeister, and that's why some of the early German classical recordings aren't as good as they should have been. We always had with us a musical director in the studio whose word was absolutely law about tempo performance, but anything to do with dynamic range, the engineer had a say, if it was 3 pianos and they played 4 and it was down in the dirt, we'd stop. Playing what had been recorded back to musicians would have been impossible...

[...]

...But you can’t do it if your main love is music.\(^3\)

Haddy believed it was imperative that engineering staff worked closely with designated studio music directors, but that they had to have separately-defined roles; they were ‘different staff, different payroll.’\(^4\) But who were the ‘musical directors’ who provided another level of interface between the musician in the recording studio, the engineer and the mass-produced records seen in the newsreel? Where were these individuals engaged in the production of records placed in the chain of command? Having established that the parameters for engineers were to measure, calibrate and control audio and to develop the ability to attenuate sound perceptually as an audio signal, Haddy had declared that the engineer at Decca must respond to music—professionally at least—as absolute ‘sounding forms in motion’ rather than as ‘forms symbolic of human feeling.’\(^5\) If engineers’ sole considerations were the control and manipulation of acoustic energy, what kind of authority over both music and musicians did the musical director, of which Haddy speaks, exert?

This thesis presents a study of this studio role at the Decca Record Company, and traces its emergence in the 1930s, through its apotheosis as the titular ‘recording producer’ in the late 1950s and 1960s, to its ultimate demise as a staff position in the late 1990s. It aims to present the role from operational and philosophic perspectives, and how the development of organisational culture has an effect on recordings as artistic creations.

---

MacRae, *Winston Churchill’s Toyshop: The Inside Story of Military Intelligence*, 2012). Lilley’s employment as a recording engineer lasted fifty years (see Stuart, Decca discography, 2014).

\(^3\) Arthur Haddy, British Library Oral History interview, 1983.

\(^4\) Ibid.

Therefore, the thesis considers recordings as the end-points of a cultural process, rather than as a spontaneously-occurring audible form. In pursuit of this, focus is given to the career and working methods of Christopher Raeburn, who was Decca’s longest-serving studio producer of classical music. Engaged in 1957 by the then director of artists and repertoire (A&R), John Culshaw, Raeburn was present at iconoclastic junctures in recording industry history: from studio assistant in Vienna during Culshaw’s recording of the Ring, at the development of digital recording, and eventually through the classical music marketing revolution of the 1990s during which he became audio producer for a series of The Three Tenors Concerts for both Decca and Warner Music. Culshaw’s international profile as a dominant force in recording, gained through his opera recordings of the 1960s and publicised through his extensive journalistic output, provides the context in which to draw comparisons and to discuss whether Raeburn was an epigone, or indeed an architect of an original approach to recording.

Although Decca enjoyed a global reputation in the music industry as a pioneer of recording and with access to the leading classical musicians of the day, as a company, it has proved resistant to research on account of its lack of systematic documentation. Its founding managing director and subsequent chairman, Edward Lewis, saw fit to produce a small volume giving a brief account of the company’s formation from a business perspective, but the company has never prioritised documenting its industrial heritage. As a current imprint of Universal, Decca retains papers in informal storage in basements and warehouses, but these are not accessible, either for its staff or researchers of the music industry. Indeed, Decca marks its historical milestones by exploiting its catalogue in new presentations rather than through cultural reflection. Compared to its British rival, EMI, whose private archive has sustained past academic studies on its economic history by Peter Martland, and the effect of recording on musical activity as analysed through the work of selected conductors by David Patmore, knowledge of Decca’s recording practice has resided primarily in the memoirs and journal articles by John Culshaw that were published as companion pieces to his recordings in the 1960s. There can be no doubt that the policy to retain its company ‘secrets’ was part of a drive to retain a competitive advantage, as

---

8 David Patmore, ‘The influence of recording and the record industry upon musical activity, as illustrated by the careers of Sir Thomas Beecham, Sir Georg Solti and Sir Simon Rattle’, PhD thesis, 2001. The EMI archive, however, is currently not open to researchers at the time of writing.
Christopher Pope remarked. But in the 1980s, Decca allowed an independent researcher, Michael Gray, access to its engineering documentation held at the company’s recording centre, and since that time, knowledge of Decca’s working practices have often focused on specific aspects of sound engineering, found in audiophile literature, accompanying excerpted re-mastered Decca recordings, as part of discographies, and more recently, carried by professional audio internet forums. There has also been significant growth in the number of personal testimonies, both recorded and published.

While Decca’s staff had been pursued for interview in the music press over many decades, it was not until the closure of the company’s recording centre in north London in 1997 that published personal accounts of working lives of its staff appeared with greater frequency, reflecting the urgency to militate against the loss of knowledge in their inevitable (and perhaps imminent) demise. As a consequence, the relatively small number of studies that have aimed to explore classical music recording culture, practice or aesthetics and which reference Decca, such as those by David Patmore and Terence Curran, have, as a matter of necessity, relied on personal testimony in conjunction with John Culshaw’s memoirs. The study of recording practice in classical music has therefore been dominated, as Simon Frith agrees, by individuals—Culshaw included—who have made vigorous personal efforts to create a public legacy for themselves, and have sought to emphasise the qualities of individualism, although working within large, corporate organisations. While other post-war Decca producers, Victor Olof and Ray Minshull, wrote

---

9 Christopher Pope, interview recorded 27 July 2016.
13 For example, online manuals covering the configuration of the Decca ‘Tree’ microphone array. See <https://www.opusklassiek.nl/audiotechniek/deccatreed2.pdf> [accessed 30 September 2016].
14 A large number of Decca staff profiles appear in Classic Record Collector and Classical Recordings Quarterly between 2006 and 2011.
accounts of their working lives which remain unpublished,\textsuperscript{18} Culshaw continues to ‘speak’ for Decca, despite having resigned in 1967.

The British Library’s acquisition of Decca staff producer Christopher Raeburn’s papers in 2011 presented an important addition to the knowledge of classical recording production previously accumulated by means of memoir and oral history, and offers a unique research opportunity. This thesis is the first study to use Raeburn’s archive as the principle locus of enquiry; it is the inspiration for my research, and as such, is more raison d’être than primary source. The scope of the archive covers a wide range of documentation relating to Decca’s company business and recording activities, along with Raeburn’s private communications and research. It reflects all the major phases of his life and work: as a staff producer for Decca with its attendant wide-ranging communications, but also as a sometime music journalist, performance critic, artists’ mentor and researcher of operatic performance history.

From reading the archive, there is, therefore, a cumulative understanding of Raeburn the man, but also as a part of a complex system in a creative industry whose object was to make goods of expressive and artistic intent. The designation of ‘producer’ suggests an imperative to create, or ‘bring forth,’ so fundamental questions that this thesis seeks to explore focus on what aspects of control and choice were available to the recording producer that allowed them to have a personal input, and in what ways these choices could be aesthetic and artistic. How did the producer’s relationship with the artist determine the scope of their influence on musical interpretation? To what extent might the recording medium itself be used to enhance or convey interpretation under the direction of the producer? Apart from their relationship with artists, staff producers at Decca were also subject to the demands of a corporate system in which there were many other individuals working towards the same goal from a wide range of perspectives. Indeed, the staff producer did not act alone in any aspect of making music recordings. This thesis also aims to examine how constraints, expectations and relationships within the system shaped the way in which the producer worked. Therefore, this is a study of both the individual and their social, and indeed cultural, frame. It aims to deduce whether there was a ‘house style,’ or convention of production, or whether the producer, as an individual, could truly influence the mode and means of recording.

As such, it is appropriate to consider these topics in relation to the literature that has been developed to address how artistic and cultural artifacts are produced and disseminated, whether as pictorial art, film, theatre or other creative media. Theoretical concepts of how culture is made have a well-developed history and have been dominated over the last forty years by the work of sociologists Howard Becker, Richard Peterson and Pierre Bourdieu. All three writers consider that cultural phenomena are the outcomes of collective action, which has natural relevance for music recording within a large, corporate environment such as Decca, where the creation and preparation of the final product passes through many hands. Becker’s theory of art ‘worlds,’ Bourdieu’s ‘field’ concept and Peterson’s ‘production of culture perspective’ recognise that cultural artifacts are created through underlying structures. While Peterson considers that limiting factors imposed by the organisation determine aesthetic choices, Becker focuses on cooperative human networks:

All artistic work, like all human activity, involves the joint activity of a number, often a large number, of people. Through their cooperation, the art work we eventually see or hear comes to be and continues to be. The work always shows signs of that cooperation.

Becker’s theory describes that while the ‘artist’ is the prime-mover, there are ‘supporters’ who are also integral to creativity. But these nominal designations can change when new influences are brought to bear, such as the introduction of new technologies. This is particularly pertinent for recording production in regard to where the boundaries of the artist’s actions lie and how they are identified during the recording’s critical reception. As Becker comments:

Participants in art worlds worry about the authenticity of art work. Did the artist supposed to have done this work really do it? Has anyone else interfered with the original work, altered or edited it in some way so that what the artist intended and created is not what we now have before us?

...If we judge the artist on the basis of the work, we must know who really did the work, and therefore deserves the judgment we make of its worth and the worth of its maker.

---


21 Ibid., p.300ff.

22 Ibid., p.22.
However, there are few guidelines offered by Becker and Peterson by which to study cultural production. Peterson analyses six components, naming technology, law, organisational structure, industry structure, careers and market as useful avenues for consideration. Becker, in contrast, names only the division of labour as the perspective for research, suggesting the field for enquiry should not be limited. Indeed, Becker remarks that ‘every art...rests on an extensive division of labor [sic]...But do we need all this apparatus of the division of labor to understand painting, which seems a much more solitary occupation? We do.’

Studies of cultural production that have been made using structuralist paradigms—the analysis of underlying functions and relationships that support the production of art—are numerous, and have included work on popular music recording, jazz, the symphony orchestra, and country music. Classical music production is noticeably absent from the corpus. Although there is a prevalence of current, first-person observational studies, the socio-structuralist rationale has also been applied in historical studies. As Becker notes, archival documents and historical objects are ‘acceptable substitutes for first hand data.’ While the facets of inquiry presented in Peterson’s and Becker’s theories are useful guidelines, some are less relevant to understanding the role of the recording producer at Decca that might be perceived from a reading of Raeburn’s archive. This is a reflection of the documentary evidence it offers, which does not represent the company’s entire operation, but rather Raeburn’s corporate status and ambit of his role. The thesis aims to combine both Becker’s and Peterson’s

---

approaches and recognises organisational culture, occupational careers and the division of labour as research orientations to explore the context of recording production.

To consider how and in what ways the producer might personally influence recordings and exercise aesthetic judgement, the thesis adopts a narrative approach that considers processes, actions and specific, subjective experiences. In this respect, it considers biography, case studies and aesthetics of recording to understand the lived experience of making recordings. Since the 1980s, there has been what Ian Kershaw has termed a ‘biographical turn’ in the use and renewed acceptability of personal testimony and oral history to inform works of historical scholarship.31 The social sciences have, as the York University Centre for the Study of Working Lives states, ‘recognised the importance of understanding the workforce to the effective functioning of industry’32 since the early twentieth century. Simone Lässig recognises that since then, a ‘surge of individualisation that has taken hold of nearly all western-oriented societies’33 has directed historiography towards promoting the values of individuality, and individual initiative. In the last thirty years, an increased consciousness in gathering oral history data within the British cultural industries to rectify the cumulative loss of memory has resulted in a number of large-scale incentives, such as the British Entertainment History Project, which seeks to document the lives of employees working in film, television, theatre and cinema.34 The British Library’s (ongoing) Oral History of Recorded Sound project, whose aim was to document working lives and institutional heritage, could also be seen to have reflected this wider trend.35 Staff of the Decca Record Company from all aspects of the business gave interviews for the British Library’s project, which remains a valuable source of information on its culture, especially in regard to an absence of a formal, archival source to provide context, or what Kershaw calls a ‘grand narrative underpinned by grand theory.’36 Indeed, as Kershaw has

---

32 <See https://www.york.ac.uk/management/centres/cswl/bg_rationale/> [accessed 2 April 2018].
33 Ibid. Introduction, p.3.
34 The British Entertainment Project was founded in 1987 and is curated by the British Film Institute. See <https://historyproject.org.uk/content/about-us> [accessed 17 February 2016]. Most recently, Royal Holloway, University of London, initiated the ADAPT project (2013–2018), which has aimed to document the history and development of broadcast television technology since 1960, and the working lives of technicians. See <https://www.adaptTVhistory.org.uk> [accessed 3 May 2016].
35 Oral history Interviews with music recording industry practitioners were initiated in large numbers after the British Institute of Recorded Sound merged with the British Library in 1983 to become the National Sound Archive.
noted, ‘a fragmented history without pattern or meaning reasserts the focus upon the will, actions, and impact of an individual.’

**Use of sources**

The thesis has been informed by a range of archival research, oral history interviews and written memoirs. While some sources, such as interviews from the British Library’s Oral History of Recorded Sound are in the public domain, the majority of my research has been conducted using materials that have either not been used previously or have hitherto remained private.

A major requirement of this research project has involved organising and evaluating the British Library’s Raeburn Archive to create an inventory and finding aid, and to limit the extent of the papers. This has been a formidable task as the archive was received in an amorphous condition, consisting of many tens of thousands of documents with no discernible collecting pattern or meaningful structure to retain. To be both researcher and cataloguer simultaneously is to acknowledge a tension that exists in deriving meaning and significance while exercising syntactic value judgements with the available raw data, and has underlined the possibilities of creating archival bias and exerting influence on how the collection might be used by future researchers. The degree to which the documents had a bearing on his professional life as a recording producer provided the guiding question. Choosing how to arrange and present Raeburn’s archive, therefore, has had a significant influence on the selection of the topic and rationale for this thesis, as it has necessitated analysing what was important to Raeburn’s life and work through what he chose to collect and keep. The process took three years to complete, during which time I read and re-sorted the material four times to refine dates and areas of interest as much as they would yield. The targets, types and frequency of Raeburn’s documentary communications appearing in his archive are shown in the graphic on page 19 (Fig.0.1). This gives a view of the archive’s scope, which was then rationalised to create the archive title page for the British Library. The title page is presented in Appendix 7.

The choice of other primary sources was largely determined by the leads provided by the Raeburn Archive. Raeburn’s strong personal and professional links with Austria and the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra (VPO), and Decca’s exclusive contract with the orchestra, dating from 1948, made a request to visit to the VPO’s archive a rational decision. The VPO archive has attracted much attention over the last decade by allowing a

---

37 Ibid.
small number of historians, notably Fritz Trümpi, Oliver Rathkolb and Bernadette Mayrhofer, access for the first time, and whose research aims to uncover the extent of the orchestra’s association with Nazism after the Anschluss in 1938. Their work does not interface with the orchestra’s recording history, and according to the VPO’s archivist, the papers relating to its recording activities with Decca have never previously been requested. The Decca-VPO correspondence is, however, incomplete. The collection spans the years 1962 to 1978, and documents covering the early years of its exclusive recording contract have been disposed of or lost. Given the mutual importance of the relationship, which provided the VPO with a regular income and promoted its post-war cultural independence, and gave Decca a presence in mainland Europe and the prestige of an historical name, this is surprising. For the purposes of the timeframe of this thesis, however, the collection has relevance, but the information it yielded was far more limited than anticipated. Indeed, up until 1978, the correspondence with the VPO’s management had been restricted mostly to the head of Decca’s artists and repertoire (A&R) department (John Culshaw followed by Ray Minshull). The documents were more insightful, however, regarding the VPO’s negotiations to perform and record with Leonard Bernstein in the late 1960s and early 1970s, which had direct relevance for the case study presented in Chapter 6.

I was also given access to a subset of the papers and unpublished, incomplete memoirs of Decca’s long-serving head of A&R and vice-president, Ray Minshull, whose career was coincident with Raeburn’s. These documents have played a crucial part in my research and have enriched an understanding of Decca’s executive decision-making. Without a neutral, corporate archival source for reference, Minshull’s papers provide an important complement to Raeburn’s collection in representing Decca’s culture; offering an alternative perspective, representation and individual bias that is inherent in personal archives. The orderliness of Minshull’s paperwork could not be a greater contrast to Raeburn’s: Minshull kept typescripts of telephone conversations with Decca’s exclusive artists between 1967 and 1994 as aide-memoirs, which contain prodigious amounts of detail and from which artists’ career expectations might be perceived. The two incomplete

38 Since 2014, and following its receipt of the Birgit Nilsson Prize to assist digitisation of its assets, the VPO archive has allowed greater access to bona fide researchers.
39 However, one of the main correspondents in the VPO files relating to Decca is Helmut Wobisch, the orchestra’s president from 1953 to 1969 and a former SS member.
40 The papers of Ray Minshull were offered to the British Library in September 2018, after drafting this thesis.
Fig. 0.1 Christopher Raeburn target communications withrelative frequency from the Raeburn Archive
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versions of his unpublished memoirs are also based on his notes, which had been shown to his colleague Raeburn to proofread and edit. These provide a nuanced reinterpretation of some of the information presented by Culshaw in his writings, who Minshull considers was ‘not averse to exaggeration.’

Alongside the archival research for this thesis, I conducted fifteen oral and written interviews with ex-Decca staff members whose collective company service spanned 1959 to 2007, together with Michael Raeburn (Christopher Raeburn’s brother, and also briefly employed at Decca by John Culshaw), and key people from particular vantage points within the recording industry, including the artists Cecilia Bartoli and Gabriele Fontana. This confers a position referred to by Anthony Seldon and Joanna Pappworth as ‘elite oral history’ which involves ‘asking questions and gathering information from those who forged or witnessed events in history.’ As members of an ever-decreasing group who were participants in the topics and timeframe investigated by this thesis, the interviewees’ responses are not evaluated here in terms of their veracity or reliability, as is contested by many critics of oral history research. Rather, it is their subjective responses that have been sought, which create strong impressions of the culture, as much as fill factual lacunae in the archival sources. This illuminates what Alessandro Portelli maintains is a ‘different credibility’ which ‘tell us not just what people did, but what they wanted to do, what they believed they were doing, and what they now think they did.

The interviews were semi-structured and the questions drawn from a plan with three main areas of concern: ‘personal,’ ‘Decca,’ and ‘Raeburn.’ Within the three areas, questions were formulated to allow the respondents to discuss their personal background, to reconstruct the details of their experience of working at Decca and with Raeburn, and ultimately to reflect on the meaning of their work experience. From the perspective of the artists interviewed, the questions posed focused on the background to their recording career, the studio process, their perceptions of the general qualities required of a recording producer and their opinions of Raeburn as a collaborator, mentor or facilitator. They were all encouraged to talk around the subjects raised and digress as they wished. The interview plan is given in Appendix 6.

42 Anthony Seldon, and Joanna Pappworth, By Word of Mouth, Elite Oral History, 1983, p.3.
45 See Appendix 6.
Thesis structure and method

As there is no comprehensive ‘method’ associated with the theories of cultural production expounded by Becker and Peterson, the overall structure of the thesis has utilised quantitative and qualitative information derived from the interviews, and is divided into three main sections. Throughout the thesis, Raeburn is used as the main exemplar, but comparisons are drawn with other colleagues to give context.

Part 1 traces the institutional origins of the producer’s role at Decca, together with the background cultural influences of Raeburn, as the producer ‘case.’ Part 2 considers the features of the producer’s role from the perspective of its inner and outer worlds. This refers to both the internal systems of the company, how the role was realised among musicians and agents outside the company culture, and the degree to which this was open to individual interpretation. The recording producer Erik Smith articulates this as a role ‘dependent on an interconnected network of important relationships and perceptions.’ In this respect, it has been useful to invoke the approach to understanding organisational culture developed by Edgar Schein. In his analysis of organisational culture, Schein defines the concept of group culture as ‘a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration.’ The dynamics of internal and external relationships are regarded as the key archetypal problems in the history and social evolution of organisational culture and are interdependent and intertwined. Schein’s approach to understanding the culture of a group is based on an analysis of three interrelated levels, which are arranged by the ‘degree to which the cultural phenomenon is visible to the observer.’ At the observable surface level of culture are ‘artifacts’—what Schein refers to as the ‘visible and feelable structures and processes.’ This is interpreted in this thesis as the formal task designations, or the division of labour of staff: the documented, concrete aspects of the post, or what is seen to be done. Schein’s analysis also recognises ‘espoused beliefs and values,’ at a second level, which are the ideals, goals, aspirations and ideologies of the workforce. This second level of culture is utilised to explore the ways in which the producer approached both artists and repertoire. The third aspect of Schein’s method, the ‘basic underlying assumptions,’ refers to the deepest aspects of cultural identity and the essential values of a group, which are non-negotiable and recognised by all. As Schein explains ‘to understand a group’s culture you must attempt

46 Erik Smith, letter to Christopher Raeburn, 17 February 1995, BL/RA.
48 Ibid., p.18.
49 Ibid., p.23ff.
to get at its shared basic assumptions and understand the learning process by which such basic assumptions evolve.’ This most fundamental aspect of culture—the collective goal—is reserved for the general conclusion to this thesis.

Part 3 looks at the practical applications of production through the use of four case studies in which Raeburn played a part. Here, as in the rest of the thesis, the focus is on opera, vocal music and relations with singers, which represent his core interests. The rationale behind the choice of the cases is that they are of intrinsic interest in their own right rather than promise representativeness, or defined by Robert Stake as ‘not a methodological choice, but an object to be studied.’

Following the comparative Raeburn-Decca chronology, the chapters are summarised thus:

Chapter One describes the early manifestation of the recording producer in the pre-war era as a so-called ‘artist manager,’ and the circumstances under which a schism between artistic and executive aspects of production evolved, which eventually settled the role of the studio producer. It considers how the A&R roles emerged through the personal qualities and interests of its staff, and the recruitment of a new generation of producers in 1957 under John Culshaw, including Erik Smith, Ray Minshull and Christopher Raeburn, to serve the demands of nascent stereo recording.

Chapter Two consists of a personal profile of Christopher Raeburn, his background in the theatre and his formative musical influences, particularly for opera. It describes the development of his interest in Austrian culture through his residency in Vienna and his research on early performance, his work as a music journalist and development of an influential network on which he drew as a Decca producer. It evaluates how these features informed his attitude to recording production.

Chapter Three offers a detailed analysis of the division of labour among Decca’s recording staff and a taxonomy of the studio producer’s role, based on the generic requirements derived from a close reading of Raeburn’s papers. It considers the formation of the Decca ‘team’ ethos and suggests possible reasons for its potential unravelling during the 1970s, due to a range of destabilising social and economic forces.

---

50 Ibid., p.32.
Chapter Four describes the subjective aspects of the producer’s role that were open to individual interpretation. Using Raeburn as the main case, it looks at how relations were brokered with artists to create ‘trust,’ particularly those with exclusive contracts and what kind of musical and philosophical synchronicity he shared with them. The chapter also considers the roles Raeburn took on outside the studio that had an impact on his recording decisions.

Chapters 5 and 6 consider the practical applications of a production philosophy in the form of case studies. They are prefaced in Chapter 5.1 with an exposition of Raeburn’s recording philosophy and how it contrasted with that of John Culshaw. This chapter section considers how Raeburn responded to the challenges of connecting the listener more fully to the studio performance. It examines whether the criticisms put forward in the theory of Walter Benjamin—that ‘mechanical production’ had tainted the unique relationship between the perceiver and the artwork by removing it from a specific time and place—were acknowledged by Raeburn, however tacitly. The case studies in Chapter 5 are, for the most part, presented in a narrative format. Section 5.2 considers the producer-artist relationship and examines Raeburn’s influence on Cecilia Bartoli’s early career and its significance for his own. The two smaller cases in Section 5.3 give accounts of how Raeburn negotiated working in collaborative audio-visual ventures in productions of Wagner’s operas at Bayreuth and for film, and raise the question of whether both Raeburn and Decca were prepared to compromise their production values. The study presented in narrative form in Chapter 6—the recording of Strauss’s *Der Rosenkavalier* with Georg Solti and the VPO in 1968–1969—was supported by the most complete documentary evidence of the process of recording for any project in Raeburn’s collection. The impression given, and certainly in the context of the archive, was that this recording had personal significance by Raeburn and exemplified best practice, and was therefore deemed worthy of reconstruction for this thesis.

In addition to providing a general conclusion to the key themes of this thesis, Chapter 7 completes the analytic model of organisational culture devised by Edgar Schein by examining the third and most fundamental level of Schein’s theory: the basic assumptions that condition and direct the cultural identity and practices of a group.

The appendices include a range of material that supports the main body of the text. These include comprehensive details of Raeburn’s recording and journalistic output, a chronology of Decca’s production staff, a commentary on the annotations made to Decca production scores, the title page created for the Raeburn Archive and thesis interview details. The aims, methodology, recruitment, data confidentiality and storage, and process
of obtaining consent for interviews were approved by the University of Sheffield Department of Music research ethics committee prior to approaching individuals for the thesis. All the participants were issued with consent forms, a project information sheet and a list of interview questions by email before the interview appointments took place. These documents included details of the objectives of the project, confirmation that their contributions would not be anonymised, data management arrangements and a statement of use of information provided for the thesis and for any subsequent publications and presentations arising from this research. All the interviewees gave their consent by email in the first instance and five completed forms were returned. The audio interviews were transcribed using both NVivo software and Microsoft Word. Permission to reproduce archival photographs of artists and recording sessions was received by email from Decca, and archival documents were reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board.
The following chronology presents a comparison between Raeburn’s life and work and key events in the history of Decca; particularly with matters that have a bearing on the subjects that this thesis explores. It has been compiled using sources referenced in the bibliography; particularly the Raeburn Archive, the papers and unpublished memoirs of Ray Minshull, the Philip Stuart Decca Classical discography (2014), an interview with Roy Wallace, (Malcolm Walker, 1996) and oral history interviews recorded for the thesis (2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Raeburn</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Decca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Christopher Walter Raeburn born in London (31 July), son of socialist barrister and judge Walter Raeburn and Dora Williams. Father’s family of German-Jewish background (formerly Regensburg). One of seven siblings.</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Barnett Samuel &amp; Sons (gramophone makers, musical instrument makers and wholesalers) floats under the name of the Gramophone Company. Col. E.D. Basden reconstructs the business and sale handled by Edward Lewis’s firm of stockbrokers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Edward Lewis becomes Managing Director.</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Purchase of Warner Brunswick Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Purchase of Warner Brunswick Ltd.</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Cyril Entwistle becomes Chairman. Founding of Decca Records Inc. in New York. Chairman: Edward Lewis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Harry Sarton becomes head of A&amp;R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1936–</td>
<td>Participant in plays and sketches devised by his father and his cousin, John Schlesinger.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936–1938</td>
<td>Visits Sadler’s Wells and attends first opera production (<em>Der Rosenkavalier</em>). Obtains recordings of Glyndebourne Festival at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Recordings made using ffrr technology (‘full-frequency range recording’).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946–1947</td>
<td>Musikvertrieb agrees to underwrite Decca recording costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>London Records (American Decca) founded in the US. Rosengarten signs contracts with the Vienna Octet and Georg Solti. Victor Olof promoted to full-time Decca music adviser. John Culshaw transfers to Artists’ department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Visits Salzburg Festival with family of Andrew Porter. First experience of the Vienna Philharmonic in <em>Die Zauberflöte</em> conducted by Furtwangler.</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Contract with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra begins (21 April), agreed the previous year. Contract with Renata Tebaldi. Decca adopts magnetic tape recording format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950–1951</td>
<td>Visitor to Glyndebourne Festival.</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Teldec (Telefunken Schallplatten-Decca) founded; terms negotiated by Maurice Rosengarten. Decca releases 12&quot; LP and 10&quot; MP formats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Contract with Mario Del Monaco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Applies for acting and arts administration roles, including the Westminster Theatre, RFH, and Glyndebourne. Private research on Mozart operas. Research visit to Vienna with introductions provided by Edward Dent to the head of Vienna Opera, and to musicologist Otto Erich Deutsch.</td>
<td>1953–1954</td>
<td>Development of the Decca 'Tree' spaced microphone array by Roy Wallace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1954</td>
<td>Applies for British Council Research award and a Leverhulme Scholarship for research in Germany and Austria on Mozart operas. Recommended for Leverhulme award by Deutsch. Unsuccessful applications for work at Decca, EMI, Collins Publishers, the Cambridge Theatre and Ibbbs and Tillett.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 May, 1954</td>
<td>Experimental stereo recordings made in Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar/Apr 1954</td>
<td>Joins Decca catalogue department. Also awarded Leverhulme Scholarship and offered British Council scholarship. Resigns from Decca.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Released 7” 45rpm record format.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Further European research trips; accompanies H.C. Robbins Landon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>John Culshaw assumes position of Manager, Classical A&amp;R. Erik Smith and Ray Minshull join Decca as producer and general assistant (January and October). First use of active stereo soundstage recording technique (branded as Sonicstage by marketing department from 1961). Distribution alliance with RCA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>First issue of classical EP record format.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Dec 1957</td>
<td>Invited by John Culshaw to join Decca’s recording team as an assistant producer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Argo, an independent record label founded by Harley Usill in 1951, becomes a division of The Decca Record Company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Decca headquarters move to Albert Embankment, SE11. Maurice Roach appointed Publicity and Advertising Manager on retirement of Francis Attwood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Records five operas in Rome as assistant producer (stereo team).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>First release of stereo recordings - ffss - (‘full frequency stereo sound’).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958–65</td>
<td>Recording of Wagner’s <em>Das Ring der Nibelungen</em> (Solti) in Vienna under direction of John Culshaw.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Supervises first opera: Strauss <em>Ariadne auf Naxos</em> for RCA in Vienna with Erich Leinsdorf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Contract with Joan Sutherland. Discontinued issue of 78rpm records.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Research on Count Almaviva’s aria from <em>Le nozze di Figaro</em>. Revised version (higher tessitura) recorded by Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau in 1964, Decca SXL 6490).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Nicolai Medal presented to Decca recording crew by Professor Otto Strasser ‘as a sign of thanks and appreciation from the Vienna Philharmonic.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Maurice Rosengarten appointed to the Board of Directors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Release of 10” stereo LP format.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Accompanies LSO on tour to Japan as freelance journalist. Takes sabbatical to complete book on Mozart from original research period in Vienna. Remains unfinished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Contract with Vladimir Ashkenazy. Final recording made simultaneously in mono and stereo with two independent recording teams (Ashkenazy/Rachmaninov Piano Concerto no. 2, Walthamstow [Stuart, &gt;1274]).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Returns to full-time production work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964–65</td>
<td>Roy Wallace develops first STORM multichannel modular mixer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Gives Deutsch more than 200 unpublished documents to include in Deutsch’s <em>Mozart, A Documentary Biography</em>. Writes controversial article on the original performing order of <em>Figaro</em> Act III with Robert Moberly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965–66</td>
<td>Decca buys Dolby A noise reduction system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>John Culshaw resigns to join the BBC. Ray Minshull appointed as Manager, Classical A&amp;R (7 August), reporting to Rosengarten. First regular recordings in North America (Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1960s</td>
<td>Decca 2-track recordings made with 4-track back-up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early 1970s</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trial of quadraphonic recording using a remote-controlled microphone array.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>World premiere demonstration in Berlin of the Teldec video disc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Made Senior Classical Recording Producer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>MTA Record Award for Best Concerto Record (Walton/Stravinsky – Chung/LSO/Previn).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Nominated for Grammy Award for Album of the Year (Schumann: <em>Faust</em>).</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Death of Maurice Rosengarten. Ray Minshull promoted to Director of Classical Recording. Peter Goodchild appointed Marketing Director. Resignation of engineer Gordon Parry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Nominated for Grammy Award for Best Opera Recording (<em>Cosi fan tutte</em>, Solti/LPO).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Becomes ‘Manager of Opera Production and Artistic Consultant to the Company and special additional responsibilities in Vienna.’ Visits Polydor International looking for career improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>John Culshaw offered position at Decca, but declines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Given control over all recording ventures in Vienna.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Outline of agreement between Decca and PolyGram made for acquisition of recording and music publishing activities (30 October).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>From the transfer of ownership of Decca to PolyGram, status altered to ‘Manager Opera Production,’ but job content remains unchanged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Dutch entertainment company, PolyGram N.V. (a subsidiary of Philips N.V.), buys Decca. Reinhard Klaassen appointed as Executive Chairman. Ray Minshull appointed as Executive Vice-Chairman. Decca headquarters relocates to Chiswick.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Closure of the New Malden factory (29 February). Production moves to Baarn, Netherlands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Decca Recording Centre opens in Belsize Road, NW6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Ray Minshull promoted to Executive Vice-President. Contract with András Schiff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Job title with PolyGram upon the company’s Transfer of Ownership is ‘Manager Opera Production.’</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Launch of compact disc (CD) recordings by PolyGram Group. Final recording in Kingsway Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Declines offer of position at ICM artists’ management to build roster of singers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Introduces Cecilia Bartoli to Decca.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Final recording in the Sofiensäle, Vienna. The Konzerthaus becomes Decca’s regular recording venue in Vienna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Adjudicator of the final audition of the Richard Tauber Prize.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Adjudicator for the Kathleen Ferrier Memorial Scholarship final audition.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Ray Minshull offered the Silver Decoration of Honour for services to the Province of Vienna, but declines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Makes final recording with the VPO (<em>Strauss Capriccio</em>).</td>
<td>McGill University, Montreal, confers the degree of Doctor of Music, <em>honoris causa</em>, on Ray Minshull.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Freelance Decca contract for supervision of all Bartoli recital recordings and operatic recordings in title role. Includes selecting repertoire, casting and overseeing post-production.</td>
<td>Ray Minshull retires. Evans Mirageas appointed as Executive Vice-President, A&amp;R, with remit to make 100 new recordings in his first year with a budget of £6m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Audio producer, Three Tenors Concert at Champ de Mars, Paris for Warner Music, conducted by James Levine.</td>
<td>The Seagram Company Ltd. (Canada) acquires PolyGram N.V. for US$10.6bn, to be merged with Seagram’s existing recorded music subsidiary, Universal Music Group, itself a unit of Universal Studios Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evans Mirageas resigns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–6</td>
<td>MIDEM Emile Berliner Lifetime Achievement Prize.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Makes final recording (<em>Maria [Malibran]</em>, with Cecilia Bartoli).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Receives the Special Achievement Award from <em>Gramophone</em> for fifty years enriching the classical music recorded catalogue. Adjudicator for Wigmore Singing Competition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Co-compiles a <em>Festschrift</em> for Graziella Scuitti as a fundraiser.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Dies at Ivinghoe, Buckinghamshire (18 February).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 1 The origins of the Decca producer

Chapter 1: The producer’s identity

1.1 Introduction

In 1970, John Culshaw, the head of music programming for the BBC, wrote:

I have never cared much for very old records, nor for the kind of person who
won’t collect anything recorded after 1930…the era that really interests me is
the one that began after World War II, when recording techniques began to
do justice to the sound of music, and the recording producer began to have a
voice in the land.

But the real revelation to me in terms of what could be done towards
production for records was of all things, an early CBS /Columbia LP album of
Porgy and Bess. I remember it had a credit—produced by Goddard
Lieberson—which may have been the first of its kind. I didn’t know who he
was, but I thought of him as a pioneer.

It took some critics quite a time to grasp the function of a record producer;
and it took some record companies even longer. Yet almost all great records
bear the mark of their producers, credited or uncredited.

The work of a good producer can be applied in terms of aural imagination
(perspectives and movements and the like in opera) or in terms of pure
musical judgment. A great producer like Walter Legge has molded [sic] and
indeed altered performances by many distinguished artists, not all of whom
are overgenerous in acknowledging their debt to him. It isn’t a question of
being a Svengali. A good producer has a conception of what the artist is
striving to achieve and tries to help him. A bad producer sits in the control
room and consigns music to tape without getting deeply involved musically or
technically.52

Culshaw’s article is an attempt to define the contribution made and the legacy created by
the individuals whose work and ‘dual enthusiasm’ is a bridge between the artist and the
listening public. This chapter aims to reveal the origins of the recording producer as a
separate and distinct role from the earliest days of the company. Connecting the general
public with the unseen, and in his opinion, under-appreciated work of the people behind
the microphone, was a recurring theme of Culshaw’s leadership during his years as Decca’s

52 John Culshaw, ‘Porgy Showed the Way to the Ring’, *High Fidelity* Vol. 20 No. 8 (August 1970), p.20. Culshaw is concerned that artists appear increasingly to ‘dictate classical recording policy’ by leading repertoire demands. The article also serves as a rebuke for the perceived insult from Deutsche Grammophon against Culshaw’s 1964 production of *Götterdämmerung* in anticipation of their recording under Karajan, produced by Otto Gerdes. Culshaw notes that Deutsche Grammophon regarded their 1970 production as the first to attempt to *produce* the opera for recordings.
Artists and Repertoire (A&R) manager and also that of his successor, Ray Minshull. Their frequent memoranda to A&R and editorial staff at Decca were attempts to establish and regulate the administration of recordings, particularly with regard to accreditation. Whether or not this was motivated by a personal publicity campaign, to protect and celebrate the work of the recording staff, or indeed to allow the public some connection with the process of recording, it was a far cry from Decca’s pre-World War II recording era, where credits were not transferred from recording information sheets systematically. Burkowitz suggests that companies maintained the anonymity of the recording team (and in some cases place and date of recording too) through a prolongation of what he refers to as ‘the old telecommunications authority tradition they had been exposed to all their professional lives’:

That tradition told them that the crew consisted of employees whose job is located behind the curtain and must not be spotlighted [...] It took a long time for them to realise that, in marketing reality, the specific acoustic climate of a hall and the sounding hand-writing of the team is a hidden but real value...Motion picture people were more progressive, following the plain motto: ‘why spend foolishly on constraining habits?’ They believed that if a project sells well all the people involved must have been good.54

Even in the 1980s, where Symes notes that the International Association of Sound Archives first prescribed a list of data with which to identify sound recordings, including technical credits, Ray Minshull, Decca’s director of A&R, was still struggling to establish a system of automatic crediting of all staff working directly with recorded sound.56 But more than either as a convenience for sound archivists or as an interesting ‘paratextual framing device,’57 the issue of attribution is a fundamental one to the identification of the role and function of recording staff, including the producer. Naming the contributors is an acknowledgement of the process of recording: the intervention of others in addition to the artist in the recording of a performance and a stake of their own professional reputation.

53 These were variously ‘Electrical Record of Session’, ‘Producers’ Record of Session’ and ‘Longsheets’.
55 Colin Symes, Setting the Record Straight, 2004, p.133.
56 See a series of internal memos sent by Minshull, 1987–1989, BL/RA. In at least one case, the decision to include recording editor credits was overridden by an unknown source further down the chain of production.
During the operation to create a full classical discography for Decca, not begun until 1979, a succession of independent researchers were allowed access to archival papers that enabled details of production credits to be assembled as a single document. Although recording personnel have been identified as ‘producer’ in some of Decca earliest recordings (specifically 1929 to 1944) and are manifest in the Stuart discography under this title, source material on which this thesis has drawn shows that these people were the artist managers or music supervisors: indeterminate titles indicating the lack of formal recognition and official scope of the job function. The discography asserts that ‘the art of the record producer was unknown in 1929 [the year of the foundation of the Decca Record Company], and scarcely possible before the advent of tape recording and studio playbacks.’ This suggests, as does Culshaw’s article, that the ‘modern’ manifestation and definition of the (successful) producer is dependent on certain technologies that enabled quick access to comparative recorded material to make a critical judgement, and that the producer must embrace the available technology to develop a reputation for creativity and competency. In the earliest days of electrical studio recordings, with a microphone driving the cutting stylus through an amplifier, the recording process was mechanical and unwieldy: the master was still a rotating blank of frangible wax, which afforded no possibility of playing back even once to assembled musicians, let alone repeatedly. But the role of the recording producer, as indicated by Culshaw, also requires an ability to understand and communicate with an artist based on practiced musical judgement and total engagement. Predicated on these essential conditions—technological expediency, open-mindedness on the uses of technology and a deep understanding of repertoire and its interpretative possibilities—this chapter presents a history of the development of the Decca producer, and traces the function of the artist manager.

58 Philip Stuart’s discography (2014) states that it is the cumulative work of Brian Rust, Malcolm Walker, Michael Gray and Stuart himself, with assistance from current and past Decca employees. Reference is made here particularly to the interviews with Decca personnel made for the British Library Oral History of Recorded Sound project, (in particular Bill Townsley, Frank Lee and Tom Stephenson) which are listed in the bibliography, and the unpublished memoirs of Victor Olof and Ray Minshull, also cited in the bibliography.

59 Philip Stuart, Decca discography, 2014. It also states that no engineers have been identified prior to 1937.

60 Information assembled from the Audio Engineering Society at <https://www.aes.org> [accessed 15 February 2017].
1.2 The early artist manager

The term artist manager and its variants recording supervisor and recording manager were used interchangeably and misleadingly in the 1930s and 1940s to refer to employees who had either overall managerial control of the artists’ department or who were engaged in the ‘supervision’ of recordings across all genres: jazz, popular and (nascent) classical. Decca’s earliest artist managers were Philip Lewis, John Gossage, Walter Yeomans, Hubert Foss, Frank Lee and Harry Sarton, and of these, Lewis, Lee and Sarton occupied the position of head of general A&R between 1930 and the late 1950s.

Artist managers brought to their job their musical interests and inclinations but rarely professional musical knowledge: while Lewis can be traced to predominantly jazz and dance-band repertoire as an auditioner and assembler or ‘fixer’ of musicians for recordings, both Yeomans and Foss were classical specialists and credited in Stuart (2014) with a small number of titles each. As a prominent pianist, conductor and first music editor of Oxford University Press, Foss’s association with Decca was chiefly to supervise recordings of William Walton’s music and was not in their direct employ, whereas Yeomans was a member of staff, having worked previously within the education department of The Gramophone Company and as a gramophone reviewer for Illustrated London News.

Yeomans’ credited recording work was exclusively with Henry Wood, but Stuart describes him as Decca’s ‘Music Director’ and is referenced in The Gramophone as an ‘authority on modern British music’ who had represented Decca at The Gramophone conference of 1938, alongside Decca’s ‘senior recorder,’ Arthur Haddy. Walter Yeomans was therefore Decca’s first exclusively classical music manager to combine an administrative remit and

---

64 For this reason and for his association with only three recordings between 1935 and 1937 (one ‘supervised by the composer’ [Walton]), Foss is not included in Appendix 2 timeline. Foss’ other appearances for Decca were as a piano accompanist.
67 ‘The Gramophone Conference’, The Musical Times Vol. 79 No. 1150 (December 1938), pp.941–943 DOI: 10.2307/923683 [accessed 24 March 2017]. Yeomans was speaking in succession to Fred Gaisberg on ‘the place of the gramophone in modern life’, and contributed to a discussion on expanding recorded repertoire to include more British composers. Haddy gave ‘an illustrated lecture on Modern Recordings.’
classical music specialism. Yeomans’ credited recordings are few, and it is unclear whether his recording supervision extended further than those for Henry Wood, or indeed the true scope of his creative input. As Victor Olof indicates\textsuperscript{68} that the conductor Boyd Neel supervised recordings of his orchestra, and Stuart\textsuperscript{69} contains several references to composers supervising recordings of their music, we might deduce that to make classical recordings in the pre-war era at Decca required three specific areas of expertise: an artist manager, who had agreed terms for the performer and the music but who was not necessarily present at the time of recording,\textsuperscript{70} a ‘recorder’, or engineer who controlled the recording apparatus, and a third, un credited person in a supervisory capacity who it is likely also doubled as a performer on the recording (or else a composer, arranger, conductor, or publisher) in possession of some theoretical knowledge of music, a personal connection with musicians or specific knowledge of repertoire. The exact nature of the supervision in these pre-war years cannot be fully known, although as Haddy states, there was some direction given to tempo, but not to dynamic.\textsuperscript{71} Given the technology at their disposal, the music supervisor’s function is likely to have been largely limited to checking that the content of the score was present on the recording and was free from human error.

1.3 Establishing a new order: the studio and executive producer

Harry Sarton and Frank Lee, Decca’s chief artist managers between 1930 and 1959, cut very different figures in their influence of the company’s classical recording activities. Sarton had been employed by Decca following the company’s acquisition of the jazz and blues label Brunswick records’ UK operation;\textsuperscript{72} Lee from HMV’s international artists’ department, under Fred Gaisberg, and from the English branch of commercial radio station Radio

\textsuperscript{68} Victor Olof, unpublished memoirs, Chapter 4 p.26.
\textsuperscript{69} Philip Stuart, Decca discography 2014 (passim).
\textsuperscript{70} In his memoirs, Victor Olof notes from his experience of recording for HMV in 1926 that the selection of musicians was usually dependent on the good judgement of the artist manager, but in his first recording for the company he was subjected to a twelve-person committee which included Fred Gaisberg and Sir Landon Ronald, and was surprised ‘how disturbed we were on this occasion, with the smoke-laden room and the incessant chatter that went on the whole time, even when we were playing.’ (1972, Chapter 2, p.16).
\textsuperscript{71} Arthur Haddy, British Library Oral History interview, 1983.
\textsuperscript{72} Sarton is described as ‘British Brunswick’s artist and repertoire man.’ (See Roberta Schwartz, \textit{How Britain Got the Blues: The Transmission and Reception of American Blues in the United Kingdom} 2007, p.29.)
Luxembourg.\textsuperscript{73} Charged with overall administrative responsibility, both men interpreted the role from different perspectives. While Sarton received widespread approval as a manager of uncommon diplomatic ability with artists of all musical genres,\textsuperscript{74} and was prepared to take advice where necessary on classical A&R matters, Lee was intent on exerting control over choice of repertoire and artists with little evident consultation. Neither Sarton nor Lee is indicated to have had a particularly nuanced personal knowledge of classical music. However, as can be noted from his 1984 interview, despite his self-confessed absence of practical musical ability or scholarship,\textsuperscript{75} Lee was neither lacking in musical opinion nor afraid to speak his mind. As a gramophone and radio enthusiast with an inclination towards dance band music, reflected in his preference for assembling bands and selecting their repertoire, Lee had, as Ray Minshull notes,\textsuperscript{76} little empathy for classical artists. Of the two, it was Sarton, a man with initiative and zeal, who had the greatest impact—crucially supported by Arthur Haddy—on the development of the role of the studio producer at Decca.

Decca’s classical recording activities during the World War II were modest, as is indicated by Stuart’s discography. With fewer than two hundred titles made during the war years—many of which have been listed by Stuart as unpublished—there was a strong emphasis on chamber ensembles recording from Decca’s West Hampstead studios, or with occasional visits to record the Bournemouth Municipal Orchestra in the relative safety of the south coast of England.\textsuperscript{77} Since becoming head of A&R in 1935 on the departure of Frank Lee (Lee’s first of two periods of employment with Decca), Sarton had signed contracts with leading British artists, including Clifford Curzon, Kathleen Long, Moura Lympney, Kathleen Ferrier, Benjamin Britten and Peter Pears,\textsuperscript{78} but the degree to which Sarton played an active or passive role in the choice of recording repertoire is unclear, and it might be assumed that this was influenced to a large extent by the repertoire with which...
the musicians identified themselves. As John Morris has shown, concert life was severely disrupted in London during the war, and the possibility of hearing and engaging orchestras for recordings was limited. However, towards the end of the war, and with the possibility of deploying Arthur Haddy’s newly-developed full frequency range recording system (fFRR) and his improved moving coil cutter, Sarton attended a concert given in London by the National Symphony Orchestra, with a view to developing orchestral repertoire on disc. As a venture initiated by the wealthy amateur conductor Sidney Beer, the orchestra was formed after the disbanding of the BBC Salon Orchestra, which had as its chairman Victor Olof, a professional violinist and conductor. Olof, who had accepted the position of manager of Beer’s new orchestra on the condition that he was made assistant conductor, wrote:

Harry Sarton, the Artist Manager, impressed with this new orchestra, quickly got in touch with us to sign a contract, and Tchaikovsky’s Fifth Symphony was duly recorded at the Kingsway Hall...This was the first big classical recording session that Deca had undertaken with their new system and it was musically supervised by Boyd Neel, who was unable to attend the following session due to a prior engagement. On Sarton consulting Beer who should take his place, the latter replied ‘Mr. Olof. He knows more about it than anyone!’

1.4 Artistic influence: Victor Olof

According to Olof, the adventitious recording session, made in the afternoon of 8 June 1944 when Boyd Neel was indisposed, demonstrated to engineering director, Arthur Haddy, that there was a need for a contractual arrangement with a suitably experienced individual if

---

80 See Harvey Schwarz, British Library Oral History interview, 1983. Schwarz, a colleague of Haddy’s in Decca Navigation, gives details on the fFRR increased bandwidth system, extended to 14 kHz ‘to sound more natural.’
81 Details of Sarton’s attendance at the concert are given in the unpublished memoirs of Victor Olof, chapter 4, pp.24–26. A note in the Stuart discography (2014) says that ‘On 8 June 1945 Decca announced that its fFRR (full frequency range recording) system had been “in daily use for the last twelve months.”’
82 Victor Olof, unpublished memoirs, chapter 4, p.26. The recording sessions supervised by Victor Olof were held on 8 June 1944 (see Philip Stuart, Decca discography 2014, >0290. No production credit is given, but the engineer is named as Kenneth Wilkinson). Therefore Olof’s testimony corroborates Stuart in that Decca first used fFRR technology in 1944.
Decca was to make a concerted start in creating a catalogue of orchestral music. The role of a paid music supervisor with knowledge of repertoire and performance practice together with managerial experience of musicians also had a number of other potential benefits. It provided Haddy with the perfect foil to his notion of delimiting the role of the engineer to purely technical matters. And it ensured or enhanced the possibility of more reliably accurate performances and attention to detail (particularly with regard to observing dynamics and instrumental balance) that would display the ffrr recording system to its best advantage. In 1944, Sarton was also possibly aware of the plans of EMI’s head of recording, Walter Legge, to form a recording orchestra, and not to be outdone, saw the partnership of Olof and the National Symphony Orchestra as a future equivalent ‘house orchestra.’

As a seasoned concert and recording musician, conductor and chamber music impresario of an eponymous orchestra, Olof’s connections in professional music circles, broadcasting and recording were wide-reaching. He appears to have found his first recording session as a supervisor compatible with his skills and experience as a practicing musician:

Arthur Haddy, Decca chief engineer, was much impressed with my musical knowledge so Harry Sarton asked me if I would supervise all their future recordings on a part-time basis. I happily accepted as I found the work extremely interesting and I was able to apply all my experience and knowledge of the wide field of music to my job. This stood me in good stead when discussing the balance and interpretation of the work in hand with artists and conductors, who valued my opinion even if they did not share it!

Sarton employed Olof on a part-time basis until 1947 (whereupon he became a full-time ‘music adviser’), and took on a further musically-trained assistant artist manager, Terence Gibbs, as the number of recording sessions increased. Olof describes Sarton as having ‘a great flair for his job, both in the classical and pop fields,’ and who took the initiative to invite foreign conductors to the studio following their first post-war appearances in the London Philharmonic Orchestra’s 1946–1947 concert series. This, Olof says, ‘gave Decca

---

84 Walter Legge founded the Philharmonia Orchestra. In his memoir On and Off the Record p.91, it is noted that the orchestra ‘was not...formed specifically for a “very special purpose” of recording. Neither did EMI encourage its formation.’ However David Patmore (PhD thesis, 2001, p.267) suggests that EMI was heavily involved financially in the formation of the Philharmonia, which was dependent to a high degree on the recording fee it received from EMI. Patmore also notes (ibid., p.99) the parallels with the formation of the LPO and RPO by Sir Thomas Beecham and their reliance on recording for additional income and as a means of attracting the best instrumentalists.
86 Ibid., p.33.
great prestige and laid the foundation for their international catalogue and contributed to the incentive to record with these artists in Europe, first with the Amsterdam Concertgebouw Orchestra with Eduard van Beinum and then to Geneva, Zurich and Milan. Sarton accompanied these recording trips to make administrative arrangements, while Olof was left to assess the orchestras and artists. In Milan he was presented with a ‘conglomeration of artists, all famous in their day and now past the zenith of their careers’ but Olof did not make contractual decisions for artists, nor was he expected to search for new talent: he was employed by Sarton to guide and support musicians in their aspirations for recording, to guarantee that every bar of the score had been recorded, and to share playbacks of test pressings (and eventually with tape after its appearance at Decca in 1949) so that musical and interpretative re-adjustments could be made and a final master could be approved, which Olof indicates was essentially a joint decision between himself and the artist.

It was not until he was employed on a full-time basis that Olof was given the authority to search for new, and particularly young artists, and make a contribution to developing repertoire. It is clear from Olof’s memoirs that his relationship as a recording supervisor with conductors was predicated on his need to be seen as an equal musical partner in the recording situation: he was at pains to establish his status as a musician and qualified to make judgements on their performance as neither an administrator nor a recording engineer were equipped to make. His first meetings with conductors were hallmarked by mutual evaluation, as Olof notes of Josef Krips:

My rapport with Josef was immediate: ‘But you are such a good musician!’ he declared at our first session together, and from then on he was always ready to listen to any comments—critical or otherwise—that I had to offer.

On meeting Erich Kleiber, Olof’s reaction was the same:

Although I was particularly keen to meet him, I was in some trepidation as he had a reputation of being a complete egoist, a martinet and very difficult to please...I was faced with a short, stocky man, stern and brusque in manner, who eyed me up and down as if to sum up my capabilities.

---

87 Ibid., p.33. Sarton had invited conductors Ernest Ansermet, Eduard van Beinum, Charles Münch and Víctor de Sabata. Ray Minshull (unpublished memoirs, 1995), also describes ‘the stimulus of Sarton’s leadership’ as having a major influence on Decca’s post-war success in launching the LP.

88 Ibid., p.58.

89 Ibid., p.34.

90 Ibid., p.65.
However, during our discussion, he discovered that I was a fully-trained musician and could meet him on his own ground and he visibly relaxed.

‘You are unusually well informed, Mr. Olof!’ he conceded, and from then on treated me with great respect. ⁹¹

With other artists, too, Olof showed a need to establish himself as the ultimate arbiter of musical standards, resenting artists whose levels of perfectionism competed with his own and who attempted to force his hand during recording. The baritone Gérard Souzay was ‘particular almost to the point of fussiness’ ⁹² and complained that he sounded too distant, or that his upper register sounded breathy, or that he didn’t sound as if he was conveying the ‘right mood’. Conversely, Olof could complain that the artist was not focused enough on details: the pianist Eileen Joyce was chided for her prioritisation in creating an exciting atmosphere in her performance at the expense of musical accuracy. ⁹³

By employing a professional musician in Olof, Sarton had established clear separation between his role as overall A&R manager and with the recording supervisor, and defined the supervisor’s job as a musical-critical role. It also reinforced a reputation for Decca for high musical integrity alongside its pioneering approach to technical development. Olof’s pride in his superior knowledge and experience made him, in his opinion, indispensable to high-profile artists whose confidence he gained, but there is little evidence to suggest he coveted a senior executive role in recording decisions. Olof’s memoirs indicate that his relationship with Sarton was warm and respectful, although the evidence is ambiguous as to who took responsibility for managing the increasing volume of post-war recordings through the allocation of new staff. Olof credits himself with the appointment of John Culshaw as an assistant:

I was so hard-pressed that when a young man appeared in my office asking if I had any position to offer him, I gave him an attentive ear...Bored with his work [in the publicity department] he admitted to being a music-lover and although confessing to no musical education, I took him on as a trainee assistant as I needed help badly. ⁹⁴

Culshaw claims, however, that it was Sarton who arranged for him to take the recording sessions that Olof and Gibbs were unable to cover. ⁹⁵ The only other A&R recruits appointed

⁹¹ Ibid., p.67.
⁹² Ibid., p.61.
⁹³ Ibid., p.62.
⁹⁴ Ibid. pp.77–78.
⁹⁵ See John Culshaw, Putting the Record Straight, 1981, pp.63–64.
during Olof’s period at Decca were practising musicians (the Australians James Walker and Peter Andry), supporting the notion that Olof saw the role as being most suited to those with professional knowledge of music.

1.5 Executive power: Maurice Rosengarten

In his interview for the British Library, Arthur Haddy, Decca’s technical director and recording engineer, describes that soon after the war he accompanied Harry Sarton on a reconnaissance tour of Europe to look for recording material with the hope of building a catalogue with European artists, during which time they paid a visit to Maurice Rosengarten, a Swiss-based businessman with an eclectic portfolio of interests. In addition to his being a wartime licencee and distributor of Decca-Brunswick records, he had founded the Musikvertrieb company in 1935, which included a jukebox distribution arm and a talent management agency, which Minshull notes had important consequential rights in Germany and Austria. Haddy says of their visit:

During the war, Rosengarten had a small factory in Switzerland and he imported Brunswick records of Bing Crosby and these people. And he copied them and issued them to the Swiss market and he kept the Decca name alive… And he loved this business of artists, and he had great flair and could select artists and a cast that didn’t fight among themselves.

Culshaw explains that Rosengarten was keen for Decca to record in Europe and was prepared to underwrite the costs of recording in exchange for royalties from sales, which Decca’s director Edward Lewis accepted. According to Minshull, Rosengarten managed

96 See Billboard, 15 August 1960 p.72, 20 April 1963 p.43 and 31 October 1960 p.90 for details of Rosengarten’s business activities.
98 British Library Oral History interview, 1983. It is unclear from Haddy’s interview whether the initiative for the visit to Zurich came from Decca or on the invitation of Maurice Rosengarten. Through Harry Sarton’s decision for Decca to record visiting European conductors in London in 1946-1947 in advance of recording outside the UK, it is possible that Sarton shared some of the responsibility for Decca’s European expansion. Olof also states (1972, p. 57) that it was Sarton who had arranged a long programme of recording in Geneva, Zurich and Milan in 1947. Ray Minshull’s papers suggest that Rosengarten, described as a then small-time businessman (a bicycle dealer), approached Edward Lewis in 1936 to distribute Decca-Brunswick records. There may also have been a connection between Sarton’s management of Brunswick records on its transfer to Decca in 1932 and Musikvertrieb’s Brunswick import activity.
100 Ibid. p. 90, 1995. Rosengarten founded Musica Vienna and Decca Dischi and negotiated the arrangements between Telefunken Schallplatten and Decca in 1950 to form the Teldec record company based in Hamburg. See also <https://www.musikvertrieb.ch> [accessed 26 February 2017].
Decca’s recording contracts through a network of European companies and business partnerships over which he had complete control and which connected Decca’s interests, but which were concealed from those involved in making the recordings. As Haddy also remarks, Rosengarten was able to influence the direction of Decca’s post-war recording because there were no exchange controls for Swiss currency as there were elsewhere in Europe:

...[H]e had Swiss Francs, which was the only free currency. He could get what artists he wanted with Swiss Francs—all the big German people, like Knapperstbusch—artists flocked to him—Swiss Francs. Lewis realised that he [the chairman, Edward Lewis] didn’t own the Decca classical catalogue—Rosengarten owned it.101

As a consequence, Decca signed exclusive contracts with Georg Solti, the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, Renata Tebaldi, Mario Del Monaco, Ernest Ansermet, the Orchestre de la Suisse Romande and the Stuttgart Chamber Orchestra with Rosengarten’s finance and support. Rosengarten had therefore established himself as Decca’s offshore negotiator for classical artists’ contracts, and as can be understood from Minshull, he also controlled repertoire plans for artists in order to broker recording deals.102 Olof also comments that Rosengarten promoted Decca’s advantages in recording technology as leverage to contract Europe’s most prominent musicians, including the pianist Wilhelm Backhaus, on account of his wanting to trial Decca’s ffrr recording system.103

Rosengarten took an unorthodox position in Decca as a second executive controller, specifically of European classical A&R to Sarton’s overall executive management of all genres, but the arrangement emphasised the lack of a specific artist manager responsible for all Decca’s classical recordings. Decca’s classical organisation—and certainly its output in Britain—was still the junior and dependent partner in the company’s total recorded releases. This arrangement worked while Rosengarten, Sarton and Olof had a mutual understanding of each other’s positions at Decca, but on Sarton’s death in 1951, the new (and returning) Decca artist manager, Frank Lee, re-interpreted the role to which he was recruited.

1.6 The dynamics of Decca’s A&R in the 1950s

Frank Lee’s early Decca career had focused on assembling popular and middle-of-the-road recordings and creating ‘packaged’ musical excerpts for Decca-sponsored broadcasts on BBC radio and French radio, but he claims in his interview for the British Library that his return to Decca in 1951 was dependent on his being given full responsibility for all genres of music. Since he had left Decca in 1935, the artists’ department had undergone radical change. It had acquired a senior classical recording supervisor with professional musical knowledge (Victor Olof), two further recording supervisors: one trained in music (Terence Gibbs), one self-taught (John Culshaw), and an effective external executive A&R manager who financed Decca’s classical recording activity (Maurice Rosengarten). By 1951, the company had also trebled its British classical recording output and established a European presence.

It is apparent from his British Library interview that Lee harboured ambitions to marry the executive function of his position as head of Decca’s A&R department with the role of the studio ‘producer’ in its most creative and conceptual sense, and as far as non-classical repertoire was concerned he showed a high degree of skill and ingenuity. For Decca’s popular recordings, Lee worked directly with music arrangers to create ‘new sounds’ for his artists, suggesting orchestrations that he felt would catch the public’s attention. He developed novel, commercial ways of presenting recordings by directing Decca engineers to fade in and out sound effects to frame music tracks, possibly a technique Lee had retained from his experience in commercial radio. But Lee also attempted to produce ad hoc classical recordings too, which served to underline the sometimes facile nature of his A&R decisions and which undercut the functions of the A&R staff. Lee was evidently aware that his interference in studio matters risked the opprobrium of technical director and studio manager Arthur Haddy, hence his decision to carry these out when Haddy was working on recordings abroad, as Lee notes:

When I got [back to Decca] I realised we’d got no ballet music, only ballet from opera, and I’d seen [Les] Patineurs, and I thought we must have


106 Based on comparisons drawn from pre-and post-war recordings shown in the Philip Stuart-Decca discography, 2014.

107 Lee worked with arranger Roland Shaw on orchestrations for Mantovani (see British Library Oral History interview, 1984).
Patineurs...and we’d put Le Cid on the back. So when Haddy was away, I said to Arthur [Lilley] ‘Let’s get the LSO and go down to Kingsway Hall, and go down and record Patineurs.’ I said ‘Patineurs is very good, but Le Cid is a bit exciting at the end—what I think we should do is to turn down the quiet bits and pull up the loud bits...So if I get the score and indicate’...and Haddy said to me, don’t get up to those tricks...  

Under Lee’s management of Decca’s classical A&R, the high-profile contracts of Kathleen Ferrier and Benjamin Britten were re-negotiated, but it is clear from Lee himself that many of these contracts were dependent (perhaps grudgingly) on Victor Olof’s advice as much as they were on his own decision-making. His combination of strong but unsophisticated personal opinion in managing the classical A&R organisation appears to have been resented deeply among the other A&R staff, and Lee’s relationship with Victor Olof and John Culshaw is central to the changes in Decca’s classical A&R executive management during the 1950s.

It can be understood from an aggregated reading of Culshaw, Olof, Lee and Minshull  

that Olof, Culshaw and Lee took issue with each other’s handling of Decca’s classical A&R affairs, but their opinions of each other’s motives are somewhat contradictory and create a confusion of personal politics. Lee, for instance, believed that Culshaw harboured feelings of inferiority in musicianship in the presence of Olof’s experience, but Olof only admits to finding Culshaw overly-ambitious and impatient to supervise recordings with major artists, which as senior recording supervisor, Olof felt was his prerogative. Minshull describes Culshaw as having little confidence in Lee’s leadership, yet Culshaw himself makes no direct indictment of Lee’s management. Culshaw is very clear, however, in his recognition that Olof refused to accept Lee’s authority. In a further convolution, Minshull also reveals that Maurice Rosengarten and Edward Lewis held their own partisan views on the relative strengths of the A&R staff, with Rosengarten favouring Olof, and Lewis supporting Frank Lee. This complex situation created a period of great instability for Decca’s classical organisation. John Culshaw resigned in 1953 and was subsequently reinstated in 1955, and Victor Olof resigned in 1956, leading to a depletion of Decca’s studio production team.  

At this juncture, Culshaw assumed Olof’s position on the A&R staff,  

---

108 Ibid.  
110 In the interim period, Culshaw was employed by Capitol. See John Culshaw, *Putting the Record Straight*, 1981, pp.120–127.  
111 In his memoirs (p.133), Olof chooses to circumvent the nature of his resignation, citing that ‘for various reasons concerning the management, I had been unhappy in my job for some time, although
and resolved to wrest executive control of Decca’s A&R classical policy from Frank Lee’s general management. Lee, however, retained his nominal position until the early 1960s. At this hiatus, the company looked to recruit new staff to supervise its classical recording programme.

Decca’s adoption of experimental stereo recording in 1954 had created the need for two separate teams of engineers to take part in a single recording session in which mono and stereo were recorded independently. As Minshull notes, the notion of the double recording team emphasised the shortage of music staff, and by 1957 the need to expand the A&R department became critical as only John Culshaw and James Walker were permanently employed. The shortage of production staff was further exacerbated by a new recording and distribution alliance with RCA which generated further work for Decca, won from EMI in 1957 by Edward Lewis. The ensuing recruitment drive highlighted the parallel system of A&R management under Lee and Culshaw, with both men hiring staff independently of each other: Culshaw appointed Erik Smith and Christopher Raeburn, while Lee engaged Ray Minshull. Although this was managerially unsatisfactory, it enabled twice the number of people to be inducted into the processes of recording, and was, as Minshull says, a good time to join the industry.

1.7 The producer as critic: John Culshaw and his protégés

Regardless of the authority on which they were engaged, the new recruits to Decca’s A&R department in 1957 represent a significant departure in terms of the scope of their competencies when compared to the incarnation of the producer during the time of Victor Olof. These new staff incumbents—Erik Smith, Ray Minshull and Christopher Raeburn—were primarily trained and experienced in permutations of languages, music journalism and publishing as music ‘enthusiasts,’ but not as professionally-trained and practicing musicians.

musically I was fully extended and content.’ Peter Andry, recruited to Decca’s classical A&R department in 1953, also resigned in 1956.

112 Culshaw notes that he was not officially appointed to Olof’s job, but it was assumed that he would take his role. See Putting the Record Straight, p. 141.

113 Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1995

114 Minshull notes (ibid.) that his hiring by Frank Lee was regarded by John Culshaw as a highly provocative move. Culshaw demanded to interview Minshull in Vienna to confirm his appointment (the interview did not take place). Minshull also notes that Michael Williamson, who had been a freelance producer for Decca in 1956, was promoted to a permanent staff position, probably by Frank Lee (although the details of his engagement are not clear).

115 Ibid.
Culshaw possibly regarded this group as having skills that complemented his own, who could bring diverse cultural interests and opinions, and whose linguistic facility would assist the company’s commitment to expanding its continental recording programme.

According to Culshaw, the company bore the hallmarks of a feudal system that was founded on the spirit of risk and enterprise of its chairman, Edward Lewis. Lewis, he says, presided over an empire built on ‘the combination of discipline and freedom...one was ‘under orders’ to complete a certain task, but precisely how it was done...was left to those in the field.’ Evans Mirageas concurs with Culshaw in his description of Decca as ‘a personal fiefdom of Edward Lewis and Maurice Rosengarten until their deaths.’ Lewis himself explains that the company’s very existence owed much to the possibility of making investment decisions and raising capital ‘at a moment’s notice,’ without let or hindrance from pre-war banking regulatory bodies, because ‘unless we get back to the freedom of enterprise, when men can decide to risk their capital as they will, where lies the future industrial wealth of this country?’ Within a company culture lacking rigid orthodoxies, staff were encouraged to pursue ventures outside their ordinary work—a policy that filtered down to employees at all levels—and in addition to his demonstrations of Decca products, Culshaw took to lecturing for the Workers Educational Association and for the extra-mural departments of Oxford and London Universities. Lewis also created the conditions under which staff could initiate their own projects without seeking top-level managerial approval, an example of which we see in the brief appearance of a music magazine—‘not a record magazine, not an advertising medium for Decca, but a real music magazine that would sell on the bookstalls and by subscription’—as a spontaneous idea of the publicity manager, Francis Attwood, to which Culshaw was appointed as editor.

The spirit of personal enterprise and independence might be seen to manifest itself in individuals who had come to Decca from the world beyond recording and musicology. By contrast, the company’s European rivals, Deutsche Grammophon and Philips, recruited their recording production staff largely from the German Tonmeister training system, which

---

116 Minshull writes (ibid.) that for Culshaw, foreign languages ‘were things he respected rather than used.’
118 Ibid.
119 Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016. Evans Mirageas succeeded Ray Minshull at Decca as senior vice president, A&R in 1994, having previously worked at WFMT Radio Chicago, and for the Boston Symphony Orchestra.
121 Ibid., pp.61–62.
had been developed by Erich Thienhaus at the Detmold Music Academy in 1949. The model for the Tonmeister concept has its origins in the school for ‘soundmen’ proposed by Arnold Schoenberg in 1946, whose training in music and acoustic science would enable practitioners to ‘control and improve the sonority of recordings, radio broadcasting and of sound films.’ This rigorous German programme conflated the role of the producer and the recording engineer, giving the student ‘an understanding of the acoustical properties of the studio, stage or concert hall, the technical realization of the recording or transmission and the artistic direction of the performance.’ The Tonmeister model created a homogenous, professional workforce with capabilities across all the aspects of recording and production, but its balance of theoretical and practical instruction did not align with the entrepreneurial or instinctive thinking that Decca encouraged, out of which John Culshaw had developed his career. The company’s technical director and head of studio operations, Arthur Haddy, believed that role specialisation was the key to ensuring the quality and expediency of the final product and to militate against ‘muddled thinking.’ Culshaw, too, concurred with Haddy—doubtlessly influenced by his conspicuous authority on such things—that the notion of the producer assisting at the mixing desk was illogical and impossible:

The idea, prevalent still in Germany, that the music man, or producer, should himself handle the controls is, in my opinion, absurd. It is impossible to read a score and several meters at the same time: it is impossible to exercise musical and technical judgment at one and the same instant. The concept of the Tonmeister, as he is called, is a typically German invention, and more often than not the occupant of that exalted position turns out to be a frustrated conductor who has been shrewd enough to pick up a smattering of technical knowledge and so find a way to earn a living.

It is in Culshaw that we see the producer in the most complete autodidactic form: a man without formal further education in any subject and according to Minshull, and yet also described by him as a man of intelligence and tenacity, driven by opportunistic

---

122 As explained by Günther Breest in Remy Louis, (ed.), Deutsche Grammophon: State of the Art, 2009, p.196. Breest describes his role at Deutsche Grammophon as ‘a producer with assigned artists’ in which his responsibilities were for ‘the planning and actual recording of projects as recording supervisor’ and also as ‘a recording engineer at the same time.’


124 According to the Eric-Thienhaus-Institut at Detmold, the tonmeister system trained students in mathematics, physics, acoustics, electronics, instrumental training, ear training, composition, theory and history of music. See <https://www.eti.hfm-detmold.de> [accessed 28 March 2017].


ambition. Culshaw’s musical education by his own hand is described in his memoir _Putting the Record Straight_ as a form of solace in wartime, conducted under primitive conditions with limited resources, and the means by which he intended to carve out a post-war career in music journalism, broadcasting or recording. Culshaw’s self-education in music took the form of his studying scores in tandem with recordings where they were available (and indeed when finances allowed), and submitting his opinions and research to music magazines in which he found eventual success in _The Gramophone_. Andrew Blake suggests that producers with a background such as Culshaw’s were ‘trained’ in musical appreciation, rather than through the formal university syllabus of performance and composition, which promoted musical conservatism due to the limits of recorded repertoire available to study.\(^\text{127}\) This created, Blake argues, a recording policy limited to ‘a museum repertoire of a relatively small number of recognised “masterpieces” from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.’ But the determination shown by Culshaw in acquiring knowledge of music and performance led to the formation of a wide range of interests and strongly-held opinions as the range of his published writing on individual composers and music history attests. The aim in his _A Century of Music_, he notes, was to project his own subjective opinions on what he terms the development of creative musical thought and the evolution of contemporary music:

> There are other similar books, and one or two of them confine themselves to facts without opinions and are consequently objective and unprejudiced: the remainder claim to be objective and unprejudiced; this one is neither, because in the last resort it is not facts and figures that encourage the listener to think about the music he is hearing.\(^\text{128}\)

Therefore, by being ‘subjective’ and ‘prejudiced’, Culshaw derived the impetus to campaign for his musical interests and preferences to be considered for recordings. Culshaw himself attests that his complete recording of Wagner’s _Ring_ was driven by ‘a producer and a first engineer devoted to Wagner,’\(^\text{129}\) but its realisation was ultimately determined by the authority of Edward Lewis and Maurice Rosengarten.


\(^\text{128}\) John Culshaw, _A Century of Music_, 1952.

\(^\text{129}\) John Culshaw, _The Ring Resounding_, 2012, eBook, loc. 71–107. Culshaw’s mention of a ‘first engineer’ is Gordon Parry. In his British Library interview, Haddy is somewhat disapproving of Parry’s musical enthusiasms, as he did not maintain an engineer’s required level of neutral disinterest.
In his work, Culshaw displays traits that sociologist Robert Stebbins refers to as ‘occupational devotion,’ which he describes as ‘a unique combination of strongly-seated cultural values: success, achievement, freedom of action, individual personality and activity in the form of work.’ It is through this, Stebbins says, that the devotee is able to find occupational fulfilment in exercising a combination of their personal enthusiasms and paid employment. In the 1950s, the job of the recording producer was, as was discussed earlier in this chapter, largely unidentifiable outside the industry itself, while being uncodified and undefined from within. As a relatively new field, the number of workers on a global scale was also small. But Culshaw’s energetic pursuit of musical knowledge and exercise of critical opinion provided a valid model for the role. Indeed, Culshaw and Christopher Raeburn only became aware of the possibility of channeling their enthusiasm for music into a job within the studio after they had been recruited first to Decca’s publicity department. Ray Minshull’s entrée to the company as a general A&R assistant was achieved by direct contact, having written to Decca’s correspondence address as it appeared on LPs sleeves. The notion of the ‘opportunistic’ A&R appointment has had its detractors, including those from within Decca. Andrew Cornall, a colleague of Minshull and Raeburn who joined the company in 1976, describes this earlier period thus:

I think the time that the Minshulls and the Raeburns in the 50s and early 60s was almost at times—and I say this with total respect—as a sort of dilettante period: it was an interest that you wanted to pursue rather than having a skill that you had learned or been taught before you went in there.

This somewhat provocative view of the Culshaw era of production is due in part to Cornall’s training in electronic music, composition and recording at the universities of Manchester and East Anglia, revealing a certain tension between formalised learning and self-education in music and associated disciplines, but it is also perhaps attributable to what Stebbins refers to as the ‘transformation of meaning of “amateur,”’ which he says seems to have occurred ‘as professionals begin to dominate a field pioneered by amateurs:’

Amateurs...are defined in one sense as devotees who love a particular activity: in another sense, however, they are considered superficial.

---

131 Ibid., p.2.
132 As described by Minshull in his unpublished memoirs, 1995.
133 Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.
participants—dilettantes or dabblers. Dilettantes, on the other hand, are defined, in the first sense, as lovers of the arts and, in the second, as people with discrimination or taste. Consider also the logical difficulties posed by yet another sense of the word ‘amateur’—that is, the inexperienced person—and the patent fact that devotees of an activity quite naturally put in much time at it, thereby achieving remarkable competence.¹³⁵

By giving his protégés free rein to continue their musical interests outside Decca, Culshaw ignited the department with an atmosphere of scholarly creativity. Such activity, no doubt, gave credibility to Decca’s A&R team with artists and inspired them to conduct rigorous pre-recording research.

Culshaw had appointed Erik Smith directly to the position of assistant producer for stereo recordings from a job at Universal Edition tenured both in Vienna and London. Smith had studied German and French at Cambridge University and although was by his own admittance a ‘more or less self-educated musician,’¹³⁶ he came to Culshaw’s attention from the recommendation of the pianist Julius Katchen, with whom Decca had recorded intermittently since 1947. Katchen had worked with Smith’s father, the German conductor Hans Schmidt-Isserstedt, with whom Culshaw had negotiated a contract during his employment at Capitol.¹³⁷ Although Smith did not spend his formative years with his father and had not benefited from any musical influence,¹³⁸ Culshaw considered Smith’s musical credentials to be excellent.¹³⁹ Like Christopher Raeburn, who will be examined in the following chapter, Smith was a devotee of Mozart and wrote musicological pieces for journals, reviews and sleeve notes for recordings, in some instances based on his own research from Urtext material which he conducted in addition to his production work.¹⁴⁰ Smith, uniquely at the time, also contributed his own orchestrations, arrangements and completions, some of which were recorded by Decca.¹⁴¹

Minshull had been a student of languages at the University of Sheffield, and had also taken music as a supplementary degree there, but had planned a career in journalism following his studies and National Service. Although he initially accepted a job with a north London newspaper, he was concerned that his qualifications would result in the expectation

¹³⁵ Ibid., p.57.
¹³⁸ Ibid., p.115.
¹³⁹ Ibid., p.142.
¹⁴⁰ Smith’s book, Mostly Mozart, 2005, contains many of his own articles that analyse Mozart’s compositional methods.
¹⁴¹ Erik Smith, Mostly Mozart, 2005, pp.73–74. Smith gives details of incomplete works by Mozart that he finished or arranged that were recorded for the series of dances made in 1964–1966.
of his becoming the paper’s music journalist, which would, he said, have been unbearable. He had thus made approaches to Decca, EMI and Philips in the hope of securing a position in which he could possibly utilise his ability to read a score and make use of his formal musical training. However, at his initial meeting with Frank Lee, Lee made Minshull aware that Decca had no interest in further education qualifications. The impression created by reading Minshull’s memoirs is of someone lacking self-confidence but of acute self-awareness, who set his own standards impossibly high. His musical education, perhaps, made him more aware of convention than either Smith or Raeburn, or indeed Culshaw himself, which inhibited his ability in self-expression. He suggests that unless one had the creative genius of George Bernard Shaw then music journalism offered limited opportunities, and while John Culshaw and his peers at Decca wrote pieces for the press regularly on the process of recording and on musicological subjects, Minshull contributed only a small number of sleeve notes and appears to have made no journalistic offerings to publications. Mirageas describes Minshull as a man of very strong opinions, yet he evidently craved approbation for his ability to express himself from Culshaw, and Culshaw was gracious enough to give Minshull his support.

However, the approval of Culshaw’s management style by his department stops short of unanimity and was dependent, as Minshull’s memoirs state, on whether staff were considered to be members of his close circle; what Minshull refers to as the ‘Culshaw mould.’ According to Minshull, Culshaw’s favour was not evenly distributed and omitted producers James Walker, Michael Williamson and (later) Michael Bremner, but no further explanation of their exclusion is given. Culshaw’s closest associates at Decca—Erik Smith, Ray Minshull and Christopher Raeburn—offered what Minshull and Raeburn describe as unquestionable publicly-expressed support of his management, despite Culshaw’s selectivity in the length of their probationary periods. Minshull’s opinion is that Culshaw was able to stimulate the self-confidence of his staff in the same way he did for artists, and Raeburn notes that ‘to work with John was a pleasure…he was very good natured, extremely good company and he would be interested in ideas and suggestions from any of...

---

142 Interview recorded by Evans Mirageas for WFMT Radio Chicago, 1985.
143 Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1995. Minshull recounts that Lee wanted to establish that Minshull could read music, but did not have the skills himself to prove Minshull’s competency.
144 Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016.
145 In his memoirs, Minshull describes writing sleeve notes to Kertész’s recording of Dvořák Symphony no. 8 in 1963, after having been moved by Kertész’s performance. Culshaw, he says, was complimentary about his efforts, which he found particularly encouraging, coming from a published author.
us.’ Smith says that the Decca producers were ‘brought up by John’ to be critics: to be able to analyse what was being recorded from the widest perspective, to listen to music as emotional arbiters and to make expeditious, diplomatic decisions.147

1.8 Conclusion

Although the terminology to identify the role of recording personnel was gradually refined over a period of more than 25 years, the basic functions of these jobs at Decca were established in the earliest years of classical music recording. The company’s history of empirical research and technology, the foundation and background from which the early recording engineers were drawn, was a primary factor in fixing the function of the engineer in the recording studio and separating it from other aspects of recording management. Recordings needed administrative control, but the notion of employing a third staff function with a knowledge of music and performance who could build a sense of support and trust with artists in the studio was not realised until the post-war years, largely due to the intensification of classical recording activity and the increasingly refined technology that merited (or warranted) the care and attention of someone able to make a critical evaluation of performance. There is no conclusive evidence from the sources consulted as to when the term ‘producer’ was applied to refer to the musical supervisor of the recording session, although Culshaw’s first reference to the title suggests that it became accepted parlance during the mid-1950s.148

The serendipitous appointment of Victor Olof had established the role of the recording supervisor, or ‘producer,’ as a person with a professional association with musical performance and this was replicated in most of the other appointments to this job made during Olof’s employment. But John Culshaw provided an alternative paradigm: the producer as a self-informed cultural critic. The concept of a ‘profession of production,’ however developed it may have been in continental Europe in the late 1950s, was neither encouraged nor prioritised, and Decca looked for individuals who could contribute their own ideas without the constraint of upholding a particular school of thought, enabling the A&R team to work flexibly and with originality.

---

147 In an interview recorded by Evans Mirageas for WFMT Radio Chicago, 1985.
148 See John Culshaw, Putting the Record Straight, p.63, in which he says ‘The Artists’ Department in those years...was managed by an enchanting man called Harry Sarton. Working for him were people who, more than a decade later, would be described as producers.’
Without a dedicated and centralised planning and financial organisation to oversee the company’s classical recordings, Culshaw saw that a situation had been created in which ‘Decca’s programme was not really a programme at all. It consisted in the main of random leaps into all parts of the repertoire and it lacked any kind of consistent artistic or indeed commercial policy.’\(^{149}\) Olof’s expertise in knowledge of repertoire had undoubtedly made a major contribution to Decca’s classical recording output, but he did not have the administrative responsibility to oversee an integrated vision of a recording programme. In taking the initiative for classical recording management away from Frank Lee, the nominal head of general A&R, in what he saw as a managerial vacuum, Culshaw established himself as the first executive producer of classical recordings at Decca. Culshaw created the conditions for the independence of a classical recording organisation, and by combining the roles of recording supervisor and administrative head of classical A&R, an organisational blueprint was created that lasted until the mid-1990s. This system was vigorously opposed by Lee, but as Minshull’s papers suggest, Lee eventually relinquished a claim to Decca’s classical organisation by 1959.\(^{150}\) However, the final word on classical recording policy lay in reality, as Minshull reveals,\(^{151}\) in the hands of Maurice Rosengarten, and Culshaw made fewer executive decisions himself than the rest of the A&R staff realised. According to Minshull, Rosengarten saw Culshaw as a senior artistic adviser who discussed musical matters with artists and implemented detailed project strategy on behalf of the management, so although the de facto head of classical recording, he was in reality the public face of Decca’s classical A&R rather than the ultimate architect of its recording policy.

The unofficial appointment of Maurice Rosengarten as Decca’s offshore director of classical recording investment and administration created an office of senior executive authority over Decca’s general A&R department based in London, with the consequence of distancing the role of the staff producer from business and administrative functions, and the financial liabilities of recording.\(^{152}\) As both Minshull and Evans Mirageas attest,\(^{153}\) this

\(^{149}\) Ibid. pp.140–141.
\(^{150}\) Notes in Ray Minshull’s personal document archive. Lee’s role was eroded further in 1953 by the appointment of Marcel Stellman who was given control over a proportion of Decca’s pop repertoire (letter from ‘Hilary’ to Ray Minshull, 15 May 1994).
\(^{151}\) Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1995. Minshull succeeded John Culshaw as head of A&R in 1967, and worked under the influence of Rosengarten until the latter’s death in 1975, after which he was promoted to the status of Director of the company. One assumes that Minshull had access to Culshaw’s paperwork, and on Rosengarten’s death would have assumed some (if not all) of the functions undertaken by Rosengarten. He would therefore have been able to inspect at first-hand the level of Culshaw’s involvement with management decisions.
\(^{152}\) According to Minshull’s personal archived papers, Rosengarten had no official Decca appointment until 1960, when he was elected to the Board.
allowed producers to concentrate wholly on the quality of the result and conduct unlimited amounts of research on the projects to which they were assigned. From the 1950s until the 1990s, the studio producer at Decca was insulated from the realities of the cost details and fees to artists, which Minshull says had profound implications in how the A&R team applied themselves to their work. This guaranteed a personal approach to making recordings, which as Mirageas notes, resulted in individuals ‘with very strong opinions, tremendous musical instinct and brilliant minds being left to their own devices.’

153 Ray Minshull, ibid., and Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016. Mirageas was the first executive appointed to the department who did not combine the role with studio production since the departure of Frank Lee in the late 1950s.

154 Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016.
Chapter 2: Cultivating the producer: Christopher Raeburn

2.1 A cultural heritage

His greatest strengths were his curiosity, intelligence and ability to be interested in anything and anybody. He had a huge personality and abundant charm. I have a feeling that if he had the absolute pitch that Ray Minshull claimed to possess, he would have relied on that rather than taste, sophistication and acute intelligence.  

Michael Haas’s description of Christopher Raeburn indicates a man whose professional reputation had been founded on cultural immersion. This chapter aims to outline Raeburn’s background to assess the ways in which his appreciation of the arts in the widest sense and interest in the historical context of musical performance might have conditioned his approach to recording. That Raeburn had little formal musical education or indeed knowledge of recording practice mattered little to John Culshaw. Raeburn brought a level of cultural sophistication to Decca and a savour of European intellectualism that had been acquired in part through earnest efforts to integrate himself into Viennese cultural society in the mid-1950s. He had, however, a pragmatic view of his lack of musical education. Like Culshaw, it freed Raeburn from convention, but was dependent on the strength of his convictions developed through an exposure to music as heard in the opera houses and concert halls of Britain and continental Europe, and through his determination to pursue original research. Throughout his life and career, Raeburn could be found among charismatic figures from a range of artistic and scholarly fields that inspired his own interests, his aim being, he says, to uncover immutable fact from original sources. This search for objective ‘truth,’ the Urtext, is of paramount importance to Raeburn, and this chapter discusses his background and the people, groups and places that made an impact on his world view and his work in the recording studio.

Despite Raeburn’s negative description of his being undereducated, which he says was a source of regret rather than shame, this was far from a true representation of his background. Raeburn came from a large family of liberal socialist German-Jewish assimilationists who placed high value on learning, especially in the arts. Although the family

---

155 Michael Haas, interview, 10 May 2016.
156 See notes ‘Austria, Salzburg and Vienna’, BL/RA. Here, Raeburn suggests that his interest in original research was kindled despite rather than because of his experience studying modern history at Oxford University, which ‘had only prepared me to read standard textbooks and to respect my tutors.’
157 As he describes in ‘Random Notes for a Memoir’, BL/RA.
were second-generation English, Raeburn’s brother Michael describes a ‘certain really German middle-class background that carried over a bit’ and an upbringing in a rich intellectual environment dominated by the serious pursuit of the performing, creative and literary arts by all members of the extended family. Another family member, the historian Ian Buruma, writes of their relationship with the arts:

Music was a sign of education, high culture, and emblem of class. This is the way it had been in Germany, where a classical education was the indispensable mark of the bourgeoisie, the Bildungsbürger.

The Raeburns chose their company carefully, and as Michael Raeburn acknowledges, isolated themselves consciously from the immediate community, preferring to create their own intellectual and artistic milieu, despite having taken much trouble over two generations to integrate themselves professionally into English life. His father, Walter Raeburn, aimed to complete the transition from German émigré family to embedded British upper-middle class, built on a Victorian model that historian William Whyte says comprised ‘family and friends, schools, colleges and clubs [that] together produced a new class...a social fraction with its own common culture and shared identity.’ Michael Raeburn explains that his father harboured a ‘huge sense of superiority’ and disapproved of business people as personal acquaintances as much as he did the working class. Working as a senior member of the judiciary and an active member of the Labour party, Walter Raeburn wrote on legal philosophy and also diverted much time to poetry, prose and plays on morality themes for children. Dividing family life between homes in north London amid Hampstead socialists and in the Surrey hills, the Raeburns and their friends created what Antonia Raeburn describes as ‘an intellectual retreat with sessions listening to long musical works on the gramophone, readings of Father’s plays, communal readings of Shakespeare and poetry and

158 Michael Raeburn, interview recorded May 2016.
159 Ian Buruma, Their Promised Land: My Grandparents in Love and War, 2016, eBook p.25, loc.302. Christopher Raeburn, in his personal notes Austria, Salzburg and Vienna (BL/RA) says that ‘as children, [we] were not in the least bit proud of our German Jewish background.’
160 Michael Raeburn, interview recorded 11 May 2016.
161 William Whyte, in his essay ‘The Intellectual Aristocracy Revisited’, Journal of Victorian Culture Vol. 10 No. 1, 2005, pp.15–45, describes the interconnected individuals and families living in pockets of Victorian London who ‘lived the lives of intellectual aristocrats’ (p.26). His depiction of a discrete social stratum, schooled in an approach that created ‘a caste of educated, active citizens: a society of well-meaning gentlemen. It was this system that perpetuated the intellectual aristocracy.’ (p.23), describes the position of Walter Raeburn fittingly. Walter Raeburn saw intellectualism as reinforced through the acquisition of cultural knowledge.
162 Michael Raeburn, interview recorded 11 May 2016.
long talks into the night.' Their household was open to the extended circles of their European émigré artist-friends whose work they collected, who included the potters Lucie Rie and Hans Coper, sculptor Fritz Kormis and industrial designer and painter, Sigmund Pollitzer. Pollitzer became a long-standing friend of Christopher Raeburn, who according to Antonia Raeburn, made a great impression on the family through the breadth of his cultural interests: ‘with his fascinating collection of old books, old and new in various languages, and...his collection of gramophone records ranging from the seventeenth century to the present day.’ There were ‘long musical sessions and Mother and the boys talked endless art, literature and theatre with him.’ Anita Besson, an associate of Pollitzer’s, describes the Raeburns as a large, busy family given to animated discussions and passionate about opera and the theatre. Walter Raeburn’s letters indicate a family whose members shared their interests in art and literature; gifting copies of Sheridan and Webster, contributing to funds for opera recordings, paintings or evenings at the theatre between themselves and their nearest relatives, the Schlesinger family. Even the closest family members adhered to the etiquette of formal letters of thanks, schooling Christopher Raeburn from an early age in good manners and the art of diplomacy.

Walter Raeburn’s musical opinions weighed heavily on Christopher Raeburn and his siblings, and described by William Mann as someone ‘for whom anything later than Mozart was looked down upon.’ Raeburn senior was the chief arbiter of family taste and listening habits, as Michael Raeburn explains:

And we had gramophone records and my parents went to Glyndebourne before the war and we were brought up with the Glyndebourne recordings of the Mozart operas. There was a certain snobbery about music...I remember a Canadian friend came, and knowing Christopher he brought a recording of Rachmaninov’s second piano concerto and Christopher couldn’t get it out of the house quick enough. Because it was something that was too appalling. We listened to Mozart principally and Handel, Beethoven, Chopin, Tchaikovsky were absolutely our kind of thing... And when I became a teenager I got into the Bartôk string quartets and I got recordings of them. And every time I played them my father would stomp out of the room—
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164 Ibid.
165 Ibid.
166 Ibid.
168 W.A.L. Raeburn Archive, London School of Economics.
169 William Mann, *Edge of Midnight: The Life of John Schlesinger*, 2004, pp.69–70. The film director John Schlesinger was first cousin to Christopher Raeburn. Mann also credits Walter Raeburn here as a major influence on the career of his nephew: he ‘displayed an enthusiasm for the theater that would nudge John towards his own interest in acting.’
thought it was noise, not music. What was funny was that he and his sisters
used to play Brahms and his father reacted in exactly the same way about
Brahms...I do remember Christopher feeling anti all weekend because [of]
this appalling Rachmaninov in the room. I think we were brought up to be
very opinionated.\textsuperscript{170}

Buruma describes the extended family’s appreciation of classical music as ‘a kind of family
cult,’\textsuperscript{171} but however committed Walter Raeburn was to encouraging his children to
immerse themselves in the performing arts and to learn musical instruments, it was done so
out of intellectual cultivation rather than through the pursuit of self-expression. Neither
Christopher Raeburn nor his siblings benefited from formal training and analysis in music
and the performing arts at university, yet the artistic professions were not discouraged.\textsuperscript{172}
Surrounded by strong characters at home, Christopher Raeburn learned that ‘taste’ itself
was not enough; it had to be supported, substantiated and transcended by erudition if it
was to withstand robust family discussion and present a considered point of view.

2.2 The theatre, Mozartian opera and Austria

Raeburn’s three indivisible passions for the theatre, as a performer and in theatre history,
for Mozartian operatic scholarship and for Austrian culture, were inspired largely during his
time at university through a circle of college associates and as a member of the Oxford
Experimental Theatre Club (ETC) and Oxford University Dramatic Society (OUDS).\textsuperscript{173} His
archive shows him to have been an active attendee of the opera, ballet and music club
performances, but his own energies were channelled towards revue rather than the more
highbrow theatrical genres on offer at Oxford. Raeburn took part in OUDS and ETC
productions alongside Michael Codron, Tony Richardson and his cousin, John Schlesinger.

\textsuperscript{170} Michael Raeburn, interview recorded 11 May 2016.
\textsuperscript{172} Christopher Raeburn and his siblings studied subjects (namely history and classics) that William
pp.15–45, p.23 quotes from other sources as ‘explicitly anti-vocational, designed to foster character
and not to equip them with practical skills’ and used ‘to train morally-responsible leaders.’ Despite
the precariousness of employment prospects, Michael Raeburn says (interview, May 2016) that a
career in the arts was considered by Walter Raeburn to be morally preferable than the perceived
vulgarity of business and commerce. Indeed, Christopher Raeburn’s brothers Andrew and Michael
worked for Decca after he became a member of the A&R team; Andrew for five years as producer for
Argo, and Michael on a short-term arrangement with John Culshaw.
\textsuperscript{173} Archival references to his student musical activities are brief and indicate somewhat sporadic
activity: Raeburn was President of the Worcester-Somerville Music Society for a year, a cellist in the
university second orchestra and a member of the city’s Bach Choir. From his archive there is no
evidence to suggest that he had any dealings with academic staff from Oxford University music
faculty.
But it was his friendship with fellow Oxford actor, student of English and college organ scholar, Andrew Porter, and student of German, Peter Branscombe, which ignited an interest in the rich cultural landscape of Austria.

As an undergraduate in 1949, Raeburn was invited by Andrew Porter’s family to accompany them to the Salzburg Festival, which he describes:

... a cultural awakening...Still under the benevolent American occupation, life was virtually back to pre-war, in fact pre-Nazi, normal, but with a thriving black market in money exchange. We found a modest bed and breakfast, and our first opera was the world premiere of Carl Orff’s Antigone in the Felsenreitschule. This was clearly an event, but it made little lasting impression. However, Zauberflöte the following evening conducted by Furtwängler with the Vienna Philharmonic was emotionally shattering. My parents had brought us up on the records of Mozart’s
opers, and I had got to know the opera well in Beecham’s Berlin recording, but the great experience was to hear the Vienna Philharmonic playing the opera...Hearing the sheer sound of these musicians playing *Zauberflöte* was probably the most important musical moment of my life. The organic integration of the woodwind section...the musical phrasing of the strings, and again the sound was the first time I experienced Mozart playing in real life with the beauty and sensitivity that surely belonged to it [...] Life was never the same after Salzburg. 174

Raeburn writes that he was ‘simply devoted’175 to Mozart’s music, but at the time admits to being ill-informed of what the Festival represented; what Michael Steinberg calls ‘a romantic redefinition of a society as a community, an aesthetic totality.’176 This notion of a community thick with culture in which society as a whole seemed to share his interests—‘a meeting place of the intellectuals of Europe’177—had great appeal for Raeburn, and one in which he followed the Porter family lead.

Raeburn, who says he had followed the cast lists of the Vienna State Opera since its early post-war guest appearance at Covent Garden in 1947, speaks of an ‘intangible magic’178 created by the Vienna State Opera in Salzburg, and pays particular attention to describing the vocal timbres and casting of the operas in the Festival repertoire he regarded as of singular importance: Kirsten Flagstad and Julius Patzak in *Fidelio*, Jarmila Novotna in *Der Rosenkavalier* and Marta Rohs and Patzak in *La clemenza di Tito*. The Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra (VPO) as accompanists to the State Opera were in Raeburn’s opinion a superlative force, and for the orchestra’s 150th anniversary publication he elaborated on the quality of sound that made such an impression on him in 1949:

The Vienna Philharmonic are arguably the finest opera orchestra in the world, and much of their special quality comes from their association with opera, and the combination of being partly an operatic orchestra and partly symphonic. Their concert work prevents the inferiority complex of a permanent pit band, and their operatic work contributes enormously to the homogeneity of sound and bel canto line which is so characteristic of their playing [...] The tradition of the Vienna Philharmonic is its

174 Christopher Raeburn, notes, ‘Austria, Salzburg & Vienna’, BL/RA. We might contrast Raeburn’s first experience of opera here with Ray Minshull’s; Minshull notes in his memoirs that he had never seen a professional opera production before working at Decca.
175 Ibid.
177 Gerard Mortier, interviewed in *The Salzburg Festival*, a film by Tony Palmer, 2006 (TC c.02.19.45).
178 Christopher Raeburn, notes ‘Austria, Salzburg & Vienna’, BL/RA.
individuality, the homogeneity of sound, its string tone and phrasing...the fundamental quality, conveying the poetry in music.\textsuperscript{179}

In this 1992 anniversary article, Raeburn states unequivocally that Decca’s connection with the Philharmonic was the reason behind his choice to join the company. But his papers show that as a graduate in 1951, his ambitions were fixed on becoming an actor, and the notion of steering his professional life towards an association with the VPO was a somewhat fantastical notion. In the three years that followed, Raeburn’s efforts to find acting work—indeed any work at all—were constantly thwarted.\textsuperscript{180} A small number of non-acting opportunities arose: as a production management assistant at Bernard Miles’ Mermaid Theatre, in secretarial work for Desmond Shawe-Taylor and Edward Sackville-West’s Record Guide (a position brokered by his friend Andrew Porter), and as an assistant at Palace House, Beaulieu, for Edward Montagu. These were all short-lived engagements, but provided Raeburn with a wide array of influential connections to approach for help in securing further work. He had hoped to use the influence of Etienne Amyot, the BBC’s first planner of the Third Programme and an associate of Shawe-Taylor and Sackville-West, to secure a permanent position, and Amyot gave Raeburn a reference for George Barnes, Head of Television at the BBC. ‘He is extremely gifted,’ wrote Amyot, ‘has great musical taste, and might well be a creative person for TV.’\textsuperscript{181} Amyot also provided an introduction to David Webster at the Royal Opera House to discuss whether he would be ‘fitted for a job in the opera world,’\textsuperscript{182} and intervened on his behalf for advice from Sir Steuart Wilson as Raeburn had decided impulsively that he wished to become a singer, only to be assessed as a potential ‘singing actor’, but with little hope of being trained to sing on the opera stage.

\textsuperscript{179} Christopher Raeburn, in Otto Biba and Wolfgang Schuster (eds), \textit{Klang und Komponist: ein Symposion der Wiener Philharmoniker Kongressbericht}, Hans Schneider, 1992, pp.145–147. Empirical analysis undertaken by Matthias Bertsch (paper, ‘Can you identify the Vienna Philharmonic compared with the Berlin or New York Philharmonic?’ 2003) attempts to identify the characteristics of the ‘Wiener Klangstil,’ (‘Vienna Sound’), described as ‘a combination of the Viennese playing style and the Viennese instrumental timbre.’ It concludes that playing style is a greater indicator of difference than timbre, but no detailed description of stylistic characteristics is given.

\textsuperscript{180} Raeburn was turned down for acting roles at the Westminster Theatre and for the Oxford and Cambridge Players. He was also unsuccessful in his applications to \textit{Opera} magazine as private secretary (despite assistance from Andrew Porter, who had been a reviewer for \textit{Opera} since 1953), for the BBC’s television training scheme and temporary work at the BBC Music Department. Additionally, Raeburn made applications to the Royal Opera House, Decca and EMI, Collins publishers and Ibbs and Tilletts’ management without success. (See personal correspondence, BL/RA).

\textsuperscript{181} Etienne Amyot, letter to George Barnes, 8 April 1952, BL/RA.

\textsuperscript{182} Christopher Raeburn, letter to David Webster, 26 April 1952, BL/RA.
Although Raeburn had also applied unsuccessfully for work during several seasons at Glyndebourne in the early 1950s, he had gained entry to the Festival rehearsals by means of personal connections, and indeed, had been invited to sit among the orchestra during Fritz Busch’s final performance of *Così fan tutte*. This experience had made a profound impression on him, and the stimulus of ‘the principles expounded by Mr C[hristie], Dr Busch and Professor Ebert,’ as he wrote in appreciation, had bolstered his conviction to find employment in music in some capacity, being ‘too much of an idealist to abandon music and the theatre.’

Raeburn was already familiar with Glyndebourne’s distinguished Mozart tradition on record from the pre-war era, and with the Festival’s reputation as creating the highest possible standard of performance and production values, an ‘incorruptible approach...no gimmicks, no pandering to stars, only truthfulness to the intentions of the composer’ that filtered down to every aspect of the production. As Peter Ebert writes, the principles of assembling an ‘ideal cast for each opera—ideal in every respect, not only vocal...Much more important was the blend of voices in ensemble, musicality and acting ability’ were enshrined from the Festival’s inauguration. From his experience at the rehearsals, Raeburn was struck by Busch’s detailed preparation, ‘the consummate Mozartian, whose rehearsals were an object lesson,’ as he describes. Indeed, Raeburn kept the typescript of *Fritz Busch: The Conductor* among his papers: the posthumously-published instruction manual for aspiring conductors he felt was also a relevant tutorial for himself as a junior studio producer. Here contained and incanted are the principles that had so impressed Raeburn: ‘Mediocrity is culture’s greatest enemy... Every detail matters in art and the appreciation of its values heightens the joy of our own achievement... We do not fear being called meticulous, inclining as we do to the view that only thoroughness can be truly entertaining.’ Busch speaks of the importance of taking the trouble to explore and collect the evidence that relates to the composer’s artistic intentions: the correspondence, commentaries, and stage directions and all interpretative instructions, as the composer
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183 Christopher Raeburn, draft letter to ‘Miss D’ at Glyndebourne, undated, BL/RA.
184 Christopher Raeburn, draft letter to ‘Mr C[hristie], undated, BL/RA.
185 Peter Ebert, *In this Theatre of Man’s Life, a Biography of Carl Ebert*, 1999, p.98.
186 Ibid.
187 Christopher Raeburn, typescript notes, ‘Baccaloni’, BL/RA.
189 Ibid.
‘must have best known his style,’\textsuperscript{190} and to work on every aspect of the music-drama collaboratively with Ebert in which ‘there was not a bar, not a chord, not a change of harmony or a particular color [sic] in the orchestration whose musical and dramatic meaning we did not investigate.’ Pronunciation of the text is also considered an essential part of expression by Busch, yet in Raeburn’s opinion, this was one aspect of the Glyndebourne production philosophy that could have been even more nuanced, as the choice of cast was sometimes not as idiomatic as he preferred. ‘I developed a prejudice fairly early on that the best operatic casting came from artists who were born to the language they were singing in,’ he wrote, so that a singer might ‘relish the character and the words.’\textsuperscript{191} Nevertheless, in Glyndebourne he had found the spirit of the Salzburg Festival on the Sussex Downs.

Raeburn’s difficulty in establishing a career, despite his resourceful use of contacts, ‘when one has many enthusiasms and a certain amount of ability in various directions,’\textsuperscript{192} and an innate belief in himself as ‘being capable of doing a really good job of work’\textsuperscript{193} was cast against a background of private research which had been inspired by a production of Mozart’s \textit{Der Schauspieldirektor} staged by a number of his ex-university colleagues at the Camden Festival in 1951. Raeburn had been cast here in a non-singing role—his final public stage appearance—in an opera whose plot and appeal lay perhaps in its reflection of his own thespian predicaments. During his research in the reading room of the British Museum, Raeburn established that there was at the time no comprehensive study of Mozart’s operas, and what appeared to be a number of inconsistencies and queries in the standard Mozart textbooks relating to the first performances of \textit{Der Schauspieldirektor}. ‘Being theatrically-minded,’ he says, ‘I was particularly interested in the original productions; there had been some works attempting musical analysis already, but the theatre side had been overlooked.’\textsuperscript{194} It is likely that Raeburn’s university friend Peter Branscombe, a scholar of German and Austrian literature, opera libretti and theatre history, encouraged Raeburn to pursue his research interests. Michael Raeburn says that in addition to Porter, Branscombe was a regular house guest of the Raeburns, introducing the whole family to the works of

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid. Here Fritz Busch gives Wagner as the example of a composer’s interpretation of their own music, but ‘the same applies to performances of the works of Bruckner, Mahler, Reger and many other masters.’

\textsuperscript{191} Christopher Raeburn, typescript notes, ‘Baccaloni’, BL/RA.

\textsuperscript{192} Christopher Raeburn, draft letter to Sir Steuart Wilson, undated, BL/RA.

\textsuperscript{193} Christopher Raeburn, draft letter to ‘Miss D’ at Glyndebourne, undated, BL/RA.

\textsuperscript{194} Christopher Raeburn, typescript notes, ‘Austria, Salzburg & Vienna’, BL/RA.
Johan Nestroy, Ferdinand Raimund and the historical traditions of the Old Viennese Folk Theatre.\textsuperscript{195}

To consolidate his approach to the topic and to understand current trends in thinking, Raeburn joined the Society for Theatre Research which had as its president Professor Edward Dent, to whom Raeburn wrote to discuss his ideas for a project.\textsuperscript{196} A leading figure in Mozart scholarship, Dent assisted Raeburn in locating source material, and provided him with an introduction to the Austrian musicologist Otto Erich Deutsch, a scholar of Mozart, Schubert and Handel. Raeburn’s intended focus on the performance history of Der Schauspieldirektor was at the time, not a mainstream approach, but the Society encouraged the development of theatrical criticism as a discipline separate from literary criticism; that ‘recovering, ordering and assessing the records and reviews of past performances can sharpen the critic’s eye for the significance of the stage actions, movements, and visual relationships implied in the author’s text...illustrations, prompt books, and memoirs, as well as cast-lists and reviews may together or separately show the critic the range of possible interpretations and help him discriminate between them.’\textsuperscript{197} This provided Raeburn with methodological validation for his angle of study of the opera, and with financial support from Andrew Porter and an introduction to Deutsch provided by Dent, Raeburn made a brief research trip to Vienna to continue his work on Der Schauspieldirektor, his first visit to the city. Deutsch was of inestimable help, providing advice on where to locate sources and providing further contacts, and Raeburn’s confidence was buoyed by the ease with which he found the theatrical ephemera he sought in the National Library. Researching by day, Raeburn spent his evenings at the Theater an der Wien, producing a report of the Vienna State Opera’s performances for Opera magazine—

\textsuperscript{195} Michael Raeburn, interview recorded 11 May, 2016.
\textsuperscript{196} Edward Dent was Professor of music at Cambridge University from 1926 to 1941, a founder of the International Society for Contemporary Music and an influential member of a number of arts institutions. As a dominant musicological authority since the beginning of the twentieth century, his range included work on Mozart, Italian Baroque opera and English dramatic music of the seventeenth century. Raeburn gained an introduction to Dent through the intercession of musicologist Eric Walter White, who was an acquaintance of the Raeburn family and also a member of the Society for Theatre Research. See Christopher Raeburn, letter to Eric Walter White, 15 July 1953, BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{197} Typescript entitled ‘Theatre Research and Literary Criticism’ by John Russell Brown, collected by Raeburn (BL/RA) and annotated as ‘very important.’ The paper by Brown acknowledges that theatre criticism was seen at the time as inferior to literary criticism: ‘many critics think of the theatrical experience as coarse and vulgar, measurable only in terms of its popular appeal. Others regard it as unmanageable and unprofitable for discussion, owing to such difficulties as antiquarian considerations, diversity of opinion, and dispersal of interest.’
Autumn in Vienna—his first published piece.\textsuperscript{198} The visit was, as he describes, ‘life-changing,’\textsuperscript{199} and provided him with a purpose and direction that he had not found in Britain. ‘I investigated the careers of actors and actresses taking part in the Schauspieldirektor,’ he wrote, ‘and began a study of late eighteenth-century Austrian theatre, which was to become my work for the next three years, and a lifetime’s study.’\textsuperscript{200}

2.3 Raeburn as researcher, author and journalist

Raeburn’s successful but brief research visit to Vienna, together with the support he received from Otto Deutsch, encouraged him to apply as an ‘actor and musicologist’ to the Leverhulme Research Fellowship Committee and to the British Council for scholarships to continue his research in Vienna on the original productions of Mozart’s operas, the original singers for whom the roles were composed and theatre life in the eighteenth century. However, as Raeburn describes to Dent, he was ‘still looking for work in the opera field, but there seem to be no vacancies. It is all rather depressing though I get a little pin money by doing some musical journalism.’\textsuperscript{201} Raeburn approached Decca for a job, and was given a post in the publicity department in 1954, as John Culshaw had been in 1946, but within days of starting, learned his application for scholarships from the Leverhulme Committee and the British Council had been successful. Convinced that his future lay in scholarship in Austria rather than in an administrative post at Decca’s Brixton Road offices, Raeburn left Decca for Vienna after six months.\textsuperscript{202}

The correspondence between Deutsch and Raeburn during his three years’ research in Vienna indicates an intensive level of activity spent in the Theatre Collection of the National Library, generating by his own estimation ‘literally thousands’ of handwritten

\textsuperscript{198} In Opera Vol. 5 No. 1, January 1954, pp.17–21, (see Appendix 4.) It is likely that Opera’s acceptance of Raeburn’s piece was a result of Andrew Porter’s influence (Porter was tenured to Opera magazine as a contributor).

\textsuperscript{199} Christopher Raeburn, notes, ‘Austria, Salzburg and Vienna’, BL/RA.

\textsuperscript{200} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{201} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{202} Raeburn took up the Leverhulme award, which had been granted without an interview on the strength of references supplied by Dent and Deutsch. He attempted (unsuccessfully) to secure both scholarships simultaneously, promising to deliver to the British Council ‘a unique theatrical and musical document; a worthy English publication for the 1956 [Mozart] bicentenary’ should he have been allowed to keep their research funding. See Raeburn letter to the British Council, 29 April 1954, BL/RA. Although he did not produce a manuscript for the Mozart bicentenary, Raeburn maintained contact with the British Council and gave a lecture on their behalf at the Salzburg Festival in 1956 (in German) entitled ‘Mozart in England.’ Raeburn also received an Austrian Government scholarship to extend his stay in Vienna until Spring 1957 on the recommendation of Deutsch.
and typescript notes copied verbatim from eighteenth-century journals and manuscripts. Many of his findings, including the confirmation of cast lists made through his exhaustive studies of theatre bills and biographical details of singers, were passed to Deutsch for reference in his *Mozart, A Documentary Biography*, and Deutsch acknowledges Raeburn’s considerable contribution to scholarship through ‘not withholding his discoveries in the periodicals of Mozart’s Vienna period.’ Raeburn’s intention was to publish his own book, along with a biography of the soprano Aloysia Lange as the culmination of his research, but it was important for him to publish first, as he explained to Deutsch:

But I must say that I am unrepentant on the general principle on being the first to republish facts or documents…the documents are to be the entire basis of my book. They speak for themselves. And please believe that this has always been my view and not any connexion with your excellent documentary biographies. You will see, I think, from my *Schauspieldirektor* article, and that was written before, I am ashamed to say, I knew about your documentary method. So I simply ask you to respect my point of view, and try to understand at least how much importance I personally attach to my finds from sources, which have involved many hours of work, and the vast majority of which, as you know have not been re-printed since first published.

But from the incomplete draft sections of Raeburn’s book in his archive, it might be seen that his methodology owed much—contrary to his admittance—to Deutsch’s, in what David Wyn Jones describes as a synthesis of iconographic and bibliographic evidence. Raeburn intended to analyse each Mozart opera against the background of the text, language, plot and theatrical conditions ‘in an effort to establish the practical truth’ that he felt had hitherto been absent from scholarship. Indeed, he ‘made no apology’ for amassing such a large quantity of documentary evidence, which he felt gave the book ‘exceptional value.’ Along with uncut text and translation of each libretto and numerous colour and black and white plates, the appendix, containing much of his new material, was ‘largely the raison d’être of the book itself,’ and was to include
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204 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Deutsch, 28 February 1956, BL/RA.
205 David Wyn Jones, ‘Deutsch, Otto Erich’, in David Wyn Jones (ed.), *Oxford Composer Companions: Haydn*, 2009, p.63. Raeburn’s assessment of Deutsch was that ‘besides being a scholar, without doubt the finest compiler of documents of our time…his remarkable gift lay in sorting documents with an objective “lawyer’s mind,”’ (Christopher Raeburn, undated typescript, BL/RA).
206 Christopher Raeburn, undated draft typescript of book, called initially ‘Mozart’s Operas in His Time’, BL/RA.
biographies of singers for whom Mozart wrote roles...their style, range and ability, including contemporary criticism...criticisms of Mozart Opera performances in the towns where they took place...all important eighteenth century writing on Mozart opera, taken from biographies and music journals...an analysis of the eighteenth century orchestra...Joseph II’s correspondence with his chamberlain Rosenberg...Extracts from the diary of Graf von Zinzendorf...Rules and regulations of the theatre at Hamburg...An analysis of the Vienna national theatre accounts, the personnel and their salaries...Discussion on costumes, scenery and stage apparatus, stage directions and sundry curious incidentals of importance.  

This prodigious range of material of fanatical detail and accuracy made the book untenable in terms of its reproduction costs, and indeed risked the prospect of its completion. Egon Wellesz, who examined Raeburn’s plans as series editor at Routledge and Kegan Paul, was highly critical, perceiving his quest for a ‘Rolls Royce finish’ to be a lack of focus, selectivity and interpretation:

In the series for which I take responsibility I want to have things in the right proportion. I have the experience of what interests the musical public; Raeburn is too much excited about the things he found to see what is important to know.  

Raeburn was not indifferent to Wellesz’s criticism, but neither was he prepared to make any compromise, despite his inexperience in the field of research and publishing. His reply to Wellesz shows a youthful lapse of diplomatic restraint:

I am rather afraid that Prof Wellesz and I will continue to differ...on what is the ‘right’ proportion and ‘what is really important to know’...In view of his dogmatic comments I see little room for understanding...Prof. Wellesz talks about the musical public, but I am thinking in terms of the theatrical public as well. That is the whole point of my approach. If I am compelled to change it to a mere further version of the stuff already published, I think I would better abandon the whole thing...I am perfectly prepared to go ahead with Bärenreiter’s...[who] have very much clearer grasp about what I am getting at than Prof. Wellesz.

Between 1958 and 1965, and long after he had re-joined the staff at Decca, Raeburn approached four other publishers with his book plans. At Barrie and Rockliff his writing
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207 Christopher Raeburn, end notes to General Introduction, undated typescript, BL/RA.
208 Egon Wellesz, letter to Colin Franklin of Routledge and Kegan Paul publishers, 11 February 1958, BL/RA.
209 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Colin Franklin, 15 February 1958, BL/RA.
specimen was said to ‘let him down’ and needed ‘meticulous polishing,’ and although Culshaw agreed to a literary sabbatical from Decca for six months in 1963 in preference to Raeburn’s offered resignation, Raeburn was unable to bring his research work to a conclusion. He confided in Deutsch:

I am struggling with my book. It is taking shape but there are many loose ends to tie up. I shall probably call it ‘Mozart’s Operas and the Eighteenth Century Theatre: a documentary history.’ This seems to be the least misleading title, but it should make it clear that it is not another of these dreadful musical analyses.

From his papers it appears that Raeburn made no further attempts to advance his Mozart book after the mid-1960s, restricted no doubt by his recording priorities. It was not until a request from the BBC in 1974 for Raeburn to present a radio programme on the genesis of *La clemenza di Tito* that an opportunity to talk publicly about his research arose. Although he was prepared to adapt his work to suit the medium so that the script would not compromise his past work on the opera, he was bound by the research ethic he had upheld for twenty years: a refusal to commit himself to a theory ‘unless the facts more than probably fit...the stand I have taken in the past over Tito is pulling people to pieces for trying to make facts fit their theories.’ Indeed, in this regard, Raeburn was not averse to decrying the work of his most enduring allies, including Edward Dent, who Raeburn suggests lacked rigour in his research:

In attacking Prof. Dent I should not like it to be misunderstood as an attack on a great scholar. Dent has done more research into eighteenth-century opera than any author who has published his findings. It is merely a method I question. This present age is attacked on grounds of over-specialisation. That is a questionable attitude though scholars have had the opportunity of 180 years to find the obvious unquestionable instances where a work is in parts completely indebted to its source, scholars have chosen to omit this essential landmark and have gone to far more dubious ‘sources,’ other works written during the same decade or earlier which bear similarity but which in fact are probably totally disconnected. This is merely making scholarship more complicated...not only for the scholar himself, but for his misled public. The conventional method of such
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210 See Geoffrey Robinson, letter to Christopher Raeburn, 7 February 1963, BL/RA.
211 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Otto E. Deutsch, 28 November 1963, BL/RA.
213 Christopher Raeburn, draft letter to [Patricia Brent], undated, BL/RA. Raeburn possibly refers to Professor Jack Westrup’s 1958 article in *Music & Letters* Vol.39 No. 4, pp.327–335 on the history of the first performance of *La clemenza di Tito*, in which he claims to have ‘gone into greater detail’ (cf. Christopher Raeburn, letter to Eric Blom, 16 March 1959), BL/RA.
analysis is...from the standpoint of musical trends. I feel a more satisfactory method is to examine all practical evidence...before one attributes causes in a work to a distantly-related work.\(^{214}\)

While Raeburn’s own grand literary plans remained incomplete sketches, there were other more successful outlets for his writing in the form of journalistic pieces for the magazines that were founded in the years after the war, and a study of these give intimations of his preferences and attitude toward opera production and performance. Raeburn became *News from Austria* columnist for *Opera*, (an appointment influenced, no doubt, by Andrew Porter’s and Desmond Shawe-Taylor’s presence on the editorial board); Vienna correspondent for *Music and Musicians*; and a general contributor to *Music Mirror* magazine.\(^{215}\) Arriving in Vienna in 1955 on the threshold of the re-establishment of Austria as a sovereign state and at the re-opening of the State Opera House, Raeburn was well-placed to comment on the musical politics of the city and establish himself as a familiar figure within the corridors of the Opera House and as an interviewer of the associates of its new director, Herbert von Karajan. Raeburn’s Vienna articles from the mid-1950s focus on the opera stage and the casting, production and restoration of standards that might ‘echo the old tradition’ and ‘emulate the glory of previous years’\(^{216}\) of the State Opera. He was aware that after the war, the State Opera had devised no long term artistic plan and in his opinion showed ‘complacent reliance on the orchestra and best artists to carry the thing along.’\(^{217}\) Raeburn also gained experience of evaluating the performances of international guest musicians and orchestras at the reinstated Vienna and Salzburg Festivals. *Otello*, performed at the 1957 Vienna Festival, had, he said, ‘a significance beyond its merit as a performance, since not only was it in Italian, but it contained a cast consisting almost entirely of Italian guests. As a performance it approximated fairly closely to Verdi’s intentions, and was laudable in that it gave a Viennese audience the opportunity of hearing Italian opera sung much as it should sound.’\(^{218}\) Here are the seeds of Raeburn’s life-long preference for and sensitivity towards idiomatic language on the stage—‘the sparkle of the

\(^{214}\) Christopher Raeburn, draft reply to a potential (unknown) publisher: undated, but likely to have been written after the death of Dent in 1957, BL/RA.

\(^{215}\) Consult Appendix 4 for details of Raeburn’s published articles, copies of which are kept in his archive (BL/RA).

\(^{216}\) Christopher Raeburn, ‘The Vienna State Opera: Opera Tradition in Vienna’, *Music and Musicians*, 1955. Raeburn here refers to a tradition of maintaining artists, conductors and theatre producers on long contracts, establishing a large, permanent cast and allowing an adequate amount of rehearsal time for the works in repertory.

\(^{217}\) Christopher Raeburn, ‘New Opera Houses: Vienna’, *Tempo* 38, 1955–1956, pp.28–29 (see Appendix 4).

\(^{218}\) Christopher Raeburn, ‘Opera was the Star of Vienna’s Festival’, *Music and Musicians* (August 1957), p.17 (see Appendix 4).
language as he puts it—performances executed in the mother-tongue of the cast combined with the original language of the libretto allowing a sense of dramatic action to emerge naturally as a consequence of the property of a ‘felt’ rather than an acquired understanding of the text. This was certainly his criticism of Mozart as performed by the newly-resurrected Vienna State Opera. ‘We look to Vienna as our standard for Mozart performance,’ said Raeburn, writing of Don Giovanni in 1957. ‘Understandably, the opera was sung in German, but it is worth reminding these people—since they believe that they are presenting the finest Mozart in the world—that the German text sounds miserable when compared with the Italian original. I am not quarrelling with the fact that it has to be sung in German, but with an attitude that this is the “right” language for the opera…[they] might ponder on the fact that Don Giovanni was written to an Italian libretto for a totally Italian cast.’ And indeed, these articles show the persistent presence of Glyndebourne and its German émigré artistic and musical leadership as Raeburn’s benchmark comparator: of Don Giovanni at the 1955 Vienna Festival he writes that the ubiquity of Mozart opera performances in the city ‘can bamboozle one into thinking that the performances are first rate, until one remembers how much subtlety Fritz Busch could elicit from a Mozart score, or the detail and discretion inherent in an Ebert production.’ Similarly, a ‘first-rate’ ensemble from La Scala brought over to the Vienna Festival in 1956 for a performance of Cimarosa’s Il matrimonio segreto succeeded because it ‘had all the care and polish of Glyndebourne at its very best.’

Raeburn’s journalism was, in many ways, a substitute vehicle for his scholarly aspirations, and through which he wove elements of his accumulated research. Towards the end of his scholarship period in Vienna, he also began to contribute to German language publications, including the programmes of the Vienna State Opera, the Österreichische Musikzeitschrift and Salzburger Amtsblatt. Many of the reports he filed as a retained magazine writer, and particularly for the English journals, show a propensity to illuminate his subject with historical detail and references to its performance history. His article What They Thought of Figaro, for instance, is in essence an exposition on the origins of the opera’s libretto and eighteenth-century reception. Raeburn’s style bears a striking
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219 Christopher Raeburn, ‘The European Festivals’, Music Mirror, May 1954 (see Appendix 4).
220 Christopher Raeburn, ‘What is wrong with Vienna’s State Opera?’ Music and Musicians, April 1957 (see Appendix 4).
221 Christopher Raeburn, ‘New Opera Houses: Vienna’, Tempo 38, 1955–1956, p.29 (see Appendix 4).
222 Christopher Raeburn, Music and Musicians, September 1956, p.15 (see Appendix 4).
223 For Music and Musicians, April 1956, p.13 (see Appendix 4).
similarity to the method to which his friend Andrew Porter subscribed, which Porter himself describes:

My method, if that’s not too grand a word for it, was to try to relate the latest performance of a work from the past to its long history...I liked to include plenty of information; and to tell readers about any new discoveries, which perhaps only the musicological press had noticed, that might bear on the work under review and its performance.\(^{224}\)

The self-acknowledgement of a sense of history and context by Porter in his writing is described by Max Loppert as upholding ‘a belief that opera production should reflect the ethics and aesthetics of Werktreue—the idea...that a work of art has a ‘real meaning’ which can and should be established through faithful observance of its creators' notes, words and executive instructions.’\(^ {225}\) Porter had gained considerable experience and reputation as a full-time critic for the broadsheet press before Raeburn had begun reporting for *Opera*. Their close and supportive relationship suggests that Raeburn could see that this literary model—combining personal observations with historiographic detail to reveal the intentions of the creator—was a successful paradigm to emulate.

Raeburn’s circle of contemporaries in the field of journalism and scholarship were treated with deep respect for their work and opinions, as we see in his correspondence with Porter. This is also true of the American scholar of Haydn and Mozart, H.C. Robbins Landon, to whom Raeburn was introduced in Vienna by Deutsch, and with whom he shared research tours of Germany, Austria and Prague in the late 1950s for their individual interests, but occasionally providing him with research assistance. Raeburn and Landon discussed together how best to present the output of their findings, with Landon keen to explore ways to prevent the material from ‘being published in some complete edition and remaining in the libraries, to be considered as merely of academic interest.’\(^ {226}\) At the point of their meeting, Landon had already established himself as a published scholar of merit in Europe.

---


\(^{225}\) Max Loppert, Andrew Porter obituary, *Opera*, 2015 <https://www.opera.co.uk/view-review.php?reviewID=156> [accessed 29 April 2017]. Despite Loppert’s description here of Porter as ‘widely considered the leading music critic working in the English language,’ he acknowledges that Porter’s dedication to the concept of Werktreue ‘in our day of Director’s Opera, Concept Opera and those omnipresent “critical” stagings’ made him ‘something of a critical outsider,’ losing him ‘a sympathetic hearing from certain younger opera appassionati.’

\(^{226}\) Christopher Raeburn, draft notes (possibly for memoirs), undated, BL/RA.
and America: as the founder of the Haydn Society, as a music journalist for American and British publications, including *The Times*, and as a broadcaster for the BBC’s Third Programme, in which he hoped to ‘introduce a new kind of “advanced” musicology to radio audiences.’ The Haydn Society was a manifestation of Landon’s energetic pursuit to bring his research to the attention of a mass audience through the widest use of media, and through it he intended to produce performing editions of the composer’s works, and also to issue recordings. As a result of his activities, Landon’s contacts in publishing, broadcasting and recording across Europe were widespread: we see many of the contacts to which he refers appear in Raeburn’s papers (particularly in regard to Raeburn’s book publishing correspondence), and is likely that Landon shared the knowledge of these associations with him. Raeburn was also fully aware of Landon’s impresarial activities as the director of a specialist independent record label that was an agent of his research and had ‘genius and dynamism unequalled in the musicological field.’ In Raeburn’s writing that ‘the rewards of historical research are when they can be applied in the present; studying in a vacuum has little point and can be a dead end,’ it is possible to see the influence of Landon on how Raeburn perceived the limitations of his research work towards the end of his scholarship in Vienna, and the attractiveness of the possibility of applying his accumulated knowledge outside academia.

### 2.4 Raeburn and Decca in Vienna

During his three years’ residency in Austria, Raeburn had worked intensively to establish a strong network of social and musical connections to what Andrew Cornall refers to as ‘the soft underbelly’ of Viennese musical life, the culturally-influential people of the city, the patrons of the arts and the British expatriate community, including other visiting students, and in particular with the British Council, on whose behalf he had conducted a public lecture during Mozart bicentenary celebrations. But crucially, he also maintained
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228 Ibid., passim.
230 Ibid.
231 Christopher Raeburn, draft notes (possibly for a presentation), undated, BL/RA.
232 Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.
233 Raeburn notes that among others, he befriended Peter Moores, who was studying theatre direction in Vienna, and with whom he shared accommodation temporarily. Undated notes, BL/RA.
contact with Decca through his visits to the recording team when they were in residence at the company’s permanent recording location, the Sofiensäle, commencing soon after his arrival in Vienna in June 1954 with his attendance at Victor Olof’s Der Rosenkavalier sessions with Erich Kleiber. Raeburn functioned as a messenger and sometime page turner at Decca recording sessions intermittently throughout his three-year research period in Vienna, but his papers give few details on the nature and extent of his involvement in recording, save his appearance in a speaking role in Lehar’s Giuditta in 1957.

Without further elaboration, Raeburn states simply that Culshaw asked him to join Decca’s A&R team at the end of the same year. This appears to have been pragmatic and convenient for all concerned for a number of reasons. As has been established in Chapter 1, Decca’s experimental stereo research and development and its relatively slow supplanting of mono recordings required a greater number of personnel to oversee their parallel production, and additionally, RCA’s new UK alliance with Decca necessitated further recording crews to be found to cover their substantial European classical recording programme. Raeburn’s frequent appearances at the Sofiensäle in the autumn of 1957 also happened to coincide with Culshaw’s approach to Decca’s International Repertoire Committee with his plans to record Wagner’s Das Rheingold, for which a large team with specialised designations would be required. Culshaw is explicit in The Ring Resounding that he had found the transition of leading recording in Vienna—assuming the role that Victor Olof had previously occupied—to have been less straightforward than with the Amsterdam Concertgebouw Orchestra or the Paris Conservatoire Orchestra. Indeed, Culshaw writes that he found the administration and players of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra resistant to change and imbued with what he describes as a self-absorbed, ‘village mentality.’ Here the benefit of employing Raeburn was clear: with his local knowledge he had the potential to be a cultural intermediary who might assist in moderating expectations on both sides. For Raeburn, too, Culshaw’s invitation coincided with the expiration of his Austrian Government

234 As reported by Alan Blyth in ‘Producer Emeritus’, Opera Vol. 47 No. 8 (August 1996), p.875. Here Blyth reports that Raeburn page-turned for Clifford Curzon in a recording of Brahms Piano Concerto no. 2 with Hans Knappertbusch and attended the ‘trial run’ recording of Die Walküre with Flagstad, also conducted by Knappertbusch, both recorded in October 1957 by Culshaw.

235 John Culshaw, in Putting the Record Straight, p.151, writes that Raeburn assisted with the stage movement for his production of Strauss’s Arabella in Vienna in June 1957, but Raeburn does not reference this in his papers.

236 Numerous references to Culshaw’s invitation to can be found in Raeburn’s notes, but none give a fulsome account of the circumstances.


scholarship that had supported him in Vienna after his British award had ended. Having been unable to consolidate his research to the point of publication, and having seen the success that H.C. Robbins Landon had enjoyed in creating a wider interest for his musicological work in recordings and documentary radio programmes, it is highly probable that Raeburn hoped to find a method of integrating his research with the role of a staff recording producer.

2.5 Conclusion

At the point of his re-joining Decca as a member of John Culshaw’s A&R team, Christopher Raeburn presented himself as a fully-formed opera specialist, theatre historian, journalist and academic. This image was a result of intensive autodidactic efforts combined with fortuitously-made but also skilfully-developed professional and social contacts. Raeburn quickly found himself among Europe’s pre-eminent musicologists and critics as an equal, and in some cases as a personal friend. Compared with his A&R department peers at Decca, his network was sophisticated and influential, which was a significant compensatory benefit for unfamiliarity with the process of recording. He was part of a group described by Stanley Sadie as ‘powerful and diverse,’ and along with Andrew Porter included many of the music critics for the British press, which gave the potential for Raeburn to bring Decca recordings to the personal attention of his associates. Despite Raeburn’s herculean research efforts and public shows of self-possession, seen especially in his approaches to publishers and his castigation of well-known academic figures, there is an underlying sense from his correspondence that he reflected rather than pioneered the views of his group and laboured assiduously to try to match their standards and successes.

The influence of Viennese cultural life on Raeburn was profound, and also reinforced his culturally- and musically-conservative background: the prevailing politics of culture in post-war Austria were traditionalist and conservative, and was indeed considered as such even at the end of the 1960s, as is noted by the British Council. That Austrian
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239 Stanley Sadie and Joseph Kerman, ‘Andrew Porter: A Transatlantic Appreciation’, in D. Rosen and C. Brook (eds), Words on Music: Essays in Honor of Andrew Porter, 2003 vii ff. The group is described as comprising William Mann (The Times), Donald Mitchell (The Daily Telegraph) and Peter Heyworth (The Observer).

240 See A. C. Hawkins, British Council Representative’s report on British Music Week, p.8 (AUS/150/5), National Archives: ‘there will probably be a real change in outlook when the younger generation take over, but the conservative forces—elderly heads of this and that, subscription series with the same audiences year after year, the weight of the great classical tradition...are very strong.’
culture of the period favoured what Oliver Rathkolb calls the ‘inspired masters concept’—generally the art and music heritage of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—is viewed as having been appropriated by the government as a stabilising agent in the reconstruction of post-war national identity. Viennese opera in particular, Rathkolb says, ‘was supposed to unfold under the auspices of the state’ and was therefore subject to the control of the central authorities. Vienna was a subscription city, and as Georg Solti expresses, ‘all subscription cities are conservative,’ operating on a ‘modified museum philosophy, whereby the great works of the old masters are continuously available in the central exhibit.’

According to his brother, Michael Raeburn, Christopher Raeburn and his close circle of allies, especially Peter Branscombe and H.C. Robbins Landon (and also Raeburn’s Decca colleague Erik Smith), were in thrall to the post-war reconstituted gute alte Zeit of imperial Vienna, and were described as being ‘soaked in the charm of Alt-Wien.’ Indeed, Raeburn was personally well-suited to the preponderant Viennese social disposition, as it is described in British Council dispatches:

Despite the vicissitudes of two world wars, which changed effectively the structure, means and outlook of the people, the Austrians are still almost over-anxious to become cultivated...all consider it de rigeur to reverence literature, the arts, the theatre, and above all, music.

Christopher Raeburn’s experience of the State Opera in Vienna in its smaller, temporary home at the Theater an der Wien during the reconstruction of the State Opera House, conditioned a preference for a chamber ensemble-style production hallmarked by ‘simplicity, concentration, and attention to the basics,’ in which there was ‘no need for great gestures, but for personal intensity, truth and immediacy.’ This so-called ‘Viennese Mozart-Style,’ of performance, exemplified by Josef Krips, had been developed to suit the more intimate dimensions of the theatre, and was marked by clarity of diction, precision of rhythm, even in coloratura, and less vocal projection. Raeburn attempts to define it in a number of interviews: in his opinion it was characterised by the phrasing of the opera orchestra—the VPO—and ‘comes from the Vienna temperament. They play in a bel canto

242 Ibid. Rathkolb notes that provincial Austrian theatres were allowed to develop independently.
244 Michael Raeburn, interview recorded 11 May 2016.
245 British Council papers, AUS/701/3, report 1964/65, TNA.
247 Walter Berry, interviewed by Bruce Duffie, 1985, describes these attributes as his view of the characteristics of the ‘Viennese Mozart-Style’ <https://www.bruceduffie.com/berry.html> [accessed 23 May 2017].
way, they have an ability to phrase, not to attack phrases’ that is ‘melodic, musical poetic Mozart playing, without being sentimental.’

He also suggests that it was created by the collective intuition of the VPO in balancing the sound; that without direction from a conductor, ‘they used different string strengths for certain arias...at least one desk would go...they know what a bel canto line is and they have to listen.’

It appears paradoxical that Raeburn’s operatic ideal should combine what he saw as a contingent tendency towards instinctive group understanding, exemplified by the VPO and by singers performing in their mother tongue, with the intensive preparation and exactitude of Busch and Ebert in Glyndebourne. Yet in both traditions Raeburn saw the continuation of a particular heritage. Glyndebourne, he said, had sprung ‘from a tradition of making music at home’—Hausmusik—which had its roots in ‘the days of patronage in the eighteenth century,’ whereas the VPO was ‘the most individual and characteristic orchestra in the world with a great tradition of its chosen repertoire,’ with a ‘definite tradition in...playing and interpretation.’

An awareness of these remoter pasts, to paraphrase Edward Downes of Andrew Porter, permeated Raeburn’s entire musical outlook and through which his musical preferences and observations might be viewed.

In his transformation from actor to cultural commentator, Raeburn’s papers show him to have been somewhat volatile and inconsistent: sensitive and observant of diplomatic refinements and yet choleric when compromised or criticised. It appears from the comments of his Decca colleagues that although employed by reputation as a scholar, Raeburn had forgone none of the histrionic attributes of his earlier incarnation as an actor: Culshaw describes him as ‘generat[ing] too much intensity, but if he did it was a fault on the right side. He was popular with the artists, and an exceptionally hard worker.’ Minshull, too, explains that some Decca staff found Raeburn a somewhat unfathomable, erratic character: ‘a vibrant and overpowering personality emerged with a stronger presence than almost any of the artists...He loved being outrageous, to the point of caricaturing himself,’ but tempered, however, because ‘behind everything was a totally loyal, serious and highly
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250 Christopher Raeburn, ‘Twenty Five Years of Glyndebourne’, article written for the Glyndebourne Festival brochure, 1959, copy in BL/RA.
251 Christopher Raeburn, personal notes, BL/RA.
entertaining colleague, whose pursuit of perfection made all of us even more obsessed with the same goal.\textsuperscript{254}

\textsuperscript{254} Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1995.
PART 2 Deconstructing the Decca producer

Chapter 3: The inner world: internal integration

3.1 The formation of the ‘team’

Deep down, what did we producers think we were supposed to be doing? Apart from being able to sample constant travel, endless ‘business’ visits to concerts and operas, we all seemed to be very independent, and yet were happy to be led by Culshaw. We got on easily socially, but we certainly did not spend such time analysing the nature of our job. However, I suspect that I was not alone in trying to form a concept of what I, for one, might contribute. 255

This reflection by Ray Minshull on independent action and the influence of group culture raises the principle topics discussed in this chapter. It discusses the degree and nature of autonomy that a producer might possess in making recordings, and the extent to which Decca’s organisational culture required producers to fulfil their role as part of a process of production depend on an understanding of the concrete, factual elements of the job. There was, however, no formal job description for the Decca staff producer. This chapter describes the role in relation to the group dynamic; its ‘internal integration,’ as Edgar Schein’s model of organisational culture expounds. 256 It aims to analyse the division of labour, which, as Howard Becker suggests, is necessary for understanding how all art and culture is produced, 257 from which a taxonomy of the generic requirements and responsibilities to be met in the course of the job might be constructed. The chapter also considers whether the internal relationships on which the recording process depended were sufficiently robust to withstand a sequence of destabilising influences, both internal and external, during the 1970s.

Decca producers, other than John Culshaw, were not frequent authors on the process of recording, and as Minshull suggests in his memoirs, neither did they often seek to express their thoughts on a personal approach and contribution to recorded production. From the end of the 1950s there was rising demand for the mechanics of production to be made public, and the relationship between Decca and the music press was complex and

256 Edgar Schein, Organizational Culture and Leadership, 4th edition, 2010, and as discussed in the Introduction to this thesis.
257 Howard S. Becker, Art Worlds, 1982, and as discussed in the Introduction to this thesis.
symbiotic, equally courted and tolerated on sufferance for the marketing exposure it created.\textsuperscript{258} Edward Lewis and Maurice Rosengarten, Minshull says, were very much opposed to public curiosity, and Culshaw’s numerous expositions on recording techniques in the press during the 1960s were seen by Lewis as creating a personal platform for Culshaw that challenged Lewis’s leadership image.\textsuperscript{259} This was compromised further, no doubt, as Culshaw stated that ‘nobody in management had even the remotest idea of what classical producers actually did.’\textsuperscript{260} Yet Culshaw was sensitive to criticism that airing his views in the public domain could create misunderstandings as to whether he represented the views of the company, or spoke independently. The tension between recordings construed as corporate, group property, or as products of individual artistic responsibility is revealed in his rebuke in \textit{High Fidelity} of criticism of his recording of Strauss’s \textit{Elektra} (1966–1967).\textsuperscript{261} In this article, published in 1968 after his resignation from Decca, Culshaw emphasises that he was now ‘free to do battle’ and defend his artistic reputation without prejudicing the company’s integrity or relationship with the critical press. Conrad L. Osborne’s swingeing attack on Culshaw’s production of \textit{Elektra} questions the ‘powers and limitations’\textsuperscript{262} of the producer to ‘impose himself,’ as Culshaw puts it, ‘between the opera and its audience.’\textsuperscript{263}

Decca’s staff producers were considerably less visible to the public than Culshaw. There is no substantive evidence that their views were censored, but even for a seasoned journalist such as Christopher Raeburn who maintained his research interests after joining Decca’s A&R department, few articles were published that attempted to explain or describe his approach to recording.\textsuperscript{264} However, there was no shortage of offers from music magazines for contributing articles: Roland Gelatt, editor-in-chief of \textit{High Fidelity}, for one, requested first refusal on anything Raeburn wrote connected with recording.\textsuperscript{265} Colin Symes notes that a proliferation of record and audiophile magazines eager to harvest insights into the techniques and background details of recording corresponds to ‘paradigm switches’ in

\begin{itemize}
\item[259] Ibid.
\item[264] Details of Raeburn’s journalistic output are given in Appendix 4.
\item[265] Christopher Raeburn, letter to Roland Gelatt, 23 March 1967, BL/RA. Raeburn fielded similar requests from William Weaver of \textit{Discoteca} magazine and Kurt Blaukopf of \textit{Phono}.
\end{itemize}
the industry at junctures of significant technical development. As pioneers of stereo, and with the huge interest generated by Culshaw’s Sonicstage opera recordings in the 1960s, and even for what Culshaw describes as ‘my most innocent and gimmickless recordings’, Decca was of high value to audio journalism. It is noteworthy, therefore, that while Culshaw maintained a dialogue with the press that revealed ‘behind-the-scenes’ information, articles in this field by Raeburn and his colleagues are largely confined to the post-Culshaw (post-1967) era of Decca.

Of particular significance is a typescript of Raeburn’s, dating from early in his A&R career—‘Opera in Stereo by Christopher Raeburn’ for Discoteca—because it duplicates numerous paragraphs of Culshaw’s own article, ‘Making a Stereo Rheingold,’ published in 1959 for The Gramophone. The text common to both articles presents the sequence of arrangements and procedures (and ensuing problems) of this opera recording; an account of the work on Das Rheingold, writes Raeburn, ‘applies to almost any projected opera recording these days.’ Whereas Culshaw’s text focuses on this recording, Raeburn uses Rheingold, along with a set of operas recorded in 1958 at the Accademia Santa Cecilia, Rome—La fanciulla del West, Madama Butterfly and Mefistofele and Aida with Herbert von Karajan in Vienna (1959)—for a broader illustration on the stage production and sound effects of stereo opera recording. That someone of Raeburn’s sensitivity towards written attribution, as has been discussed in Chapter 2, could replicate Culshaw’s published text under his own name, seems scarcely credible. This could be interpreted in several ways: that as head of A&R, Culshaw had a monopoly on writing on recording, that by inadvertently divulging experimental methodologies compromised Decca’s position, or indeed that he controlled the information released to the public to maintain a certain level of homogeneity in the message. Yet perhaps the answer lies in both articles themselves.

We are told that at the end of the recording of Rheingold that:

---


268 Erik Smith contributed just two pieces which broach the subject of the recording process: ‘Peter Grimes in Stereo’, for The Gramophone, 1959, and a sleeve note to Il Trittico, recorded in 1962 (Philip Stuart, >1073) before he resigned from Decca in 1968.

269 Published in Discoteca, December 1960 as ‘Regia per i dischi’, pp.23–27. The editor, William Weaver, had requested that Raeburn write an article on ‘producing in the dramatic sense stereo opera recordings’ (letter from Weaver to Raeburn, 29 June 1960, BL/RA.). Raeburn also wrote a presentation speech for a record club that conflated his own article on the evolution of stereo with Culshaw’s Rheingold article.

A night emergency session had been called, after which the huge Vienna Philharmonic at full complement trudged home in the early morning hours; and the conductor, recording crew and what was left of the cast listened to what they had done, were rather pleased with it, and went off at four in the morning to drink goulash soup and talk over whatever might be coming up next.  

This short passage, appearing in Culshaw’s and Raeburn’s articles, illustrates vividly how the Decca crew operated on a recording session in the late 1950s, somewhat magnified by the peripatetic nature of life working on location. The group had succeeded in solving its problems, reaching a consensus, achieving its goals and maintaining a high degree of socialisation. They were all prepared to work through the night, yet remain positive and enthusiastic in anticipation of the work to come. In this kind of environment, it is possible to see how the ‘shared’ authorship of a multipurpose text by Culshaw and Raeburn might be seen as an exemplar of the Decca working culture—of how the sharing of the message might be considered to be the most desirable and effective operational norm for the success of the company. Raeburn himself reinforces this idea in his archive:

The Decca ethos was for five producers to work as a team, though each was as good as the other. The team spirit was endemic to the success of Decca from 1958 and the subsequent 30 years. It was the justification of democracy. Opera and big project recordings were discussed in detail between the producers and engineers concerned, and every person including the location editors were invited to comment. This even extended to such completely artistic issues as to whether Ettore Bastianini or Jussi Björling should be sacked.

A consensus of opinion among staff working in the 1950s and 1960s upholds Raeburn’s view. Jack Law, a technical engineer, believes that ‘the good relationship at Decca between production staff, engineers and musicians was due to a certain atmosphere of informality and equality, unlike at EMI, where artists were allowed to treat company employees almost like servants.’ Stephen Johns concurs with Law that EMI’s company culture was formal in comparison to Decca: until the early 1960s, he says, ‘balance engineers [of EMI] were distinguished by their white lab coats and were not allowed to talk to the talent as it was
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272 Christopher Raeburn, notes for a memoir, ‘Recording Producer,’ undated, BL/RA. The five producers in 1958 to whom he refers are Ray Minshull, Erik Smith, James Walker, Michael Williamson, and himself.
not their job. Ray Minshull and Erik Smith agree that the concept of teamwork built on an ethos of equality was an omnipresent feature of Decca’s operation, particularly between producers and balance engineers: Minshull says that ‘the producer has the front man job, but that’s the only appearance of any difference in seniority. It’s fundamental to the attitude and the preparation.’ Smith likens the Decca notion of ‘team’ to the school ‘house spirit,’ an influence he hoped to take with him to Philips on his departure from Decca in 1968, and Culshaw, in his preface to *The Ring Resounding*, writes of the ‘communal decisions’ and ‘the greater “we” which represents the Decca Record Company itself.’ In the opinion of *Gramophone* editor Anthony Pollard, the concept of the ‘team’ at Decca, as founded in the 1950s, was grounded in the military service background shared by Culshaw and other members of the A&R team, including Raeburn and Minshull, which created intense loyalty between colleagues that crossed interdepartmental boundaries, and perhaps, as Raeburn and Minshull suggest, notional hierarchies too. Indeed, Decca’s history of wartime research, development and manufacturing, as has been discussed in Chapter 1, might be seen to have established the conditions of its working environment in the long term: Anthony Griffiths, Decca’s technical director from 1986 to 1997 sees his predecessor, Arthur Haddy, along with senior engineer Kenneth Wilkinson, as creating ‘a house approach, a house technique, a house quality. In companies like D[eutsche] G[rammophon] and Philips there isn’t a house approach—it’s a collection of individuals.’ For Raeburn, the ‘team’ was the causal factor that enabled Decca to retain a sense of artistic and technical independence following the sale to PolyGram in 1980:

> There is a very close working relationship between producers and engineers...and there is always a close collaboration in all our work together. We’ve gone out of our way to maintain [it] and I think the so-called Decca Team...I think that accounts for a very positive side of Decca’s results.  

If, like Raeburn says, the Decca concept of ‘team’ was as a homogenous group of democratic outlook—that is, ‘interdependent’—but also, as Minshull observes in the opening quotation to this introduction, that producers were ‘very independent,’ were staff
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274 Stephen Johns, interview recorded 21 October 2016.
275 Interview recorded by Evans Mirageas for WFMT Radio Chicago, 1985.
279 Christopher Raeburn, unpublished interview with Malcolm Walker, 1 February 1983.
able to uphold the company’s guiding principles while finding their own voice? Were there boundaries between staff roles that were generally respected?

3.2 Training and hierarchy

The concept of internal integration at Decca is particularly significant because of the nature of the segmentation of roles within the company, and their diffuse operational locations in Europe and North America. Decca’s studios in Broadhurst Gardens, West Hampstead were the London home of its staff producers from 1936 until 1981, and at its recording centre in Kilburn until 1997, along with the recording and post-production staff, although both Culshaw and Minshull (and later Mirageas), as A&R directors, were based administratively at Decca’s headquarters. Continuity and stability at the Decca studios were features of the working environment that was observed by several of the project interviewees: producer Christopher Pope is aware at the point of his joining Decca in the 1990s from the BBC that there were many staff marking their fortieth anniversaries with Decca who ‘were right at the top of their game until the day they retire[d].’ Pope considers the relatively low turnover of staff to have been part of the attraction of working for Decca—‘what is the magic in this?’ —he asks, especially in contrast to the BBC at the time, in which he describes long-serving staff as ‘burdensome’ to the corporation. Decca managing editor, Nigel Gayler, concurs with Pope:

Nobody was moving on, and there was a good reason for that, because where would you move to? Decca was at the forefront of recordings and you were working with the greatest classical artists in the world and I think that they felt ‘where would you move to?’ You could possibly move to Deutsche Grammophon or possibly to EMI but Decca really was at the forefront of it all, so why move on? Also, because of this team element, people actually enjoyed working with a team and everyone seemed to get on by and large. And I think they enjoyed this fact, and that’s what Decca was like. People will refer to Decca as a ‘family’ and I know a lot of companies are referred to as families, but no doubt about it, it was the Decca ‘family’.

280 Decca’s management was located at Albert Embankment between 1958 and 1980, at Rockley Road, Chiswick until 1990 and from then to Chiswick High Road. Although the Decca studios included an electrical workshop, the company’s R&D department did not join the studio site until the move to Belsize Road in 1981. See Tom Stephenson, British Library Oral History interview, 1984, and James Brown interviewed by Jon Tolansky, Classic Record Collector, Issue 46 (Autumn 2006), pp.17–21.

281 Christopher Pope, interview recorded 27 July 2016.

282 Nigel Gayler, interview recorded 25 May 2016.
Gayler’s point that there were limited possibilities of mobility underscores the question of how task orientation and training differed between Decca and its rivals, and whether there were possibilities for staff to find equivalent jobs elsewhere. As has been discussed in Chapter 1, Deutsche Grammophon’s recording production model frequently combined technical and production roles, referring to itself as ‘an effective, modern enterprise’ in which their ‘young staff of versatile experts [were] all closely connected with each other in their interests and duties’ and where they ‘set great value on having our artistically-responsible staff bear some of the business and commercial responsibility...and that our business and product managers, and also our technicians are able to evaluate musical quality and the artistic standard of our product.’

At EMI, there were fundamental differences in the relations between its production and studio operations. Stephen Johns explains that EMI was in essence two separate institutions: the International Classical Division (ICD) for which studio producers worked in an executive-style capacity with responsibility for budgets, and the studios group, where the recording and post-production functions were based. He describes an arrangement in which there was no expectation for recordings to be made with EMI’s own studio facilities, with the producer given free rein to take work wherever budget and workflow were most favourable. Therefore, Decca staff used to a certain team dynamic could not necessarily expect the same degree of input in recordings or working conditions if considering a move to EMI.

From the 1950s onwards, producers of the Decca A&R department and their studio colleagues served lengthy, informal apprenticeships based on the observation of their peers at work, in order to transmit and preserve institutional memory. Trainee studio personnel, who until the mid-1970s comprised a large number of school-leavers, were likely to have been integrated into the company through work experience in a number of different engineering or technical departments before settling into a permanent role based on aptitude, as has been described by several project interviewees. Balance engineer Simon Eadon learned LP cutting and analogue editing before being employed as a session tape operator, from which he was able to observe Kenneth Wilkinson and James Lock, two of Decca’s most senior engineers, and a full five years before being allowed to use a mixing board.
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283 Publicity brochure, PolyGram International Conference, Killarney, 1986, BL/RA.
284 See in particular interviews with David Bicknell, Bob Gooch and Christopher Bishop, British Library Oral History of Recorded Sound.
286 Technical engineer Peter Van Biene describes in interview beginning his career in Decca’s electrical workshops before being mentored by Wilkinson on location recording sessions. Similar traineeships are described by engineer Stanley Goodall, Classical Recordings Quarterly No. 76 (Spring 2014), pp. 17–21, and Jack Law, Classical Recordings Quarterly No. 67 (Winter 2011), pp. 36–39.
console. Eadon says that a job as a balance engineer was considered to be aspirational among studio employees, due primarily because the ‘Decca Sound’ was the company’s vigorously-marketed principal selling point.\textsuperscript{287} The mechanism for training engineers was both imitative and heuristic: Van Biene says that ‘Wilkie [Wilkinson] tried things and they worked, but he couldn’t tell you why they worked. It doesn’t sound too polite, but in some ways he was a “rule of thumb” man.’\textsuperscript{288} 

In contrast, trainee Decca producers were assigned to the A&R department without experience of work in other areas of the recording chain or first-hand knowledge of how recordings were put together, and as Minshull affirms, ‘there was no ladder’ either internal or external.\textsuperscript{289} Probationer producers of the 1970s to 1990s describe their Decca apprenticeships as having been sent to observe their established colleagues’ practical and diplomatic handling of recording sessions as their general assistants: to see what had been committed to tape and how they had coped.\textsuperscript{290} Cornall recalls\textsuperscript{291} a phased approach to full induction during which producers gravitated towards their preferred repertoire:

When you were a youngster, you’d do everything, from the not very good artist who was churning out a particular series, to eventually big stuff with big artists. It could be opera, it could be choral, orchestral or chamber. But, naturally when we had a little bit more say in what we did, we tended to direct yourself towards the areas that you enjoy.

However, the generation typified by Raeburn and Minshull, who joined Decca within a few months of each other, lacked the range of experienced production colleagues on whose expertise to draw. Minshull describes his apprenticeship as lasting six years in which recording projects were allocated to him, many for Decca’s partnerships with L’Oiseau-Lyre and RCA, before being allowed to make his own choices.\textsuperscript{292} Raeburn’s training was spent assisting either John Culshaw or Erik Smith, acting frequently as Culshaw’s sound stage assistant for stereo opera productions in which he provided the link between conductor, stage and control room, and choreographing singers’ movements across a grid described on a canvas drugget on stage, as director of the aural mise-en-scène.\textsuperscript{293} Although this was a

\textsuperscript{287} Simon Eadon, interview recorded 17 October 2016.  
\textsuperscript{288} Peter Van Biene, interview recorded 19 October 2016.  
\textsuperscript{289} Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1998.  
\textsuperscript{290} As described by Michael Haas, Andrew Cornall and Christopher Pope, interviews recorded 10 May 2016, 15 June 2016 and 27 July 2016.  
\textsuperscript{291} Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.  
\textsuperscript{292} Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1995.  
\textsuperscript{293} This grid technique of Culshaw’s active ‘Sonicstage’ stereo opera recordings has been incorrectly attributed by Raeburn himself as his own invention (British Library Oral History interview, 1987).
probationary task particularly suited to a former stage assistant and researcher of historic theatre production, for which he was acknowledged as having a particularly exuberant approach, Raeburn’s appetite for the job was dulled by awareness that it carried pejorative hierarchical connotations, which he makes clear to Culshaw:

You mentioned the possibility of members of the musical staff undertaking specific projects...you know I am always interested in [Mozart vocal projects] from the musical side as opposed to being ‘on stage’...I am perfectly prepared to do stage work as a member of an anonymous team, but immediately names are involved, I am anxious not to acquire a permanent label as ‘stage assistant’ or the equivalent. If I am to be dubbed

Raeburn acknowledges in both his memoir drafts and in his 1960 article ‘Opera in Stereo’ for Discoteca magazine that this system was first used for Die Walküre Act III (1957), which pre-dated his arrival at Decca, and is corroborated by Culshaw in Records and Recording (‘Our Search for Stage Atmosphere’, Vol. 1 No. 5, December 1957). Erik Smith recalls in interview with Evans Mirageas (WFMT Radio Chicago, 1985) that for Arabella (1957) ‘we had a two-dimensional stage like a chessboard, and we treated the stage like a stage in the theatre.’ The only extant example of the stereo grid production system in Raeburn’s archive is by Smith for Norma, 1967 (see Fig. 3.1).

294 Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1998, describes Raeburn’s effectiveness on the sound stage as ‘the brio which Raeburn inspired in the acting of all these artists [Bastianini, Siepi and Cesari in La Bohème, 1959] was a joy to see.’
‘stage assistant’ as opposed to a member of the team with equal musical status as the others under you I should be dissatisfied. Musical direction (even mono) carries more prestige to the layman, and if it is implied that I am not equally competent and also employed in that sphere, I should like it corrected.  

Raeburn’s inference was that the cooperative status quo is preserved by anonymity and lack of rank assignation (however informal) was part of the A&R department’s culture, and an ethos preferred by Culshaw and continued under Minshull. As Raeburn maintains (and the Stuart-Decca discography indicates), the roles of producer and assistant producer were largely interchangeable in the 1960s—‘each was as good as the other.’ Until 1976 there had been no change in functioning operational hierarchy, making Raeburn the longest-serving staff producer without supplementary authority or promotion.  

It can be seen, therefore, that between 1958 and 1976, the role of the staff producer was stable and no official, permanent hierarchy had been established.

This ‘flat’ structure under the paternalistic management of Culshaw, which was continued by Minshull, provided the conditions within the A&R department for a collaborative culture to develop; one which operated with fewer layers of hierarchy and ‘the authority to make decisions is spread across a flat organisation…Decentralization gives employees a higher level of responsibility and accountability…as well as bigger stakes in the outcomes.’ Yet journalists and commentators from the European press found the attitude of what Raeburn calls ‘English fair-play’ a curious concept, as can be seen from his protracted correspondence with the Austrian musicologist Kurt Blaukopf. Here, Blaukopf credits Raeburn erroneously in an article for Heute magazine as the managing force behind Das Rheingold (1958) and Aida (1959). Blaukopf attended a presentation given by Raeburn in Vienna on Decca’s stereo opera production on behalf of the indisposed

---

295 Christopher Raeburn, letter to John Culshaw, 19 August 1960, BL/RA. Raeburn is writing in response to the promise of publicity on the work of the Decca team—to be referred to by name—by Terry McEwen, Decca/London manager in New York.

296 Christopher Raeburn, notes for a memoir, ‘Recording Producer’, undated, BL/RA.

297 Raeburn was given the title ‘senior producer’ after fifteen years’ service in 1973, but this appears to have been bestowed honoris causa rather than being functional.


299 As conveyed by Raeburn to H.C. Robbins Landon referring to his correspondence with Kurt Blaukopf, correspondence dated 26 January 1960, BL/RA.
Culshaw, which led to the misattribution. Raeburn’s attempts to correct Blaukopf’s interpretation caused great confusion, forcing Raeburn, concerned that this would be seen to undermine the Decca team philosophy and lead to his expulsion from the circle of Culshaw, to lavish his apologies, noting that ‘it is quite beyond the comprehension of an Austrian to think that anyone in my position should bother to deny credit when given.’

Like their A&R colleagues, Decca’s engineers worked under conditions that reflected the style of their department management. According to Peter Van Biene, Arthur Haddy, the head of studio operations and engineering manager, took no interest in the management of functional hierarchies, which he says ‘were a complete mess’ until the mid-1970s. However, Haddy’s disinterest may have been partially pragmatic: studio job titles belied the adaptability of engineering staff, and as has been shown, Decca’ engineers were likely to have had experience of other departmental jobs apart from their own as part of their initiation to Decca. Under the pressure of foreign location working, the use of contingent support was an important part of managing technical risk, which due to the nature of the proprietary recording equipment meant that in-house problems demanded in-house solutions. The job of location or technical engineer was particularly diffuse: according to Van Biene and Law, until the mid-1970s it included repairing equipment, tape operation, editing on location and in some cases balancing the sound, in the rare instances that a balance engineer was indisposed. There was a tacit expectation of engineers of working flexibly and assuming extra general tasks to increase efficiency. Simon Eadon recalls that ‘it was about getting involved. If anything had to be done, whether it was unloading equipment, or setting equipment up. It was about being flexible and if you’re asked to do something, do it, or even anticipate it.’

3.3 The division of labour

The Decca production process comprised a chain of units with core specialisms, and as the range of Raeburn’s papers show, the role of the staff producer intersected and fulfilled a function with departments across internal divisions: the studio operations

300 Ibid.
301 Peter Van Biene, interview recorded 19 October 2016.
302 Arthur Haddy was head of studio operations (and a Board member) until his official retirement in 1977.
304 Simon Eadon, interview recorded 17 October 2016.
(recording, technical, post-production, mastering), marketing and promotion, and creative services (sleeve and artwork), giving the producer a clear—and unique—overview of the entire recording from concept to product. Part of the problem of defining the job originates from the fact that contact between internal departments and A&R staff came from a different perspective and need, and so no employee, save the head of A&R, had a detailed and comprehensive appreciation of what the job entailed. Raeburn negotiated renewable contracts for himself every few years which contained confidentiality agreements, yet were not explicit in what was formally expected of the role. During the process of organising Raeburn’s papers, an objective of research has been to analyse the extent of the producer’s responsibilities and accountability at Decca through the range of documentation available. The information derived provides a taxonomy of the role as a job-of-work based on evidence from situations with which Raeburn dealt, rather than on a perception of the job, and is shown in Fig. 3.2. As the role remained hierarchically uncomplicated until the mid-1970s, Raeburn’s work is considered to be representative of the staff producers until this time. Tasks have been grouped according to their general purpose and orientation to reveal the main areas of responsibility.

Fig. 3.2 A taxonomy of the Decca recording producer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of responsibility</th>
<th>Area of concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assume responsibility for all musical and technical aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assume responsibility for front-line public relations on recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warrant and represent that recording is of the highest technical quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assume responsibility for final product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer and assign any and all rights to master (for collaborative work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act as conduit for external funding possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build rapport with artist (professionally and socially)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparatory talks with artists: attend concerts and rehearsals with artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend festivals, concerts, competitions: talent-scouting (file reports*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liaise with a musicological authority in creating specialised recording concept/preparation of condensed opera dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree casting for specific projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some (limited) input in repertoire selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devise running order sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalise editions of repertoire to be recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree cadenzas with artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrange for transpositions to be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advise on instrumentation requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select desired orchestral members for recording (where possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create ‘atmosphere’ and ‘pace’ on recording session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage movement direction (assistant producer role)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raeburn’s contracts signed between 1968 and 1980 read ‘to perform the duties in relation to the Artists’ Department of the Company and of its subsidiaries.’ (BL/RA).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Organisational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraise artists’ auditions: comment on style and presentation (file reports*)</td>
<td>Liaise with external recording stakeholders/partners/agents/organisations in conjunction with Head of A&amp;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make artist recommendations for repertoire or role</td>
<td>Liaise with engineers on choice, suitability and acoustic modifications needed for recording venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opinion when sound balance is being worked out</td>
<td>Book session time at recording venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide cues for the balance engineer during recording</td>
<td>Discuss number of sessions and preferred times with artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct recording to be stopped and started from personal evaluation of performance, where performance breaks down or on evaluation of conductor</td>
<td>Arrange rehearsals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select takes in consultation with the artist and prepare production score for editing staff</td>
<td>Plan recording schedule or remakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give constructive input and feedback to artist</td>
<td>Submit a detailed recording plan (detailed breakdown of music content/duration per session in accordance with local union rules)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate artists’ comments on edited versions and make alternative sequence</td>
<td>Monitor the session time schedule and advise if overtime is used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give instructions to change phrasing/dynamics (in addition to correcting performances mistakes) to post/production staff</td>
<td>Announce take numbers over a talk-back system, recorded onto tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Record of Session form (details of recorded take durations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Advance Recording Information (ARI) form and sleeve/label copy details (Longsheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver copies of interim edited versions for playback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrange playbacks and book engineering assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirm that test pressings match the master tape*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propose and nominate booklet authors/other printed matter for recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (infrequent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present recordings for promotional events at Decca headquarters and international conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrange playbacks for cultural meetings (e.g. ambassadorial)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give talks to music societies and record clubs*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competition adjudication*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write booklet/sleeve notes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write musical arrangements** (under a separate agreement) and transpositions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Largely era-dependent activities (1950s–1970s) ** Dependent on the theoretical musical skills of the producer

As Fig. 3.2 shows, operationally, the central role of the staff producer was to be accountable for the final recorded product and to vouch for the artistic and technical standards expected of the ‘house quality.’ This was dependent on maintaining a balance of internal and external working relationships; as distinct from their colleagues in the chain, the producer was required to demonstrate competencies across a range of fields and activities with skills that were less rooted in assigned ‘vocational’ specialisms. Unlike engineers, producers were not ‘flexible specialists,’ and according to Eadon, were not
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expected to be able to deputise in roles (like engineering) in which staff had served specific apprenticeship training. ‘If someone fell ill, for instance,’ Eadon remarks, ‘someone else could take over...The assistant could go to the mixer and tape op, and I could be the producer. But had it been the other way round, the producer could not have moved into my role.’

Indeed, Culshaw went so far as to impress upon A&R staff not to ‘fiddle unconsciously with whatever knobs or gadgets are within reach’ and ‘not to touch anything’ in studio cutting rooms to as not to risk accusations of inter-departmental sabotage.

There was, however, an expectation that there would be open dialogue and discussion with colleagues on session, and producers exercised their opinion over the nature of the desired sound for the recording. As producer Andrew Cornall explains, when he joined the company in the 1970s, there was sufficient time (and financial resources) on sessions to record test takes to optimise the sound for the artists and the repertoire in a particular recording location:

> We used to talk about ‘getting the sound’ and the artists used to recognise this, and it would take anywhere from around half an hour to an hour and a half (if we did, it was complicated). And this was totally accepted by the artist. They would be rehearsing and the recording teams would be getting the sound. You’d do test takes and the conductor would come back and there would be a discussion...And we used to talk about the sound we wanted to get for French music as opposed to a Mahler symphony, or a particular opera, say a Donizetti opera rather than a Wagner opera. So it was quite nuanced in the way we tried to approach the sound. And in the 1950s and 60s they might have a whole session just putting the sound together. You had the time to make things up.

Producers were solely responsible for time management of sessions, so it is likely that working by consensus was deemed to be efficient. The recording session maxim of the 1950s to the early 1970s was to obtain the desired result in situ rather than spend time afterwards revisiting the sound. In his draft memoir notes, Raeburn remarks that this approach facilitated the possibility to ‘recapture the sound of the recording hall,’ which he emphasised was an entirely different recording philosophy to that of Deutsche Grammophon, who relied on a system of creating a post-session mix ‘to fit their political needs if venues changed and for other exigencies.’ It was also a far cry from producer Paul

---

306 Simon Eadon, interview recorded 17 October 2016.
307 John Culshaw, memo to A&R staff, 19 October 1959, BL/RA.
308 Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.
309 Christopher Raeburn, undated notes, BL/RA.
Myers’ description of CBS’s attitude of ‘making do’ with whatever conditions were available for recording.310 The Decca method of establishing the desired sound at the time of the sessions was, according to Raeburn, the central ‘unspoken philosophy, so that the Decca sound was recognised as such.’311 Consequently, the choice of recording space and its acoustic properties was more than a subjective opinion, but the guarantor of the highest recording standards, prompting ‘terrible arguments between Haddy and Wilkie [Wilkinson] about the acoustics in different halls.’312 Under Minshull’s leadership, the A&R team were canvassed every few years on their opinions of recording locations in Britain and asked to score venues for their suitability for a range of repertoire genres, from large-scale choral works and opera, to chamber and solo instrumental music, with the results of such surveys used as the basis on which to sign exclusive contracts with recording venues.313 However, to broaden the scope of recording locations suitable for specific repertoire and artists, producers relied on ‘hall searches’ and ensuing reports made by balance engineers to finalise their recording plans. An example of the parameters addressed in reports between engineers and the A&R department can be seen in Fig 3.3a and 3.3b below:

310 Paul Myers interviewed by David Patmore, Classic Record Collector Issue 61 (Summer 2010), p.38.
311 Interview with Alan Blyth, ‘Producer Emeritus’, Opera Vol. 47 No. 8, (August 1996), p.875. Decca was not averse to dismissing its own recording facilities on grounds of acoustic unsuitability: a memo from chief engineer Kenneth Wilkinson to Nella Marcus (16 March 1967, BL/RA) states that Decca’s Studio 3 at West Hampstead was deemed unsuitable for solo voice and piano recordings and should be used ‘only as a last resort’ if Kingsway Hall and Walthamstow were not available.
312 Peter Van Biene, interview recorded 19 October 2016.
313 An example of this is an exclusive contract drawn up between Decca and Walthamstow Town Hall in 1986. See Ray Minshull, memo to producers and engineers, 23 June 1986.
Fig. 3.3a Hall inspection report p.1 for Millstatt Church, Austria, 1987, with details of acoustic and practical considerations, and suitability for particular repertoire, (BL/RA). 314

314 Report to Ray Minshull made by Stanley Goodall, 12 August 1987. The venue was subsequently used for recordings of Mozart piano concerti with András Schiff and the Camerata Academica Salzburg, produced by Christopher Raeburn and Michael Haas.
**Hall Inspection Report**

**Fig. 3.3** Hall inspection report p.2 for Millstatt Church, Austria, 1987, with details of acoustic and practical considerations, and suitability for particular repertoire, BL/RA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL QUALIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For which sort of music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable: Chamber Music - Mozart piano concerti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not suitable: Large orchestral works, opera.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTROL ROOM EQUIPMENT PRESENT:</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixing Desk: type:</td>
<td>output:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. Recording Machines: type:</td>
<td>tracks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. Recording Machines: type:</td>
<td>tracks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loudspeakers: type:</td>
<td>EMT pls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverberation Chamber: type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr. Microphones: type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IS HALL IN USE FOR RECORDINGS:** YES OCCASIONAL/FREQUENT

**BY WHICH COMPANIES:** DELTA MUSIC, LABEL ‘CAPRICCIO’, BASED IN KÖLN.

**UNLOAD PLAN:** PARK TRUCK OUTSIDE

**BOOKING TARIFF:** PAU

**CATHERING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drinks:</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meals:</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEOGRAPHICAL SITUATION:** 100 MILES FROM SALZBURG

**MEANS OF TRANSPORT:** CAR

**PARKING FACILITIES:** OK

**SPECIAL REMARKS:**

Very promising. Build rostrum over altar steps and insulate under to extend working area. Build rostrum at rear to accommodate woodwind.

**INSPECTED BY:** Stan Goodall

**NAME:** (NAME). 10.8.87

**DATE:**

**EXPERIENCES AFTER TEST OR FIRST RECORDING:**

---

The Decca production philosophy of maximising the work completed on session also extended to editing recordings, much of which was done on session until 1975, to establish that all the material had been covered and the artist was happy with the takes that had been chosen. Culshaw chooses to express this in *The Ring Resounding* as a Decca tradition ‘to do your own editing,’ and that ‘producers and technicians on any major work will not only make the choice of what material is used out of what has been recorded, but
will actually join it up and sign off the complete performance,\footnote{John Culshaw, \textit{The Ring Resounding}, 2012, eBook, loc. 1568. According to Stephen Johns (interview, 21 October 2016), EMI saw the difference between EMI and Decca editors in that ‘EMI would employ musicians and turn them into editors because they thought that musicians could learn the technical side, but not vice versa. They felt that at Decca it was technicians that were doing editing.’} but both Van Biene’s and Law’s accounts of their jobs show that producers did not physically edit recordings themselves.\footnote{Peter Van Biene, interview recorded 19 October 2016, and Jack Law interviewed by Alan Sanders for \textit{Classical Recordings Quarterly} No. 67 (Winter 2011), pp. 36-39.} This, too, was part of Culshaw’s culture of promotion—that the ‘wisdom of the crowd’ encouraged staff to value their input and work to the highest quality in the knowledge that there was no competition over ownership and credit.

Although producers (of Raeburn’s generation in particular) lacked the adaptability and specialist knowledge to take on technical tasks, there were certain opportunities for involvement in Decca’s non-studio activities associated with the preparation and promotion of the final product, especially during the 1960s and 1970s. Culshaw turned to Raeburn in particular to deputise for him in promotional speaking engagements for record clubs and at press conferences when these clashed with recording obligations. Described by his colleagues Michael Haas\footnote{Michael Haas, interview 10 May 2016.} and Christopher Pope\footnote{Christopher Pope, interview recorded 27 July 2016.} as a person ‘of huge personality and abundant charm’ who ‘loved the product,’ Raeburn was well-suited to the task. However, these were occasions in which a script had been prepared to accompany musical excerpts, and were mostly devised (by Culshaw) to introduce Decca artists to a wider audience rather than to present the company’s recording philosophy. Although Raeburn would personalise the address, as is evident from his editorial markings, the mandate was to stay focused on the topic and deliver the message.\footnote{See text of a talk delivered to the Blackpool Music Festival, 1962, BL/RA.} Raeburn’s enthusiasm as a Decca emissary spilled over into his life outside recording too—a less successful enterprise. A notable instance is found in his visit to the Osaka Festival in 1963 during a sabbatical from Decca work,\footnote{This sabbatical was granted by Culshaw and Maurice Rosengarten (somewhat grudgingly) for Raeburn to complete his book on Mozart opera and eighteenth-century theatre.} in which he was travelling as a journalist on behalf of \textit{High Fidelity} magazine, and for \textit{Music and Musicians}, in the entourage accompanying the London Symphony Orchestra on their first tour to Japan. The party included the music director of the British Council, who impressed upon Raeburn the need for record companies to do more to stimulate sales in a potentially valuable market, noting that there were too few Decca/London recordings in Japanese record shops. In addition to giving a radio talk and press interview—unsolicited—on behalf
of the company, Raeburn planned to write an article for *High Fidelity* on Western classical music sales in Japan, but concern was raised by Culshaw that his unilateral efforts interfered with the work of Decca’s licencee and distributors in the Far East. The situation was diffused by Raeburn’s own diplomatic contrition, conceding that the situation was more involved than he realised, and that he had ‘stepped into [their] province.’

Equally controversial was the A&R staff’s dealings with the sleeve note department and their offers either to contribute notes themselves or to make suggestions for a particular source of expertise. Here Raeburn was a keen and particularly experienced volunteer, but his work was subject to significant editorial intervention and described stylistically as ‘a bit breathless.’ As Appendix 4 shows, during the 1960s and 1970s he wrote many sleeve notes himself, and was also able to draw upon the considerable resources and specialisms of his network of critic friends. Indeed, it was considered by the A&R department that their association with musicologists and their proximity to artists—being ‘closely in touch with the musical world’ as Minshull put it—gave them a degree of authority over this aspect of the product. The innumerable terse exchanges between the two departments in the 1960s and 1970s show that the Decca team spirit, the publicly-cherished ideology that kept the studios functioning harmoniously, was not a feature of the producers’ relationship with Decca’s Publicity and Sleeve departments, with the possibility of cooperation becoming increasingly fragile. Sleeve note-writing by producers, along with their nominations of specialist writers, was tolerated on sufferance, but their commissioning notes was deemed not acceptable. From time to time, adverse criticisms of notes written by A&R staff appeared in the musical press which further served to undermine this work: John Culshaw writes in response to these that ‘when it was agreed that members of the musical staff should write and receive payment for sleeve notes the decision was based on the argument that such notes would be more perceptive and accurate than those generally obtained outside...In view of the continued problems with
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321 Letters between Christopher Raeburn and Derrick Coupland, Decca Records Orient Ltd, (undated) and Mr Yanai, King Record Company, Japan, 13 June 1963.
322 Corrections to galley proofs made by Robin Horsley of Raeburn’s sleeve notes for Teldec *Mozart Opera Festival*/Kertész, 1972, BL/RA. Raeburn’s notes for a recording of Mozart piano concertos with Clifford Curzon in 1968 (Philip Stuart, >1549 and >1562) were also returned for editing as Curzon said there was ‘a little too much emphasis on opera.’
323 Ray Minshull, memo to Maurice Roach (Publicity department), 22 February 1977.
324 Both Minshull and Raeburn also aimed to select the sleeve artwork of their recordings during the 1960s: as Minshull notes in his unpublished memoirs (1995), he insisted on using Blake’s *The Ancient of Days* for his recording of *Die Schöpfung* (1967) and Brueghel for Dvořák Symphony no.9 (1966), having been convinced of the importance of the cover of recordings following the creative photography used for *Das Rheingold* (1959). See Chapter 6 for Raeburn’s input in sleeve artwork for *Der Rosenkavalier* (1968–1969).
the department involved, it is more important than ever that our contributions should be careful, complete and accurate. The fundamental differences between the departments lay in a failure to understand what each considered to be the purpose of the sleeve to the product: ideally, producers saw it (notwithstanding their own occasional shortcomings) as enhancing the recording with the best in musicological understanding, whereas the publicity department, unsurprisingly, regarded it as a marketing asset that required objective and coherent content within the limitations of the packaging. But deeper still, there was what Ray Minshull—by this time Director of classical recording and answerable only to Edward Lewis himself—considered as an intrinsic failure in Decca’s internal systems to identify the locus of the producer in the production chain. His correspondence with Maurice Roach of the publicity department serves as an important explanation of the relationship status of the producer in the late 1970s:

It is essential that [the sleeve department] should all have a clearer understanding of the producer’s function...both for their own enlightenment and for the benefit of Decca.

The producer is not merely a person who announces take numbers and arranges for the editing of the tapes. His fundamental importance and most difficult function is to further the intelligent personal artistic relationship between the artist and the Company. Indeed, it is not going at all too far to say that...the producer is the actual visible representative of Decca as far as the artist is concerned.

Our catalogue is based on our exclusive artists and our producers are our direct and vital links with these artists. The artists themselves do not see Decca as a collection of separate departments and internal sections, and the only other department working directly in conjunction with the artist is, and should be, the Classical Marketing and Promotions department, whose contact with them is inevitably more sporadic and less close.

It would obviously be impertinent of me to define the role of one of your sections in your Department especially since you have done it so well in coining its title as ‘Classical Sleeve Co-ordination.’ I take this to mean that its function is to co-ordinate all of the various materials needed to design and present the finished classical sleeves – a liaison function between artists and producer, Art Studio and Promotions Department, translator and note-writer and the finished result.

John Culshaw, memo to the Musical Staff, 27 January 1966. Culshaw notes that criticisms in The Gramophone included notes for Don Carlo (1965, Philip Stuart, >1369), described as ‘positively misleading’ and those for Boccherini/Viotti (1964, Philip Stuart, >1085) as ‘misleading and very short.’ Christopher Raeburn is likely to have been the author of the notes for Don Carlo (see notes in the Raeburn Archive, with details here in Appendix 4).

See Barry Malcomber, memo to Maurice Roach, 19 January 1977, BL/RA.

Minshull was at this time responsible for the delivery of the classical recording output, budget control, artists’ contracts and long-term repertoire plans.
What has to be clearly understood and acknowledged is that the artist and the producer have an inescapable right to propose and nominate specific pictures, note-writers and in some cases type of presentation, which, as long as the proposal is not challenged by yourself, myself or the Marketing and Promotion manager directly to the artist or producer, it is the obligation of the sleeve-co-ordinator to fulfil.

During my first 15 years with Decca whenever a producer offered his services to write sleeve notes he wrote on the relevant form ‘I will provide these.’ In those days the words were welcomed...so why have these same words suddenly given rise to what I can only describe as petty-minded opposition?328

Although Minshull attaches importance to the producer’s front-line authority to represent the company’s interests, it is evident from the job taxonomy in Fig. 3.2 that there were a number of intrinsic elements missing from the role that might support this status as the visible, artistic intermediary for Decca; these being chiefly knowledge of the details of artists’ contracts and recording project budgets, and of input in long-term strategic repertoire plans. As Minshull states in his notes,329 he was not responsible for negotiating contracts or deciding which works would be recorded until he was promoted from producer to head of A&R in 1967 on the departure of John Culshaw, after which Minshull would fly to Zurich at weekends to discuss such matters with Maurice Rosengarten. As Raeburn’s papers show, both Culshaw and Minshull invited A&R staff to prepare lists of repertoire for consideration as part of future recording planning, yet the prospect of a producer’s influence on repertoire was restricted largely because of the direct relationship between repertoire and the more pressing needs of commercial and artistic policy: repertoire that could be married to the career of particular artists. Repertoire suggestions from A&R staff frequently reflected their personal musical interests in the form of individual musical works rather than an awareness or perception of major lacunae in the catalogue. As Mirageas says,330 historically, repertoire ideas came from a variety of sources—from Decca’s licencees in territories worldwide, from artists and conductors, retailers and indeed, sometimes producers—but the final decision lay with the controller of the overall budget in light of the sales potential across the territories, set against the cost to make the recording.331 Minshull notes that traditionally, Decca was committed to its

328 Ray Minshull, memo to Maurice Roach, 22 February 1977, BL/RA.
330 Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016.
331 The classical recording budget was managed consecutively by Maurice Rosengarten until 1975, by Ray Minshull until 1994, and by Evans Mirageas until 2000.
exclusive contracts with conductors, singers and soloists, leaving only ten percent of the annual capacity ‘to look for other musically-rewarding ventures.’ However, a couple of exceptions emerged in the early 1970s with the establishing of specialist recording imprints at Decca. Notably, these were the Florilegium series directed by producer Peter Wadland—a fruitful recording partnership with Christopher Hogwood’s Academy of Ancient Music (AAM), and the Headline series, developed by James Mallinson to champion contemporary composers—albeit those with already well-established international reputations.

Although these two producers were each able to exert influence on the artistic direction of the labels through their contact with artists and composers—a ‘catalytic role of personal relations between individuals’ as Nick Wilson writes in his analysis of the AAM’s development—it is evident from later correspondence with Ray Minshull that neither knew the true costs of their recordings. Mallinson had asked, unsuccessfully, for details of the disposition of the annual recording budget, sponsored recordings and exclusive artists’ contract details (such as duration, number of records and long term plans), but it is not until 1984 that Minshull can be seen to concede that withholding such information was a driver for potential internal conflict. He writes to the A&R staff:

> What brings this to a head is a long and unhappy conversation with Peter Wadland... It is very hard for Peter, without facts and figures at his disposal, to understand why I am pressuring him to find a way of recording this two-record set [Vivaldi _La Stravaganza_] in less than 12 sessions. Also without sales forecasts from around the world, it is hard for him to understand how he was allowed to get away with 14 sessions for the Vivaldi op. 8...which is an insane number for two LPs. The session costs

---

333 The Florilegium imprint was administered under the L’Oiseau-Lyre label, which had been acquired by Decca as a subsidiary in 1970 and thereafter managed by Peter Wadland. L’Oiseau-Lyre was highly influential in generating interest in the English historically-informed performance (HIP) movement of the 1970s, and it has been suggested by David Patmore that this repertoire offered a marriage of commercial ‘distinctiveness and innovation’ with current thinking in music scholarship as Decca’s response to Telefunken’s Das Alte Werk label, whose domination by Nikolaus Harnoncourt and Gustav Leonardt had influenced a generation of early music scholars and performers in England. See David Patmore, ‘The influence of recording and the record industry upon musical activity, as illustrated by the careers of Sir Thomas Beecham, Sir Georg Solti and Sir Simon Rattle’, (PhD thesis, 2001), pp.22–23. The Headline series ran until 1980 and included music by Harrison Birtwistle, Thea Musgrave, David Bedford, Toru Takemitsu, Luciano Berio, György Ligeti, Hans Werner Henze and Roberto Gerhard, and frequently performed by the London Sinfonietta (see Philip Stuart, Decca discography, 2014).
335 James Mallinson, memo to Ray Minshull, 1 April 1982, and Ray Minshull, memo to all producers, 11 October 1984, BL/RA.
come to £25,000. Peter thought that the whole project only cost £6-7,000.336

Michael Haas reflects that until he developed his own repertoire series in the 1990s—*Entartete Musik*—he felt that there was artificiality to the idea that, as a producer, he could be ‘a window into Decca’ 337 as he lacked sufficient influence and knowledge to comment either on company policy or individual contracts. As can be seen in the cases of Wadland and Mallinson, even with this degree of responsibility came no guarantee of understanding the bigger picture of the commercial aspect of their recordings.

### 3.3 The team in trouble?

It is a moot question whether the relative artistic independence of producers like Wadland and Mallinson undermined the notion of equality in the workforce during the 1970s. If the 1950s and 1960s at Decca were marked by the consolidation of the team, the 1970s brought a shift in the balance of internal relationships that is visible through a number of developments. Seen cumulatively, these might have provided Christopher Raeburn with the grist with which he considered tendering his resignation from Decca and moving to Hamburg-based PolyGram in 1977.338

Raeburn had been a campaigner for the public profile of producers (and engineers) to be raised by the inclusion of credits in the sleeve information *by right*, which was criticised by a number of sources. Peter Goodchild, Head of Classical Promotion, writes:

> Such fame brings, as well as its own rewards, its own responsibilities; I may as well warn those of you who do not already realise it that many of our beloved public are going to regard the name on the sleeve as someone to whom their hearts may be poured out. I hope for all your sakes that you receive nothing but paeans of praise, though in my experience it is unlikely. In any case, personal letters require personal replies, and I want to say loudly that letters to you which have nothing to do with classical promotion may not and will not be shuffled instantly to me.339

---

336 Ray Minshull, memo to all producers, 11 October 1984, BL/RA.
337 Michael Haas, interview 10 May 2016, BL/RA.
338 See correspondence between Raeburn and Roland Kommerell (then vice-president of Polydor, which along with Phonogram was a subsidiary company of the PolyGram group), January-March 1977, BL/RA.
339 Peter Goodchild, memo to A&R staff, 16 March 1972, BL/RA.
Ray Minshull, in more equitable tones, describes himself as ‘a very lonely voice’ in his own criticism, pressing for names of producers and engineers not to be credited, as he thought that others in the chain of production had an equally valid claim to this stamp of authority on the final product as a collective creation. His opinion was that it was only the company name—and that of the artist—whose reputation was at stake, yet acknowledged that artists rarely appreciated that their career, of which recording was only a constituent part, was the basis of the livelihood of the company’s employees. But Raeburn won his argument, and this set in motion moves by other departments to be acknowledged as equal partners.

The death of Maurice Rosengarten in 1975 left Minshull not only isolated in the financial management of Decca’s Classical Division, but also without peer support in negotiating artists’ contracts and formulating strategic repertoire plans. It was at this juncture that Minshull looked to Christopher Raeburn to shoulder some of the responsibility by promoting him to oversee opera production and to become the main point of contact for recordings made in Vienna, and from this point onwards, we see a greater number of business-related documents in Raeburn’s collection, confirming his membership to an inner circle of managerial power. At the same time, Minshull bolstered the A&R department by recruiting a new generation of staff trained professionally in combinations of music theory and practice, languages and knowledge of recording techniques. Within the Sleeves and Promotion departments too, there were new subdivisions that aimed to professionalise and streamline the process of creating the final product. Minshull’s diatribe to Maurice Roach for his ‘petty minded opposition’ to producers’ involvement in the creation of sleeves, as has been recounted previously, was based on the division of labour and inter-departmental relations as they had been in the late 1950s and 1960s, and

---

341 Recording editors were credited from 1987. See Ray Minshull, memo to staff, 10 November 1987, BL/RA. By the end of the 1980s, numerous other job functions were listed, including art, picture research and sleeve translations.
342 Ray Minshull, typescript for Jonathan Nugent, 15 July 1995, personal papers. He describes that his appointment to Director of classical recording on the death of Rosengarten meant that he reported directly to Sir Edward Lewis, who exercised very little day-to-day financial control. The role of his deputy, managing director Bill Townsley, is described as confined largely to managing Decca’s factory.
343 This group comprised Minshull and Raeburn. After 1980, it included those with executive knowledge of Decca’s function; namely Paul Myers (appointed as Manager, Symphonic Production in addition to his duties as recording producer), Reinhard Klaassen (Executive Chairman, 1980–1982, and President, 1982–1986) and Roland Kommerell (President, 1987–1996).
344 Of note here are Richard Beswick, Andrew Cornall and Michael Haas.
345 See pp.103–104.
shows that Minshull had failed to grasp that jobs at Decca in general—which were outside his control—were being further divided and specialised.

This was also true of the role of the recording editor, which did fall under Minshull’s control. Until the mid-1970s the job had been mostly performed on session in combination with a variety of technical tasks by the location engineer. In 1964, Culshaw had instructed for editing ‘as much as possible’ to take place on recording sessions to ameliorate the extreme pressure of work and to ‘endeavour to make the right judgements during sessions rather than listen to innumerable takes to arrive at the editing sequence.’ After 1975, as part of Minshull’s efforts to reduce the costs of sessions, he specified that this was an indulgence that had to be terminated. His reasons were both financial and operational: recording sessions were scheduled to be increasingly efficient so that the periods of inactivity, in which editing would usually take place, were eliminated; improved accommodation at the studios in West Hampstead allowed for a move towards post-production activity, and increased effort in integrated planning between A&R and marketing departments meant that there were frequent long time lapses between completion of the recording and scheduling the release of the final product.

Consequently, the Decca recording editor was no longer a member of the location recording team and was not privy to undocumented discussions with the artist that took place in the privacy of the control room. This meant that there was no supplementary source of qualitative judgment in situ on which the producer might rely, making selecting takes ‘by committee’ a defunct process. The editor was now reliant on the notes made during the session, and on recorded conversations captured on tape between takes to understand the architecture of the performance chosen by the producer, in consultation with the artist. However, the development of the Decca digital recording and editing system in 1976–1977 gave editors the functionality to locate and repeat short sequences of music, allowing them greater scope for comparative listening between takes than their A&R colleagues, whose playback facilities remained surprisingly limited. Unlike producers, editors had to make a recording ‘work in a musical sense, and [also] had to find the right technical means to make it work.’ According to Andrew Cornall, although editors

346 John Culshaw, memo to Mr Haddy and all musical staff, 12 February 1964, BL/RA.
347 See Ray Minshull memo to Arthur Haddy, 17 October 1975, BL/RA, which covers these points.
348 See Andrew Cornall, memo to Tom Stephenson, 20 March 1985, BL/RA.
349 Caroline Haigh, interview recorded 26 September 2016. The editor, as well as the producer, was required to develop a facility in dichotic listening, or selective attention, trained to hear the musical (subjective) and technical (objective) aspects of the recording in separation.
could be no interference in the producers’ ultimate right to decide the amount of editing required, as only the producer can assess the sensitivity of an artist to a particular recording.\textsuperscript{350} Revolutionising the playback capabilities for the editing department gave the potential for duplicating the producers’ task of comparing musical takes from which to formulate the master, necessitating the clarification of the relationship between the two departments. For A&R staff, it was important to re-emphasise that their working proximity to the artist remained the touchstone of the recording process at Decca, and with it, the right to be the final arbiter in the chain of production.

Perhaps the greatest potential peril for the survival of the Decca team in the 1970s was given focus with the unionisation of the studios in 1977, which according to Ray Minshull was the ‘one constant fear’ \textsuperscript{351} of Arthur Haddy and a signifier of the loss of management control by the Chairman, Edward Lewis. The politicising of Decca might be seen as part of the national trend of the rise of militancy in labour relations during the late 1970s under the successive Labour governments of Harold Wilson and James Callaghan in the year prior to the so-called Winter of Discontent, but it also coincided with studio director Arthur Haddy’s official retirement from Decca, raising speculation that this was either timed intentionally, or prompted him to leave.\textsuperscript{352} Culshaw, in \emph{Putting the Record Straight}, speaks of the spectre of unionisation stealing across the minds of Rosengarten, Lewis and Haddy when he asked for the engineers to be paid a bonus for recording through the night on \emph{Carmen} with the Orchestre de la Suisse Romande in 1963. The management could not, Culshaw says, assume ‘endless goodwill on the part of the engineers’ or risk ‘preparing the way for some as yet unknown militant to make trouble,’ yet neither did they acquiesce, believing it to be ‘the thin end of the wedge.’\textsuperscript{353}

The aims of representation by the ACTT union, beyond improvements to pay and working conditions, included ‘the elimination of unfair anomalies’ and better communication between the management and staff, giving them the opportunity to discuss their working arrangements ‘rather than having them imposed in an arbitrary or autocratic

\textsuperscript{350} Andrew Cornall, memo to Tom Stephenson, 20 March 1985, BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{351} Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1995. Edward Lewis is also quoted as capitulating perhaps too readily to the demands of organised labour in Louis Barfe, \emph{Where Have All the Good Times Gone?}, 2005, p.287.
\textsuperscript{352} Roy Wallace, interviewed in \emph{International Classical Record Collector}, Autumn 1997, p.62, gives 1977 as the date of Haddy’s official retirement.
\textsuperscript{353} John Culshaw, \emph{Putting the Record Straight}, 1981, p.325.
manner." It also hoped to ‘increase working flexibility and lead to better inter-departmental co-operation and understanding’ through staff training and experience in other departments, rather than to seek demarcation and restrictive working, but for a company with such little internal movement and an increasingly specialised workforce, this seems to have been a somewhat futile goal. Although there is little evidence to suggest there had been a catastrophic breakdown of relations with the management, the studio staff were polarised between those who spent the majority of their working life recording abroad and those who were based permanently in London. This was the primary source of the union committee’s claim of unfair anomalies, particularly with regard to pay, which had become a contentious issue. Christopher Pope says that ‘Ray Minshull had a funny attitude towards staff pay, by which you pay them next to nothing but to treat them like kings on expenses...There was a suspicion that this was a ploy to keep people working on the road.’ Yet compared with the complexity of inter-union relations at the BBC, described by Pope—speaking as an ex-BBC studio manager—as a culture of entrenched inflexibility and strict delineation of jobs, Decca’s unionisation worked along more positive lines, which he says relied on personal respect for the accumulated knowledge and expertise of long-serving colleagues. But with increasingly technically-competent A&R staff employed during the 1970s, it became necessary to adapt the language used on session to maintain diplomatic relations with engineering colleagues, as he says ‘everyone at Decca were proud professionals. I couldn’t tell an engineer to lower the mics by an inch as that was telling someone how to do their job, which is indefensible.’ Therefore, Pope adopted Raeburn’s collaborative working methods in the studio: he would describe what he felt was wrong in the sound balance and ask the engineer to provide the solution that rendered the effect he sought. For Raeburn, whose technical understanding of recording techniques has been acknowledged by his colleagues as rudimentary, this approach had the dual benefit of preserving the spirit of egalitarianism in the workplace as well as personal dignity and status.

354 ACTT Union Committee document, February 1977, BL/RA. Further documents show that unionisation achieved a sixty one percent rise in total recording staff salaries in 1977 up from the previous year (source: accounts figures, Ray Minshull papers).

355 Christopher Pope, interview recorded 27 July 2016. Pope also adds that this system of pay kept employer contributions and national insurance contributions low. Christopher Raeburn, however, negotiated his own contractual terms, devoting much energy to seeking favourable agreements, as is indicated by his many archived memos to John Culshaw and Ray Minshull.

356 Ibid. Pope gives the example of BBC producers who had been trained previously as studio managers being prevented from using a mixing console. The relationship between the BBC and the unions is discussed in detail in Anthony McNicholas, ‘Aunty and Her Little Villains: The BBC and the Unions, 1969–1984’, University of Westminster, Researchgate, 2013.
The destabilising forces at Decca in the mid-1970s helped to fuel Christopher Raeburn’s dissatisfaction with the progress of his career. Despite his promotion to an executive-level position in 1976, which he accepted on condition that the A&R staff consider him the senior member working under Minshull, he found the company’s outlook ‘neither ambitious nor spurred by competition.’

In notes for his consultation with Roland Kommerell at Polydor, Raeburn’s opinions of a ‘disastrous’ Sleeves department, ‘inefficient’ publicity, and a ‘short-sighted’ recording policy in need of consolidation were invoked as reasons to leave Decca. He also writes of his desire to realise a long-term project to record the complete works of Mozart as a bicentennial memorial by 1991—‘in view of [his] being a Mozart specialist.’

This could also be seen as a substitute for his own unfinished documentary history of Mozart’s opera productions—which perhaps he knew had little chance of realisation in his present position. It was important to Raeburn that a move should preserve his current status, with overall artistic direction in the operatic field rather than reverting to what he calls a ‘mere producer,’ and would offer him the chance to produce at least five operas per year. However, Kommerell’s reply indicated that employing Raeburn would be impossible as it would create ‘a unique situation in our set-up…it is the status, the exposure, the hierarchical aspect (in the sense of authority, freedom in decision-making, seniority)’ and would require the PolyGram group to re-structure their classical recording organisation. Raeburn was thus resigned to remaining with Decca, ‘as long as Decca maintains its strengths and can take a long look at its less good points…it is probably in my interests to stay there. I hope I am not making a mistake!’

Although Minshull had in Raeburn a somewhat grudging senior ally, it was in his interests to engage an additional person whose remit, based on their specialist interests and knowledge, complemented Raeburn’s, which was focused on opera, vocal music, casting and general artists’ relations. In 1978, Minshull offered a contract to John Culshaw to fulfil this role. Culshaw, who since resigning his position as the BBC’s head of music television in 1975 had served as chairman of the Arts Council’s music panel and was now a freelance recording producer, was tempted by Minshull’s offer, but eventually declined. He wrote to Raeburn to explain:

While you were the first to hear from Ray, I feel that you as much as anyone, deserve an explanation.

357 Undated draft notes, BL/RA.
358 Ibid.
359 Roland Kommerell, letter to Christopher Raeburn, 18 January 1977, BL/RA.
360 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Roland Kommerell, 6 March 1977, BL/RA.
I was very much looking forward to coming back... Ray had offered me a decent contract, and if all goes well, I could expect to have taken part, along with both of you, in the formation of policy, both artistic and commercial. But along came Peter Andry with a contract in his pocket—a firm offer, with the undertaking to reduce my recording commitment per annum by almost half, in order to accommodate it. I went through agonies, thinking of how I’d be letting you all down at the last moment; however, it was a bird in the hand—a firm offer as opposed to an offer of possibilities for the sort of work I would like to do. So I hope you will understand that I considered my acceptance to be good for my career, even if I did so with a heavy heart.\footnote{John Culshaw, letter to Christopher Raeburn, 2 March 1978, BL/RA. Peter Andry was Head of EMI’s International Classical Artists Division in the late 1970s (see Peter Martland, *Since Records Began: EMI—the First 100 Years*, p.277).}

This was perhaps a surprising move by Minshull, and underlines his vulnerability, since following his resignation from Decca in 1967, there had been wanton interference in Decca’s affairs by Culshaw, initially without Minshull’s knowledge. In his memoirs, Minshull describes how during the planning of Solti’s *Parsifal* in 1971, Christopher Raeburn’s first supervision of a Wagner recording, he had received daily calls from Maurice Rosengarten in Zurich, questioning the selection of artists.\footnote{Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1998. Minshull describes Culshaw’s chief objection, relayed through Rosengarten, to casting Gottlob Frick, aged sixty-five, as Gurnemanz in *Parsifal*, despite their choice of an ‘idiomatic and experienced cast’ that also included René Kollo, Christa Ludwig, Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau and Hans Hotter. (See Christopher Raeburn, personal notes for interview, BL/RA.)} Although there was full consensus between Solti, Raeburn and Minshull, it was found that Culshaw had written a series of letters to Rosengarten, copied to Edward Lewis, objecting to the decisions made on casting the opera. When challenged, Culshaw expressed remorse and he and Minshull were reconciled over a ceremonial burning of the letters, but such a provocative act lived long in the memory. There is no evidence of a reply from Raeburn to Culshaw’s letter in 1978, nor is it known whether Minshull ever divulged the incident to Raeburn, but it could be deduced that Culshaw’s return to Decca would have been an unpopular move, with the potential to threaten the very sensitive new balance of status and seniority.

The acquisition of Decca by PolyGram in 1980 after its steadily dwindling fortunes during the mid to late 1970s threatened to decimate the workforce, as had been reported in the industry press.\footnote{See *Billboard*, 10 November 1979, p.64. It reports that Edward Lewis could not predict the number of job losses in the disk division.} Yet as can be seen in Fig 3.4 and 3.5, the structure of the A&R and studios functions held fast, due in Raeburn’s opinion, to ‘the fact that we stood by
[PolyGram] when we could have rocked the boat, but also because of Minshull’s ‘loyalty to an artistic policy and loyalty to his colleagues. The PolyGram takeover would have been a very different story if he had not spent hours and hours putting forward the case for the retention of Decca personnel, and the values which make for Decca’s individuality.

Christopher Raeburn, letter to Ray Minshull, 4 February 1982, BL/RA.

Christopher Raeburn, speech on the occasion of Ray Minshull’s 25th anniversary with Decca, 1982, BL/RA.
3.4 Conclusion

Decca adopted a decentralised style of management by default, in which the producer, on whose opinion and authority rested consequential financial investment, did not benefit from any enhanced recognition or social reward that might have been expected of a project manager working in an international context. During the 1950s and 1960s this encouraged a participatory, civic type of recording team leadership that was well-suited to Raeburn’s generation: the ‘gentleman producer’ fashioned in the tradition of the cultured English amateur. It was also a testament to the charismatic leadership of John Culshaw that the staff would work autonomously—and anonymously—without wider influence. Whether this had been a stumbling happenstance or an engineered, benevolent dictatorship, calculated to enable Culshaw to build an unchallenged personal profile in the music press as ‘Mr Decca’—to use a phrase of Ray Minshull’s—is open to question. 366 Certainly, there was little dissent while the staff were inexperienced in their roles, and indeed in his memoirs, Ray Minshull speaks of a sense of loss upon being promoted to the head of the A&R department—specifically a loss of protection from the financial liabilities of recording and the loss of the sense of equality he felt he shared with his colleagues. Minshull also recognised that with his appointment came the likelihood of unfavourable comparisons with his predecessor on account of ‘the pervasive shadow of [Culshaw’s] well-honed and popular personal publicity campaign.’ 367 Culshaw tells us that he nominated Minshull rather than Raeburn to his position because of Minshull’s sangfroid, a suitable foil for the ‘impetuous’ Rosengarten, 368 but it could be seen that in Raeburn he perceived a level of personal ambition that posed a threat to the team ideology he had championed. Although Raeburn paid lip service to the Decca team mantra in public, which we see repeatedly in published and recorded interviews, including his oral history recording for the British Library, 369 he was acutely sensitive to the perception of status and hierarchy, and did actively seek recognition for his work. This view is supported in the interviews recorded for this project: Michael Haas says that in the 1950s and 1960s, ‘the producer was definitely, as Christopher Raeburn explained to me, the “officer class,” and the others were the recruits.’ 370 Even Minshull, who subscribed fully to the egalitarian ideals that had been

367 Ibid.
370 Michael Haas, interview recorded, 10 May 2016. Interviews with Nigel Gayler, Caroline Haigh and Peter Van Biene, all studio employees working alongside the A&R department, emphasise that the
reinforced through living and working in close proximity in recording locations around the world, noticed that by the 1980s, the emphasis ‘changed away from such a united approach.’

From an internal perspective, the effectiveness of the role of the Decca producer was dependent on a mutual understanding between departments and colleagues as to where the boundaries of their jobs lay. In earlier, informal days in which the secure patronage of Rosengarten enabled the indulgence of time and creative experimentation in recording, the producer’s input varied between projects depending on personal enthusiasms. This was an arrangement eminently suited to a producer such as Raeburn, who delighted in the recording as a package of culture—musical, intellectual and visual—and who hoped, where possible, to exercise his aesthetic judgement across the whole architecture of the product. But the gradual professionalisation of the workforce into increasingly skilled and operationally-restricted divisions led to conformism and standardisation of processes, and initially also to misunderstandings in the production chain. This was most conspicuous in the relations between the A&R department and Sleeves and Promotion where tensions remained unresolved between the producers’ claim to aesthetic insight through understanding the artist, and the marketers’ knowledge of consumer interest. Michael Chanan, in his study of the British film industry, identifies similar discord between the incipient roles of the film director and producer, albeit evolving sixty years earlier at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Over time, both length of service and familiarity with Decca’s exclusive artists meant that balance engineers, once restricted to aural rather than musical opinions, were increasingly likely to have independent conversations with artists, or disagree with the producer’s point of view. Simon Eadon suggests that in the charged atmosphere of the studio, it was the engineer who had the final word on the balance, although he acknowledges that it was preferable for the outcome that the producer and engineer collaborated:

producer was the project manager, based on the need for there to be decisive leadership on recording sessions.

I remember doing Beethoven 5 with the Academy of Ancient Music. Peter Wadland insisted that the piccolo wasn’t loud enough and I thought it really was and he went with what I thought. But listening afterwards in different conditions, I thought I should have listened to Peter. His and my listening positions offered different ideas of the balance. But it would have been down to me. You’ve got the faders. There’s that famous Decca phrase: *the man on the mixer’s in charge of the session.*  

Such situations might be the result of what Christopher Pope describes as ‘good artistic friction’ that aimed to preserve the integrity of the end product, but both Pope and Michael Haas also relate examples where engineers had refused to respond to their cues during recording, leading to the speculation that these internal relationships were not without conflict. By the late 1980s, it was not exceptional for engineers to be requested by name for recordings, and James Lock, as a case in point, had a particular alliance with Luciano Pavarotti, leading to their direct communication without the intermediary presence of a producer. Lock, described by Haas as having been ‘catapulted to the highest level’ and who ‘went totally out of control,’ makes a controversial case for the obsolescence of the producer. In an interview with David Patmore he challenges the notion that it was the producer who claimed the closest institutional and artistic relationship with the artist:

> Producers rarely put their stamp on the recorded sound. Solti would talk to me directly about the balance of the orchestra, and the producer’s role was to make sure that everything was note-perfect, the sessions were handled smoothly and everyone was generally happy. The merits of a good producer are not to interfere too much with the musical side, because that can certainly upset the conductor—the best producer usually says nothing, but things happen. Talking about things can sometimes do a lot of damage—diplomacy is very important.

With a very low staff turnover, the effect of the knowledge and experience gained in the ‘job for life’ at Decca had the unexpected result of unsettling the balance for power in the control room. The prestige and status—particularly in the eyes of artists—gained by members of the recording team, such as Lock, created the chance to challenge the producers’ mandate for leadership. Over-specialisation was ultimately career-limiting, and for those who sought respite from the team-spiritedness of the 1950s and 1960s and were considering their own legacies had the potential to create resentment. Nowadays, as
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373 Simon Eadon, interview recorded, 17 October 2016.
374 Christopher Pope, interview recorded 27 July 2016.
375 Michael Haas, interview, 10 May 2016.
Michael Haas says, the notion of a recording session with more than one person in the control room is a rarity, and financially, Decca’s traditional system could not be maintained: ‘Sound engineers who don’t read music? Only at Decca! Producers who can’t edit? Only at Decca!’

377 Michael Haas, interview, 10 May 2016.
Chapter 4: The outer world: external adaptation

4.1 Perceptions of the role of the studio producer

To prepare a studio recording was a challenge by the very freedom it offered. The restrictions it imposed on us were negligible; we could record where and with whom we wished.\textsuperscript{378}

Decca studio producers, shorn of executive responsibilities, but accountable for overall artistic and technical outcomes, were free to develop a personal philosophy and perspective for their recording projects. It is in this dimension of the role that the ‘espoused beliefs and values’ of Edgar Schein’s theory of organisational culture can be analysed.\textsuperscript{379} represented here as the perceptions and strategies adopted by producers, and their aspirations and goals. Working in the studio under autonomous conditions allowed Decca A&R staff to choose how they developed and adapted their style of production with the external partners of recording: chiefly musicians and conductors, and the wider network of actors—the managers, cultural organisations, publishers and musicologists whose work intersected with theirs. Andrew Cornall describes this ethos, which was still relevant in the 1990s, as incorporating ‘a huge variety of ways of dealing with artists and music, which is why as a production team there was always someone who suited a particular artist, which I’m not sure was a particular policy...but it’s how it worked out.’\textsuperscript{380} The taxonomy of the production role presented in the previous chapter identified four categories of permanent responsibility of the staff producer,\textsuperscript{381} and it is largely the artistic and critical areas of concern that are dealt with here; the mode in which the producer pursued the ‘intelligent personal artistic relationship between the artist and the Company,’\textsuperscript{382} and the degree to which these relationships were specific or diffuse.\textsuperscript{383} This is considered mainly through the example of Christopher Raeburn, but also looks at aspects concordant or divergent with other members of the A&R team.

Like other leading record companies, Decca maintained a roster of singers, instrumentalists, orchestras and conductors (and in their case, a singular composer, \textsuperscript{384})

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{379} Edgar Schein, \textit{Organizational Culture and leadership}, 4\textsuperscript{th} edition, 2010, p.25 ff.
\item \textsuperscript{380} Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.
\item \textsuperscript{381} See Chapter 3, p.95–96.
\item \textsuperscript{382} See Chapter 3, p.103.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Benjamin Britten) under exclusive and long-term contracts, which accounted for up to ninety percent of the annual recording budget, and it was the company’s ethos to engage musicians at the start of their careers with exceptional potential—and highest risk—who had not been signed previously elsewhere. Through exclusive contracts, Decca maximised the benefit of the artist’s services, but as Ray Minshull explains, although there was a correlation between the perceived quality of a company and the strength of its artist list in the public eye, the costs to the company were substantial. Over the course of his career at Decca, Minshull dealt with more than forty such contracts, with around eight or nine artists yielding at least eighty-five percent of Decca’s income. Launching careers required confidence on the part of the Director of A&R due to the long time-scale of development, estimated to have taken at least fifteen years to be both artistically and commercially successful in some cases. Such contracts, he says, allowed artists to plan and develop their careers—a seductive combination of freedom and security—which Decca followed. Sometimes, as in the case of Zubin Mehta as music director of the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra, such contracts helped to determine new locations for recording and novel modes of finance. It also created the potential for studio producers to form close and direct working relationships with artists, and with their managers, and for respect for a producer’s opinion to accrue over time, thus making them uniquely qualified to assess the capabilities and ambitions of an artist without interposition from either marketing or public relations. Indeed, the establishing of trust during the making of a recording, and across the entire recording career of an artist, was a defining theme in all the interviews for this thesis and cited as the singular most important aspect of the studio role.

Trust was manifest in many different forms, dependent on the particular relationship that developed between artist and producer, and with the repertoire to be

385 Simon Frith, in ‘The Making of the British Record Industry 1920–64’, p.283, in James Curran et al (eds), *Impacts & Influences: Essays on Media Power in the Twentieth Century*, 1987, notes that “Edward Lewis became aware that the crucial asset of a record company was not the hit song but the big star...in the 1930s the selling point became the artist. And it was not enough just to invest in existing big names...Recording stars could be created from scratch, and one clear effect of the record companies’ 1930 policies was the increasingly direct relationship posited between the record producers and consumers.’ Although this refers primarily to popular and middle-of-the-road music of the time at Decca, this policy was, according to Minshull, evidently extended to post-war classical music and its artists.
387 According to Minshull (unpublished memoirs, 1995), Decca felt compelled to record Mehta in Los Angeles in 1967 despite the high minimum union rates compared to European orchestras, for fear of poaching by RCA. Maurice Rosengarten agreed to pay the same rate as the VPO, with the balance of the ‘American rate’ found through fundraising by the orchestral management (and therefore subsidising Decca).
recorded, requiring the producer to assume a range of personas—regisseur, mentor, steward, and guardian. Decca producers, by their own reckoning,\(^{388}\) saw their objective in its purest form as assisting the artist to realise their interpretive ideas in a recording, requiring an understanding of their overall creative vision, coupled with the knowledge and confidence to challenge ideas where they constituted a significant departure from the score. In this way, the producer was also serving the composer’s intentions indirectly: finding the means to uphold both the needs of the performer and the performed, as Michael Haas has expressed.\(^{389}\) Evans Mirageas sees the skilful producer as able ‘to understand what the artist wants and how the artist thinks they’re going to achieve it, and...to ensure that they do,’ and even ‘to make the artist think that the decision they were about to take was theirs alone.’\(^{390}\) But the producer at Decca also served the requirements of the recording itself: beyond the most elementary ‘policing of inaccuracies,’ as Erik Smith says,\(^{391}\) was the ability to understand the difference between the artists’ perception of their performance in the studio and the resultant sound committed to tape, and to find the most appropriate means of upholding and conveying those original intentions. This, therefore, was more than the pursuit of fidelity to the composer’s directions, but the knowledge of how the acoustic properties of the recording location and the recording medium itself changed the perception of what had been intended. This needed sensitivity to both musical and sonic qualities of the recording, and critical acuity as to whether it was most expedient for the artist and conductor, the engineer or the editor to make the changes desired—at the time of the session or during post-production. As a singer, Gabriele Fontana acknowledges this process as dependent on the close co-operation of producer and artist:

> The voice sounds so different in a microphone than in a hall...And this makes it difficult for the producer and the singer. When I heard myself for the first time it was a big shock. A singer hears their own voice completely differently to anyone else. It is so difficult. And when you don’t have the experience of it, then you need some takes first to gain an understanding of your sound.\(^{392}\)

\(^{388}\) In interviews made for this thesis with Andrew Cornall, Michael Haas and Christopher Pope, all three concur.


\(^{390}\) Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016.

\(^{391}\) Erik Smith, in a recorded interview with Evans Mirageas for WFMT Radio Chicago, 1985.

\(^{392}\) Gabriele Fontana, interview recorded 12 October 2016.
Indeed, feedback in the studio environment was paramount for instilling confidence in the musician, who was often too close, both spatially and emotionally, to their performance to be able to form an objective view of what had been recorded. The pacing of the recording and the producer’s decision either to continue repeating and recording short sections of music, or to allow the artist to continue uninterrupted, was an element of the artistic control and part of negotiating a complex set of needs based on the schedule and the sensitivity of the producer-artist relationship. This was particularly apparent in the dynamic between the producer and the conductor, as Christopher Raeburn describes:

“A producer and stage regisseur have a lot in common, but the producer putting himself in the position of the listener is probably more qualified to judge whether something is working and coming across, and being effective. The conductor is naturally responsible for the overall control of the orchestra and singers... In a big session the producer has to decide as much as the conductor when something can no longer be improved.”

4.2 The producer-conductor axis

Although it was accepted that there would be two or three producers working regularly with an artist, to avoid what Minshull calls ‘undesirable cliques and personal empires,’ associations were established, more often than not, on mutual rapport, interest in particular repertoire, the artist’s need for the reassurance of familiar faces in the control room and possibly even a consensus of opinion in an approach to interpretation. The studio partnership of John Culshaw and Georg Solti is well-documented in Culshaw’s memoirs, and further examples of long-term working associations can be seen notably with Andrew Cornall with Riccardo Chailly and Vladimir Ashkenazy, Peter Wadland with Christopher Hogwood and Ray Minshull with Clifford Curzon and Charles Dutoit. But it is with Christopher Raeburn that one sees the greatest breadth of studio-artist alliances, across all classical genres, and his correspondence shows that the boundaries between professional and personal relations were in many cases indistinct. However, Raeburn’s relationships with conductors were subject to stark variations dependent on individual temperaments and his own knowledge and enthusiasm for the repertoire being recorded, as these factors
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393 Christopher Raeburn, draft notes for interview, BL/RA.
396 Raeburn’s most frequent correspondees were Kiri Te Kanawa, Vladimir Ashkenazy, András Schiff, Kyung-Wha Chung, Teresa Berganza, Cecilia Bartoli, Joan Sutherland, Richard Bonynge and Christoph von Dohnányi. Certain Raeburn alliances became close personal friendships, particularly with Berganza, Bonynge, Bartoli and Marilyn Horne.
governed the extent of his input on a recording. Raeburn’s passion for opera, personal research and the degree to which he had been steeped in the performances on the stages of European opera houses since the late 1940s, contributed to vast reserves of comparative performance knowledge, and indeed to performance preferences. Here, he had to learn how and where to exercise restraint in his opinions; enough to be a credible, critical voice, but not so much as to destabilise the balance of artistic power with the conductor:

A producer needs to be sensitive to all tastes and ideas—he cannot be merely an efficient organiser, though that is also necessary. He needs a clear head and must have a definite point of view and the initiative to take a final decision, but be sufficiently broadminded to have the objectivity to switch to an alternative very quickly where necessary.\(^{397}\)

According to his colleagues, Raeburn’s aura of Mitteleuropean literary sophistication and scholarly eccentricity usually mollified the most coercive and impetuous of artistic personalities, and ultimately he was willing to subdue his own ideas to avoid confrontation with conductors. His lack of formal musical knowledge seems to have made little difference to the confidence placed in him by artists, despite there being instances where this created problems in the studio: there were other members of the A&R department on whose complementary skills he could draw. With Berg’s Lulu, recorded with the VPO and Christoph von Dohnányi in 1976, Raeburn delegated the task of preparing editing notes to his colleague Andrew Cornall chiefly because he found reading the orchestral parts too difficult.\(^{398}\) Michael Haas also recalls Raeburn’s candid admission to Dohnányi with problems reading the alto clef, but the conductor never gave any indication that this was a fault in Raeburn’s competence.\(^{399}\) Perhaps it was Raeburn’s honesty that disarmed certain artists: his response to Vladimir Ashkenazy’s query on a disputed harmonic progression in the Mozart C minor piano concerto was that he was ‘perfectly hopeless at academic harmony,’\(^{400}\) and put the problem to his colleague Richard Beswick to solve. Raeburn recognised his limitations, but was also aware of the weight attributed to his opinions in vocal music and opera.

To minimise the risk of diplomatic fallout, Michael Haas says that Raeburn gravitated towards conductors for opera who he thought to be culturally idiomatic,

\(^{398}\) Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.
\(^{399}\) Michael Haas, interview, 10 May 2016.
\(^{400}\) Christopher Raeburn, letter to Vladimir Ashkenazy, 30 July 1975, BL/RA.
preferring what he describes as ‘small-town Italian Kapellmeisters for Italian opera.’

Although Haas’ meaning is essentially pejorative, it refers to Raeburn’s bias towards conductors who had developed a deep knowledge of national and historic performance style in the provincial opera houses of Europe, rather than towards those courting an international presence—exemplified by Franco and Giuseppe Patanè, Silvio Varviso and Leone Magiera. In an extended letter to Raeburn, written in regard to their recording of Rossini’s Il barbiere di Siviglia in 1988, Giuseppe Patanè describes himself as ‘a very traditional conductor,’ whose main concern with the recording was to present an ‘uncorrupted’ account in which all traces of potentially specious revisions had been removed

without touching any of the traditional devices, because these are what the composer himself approved of with agreement with the conductors of his time...Truth, in my opinion is reflected only in a certain tradition which we cannot forget. Should this tradition disappear, opera as an art form would suffer and we would gradually see the disappearance of the works themselves. Opera exists for the benefit of its audiences and we have recorded a Barbiere designed to entertain them. Let’s not forget, after all, that this was Rossini’s own intention. I have tried to follow the example of all the great conductors who have done this Barbiere in the past. I cannot betray the performances of Serafin, de Sabata etc....it’s best to leave a document to posterity of how the Barbiere used to be done and how it should always be done...I sincerely hope that these operas will not be corrupted by revisions which do not do justice to the author’s intentions. So let’s hope it’s a success and that the critics will understand my words...even if they should criticise me unjustly, it doesn’t really matter because the truth always surfaces in the end. This is the way I will always do it to the end of days...I cannot change.

This approach appealed to Raeburn. The concept of producing a recording of ‘documentary’ quality; a singular, fastidiously-researched account that preserved and continued the work’s performing and interpretive traditions chimed with Raeburn’s own interests in establishing the ‘practical truth’ in early performances of Mozart operas, as has been discussed in Chapter 2. The language that Patanè uses is often found in Raeburn’s own writing. ‘Truth’ can be seen as an analogue of both ‘fidelity’ and ‘authenticity’—notions that in musicological and theatrical debate are bound to the provocative concept of Werktreu and encompasses both obedient attention to the ‘work’ as an immutable entity, and to the realisation of the score in the style of its first performances using historically-accurate
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401 Michael Haas, interview, 10 May 2016.
402 Giuseppe Patanè, letter to Christopher Raeburn, trans. Fabio Perselli, 21 November 1988, BL/RA.
403 Ibid.
Richard Taruskin, one of Werktreue’s most ardent polemicists, recommends that the so-called ‘divine details’ be replaced with ‘imaginative response, empathic identification and artistic insight,’ which he regards as ‘euphemisms, of course, for intuition.’

Among conductors who had established international operatic reputations, Raeburn aligned himself with Tullio Serafin and Josef Krips for their respective vernacular affinity with Italian and German repertoire, but also for their innate understanding of the voice.

Fig. 4.1 Christopher Raeburn (R) with Josef Krips, recording Schubert Symphony no. 8 at the Sofiensaal, Vienna, 1969, BL/RA. Photo: Decca.

Werktreue, a nineteenth-century, Romantic concept, is discussed widely in musicology and drama criticism by, among others, Richard Taruskin (Text and Act: Essays on Music and Performance, 1995), Peter Kivy (Authenticities: Philosophical Reflections on Musical Performance, 1995), Jean-Jacques Nattiez (The Battle of Chronos and Orpheus, 2004), Lydia Goehr (The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works, 1992), David Barnett (Offending the Playwright: Directors’ Theatre and the Werktreue Debate, 2013) and Daniel Meyer-Dinkgräfe (Werktreue and Regieoper, 2015). Taruskin and Barnett in particular pay attention to the theoretical (written) and practical (performance) contradictions of Werktreue, and whether the concept can embrace both.

Serafin, Raeburn believed, ‘had a greater empathy with singers even than Toscanini,’ and with Krips, his impeccable attention to detail and his association with the so-called ‘Viennese Mozart-style.’ With Richard Bonynge and Zubin Mehta, too, Raeburn also found a congruous sense of style: befriending Mehta during the early 1950s in Vienna when both were students, Raeburn saw the conductor’s musical origins as a cognate of his own, ‘having received so much truth in music-making as we grew up...I believe your and my beginnings stem from Vienna and from the Philharmonic—it is the accent you spoke about—I define this as the poetry of music.’ In the late 1950s Raeburn had also introduced Mehta to

Fig. 4.2 Christopher Raeburn, Zubin Mehta and Willi Boskovsky (seated L-R) in the control room at the Sofiensaal, Vienna during the recording of Liszt and Wagner preludes with the VPO, 1966, BL/RA. Photo: Decca.
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406 Christopher Raeburn, tribute speech to Joan Sutherland made in the absence of Ray Minshull, undated, BL/RA.
407 See Chapter 2 of this thesis, which describes Raeburn’s attitude towards the Viennese Mozart-style, a production style deployed during the Vienna State Opera’s temporary housing in the Theater an der Wien after World War II, and characterised by ‘simplicity, concentration, and attention to the basics,’ and ‘delivered without grand gestures but with personal intensity.’
408 Christopher Raeburn, draft letter to Zubin Mehta, 13 January 1989, BL/RA, written after Raeburn received the Schalk Medal from the VPO.
John Culshaw, who had subsequently offered Mehta a contract. Although the offer was declined, the early show of confidence made an impact on the young conductor.409

Although Haas believes that Raeburn found relinquishing artistic control to all conductors undesirable, with Richard Bonynge, Raeburn created a studio partnership with an artist whom he saw as a ‘singers’ conductor’ and with whom he shared an ideological affinity:

A vocal score is very underrated. Respect for a vocal score with any luck means for a horizontal and, dare I say it, a musical line. Conductors of our time, like Solti, prided themselves on being able to reduce a full score for the piano, but they always saw it vertically. I feel that Toscanini had possibly too much respect for the vertical line, whereas Maestro Serafin, whom I saw rehearse, totally understood a musical line. He also loved singers, and had enough humanity to adapt to the requirements of a human being. Whether you have this simply from instinct, or from having observed Maestro, I have no idea, but you are justifiably sought after today, not only for your extraordinary knowledge of repertoire, but above all, style.410

Bonynge’s view of the score in terms of its dramatic presence: the teleology of the action through the textual meaning—‘a sense of span’ as Raeburn says—coupled with a certain ‘judicious imprecision,’ was what he thought to be the essence of ‘making real music.’411

Bonynge and Raeburn also shared an affinity with bel canto, and with singers who could adapt their performance to this repertoire; what Bonynge refers to as a tradition emanating from eighteenth-century schools of singing and in which roles were written with specific voices in mind, and exemplified by the music of Rossini, Bellini, Donizetti, Cilea and Massenet in the nineteenth century.412 Raeburn’s preferences, as established in Chapter 2, are seen in the ability to shape and colour each phrase of a vocal line in an even legato, achieved through knowledge and assimilation of the performing traditions of the remoter past, together with an intuitive response to language.

409 See Zubin Mehta, letter to Christopher Raeburn, 6 December 1959, BL/RA. Mehta writes ‘he [Culshaw] was very kind to me that time in Vienna, and I am deeply grateful to you to have introduced me.’
410 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Joan Sutherland and Richard Bonynge, 7 October 2007, acknowledging their tribute to him in Gramophone on his receipt of a Special Achievement Award, BL/RA.
411 Christopher Raeburn, tribute speech to Joan Sutherland made in the absence of Ray Minshull, undated, BL/RA.
If Richard Bonynge occupies one end of the spectrum in terms of Raeburn’s conductor relations, Georg Solti might be found at the other. Despite a mutual association with more than thirty Decca recordings over nearly forty years, Raeburn describes Solti as a martinet-conductor who ‘beat the hell out of music’—a view reminiscent of Victor Olof’s assessment of Solti’s approach, which he referred to as ‘uncontrollable brashness.’

Andrew Cornall believes that Raeburn’s focus on the clarity of the voice and with much less regard to the quality of the orchestral sound ‘wound Solti up,’ and for his part, Solti’s own vivid and direct account of his vision of the producer-conductor relationship reveals the extent of the *amour propre* with which Raeburn struggled:

> He must know what is good, what is not, what must doing again [sic], how much is missing. There is never enough time, never...My producer must believe that I am the best: the best! It must not be that he sits there thinking he could do it better, or somebody else could do it better.

The end of Solti’s working partnership with John Culshaw in 1967 was, according to the same article, a source of deep regret for the conductor, having developed a level of mutual understanding not matched by other members of Decca’s A&R team, either present or future. Under Culshaw’s management and support, Solti had cemented an international reputation, which had in turn brought the company great prestige. But despite a lack of synergy, neither Solti nor Raeburn seem to have contrived to curtail their working together: although Decca’s highest-profile artists, such as Solti, András Schiff and Radu Lupu were allowed mutual approval of personnel in the recording team, Solti himself appears to have rarely used this privilege. In contrast, correspondence between András Schiff’s agent, Terry Harrison, and Minshull shows that Schiff was particularly keen to exercise his contractual right to choose the producer, which he felt depended on the repertoire—insisting on Raeburn for recording Mozart—and would rather take advantage of the contract’s break clause and leave Decca than work with another member of the A&R team.

According to Minshull, Solti was usually happy to work with all Decca producers,
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413 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Joan Sutherland and Richard Bonynge, 7 October 2007, BL/RA.
415 Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.
417 Ray Minshull’s notes of telephone conversations with Decca’s major artists during his tenure as Director of A&R (1967–1993) mention very few instances where a particular producer or engineer was requested.
418 Terry Harrison, letter to Roland Kommerell, 19 January 1994, BL/RA.
with only a minor preference for the longest-serving, but Minshull interprets this as reflecting the conductor’s fundamental attitude to the role of the producer:

I have always sensed that whatever any producer might have to contribute artistically is neither wanted nor called for, and is probably wasted on his particular approach to recording. The producer is there to manage things in such a way as to make sure that nothing is permitted to derail the conductor’s [Solti’s] single-minded intentions.\(^{419}\)

As Culshaw’s successor in A&R management, Ray Minshull describes himself as ‘more of a sacrificial lamb than an optimistic impresario,’\(^{420}\) whose relationship with Solti in his new executive position had to be built from scratch, despite their frequent studio work together during the 1960s. Here Minshull speaks of a crisis of personal integrity, owing to his lack of comprehensive admiration for Solti’s music-making, while acknowledging the conductor’s importance to Decca’s profile. Solti’s desire to control every aspect of the recording process, leaving little room for creative input from the producer, is also illuminated in a series of reports on recordings by company staff, written to mark the releases in his thirty-fifth year of exclusive association with Decca in 1982.\(^{421}\) These documents speak of Solti’s energetic preparedness for each recording, for which he would consult the Urtext and alternative editions of a work, mark his score with the directions with which to realise the sound and balance he desired, and record with a calculated efficiency through his control of both the amount of recording and subsequent playbacks. Although a contribution by Raeburn is noticeably absent from these documents, despite his \textit{Le nozze di Figaro} (1981) being a featured anniversary release, John Kehoe writes on his behalf, noting that ‘on getting a complaint from Raeburn that a \textit{piano} marking had not been observed, Solti retorted, “Why do you say that? I am doing it,” at which Raeburn quipped, “You may be doing it, but nobody else is.”’\(^{422}\)

It is significant that Raeburn’s relationships with conductors appear to falter specifically in two particular areas of concern: in recording Mozart, and in his unquenchable enthusiasm for the process of casting operas. His papers show an antipathy to a conductor’s

\(^{419}\) Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1995. Here, Minshull also suggests that this conception of the producer-conductor relationship was shared by George Szell and Antal Doráti.


\(^{421}\) Contributions were made by James Lock (engineer), John Kehoe (Promotion department), Paul Myers, James Mallinson and Michael Haas (producers). Of these accounts, balance engineer Lock’s is the most effusive in praise of Solti’s recording methods, remarking that Solti has ‘that rare skill among musicians, of knowing how things will sound “at the other end” coming out of the loudspeaker,’ BL/RA.

\(^{422}\) Ibid.
approach to Mozart for two primary reasons: either where Raeburn thought the conductor was charting unfamiliar artistic territory as an indulgence of their musical ambitions rather than, as Michael Haas suggests, provide ‘an organic development from what they do best...in their relationship with the label and their public,’ or because their equally strong views on performance gained through research promoted rivalrous exchanges. Even his friendship with Richard Bonynge was not immune from dispute: this is particularly evident in Raeburn’s 1968 recording of Don Giovanni with Bonynge in which he writes to Ray Minshull in advance of the sessions that

> No one in any interviewing or journalistic capacity is allowed at the Don Giovanni sessions. I feel that this is a most necessary precaution so that at no time will I be pressed into the embarrassing position of having to explain how I do not reconcile my personal reputation and beliefs as a Mozart scholar with the approach likely to be committed to record. If my name were to get linked with the recording in any way, I should feel compelled to make my position clear, which in the circumstances is highly undesirable. I may say that I intend to give the recording the greatest care and attention as always and I do not anticipate it suffering from my ideas being poles apart from the conductor’s since I have no intention of imposing my (or rather Mozart’s) ‘interpretation’ on this recording.

Therefore, rather than provoking a confrontation with a conductor, Raeburn preferred to withdraw his association from a project, believing that ‘a bad producer can be like a conductor who puts himself between the performer and the music like a wedge.’ But truly, could he have believed that he, rather than the performer, represented—even protected—the composer’s intentions?

Aside from his recording work, Raeburn’s reputation as a scholar of Mozart was comparatively well-developed in the 1960s, and had attracted the attention of a number of international conductors through the research he had undertaken on the compositional evolution of Le nozze di Figaro; notably by his proposal of an alternative sequence to Act III. Convinced of Raeburn’s breakthrough, these suggestions were adopted by (among others) Richard Armstrong (WNO, first realisation, 1970), Colin Davis (1971), and Herbert
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424 Christopher Raeburn, memo to Ray Minshull, 31 May 1968, BL/RA. Raeburn also withdrew his association with Solti’s recording of Così fan tutte in 1974.
425 Christopher Raeburn, draft memoir notes, BL/RA.
von Karajan (1974 and 1978), Karl Böhm (1975, produced by Raeburn himself), and John Eliot Gardiner (1994), but perhaps significantly, not by Georg Solti for Decca in 1981. Raeburn’s research was also well known to Charles Mackerras, whose intense interest in Mozart style and the HIP approach had led to his own rigorous investigations, specifically on the realisation of ornamentation, and focusing on Figaro. Raeburn, who had little sympathy for the stylistically-faithful performance attributes of HIP, despite his own interests in meticulous research detail, describing it as ‘a most intelligent academic approach’ but devoid of ‘poetry’ and ‘joyfulness,’ entered into a protracted and public correspondence in collaboration with his colleague Erik Smith, both of whom disagreed vociferously with Mackerras’ arguments for the inclusion of unwritten appoggiaturas in opera performance, in what Raeburn calls ‘cavalier abandon in obscuring a tune.’ Raeburn and Smith together consulted a large number of contemporary singing manuals ‘to try,’ as Raeburn puts it, ‘to get closer to the truth,’ and support their argument. The appoggiatura debate, a singular issue in the wider set of performance controversies of the early music movement in the 1960s and 1970s, stimulated contact between the worlds of the scholar-performer and amateur musicologist, exemplified by Mackerras and Raeburn. Here, the paradox of Raeburn’s position can be seen clearly. Although finding natural allies in amateur researchers such as Robert Moberly, Raeburn’s professional contacts made through Decca, along with his track-record of research in the influential company of musicologists such as H.C. Robbins Landon and Peter Branscombe, had elevated his status to that of his illustrious counterparts. Mackerras’ intermittent correspondence with Raeburn shows a heedful respect, suffused with cheerful eagerness in identifying his musicological and

427 See ‘A Loyal Company Man: An Interview with Christopher Raeburn’, first interviewed by Martin Elste in 2004 and published in Classic Record Collector, Issue 57 (Summer 2009), p.22.
428 See The Gramophone, September and October 1964, and Records and Recording, 1965. These also contain responses from the general public on the subject of the realisation of the appoggiatura. See also Nigel Simeone, Charles Mackerras, 2015, pp.16–22 which gives a detailed description of the appoggiatura debate from Mackerras’ point of view.
429 Christopher Raeburn, draft notes in response to Mackerras, undated, BL/RA.
430 Christopher Raeburn, draft notes, undated, BL/RA.
431 The polarising of scholarly and amateur positions in the HIP movement is discussed in Harry Haskell, The Early Music Revival: A History, Chapter 8, p.161ff, in which the influence of Thurston Dart on British musicology is assessed against a background in which ‘the tradition of amateur scholarship and music-making was deeply ingrained.’
432 Moberly remained an employee of the Atomic Energy Authority while engaging part-time in musicology, including revising the plan of Figaro with Raeburn. See correspondence between Raeburn, Moberly and Anthony Powell of Methuen Publishers, 1960s passim, BL/RA.
433 See H.C. Robbins Landon, Horns in High C, pp.101–106, in which he describes his work with Mackerras on several series for the BBC, and a research trip to Donaueschingen with Raeburn in the 1950s that had been inspired by a visit undertaken by Mackerras.
professional shortcomings, so despite a recording career at Decca spanning more than fifty years, it is perhaps unsurprising that all Mackerras’ recordings for Decca were made under the supervision of members of the A&R department other than Raeburn.

Such musicological sparring was possible perhaps only outside Raeburn’s studio role, but one senses that despite his diplomatic restraint on account of the company’s artist relations, there was a certain frustration that he could not fully realise his ideas even in areas of his own specialist interests. Apart from his recording of Figaro with Böhm in 1975, Raeburn gives little evidence that indicates the extent to which his research was incorporated into Decca recordings, save his Haydn and Mozart Discoveries recorded with Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau in 1969 which included the revised 1789 version of Almaviva’s aria ‘Hai già vinta la causa’ from a score he had located in Florence and edited for the recording. On account of Raeburn’s distaste for HIP, Decca’s early music L’Oiseau-Lyre label was a recording division into which he rarely ventured, and although consulted for his opinions by Ray Minshull, Raeburn’s ideological differences with the movement precluded him from having real influence, leading him to conclude that musicological research had had ‘almost no influence at all’ on his recordings, due to ‘the policy of the company.’ When asked by Minshull for his input on the possibility of recording Mozart operas with Arnold Östman at the Drottingholm Palace Theatre, Raeburn replied that

Earlier on I stressed that an Italian element was desirable if not essential to an ‘authentic’ Figaro or Don Giovanni...This seems to have left little impression and whether due to lack of availability or other reasons we are back at the old provincial recipe. Since this seems to be what Östman and Peter [Wadland] wish to cook up, my feeling is that they should be left to get on with it without further interference from me. My suggestions were made in goodwill, but since I have very little personal sympathy with what Östman and his little lot have done so far, I think

---

434 For example, Mackerras’ letter to Raeburn (7 December 1982) praising his Mozart soprano concert arias recording (Time-Life, 1981) quickly draws attention to what is described as an ‘error’ in which Raeburn has not used the full, ornamented version of aria K294 available from the complete Mozart Edition. In his interview (10 May 2016), Michael Haas admits that Raeburn ‘couldn’t stand Mackerras.’

435 See ‘Mozart Manuscripts in Florence’ (written with Michael Raeburn), Music & Letters Vol. 40 No. 4, 1959, pp.334–40, and draft notes for autobiographical sketch, BL/RA. See Appendix 4. Raeburn also asked Minshull to consider follow-up recordings with the London Wind Ensemble in arrangements of Mozart arias, on account of his own research overlapping with that of David Whitwell, the consultant for the 1970 recording of the Ensemble’s version of Figaro. A recording of Die Entführung aus dem Serail was made eventually in 1975, but no others followed.

436 Raeburn produced only two recordings for L’Oiseau-Lyre, a selection of Mozart arias with Stuart Burrows (1974) and Haydn’s L’anima del filosofo with Cecilia Bartoli (1996).

437 Christopher Raeburn, interviewed by Martin Elste, Classic Record Collector, Issue 57 (Summer 2009), p.22.
Peter should be allowed a free hand. He can then claim responsibility for all the success (or otherwise) which the final result achieves.  

4.3 Choosing artists

The choice of cast, conductor or accompanist for a recording project comprised a series of elaborate transactions between the demands and requests of Decca’s exclusive artists, the availability of non-tenured artists under the terms of other contracts of exclusivity, and through the recommendations of the producer. Auditions were carried out primarily in recording locations between sessions, and until the early 1980s, notably in the favoured venues of the Kingsway Hall in London and the Sofiensaal in Vienna, from which the supervising producer duly filed a report on the outcome and advised on a candidate’s suitability for certain repertoire. Under the management of John Culshaw in the 1960s, artists’ tests of a more routine arrangement were held at Decca’s studios in West Hampstead, which at the time had been thought ‘worthwhile even if they lead only once in ten years to the acquisition of someone important.’ These were arranged largely to maintain relationships in the industry rather than out of the expectation of discovering a luminous talent or filling a vacant *comprimario* role. Being time-consuming and of variable standard made them an unpopular aspect of A&R work, and as is evident from Culshaw’s memos of the time, Decca producers sometimes fell short of maintaining even a professional veneer of encouragement, moving Culshaw to express the importance of putting musicians at their ease to ‘create an atmosphere in which the applicants will be able to give the best they are capable of [which] in turn will help us form a proper judgement.’

Although many auditions were arranged on the recommendation of artists and noted pedagogues, Raeburn’s audition reports show that these assurances were no guarantor of either a high standard of accomplishment or a sympathetic hearing. In one instance, Raeburn dispatched an unidentified singer who had previously impressed Herbert von Karajan, and auditioned at Ray Minshull’s request, but whose performance Raeburn described as ‘scandalous’ and ‘disgraceful’: ‘an ugly and uncontrollable voice, pitch trouble, bad rhythm and the top is completely strained.’ Raeburn had been completely unmoved by the provenance of the recommendation, as ‘even accounting for Karajan’s strange taste, no-

---

438 Christopher Raeburn, memo to Ray Minshull, 24 August 1986.
439 John Culshaw, memo to producers, 11 January 1966, BL/RA.
440 Ibid.
A number of Raeburn’s audition reports also reveal a bias against the ‘English voice,’ or more precisely, for British singers performing German repertoire. His comments such as ‘surprisingly good Schubert for an Englishman,’ ‘her approach is all a bit English,’ and ‘too English in Mozart,’ and might be seen to use the epithet as a descriptor for all that is unspontaneous and lacking in musical and dramatic intuition. Intuition in musical performance, then, was paramount to Raeburn’s judgement of all that was good. To be ‘English’ was to be inflexible and be uncomprehending of ‘style’: to lack vernacular understanding of the deeper culture in which the music was created. Even his judgement of German singers weighed their merits against what the English voice represented: ‘that they are charmless and he is fundamentally a boring singer, but at least the language is idiomatic which is more than one can say for any English singer in this repertoire [Beethoven Lieder].”

By the early 1970s, routine studio auditions were largely phased out, superseded by the availability and improved sound quality of the compact cassette as a means for agents and artists to promote new talent. But it remained an intrinsic part of every Decca producer’s job to be conversant with international standards of performance, usually acquired through their regular presence at the opera houses, concert halls and festivals worldwide, and also by the ubiquity of commercial recordings which made comparative listening straightforward. As Andrew Cornall recalls, ‘We were out and about. You might hear of them [artists] at La Scala or the Royal Opera House and the Deutsche Oper. There were enough people out and about round Europe seeing these people to get a very good idea.’ To serve as an A&R reference anthology for combinations of artists cast in concert and opera performances on the home and international stage, Raeburn initiated a system of formal reporting for every musical event attended by A&R staff, with his notes presenting a candid and sometimes visceral view on emergent and celebrated musicians alike. Following a recital by Teresa Berganza at the Queen Elizabeth Hall in 1973, his notes advise that Decca should consider offering her any recording work, as there is still ‘no-one in her field to touch her to-day.’ For the Vienna State Opera’s production of Salome with Karl Böhm in the same year, he indicates that Böhm is ‘still capable of getting a good performance in the theatre.’

441 Christopher Raeburn, memo to Ray Minshull, 26 August 1968, BL/RA.
442 Raeburn’s comments are taken from reports written between 1967 and 1968, BL/RA.
443 Christopher Raeburn, notes made 11 April 1989, BL/RA.
444 Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.
but that Eberhard Wächter as Jokanaan, once cast in the role with Solti’s 1961 recording, is
now ‘pretty off-hand and vocally clapped [out].’\textsuperscript{445}

Decca was particularly protective of its standards and reputation in assembling casts for opera: Raeburn explains that their approach was ‘idealistic and individual as far as personality is concerned’ and since the 1950s ‘a conscious effort was made to bring together the right people for the right operas,’ noting that ‘live opera recording has not proved to be the answer. The more the quality of the recording improves, the less satisfactory live becomes...No opera house can seriously afford to pay for the star casts which are possible on record, nor are the artists simultaneously free for enough time.’\textsuperscript{446} But star artists often looked to collaborate with musicians of similar stature signed to rival companies, and exclusivity was subject to different interpretations. Minshull’s approach was to release Decca artists occasionally for such partnerships, which gave them a wider audience and created the possibility for what he describes as a ‘credit balance,’\textsuperscript{447} or \textit{quid pro quo} arrangement. However, there were often exceptions to such deals, particularly when the choice of repertoire overlapped with a rival and or Decca could offer a similar arrangement, as can be seen in his refusal to release Christoph von Dohnányi to EMI in 1988 for a recording of \textit{Der Rosenkavalier} in Dresden, on account of Decca’s forthcoming plans for him to record several Strauss operas.\textsuperscript{448} Indeed, according to Minshull, the only major artist who never asked to be released from their contract was Joan Sutherland.\textsuperscript{449}

Another issue centred on the expectations of contracted artists in influencing casting decisions. Until 1975, Maurice Rosengarten’s executive input in casting had been marked; a bulwark against the more extreme demands of their exclusive artists, as is shown in the notes of meetings and telephone calls between his office in Zurich and with Ray Minshull in London, which indicate that all matters regarding budgets, fees, royalties, contractual matters and finalising of casts were conducted with his approval.\textsuperscript{450} Minshull’s notes on the developing career of Luciano Pavarotti, for instance, chart not only a growing

\textsuperscript{445}Christopher Raeburn, anthology of Reports on Performances, 1973, featuring his assessment of artists performing in the UK and Vienna.
\textsuperscript{446}Christopher Raeburn, presentation made at the PolyGram International Conference, Killarney, 1986, BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{448}Ray Minshull, letter to Christoph von Dohnányi, 6 May 1988, BL/RA. The letter states that he would also offer \textit{Der Rosenkavalier} with the VPO to Dohnányi, perhaps as recompense. However, two years later, Dohnányi notes that details for his promised \textit{Rosenkavalier} recording were still to be scheduled (Christoph von Dohnányi, letter to Ray Minshull, 3 January, 1990, BL/RA).
\textsuperscript{449}Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1998.
\textsuperscript{450}Brief notes of meetings and telephone calls made by Ray Minshull in respect of the careers of Decca’s exclusive artists, 1967–1993.
list of financial obligations, such as payments for coaching him in unfamiliar repertoire, and increasingly ostentatious demands for tangible career benefits, but Pavarotti’s sustained desire to influence the choice of casts and conductors. Pavarotti, Minshull says, was particularly keen to work with established star singers, but with complaisant conductors, which conflicted with the company’s approach to engaging individuals on musical and artistic merit. Indeed, according to Raeburn, who from 1977 included casting consultation as an official part of his job for all Decca’s opera recordings, whether or not as the assigned producer, neither was the company ‘pro casting to do friends favours, or to give circus trainer conductors docile animals,’ an oblique reference to his experience of the casting process with Georg Solti. Together with Minshull, Raeburn attended frequent pre-recording meetings with Solti at his home, in which specific artists would be discussed for roles.

451 Among Pavarotti’s many requests, such as a custom Mercedes car, a briarwood Steinway piano (7 April 1981/7 May 1981), secretarial support for recordings and free LPs for concert ticket-holders, Minshull’s notes (26 January 1976) show that Pavarotti wished to form a record company with Mirella Freni and Leone Magiera using Decca personnel and equipment, with recordings to be leased to Decca to market. It is noteworthy that there is a noticeable increase in such requests by Pavarotti following the death of Maurice Rosengarten at the end of 1975; no doubt using the interregnum to petition for extra benefits. Rosengarten’s verdict on Pavarotti (14 May 1973) was that he was ‘not Caruso and costs much more.’


453 Christopher Raeburn, memo to Ray Minshull referring to recording with Solti at the Salzburg Festival, 9 April 1990, BL/RA. Artists’ contracts available in the Raeburn Archive and Minshull papers do not mention any standard or explicit rights to influence casting.
recording excerpts of potential artists provided for the conductor to assess, auditions arranged (usually in between sessions) and the number of recording sessions agreed. Raeburn’s papers show a wide variance between consensus and insuperable dissent in these negotiations: for the recording of Die Zauberflöte in Vienna with Solti in 1990, Raeburn felt it was worth recording again with the conductor (their previous recording of the opera had been in 1969) only if it was ‘truly Austrian-German throughout’ and avoided what he refers to as the ‘usual Solti Americans.’ Solti, as Minshull points out, ‘did not always see the sound of the language from our point of view.’ Although Raeburn’s preferred approach was adopted in Die Zauberflöte, he did acquiesce to Solti for some roles, but made it clear that this was entirely Solti’s decision in which he played no part himself.

For other recordings, such was Raeburn’s personal investment in selecting the cast that he was prepared to abandon a project rather than to accept compromise. Decca’s audio version of Strauss’s Die Frau ohne Schatten with Solti and the VPO (1989–1991), a monumental project described by Ray Minshull as a ‘colossal investment’ whose search for sponsorship and mutually-agreeable casting had begun five years earlier, presented such a case. Whereas twenty years earlier Raeburn would have withdrawn his name from the project, as has been seen in his disagreements in approaches to recording Mozart, towards the end of his career he was prepared to issue a direct challenge. Writing to Solti in 1986, Raeburn made his difference of opinion clear:

I am pleased we had the opportunity to talk yesterday, and I hope this will always be the case even if we do not always share the same point of view. In the case of Frau ohne Schatten although I take very much to heart all you said, I still feel as I did before, and that it would be a mistake for me to be involved in something over which both of us have equally strong, but differing views. Just as you feel that [Cheryl] Studer is the ideal Kaiserin, I feel that [Anna] Tomowa [-Sintow] would be the best today. Both of us have been looking for the best Kaiserin for at least three years, and we have come to definite conclusions which regrettably differ.

Much as I should like to work on what could well be my last Decca opera with you, it would be completely unproductive for me to be in the way of something I disbelieved in this much...

I am most grateful that we have had the opportunity to discuss this openly… I hope this frank exchange now will prevent a personal rift,

454 Christopher Raeburn, memo to Ray Minshull, [1990], BL/RA.
456 For example, in turning down soprano Brigitte Poschner (21 March 1990, BL/RA) Raeburn acknowledges that ‘you sang very well and I would be happy to have you in the cast [as Pamina]. Unfortunately Sir Georg sees it differently and so I’m afraid we cannot offer you the part.’
457 Ray Minshull, letter to Georg Solti, 25 July 1984, BL/RA.
which could certainly have arisen if the position had continued to smoulder.\textsuperscript{458}

Raeburn’s hubris here is breathtaking, although the sentiment is sincere—giving weight to Evans Mirageas’ opinion that ‘producers...[were] as much artists as the performers themselves,’ an opinion with which other ex-Decca studio producers interviewed for this study strongly disagreed.\textsuperscript{459} Although Raeburn succeeded largely in engaging the singers of his choice for the audio recording of \textit{Die Frau ohne Schatten}, particularly with regard to Hildegard Behrens in the role of Barak’s Wife, who he thought ‘transformed the whole cast,’\textsuperscript{460} Solti had the controlling hand in the casting for the video version of the opera made two years later at the Salzburg Festival, in which every role was selected anew, and Cheryl Studer, who had been Solti’s first-choice Kaiserin, duly appointed.

For major operatic roles, a balance was sought between engaging an international star and ‘casting nationally’—the much-repeated axiom of Raeburn’s, for which repertoire dictated the choice and guaranteed an intuitive approach and nuanced understanding of language. Beyond the standard German and Italian canon it was often only practical to give a recording a sense of linguistic authenticity by selecting an entire national cast—for example, Decca’s series of Janáček operas recorded in Vienna with Mackerras between 1976 and 1982—but in more mainstream repertoire, this was often achieved by casting native singers in \textit{comprimario} roles. Raeburn asserts that his own preference for casting along national lines was also ‘in general terms a Company view...as long as the singers are of top standard,’\textsuperscript{461} which was a major factor influencing Decca’s search for new enterprises abroad.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the company’s efforts to establish a working relationship with cultural and artistic organisations in the Soviet Union during the 1980s. Earlier attempts by Decca to record Russian repertoire with fluent casts had been conducted in the mid-1950s in Communist Yugoslavia, which as a non-aligned country was receptive to Western art and culture, and allowed freedom of movement.\textsuperscript{462} Here, producer James Walker had supervised the Belgrade Opera Chorus in a series of Russian operas, formed of

\textsuperscript{458} Christopher Raeburn, draft letter to Georg Solti, 15 December 1986, BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{459} Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016. As Minshull’s successor as Director of A&R, Mirageas chose not produce studio recordings.
\textsuperscript{460} Christopher Raeburn, draft letter to Ronald Wilford, 1988, BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{461} Christopher Raeburn, memo to Ray Minshull, 9 April 1990, BL/RA.
Russian-speaking, competent local singers. Decca had also been able to record non-operatic repertoire with the Moscow Chamber and Philharmonic Orchestras and Borodin String Quartet in London during their tours to London in 1962–1963, but by the early 1980s, under the aegis of PolyGram, Decca coveted the possibility of being the first Western record company to record Soviet artists on Russian soil, and in so doing combine the promise of linguistic and acoustic authenticity. Despite a lukewarm response to the idea from the company’s global licencees and marketing department, primarily because of the fragility of Cold War Soviet-American relations and the absence of Russian artists on the American stage, they did not prevent a series of exploratory visits from going ahead. Spearheaded by Raeburn and his A&R colleague Paul Myers, the visits were arranged with the cooperation of the Russian foreign trade organisation Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga, the state authority responsible for foreign cultural transactions, and a full panoply of diplomatic intermediaries. The motivation for the mission was explained by Raeburn:

It has been the general aim of Decca to record idiomatic performances. Just as we would go to Austria to record Mozart, Schubert and Brahms, it would be logical to go to the Soviet Union to record Russian repertoire with the finest national artists. Decca pioneered uncut versions of works, and it has been an aim to get as close as possible to the composer’s intentions.

[...]

It was with Decca’s artistic and technical reputation in mind that we approached Mezhkniga with the aim of producing, with national artists, orchestras and choirs, a standard even higher than has been achieved on records before.

Thus any work to be recorded should be performed by the finest musicians and singers, and in versions which would do justice to the composer. Decca believe that with sufficient preparation, a will to achieve the very best, and given sufficient time, something exciting and new could emerge.

Myers had made a solo trip to Russia as Decca’s advance party in 1983, by way of introducing the company and outlining potential areas for recording a range of genres: symphonic, opera and chamber. The Leningrad Philharmonic Orchestra was to be conducted

---

463 Minutes of Decca International meeting with global licencees, 26–27 November 1985, BL/RA. The licencees were aware that recording in Russia would be cheaper than recording in the West, which would offset lower sales figures, and that Russian artists were not subject to restrictive, exclusive contracts.

464 Referred to in Raeburn’s papers as Mezhkniga (The International Book).

465 Christopher Raeburn, draft memo, ‘Recording in Russia’, 1986, BL/RA.

466 See Christopher Raeburn, memo to Paul Myers, 27 July 1983, BL/RA.
by Solti and Yevgeny Mravinsky, the Bolshoi Opera with Mark Ermler and solo recitals given by Paata Burchuladze.\footnote{Christopher Raeburn, memo to Ray Minshull and Reinhard Klaassen, 7 January 1986, BL/RA.} As manager of symphonic production (see Fig. 3.5, Chapter 3), Myers had been appointed from CBS in 1981 as Raeburn’s equivalent executive colleague, and although briefed on the company’s operatic interests in Russia by Raeburn—to discuss recording Borodin’s \textit{Prince Igor} with Ermler before offering more mainstream Russian repertoire—Myers appears to have been overwhelmed by Ermler’s enthusiasm to choose the cast and to press for recording to video in addition to audio. Raeburn felt that Myers had undermined Decca’s authority from the outset with his offer to consult with and be guided by Ermler in the selection of singers, and felt that as a relative newcomer to Decca, Myers did not yet fully grasp the company’s approach to operatic production, or indeed Raeburn’s pre- eminent position in casting:

\begin{quote}
Of course it is a help to consult them and to have their suggestions, but as I explained to you when you told the French people that we would be guided by their casting, it gives them the impression that we are to accept a package deal of their choosing. I do not say that I can necessarily do better than the casting director of French Radio or the Bolshoi, but it makes our controlling position very difficult when the matter is surrendered from the start. I know that the politics involved in casting our operas by Rechtanwald in Vienna and Moresco and his sister in Italy until 1957 were distinctly detrimental to the results. The likelihood of home casting means ‘fair’ shares to all and especially ‘fair’ shares for the party favourites.

I am delighted you have asked for records of singers and I hope that either I or whoever is involved will hear artists in performance, but I can’t concede that I expect to be guided by prejudiced parties.\footnote{Christopher Raeburn, letter to Paul Myers, 21 July 1983, BL/RA.}
\end{quote}

With the intention of preventing what he perceived as a further surrender of company values to cabal-driven pressure, while keeping cultural diplomacy on course, Raeburn joined Myers on two subsequent Russian visits to establish dialogue with the Bolshoi’s new artistic director Alexander Lazarev before the dissolution of the Soviet regime in 1991. However, no
agreement could be reached on the production of *Prince Igor*, or indeed any other opera, due mainly to the Bolshoi's assertive demands on repertoire and with casting, and with issues in creating a suitable space for recording in the Bolshoi Theatre. But as a hopeful Raeburn remarked, ‘if Soviet participants—officials, artists and musicians are as enthusiastic as we are, there is no reason why a great Russian masterpiece should not receive its finest presentation on video and record. It could represent a world co-operation not previously achieved in film and recording, but only if artistic standards are not compromised.’

As has been shown in Chapter 1, building an international catalogue had been a major part of Decca’s operation since the end of World War II and the concept of ‘world co-operation,’ as Raeburn describes, is indicative of how he chose to interpret his role as a diplomatic representative of the company. Raeburn’s statesman-like approach owed much to his background; his diplomatic connections were particularly developed in Austria, where he had moved in the cosmopolitan and patrician social circles associated with the British

---

469 Christopher Raeburn, draft memo, ‘Recording in Russia’, 1986, BL/RA. Although Decca recorded the Chicago Symphony Orchestra with Solti in St Petersburg in 1990, it was not until 1994 that the St Petersburg Philharmonic was recorded in situ with Vladimir Ashkenazy. To date, the company have made no complete operas in Russia.
Council and with the city’s musical institutions since the 1950s as an expatriate student and journalist. As a Decca producer, Raeburn continued to pursue these relations, counting among his frequent correspondents the soprano Adele Leigh, whose international performing career in leading roles at Covent Garden and in broadcast media had been integrated with her marriage to the Austrian ambassador to the UK, and with it a role in cultural advocacy. A sophisticated network such as this—which Ray Minshull, although director of classical recording, lacked conspicuously—gave Raeburn an entrée to receptions and debut recitals at embassies and cultural institutes, where the promotion of national musical and artistic talent was a strategic component of international relations. Cultural diplomacy of this kind was of mutual benefit; while providing a showcase for national talent, it also lent Decca a platform for subtle commercial promotion. The Embassy of Finland in the UK, for example, honoured Decca’s issuing of a complete cycle of Sibelius songs (recorded with Tom Krause and Elisabeth Söderström over a period of some four years) with a reception in 1985, extolling it as a ‘Finnish cultural landmark’ and vindicating criticisms from within the company for its ‘extravagance artistically and financially.’ Such projects, Raeburn had argued, merited additional expenditure on aspects such as the finesse of the presentation because they underlined the innate value of creating a prestige product which preserved and documented national identity and heritage, either by virtue of the choice of repertoire, the performers or indeed both, which he describes as giving the product ‘permanent worth.’ ‘Even though prestige is a word commercially frowned upon,’ Raeburn continues, ‘Decca’s programme requires a balance to counteract the necessary popular repertoire remakes.’

4.4 Judging voices

The growth of music competitions in the aftermath of World War II, which according to James English increased fivefold from their pre-war numbers, and ‘doubled again between 1970 and 1990,’ provided record companies such as Decca with a means of locating new

---

470 Many of Raeburn’s diplomatic invitations date from the 1980s and come from the embassies of Poland, Canada, Austria, USSR, Finland, Japan, Italy and Israel, (BL/RA.)
471 Christopher Raeburn, letter to H.E. The Ambassador of Finland, 8 February 1985, BL/RA. Here, Raeburn quotes the Ambassador’s description of the recording.
472 Christopher Raeburn, draft notes, ‘Sibelius,’ undated, BL/RA.
473 Ibid.
474 Ibid.
sources of musical expertise judged to be prestigious and ascribed with the combined values of artistic accomplishment and potential commerciality. This surge in proliferation, English observes, was driven by a mix of philanthropic zeal, a desire for artistic ‘immortality,’ and a quick and efficient means of creating public interest in a particular artist. Some music competitions established in the first decade after the war also sought to promote and re-invigorate a home nation’s cultural industry, as much as creating an international ‘stock exchange’ of talent, just as the British Council had sponsored Decca and EMI recordings of British composers and organised expositions abroad at a government level, and embassies promoted visiting artists at the diplomatic. Finding and encouraging new musical talent was deeply ingrained in Decca’s company culture from the Chairman downwards, and Edward Lewis chose a philanthropic course, most notably establishing the Decca Prize as a component of the Kathleen Ferrier Competition (1956), which had been founded to support the careers of British and Commonwealth musicians. According to Raeburn, ‘of all the bequests made in Decca’s name...[this] was probably the one with which Sir Edward Lewis felt most concerned,’ but for Raeburn, the association brought prestige to Decca’s name rather than the promise of a raft of new talent for Decca’s strongly Eurocentric repertoire. Raeburn served as Decca’s intermediary for the award, and after the death of Lewis, petitioned for it to be continued as ‘a tradition worth preserving, and furthermore if it was discontinued it would reflect disappointingly on the company,’ while noting that sales of Ferrier’s re-issued recordings on CD had been very successful.

Competition jury panels were not limited to pedagogues and peers, nor indeed were they wholly non-partisan: the growing importance of recording on the careers of musicians, and the need for a competitive edge in a record company’s artist roster made it appropriate for executives and staff representatives from the industry to sit as panellists with the hope of exerting some influence on the outcome. A number of Decca producers and ex-members of staff had been actively involved as competition adjudicators; Erik Smith, Peter Andry, John Mordler, Michael Woolcock, Christopher Raeburn, and later in the 1990s, Evans Mirageas, but not, as a lack of evidence might suggest, either John Culshaw or Ray

476 The international Belvedere Singing Competition, founded by Hans Gabor in 1982 describes itself as based on ‘an idea of a trustworthy singers’ stock exchange without a strictly academic orientation.’ See <https://www.belvedere-competition.com/about/> [accessed 10 January 2018]. Raeburn became involved with this competition towards the end of his Decca career.
477 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Ray Minshull, 1 October 1986, BL/RA. In addition to Ferrier being a Decca artist, the sponsorship was possibly maintained because of Decca’s relationship with Roy Henderson, Ferrier’s mentor and the featured artist on the company’s first classical recording made in 1929.
478 Ibid.
Minshull. Raeburn’s association with competitions broadened during his career—a role to which he was well suited by virtue of his experience inside and outside the studio, his gregariousness, and his stamina and obvious relish in lending an opinion to a wide range of musicianship. These were mainly international vocal competitions—the Richard Tauber, Stuyvesant, Belvedere, Walther Grüner, Wigmore and Paris Opera Vocal competitions, where he was often deployed to winnow candidates in preliminary rounds—but he also joined the committee of the Park Lane Group for young musicians in London in the 1970s, which brought him into contact with a wider range of artists. Raeburn’s judging notes for competitions, as hastily-scribbled marginalia or crammed into pre-prepared forms, reveal much about what attributes he looked for in a ‘complete’ performer. The table in Fig. 4.5 has been compiled from his notes written for the Kathleen Ferrier Awards in 1985, with the aim of suggesting dominant themes for his thoughts and to offer an analysis on how Raeburn perceived the ‘English voice’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Typical comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tone</strong></td>
<td>‘top is pushed – a bit squally,’ ‘quality not very pleasing when above a mezzo forte,’ ‘curious smoky voice,’ ‘fluttery, rather thin voice,’ ‘rich voice,’ ‘good centred, strong voice,’ ‘tone slightly thins out on top,’ ‘an ugly sound,’ ‘bit edgy cutting voice,’ ‘glorious sound sometimes,’ ‘could contribute more colour,’ ‘voice bleats,’ ‘top at forte is rough,’ ‘mid voice ok but flattens a bit,’ ‘voice doesn’t sound free right through,’ ‘with different training, voice would be larger, freer and more resonant,’ ‘top unsafe,’ ‘seems to have resonant overtone that mess up intonation,’ ‘top bit questionable, but could be tidied up,’ ‘voice not very beautiful,’ ‘pretty round voice,’ ‘wobble still persists – it isn’t just vibrato,’ ‘top very peaky and wild,’ ‘voice doesn’t sound open,’ ‘quite a clear cutting voice,’ ‘must tame and control top,’ ‘nice warm voice,’ ‘curious plangent voice,’ ‘quite a dark colour,’ ‘tends to deaden on sustained notes,’ ‘full voice with a bit of bite,’ ‘sounds knodely,’ ‘with his resonance he should not try to cut through, but just let it sound,’ ‘curious catty sound,’ ‘birdy voice,’ ‘creamy voice,’ ‘unpleasant hoot at top’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phrasing</strong></td>
<td>‘doesn’t really understand legato,’ ‘tends to drop ends of phrases,’ ‘can’t really cope with coloratura – needs lots of tuition,’ ‘good stretched line,’ ‘not a natural coloratura,’ ‘can’t handle turns,’ ‘slows down on runs, but on the whole clean,’ ‘manages passage work quite well,’ ‘a beautiful start and good line,’ ‘no indication of agility,’ ‘attempt at piano but can’t control it,’ ‘some good agility,’ ‘can sustain a line,’ ‘all ends of phrases too long,’ ‘triplets slow and bit tentative – the fly saying boo to the elephant,’ ‘good sostenuto line,’ ‘smudgy coloratura,’ ‘each phrase follows too fast’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language skills/use of words</strong></td>
<td>‘text not integrated,’ ‘German pretty unsatisfactory,’ ‘Italian pretty primitive,’ ‘don’t get the feeling she speaks or understands French,’ ‘Russian sounds convincing,’ ‘makes nothing of words,’ ‘words hard to distinguish,’ ‘well studied German,’ ‘Italian sort of ok,’ ‘incomprehensible,’ ‘earnestly studied,’ ‘an attempt at words,’ ‘clarity of pronunciation,’ ‘gives impression he understands it,’ ‘puts across a feeling of French,’ ‘German is very English – unashamed,’ ‘Italian adrift,’ ‘Uses English sibilants in Italian,’ ‘despite studying in Munich still sounds unrepentantly English’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of key themes can be identified to which Raeburn paid particular attention. The table in Fig. 4.5 reflects a regularly-occurring sequence in which a candidate’s attributes were assessed: the tone, phrasing, linguistic abilities, interpretation and expression and in a final summing up, the degree to which the individual could command attention in their manner and appearance. Aside from Raeburn’s eccentric language—the ‘knödely’ tone, the ‘unrepentant’ English accent, and the ‘sphinx-like’ presence—and his limited technical vocabulary, otherwise considered mandatory for a critic of the vocal arts, his comments are immediate and intuitive. The responses align with a person who has gained musical intuition through experiential means rather than through formal training, but are vividly descriptive and therefore memorable—a useful property when comparing individuals during a competition comprising many rounds. Although many of the comments are negative, their inverse qualities might reveal the hallmarks of Raeburn’s ideal performance.

In essence he hoped to encounter a natural, unaffected style devoid of stylised mannerisms, supported by flexibility, smoothness, but also clarity—an effortless bel canto technique—while emphasising service to the text rather than dwelling on technical detail. Above all, Raeburn was looking for a singing-actor with an innate theatricality that was able to communicate narrative and respond to the text for the listener: an ability which he alludes disadvantaged the English voice in the core vocal European repertoire as he believed that it was difficult to disguise the mechanics of learning. In an interview for Gramophone, Raeburn reveals that this was particularly important for comedy roles, which...
states that ‘he is absolutely convinced—and it’s a rare conviction these days—that the language sung must be native to the singer, particularly in comedy. To have an inbred feel for the language and its idiomatic use is vital, especially for comic timing.’\(^{479}\) Michael Haas believes that unlike a number of his Decca colleagues, it was Raeburn’s wide-ranging cultural interests that gave him perspective and context rather than inconsistency and flaw when analysing a performance:

He showed that credibility came not from being able to hear a misplaced E-flat in a Mahlerian chord, but because he was intellectually interested in what an artist had to say about a work. He was interested in what a performer *communicated*, not how fast they played the piano, or how many trills they could sing in the upper-octave. He wanted to have someone tell him a story using music as the language of communication. This impressed me. Other colleagues...they thought it far more important as a producer to spot the misplaced E-flat in a thick Mahlerian chord.\(^{480}\)

A major difference, Haas claims, is that Raeburn’s experience was honed in an era when time allowed for a relationship to develop between producer and musician in which opinions on style and interpretation could be shared and traded: ‘artists were interested in the producer and the producers were interested in the music and what the artist had to say.’\(^{481}\)

The Austrian soprano Gabriele Fontana, who came to Raeburn’s attention as the winner of the 1980 Richard Tauber Prize, recalls how he communicated with the professional singer:

I think that from all [Raeburn’s] experience in his recording career he learned to listen very carefully and express himself in a way that a professional singer could understand. He was also so interested in singers, and eventually he could compare voices and manners of technique and producing tones...And he would say ‘what’s the quality of this tone? Be careful of this tone. Look at this phrase once more and do this’ and so on. Then the puzzle was completed and he had the result he wanted.\(^{482}\)

Fontana, a protégé of Elisabeth Schwarzkopf, who Raeburn saw as ‘the most promising talent in her Fach since [Irmgard] Seefried in the late 40s,’\(^{483}\) built an enduring friendship

\(^{480}\) Michael Haas, interview, 10 May 2016.
\(^{481}\) Ibid.
\(^{482}\) Gabriele Fontana, interview recorded 12 October 2016.
\(^{483}\) Christopher Raeburn, draft letter to André [Previn?], undated, BL/RA.
with Raeburn in which he took the role of mentor in her developing career. Raeburn’s knowledge of singing technique, as it has been established, was not a product of formal study, but derived from personal observation and through correspondence with prominent singing teachers, such as Vera Rózsa. Yet his confidence was sufficiently secure to intervene and dispense guidance on technical adjustments to Fontana’s voice that might increase the possibilities of further work for Decca, sending her copies of recorded takes for her to assess:

Listen to the quality of the top of your voice. I am certain that you can improve the quality and make it more in line with the quality (roundness, purity and expressiveness) of your middle register. This is only for you, but I do want to know whether you agree or disagree with what I say, because it is a point I have been making for nearly four years. I think the chances of our giving you Zdenka [in Strauss’s Arabella] are very good, but it would make a great deal of difference if you can guarantee performing it on stage prior to July 1986.\footnote{Christopher Raeburn, draft letter to Gabriele Fontana, 18 April 1985, BL/RA.}

Raeburn’s advice was perhaps motivated from an ultimate desire to direct performance, much in the manner of a stage regisseur, inasmuch as he wanted input, where possible, in dramatic interpretation of the score’s text through the quality of the voice alone. As Fontana suggests, this was most likely to occur in a recital recording without a conductor, as ‘[Raeburn] was a strong personality...he had his vision and with another big personality there were “discussions.”’\footnote{Gabriele Fontana, interview recorded 12 October 2016.} Raeburn, she says, could be impatient with conductors but not with singers. In Raeburn’s own view, ‘the harder but better and more rewarding way to bring the best out of your artists is by encouragement and a firm insistence to get their best’ rather than by being authoritarian.\footnote{Christopher Raeburn, draft notes for interview, BL/RA.} As a recording producer rather than a regisseur, his obsessive interest in the characteristics of the voice and the sensitivity of the singer to convey drama through timbre, inflection and use of language is related to his understanding of vocal performance primarily as an audio rather than an audio-visual event. The singing voice, for Raeburn, should contain and encompass all that is necessary to convey and invoke the text, and the physical attributes of performance support this fundamental ability, as is indicated in his correspondence with American soprano Grace Bumbry:

You are one of the few artists who has got beyond the conventional stage of lieder recitals, I think you can do less with your hands and let your face and above all your vocal expression mesmerise your audience.
Try focusing your mood on the mood of the music, rather than continuing the same mood as before. I want to hear emotion—I don’t mean cheap sentimental, but let us hear you have a heart. These contrasts are not affectations. For me they are the natural expression of a great artist for whom the words and drama are of the greatest importance...Don’t be happy when the audience says ‘that was a nice piece of singing,’ but ‘what a wonderful way to express that song or that role.’

Bumbry, although not a Decca artist, was evidently well acquainted enough with Raeburn’s reputation to consider him a trustworthy and credible aide. Tributes paid to Raeburn on his receipt of a Gramophone Special Achievement Award in 2007 affirm that he had succeeded in gaining the confidence of artists, regardless of his unorthodox musicianship. Joan Sutherland and Richard Bonynge describe him as ‘a great eccentric and a superb musician,’ while Luciano Pavarotti calls Raeburn ‘a very serious musical intelligence, he understands the particular language of the voice.’ In the opinion of Evans Mirageas, more than any of his colleagues, Raeburn’s greatest gift with the artists he worked with was ‘making them special and allowing them to feel that anything was possible for them to accomplish in a session if they would just keep at it.’

4.5 Conclusion

As an independent company and subsequently as a division of PolyGram, Decca considered its long-term, monogamous relations with artists under contract to be its primary focus. As Ray Minshull states, ‘as a historical point of policy, we were a company which stayed with its exclusive conductors, singers and soloists and moved with their careers,’ crediting this strategy as having created the company’s international presence. A corporate image campaign launched by PolyGram to run in Billboard magazine in the mid-1980s featuring portraits of key staff in all divisions whose jobs involved working in close contact with artists, aimed to underline that these relationships were of paramount importance to the company’s commercial success. Under the slogan ‘we give our artists the world,’ its message intended to convey that sensitivity to artists’ careers, which allowed their needs to

487 Christopher Raeburn, draft letter to Grace Bumbry, 2000, BL/RA.
488 Quotations copied as typescript, BL/RA.
489 Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016.
491 W. Munczinski, memo to PolyGram executive management and A&R staff, 20 May 1986, BL/RA.
492 See Billboard, 27 September 1986, p.53.
develop in the manner of their choosing, and coupled with the company’s worldwide marketing and distribution power made them a competent partner. Decca had created its star artists from scratch, and continued to build its roster and renew contracts despite, as Terry Teachout’s analysis aims to show, that in other parts of the classical recording industry the ‘traditional’ star system had been in steady decline since the 1970s.\(^493\) Exclusivity promised healthy returns if given enough time to prove, and as David Patmore has shown, created what he refers to as a ‘virtuous spiral’ by which ‘the less successful recordings [are] traded off against the more successful.’\(^494\) It also needed a degree of flexibility for the artist to collaborate elsewhere, within certain limitations, to prevent creative stagnation and to widen an artist’s public appeal. Decca had to choose whether to follow its exclusive artists across the stages of Europe and America, and if so, maximise its input and stake in collaborations to prevent being ‘steamrollered,’ by the artists themselves, as Raeburn describes.\(^495\)

The relationship between Decca producers and the company’s exclusive artists—and in particular its conductors—was complex. Long-term working relationships had the capacity to reveal simmering ideological differences as much as cementing long-term friendships, although there is no evidence in Raeburn’s papers that standards of professional conduct were ever breached permanently. Indeed, Evans Mirageas explains that part of the job of Director of A&R was to monitor the relationship between artist and producer, and to encourage affinities. In his words, he ‘had to be comfortable with producers taking on certain artists in particular repertoire.’\(^496\) But for Raeburn, who believed that his personal academic reputation was at stake—even a decade into his job as a producer—it was not tenable to indulge artists in alien repertoire. His relationship with Solti in particular, founded due to what he saw as the conductor’s autocratic practice and lack of subtle, poetic understanding of music. Yet in other respects, there is congruence in Raeburn’s and Solti’s philosophies. Solti has said ‘[I] and a few other talented conductors of my generation have a damn duty to preserve the classical masterpieces and give them to the next generation. That’s my job. I concentrate on that. That’s what we got from Toscanini, Furtwängler, Walter, Kleiber. If we don’t do it, [there] will be a gap; and nobody will know in fifty years’ time how a Beethoven, a Brahms [symphony] should be played; or a
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\(^{495}\) Christopher Raeburn, letter to Ray Minshull, 9 April 1990, BL/RA.
\(^{496}\) Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016.
Bruckner.” The ideology can be seen to correspond to Raeburn’s concept of recording as an act of preservation on behalf of the composer and also in the context of the music’s performance history, where the recording itself might become part of that historical lineage, and which Raeburn describes as ‘to re-create a score in the way a composer might have wished for if he had had modern recording techniques at his disposal.’ Echoes of his attachment to the concept of Werktreue, seen by Richard Taruskin as ‘the Romantic notion of the autonomous transcendent artwork entail[ing] a hierarchized, strictly enforced split between emancipated creators, beholden...to no one but the muse, and selfless curators, sworn to submission,’ are found throughout Decca papers. Recordings are frequently referred to as ‘historic milestones,’ ‘masterpieces,’ and ‘cultural landmarks,’ descriptions that aim to elevate the recording to a state of immortalisation and charge it with eternal value, which in a commercial sense, Decca hoped to achieve through a recording’s longevity in the catalogue. After all, as Raeburn has expressed, for a recording to have a long life and for it to justify the investment (for opera in particular), it needed extensive preparation and thoughtful consideration of the choice of cast, conductor and orchestra, as well as a suitable location and technical facilities, and that much effort was spent ‘over and above the bare essentials because...the extra trouble is worthwhile even though one person in a hundred may appreciate it.’ Ray Minshull’s view of the choice of artist was rather more prosaic, as befitted the Director of A&R with budgets to balance, and as far as singers were concerned, the bottom line was not just what was instinctively appealing, but what would appeal to the largest audience. ‘The human voice can be a mighty power indeed,’ he writes, ‘but only with the heartfelt approval of the paying public.’

There was not unanimous belief among Decca’s A&R staff that there was a direct correlation between documenting the careers of exclusive stars and the notion of making ‘prestige’ recordings that achieved an exalted, higher purpose as Raeburn’s comments suggest. As Michael Haas has commented, at Decca, ‘prestige was a subjective concept.’ Prestige for some, like Ray Minshull, says Haas, was interpreted as the number of versions

---

498 Christopher Raeburn, presentation made at the PolyGram International Conference, Killarney, 1986, BL/RA.
500 See Christopher Raeburn, presentation made at the PolyGram International Conference, Killarney, 1986, BL/RA.
501 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Mr and Mrs Soria, 15 January, 1961, BL/RA.
503 Michael Haas, interview 10 May 2016.
of the same work in the catalogue, sometimes with the same artists. Decca’s 1966 complete recording of Tosca in Italian with Lorin Maazel, for instance, was made during the same recording period as a selection of excerpts from the opera translated into German with the same conductor.504 Raeburn, on the other hand, saw the justification to record based on the quality of the entire cast and the notion of upholding a company standard rather than the availability of star artists. In his opinion (when considering a new recording of Aida), ‘simply to produce the best technical recording available with Mehta and Pavarotti does not justify recording Aida in the immediate future. I should very much like a new Aida, and with Pavarotti, but the likelihood of a cast worthy of Decca is unrealistic.’505 For Raeburn, other qualities such as casting singers in their vernacular language could surpass the benefits of engaging international stars, as with this came the promise of intuitive performance and a deepened sense of dramatic purpose and narrative understanding. The most successful artists were, for Raeburn, the living ideals of dramatic accomplishment rather than a contrived brand, product or traded commodity. His pursuit of ‘truth’ in recording incorporated more than serving the intentions of the composer as revealed in the Urtext: he saw ‘truth’ also as an artist’s reaction to language through interpretation. Although seemingly contradictory and mutually-exclusive, Taruskin suggests that both are valid features of an older, broader understanding of fidelity to the work (Werktreue) which he believes has become emasculated over time to refer only to fidelity to the text (Texttreue).506

Raeburn created a unique persona as a Decca producer as both eccentric English amateur and European sophisticate, which appealed to artists and concealed his shortcomings as a musician, and also to some extent, his desire for artistic control. By forming diffuse relationships with musicians, Raeburn was able to expand his influence discreetly, although there is no indication that this was premeditated manipulation. Indeed, the friendships he struck, although effusive, appear wholly genuine in intent, and as his papers show, in many instances this created little or no distinction between his work objectives and personal life. This contributed to working conditions into which he poured maximum time, commitment and enthusiasm, and by which artists saw him as an astute critic and adviser.

504 See William Weaver, ‘Decca/London’s Two Toscas’, High Fidelity Vol. 16 No. 10 (October 1966), p.12, 16.
505 Christopher Raeburn, memo to Ray Minshull, October 1983.
506 Taruskin uses the example of Wilhelm Furtwängler to explain that besides being ‘the concept’s [Werktreue’s] very paragon,’ his performances ‘freely interpret the “inviolable” text.’ Text and Act, 1995, eBook, p.12.
PART 3 Production in action

Chapter 5: Concepts of production

5.1 Drama, truth, illusion: philosophy forged in the studio

Mr Raeburn changed his shoes and ran about the church, with the tapes spinning, to record the footsteps of Angelotti at the beginning of the act. At Castel Sant’Angelo bells were recorded and the guns of the firing squad. This Tosca, it seems, will have a special sonic authenticity.\(^{507}\)

William Weaver’s account of the creation of sound effects for Tosca in 1966 at the Santa Cecilia Academy in Rome captures the essence of dynamic industriousness, but his presence at the recording session was somewhat exceptional. Christopher Raeburn had built a reputation for recording behind closed doors and admitting only so-called ‘insiders’ to the control room, although as the founder of the Italian Discoteca magazine, sometime sleeve-note writer, friend of Maria Callas and a feted literary translator, Weaver fitted the mould of Raeburn’s European cultural network.\(^{508}\) Others were less welcome, and the letters of contrition from artists’ managers and marketers in Raeburn’s papers show intolerance for impromptu appearances from those judged to serve their own interests, or disturb the confidentiality of the recording session producer-artist relationship, and breach what the agent Athole Still calls Raeburn’s ‘inner sanctum.’\(^{509}\) This chapter considers Raeburn’s recording methods in the ‘inner sanctum,’ and compares his approach to sound manipulation and studio performance direction with that of John Culshaw. It offers an exposition of Raeburn’s recording philosophy, culminating in two studies that consider his work in regard to the individual artist (Cecilia Bartoli), and external collaborative partnerships (Bayreuth Festival/Wagner Film Gmbh).

Privacy while recording was, of course, related closely to keeping to a strict recording schedule, and had the benefit of keeping Raeburn’s unorthodox musicianship.

\(^{507}\) William Weaver, ‘Decca/London’s Two Toscas’, High Fidelity Vol. 16 No. 10 (October 1966), p.12, p.16. (Decca was recording the opera complete in Italian, and in the same period a recording of highlights in German, with Lorin Maazel and Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau common to both.)

\(^{508}\) See <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/nov/18/william-weaver> [accessed 9 January 2018]. Weaver translated and published Raeburn’s article ‘Opera in Stereo’ in Discoteca, December 1960.

\(^{509}\) Athole Still, letter to Christopher Raeburn, 5 July 1984, BL/RA. Here, Still apologises for his ‘apparent discourtesy’ in appearing at Walthamstow Town Hall, but blames the singer Paata Burchuladze for ‘literally bulldozing me into your studio.’
undisclosed to a wider circle, but it also reflected a number of other important factors. A belief that information in the public domain on Decca’s recording methods should be carefully controlled stemmed from the era of John Culshaw who, as has been discussed in Chapter 3, had made an art of presenting details of recording without divulging company strategy or engineering methods, while enhancing his personal reputation. But Raeburn was aware of criticisms that the privacy and control afforded by the studio environment also begat lifeless performances:

A criticism has been levelled that a studio performance can be sterile, but it is all up to the parties concerned to maintain the drama of the piece. If there is no drama, which is after all the essence of opera, the recording has failed.\(^{510}\)

Although Raeburn does not single out the source of the criticism, the argument regarding the negative aesthetic impact of ‘mechanical reproduction’ of performance through recording had been an established position since the 1930s, originating in the work of Walter Benjamin, and particularly in the loss of what he terms ‘aura.’\(^{511}\) Described by Michael Rosen as ‘that quality of numinousness,’\(^{512}\) Benjamin’s key concept of ‘aura’ has been subject to numerous subtle descriptive emphases, as neither an objective nor subjective quality, but as a quality of uniqueness of experience for the observer in the observed. For Peter Johnson it ‘induc[es] a particular kind of response in the observer,’\(^{513}\) for Michael Chanan, it is an authentic, physical quality of performance dependent on time and place,\(^{514}\) and for Robert Witkin it is ‘the special authority’ of the work which ‘becomes detached from the domain of tradition; its history drains from it’ when it is made reproducible.\(^{515}\) There is little evidence to suggest that Raeburn, although fiercely interested in art and aesthetics, was conversant with Benjamin’s cultural and philosophical theories, but he was sensitive to criticism of lack of emotional integrity in recording leading to a lack of frisson and a sense of disembodiment, which cast the music adrift from both the

\(^{510}\) Christopher Raeburn, presentation made at the PolyGram International Conference, Killarney, 1986, BL/RA.
performer and the space of the performance. Raeburn’s understanding of ‘truth’ in music as a cognate of the ‘divine details’ of Werktreue, (discussed in Chapter 4), gave him the impetus through which to create the kinds of recording detail that might prompt a sense of the authentic and the unique, both of which Rosen describes as qualities of Benjamin’s ‘aura.’ As a reader of the essays of Eric Gill, one expects that Raeburn would have found Gill’s advice to take care of goodness and truth, and beauty will look after herself as further confirmation that by emphasising the detail in the score, the dramatic capabilities of the artist and the authentic significance of the location, that criticisms of sterility would be silenced. As Raeburn says, in recording opera

we are trying to create drama, human emotional involvement and musical entertainment, to bring the score to life, and to make sure the stars can come to life as they do on the stage.

Decca had experimented with recording moving sounds to demonstrate the potential of stereo since 1957, and as Raeburn describes, in the same year had ‘taken the plunge and decided that we must approach our operatic recordings as stage productions’ using a system of choreographed stage movements that were intended to ‘recreate the actual illusion of a performance for the listener.’ Both Raeburn and John Culshaw saw that a fundamental part of the production role was to infuse drama and counteract sterility in recording—to ‘recapture that vital spark’—but understood that this required a creative concept of recording over and above attempts to simulate theatrical stage movement. The Sonicstage system, introduced in the early 1960s and an extension of Decca’s earliest active soundstage stereo experiments, incorporated sound effects and sound manipulation to

---


517 See Eric Gill, Beauty Looks after Herself, 1933 and 2012, especially p.208ff. See also Michael Haas, email (print) to Christopher Raeburn, 11 October 2005, BL/RA. Here, Haas recalls Raeburn’s suggestion that as a music student he read Gill as ‘the broader one’s general world view, the more focused one’s musical sight-line.’

518 Christopher Raeburn, presentation made at the PolyGram International Conference, Killarney, 1986, BL/RA.

519 See Frank Lee, British Library Oral History interview, 1984. Lee recalls creating a sampler named ‘journey into stereo’ to promote the possibilities of stereo in 1957 which comprised train sounds, tap-dancing, ping pong and other moving sounds.

520 Christopher Raeburn, draft notes for talk, undated, BL/RA.

521 Ibid.

522 Decca’s trials in quadrophonic sound in the early 1970s developed this idea further through a remote-controlled system designed to move microphone head positions. In an interview with Evans Mirageas (recorded for WFMT Radio Chicago, 1985), Ray Minshull cites his productions of Death in Venice (1974; Philip Stuart, >2155) and Tannhäuser (1970; Philip Stuart, >V343) as using the moving microphone system, which he believed worked equally well in stereo. Minshull did, however, create
varying degrees, through which it was intended to intensify the recording experience for the home listener, either as specified or implied in score, or to convey or enhance psychological subtexts in the characterisation or narrative; termed by William Mann as what could be heard in ‘the mind’s ear.’⁵²³ Indeed, Raeburn describes wryly that ‘with the inception of Sonicstage the Artists Department developed into a Sound Effects Studio.’⁵²⁴

A description of Raeburn’s approach in ‘bringing the score to life’ is complicated by his flexible and inconsistent use of language: at any time the process of recording opera can be an act of imitation, simulation, recreation or illusion of its original theatrical manifestation. An interview for Music Week in 1973, for instance, makes clear that like Culshaw before him, Raeburn’s aim was to create a sense of theatricality rather than a sense of the theatre experience: not to replicate the conditions of a live performance, but to transcend them, which Raeburn says was ‘to achieve something that the composer obviously wanted.’⁵²⁵ The notion that an opera composer of a bygone age could have projected their imagination into a future beyond the restrictions of their theatrical locus, to a place where recording producers waited to confer a battery of concrete sounds from the world outside the theatre, as in the case of Raeburn’s production of Tosca, is fanciful and impolitic, and overextends any definition of fidelity to the composer’s intentions. Conversely, in an interview with Martin Elste,⁵²⁶ Raeburn presents his goal as to ‘recreate the sound of a performance: for me a good sound is probably a prime seat in the concert hall,’ which in so doing invokes the controversial ‘best seat in the house’ ideology, and confines recording to a passive act of inferior status.⁵²⁷ By way of offering him absolution for
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⁵²⁴ Christopher Raeburn, speech for Ray Minshull’s twenty-fifth anniversary, 1982, BL/RA. Culshaw encouraged further experiments in effects-enhanced recording in non-operatic repertoire, ‘to see if we could come up with something different but relevant to the mood of the sixties, with no particular holes barred,’ as Minshull writes. For this, Minshull devised a concept project (‘Project 267’) in 1966 to combine arrangements of instrumental music (Strauss, Handel and Grieg) with sounds from the Argo label’s effects archive. The project was discontinued (see Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1995).
⁵²⁵ ‘Raeburn goes for the theatrical atmosphere’, Music Week, 26 May 1973, p.IV.
⁵²⁶ Interview with Martin Elste made in 2004 (typescript, BL/RA), published as ‘A Loyal Company Man: An Interview with Christopher Raeburn’, Classic Record Collector, Issue 57 (Summer 2009).
his crimes of rhetoric, it might be seen that for Raeburn, the ‘best seat’ was a metaphor for optimum clarity, perspective and detail (and indeed with more detail than could be heard in a concert performance), and was also an advertising device, rather than a maladroit reference to the concept of concert-hall realism. Indeed, elsewhere in his papers, Raeburn attempts to describe the ‘best seat’ as a position where ‘the component parts one hears complement one another...the soloists should be prominent without being overlaid in a different acoustic.’

To attempt a restitution of aura, both Raeburn and Culshaw considered using acoustic space and sound effects in realising the composer’s authorial theatrical directions, while rejecting what Culshaw describes as ‘misguided loyalty to [performance] tradition.’ As Culshaw writes in *The Ring Resounding*, the original techniques available in the first performances of *Das Rheingold*, the ‘vast speaking-tube’ to convey Alberich’s invisibility—for example—were not suitable dramatic tools for the recording medium. Culshaw’s pursuit of creating non-diegetic audio elements and stylised effects to enhance explicit and implicit dramatic features of Wagner’s scores—in service to heighten the listener’s experience, such as banks of speakers and power amplifiers to create a psychoacoustic ‘resonance’ of terror for the appearance of Fafner in *Siegfried*—were ultra-verist and ‘auratic,’ to quote Benjamin, but not were not authentic or faithful to the performance history or the directions of the score. Culshaw’s concept of the effects of sound was more akin to stage designer Adolphe Appia’s development of ‘active,’ scenographic lighting design for staging Wagner opera productions in the late nineteenth century, which gave ‘life’ to both actor and space, and whose practice ‘revolutionise[d] thinking about...the use of light as an expressive material in the theatre.’ Indeed, Decca engineer James Brown also
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528 Michael Haas and Christopher Pope both make the point that the ‘best seat’ is company advertising propaganda (interview 10 May 2016 and 27 July 2016). Pope comments that in the 1960s, ‘the best seat in the house was allied to the fact that the consumer was paying over what a seat in the opera would have cost. Today it’s completely reversed.’ Simon Eadon also suggests that recording perspective—especially front-to-back, rather than left-to-right—is important for a spacious, opulent sound (interview recorded 17 October 2016).

529 Christopher Raeburn, notes made for an interview (with Brendan Carroll), undated, BL/RA.


531 Ibid.


533 Scott Palmer, ‘A “Choréographie” of Light and Space: Adolphe Appia and the First Scenographic Turn’, in *Theatre & Performance Design*, 2015 Vol.1–2, p.31. Appia is described here as ‘one of the most influential thinkers and contributors to the modernist theatre aesthetic and therefore a founder of contemporary notions of scenography.’ Carolyn Abbate and Roger Parker, *A History of
makes this point, referring to exploiting the different acoustic properties of the Sofiensäle halls to realise sound effects as analogous to ‘fad[ing] in and out of scenes aurally as if we were making a stage production with lighting.’

If Culshaw’s ideas in using sound expressively were, like Appia’s in scenographic lighting, iconoclastic, then Raeburn showed an altogether different response to the challenge of creating drama and frisson in recording. Coincident with Culshaw’s departure to the BBC in December 1967, Raeburn published an article in the music press that described his approach to creating the effects for his recording of *Tosca*. Since the late 1950s, Raeburn had played a major part in realising some of the most ambitious sound effects conceived by Culshaw as his studio assistant: on the sessions of *Das Rheingold*, Raeburn had led a throng of wailing Viennese children around the Sofiensaal to represent the fearful Nibelungen, and had hauled iron bricks around the stage to convey the giants’ concealing Freia with their golden hoard. His article pays tribute to the pioneering work of the company over the previous decade in understanding the importance of theatrical drama to recording, yet cautions that a musical performance can be ‘upset by an overdose of extraneous noises.’ A degree of unfavourable criticism had been levelled at Raeburn’s productions in his early career in this respect. It had been noted by Herbert Kupferberg in a review of Raeburn’s *Lucia di Lammermoor* (1961) that the effects had been overdone in the wedding feast scene so that ‘the guests set up such a racket talking to each other that you can scarcely hear the orchestra.’ Raeburn reflected on this recording decades later that ‘there’s a feeling that we were moving people just for the sake of it. So things could get out of hand. We went over the top, with cocktail noises and the like.’ From his experience assisting Culshaw, and from reviews of his own productions, Raeburn refined his position. He adds in his article on the Maazel *Tosca* recording that ‘when a composer specifies extra-musical sounds in his stage directions, not only should his instructions be followed, but they can often be better reproduced on record than in the theatre.’

---

*Opera: The Last Four Hundred Years*, 2012, p.374) and Gundula Kreuzer, (*Verdi and the Germans: From Unification to the Third Reich*, 2010, p.172) consider the work of Appia to have foreshadowed the avant-garde settings of *Regieoper*.


536 As told by Erik Smith, interview with Evans Mirageas (recorded for WFMT Radio Chicago, 1985).

537 Christopher Raeburn, draft notes for ‘Ring Twice and Ask for Mario’, BL/RA.

538 Herbert Kupferberg, review cutting, 12 November, 1961 (possibly *New York Herald Tribune*), BL/RA.

an appropriate subject for this kind of treatment, having been written in the verismo idiom and situated in particular locations of dramatic significance in Sardou’s play, which he acknowledges gave the authority to record authentic sound effects in situ in their authentic locations. Yet he felt that ‘atmospheric’ sounds were to be avoided; although they had the potential to add aural depth, they were not authentic to either active or passive directions in the score. The priority was to retain a sense of proportion, and moreover, as Raeburn believes, ‘integrity,’ so that the dramatic presentation did not detract from the music. Six years later when making the first studio recording of Parsifal in Vienna in 1972, Raeburn consolidated his vision by writing in Gramophone of the importance of resisting ‘gimmickry’: it is evident that he refers to lessons learned recording Wagner under the directorship of Culshaw, from whose methods Raeburn distances himself, stating that ‘the temptations to turn Parsifal into a “spectacular” are enormous…I think it would have been no surprise in some quarters for Decca to put out a “flash” Parsifal…I felt the only way to hope for a great Parsifal was to take advantage of what all of us had learned in our careers, and then go back to square one, and try and distil this experience into a straightforward and simple approach.’

Raeburn looked to less technically-interventionist, but equally literal, means to strengthen the aural experience for the recording medium in his quest for ‘truth.’ If ‘aura’ is considered as an analogue of ‘atmosphere,’ as Gernot Böhme suggests, sensed as an ‘indeterminate, spatially-diffused quality of feeling,’ then Raeburn was convinced that it was necessary to counter gimmickry on the one hand and the perils of lifelessness on the other by creating ‘atmosphere.’ This is a key term that he often repeats; using it to denote both the actual acoustic space of recording and the dramatic tension of performance created in the studio. Raeburn’s goal was to preserve a trace of the performing acoustic

---

540 Raeburn’s recording of Angelotti’s footsteps in the Attavanti Chapel at the Sant’ Andrea della Valle for Tosca to set the atmosphere were ultimately rejected as ‘illogical’ to use only at the beginning of Act 1, and as an ‘intrusive irritant’ if used throughout the opera. (Draft notes for ‘Ring Twice and Ask for Mario’, BL/RA.)

541 Christopher Raeburn, ‘The First Studio Recording of Parsifal’, Gramophone Vol. 50 No. 599 (April 1973), p.1840. It might be noted that Raeburn’s Parsifal attracted covert criticism from John Culshaw for the choice of cast, although no reference is made to the dramatic presentation.


environment in his recordings by using natural hall ambience and reverberation as a
verismo element, and in so doing, connect the listener with the original studio recording
conditions. Recording balance, he argues, in the first instance, should be achieved by natural
means—the responsibility of the conductor—who should react and adjust to the
reverberant energy in the hall space, and give directions for instruments whose natural
resonance requires refinement, such as shortening notes, playing with more *legato* or
adjusting tempi.\(^{544}\) Where possible, he continues, creating the balance solely in the mixer, or
during post-production, should be avoided on account of creating an artificial perspective, a
practice that he felt was exacerbated by the development of multitrack recording, which
enabled instruments and voices lost in the mix to be ‘fished out,’ leading to a ‘spot-lit’
effect, lacking natural hall ambience. By the end of his career, Raeburn remained categoric
that developments in multitrack and surround sound had created recordings that
inhabited a disembodied space; a plastic and pliant artifice, detached from the reality of the studio.
Using whimsically idiosyncratic language, he describes the possibilities of creating post-
session mixes, often using multiple locations for recording, as a ‘velvety nonsense.’ This
provides, he believes, too many production choices, and is responsible for destroying ‘aura’:

> Certain companies would start in a particular location and say fine, we’ll go
from a gymnastic hall and will finish in a church, because we can change
the sound later...[but] it sounds more like the church, because you can’t
unchurch a church...the temptation is to play around with the sound. And
this is my complaint about today. Young colleagues I speak to say, “look,
don’t worry, we can change it.” My whole feeling is that I don’t want to
change it.”\(^{545}\)

The inherent problem with his disinclination for change was, naturally, that the recording
industry was evolving around him perpetually, and resisting its flow a somewhat futile aim.
It might also be noted that Raeburn was not in a position to restrict finalising the recording
balance to the session itself: Decca incurred heavy recording session costs across its
worldwide operations, which at the time of PolyGram’s takeover in 1980 exceeded £1.2
million (net), and opportunities to make changes with its own post-production facilities
offered obvious benefits.\(^{546}\) Although Nicholas Cook writes that ‘technology affords but

\(^{544}\) Christopher Raeburn, ‘The Recording of Opera’, notes for talk, undated, BL/RA.
\(^{545}\) Typescript of interview with Martin Elste in 2004, published as ‘A Loyal Company Man: An
Interview with Christopher Raeburn’, *Classic Record Collector*, Issue 57 (Summer 2009), p.22.
\(^{546}\) Accounts details taken from Ray Minshull’s papers. Since the 1960s, Decca strived to make
recording session economies large and small; from reducing the standard number of orchestral
does not determine cultural practices: production might be seen as the series of interpretive choices, multitrack’s potential for Decca was as much a factor of economic and logistic necessity as it was an interpretive choice in sound engineering and production.

As a man of theatrical background, Raeburn understood that generating ‘atmosphere’ during recording sessions by inspiring singers and musicians to create and maintain dramatic expressivity in performance, was the foremost method of breathing life and frisson into recording opera. This he accepted as both a ‘genuinely theatrical’ mood, but also as an illusion of the theatre performance: that is, a paradoxical ‘genuine illusion,’ created without intention to mislead or confuse, but rather to heighten the affective power of the music and to produce a veristic performance. But Raeburn evidently intended that the public should be encouraged to suspend their collective disbelief by his insistence on limiting access to recording session photographs, where possible, only to those who had a professional interest in recording:

I was never enthusiastic about session photographs appearing in the record booklets, because if in an opera I have tried to maintain or re-create the atmosphere of the theatre, I do not want the public to see a lot of artists in their working clothes with banks of microphones. Rehearsals and session photos are of interest to insiders…but I do not want to go out of my way to destroy the illusion for the public which I have taken the trouble to create.

It seems anachronistic, and somewhat naive, to believe that audiences of recorded music in the mid-twentieth century could be protected from the physical realities of the studio process, and suggests that, fundamentally, Raeburn felt a sense of discomfort, perhaps believing that the process of creating the illusion was in some way an unethical deception. For the same reason, Raeburn would not permit music journalists access to production scores marked for editing. Submitting the critical faculties to the will of the creative authority was hardly a new concept. Literary audiences had been invited to engage
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549 Christopher Raeburn, email (print) to Martin Elste, 4 March 2004, BL/RA.
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with ‘that willing suspension of disbelief for the moment, which constitutes poetic faith’,\textsuperscript{551} since the publication of Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s \textit{Biographia Literaria} in 1817, described by Michael Tomko as ‘the acceptance in art of the most fantastic worlds whose premises, outcomes or actions we would question or reject in reality.’\textsuperscript{552} This is not to infer that Raeburn thought the studio-created recording was aesthetically inferior to either live performance or the recorded capture of a live performance, itself a time-worn argument that had been discussed robustly in the columns of \textit{The Gramophone} since the 1930s,\textsuperscript{553} but that ‘revealing the secrets of the cuisine,’ as he says, was ‘letting the show down.’\textsuperscript{554}

Raeburn’s evident desire to return the recording medium to a state of transparency, which Eric Clarke and David Patmore discuss as the ideal ‘by which any auditory awareness of the recording as object disappears,’\textsuperscript{555} was already too late. John Culshaw’s bold operatic realisations in the 1960s, practices such as adding novel psychoacoustic devices to ensure unequivocal emphasis of an opera’s subtext, had ensured the metaphorical opening of the studio door. These were sounds that could only have been made with creative effort in the studio—production made truly audible—and with them the work of the recording team behind the door had been revealed.

Having eschewed the kinds of acoustic effects used by Culshaw, Raeburn was particularly reliant on the dramatic abilities of his artists to carry an opera or vocal recital recording, which was a significant influence on his determination to control casting and engage singer-actors wherever possible. The capacity for intensity of characterisation, storytelling ability and agility in changing mood were all as important as the aesthetic quality of the voice, but according to his A&R colleague Andrew Cornall, Raeburn set out to compensate for the piecemeal nature of the recording process by often creating tension on sessions:

…he hated a relaxed session, and people used to say that quite often he deliberately created tension on a session just to stir things up. And Christopher [Raeburn] himself got quite worked-up and that quite often rubbed off on other people. But I think that was his modus operandi. He needed to get himself worked up to get into some of these things… Ricky

\textsuperscript{552} Michael Tomko, \textit{Beyond the Willing Suspension of Disbelief: Poetic Faith from Coleridge to Tolkien}, 2015, p.1.
\textsuperscript{553} See Oliver Read and Walter Welch, \textit{From Tin Foil to Stereo}, p.354–358. Here, the authors quote arguments focusing on electrical versus acoustic recording as a means of conveying ‘the spirit of the music’ between Percy Wilson, P.G. Hurst and Compton Mackenzie at length in \textit{The Gramophone}.
\textsuperscript{554} Christopher Raeburn, email (print) to Martin Elste, 4 March 2004, BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{555} David Patmore and Eric Clarke, ‘Making and Hearing Virtual Worlds: John Culshaw and the Art of Record Production’, 2008, p.3.
[Richard Bonynge] and Christopher could wind each other up. But they got things going because that’s how they worked. I went completely the other way and tried to make sure everybody was relaxed, and working in a different sort of way.  

It was the preferred procedure at Decca not to record operas until artists had first performed their roles in a live stage performance. According to Joan Sutherland, this made it easier to maintain a part with more consistency and fully enter into the illusion for the recording, but inevitably the start-stop nature of the session process made it difficult to preserve the ‘continuity of feeling.’ Maintaining a concert-like atmosphere concurrently with repeating takes was a test of endurance, particularly for singers, as the artists interviewed for this thesis have remarked. Gabriele Fontana remarks that

> Recording is such a special field for a singer and musician, because you are so exposed on the microphone, and you must be so en pointe; repeating, repeating, repeating. It’s a big pressure on you. In all the sessions, I was forced to be my very, very best.

Repetitions would be made to cover points of interpretation as much as for error correction, and Fontana recalls much discussion with Raeburn on phrasing, dynamics and tone. Raeburn’s preference was for long takes to retain familiar performance conditions and to establish the overall architecture of the music—for a least half a movement or piece rather than as Fontana says, bar by bar—to give an opportunity to explore alternative ideas if required, before making ‘patches’ to cover problem areas. There is a sense, therefore, that rather than ‘building up’ an accumulated montage of musical material to create the whole, Raeburn preferred to ‘cut into’ a performance, and the skill of knowing when to stop recording—when something could not be improved—was a hallmark of the understanding between producer and artist. Cecilia Bartoli comments that Raeburn’s ability to maintain the narrative thrust and wider perspective rather than becoming distracted with detail was key:

> ...he always insisted in giving the recordings freshness as if they were a live performance: it was important for him to perform the music in a natural

---

556 Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.
557 ‘Sutherland on recording’, *Audio Record Review*, September 1967, p.15. See also Christopher Raeburn, letter to Bruno Cagli, ‘as always I hope that a performance on stage comes first,’ 1996, BL/RA.
Christopher had a very rare talent: he knew exactly when he had the right take. He had this sixth sense for the right moment, when everything was ready, when I was prepared to create exactly the result he was looking for. He used to say ‘last take’—and there it was.

He said we have it—and he was right...

This was a very important gift, because this way he avoided that I got fatigued, tired and would force the voice or lose the concentration. This was truly unique and a great gift.

Fig 5.1 Sample of Christopher Raeburn’s score markings: Mozart Arias recording (‘Come scoglio’, Così fan tutte/Cecilia Bartoli), 1993, BL/RA. (Stuart, >V666).

559 Cecilia Bartoli, interview, 1 November 2016.
The trial and error of recording sessions offered the artist the possibilities to pursue an idealised performance, but although Raeburn was fully aware that the reputation of the artist was at stake, this was offset by the knowledge that perfectionism was also a source of sterility. In spite of his anti-interventionist views on establishing the fundamental recording balance—‘we try not to misuse the huge technical machine at our disposal,’ as he says—Raeburn had no reservations about availing himself of Decca’s post-production technology, which gave him (through the work of the editor) control over both the artist’s input, and ultimately their reputation on record. Raeburn was aware that while responding to an artist’s recording aspirations, a balance had to be struck to reflect what was representative of their achievements in the concert hall or opera stage: that the illusion was built from what was consistent and real. This kind of negotiation is exemplified between Raeburn and Luciano Pavarotti in particular: regarding their recording of Rigoletto in 1989 with Riccardo Chailly, Raeburn cautions Pavarotti on the use of extended notes, which have evidently been requested. ‘Unfortunately the long version of the top D sounds too artificial and it is clear it was made with a synthesizer,’ he says, and ‘I could not possibly risk your reputation with that version.’ Elsewhere, too, Raeburn is seen to decline a request for an unreleased recording of Mozart arias that Pavarotti made with Sir John Pritchard in 1986 to be edited because it does not meet the desired quality of performance:

They have never been edited because I believe apart from the excellent Idomeneo arias, they were the least successful sessions we have done together. I do not believe that any miracle of editing could bring them up to your usual standard.

The producer was the ultimate arbiter of the quality of the recording, and because opportunities for artists to listen back to either edited or unedited material were limited by the conditions of their contracts, it was necessary for the producer to assume the role as ‘the ears for everybody.’ Even though Raeburn’s reputation among his post-production colleagues was to be demanding and at times pedantic in his editing demands, this was mitigated by awareness that a degree of imprecision strengthened the honest illusion of recording. Christopher Pope recalls that Raeburn ‘prided himself in not necessarily choosing
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560 Christopher Raeburn, notes for round table discussion, ‘Problems and perspective of record production’, First World Record Congress, Treviso, 1973, BL/RA.
561 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Luciano Pavarotti, 6 October 1989, BL/RA.
562 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Luciano Pavarotti, 4 June 1990, BL/RA.
563 Gabriele Fontana, interview recorded 12 October 2016.
564 Nigel Gayler, interview recorded 25 May 2016.
the best take for a top note, because even if it was not quite perfect, in the general sweep of things it was right.\textsuperscript{565}

Ostensibly, Raeburn’s reasons for attempting to limit the disclosure of information of his recording methods on opera were to protect the public from any disappointment felt through the destruction of the recording illusion in the revelation of the mundane. But the underlying motive was to protect both the reputation of the artist and public knowledge of the extent of the technical apparatus deployed in the service of the recording and in so doing, preserve the sense of aura of a live event. But it also served to revive a romantic, purist ideal in recording that he felt had been lost during the years of Culshaw’s use of experimental means to engage the listener more fully in the drama. Whereas John Culshaw sought to create a ‘new medium’ that had revealed the conscious, creative potential of the act of recording, Raeburn’s relationship with the recording medium was ambivalent. But by de-emphasising the insight and auteurship of the producer as exemplified by Culshaw, Raeburn aimed to re-focus recording on the authority of the composer and the artistry of the musicians.

5.2 The producer as godfather: Raeburn and Cecilia Bartoli

Raeburn believed that as a general rule, standards and success in recording could be proved to be independent of the presence of a star musician or conductor by attending to the smallest detail, and that linguistic, dramatic or cultural affinity with repertoire were greater considerations for the success of a recording in terms of preserving the authentic and the ‘true.’ In chapter 5.1, Raeburn has been shown to acknowledge that the process of recording has the potential to dissipate frisson and aura in musical performance, and that it is chiefly the role of the skilled musician, through encouragement by the producer, to restore the connection with the audience. These aspects of Raeburn’s production ethos suggest that he saw star status and musical-cultural sensitivity as not necessarily concomitant, and moreover, that the public renown of a performer should be predicated on and emphasise a high degree of musicianship that has accrued through perseverance and devotion to the art. His remarks on the career of Luciano Pavarotti illustrate this sentiment:

A nine days’ wonder can be created by publicity, but a legend can’t...in no way was a star created overnight. Luciano had appeared as Idamante in

\textsuperscript{565} Christopher Pope, interview recorded 27 July 2016.
Glyndebourne, and he would be the first to admit his debt to John Pritchard for his counselling. There were also the tours in Australia with the Bonynges which were a unique start in the bel canto repertoire. There would be no legend without these years of hard work.\(^{566}\)

With these ideas in mind, this study of Raeburn’s association with Cecilia Bartoli, the extent of his influence on her early career, how he adapted his role as a producer to serve the needs of the star artist, and the tension between popularity and authenticity.

At the time of Bartoli’s audition and first recording for Decca between 1987 and 1988, in which she was cast as Rosina in Rossini’s *Il barbiere di Siviglia* alongside Leo Nucci, Andrew Cornall describes the prevailing artistic policy at the company as beset by short-termism:

> Nobody really looked forward five years or ten years...round that time it became very difficult to start to sign artists on the basis of developing them over 20 or 30 years. So when Cecilia came I remember there were some serious arguments, and Christopher really, really pushed and convinced Ray, and they had to push like mad to tie her [Bartoli] to an exclusive contract where they knew that the investment wasn’t going to come back immediately.\(^{567}\)

Decca was presented with a number of acute artistic and commercial challenges. With internal reports in 1986 forecasting increased competition from smaller labels, and by 1989, statements of CD sales at saturation point, unit sales flattening and rising costs, the company was under pressure to develop its promotional strategy in new areas.\(^{568}\) Decca’s worldwide licencees lobbied for more non-core classical, ‘crossover’ recording compilations recorded with its most established star singers, such as Sutherland, Pavarotti and Te Kanawa, to be released in tandem with traditional operatic repertoire with the same artists, and using ‘more aggressive and creative marketing.’\(^{569}\) It was also acknowledged that the company needed to boost the roster of younger successors to its star artists, whose exclusive contracts had been renewed continuously since the 1950s and 1960s. Ray

---

\(^{566}\) Christopher Raeburn, notes for speech at Luciano Pavarotti’s twenty-fifth anniversary as an exclusive Decca artist, 1982, BL/RA.

\(^{567}\) Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.

\(^{568}\) Reports by Reinhard Klaassen, Roland Kommerell and worldwide licencees, Decca International meetings and conferences, Chilston Park, 1987 and 1989 and London 1986, BL/RA.

\(^{569}\) Ibid. Titles such as *Volare*, *O Sole Mio*, and *Greatest Hits* (Pavarotti), *Talking Pictures* (Sutherland), *Songs of Inspiration*, *Christmas with Kiri*, and *Blue Skies* (Te Kanawa) were used to boost sales of traditional core repertoire, and promoted using television campaigns devised by licencees in territories worldwide, described in the conference reports as ‘pop-style treatment.’
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of first contract</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of first contract</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Solti conductor</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Heilmann tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Sutherland soprano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Bonyne conductor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Ashkenazy piano/cond</td>
<td>Trotter organ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Pavarotti tenor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Lupu piano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Hogwood conductor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Schiff piano/cond</td>
<td>Mauceri conductor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Chailly conductor</td>
<td>Zagrosek conductor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Dutoit conductor</td>
<td>Rogé piano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Te Kanawa soprano</td>
<td>Amoyal violin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nucci tenor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Fernández guitar</td>
<td>Rousset harpsichord/cond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Bell violin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Dohnányi conductor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Lemper singing actor</td>
<td>Schirmer conductor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: | singers | L'Oiseau-Lyre label | Entartete Musik series | Argus label |

Fig.5.2 Table of extant solo artist classical term contracts at the point of Ray Minshull’s retirement as Executive Vice President, A&R in 1994 (source of data: Ray Minshull papers).

Minshull gave assurances to its licencees that Decca’s A&R department were ‘always watching the operatic scene, but that singers of great talent were rare.’ Yet for Minshull, as vice-president of A&R, identifying a voice to support with an exclusive contract was a matter of a gamble of taste more than a perception of artistic virtue, especially in a volatile market, and that ‘the price of showing real faith in a singer has all of the dubious certainty of a win in a national lottery, and about as much chance as proving itself justified. The more one looks into the implications of offering a contract to a singer, the more attentive one becomes to every nuance.’ The company also responded to the saturated CD market by diversifying its repertoire by regenerating and forming new sub-labels, for which it signed young artists, as is shown in Fig 5.2. New Line was created in 1988, and was subsequently

---

570 Decca International meeting with licencees, London, 1986, BL/RA. Mirko Gratton, the licensee in Italy, voiced concern that ‘there did not appear to be any new great singers.’
absorbed into the Argo label in 1990, directed by Andrew Cornall. In the same year, the *Entartete Musik* series was introduced, which developed from a successful collaboration between Michael Haas and Berlin’s German Symphony Orchestra in the late 1980s.

Decca had not intended to contract a new, exclusive mezzo-soprano when casting Rosina in its production of *Il barbiere di Siviglia*. But having first heard Bartoli in a general audition at the Casa Verdi in Milan in 1986, and by auditioning her for Decca in Bologna in 1987, Raeburn declared her to be ‘the new mezzo we had been looking for.’ Indeed, as Fig 5.2 shows, she was the first female singer to sign an exclusive contract since the early 1980s. Raeburn saw Bartoli not only as a singer to sustain the lineage of Teresa Berganza and Marilyn Horne, with whom he had worked on Rossini recordings in the 1950s and 1960s, but also as the distillation of his artistic ideals. It was apparent to Raeburn immediately that Bartoli was the definitive singing actor for whom he had been seeking throughout his career, whose vocal technique and ‘innate musicality and instinct, and an actress’s feeling for Italian text’ gave her the potential to record repertoire in which his particular interests were served. These, specifically, were the bel canto repertoire, Mozart’s Italian operas and music associated with celebrated singers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that had played a major part in his early private research topics: Isabella Colbran, Aloysia Lange, Luisa Laschi, Maria Mandini, Teresa Saporiti, Nancy Storace, Pauline Viardot, and in particular, Maria Malibran.

---

572 New Line comprised contemporary concept albums from ‘progressive’ artists (notably composer Michael Nyman). From 1990, Argo focused on four key areas: British, American, choral and organ music but without specific historical boundaries.

573 The *Entartete Musik* series was developed to record the music of composers banned as ‘degenerate’ by the Third Reich. See Michael Haas, *Hitler’s Musical Tabula Rasa—Restitution—Restoration* (PhD submission by public works, 2017) p.3 ff. which details the genesis of the series.

574 In a published interview with Martin Elste—’A Loyal Company Man’, *Classic Record Collector*, Issue 57 (Summer 2009), p.26—Raeburn notes that the only other sources of initial interest in Bartoli’s voice at the Milan audition came from his ex-Decca colleagues Erik Smith at Philips and John Mordler at L’Opéra Monte Carlo.

575 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Edgar Vincent, 16 August 1990, BL/RA.

576 Raeburn’s first Rossini recording had been with Berganza in 1959 (Stuart, >1058), which he notes was long before the ‘great Rossini revival had begun,’ (Christopher Raeburn, memoir notes, BL/RA). Raeburn had produced Horne in Rossini repertoire, often in partnership with Joan Sutherland, from 1963 until the late 1970s.

577 Christopher Raeburn, typescript, ‘Some thoughts on Bel Canto’, BL/RA.

578 Raeburn contributed articles to the *Grove Book of Opera Singers* on a number of prominent eighteenth and nineteenth century artists (some subsequently revised by Dorothea Link). See Appendix 4. He is reported as having given Bartoli a copy of an etching of Malibran for good luck at the start of her career (see Jessica Duchen, ‘Soul Sisters: Cecilia Bartoli and Maria Malibran’, *The Independent*, 21 November 2007 online <https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-
The degree of conviction shown by Raeburn in Bartoli as star material was modulated by an awareness of the responsibility and accountability in crafting an ideal career from scratch: although Raeburn had been a producer for thirty years and was a discreet adviser to many artists, he had not, until this point, been the prime mover in signing an artist to an exclusive recording contract, but now took the lead in assembling support from a retinue of sympathetic agents and publicists. In a draft letter to the agent Ronald Wilford, he writes:

She wants someone to manage her career, rather than handle bookings. She is very anxious to have [Jack] M[astroianni] if possible because he has a small list and he can advise her from experience. My personal opinion is that he is the only person I know who one could entrust her career to. She is possibly the finest and most gifted singer I have ever met but her voice is small, her repertoire limited and she is very young indeed. I feel responsible for her since I gave her her big break; and I would manage her myself but I am not in the business. She needs to be looked after like you looked after Mac [Cornell MacNeil] in 1958–when you and I first met. I asked her if she had an agreement with anyone in the States. She said specifically No...I do hope you can help over this because Cecilia is remarkable and she and her career require very sensitive treatment.579

Raeburn identified the opportunity to take a role in designing a career in which recording and performing live were integrated strategically—where recording was not an adjunct—and where all parties understood the need for compatibility between the recorded voice and the sound produced live in the concert hall to prevent adverse critical comparisons between the two, to create a consistent reputation, and to preserve a sense of the honest illusion of recording. To this end, Raeburn placed himself in a position to advise against Bartoli ‘being pushed too far too soon’ and to protect her nascent reputation in recording by a considered approach to live performances and ‘not singing in venues which are too large for the natural size of her voice.’580

A common arrangement for artists with notable public careers was to be supported by what Ray Minshull describes as a ‘ghost partner’ or ‘Svengali-person;581 the individual ‘whom the artist believes to be utterly honest and truthful in their musical, stylistic, personal and theatrical comments and criticisms, and whose sole concern is quite
blatantly the protection and development of every aspect of their own performer,’ and who is ‘very quickly endowed with the unwritten (and occasionally written) authority to speak for the performer,’ chiefly to avoid their ‘being exploited by the outside world.’ The message that Minshull and Raeburn conveyed to Decca’s senior management and licencees—evidently aware of the potential for exploitation of Bartoli from within Decca too—was to exercise restraint in managing her early recording career, which should focus on creating a reputation through strategic repertoire choices. The traditional approach to creating a star performer offered by Raeburn focused on building a whole career. This appealed to Bartoli, who describes him as ‘a producer in the old way: he was a guide for the young artists...As a producer he had a general vision of a career, not only of a single recording.’

The integrated management of Bartoli’s early career was due, to an extent, to cooperative negotiation of the relatively new professional relationship between Raeburn and her agent, Jack Mastroianni (who had been manager for Mirella Freni and consulted with Raeburn when Decca had revived her recording career in the late 1980s), in terms of their expectations, areas of expertise and their relative authority as Bartoli’s joint ‘ghost partners.’ Theoretically, they each approached shaping Bartoli’s career from a different perspective—Mastroianni as the impresario-agitator securing a favourable financial and promotional settlement, and Raeburn as Decca’s artistic intermediary and repertoire adviser for Bartoli—but to a certain degree, their roles overlapped. In the early days of Bartoli’s recording career, Mastroianni describes how he extended his sphere of influence in the studio by contributing his opinion to the number of takes and the amount of editing he thought appropriate for his artist. Given Raeburn’s sensitivity to the dynamics of power in a recording studio, this approach must have been interpreted as gross interference. But Mastroianni says that over time, he was willing to yield fully to Raeburn’s session management decisions and recognised that Raeburn was also authorised to protect Decca’s recording standards. Raeburn, for his part, ‘never stepped into the [artists’] management arena,’ and did not expect to negotiate, according to Mastroianni. Yet as can be seen from the minutes of meetings held between the three, Raeburn was fully apprised of

---

582 Ibid. The examples given by Minshull are Joan Sutherland and Richard Bonynge, Franco and Loretta Corelli and Nicolai Ghiaurov and a Mr Grigorov.
583 Cecilia Bartoli, interview, 1 November 2016.
584 Jack Mastroianni, interview recorded 21 July 2016.
585 Ibid.
contractual details and Bartoli’s schedule of tours, broadcasts and recitals that were programmed, and used his diplomatic contacts to help arrange private recitals.\textsuperscript{586}

Raeburn’s chief advisory capacity lay in the choice of repertoire through which one project built logically to the next, as Mastroianni says, especially in view of Bartoli’s limited stage experience. Bartoli describes having learned a great deal from Raeburn, particularly in terms of selecting repertoire in order to ‘respect the voice, to be careful never to put it under pressure and maintain an extraordinary discipline.’\textsuperscript{587} Although sharing an enthusiasm for bel canto repertoire, where their musical interests diverged, especially in regard to her developing interest in HIP and Italian Baroque repertoire, Raeburn saw the necessity of taking musicological advice from scholars such as Philip Gossett, H.C. Robbins Landon and Silvie Mamy to ensure authentic detail in Bartoli’s recordings, to create recording concepts and to avoid the kind of criticism he had experienced from Charles Mackerras, as has been described in chapter 4. Whereas Raeburn had once engaged in his own research and contributed his own booklet notes—for instance, writing for Marilyn Horne’s Souvenir of a Golden Era bel canto recital (1965)—Bartoli’s Soirée Rossini recital recording (1990) was intended to reflect the highest level of Rossini revivalist scholarship and understanding, significantly beyond Raeburn’s own knowledge and capabilities. He devolved many of the music production tasks by contracting Gossett to oversee the entire project, who proposed a programme combining little-known, unedited repertoire that Gossett had himself restituted—described in Gramophone as ‘a touch esoteric,’\textsuperscript{588} including five settings of a text by Metastasio—together with frequently-performed pieces. Gossett’s contract also specified music copying and transcribing using modern notation conventions, overseeing and composing ornamentation and embellishments, and to writing liner notes. Disappointingly for Raeburn, Bartoli’s performance in the better-known repertoire was compared somewhat unfavourably to Marilyn Horne: ‘And fine as she is; a born Rossinian,’ writes Richard Osborne, ‘[Bartoli] does not as yet have all Marilyn Horne’s imagination and sheer dramatic daring as an interpreter of occasional Rossini…I miss Horne’s astonishing musical patience and emotional inwardness in what is the very heart of the work ['Canzonetta spagnuola’ from Giovanna d’Arco].’\textsuperscript{589}

\textsuperscript{586} Raeburn, for example, used his contact Odile Taliani (the wife of the Italian Ambassador to Austria) to arrange for Bartoli’s appearance at a fundraising recital at St George’s Chapel, Windsor (1994), on behalf of The Prince’s Trust (BL/RA).
\textsuperscript{587} Cecilia Bartoli, interview, 1 November 2016.
\textsuperscript{588} Richard Osborne, Gramophone online review <https://www.gramophone.co.uk/review/cecilia-bartoli-rossini-recital> [accessed 2 April 2018].
\textsuperscript{589} Ibid.
Raeburn and Mastroianni’s absolute conviction in Bartoli as an artist of uncommon and superlative virtuosity encouraged vigorous and expeditious early promotion by Decca. *Il barbiere di Siviglia*, recorded in 1988, had been intended primarily as a vehicle for Leo Nucci, but Bartoli had been promoted with equal billing, leading Raeburn to advise that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Takes part in a general audition at the Casa Verdi, Milan for opera house directors and music industry executives, including Christopher Raeburn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Auditions for Decca (by Raeburn) in Bologna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Rossini arias recital recording (Patanè/Vienna Volksoper orchestra).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989–90</td>
<td>Mozart recital recording (Schiff/Fischer/Vienna Chamber Orchestra).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td><em>Soirée Rossini</em> recording (Spencer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Signs exclusive five-year contract with Decca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–91</td>
<td><em>Arie Antiche</em> recording (Fischer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td><em>Rossini Heroines</em> recording (Marin/Teatro La Fenice Orchestra and Chorus. (Audio and video).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Mozart Requiem recording (Solti/VPO). (Audio and video for ORF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Bartoli agrees to any Decca producer for future operas, but only Raeburn for solo recitals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td><em>Mozart Portraits</em> (arias) recording (Fischer/Vienna Chamber Orchestra).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td><em>An Italian Songbook</em> (<em>bel canto</em> arias) recording (Levine).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Chant d’ Amour recording (Chung).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Bartoli in Italy recording (Sonatori de la Gioiosa Marca/Thibaudet). Audio and video. Duets recording (Terfel/ Chung/Accademia Santa Cecilia).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Vivaldi arias recording (Antonini//II Giardino Armonico).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Gluck recital recording (Forck/Der Akademie für Alte Musik).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05</td>
<td><em>Opera Proibita</em> recording (Minkowski/Les Musiciens du Louvre).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

- Recordings made in Raeburn’s official retirement from Decca
- Recordings made with Raeburn without Decca recording staff.

Fig. 5.3 A chronology of Bartoli-Raeburn productions for Decca.
‘some tact might be needed to explain [to Nucci] why we now wish Bartoli [to be] given equal [pictorial] prominence.’ But there was a lack of consonance between Raeburn’s concept of Bartoli’s early career image and that envisaged by Decca’s product division, the syndicate of individual company departments that during the 1980s and 1990s dealt with marketing and promotional activity. While Raeburn worked to protect her image as a serious, repertoire-focused artist, Decca’s creative services unit experimented with a ‘new style policy,’ aiming to deFORMalise the presentation of classical artists—to ‘intrigue, seduce, surprise, amuse and catch the eye’—and align itself strategically with current trends in popular media in emphasising the personality of the performer in preference to setting a musical-aesthetic tone. Raeburn appears to have had greater influence in the wider media on the direction and substance of Bartoli’s early image than within Decca. The contrast between Bartoli’s rock and roll presentation in the marketing campaign for the recording of Rossini arias with Patanè (1988) for Decca, and her studied resemblance to the nineteenth-century singer Maria Malibran for a televised concert performance in the surroundings of the eighteenth-century Parisian salon-inspired Savoy Hotel ballroom for London Weekend Television (A Portrait, 1991), could not be more marked.

In other divisions of Decca, there was greater knowledge and acceptance of Raeburn and Mastroianni’s position as a quasi-autonomous body in directing Bartoli’s career. As head of Special Projects and responsible for overseeing collaborative ventures with external media and film, Herbert Chappell acknowledged that these needed to ‘attract the support not only of Cecilia Bartoli herself, but also of Mr Mastroianni and Mr Raeburn’ if such projects were to succeed, ‘regardless of whether the finance comes from PolyGram or elsewhere.’ Raeburn’s response to an offer of a concept video from Lightship AV in Vienna aiming to present Bartoli’s career using ‘modern post-production’ and a ‘fresh style in direction’ to attract younger audiences, discloses his somewhat pious approach:

I feel that Cecilia Bartoli at this stage of career is not the right artist for you...this approach would suit a singer who has sung a variety of

590 Christopher Raeburn, report from meeting with Ray Minshull, 1988, BL/RA.
591 The product division comprised product management, marketing, creative services and commercial planning departments. See report of the Decca International conference, 1989, BL/RA. Product management, it notes, fell between the work of Ray Minshull and the A&R department and marketing. ‘while working closely with creative services and looking after the interests of the markets.’
593 See <https://www.day-ellison.com/phoenix/cecilia-bartoli/> [accessed 2 April 2018], which details the visual concept behind Bartoli’s early career campaign and ‘throwing open the windows on working practice’ at Decca.
594 Herbert Chappell, letter to Anton Weiss, Lightship AV, 7 December 1989, BL/RA.
repertoire...Cecilia, on the other hand is only starting a career and at present is strictly confined to the classical repertoire. I feel that the approach you suggest which would be fine for some artists would not be particularly successful in the case of Cecilia, and would not help her present image. It is possible in a number of years when she is both established and her repertoire is extended...it is fine for an established classical artist such as Jessye Norman or Kiri Te Kanawa to get involved in middle-of-the-road repertoire, which can take semi-pop musical arrangements...but Cecilia’s present image cannot take this and if now she changed her image, I am sure she would fall between two stools.  

Bartoli’s solo career circumvented the traditional structure of the professional singing artist, by which a period of apprenticeship was served in an opera house chorus in standard repertoire, followed by the possibility of solo work and a recording contract, and was as such an untested model. The established stage careers of Decca’s long-term exclusive artists signed in previous decades, such as Pavarotti and Sutherland, had built the credit needed to maintain their image in the transition of the industry from one in which the artist was promoted as a channel for repertoire in which they have a unique talent, to the artist as a populist construct and a product in itself, irrespective of repertoire, or as Walter Benjamin and Theodor Adorno would describe, created in lieu of aura in recording. Unlike Bartoli before them, the path to Renée Fleming’s and Angela Gheorghiu’s exclusive Decca contracts in 1995, signed under the auspices of Evans Mirageas (as successor to Ray Minshull), had followed a more traditional route to a recording career. Fleming’s already substantial experience in the opera houses of North America and Europe, and a reputation for professionalism in deputising for indisposed artists at short notice had brought her to the attention of both Mirageas and Sir Georg Solti independently. Fleming describes her career progression as ‘a slow and steady climb’ in which ‘performing career and...recording career dovetail and reinforce each other.’ Gheorghiu, at the time of her Decca signing, had been a prize-winner at the Belvedere Singing Competition following extensive conservatoire training, and had performed on stages throughout Europe and the Americas before auditioning for Solti at the Royal Opera House in London. As more established artists, Fleming and Gheorghiu had already received public approbation that moderated the financial risk to Decca. With a career that was created in the studio rather than primarily on
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595 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Anton Weiss, Lightship AV, 25 January 1990, BL/RA.  
597 Fleming’s and Gheorghiu’s recordings for Decca were produced by a number of different Decca producers, particularly Michael Haas, Andrew Cornall and Michael Woolcock, but not by Raeburn. See Philip Stuart, Decca discography, 2014.
the stage—the reverse of the norm—it was necessary for Raeburn to impress upon Bartoli that an international recording career did not progress within a vacuum. Decca considered Bartoli to be ‘an increasingly important artistic ambassador for the label in the future,’ and that the commercial success of recordings and her ability to control her artistic development depended on public and critical approbation, garnered through the reliable availability of the star in personal appearances, tours and concerts. However, at the time of Bartoli’s renewed exclusive contract with Decca in 1994, her worldwide recording sales exceeded a million units, giving her the commercial traction and status to maintain a profile as a ‘speciality singer,’ to quote Herbert Breslin, and to devise concept-driven recording programmes focusing on infrequently-performed, obscure or indeed ‘lost’ chamber repertoire beyond the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century repertoire interests that she shared with Raeburn. But where once he had helped to ignite Bartoli’s musical interests, by the mid-1990s, and in official retirement from Decca, Raeburn was prepared to follow Bartoli into repertoire with which he had little personal affinity as ‘the freelancer who was happy to take whatever repertoire Cecilia had dreamed up.’ As Mirageas continues, ‘until Bartoli took him into that world [the Baroque], I didn’t think I would have asked Christopher [Raeburn] to produce a recording of Baroque repertoire. It wasn’t his thing, but with Bartoli he happily went in that direction and learned a great deal.’

While Raeburn advised and supported Bartoli’s project choices and career direction, her artistic freedom and rapid rise to fame was interpreted from across the wider industry as her succumbing to the stratagems of a company in financial decline. Salzburg Festival director, Gerard Mortier, maintained that ‘the mischief-makers of music today are the record companies’ who had created superstars that destabilised the industry, and that Bartoli had been ‘gravely damaged by the irresponsibility of the record company.’ Raeburn countered on Decca’s behalf that

[Decca] have behaved with exemplary responsibility respecting Cecilia’s career. Far from being pushed, in eight years with the Company, Cecilia has taken the lead in only three operas, and has recorded seven solo CD recitals,

598 See correspondence between Erik Smith and Christopher Raeburn, 1995, BL/RA.
599 Report from _The Decca Record_ (company magazine), issue 1, 1994, BL/RA.
601 Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016.
602 Ibid.
603 Christopher Raeburn, undated typescript (circa 1996), BL/RA. As an opera house director and impresario, Mortier had gathered a reputation for preferring to cast unknown singers for financial expediency and to emphasise repertoire and the qualities of the production over the merits of individual artists (see Barry Millington, Gerard Mortier obituary, _The Guardian_, 14 March 2014).
all well within her range and ability and in her own confined repertoire. All these records have been made at her own wish.\footnote{Christopher Raeburn, undated typescript (circa 1996), BL/RA}

Fig. 5.4 Christopher Raeburn and Cecilia Bartoli during recording sessions of Mozart Arias, Vienna, 1989–1990, BL/RA (Philip Stuart, >V593). Photo: Decca.
However, the degree of Bartoli’s artistic independence and clear intentions also attracted a degree of criticism from her collaborators too, as can be seen from correspondence regarding her wish to record the parts of both Euridice and Genio in Haydn’s *L’anima del filosofo* in 1995–1996. Bartoli was reported to have ‘completely believe[d] that her powers of characterisation [were] up to differentiating between the two roles,’ and that Decca had ‘aural proof of that versatility,’ for which she should be supported ‘in her enthusiasm and conviction for taking on two female roles.’\(^605\) However, conductor Christopher Hogwood, H.C. Robbins Landon—as the recording consultant—and Decca (L’Oiseau-Lyre) producer Chris Sayers expressed their reservations. Even Decca’s senior vice president of marketing, Richard Rollefson, described the idea as a ‘stunt,’ although ‘as long as it is done well is a tremendous selling point for the recording.’\(^606\) While the audio recording was generally well-received, reported in *Gramophone* as displaying ‘compelling imaginative insight,’ and that Bartoli ‘gives voice so thrillingly’ to the extremes of the emotional characterisation,\(^607\) her choice of *L’anima del filosofo* for her Covent Garden debut in 2001 was vilified in areas of the press as an indulgence of the star singer. Described in *The Guardian* as having ‘foisted the piece on us,’ Bartoli’s performance is disparaged as ‘inviting us to respond to her vocal athleticism with amazement.’\(^608\) Such criticisms serve to underline that by being denied an opportunity to make critical comparisons with other performers as a consequence of arcane repertoire choice, the focus is shifted to the properties of the voice itself and on vocal technique: ‘the holy properties of the voice,’ as Adorno describes.\(^609\)

Raeburn may not have applied pressure to Bartoli’s career decisions, but as someone who had inculcated in her the values of highest technical and aesthetic standards in recording and ‘who shared a vision of what she was hoping to do, which was to express through music her vision of what the composer wanted, and document that interpretation,’\(^610\) Raeburn continued to make a personal impression on Bartoli as a ‘godfather,’ to use Mastroianni’s epithet. There is a sense, however, that in retirement—and still as an invitee to Decca’s A&R planning meetings—he found himself in a unique, if not conflicting position, as an intermediary trusted by both Bartoli and Decca to serve their
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\(^605\) Evans Mirageas, facsimile to Christopher Hogwood, 1 August 1995, BL/RA.

\(^606\) Ibid.

\(^607\) Hilary Finch, *Gramophone* online review [https://www.gramophone.co.uk/review/haydn-orfeo-ed-euridice] [accessed 3 April 2018].


\(^610\) Jack Mastroianni, interview recorded 21 July 2016.
separate strategic interests. Yet Raeburn appears not to have seen this dual role as incompatible. His motives remained fixed on the overall quality of the recording presentation, its musical authenticity and fidelity to Bartoli’s artistic image, even though there were instances where his loyalties seem somewhat confused, and his grasp of the economic realities of the star artist limited. The recording of a live recital programme, *Bartoli in Italy* (1998) as a video collaboration in which Decca had invested US$200,000 as a co-producer with NBSC, serves as a case in point. In its development stage, Raeburn had advised that although offering repertoire well-suited to Bartoli that included the music of Vivaldi, Caccini and Handel, an audio recording in which the quartet accompaniment did not reflect the composers’ original orchestrations intended for chamber orchestra ‘would not do Cecilia or Decca much good, particularly with Decca’s L’Oiseau-Lyre reputation [for authenticity].’ His concerns appear to have convinced Bartoli to refuse Decca the rights to record a companion ‘event’ CD. Arguing that the proportion of ‘even the most popular’ video sales were approximately a tenth of audio, Decca threatened to withdraw its finance and cancel the video project if it gained no tangible benefits. Appealing to Bartoli to reassess the decision by emphasising the opportunity to increase her audience base ‘by projecting [her] true artistic identity,’ Decca and Mastroianni resorted to presenting their case as a financial necessity: a business opportunity that would generate vast worldwide sales and stimulate interest in Bartoli’s back catalogue. Bartoli duly approved the project, and Raeburn, perhaps reluctantly in sacrificing authenticity for the less noble demands of commerce, acted as audio producer.

It could be argued that Raeburn eschewed interest in the contemporary reaction to Bartoli as an artist of popular iconic status in favour of focusing on her place in the historical pantheon of female singers from the eighteenth century onwards, in whose careers and repertoire he maintained a life-long fascination. The apotheosis of their shared antiquarian interests, and indeed Raeburn’s final recording for Decca, was the project *Maria*, a celebration of the Italian Romantic and *bel canto* repertoire of nineteenth-century mezzo soprano Maria Malibran, in which Raeburn believed that Bartoli had ‘restored Bellini singing to what it should be, and something I thought I would never hear in my lifetime. I have to thank you for not only this wonderful last collaboration, but for twenty years of
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611 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Evans Mirageas, 5 December 1996, BL/RA.
612 Evans Mirageas, letter to Jack Mastroianni, 26 February 1997, BL/RA.
613 Evans Mirageas, letter to Cecilia Bartoli, 4 March 1997, BL/RA.
614 Jack Mastroianni, letter Cecilia Bartoli, 26 February 1998, BL/RA.
totally gratifying work. Although critics of the Malibran project, particularly in regard to the associated tour with a *museo mobile* of Malibran ephemera, saw it as an exercise in promotional gimmickry—an ‘exhumation of the past...conceived with a very modern eye to marketing,’ as the Financial Times describes—this is to deny the possibility of its attempt to affirm a sincere personal relationship with repertoire while seeking a cogent form of public engagement.

Disapproving of moves to popularise Bartoli’s profile (and repertoire), Raeburn contributed to the tension between her image as the reincarnation of the *bel canto* star of the *ottocento* and the girl-next-door. Without time served building both a broad foundation of mainstream stage repertoire and the goodwill of a loyal public gained through regular stage appearances, Bartoli’s propulsion to international stardom risked comparisons with the creation of a popstar prodigy by a cynical, grasping, and perhaps desperate company. But her career radiating from the recording studio was of experimental design and had no discernible precedent in classical music. By retreating to ‘the dustier corners of the baroque repertoire,’ Bartoli was as much recoiling from potential accusations of being a manufactured commercial star as evading critical comparisons with her peers. It is unlikely that Raeburn could have predicted Bartoli’s world fame or the dependency and fixation of the record industry in the 1990s on the personality of the artist as the key factor in marketing, accelerated through video exposure. Nonetheless, the fame of the artist was a guarantor of the longevity of the recordings in the catalogue: recordings bearing Raeburn’s name and legacy, which was undoubtedly a motivating factor.

Through his deep investment in Bartoli’s early career, Raeburn was able to live out his impresarial ambition at the end of his own—to become, finally, the incarnated *Schauspieldirektor* of his own unfinished Mozart research—and take on a management role which had hitherto been denied. Where his attempts to influence and contribute directly

615 Christopher Raeburn, email (print) to Cecilia Bartoli, 2 June 2007, BL/RA.

616 Richard Fairman, review of Maria Malibran tour, *Financial Times*, 20 December 2007 [https://www.ft.com/content/a65c7a0e-af14-11dc-880f-0000779fd2ac] [accessed 5 March 2018].

617 Raeburn continued to gift Bartoli his own Malibran memorabilia, including the two remaining items in his possession: an engraving and a contemporary playbill (Christopher Raeburn, letter to Cecilia Bartoli, 6 October 2007, BL/RA).


619 See Chapter 2, pp.69–71, which references Raeburn’s early research on Mozart’s *Der Schauspieldirektor* (‘The Impresario’) during the 1950s. It is notable, perhaps, that by managing Bartoli’s Decca career, comparisons with H.C. Robbins Landon’s impresarial activities might also be drawn, whose career Raeburn respected and admired (see Chapter 3, pp.77–78).
to Decca’s artistic policy had previously been suppressed by senior management, who considered his ideas naive and misunderstanding of the exigencies of the business. Raeburn’s matchless experience in artists’ relations now allowed him an opportunity for control, and he was impatient to see his impresarial efforts bear fruit to create his legacy as the architect of Bartoli’s early career. But in his retirement, Raeburn’s support for Bartoli was perhaps more avuncular than it was tactical. His genuine concern for her welfare and public reception, maintaining that he would ‘always try to protect’ her reputation ‘by trying to make sure your very best is on your records,’ meant that he could make appeals on behalf of the company from a personal rather than a business perspective. As a remorseless idealist, not all his ideas were in Decca’s interests, but his personal approach was possibly a persuasive factor for Bartoli in her remaining under exclusive contract to Decca.

5.3 Collaboration and control: recording Wagner after Culshaw

Introduction

These two case studies present contrasting accounts of Decca’s experience of recording Wagner with Georg Solti in the 1980s; how the company approached and managed their contributions to projects with multiple stakeholders under live and studio conditions, and the extent to which they were prepared to make compromises. The studies aim to indicate the importance of strategic and artistic control in audio-visual productions, and how Decca’s proprietary recording techniques influenced the outcomes of productions made with other media companies. Through the work of John Culshaw, and specifically the complete recording of the Ring made with Solti, the music of Wagner has created a production history and public frame of reference for Decca, together with the standards, technology, innovation and integrity that have defined how the company has been perceived since the 1960s. In the absence of other accounts of how business was done at Decca, recording Wagner has become both its signature and mission statement.

620 These included a range of misguided personal initiatives: his promotion of Decca to the King Record Company in Japan without prior consultation (1963); advancing the possibility of recording the audio track for a film on the life of Nijinsky (1967–1968); attempts to broker sponsorship for recording Mozart’s operas in English with Peter Moores (a personal friend) in the mid-1980s, and initiating a Decca-sponsored arts festival in Vienna in the 1980s.
621 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Cecilia Bartoli, 31 December 1997, BL/RA.
After the late 1960s, Decca’s classical music division worked in an official capacity with many international partners in producing audio for film production and distribution companies, bespoke recordings for media and publishing houses and in licencing recordings to be used for recording and broadcast projects outside the general scope of its own business. The nature of the collaborations was often complex, in multifarious audio-visual combinations. Negotiations for these projects fell within the remit of Decca’s president, the director of classical music artists and repertoire (Ray Minshull), the manager of classical marketing and artists’ relations, and to an extent with Christopher Raeburn. Decca had had an association with the German music film company Unitel since 1971: the recording teams created twelve soundtracks during the 1970s to accompany the Unitel filmed opera and orchestral performances made under studio conditions in the Sofiensaal in Vienna.\(^{622}\) Raeburn himself produced six opera soundtracks for Unitel-Decca collaborations between 1974 and 1980.

For Decca, working with external partners created numerous potential problems, not least for the contractual, commercial, scheduling and recording management operations. Entering into agreements where the fundamental parameters of recording were changed—particularly in dealing with live performances—had the potential to compromise the central philosophies of the company recording style: to engage artists of international standing freely, to choose the optimum recording space for the repertoire to be recorded and to uphold their own self-defined technical and aesthetic standards. Indeed, Raeburn remarked that Minshull ‘disliked co-production in principle.’\(^{623}\) Why, then, did Decca choose to enter into complex commercial and distribution deals, and how did it assert its own production values?

**Living up to the ghost: recording the *Ring* at Bayreuth, 1983**

Following the completion of the *Ring* recording with Georg Solti and the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, John Culshaw wrote in 1967:

---

\(^{622}\) Decca producers and engineers also made three earlier audio for video recordings in 1968 and 1969 in Vienna (for an unspecified company) of opera and orchestral repertoire for which Raeburn pressed Leon Felder of Musikvertrieb for extra payments for each member of staff ‘since working for films involves extremely intensive work and very long hours, sometimes working through the night […] The persons involved are Messrs Minshull, Harvey, myself, Parry, Lock and Law.’ Christopher Raeburn, letter to Leon Felder, 2 November 1970, BL/RA.

\(^{623}\) Christopher Raeburn, letter to George Korngold, 1985, BL/RA.
But if the audience for opera in general and Wagner in particular is to grow, and if that audience is to make contact with the drama in any serious sense, the time is coming when technology must play an even greater part even at the expense of a few sacred artistic cows. Just as the conductor is no longer in charge of every aspect of a recording session but is nonetheless able to create a more accurate and prepared realization of his wishes because of the facilities provided for him, so I believe that the opera theatre of the future will be under the control of men who conceive opera in terms of expanding communication. In that direction there is at the very least a hope of survival ...simple economics and the expansion of private forms of communication like records and television will see to that...

It is now possible, for the first time, to play any part or the whole of the Ring in home conditions in such a way that it is an acceptable substitute for going to the theatre. By the next generation, it is not unreasonable to think that it may be seen as well as heard.  

As prescient as this might have sounded, video formatting for both broadcast and home markets advanced through intensive levels of technical activity throughout the 1960s in both tape and disc. Within Decca’s research laboratory in Finchley and its equivalent at Telefunken-Decca (Teldec) in Germany, work was progressing to establish and refine video disc systems with recording-standard rather than broadcast-standard audio, although this was eclipsed by the videocassette by the mid-1970s. As Decca’s technical research manager, Anthony Griffiths describes, the video disc experiments had been invaluable in gaining insight into techniques for developing digital audio recorders, and Decca produced its first digital tape recorder and editing set in 1976–1977. These advances in the quality of recorded sound were of paramount importance for the possibility of creating high-quality audio for music films, in which Decca saw a real need. Culshaw maintained that recording a complete Ring had been made possible only through the development of the LP and the stereo system of recording, and likewise, an aesthetically and technically successful audio-visual version of the Ring was dependent on a method of amalgamating high-quality audio with film.

626 Ibid.
627 According to Anthony Griffiths, ibid., the Decca digital recorders were developed following demonstrations of systems made in the US by Soundstream and 3M, whereby Griffiths and Arthur Haddy (Decca’s technical director) asked chairman Sir Edward Lewis for financial backing for the project.
Invitation to Bayreuth

In little over a decade on from Culshaw’s predictions, in 1979, Wolfgang Wagner gave permission for the first time for the entire Ring to be videotaped as well as recorded at Bayreuth in 1980, for worldwide reproduction and distribution ‘by every feasible means that technology permits, including television, videodiscs and videocassettes.’ This announcement, sent through somewhat furtive means during the mid-cycle of the controversial centennial Boulez-Chéreau production, by the American law firm handling the international interests of the Bayreuth Festival, had eventually found its way to Decca via the offices of AEG Telefunken and then its subsidiary, Teldec-Schallplatten. The Festival had the co-operation of German television network Bayerische Rundfunk in partnership with Unitel for the video recording and coverage of the technical costs of over DM 4,000,000, but was looking for further financial input to cover the artistic and management fees, which it believed would be ‘a major cultural contribution with the potential to enhance worldwide [company] esteem.’ AEG Telefunken had no interest in the project, and had therefore passed on the information to Decca.

Decca had had no dealings in Bayreuth since producer Peter Andry’s live audio recordings of the Ring conducted by Joseph Keilberth in 1955, but which remained unpublished until 2006, and European recording locations were territorial, with German locations being largely the province of Deutsche Grammophon, Electrola, and Teldec. Bayreuth, however, was a special case: companies were invited there rather than through approaching the management themselves, and Ray Minshull, as Decca’s director of classical recording, was authorised to make enquiries about the recording project direct from Wolfgang Wagner through his American lawyers, who had assumed the role of envoys. Minshull appears to have been somewhat surprised by Herr Wagner’s show of largesse, and explored the possibilities of their involvement with a view to making a live recording of the Ring in tandem with the video production. Wolfgang Wagner had agreed to admit a record company as a partner in exchange for rights to the audio recording, but Decca would have to meet the costs of the recording itself. Christopher Raeburn, who was by 1979 Decca’s head of opera production, was dispatched to meet with Wagner in Bayreuth during

---

629 P.L. Ratner, letter to Hans Groebe, 12 February 1979, BL/RA.
630 Ibid.
631 Peter Andry, Inside the Recording Studio, 2008, p.160. Andry remarks that this was due to a combination of contractual difficulties with artists signed to EMI, along with the newly-returned John Culshaw to Decca whose own plans for a studio recording of the Ring obstructed its release.
632 P.L. Ratner, letter to Ray Minshull, 23 April 1979, BL/RA.
633 Ray Minshull, letter to Wolfgang Wagner, 13 June 1979, BL/RA.
August of that year and Decca’s then head of marketing, David Rickerby, also had direct discussions with Wagner. Although there is no extant record of Raeburn’s meeting, Rickerby’s memo to both Minshull and Raeburn indicates that he—and it would appear, they—were reluctant to advance the project as ‘the cast and the artistic direction [did] not appear to be the best available and I cannot see the proposition being sufficiently commercially interesting for us to get involved on purely business grounds...do you wish to write to Mr. Wagner or shall I?’

With no sound artistic rationale by which to associate the company with the project, Decca summarily rejected the first invitation for twenty-five years to record at Bayreuth.

**Decca in Bayreuth: Solti and the ‘English’ Ring**

In the following year, the management of the Bayreuth Festival made their choice of Georg Solti as music director for the *Ring* to run for three seasons between 1983 and 1985, and engaged Peter Hall as the stage director at Solti’s suggestion. Along with a planned television recording by Bayerische Rundfunk, Wolfgang Wagner invited Decca to record all the performances in the three seasons for the Bayreuth archives, which Decca’s senior A&R management accepted on the understanding that the resulting material could provide the source for a new ‘live’ Solti-Decca *Ring* to complement Solti’s pioneering studio recording with the Vienna Philharmonic produced by John Culshaw. As an exclusive artist since 1947, Solti’s first appearance at Bayreuth provided the sound artistic and commercial potential that the previous invitation to record at Bayreuth with Pierre Boulez did not.

The contracts issued by Decca to the principal artists for the *Ring* set out the details of the plan:

> Mr. Wolfgang Wagner wrote to you about a possible release of Wagner’s *Ring* as a digital recording. I am sure that you are aware that Decca has been invited to record all of the performances in Bayreuth of this work under Sir Georg Solti during 1983, 1984 and 1985 for the archives in Bayreuth. Subject to reaching agreement with all the artists and musicians involved, it is also

---

634 David Rickerby, memo to Ray Minshull and Christopher Raeburn, 17 August 1979, BL/RA.

635 A written tribute to Solti by Minshull as part of a schedule of releases to mark Solti’s seventieth birthday in 1982 gives details of Solti’s contract, BL/RA.

636 Boulez had made two recordings for Argo in the early 1970s, but otherwise had no history of agreement with Decca. David Rickerby intended to boost the sales of the Solti-Culshaw studio *Ring* recording by releasing a ‘reduced’ version (fourteen rather than the original nineteen discs) as a special promotion to coincide with the new ‘live’ Bayreuth *Ring*. This was sanctioned by Solti, on the understanding that he would be recompensed, should the royalties from sales for the new edition incur a loss when compared to sales of the longer studio version. See Georg Solti, letter to Reinhard Klaassen, 20 May 1983, BL/RA.
hoped to prepare a complete Ring edited from these performances to release on sound-carriers as a commercial recording during 1986.\footnote{Contracts to the principal artists dated 4 July 1983. Not all the singers returned signed agreements, these being Altmeyer, Engert-Ely, Evans and Montague (see further letter dated 3 May 1984). Reiner Goldberg, who was replaced by Manfred Jung, had signed a contract offering him a flat fee of DM 25,500 for his performance of Siegfried.}

The project had great appeal for Christopher Raeburn, the producer-designate, who was particularly keen to ‘faithfully re-produce the Bayreuth sound.’\footnote{Christopher Raeburn, letter to Wolfgang Wagner, 1 January 1985, BL/RA.} The Festspielhaus, a theatre that had been designed to offer ‘natural’ acoustic control over the orchestral dynamics and allow conductors to give full rein to the instrumental balance without compromising the singers, was widely accepted, including by Solti, as outstanding.\footnote{See Georg Solti, \textit{Solti on Solti}, 1997, p. 183.} Leo Beranek describes the Festspielhaus as creating ‘a mysterious sound, emanating from an invisible orchestra...the overriding purpose of the Bayreuth pit was to emphasize the (onstage) drama...the blending of the sound takes place in the pit [and] merges in the form intended by the composer.’\footnote{Leo Beranek, \textit{Concert and Opera Halls—How They Sound}, 1996, p.232.} As the authentic recording space \textit{ne plus ultra}, Bayreuth offered Decca a location that was aligned with their recording philosophy, based on a sympathetic and supportive recording style which captured natural hall ambience rather than processed, aggressive technical interventionism. In fact, Bayreuth had the potential to extend the Decca recording philosophy to a new level: here the control of the recording balance lay in the very architecture of the space, one step further on from the conductor and even further removed from the possibility of introducing artifice through experimentation in engineering for its own sake.

However, from the outset, it appears that Solti had misgivings about releasing a recording made of the complete Ring during the first year of the production in 1983, indicating only ‘that if by some miracle either Rheingold or Walküre might be of a satisfactory standard for issue, it would be very fortunate, and is the only reason for recording at all in the first year.’\footnote{Ray Minshull, letter to Wolfgang Wagner, 2 February 1984. Hall’s autobiography indicates that he (and Solti) disagreed with Wagner’s production schedule and suggested that he stage two operas only in 1983, to which Wagner refused (Hall, p.243).} In the same letter, Minshull reveals that Wagner would only agree to release a commercial recording of all four operas together, a condition that Decca had accepted. Caught between the demands of both Solti and Wagner, Decca were bound to the prospect of recording for more than one year in Bayreuth to satisfy Wagner’s...
insistence on his own programming schedule and to generate material of a quality and quantity sufficient to uphold Solti’s exceptional standards; that that they ‘must live up to the Ghost.’

Despite these portents, a Decca recording team, comprising engineers James Lock, James Brown, Colin Moorfoot, Martin Atkinson and Simon Eadon and led by Christopher Raeburn, decamped to Bayreuth for two long recording periods between June and August in 1983. To prepare for the live recordings, Lock and Brown had made excursions to the Schoeps laboratory in Karlsruhe to discuss the use of microphones ‘discreet enough to satisfy the most discerning TV and film director’ and to ‘capture [Bayreuth’s] unique acoustic.’

Raeburn, too, had prepared by observing the Unitel filming of Lohengrin at Bayreuth in 1982. The Decca team had been advised by Wagner that the control room usually occupied by Unitel was not available for their use during the performances, and that there would be no option but to work from their truck parked outside the theatre. This inadequate arrangement had a critical effect on the ability to monitor the sound. Raeburn entreated Wagner for more suitable listening facilities during the rehearsals so the team had some means by which to establish what Raeburn referred to as ‘basically a decent sound,’ but this was significantly inferior to what they had intended. In Raeburn’s correspondence with Wagner in 1984, he makes mammoth efforts to appease Wagner over what were evidently unacceptable circumstances:

> Your help and enthusiasm was unique in my experience. We have never had such co-operation on any project that I can recall in the last twenty-five years...It has already become legend that in the space of three weeks you simply knocked down and rebuilt rooms in the Festspielhaus to create a marvellous recording room for us. Although you, my colleagues and I met in the most unexpected places such as the roof, far from stopping our experiments you were always ready to help with our problems.

Such obsequiousness belies Raeburn’s feelings: as soon as the performances were over, Raeburn wrote to Solti to express his serious doubts that any of the recordings were of use, even before playbacks were held with Solti in London:

> The experience of recording this year’s Ring has shown us that there are essential technical requirements necessary for the future if we are to...

---

642 The phrase quoted as being Solti’s; the ‘ghost’ being the Solti-Culshaw studio recording. Undated, unattributed typescript, BL/RA.
643 James Lock, letter to Dr Carl Schoeps, 18 April 1983, BL/RA.
644 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Wolfgang Wagner, 9 March 1983, BL/RA. Decca were granted permission to use the control room during rehearsals only.
645 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Wolfgang Wagner, 3 January 1984, BL/RA.
produce a result acceptable for commercial record. Only some stage noises are acceptable. The fog machine and the hydraulic platform are unacceptable. Even if efforts are made to reduce these noises for next year’s *Ring*, it is highly unlikely that these will be completely eliminated.\textsuperscript{646}

Raeburn continues by suggesting that the only method of limiting the intrusive noises is by recording a main rehearsal (*Hauptprobe*) in sections and provide musical overlaps for the scene changes during the following season. Minshull, he writes, indicated that there would be no budget for extra *Ring* sessions in 1984, but as Solti had worked tirelessly to improve the standards of the singers, it was worth persuading Wagner and Hall to adapt their schedule. These were problems that could not be solved through engineering: Decca used audio filters to attenuate noise produced by analogue means to some good effect in other problem locations,\textsuperscript{647} but the noises were too extreme and at the time Decca were still developing capabilities in digital mixing, with which finer manipulation of the sound and the reduction of noise and frequency components of the audio would have been possible.

Coupled with these recording problems were artistic obstacles that compounded the difficulties, and indeed the whole issue of Solti’s participation as conductor: casting artists that both Solti and Decca thought were capable of taking the roles.\textsuperscript{648} By February 1984, Decca—and Solti—delivered the *coup de grâce* to the project and abandoned the notion of returning later in the year. The statement from Minshull to Wagner on the decision to withdraw read:

> The resulting library tapes captured the atmosphere of these performances most faithfully. This faithfulness in the event proved to be the reason why Decca has regretfully decided to abandon the hope of issuing a live recording from the present production of the work, since the mechanical noises which are inevitable in the use of hydraulic stage equipment cannot be smoothed away from the sound recording to an acceptable extent for sound-carrier release...Should Decca consider remaking all of the passages

\textsuperscript{646}Christopher Raeburn, letter to Georg Solti, 20 August 1983, BL/RA. This clearly disagrees with Stephen Fay and Roger Wood, *The Ring*, 1984, p.187, who write that the Decca team ‘came to terms’ with the platform noise after a month of recording.

\textsuperscript{647}An example of this was at Kingsway Hall in London, where Decca engineer Dennis Jacks built a portable low-pass filter to remove the rumble from recordings from the Underground railway running beneath the hall (Peter Van Biene, interview recorded 19 October 2016.) It might also be noted that Decca had been the first company to invest in Ray Dolby’s noise reduction system Dolby A in 1966 to minimise tape hiss (see *Billboard*, 18 November 1972, p. 73).This had been adopted enthusiastically by Decca’s R&D department, but not by producer Ray Minshull, who refused to use it in his recordings (Ray Minshull, personal notes).

\textsuperscript{648}Although little is made in Raeburn’s papers on the issues surrounding the suitability of the cast, both Solti (1997, pp.183–186) and Hall (1993, pp.244–248) both elaborate on this aspect of the production in their biographies.
under studio conditions the whole point of a live recording would be lost, not to mention the fact that the costs would be increasingly prohibitive.\footnote{Ray Minshull, letter to Wolfgang Wagner, 2 February 1984, BL/RA. Decca withdrew at its own cost; a loss of DM 500,000.}

The statement also gave assurances to Wolfgang Wagner that the material would not be used for commercial exploitation, but Wagner gave instructions that their tapes should be erased permanently.\footnote{Minshull replied to Wagner (31 May 1984) that this would be arranged. However, Raeburn conferred with Minshull and Lock as to whether keeping a copy of the multitrack back-up tapes for each opera as a technical reference was advisable (‘for new types of microphone and previously untried pick-up points in the theatre’), and for preserving the material recorded by Hildegard Behrens. See Christopher Raeburn, memo to Ray Minshull and James Lock, 23 May 1984, BL/RA.}

In an analysis of the conditions needed to make possible future recordings in the Festspielhaus, Decca concluded it lay in recording simultaneously with filming for reasons practical, musical and financial.\footnote{Undated, unattributed typescript, BL/RA.} Taking opera recording out of the live domain and recording in parallel with a film crew in an empty theatre would guarantee a silent auditorium and greater control over the stage noises, with effects created under controlled conditions using a wider dispersal of microphones. Decca would have access to similar playback facilities to film and TV companies, which would enable them to monitor the sound in situ and make adjustments as recording progressed. There would be more chances to repeat sections, and possibly produce a higher overall musical standard. Furthermore, there were attractive benefits of possibly sharing the overall costs, and creating more visible publicity. Ultimately, Decca looked for the maximum possibilities to control the conditions, and felt their high expectations in the standard of audio recording could lead a collaborative venture. The television sound on the Boulez-Chéreau \textit{Ring} had, in their opinion, been ‘hopeless, and there is certainly a need for a decent soundtrack with a filmed Ring as well as a good new recording.’\footnote{Ibid.} Indeed, Raeburn’s correspondence with Wolfgang Wagner, which lasted for two more years after the abandoned recording in an attempt to leave the door to Bayreuth open to Decca, indicates his insistence that there was common aesthetic ground between Decca in the 1980s and Wagner:

\begin{quote}
    My colleagues and I still hope that we may sometime have the opportunity of recording in Bayreuth again, not to create a new sound, but faithfully to re-produce the Bayreuth sound. I know that you find this difficult to believe, but one day I should welcome discussing the whole concept with you, because I think that we both believe in the same thing. As you may
\end{quote}
remember, my colleagues used the natural hall ambience and tended not to place their microphones too close. I feel that the use of artificial echo onto close-miked information used by other record and film companies will never re-create the Bayreuth sound. The matter is of course very subjective, but I hope that 1983 will not be the last time that Decca visit. 653

Raeburn’s reconciliatory tone is in marked contrast to both Solti’s and Hall’s descriptions of the production process. In their respective autobiographies, Solti and Hall both describe a situation of simmering antagonism with Wolfgang Wagner throughout the 1983 festival. For Solti it ‘caused [him] endless suffering’ 654 and for Hall it was ‘a fairly hideous experience.’ 655 Raeburn’s attempts to convey respect and understanding for Bayreuth’s traditions with the aim of creating a sonically Urtext Ring, were probably motivated from a personal point of view as much as representing Decca’s aims, as Raeburn continued to work independently for Unitel in Bayreuth after the abandonment of the recording in 1983. 656 Decca, however, made no return to the Festspielhaus.

By accepting the invitation to record at Bayreuth, Decca had hoped to make a worthy successor to complement the Solti-Culshaw Ring. But this first recording had established Decca’s prestige as a company focused on quality, innovation and creativity: a formidable reputation built on five decades of artistic and technical endeavour. As conditions were not sufficiently adaptable in Bayreuth for Decca to exercise the level of control needed to guarantee the gold standard, Decca would rather shoulder a heavy financial loss than proceed with an artistically and technically substandard product.

Wagner: the Film—the soundtrack to a dramatic feature, 1982

Just as Wolfgang Wagner had amassed the media in Bayreuth for the centennial Ring, a Wagner project of an entirely different hue was taking shape in Vienna; as wholly removed from Wagner’s concept of a death-centenary homage as could be imagined. At the beginning of 1982, the engineer Gordon Parry, who had resigned from Decca in 1975, wrote to Christopher Raeburn with a proposition for a project on which he had been working as an historical and musical adviser. This was ‘Wagner: the Film,’ a dramatic feature currently

653 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Wolfgang Wagner, 3 January 1985, BL/RA.
654 Georg Solti, Solti on Solti, 1997, p.183
656 Raeburn was granted leave by Decca to work as music supervisor for Unitel’s film of Tristan in 1983.
in production by Vienna-based Wagner Film GmbH with finance from London and Budapest, directed by Tony Palmer and featuring Richard Burton as Wagner. Parry, a committed Wagner enthusiast, wrote:

The Wagner film is naturally a very exciting project for me, the culmination of nearly five years of interrupted work and I think a human story, in spite of its excesses, worth telling to the main public at large. Tony’s approach is, in the main, historically truthful, it will not be what Ken Russell might have done with the subject…I append a brief synopsis which, if a trifle exaggerated, it was written primarily for the ‘Rosengartens’ of the Film World to provide the money—may help to clarify things a little about the importance of the music. 657

The film company had hoped to enlist Unitel as a co-producer, and through their exclusive video contract with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, engage the services of the orchestra to record a soundtrack. Unitel had turned the project down as dramatic features fell outside their sphere of interests, but Parry and Palmer were keen to secure the Vienna Philharmonic’s services, along with Georg Solti, and to contract Decca to produce the soundtrack. It had also been mooted from the outset that Decca might be interested in producing a soundtrack album to coincide with the release of the film. Parry had hoped that Raeburn would be a positive catalyst in bringing about Decca’s involvement with the project. 658

The director, Tony Palmer, was also eager to work with Solti, having directed him previously in his film The Art of Conducting in 1966 and acknowledged Solti as ‘one of the greatest conductors of Wagner of all time.’ 659 Palmer himself has been described as making films ‘that are a genre of their own...they don’t merely tell a linear story through various talking heads. They are partly stylised, relying for the force above all on the director’s own passion for music and his deep understanding of it.’ 660 His concept of the film centred on


658 Ibid.

659 ‘Tony Palmer présente ‘Wagner’, Cinémathèque Suisse, 2013, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kVdYK5I6i6E> [accessed 1 February 2017]. Palmer says that having assumed Solti’s fees would exceed the film’s budget, Solti agreed to waive his fees if a small part was found for his daughter.

diegetic use of music: music depicted as part of the onscreen scene,661 choosing a large number of repertoire extracts himself in what he describes as ‘lots of music and a whole week of sessions.’662

If a live recording in tandem with video and broadcast companies in Bayreuth with Boulez as conductor had failed to inspire Decca, then a studio-based soundtrack with Solti and the Vienna Philharmonic was an altogether different prospect, as Raeburn said that ‘I feel that any work with the Vienna Philharmonic in the right repertoire is worth doing.’663 Reinhard Klaassen (Decca’s President) and Minshull had agreed to the production of the feature film soundtrack, but Decca’s recording musical content for feature films was an uncommon venture. In Raeburn’s words, ‘Decca [were] not doing film tracks every day and the requirements are different from our normal recordings’664 and negotiations were complex from the outset, focusing around the commercial, contractual, technical and musical requirements of the film company. Firstly, Wagner Film had preferred that the London Philharmonic Orchestra record the soundtrack under Solti’s direction, but Decca refused to promise any financial contribution to the cost of the recording if Solti were to conduct the orchestra and Solti would not be released from his exclusive contract on any other terms. According to Parry, the London Philharmonic was Solti’s third place choice of orchestra for the project.665 Secondly, from a musical perspective, the project was riddled with myriad licencing and distribution agreements for all possible forms of media distribution. It had been suggested that Decca might look at its existing catalogue of recordings made with the VPO that might match the requirements of the film, an idea that was withdrawn. This was due largely to technical impossibilities that lay in Decca’s in-house recording system of using two tracks with a four-track back-up: the selected repertoire from the catalogue contained voice that could not be removed or re-balanced, and the film required only orchestral excerpts of Wagner’s music. Raeburn advised that by using existing recordings by the VPO on the soundtrack, there would be an incompatible reverberant acoustic, making for an unconvincing match to the new multitrack material.

661 See Michel Chion, *Film, a Sound Art*, p.474, for a description of diegetic sound in filmmaking.
663 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Gordon Parry, 2 February 1982, BL/RA.
664 Christopher Raeburn, memo to Decca senior management, 7 May 1982, BL/RA.
665 Gordon Parry, letter to Christopher Raeburn, 22 January 1982, BL/RA. Parry writes that the Chicago Symphony Orchestra has been discounted as ‘they do not play the Wagner repertoire’ and he thinks that the LPO should be eliminated from the choice on artistic grounds as ‘I find them presently on poor form and again they do not play the repertoire.’
Indeed, there were many technical problems involved in Decca working collaboratively with a film company in 1982. By mid-1981 all new Decca recordings were made digitally, and there was considerable pressure for the research and development department to build more digital recorders, for which Decca’s new parent company, PolyGram, had made significant financial investments.\textsuperscript{666} The department were averaging a recorder build rate of five per year until 1986, but in 1982 there was no possibility of recording digitally in 16-track as specified by the film company, without hiring outboard equipment.\textsuperscript{667} At the time, there were not the appropriate in-house facilities for the film company’s needs: although Decca’s classical recording division inherited a single 16-track analogue machine from the pop division, this was insufficient for making master and back-up soundtrack recordings.\textsuperscript{668} Decca also had no means of editing a 16-track recording, so the decision was to hand over the raw materials to the film company where any resulting work would be their responsibility.

Tony Palmer’s concept of the Wagner film centred on extended sections that were built around the music, which he describes as ‘audio-visual montages comparable with those in Kubrick’s 2001 or Spielberg’s Close Encounters.’\textsuperscript{669} To this end, he had specified the music excerpts he required for the soundtrack down to the precise beat of the bar, some to start mid-way through a musical episode. These twenty-two segments of orchestral music and concert realisations of opera extracts lasting seventy-eight minutes were presented to Minshull and Raeburn as a \textit{fait accompli}, with no consultation. It had been assumed by Tony Palmer that the separate soundtrack album to accompany the film would be derived directly from the multitrack analogue material, and that Decca would choose the excerpts in ‘whatever mixture sells the most copies.’\textsuperscript{670} But, as Raeburn advised in correspondence with Minshull, Klaassen and Rickerby,\textsuperscript{671} Decca’s complementary recording would have to be digital to satisfy its own audio standards and would require a second crew and microphone placement. It was also unlikely that there would be sufficient time at Walthamstow to set the balances for both analogue multitrack and stereo digital recordings. Raeburn had determined that only three of Palmer’s musical selections were

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{666} See Anthony Griffiths, British Library Oral History interview, 1986. \textsuperscript{667} In his letter to Christopher Raeburn, (22 January 1982, BL/RA), Gordon Parry assumes that Decca will consider hiring a 3M digital recorder for the project. \textsuperscript{668} Memo, unattributed (possibly Andrew Cornall), 11 May 1982, BL/RA. \textsuperscript{669} Typescript synopsis of the Wagner film concept, BL/RA. \textsuperscript{670} Tony Palmer, letter to Charles Kaye (Georg Solti’s secretariat), undated, BL/RA. \textsuperscript{671} Christopher Raeburn, memo, 7 May 1982, BL/RA.
\end{flushright}
suitable for their needs, as these were the only fully complete episodes, and Decca would have to find supplementary musical items to fill their soundtrack album.

Although the London Philharmonic Orchestra made the soundtrack recording with Solti at Walthamstow Town Hall in six sessions during June 1982, Decca’s senior management had taken the advice of Raeburn and allowed a completely separate recording, a single LP, to take place with the Vienna Philharmonic in the Sofiensaal in conjunction with the film. While producer Andrew Cornall supervised the final mixing of the soundtrack with the overdubs of extra instruments, Raeburn produced the digital stereo recording in Vienna with James Lock, in familiar conditions that would not compromise Decca’s production values. Ultimately, there was a divergence of interests in terms of the musical content and concept, and the technical means by which both Decca and the film company could realise their aims. Drawn by the possibilities of exposure to a wider public, Decca had agreed to participate in the project before analysing the compatibility between their methods of recording and those required for a film soundtrack.

**Conclusion**

Although these two collaborative projects presented Decca with different issues of production and management—one a live performance with broadcast media, one an integrated film soundtrack supplemented by a standalone recording—they were negotiating with similar dominant creative forces: in Wolfgang Wagner an impresario working with an eponymous musical tradition and in Tony Palmer an auteur. In both cases, Raeburn’s role as recording producer was somewhat sidelined, or certainly re-defined. Although as Decca’s head of opera production and ‘effectively number two to Ray [Minshull],’ Raeburn had no input with business affairs, but neither did he have free rein to manage a production in the same manner of a standard studio recording. However, it underlines Raeburn’s reputation that Decca’s senior management paid heed to his analyses and advice and acted upon them. Indeed, the adventitious circumstances of many collaborative projects required decisions to be made quickly, and as a result we see more documentary evidence of senior management’s involvement in the practicalities and resources of making a recording.

---

672 Decca’s parent company, PolyGram, also required that sales forecasts were made before a recording could begin. David Rickerby obtained sales predictions of 5,000 LPs and 1,000 music cassettes within three years, and gauged the interest of Decca’s European licencees in a recording of Wagner excerpts. See telexes from Richard Rollefson and L. Worms to Rickerby, 30 June 1982, BL/RA.

673 Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.
The principal concerns for Decca, and Raeburn, were maintaining control and reputation. Decca’s inability to exert complete artistic and technical control over a project, particularly with regard to musical content, choice of musicians, use of location resources and technical execution, meant that sustaining extra recording costs or financial loss was tolerated rather than release substandard product or deal with an unacceptable level of unpredictability. New opportunities, locations and modes of recording were undeniably attractive to Decca in promotional tools in a competitive marketplace. But for a company with such a strong culture, compromising artistic and audio standards was too high a price to pay for exploring novel avenues to showcase its products.

Decca’s parent company, PolyGram, appears to have allowed these projects to evolve without applying stringent corporate accounting policy, and at the same time, continued to finance Decca’s R&D digital developments for its own recordings. According to Griffiths, Decca’s research remained biased towards digital stereo, but as has been shown, working collaboratively in new ways with external companies exposed some inflexibility in Decca’s systems and equipment, particularly for multitrack.674 The Stuart-Decca discography (2014) shows that there was a decline in the number of co-operative ventures from the early 1980s onwards, particularly with regard to Unitel’s audio-visual projects. It is possible that this might have been influenced by a PolyGram-Philips decision to develop its own compact disc video (CDV) technology and video products following the launch of the CD in 1983.675 In a speech to a PolyGram international conference in 1987, which was attended by Decca’s senior producers, Minshull said that audio and video should be treated as separate entities and had no confidence in simultaneous CD/CDV projects, particularly for opera, because he believed that ‘this led to a compromise situation where elements of quality would be sacrificed.’676 Indeed, it was Minshull’s opinion that a separate video organisation should be established within Decca to counter a lack of expertise in the area and give the company time to adjust to the expeditious rise of CD video technology. Decca’s priorities remained very much with audio, which it was felt must never be sacrificed at the expense of video, and in the words of Andrew Cornall, ‘spoil [their] operatic reputation.’677

---

674 Anthony Griffiths, British Library Oral History interview, 1986. According to Griffiths, each of the three PolyGram companies (Decca, Deutsche Grammophon and Philips) were ‘entrenched in their own ways of working.’ He indicates that Deutsche Grammophon made much more use of multitrack recording, and Philips, like Decca, were biased towards two-track.


676 Decca International conference (Chilston Park) report, 1987, BL/RA.

677 Ibid.
The point of amalgamating high-quality audio with film and video had not yet been achieved.

These two case studies suggest a certain sclerotic entrenchment in Decca’s method of production: Decca’s bias towards a two-track method meant that negotiating with other companies could prove incompatible. Michael Haas says of Raeburn, ‘like many people of his generation, he was never quite sure what [multitrack’s] implications were or how to use it to best effects.’ Raeburn viewed multitrack recording as an insurance policy against complete recording failure, rather than a legitimate means of production in itself. Live performances were also regarded as unsatisfactory, and increasingly so as quality improved with the advent of digital recording. Indeed, Raeburn was concerned that his job would become tantamount to nothing other than a ‘glorified radio station producer.’ As much as co-operation was courted, Decca were wedded to their own ways that developed at the pace set by their R&D laboratory—a difficult position to take in the early 1980s with the advent of a seismic shift in the direction and quality of audio and video.

678 Michael Haas, interview 10 May 2016.
679 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Sheldon Gold (ICM Artists), 29 January 1983, BL/RA. Raeburn voiced general insecurities after the PolyGram acquisition of Decca, and wondered whether he would ‘still have an opportunity of producing worthwhile stuff for years to come or whether Decca would be swallowed into a faceless conglomerate which will just turn out what amounts to live performances.’

6.1 Introduction

The best thing a young record producer could do was to make one recording that he, the producer, thought was perfect. ‘That should be our calling card,’ he would say.680

As the first opera Raeburn had supervised in Vienna without the support of more experienced colleagues, Strauss’s Der Rosenkavalier (hereafter Rosenkavalier), recorded with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra (VPO) and Georg Solti between 1968 and 1969, marked a turning point in his career at Decca. Raeburn had been a producer for ten years, and the VPO had maintained an exclusive, yet flexible, recording contract with Decca since 1948, which had benefited both organisations. The architect of the contract, Maurice Rosengarten, had offered the orchestra sustained recording work and a regular income in the aftermath of World War II, together with generous allowances for recording with HMV/EMI and American Columbia.681 Reciprocally, the VPO and its associated chamber groups gave Decca historical validity and connected the company with a continental tradition of music-making.682 To support the energetic recording programme in Vienna, Decca had established a permanent studio at the Sofiensäle,683 which was considered by staff to be a locus of experimentation and innovation and far removed, both operationally and psychologically, from the rest of the company. Although Raeburn had spent a significant proportion of his ten years as a Decca producer in Vienna and was devoted to Viennese culture and the Wiener klangstil,684 he had supervised mostly lower-profile recordings during this time—chamber music, recitals and excerpted repertoire—or had

---

681 The first ‘exclusive’ contract between Decca and the VPO was agreed in June 1948 and took effect in April 1949. Through negotiations by Maurice Rosengarten, Decca first contracted the Vienna Octet (a constituent ensemble), and then the VPO itself, which had previously been under exclusive contract to EMI. The number of sessions contracted gave provision for other record companies to take a proportion of the annual quota, and since 1958, a quota had been offered to EMI. Between 1964 and 1970, the annual recording session allowance of Decca and EMI was 55/20, allowing EMI to make 4 recordings per annum. (VPO schedule of contracts, Ray Minshull papers.)
682 Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016 and Pope, C., interview recorded 27 July 2016. Fritz Trümpi, in his study of the Vienna and Berlin Philharmonic Orchestras (The Political Orchestra, 2016, p.158), quotes Wilhelm Furtwängler’s description of the VPO as rooted in an homogenous people—a ‘people’s orchestra...representative of an entire German landscape.’
683 Sofiensäle refers to the complex of halls and rooms in the Landstrasse district of Vienna, which served as the location for most of Decca’s recordings in the city until 1986.
684 As has been discussed in Chapter 2.
assisted John Culshaw in large-scale operas, such as *Salome* (1961), *Götterdämmerung* (1964) and *Elektra* (1966–1967). While Culshaw’s complex and high-profile opera productions had dominated the recording headlines, it was Erik Smith who had taken supervisory responsibility for nearly two-thirds of the total recorded output from Vienna during the 1960s—supervising more than Culshaw or Raeburn. On Culshaw’s resignation from Decca in 1967 to join the BBC, followed by Smith’s move to Philips in 1968, the recording landscape in Vienna changed significantly for Decca, and particularly, for Raeburn. Supported by material from the archive of the VPO, this documentary study of the recording of *Rosenkavalier* examines how Raeburn emerged from Culshaw’s shadow to take control of a major operatic project in Vienna. Through an analysis of the recording from genesis to reception, it considers how the production values of the past were maintained at the end of a decade that had defined new standards in operatic recording. *Rosenkavalier* also provides context for a discussion of Decca’s evolving relationship with the VPO and the challenges of maintaining exclusivity while accommodating their growing desire for artistic and economic opportunity.

### 6.2 *Rosenkavalier* excerpts, 1964

The possibility of recording *Rosenkavalier* had first been mooted by Culshaw in 1963, shortly after Raeburn had resumed work after a six-month literary sabbatical. Raeburn was a natural choice as producer, having encountered the opera at strategic points of his life: as his first experience of live opera at Sadler’s Wells in 1938; programmed at the Salzburg Festival during his first visit in 1949; as the subject of his first visit to a Decca recording session as a research student in 1954 (under Erich Kleiber: the first complete recording of the opera); and as a commission for a short research project undertaken for the Glyndebourne Festival programme of 1959. In an initial step, Culshaw asked Raeburn to select repertoire for an LP of excerpts from *Rosenkavalier* to be recorded with Régine Crespin and conducted by Silvio Varviso in 1964, subject to Crespin signing a new contract with Decca. ‘Excerpting’ operas for release as single LPs was a commonplace practice in the

---


686 Raeburn had approached writing the article for Glyndebourne, ‘The Creation of *Rosenkavalier*’, in a similar way to his Mozart research. Here, he emphasised the opera’s performance history and textual colloquialisms in favour of analysing aspects of the musical composition. See published copies and drafts, BL/RA. See also Appendix 4, which lists Raeburn’s published articles.
industry at the time, but considered by the music press to be of low artistic and technical merit: ‘perpetuating the least admirable aspects of a performance.’ Raeburn, in contrast, applied himself to the task in earnest to raise artistic expectations and selected the passages with care to emphasise the character of the Marschallin as a vehicle for Crespin, and the relationship between the three main characters.

Setting up a recording with the VPO was a complex, three-way operation between London, Zurich and Vienna. Decca in London negotiated with Leon Felder, the finance director of Maurice Rosengarten’s operating company in Zurich—Musikvertrieb—and arrangements needing financial and contractual approval, including casting details, repertoire and session plans, were directed to Felder. Additionally, Felder, and occasionally Rosengarten, also corresponded with the management of the VPO too, leading to administrative misunderstandings between the three sites. Helmut Wobisch, the VPO’s chairman and managing director, conducted a great deal of the orchestra’s business by telephone, necessitating written responses as insurance from Culshaw, confirming their verbal decisions. For the recording of Rosenkavalier excerpts, it was Culshaw, and not Raeburn, who made the initial arrangements: engaging Silvio Varviso as conductor and casting Hilde Gueden and Elisabeth Söderström alongside Crespin. Culshaw also confirmed the number of sessions required to cover the repertoire with Wobisch, while Raeburn, feeling these had been underestimated, wrote to Felder to ask for more recording time.

The recording of the Rosenkavalier excerpts was scheduled at a hiatus in the musical life of Vienna with the resignation of Herbert von Karajan as artistic director of the State Opera in 1964. Karajan’s departure appears to have stimulated the VPO to re-evaluate their relationship with Decca and the effectiveness of its publicity on an international scale, despite the huge critical success of its opera recordings produced by Culshaw. Correspondence from Wobisch to Culshaw laments the ‘depressing passivity’ of Decca’s approach to their publicity in America, which was contrasted with the ‘energy and generosity’ of Deutsche Grammophon’s presentation in the USA of the Berlin Philharmonic

688 Raeburn’s choices were the Introduction and opening scene of Act I (‘Wie du warst!’); the Marschallin’s Monologue, Duet and closing scene from Act I (‘Da geht er hin’); the Presentation of the silver rose and Duet from Act II (‘Mir ist die Ehre widerfahren’); and from Act III the Marschallin’s Meeting With Sophie, Trio And Final Duet (‘Mein Gott, es war nicht mehr als eine Farce’).
690 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Leon Felder, 8 June 1964, BL/RA.
691 Members of the VPO are drawn from the orchestra of the Vienna State Opera, which is state-funded.
Orchestra, the orchestra for which Karajan served as artistic director and principal conductor. Without a permanent music director, the VPO looked to consolidate its reputation and broaden its repertoire by expanding the range of conductors with whom it worked. The orchestra questioned the flexibility of its exclusive contract with Decca and the choice of high-profile artistic collaborators it offered, suggesting music directors who conflicted with Decca’s artistic strategy. As Ray Minshull notes, there was resistance from the orchestra towards many conductors selected by Decca for their recordings, including Claudio Abbado, István Kertész, Karl Münchinger and particularly Georg Solti, preferring Karajan and Karl Böhm. Although the Rosenkavalier excerpts recording was a low-profile project for the VPO, Wobisch wished to replace Varviso and the soloists at less than three months’ notice, but Culshaw insisted that the contracts had been confirmed and could not be changed. Having been scheduled for the minimum amount of time within a month-long Tchaikovsky symphonies project with Lorin Maazel, Raeburn had been allowed only four sessions, so arranged a day of piano rehearsals beforehand with Varviso and the soloists to maximise the effectiveness of the studio time.

These were difficult recording sessions for Raeburn. On the first day, Wobisch overturned the detailed session plans, and without clear explanation told Raeburn the orchestra could not record for the standard three hour duration. In the ‘very severe’ discussion that followed, Raeburn eventually yielded to an arrangement whereby he would release the players early on the first day in return for the equivalent time being added to the end of the final session. The undoing of this ‘flexi-time’ scheme lay in Wobisch’s ineffective communication of the revised plan to the orchestra, which was further compounded by the late arrival of a number of players for the final recording.

Helmut Wobisch, letter to John Culshaw, 10 March 1964, VPO Archive. Terry McEwen, manager of Decca/London in New York, refuted such suggestions, citing the Berlin Philharmonic’s publicity has having negligible impact in the USA, and claiming this was calculated provocation by the VPO (Terry McEwen, letter to John Culshaw, 13 April 1964, VPO Archive).

Correspondence between Helmut Wobisch, Musikvertrieb and John Culshaw between March and July 1964, VPO Archive, illustrates their conflicting attitudes towards artistic strategy with the VPO. For example, Wobisch expressed a strong desire to record with Eugene Ormandy, a Columbia artist under exclusive contract to the Philadelphia Orchestra in the USA, for which Maurice Rosengarten agreed to release the VPO. Culshaw, in contrast, thought negotiating with Columbia for Ormandy (‘a less important artist’) would jeopardise his own attempts to secure a recording arrangement with Leonard Bernstein, also a Columbia artist. Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1995. He adds that ‘the VPO wanted Karajan desperately, and had not yet decided to like Solti, who was clearly Decca’s main conductor.’

John Culshaw, telegram to Helmut Wobisch, 30 June, 1964, VPO Archive. Wobisch’s tendency to fix recording dates at short notice also compromised Decca’s ability to engage conductors from the VPO’s preferred list of high-profile names, who were booked years in advance. (See John Culshaw, letter to Helmut Wobisch, 17 January 1967, VPO Archive.)

Christopher Raeburn, undated notes, ‘Strauss’, BL/RA.
session and led to the orchestra walking out en masse. Raeburn was compelled to write a detailed account of the difficulties to Decca’s management, which aimed to exonerate ‘Decca’—Raeburn—from any wrongdoing:

Ever since the record of Rosenkavalier Highlights was proposed, and since its subsequent numerous changes of schedule, Decca has always put itself out for the convenience of the Vienna Philharmonic. As a result, the sessions were compressed into three days, which made it very difficult both for the technicians and the singers...Since Prof. Wobisch had promised me to make up the ten minutes from the first session, this disgraceful incident constitutes a breach of contract...In view of the circumstances it cannot obviously be claimed, as Professor Strasser has tried to do, that we went into overtime...I must stress that if time changes are made at the request of the Vienna Philharmonic, it is not the responsibility of Decca to inform the orchestra...It is, I think, absolutely clear that Decca is in no way to blame, and that the responsibility lies entirely with the orchestra.”

However divisive this incident seemed at the time, it was perhaps Raeburn’s pragmatism in upholding a compromise with the VPO for the sake of a satisfactory artistic outcome without showing deference that brought to bear a lasting resolution for his future working arrangements in Vienna.

An informal agreement was made which was passed on to the orchestra, that if we were in the middle of a take and went into overtime, in my sessions I would always make up the time by shortening a future session. In the following 30 years, the orchestra stuck to this understanding, and during the rest of our working relationship they never let me down on this issue, which was totally contrary to their union agreement. This was a singularly Viennese compromise but typical of the orchestra who had a certain sympathy over artistic considerations.

As Culshaw had expressed, the personal quality needed to work effectively in Vienna ‘apart from musicianship, is the ability to lead and take decisions...There’s only one way to work in Vienna—you have to organize the Viennese.’

There were points of consolation for the embattled Raeburn. The recording was critically well-received, garnering praise for the beauty of the VPO’s playing under
Raeburn’s choice of long excerpts was commended for preserving a sense of dramatic continuity, while Crespin’s interpretation and sustained sotto voce was acclaimed for its sense of melancholic, sympathetic insight.

*Rosenkavalier* complete, 1968–1969

6.3 Preparation

Decca’s recording of the complete *Rosenkavalier* with the VPO had been postponed until late 1968 for several reasons. Leonard Bernstein had been engaged by the orchestra in 1966, due in no small part to John Culshaw’s negotiations to make recordings of the conductor’s debut in Vienna. Indeed, Bernstein’s dynamic reputation flattered and appealed to the VPO’s desire to perform ‘with the most important conductors of the world.’ Culshaw had arranged terms of reciprocity with John McClure of Columbia, whereby Bernstein recorded Verdi’s *Falstaff* (which was programmed at the Vienna State Opera) for Columbia with a Decca crew in exchange for a recording of Mahler’s *Das Lied von der Erde* and Mozart repertoire for Decca. It is clear from Bernstein’s letters that the VPO were enthusiastically compliant under his direction, unlike Raeburn’s recent experience with the *Rosenkavalier* excerpts, going ‘into overtime without a word of protest (never before, since Strauss himself, [said] Dr Hilbert).’ The success had inspired an invitation for Bernstein conduct *Rosenkavalier* at the State Opera in April 1968, which the VPO’s management were also keen to record. This, however, came at the juncture of John Culshaw’s resignation from Decca in 1967, which Ray Minshull, as his nominated successor, was left to steer. Given Decca’s plans to record the work imminently with Solti for their own catalogue, who had conducted a revival production at the Royal Opera House, Covent Garden (ROH) in March 1968, there was little real possibility of capitulating to the wishes of

---


701 Correspondence dated July 1964 to February 1967 between John Culshaw, Egon Hilbert (Vienna State Opera) Robert Lantz (Bernstein’s lawyer), John McClure, Maurice Rosengarten and Helmut Wobisch, VPO Archive.


703 Leonard Bernstein, letter to Felicia Bernstein, 2 March, 1966, in Nigel Simeone (ed.), *The Leonard Bernstein Letters*, 2013, pp.477–478. Here, Bernstein describes the attitude as a frenzy of obsequiousness: ‘the orchestra is cheering, the directors are fawning, the press is voluminous and astonishingly sympathetic,’ and that the VPO saw him (Bernstein) as a ‘sort of Jewish hero who has replaced Karajan.’
the VPO. This was a source of great resentment for the VPO’s management, and described by Solti to Bernstein:

> I even heard from Mr Rosengarten at Decca that Wobisch went as far as threatening to change the orchestra’s contract from Decca to Deutsche Grammophon unless they were released to make Rosenkavalier with you. As you will know by now, this involved the postponement of my own recording of the opera with the orchestra... 704

It is likely that Decca’s management reconsidered their decision for the sake of maintaining good relations with the VPO, and an offer was made, with the approval of Bernstein, to record *Rosenkavalier* for Columbia in 1969 without any collateral agreement. 705 But Columbia had decided that the opera was not a sufficiently commercial proposition at the time, and despite Minshull’s earnest solicitation, further discussions on a Bernstein *Rosenkavalier* ceased.

Minshull, as the new head of Decca’s A&R, did not declare the same interest and sympathy with the VPO and its work, or for Vienna’s ‘disposition to musicality,’ 706 as did Culshaw and Raeburn. While establishing himself in his new role, Minshull gave the planning and execution of the Solti *Rosenkavalier* recording to Raeburn, whose note of thanks for Minshull’s confidence suggests his having been conditioned to expect a high degree of management control in Viennese affairs under Culshaw’s leadership, remarking that ‘I am personally very grateful to Ray Minshull...for entrusting me with the supervision of this recording. It was a most generous gesture, since as things usually go, a project of this sort would automatically be supervised by the Head of the Department.’ 707 Raeburn was aware of the responsibility for maintaining Decca’s operatic reputation in Vienna that had been established by Culshaw, and that the production and technical standards of this recording should live up to these expectations. Indeed, Raeburn writes that ‘as a recording it will be every bit as ambitious as Götterdämmerung and (dare I say it) more enjoyable’ 708 and should be regarded as ‘an end in itself and not a mere aural reproduction of a good

706 Aurel Wolfram, as quoted by Fritz Trümpi in *The Political Orchestra*, 2016, p.158, to describe Vienna’s productive, many-faceted musical life.
707 Christopher Raeburn, draft notes for *Rosenkavalier* recording booklet, BL/RA.
708 Christopher Raeburn, letter to Nevill Coghill, 20 October 1968, BL/RA. Coghill, a noted professor of English and scholar of Chaucer, was a contact of Raeburn’s from the Oxford University ETC.
performance in the theatre, but at the same time to maintain the sense of drama and even 
enhance it [sic].\textsuperscript{709}

Raeburn and the project’s recording engineers, James Lock and Gordon Parry, held 
pre-production discussions at Solti’s London home in March 1968 during which the most 
difficult areas in the score for balancing the sound were discussed and casting was 
considered.\textsuperscript{710} Despite the informal atmosphere of the discussions, there was little 
consensus between Raeburn and Solti in casting the main characters at this stage, in which 
Raeburn acquiesced to Solti:

\begin{quote}
[Solti] wanted Yvonne Minton and HD [Helen Donath] as Octavian and 
Sophie. I wanted L[ucia] Popp and BF [Brigitte Fassbaender]. Although LP 
[Lucia Popp] was contracted to CBS for their almost concurrent 
recording, this could have been arranged. However, S[olti] was 
adamant...I was disappointed, but did not allow it to affect our working 
relationship and friendship.\textsuperscript{711}
\end{quote}

As Music Director of the ROH, Solti had mentored Yvonne Minton since she joined the 
company on a junior contract, casting her as Annina in the new ROH 1966 production of 
\textit{Rosenkavalier}.\textsuperscript{712} He re-cast her as Octavian for his revival production in March 1968, which 
was attended by Raeburn, Parry and Lock on several of the evening performances at the 
ROH to give them a clear aural and visual understanding of Solti’s interpretation of the 
work prior to the Decca recording. Minton’s deep knowledge of the opera made her an 
unassailable choice, and Raeburn took the diplomatic course in supporting Solti’s 
preference.

As Régine Crespin’s contract with Decca had been signed prior to the \textit{Rosenkavalier} 
excerpts recording in 1964, her casting was fixed, with neither Raeburn nor Solti disputing 
her position. Indeed, Crespin’s Marschallin was already acclaimed, with Raeburn describing 
her as possessing ‘the essential combination of dignity, mature reflection and coquetry’ to 
convey the etiquette and language of the Austrian court.\textsuperscript{713} Since her performance at 
Glyndebourne in 1959, Crespin had been further tutored in the ‘Viennese style’ by the

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{709} Christopher Raeburn, draft notes for \textit{Rosenkavalier} recording booklet, BL/RA.
\bibitem{710} Gordon Parry and James Lock, J., ‘The Quest for Unification’, draft recording booklet notes, p.3, 
BL/RA.
\bibitem{711} Christopher Raeburn, undated notes, ‘Strauss’, BL/RA.
\bibitem{712} Harold Rosenthal, writing in \textit{Opera} magazine Vol. 28 No. 9 (September 1977), pp.834–841, 
‘People 113–Yvonne Minton’, Raeburn first heard Minton on the BBC Home Service in 1964 (in 
\textit{Variety Playhouse} introduced by Vic Oliver) and suggested she audition for Decca, which in turn led 
to her Covent Garden audition with Solti.
\bibitem{713} Christopher Raeburn, draft notes recording booklet, BL/RA.
\end{thebibliography}
definitive Marschallin of an earlier time, Lotte Lehmann. In his review of the Decca excerpts recording in *The Gramophone*, Alec Robertson quotes Lehmann in that she had initially found Crespin ‘rather French’ as opposed to ‘Viennese,’ but was ultimately completely convinced by Crespin—“by the time of the premiere it was a Viennese woman who was singing.” Indeed, the pedagogic lineage of a singer was of great significance to Raeburn as it could provide an acceptable alternative to his recording philosophy of preferring artists who could convey the dramatic turns of the plot through an idiomatic comprehension of the language. Raeburn considered this particularly valuable for *Rosenkavalier*, an opera rich in idiosyncratic dialect and mannerisms of eighteenth-century Vienna. Crespin’s link with Lehmann, an artist favoured by both Strauss and Hofmannsthal, placed this recording of *Rosenkavalier* in the continuum of the work’s performance history. Like Crespin, Minton had received coaching from an artist personally acquainted with Strauss and Hofmannsthal. Prior to the recording sessions, Minton worked on developing the role with Alfred Jerger, *Kammersänger* of the Vienna State Opera. Jerger, along with members of the VPO who had played in the premiere of the opera in 1911 and later under Strauss himself, established a credible historical perspective. Raeburn saw this as fundamental in making ‘what one hoped to be an historic recording,’ and was keen to make the most of these connections:

Far from wanting to be different (for its own sake) we wanted to take the fullest advantage of the people and circumstances which represented a link with Strauss…this may sound vicarious…but there is a valid point of a tradition handed down. This in no sense implies that Georg Solti did not have a profound influence on the orchestra, on the contrary much needed.

Raeburn explained to Decca’s sleeve department the subtle difference that Crespin did not study the role of the Marschallin *directly* with Lehmann, and that ‘no mention of Lehmann should be included with any Rosenkavalier publicity for Crespin. The Lehmann business is a myth...’ (Christopher Raeburn, 1 November 1964, BL/RA.) However, Alec Robertson’s review of the 1964 excerpts recording (*The Gramophone* Vol. 42 No. 502, March 1965, pp.441–442) notes that Crespin studied the role with Lehmann at the Metropolitan Opera, New York, in 1962.


Hofmannsthal and Strauss discuss the merits of Lehmann’s voice in their correspondence several times: ‘perhaps the most beautiful and least strained in Europe,’ (28 November, 1928). See *The Correspondence between Richard Strauss and Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, 1961.

Raeburn was familiar with the abridged recording of *Rosenkavalier* made in 1933 for HMV with the Lehmann, Schumann and Mayr, together with the VPO conducted by Robert Heger, and kept the recording reference details in his paperwork. He also used the 1954 Decca complete recording of Kleiber’s *Rosenkavalier* (at which he had been present) with Reining, Weber, Jurinac and Gueden, as reference material. See also Chapter 2, which discusses Raeburn’s ‘awareness of the remoter past’ of opera performance history and tradition.

Christopher Raeburn, draft notes for recording booklet, BL/RA.
tightening up and even wrong notes which had been perpetuated for over half a century were corrected, but the basic unique material was there.  

Casting Manfred Jungwirth as Baron Ochs and Otto Wiener as Faninal, both native Viennese, Raeburn felt would give the recording a savour of authenticity and a guarantee of narrative detail. Jungwirth was skilled in the Austrian dialect, had sung the part ‘over a hundred times’ and had learned the complex, rapid dialogue accurately. Fortified with his detailed study of the libretto, familiarity with Strauss and Hofmannsthal’s correspondence and with Jungwirth’s experience in performance, Raeburn felt they could establish a characterisation that was less superimposed clown and more integral to the rest of the cast and their depiction of Austrian high society. Indeed, in casting the main characters Raeburn wished to ‘restore[s] the balance of the opera to the authors’ intentions.’

Raeburn and Minshull worked together on compiling a list of artists for the *comprimari* roles in early 1968, with Raeburn keen to engage singers with an international reputation and preferably with experience of recording for Decca—using the same principles as Culshaw had done for his *Ring* cycle—as ‘the creation of character in *Der Rosenkavalier* is altogether masterly down to the smallest part.’ The tenor Gerhard Stolze, a member of Culshaw’s golden guild of *Ring* artists, was offered first refusal on the part of the Valzacchi, and to secure his participation, Decca was prepared to reschedule its recording plans to accommodate his availability. It had also been hoped to engage the tenor Wolfgang Windgassen—Culshaw’s celebrated Siegfried—for the part of the Landlord. Although Windgassen had little previous connection with the opera, Minshull’s letter included the names of other cast members—Crespin, Stoltz, Gustav Neidlinger and Paul Schöffler in addition to Solti—but there was no further correspondence with Windgassen: not even his ‘happy association with Decca’ and the promise of working with some of his fellow *Ring* cast members was sufficient inducement for him to participate. Paul Schöffler,

---

719 Ibid. Solti was personally acquainted with Strauss, and describes meeting him three times, (see *Solti on Solti*, p.79). Solti also conducted the final trio of *Rosenkavalier* at Strauss’s funeral in 1949, (see Solti 93: meeting Richard Strauss <https://www.csoarchives.wordpress.com/2012/01/19solti-93-meeting-richard-strauss/> [accessed 1 November 2017].
720 Christopher Raeburn, draft notes for recording booklet, BL/RA.
721 Ibid.
722 Ibid.
723 Ray Minshull, letter to Gerhard Stolze 18 March 1968, BL/RA. Stolze was contracted to the Bavarian State Opera, who would not release him for the recording, so the part was offered to Viennese-trained Scottish tenor, Murray Dickie.
724 Ray Minshull, letter to Wolfgang Windgassen 7 March 1968, BL/RA.
now aged seventy, and who had been signed by Decca in 1946, was sought for the part of the Notary, and Decca investigated re-issuing his early recordings, possibly as a means of encouraging him to take such a minor role. By June 1968 written contracts for the parts of Sophie (Helen Donath), the Duenna (Emmy Loose), Ochs (Manfred Jungwirth), Annina (originally Margarethe Bence), Faninal (Otto Wiener) and the Kommissar (originally Marius Rintzler) had been signed by the artists, with contracts for Valzacchi, the Notary and the Landlord signed between July and September. However, to Raeburn’s chagrin, Solti would not accept Bence as Annina or Rintzler as the Kommissar, noting that ‘both performed well in rehearsal but S[olti] was against them and insisted on throwing both out.’

The dates of the recording sessions had been reserved but not confirmed, and in Zurich, Leon Felder was impatient to finalise financial arrangements with the Sofiensäle management, to draw up outstanding contracts with soloists and to establish the size of the chorus required. Raeburn was dispatched to follow up the remaining uncertainties in cast, and provoke a final decision from unresponsive artists, including the Austrian baritone, Otto Wiener, who had been asked to sing the part of the parvenu Faninal. Here, the casting plans hit another set-back. Paul Schöffler, Notary titular, piqued that his colleague Otto Wiener had been offered a role he considered superior to his, expressed a wish to resign immediately. Minshull called on Raeburn’s superior diplomatic skills to write to Schöffler:

Personally I do feel very sad about this, since your name has been associated with so many Decca recordings, and with such distinction, that I was hoping we would be able to add another performance even though on this occasion it would be more of a vignette than a large role.

---

725 John Culshaw, *Putting the Record Straight*, 1981, pp.58–59. Culshaw credits signing Schöffler, along with that of Ernest Ansermet and Guilhermina Suggia as an indication that ‘Decca was beginning to think internationally.’ Culshaw also notes that Schöffler was part of Decca’s short-lived post-war experiment to combine an artist’s concert performance with a public presentation of the test pressings of their latest recording—a ‘concert promotion business.’

726 Correspondence between Christopher Raeburn and Mark Nathans, 7–8 May 1968, BL/RA.

727 *Rosenkavalier* artists’ contracts, BL/RA. There are no records of contracts made with Crespin, Minton, Prikopa, Terkal, Auger, Yachmi, Mayr or indeed Pavarotti, the latter who was engaged as The Singer. Each artist received a flat fee for the number of recording days for their part. The comprimari artists earned between US$68 and US$87 per day. Alfred Jerger was paid US$348 for his single day of recording, perhaps reflecting his whole-career association with *Rosenkavalier*, his knowledge of Strauss and his assistance in coaching Minton.

728 Christopher Raeburn, draft notes, ‘Strauss’, BL/RA. Bence and Rintzler were replaced by Anne Howells and Herbert Lackner for the recording as Annina and the Kommissar.

729 Leon Felder, letter to Herr Ströher (Sofiensäle intendant), 22 July 1968, BL/RA.
You will realise that it would be quite impossible to suggest that Otto Wiener should forego the part of Faninal...and I do understand your reasoning when you show your reluctance to sing the Notar with one of your colleagues playing the larger part.

On the stage this would indeed be quite unthinkable, but I do feel the bella figura is not so offended by this position in a recording. I am also quite sure that it is not the financial offer which Mr. Rosengarten made which has caused you to change your mind; this in any case would be a subject for discussion...however if this is your final decision I can only say how sorry I am, as we were all so delighted when you accepted in the first place.  

Indeed, Raeburn, in his cunning, made an oblique reference in the Rosenkavalier recording booklet that might be taken to refer to Schöffler, by suggesting it was a symptom of Strauss’s and Hofmannsthal’s brilliant characterisation for even the most humble part:

...if the company can boast a sufficiency of good soloists there is always the problem of an established star refusing to accept a ‘secondary’ role; they are afraid that they will lose face.  

The casting was completed, much to Raeburn’s relief, as is evident in his recording booklet notes, by Alfred Jerger replacing Schöffler in the part of the Notary. In casting the venerable Jerger at aged eighty, an artist associated with Rosenkavalier for more than fifty years, Raeburn had sealed the bond with Strauss. With three months remaining before the recording was scheduled, Decca had finalised a cast that had become pragmatically multinational but held on to historical verisimilitude.

The Rosenkavalier sessions were confirmed between Felder in Zurich and the intendant of the Sofiensaal to run between Thursday 31 October 1968 and Friday 22 November inclusive, and the recording was to be completed without cuts, as was standard in the Viennese performing tradition. Raeburn wrote to Wobisch in Vienna to request that the plans to schedule a concert performance by the VPO in Berlin during the recording period be postponed to avoid jeopardising the ‘enormous promise’ of the recording by tiring the musicians. To provide Felder with sufficient information with which to refine a budget, it was Raeburn’s job as producer to submit a detailed recording plan, taking into account the character deployment and orchestration, and devising a system in which the

Ray Minshull, letter to Paul Schöffler, 2 July 1968, BL/RA. The letter was written by Raeburn and signed by Minshull.
Christopher Raeburn, notes for recording booklet, BL/RA.
Christopher Raeburn, notes for booklet, BL/RA. Jerger’s contract was signed in July 1968.
Christopher Raeburn, letter to Professor Wobisch, 22 April, 1968, VPO Archive.
opera could be divided into sections for the purpose of recording in sessions of three hours’ duration. The music staff often approached this task by ordering recordings made by rival companies which were kept in the Decca library for permanent reference. Raeburn had begun work on a recording schedule in March 1968. The plans were formatted as a grid, a system that had been developed by Culshaw in 1964 as part of his efforts to standardise its administrative procedures (see Fig. 6.1), for which he explains:

Only one form of schedule is clearly understood by this office and Zurich...it is essential to show what music is being performed in which session and which artists are available on which days...Do not modify or adapt this system and do not add bewildering and additional symbols.

![Fig.6.1 Rosenkavalier session schedule, undated, BL/RA, showing a breakdown of rehearsal cue numbers per act and the duration of each component section.](image)

---

734 John Culshaw, memo to Decca music staff, 28 January 1964, BL/RA.
735 John Culshaw, memo to Decca music staff, 18 February 1964, BL/RA.
This level of detail was also required by Felder to determine the legal and contractual arrangements with artists and music publishers as early as possible in the life-cycle of the recording. Decca’s London office, too, required recording schedule information to co-ordinate the location activities and ultimately to save time and reduce unnecessary session costs. By drawing up a complex matrix of time, music and personnel management, it was (at least theoretically) possible to maximise the productivity of the sessions and minimise the number of working days for artists. The drive for standardisation in Decca’s A&R operating procedures had become more pressing following a directive in 1966 from Edward Lewis and Maurice Rosengarten, to impose ‘immediate’ session economies.\(^{736}\) The session plans for *Rosenkavalier*, however, exhibit little of Culshaw’s intention to produce administrative uniformity, and the heavy annotations in multiple versions indicate the need for constant revisions to accommodate problems as they arose.

As a self-governing, private association, the VPO is likely to have operated its own policy on the duration of music that it was permissible to record during a three-hour session, along similar lines to the Musicians’ Union (UK) and the British Phonographic Industry.\(^{737}\) By studying the schedule copies together with Raeburn’s draft notes, Raeburn’s recording plan might be revealed. He first established twenty-two cue sections of music, each lasting between three and seventeen minutes,\(^{738}\) and then analysed both the full score and vocal score of the opera to compare the page references for these rehearsal cue breaks, as can be seen in Fig. 6.1. Once these details were set, Raeburn added identifying letters to each of the sections which became flexible components that could be moved around the schedule depending on the needs of his cast, conductor, orchestra and technicians. Raeburn further subdivided three sections from each of the three acts in the opera, giving four new short sections of between thirty seconds to one minute of recorded

---

\(^{736}\) John Culshaw, memo to Decca musical staff, ‘Session Economies’, 21 July 1966, BL/RA. Staff were called to a meeting in Zurich on 17 July 1966 by Rosengarten who emphasised the need to reduce the number of standard orchestral three-hour sessions from four to three, wherever possible, even for those already scheduled. Although operas were exempt from this directive, Culshaw suggests that in general savings could be made by expressing the need for faster work with artists; with engineers’ technical preparedness in receipt of as much initial information as possible; with the limiting of play-backs to intervals only, and not over-recording sections where re-takes would only produce marginal gains. Culshaw gives no further explanation for restricting resources.

\(^{737}\) This being twenty minutes for a three-hour recording session and ten minutes for a two-hours session, both in the 1960s and the present day. See Musicians’ Union document [1960], BL/RA. However, Raeburn’s agreement with the VPO to record with a ‘flexi-time’ component that was developed in 1964 suggests that the session schedule is more a guidance document that an immutable strategy.

\(^{738}\) The plan in Fig. 6.2 shows that the duration of each music sections lasts between 3’30” and 17’.
music (see Fig. 6.2). The recording plan shown in Fig. 6.2 also indicates session time set aside for remaking sections, for tracking (overdubbing) at a later date, and for ‘tags’: short lead-in, lead-out or bridging sections of music, usually for the benefit of cueing artists.

![Fig. 6.2 Rosenkavalier session schedule, 15 August 1968, BL/RA, showing rehearsal sections in a different permutation. It includes 4 extra cues sections—E2, E3, L2 and T2, provision for remakes and tracking sessions.](image)

### 6.4 Recording and post-production

In addition to Raeburn as producer and Parry and Lock as engineers, the Decca Rosenkavalier team in 1968 comprised James Mallinson as assistant producer and Jack Law

---

739 Gordon Parry and James Lock, in their draft notes for the recording booklet article write that ‘if things were going well out of sheer musical interest they will play another 15 or 20 minutes knowing we will knock this time off the next session. One is not distracted with the thought of running into overtime and the stopwatch.’
as editor and assistant engineer. For the duration of the recording, the team lived in a large apartment in a wing of the Sofiensäle and held artists’ pre-session rehearsals at the Bösendorfer piano in the sitting room.\textsuperscript{740} Parry and Lock comment that an intense atmosphere while on location at the Sofiensäle was maintained by living and working in the same environment:

The degree of total involvement in a project is only possible in the Sofiensaal where we live and work, even though it carries with it the terrible disadvantage of not being able to escape from work for five minutes, [as] the flat is only two minutes’ walk away from the [the] hall and control room...there is the telephone which always chains one to work every hour of the day. Calls from artists, London [and] Zurich are a problem. All piano rehearsals are held in the flat and we often have to pass through this even to change a shirt.\textsuperscript{741}

Sharing a combined living and working space shaped the nature of their collaborative and integrated teamwork, as the title ‘the quest for unification’ of their recording booklet article suggests. Parry and Lock’s notes indicate that the team was able to sustain momentum and productivity in the absence of external distractions relatively harmoniously, despite, as Culshaw comments, the potential for creating a ‘musical community centre: a rehearsal room, a social club and a Decca office’ from which it was difficult to seek respite.\textsuperscript{742} We find in Parry and Lock’s notes, and in Raeburn’s, a high level of expressed mutual regard for each other’s abilities; the shared, lived experience created a familial level of understanding. Intensive working conditions in the Sofiensaal also gave rise to the potential for ‘casual’ listening out of session hours. Parry and Lock describe returning to the control room in the late evenings to formulate opinions on the day’s recorded output of musical takes ahead of Raeburn’s main playback with Georg Solti.

The engineering goal of the recording was ‘to produce theatre in as glorious and sumptuous sound as present recording techniques will allow, [making] these techniques serve the demands of the score,’\textsuperscript{743} and to produce ‘the living theatre of the

\textsuperscript{740} Once the property of Wilhelm Backhaus, the piano was used for rehearsals of all Decca’s opera and vocal recordings made in Vienna from 1959 until the apartment was relinquished in 1975. Christopher Raeburn, undated typescript, BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{741} Gordon Parry and James Lock, notes for recording booklet, ‘The Quest for Unification,’ BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{742} John Culshaw, The Ring Resounding, 2012, eBook, loc. 2116. Parry and Lock disclose (notes for recording booklet, ‘The Quest for Unification,’ BL/RA) that ‘the intensity of concentration naturally takes its toll with frayed tempers and grumpiness. We got bogged down in all sorts of detail and there were endless discussions on a trivial point...Somehow or other the team held together and we certainly tried not to show that our tiredness reflected in our work.’
\textsuperscript{743} Gordon Parry and James Lock, notes for recording booklet, ‘The Quest for Unification’, BL/RA.
The engineers faced the problem of balancing the conversational-style dialogue of the singers with Strauss’s original, 103-strong orchestral forces to achieve clarity and separation in the service of the opera’s narrative. This they felt required a fresh viewpoint—the need to find a solution that brought together these elements that evoked a performance in the opera theatre:

We had to evolve a new approach in order to keep the feeling of a stage performance and depth of perspective, without forcing the voices by sheer decibels through an orchestral web, thus flattening the whole sound into a two-dimensional plane. We realised that our normal maximum of 28 microphone channels would be inadequate and the numbers of microphones and ancillary equipment would have to be considerably increased. This involved much technical modification, with supplementary equipment, to a permanent sound mixer installation which was already regarded as the largest and most versatile in Europe. 

The current mixing console in the Sofiensaal control room had been designed by Parry and his permanently-resident colleague, James Brown, to serve the needs of John Culshaw’s recording of Götterdämmerung in 1964, which required two engineers to work simultaneously. Although the ‘new approach’ is not articulated clearly, other sources give details of Decca’s process of recording on both stereo tape machines and four-channel multitrack in the late 1960s. Here, multitrack was used as contingency for the stereo master and provided the potential for re-balancing the sound after the recording sessions had ended. It also enabled precise control of individual voices or sound effects. Although the concept of Sonicstage had now been abandoned officially, the notion of creating ‘a phenomenal clarity of orchestral detail and operatic voice reproduction [to bring] the listener to the very heart of the drama’ remained the same ideal that Parry and Lock, and indeed Raeburn, pursued in Rosenkavalier. But here, the concept of intensifying the

---

744 Ibid.
745 Ibid.
746 See John Culshaw, The Ring Resounding, 2012, eBook, loc. 2653. Although Parry and Lock give few details on technical modifications, engineering journalist John Borwick, who was given access to the Sofiensaal control room in 1969, writes (‘Decca’s Vienna venue’, dB Magazine, January, 1970, pp.26–27) that Decca’s console comprised 20 basic channels, configured in two groups of ten per engineer. A further eight channels usually designated for reverberation and echo-return, could be requisitioned as extra microphone channels. Raeburn’s assertion (draft for presentation booklet, BL/RA) that ‘we had to install ten channels more than we had used for Götterdämmerung’ possibly reflects an imperfect understanding of the engineers’ modifications to the console circuitry.
dramatic effect of the narrative action is approached through technology alone rather than by choreographed stage movement. Parry and Lock note that their efforts to control acoustic perspective, to create an atmosphere of intimacy between characters and manage the balance of the offstage band in Act III, ‘could never have been tackled so successfully if [they] hadn’t agreed to make use of every cunning device that exists in the modern recording studio. These are the cases where multi-track recording, used in the ‘pop’ world as a sine qua non, can be adapted for purely artistic ends in operatic music.’ Raeburn is evasive—and most likely unsure—about describing their approach. ‘There is no point in going into the new technique [here],’ he dismisses, offering a somewhat obfuscated explanation:

…the effect is to enhance the orchestral sound itself, it is more direct without becoming emasculated or coarsened. As stereo was an improvement on mono sound, so is this a natural development in recording...

Raeburn’s extensive recording session notes form the main source of the details of each day’s recording, and were written in a standard form that could be understood by other members of the recording team (see Fig. 6.3). The Rosenkavalier sessions began on Thursday, 31 October 1968, with Raeburn seated at the mixing console in the Sofiensaal control room with a production score that he had annotated to show engineers’ cues and the points at which the LP side breaks would occur. Flanked by Lock on the left who controlled the orchestral microphone inputs, and Parry on the right who was in charge of the vocal balance, the engineering roles had been assigned and agreed mutually according to their personal preferences:

We tend to find in our team work together, that the choice of who balances what is a spontaneous mutual decision...it depends on what parts of the work we like most as individuals, hence [usually] Gordon [Parry] – orchestra, Jimmy [Lock] – voices and chorus, whereas in Rosenkavalier Jimmy found the Strauss orchestral colours a fascinating challenge and Gordon was mad on Hofmannsthal...Each of us had to have more than a simple awareness of what

749 Gordon Parry and James Lock, article as it appears in the presentation booklet, ‘The Quest for Unification,’ BL/RA.
750 Christopher Raeburn, draft for presentation booklet, BL/RA.
751 Ibid. Raeburn adds here that he and James Lock ran a pilot run for the ‘new technique’ for recording Overtures of Old Vienna in 1968 (Johann Strauss II/Heuberger/Nicolai/Reznicek Vienna Overtures, released 1969, SXL6383).
752 See Appendix 3 for details of Decca recording nomenclature. Engineers created their own set of notes that detailed the technical set-up, called the electrical record of session.
753 See John Culshaw, The Ring Resounding, 2012, eBook, loc.2653. He notes that the system of using two engineers, with the producer at one end of the mixing desk, had previously created a logistical problem in providing clear cues to the colleague at the far side.
the other was doing as we had to integrate our efforts completely. Having reached the state of mind where each of us was aware of what the other had to do, we were able to provide the environment for Christopher [Raeburn] to do his part of the work – concentrate on musical performance, expression, interpretation, in collaboration with the artists and conductor.\textsuperscript{754}

The sessions commenced with a section from the beginning of Act II lasting between twelve and thirteen minutes, up to the presentation of the silver rose at four bars after figure 38 in the Boosey and Hawkes study score. This section was repeated another three times before the session finished for the day. Raeburn added marginalia to the score as the recording progressed, noting noises, ragged vocal or orchestral entries and specifically good passages to work around at a later stage when drawing up a sequence of takes to be put together by the editor, Jack Law. According to Parry and Lock, Raeburn’s recording schedule had been organised to allow for a period of reflection and objectivity before recommencing on Monday 4 November as ‘Christopher [Raeburn], knowing the success of the whole operatic

\textsuperscript{754} Gordon Parry and James Lock, notes for recording booklet, ‘The Quest for Unification,’ BL/RA.
recording depend[ed] entirely on decisions made between first and second sessions, because after that it is too late to change one’s mind about the mix, had left [three] free days for us to come back with a fresh pair of ears.\footnote{\textsuperscript{755}}

Over the weekend, they concluded that they had produced a ‘nice juicy sound’ in the first session, but lacking in the intended definition and contrast. As the recording recommenced on Monday 4 November, Parry and Lock made considerable adjustment to the stage set up and decided on a ‘more vigorous vocal mixing technique, and coupled this with much more dynamic contrasts from the Vienna Philharmonic.’\footnote{\textsuperscript{756}} The schedule

\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{755} Gordon Parry and James Lock, draft article, ‘The Quest for Unification’, BL/RA.}

\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{756} Ibid. Additionally, John Borwick describes (\textit{dB Magazine}, January, 1970, pp.26–27) that all the possible input configurations on the console were used for the orchestral interludes in the opera.}
continued with the mornings spent listening critically to what had been recorded the previous day and holding piano rehearsals in the Decca flat, while Jack Law created a basic montage of the material to play to Solti and Raeburn. Recording sessions began in the afternoons at either 2.15pm or 3.15pm, as the orchestra was usually timetabled with rehearsals for State Opera performances or for its subscription concerts in the mornings. Photographs show the control room often full with singers and section leaders of the VPO engaged in listening back to takes during the break in the session (see Fig. 6.5). During the

Fig. 6.5 Rosenkavalier playback in the Sofiensaal control room, 1968, BL/RA. Georg Solti (seated second from right), and Christopher Raeburn (seated right) at the mixing console. Photo: Decca.

opera recording schedule, the halls of the Sofiensäle had been booked to hold the festival of Martinifeier from 9–11 November, requiring the Decca engineers to dismantle the recording set-up. The team were invited to the celebrations, and the break in recording provided inspiration for how best to approach recording the offstage band in Act III. The inconvenience of reconstructing the recording set-up was offset by Lock’s proposal to use the subsidiary Blauersaal, a room of generous natural acoustic but rarely used at the end of

757 As indicated by the VPO archive.
the 1960s because of road traffic noise from the adjacent Marxergasse. Lock believed that no other area in the building was fit for purpose without having to modify the recording with artificial room reverberation, and so approached Herr Krypl, the intendant, for help in preparing the Blauersaal for recording:

If we wanted to set any standard at all we must have the Blauer Saal and we must attempt to make recording possible in there regardless of cost...we were not very popular, having left this to the last moment...However, as usual, [Herr Krypl] made everything possible and by eleven o'clock that morning, twenty-five vast sacks of foam waste had appeared and the hall men were detailed off to stuff all this material down between the vast double windows giving on to the street...and the whole lot was blocked off with acoustic boarding. Not a sound of lorries or a hooter could be heard.

Solti was evidently delighted by the results, for on Monday 11 November when recording of the offstage band commenced under the direction of assistant conductor Rolf Hossfeld, Solti 'simply beamed at [the Decca team] and said he had never heard it sound so beautiful, and rushed out to take charge of the main orchestra and lead Rolf Hossfeld over closed circuit television.'

By the end of the second week of the schedule, the team had recorded eleven sessions: there were eighty-seven takes committed to tape, amounting to around one and a half hours of the total running time of the opera, leaving approximately half of the opera still left to record in the five remaining sessions scheduled across five days. As Felder had reserved the Sofiensaal only until 23 November, Raeburn altered the schedule to include weekend recording and holding more than one session per day where possible. His notes show that there were other problems to consider too, including illness, last-minute unavailability of the cast, including Crespin, and the State Opera’s insistence that Manfred Jungwirth attend a stage rehearsal despite having given him a month’s leave to record Rosenkavalier. Raeburn’s session notes indicate that he was given permission to extend

---

758 John Culshaw, in *The Ring Resounding*, 2012, eBook, loc.898 and 899, writes that the main road bounding the Sofiensäle was closed to traffic at their request during the recording of the Ring between 1958 and 1965. John Borwick (db Magazine, January, 1970, pp.26–27) describes the Blauersaal acoustic as a ‘giant echo-room...with an eight-second reverberation time.’

759 Gordon Parry and James Lock, draft article for recording booklet, BL/RA. John Borwick notes (db Magazine, January, 1970, pp.26–27) that while the Blauersaal is used ‘to impressive effect’ in Culshaw’s Ring, ‘when Fafner’s voice was bounced in there from 12 different loudspeakers,’ it is used ‘more subtly’ in Rosenkavalier to achieve a ‘beautiful airy perspective.’

760 Ibid.

761 Raeburn comments that ‘at the end of one of our periods of recording Mr. Solti was conducting with a high temperature,’ while Crespin was described as going through a period of emotional conflict, necessitating remakes. Raeburn writes that the State Opera threatened to ‘hold as hostages the Drei Adelige Waisen [the Three Noble Orphans, played by Arleen Auger, Rohangiz Yachmi and
recording to cover the incomplete sections of the opera, and to work on sound effects, re-balancing individual voices and recording artists whose schedules had been disrupted.  

On 23 December 1968, the team left Vienna for London, via Zurich, having completed the opera in 195 takes, ending with the final trio from Act III. A summary of the recording schedule is given in Fig 6.6.

To prepare for recording sound effects, Raeburn analysed his copy of the libretto in English, annotating and underlining the instances where Hofmannsthal and Strauss indicate specific stage directions and referencing pagination in the production score. For Raeburn, ‘the question of stage effects in Rosenkavalier presented the usual problem of what to include and what to omit. There are certain stage directions which can be translated into aural effects such as shutting windows and doors closing...In Rosenkavalier we made versions with and without stage effects, and though I was anxious to introduce any element, the majority of the effects were intrusive and disturbed the music.’  

Although the Decca team’s intention was to create ‘living theatre’ through fidelity to the explicit and implicit directions of Strauss and Hofmannsthal, and Raeburn was keen to include as many ‘verismo element[s]’ as possible for the dual function of observing historical performance practise and providing enhanced ‘scenic’ realisation of the drama, the recording team made the decision to omit many of the effects they had recorded. An example of this approach is seen in recording the silver bells worn by the page boy in Act I and at the end of Act III: the team recorded twenty-four takes of bells, some synchronised with the orchestral accompaniment and some arbitrary. However, Raeburn writes that ‘the effect as recorded was enchanting, but the orchestration is so ornamental in itself both rhythmically and in sound that the little bells...only confused the score. Furthermore I think that Strauss uses the tambourine to illustrate.’

\---

\begin{flushright}
Ingrid Mayr] if Jungwirth did not attend their rehearsal (draft notes for recording booklet, BL/RA and undated notes ‘Strauss’, BL/RA).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
762 During the recording extension period, Yvonne Minton was contracted to record Elgar’s The Kingdom for EMI. Raeburn comments that EMI producer Christopher Bishop, altered his own schedule to allow Minton to return to Vienna despite that ‘it is not in the interests of either [company] to positively assist the competitor’s recordings...Even though the gesture may have been solely to help Yvonne, for us to have received help from a quarter where one would least expect it is something for which I am most grateful and indicates an unusual team spirit within the profession.’ (Christopher Raeburn, draft notes for recording booklet, BL/RA.)
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
763 Ibid.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
764 Ibid.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
765 Ibid.
\end{flushright}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session no.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Take no.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31 Oct 1968 (Thurs)</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Act II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 Nov</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Act III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 Nov</td>
<td>9–17</td>
<td>Act II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 Nov</td>
<td>18–28</td>
<td>Act II/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 Nov</td>
<td>29–36</td>
<td>Act I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8 Nov</td>
<td>37–45</td>
<td>Act II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11 Nov</td>
<td>46–54</td>
<td>Act III offstage band at 12.45pm; orchestra at 1.45pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12 Nov</td>
<td>55–57</td>
<td>Act III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13 Nov</td>
<td>58–64</td>
<td>Act III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14 Nov</td>
<td>65–75</td>
<td>Morning recording session - Act II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15 Nov</td>
<td>76–87</td>
<td>Act II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16 Nov (Saturday)</td>
<td>88–95</td>
<td>Act III/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18 Nov</td>
<td>96–102</td>
<td>2 recording sessions: 3pm and 8pm (shorter session) Both Act I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103–106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19 Nov</td>
<td>107–120</td>
<td>Act I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20 Nov</td>
<td>121–135</td>
<td>Act I/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>22 Nov</td>
<td>136–162</td>
<td>Act II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19 Dec</td>
<td>163–178</td>
<td>Act I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAX</td>
<td>20 Dec</td>
<td>148–168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAX</td>
<td>21 Dec</td>
<td>169–191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAX</td>
<td>22 Dec</td>
<td>192–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>23 Dec</td>
<td>179–195</td>
<td>Act III. Completion of opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decca team leave Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>27 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decca team return to Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAX</td>
<td>28 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 Dec–31 Dec</td>
<td>234–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Jan 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decca team attend Vienna Philharmonic New Year’s Day Concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[TRAX] 2 Jan–6 Jan 1969</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>Sound effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAX</td>
<td>7 Jan</td>
<td>418–482</td>
<td>Sound effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAX</td>
<td>8 Jan</td>
<td>483–500</td>
<td>Re-mixes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAX</td>
<td>9 Jan</td>
<td>501–570</td>
<td>(Sofiensaal unavailable after 9 Jan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACKS</td>
<td>25 Mar</td>
<td>571–583</td>
<td>Act I voice balancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACKS</td>
<td>26 Mar</td>
<td>584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACKS</td>
<td>27 Mar</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>Act II voice balancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACKS</td>
<td>28 Mar</td>
<td>586–587</td>
<td>Act III voice balancing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6.6 Summary of *Rosenkavalier* recording schedule.
The tracking sessions were evidently object lessons in trial and error: the Decca team spent nearly a month at the Sofiensaal re-balancing and re-working existing master material and recording sound effects to give the ‘clarity and separation’ they sought from the outset, and continued to work between Christmas 1968 and for the first week of the new year. Further work was completed in March 1969 to balance the vocal tracks, perhaps as a direct result of the modifications to the Sofiensaal mixing console requiring longer to embed with their methods than had been anticipated. The recording and tracking sessions of *Rosenkavalier* had yielded a very large number of takes, all of which had to be considered before a selection was made to form a master tape. Solti had heard much of the material during the morning playbacks in the Sofiensaal and according to Parry and Lock, had already made his own musical selections. Rather than the task of listening back to the recorded material falling exclusively to Raeburn as producer, the whole recording team embarked on this process:

> We made copious notes in our full scores, argued, discussed the relative merits of this take or that…Often we found it necessary to go back over a passage six times before we all agreed on the best take. The problem was to select the best ‘theatre’ commensurate with musical accuracy…

The notion of post-production by consensus was nobly egalitarian and democratic, but it might be suspected that rather than increase the momentum in decision-making, it had the opposite effect. The team began this work on their return to Vienna at the end of December 1968 and continued into the New Year, feeding the selection of takes to be used marked in the score to Jack Law, who edited the stereo session tapes and some passages from the four-track tapes in an anteroom. As the Sofiensaal was not available for their use after 9 January 1969, it is likely that the first edit of *Rosenkavalier* was completed by this time, whereupon the team ‘packed up and went back to London...locking the Masters in the Sofiensaal safe.’

Raeburn and the recording team each created lists of editing requirements and detailed remarks of their own in advance of a playback in London, while Raeburn also collated further points raised by Solti. According to Parry and Lock, Solti ‘had very few criticisms and was thrilled but [said] he would like us to investigate a few points,
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766 Gordon Parry and James Lock, draft notes for recording booklet article, BL/RA.  
767 Ibid.  
768 Ibid.
particularly...tempi.” From their documents, it is likely that the whole recording team were present for the playback, held in the Listening Room at Decca’s West Hampstead studios, and made notes as the playback progressed, which were then summarised in a document by Parry, ‘Rosenkavalier Queries,’ shown in Fig. 6.7.

Fig. 6.7 First page of post-production playback notes summarised by Gordon Parry [possibly March 1969], showing score page number, score bar location and initials of author, BL/RA.
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769 Gordon Parry and James Lock, draft notes for recording booklet article, BL/RA.
The comments made by the recording team and Solti fall into a number of categories that are analysed in Fig. 6.8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Comment</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical editing faults (clicks on joins/changes in atmosphere/overlay)</td>
<td>CR/GP/JLaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound effects (mostly for removal)</td>
<td>CR/GS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestral and vocal balance (including direction to re-balance sections)</td>
<td>Mostly GS; CR/GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempi and fermata</td>
<td>GS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical recording problems (distortion/overload/vocal image shift/clicks)</td>
<td>CR/IL/GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear words</td>
<td>GP/CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble not together</td>
<td>GP/CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noises (acoustic)</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive interpretation (to find alternative)</td>
<td>CR/GS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omissions (including missing notes in parts)</td>
<td>GP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: CR: Christopher Raeburn; GP: Gordon Parry; JL: James Lock; GS: Georg Solti; JLaw: Jack Law

Fig. 6.8 Analysis of Rosenkavalier post-production/editing comments by type and by author.

It can be seen from Fig. 6.8 that each member of the team—and Solti—tended to focus their listening attention on their area of expertise. Solti, as conductor, was particularly concerned about the relative balance of the orchestra and voices, tempi and length of the pauses, whereas Parry, as engineer in charge of vocal balance, was inclined to concentrate on technical issues and lack of clarity in the voice parts. Raeburn’s points suggest he was attentive to both the musical content and to the desired sound, which required subtly different listening strategies. Raeburn subsequently annotated Parry’s post-production document, indicating that he listened to each query in turn and either suggested a solution or rejected the comment based on the availability of a suitable alternative. Solti’s requests for alterations to the balance in six places required a final mixing session to be held in a four-day patch session in Vienna at the end of March 1969, yet the documents suggest that a very small proportion of what was re-balanced was usable, and therefore a considerable indulgence to the conductor. The final stage of the post-production of Rosenkavalier was to record Luciano Pavarotti in his role as The Singer on 12 June 1969, and Parry and Lock note that ‘the date for the final playback kept being
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770 Ibid. Parry and Lock note that Solti referred to the process of re-editing as ‘beauty-shop’, a phrase that was adopted by Decca and appears frequently in Decca post-production documents.

771 It is likely that this was incorporated into sessions in June 1969 when Raeburn, Parry and Lock were recording the Vienna Mozart Ensemble with Willi Boskovsky.
pushed back...we always felt there was something we could do better,’ and estimating that 2,000 hours were spent recording and editing the opera.\textsuperscript{772} Indeed, the production score of \textit{Rosenkavalier} shows four distinct sequential ‘layers’ of editing, each marked in a different colour and indicating that the opera was edited four times, which confirms the extravagance in pursuing what Raeburn intended to become ‘a landmark in the history of recording.’\textsuperscript{773}

The release of \textit{Rosenkavalier} had been scheduled for September 1969, and Parry and Lock note that ‘Head Office in London was now getting a bit tired of waiting...and set us a deadline that the tapes must be back in London by the end of June.’\textsuperscript{774} The impatience appears to have piqued Gordon Parry, as communications between Raeburn and A&R administration in late June show that Parry had asked to have his name removed from the recording credits, only to be reinstated a week later.\textsuperscript{775} The withdrawal of attribution, however temporary, is indicative of the depth of feeling and personal investment of the recording team, while confirming that the recording crews operated a system of priorities that were not necessarily aligned with Decca’s commercial expectations.

\section*{6.5 Publication, promotion and reception}

To prepare \textit{Rosenkavalier} for release, there were further technical, editorial and administrative stages to be completed. As the supervising producer, Raeburn was responsible for approving the test pressing of the final master made at the Decca factory in New Malden from the lacquer master cut at the Decca studios. In the late 1960s, producers were also offered approval of recording sleeves, for which they supplied band timings, credits for artists and crew, details of the score edition, and suggestions on written and pictorial elements for commissioning by the Sleeves Department. Whereas A&R studio staff had garnered a general reputation for being dilatory in supplying the required elements for sleeves,\textsuperscript{776} Raeburn applied himself to the task assiduously. Establishing himself as the final product’s chief co-ordinator, and motivated by a desire to create ‘a presentation of the

\textsuperscript{772} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{773} Christopher Raeburn, draft notes for recording booklet BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{774} Gordon Parry and James Lock, draft notes for recording booklet, BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{775} Christopher Raeburn, memos to Nella Marcus, 23 June 1969 and 30 June 1969, BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{776} See Ray Minshull, memo to all producers, 5 June 1969, BL/RA. See also Nella Marcus, memo to producers, 31 July 1963, BL/RA, which reminds them that their work was ‘part of a process...it is unfair to ignore the rest of the procedure which has to be gone through by other people.’ Nella Marcus, as manager of classical administration, was responsible for project scheduling and progress, logistics and artists’ disbursements.
highest quality which the public would wish to treasure,’ he immersed himself in the management of the two publications to be released with the recording of *Rosenkavalier*. The first was a lavish colour booklet accompanying the boxed set of LPs, and the second, a smaller, cloth-bound marketing volume for critics and an invited audience at the recording’s launch in Vienna, which focused on the recording process rather than the musical realisation of the opera. Raeburn’s antiquarian pursuits, an interest in fine art and an enduring fascination with *Rosenkavalier* had led him to acquire rare folio reproductions of Alfred Roller’s set and costume designs for the opera—which he had reproduced in an article for the Glyndebourne Festival programme in 1959—and now recommended them for use in the recording colour booklet. His feeling of personal responsibility in the presentation of the recording extended to his devising a booklet layout of Roller’s illustrations, for which he made hand-drawn sketches, and which the Sleeve department duly adopted for publication.

Although Raeburn was not commissioned to write notes for the booklet as he had done for the 1964 Decca *Rosenkavalier* excerpts recording, he acted as the main point of contact for the literary contributors and translator. Professor Erich Graf, a violinist with the VPO for forty years, who lectured on Strauss for first-night performances at the State Opera and the Salzburg Festival, was commissioned to write an article to appear in both the recording publications, the former appearing in English and the latter in his original German. Although subject specialists were often suggested by Decca producers to the Sleeve department, Raeburn was not acquainted with Graf’s work or reputation beforehand. Like Alfred Jerger, who recorded the part of the Notary and contributed a short memoir on Strauss to both booklets, Graf’s direct line to the composer and his contemporaries helped to deepen the *Rosenkavalier* presentation’s aura of historical authority.

Raeburn’s long-standing personal associations with British music journalists and publishers influenced hiring Alec Robertson, veteran critic for *Gramophone*, as an article-writer for the State Opera presentation booklet that was subsequently published as a

777 Christopher Raeburn, draft notes for recording booklet, BL/RA.
778 Graf is described as a lecturer in opera theory and technique at the Vienna Academy of Music and the Performing Arts. He was a collaborator with Strauss himself and with conductors of Strauss premieres, such as Karl Böhm and Clemens Krauss, and also with the stage director Rudolf Hartmann.
(favourable) review in the magazine in September 1969. Robertson, as one of the first people to hear the recording before its release, gave Raeburn the immediate reassurance he hoped for, calling it ‘a splendid achievement,’ despite admitting a few initial misgivings. Raeburn’s draft reply to him is effusive:

Your personal letter means a great deal to me…It was to attempt an undertaking of this sort that I went into the profession at all. It has involved belief in artistic principles (as opposed to commercial ones), and it is a matter if delicate judgement to what extent one harnesses the technical wonders at one’s disposal without jeopardising artistic values. (I feel a more complete person for having supervised this achievement and) I believe that at last I have been able to make a (valuable) positive contribution to our musical world. (I have not said as much to anyone at all), but you of all people will understand if I say that it was a consuming passion to produce something artistically good which was the spur rather than the wish to get anything out of it personally. The whole project was teamwork from first to last, my part was no more than anyone else’s but I do thank the Lord for giving me the ability to hold this diverse band of people together.

However vindicated in his total absorption Raeburn might have felt by this kindly, but rather measured praise of Robertson’s, Raeburn’s devotion as self-appointed product facilitator, booklet designer and contact for sleeve note writers and external libretto editor, was not well-received by Decca’s publicity department. Within a couple of weeks before the release date, Raeburn was castigated in a furious tirade by the libretto editor, and accused of gross interference, having altering the libretto layout that had been prepared and proofread for printing:

…The result is that this libretto upon which you set such great store…now falls well below our usual standard…Surely it would have been only common sense—not to mention common courtesy—to have consulted me before arbitrarily altering my work.

Your procedure was equivalent to my walking into Broadhurst Gardens [Decca Studios] in your absence, altering the balance of your tapes, adding or cancelling sound effects, etc, and forwarding the results of my depredations, without saying a word to you, to the factory as finally passed
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780 Alec Robertson, letter to Christopher Raeburn, 20 July 1969, BL/RA. Robertson has slight misgivings at first on Helen Donath’s voice as Sophie: he mentions that her B flat entrance on ‘Himmel’ in the Presentation Scene is too loud, but softens the criticism with ‘I like her more each time I listen.’ Robertson does however uphold his criticism that Crespin’s last phrase in the Trio in Act III is indistinct (particularly a suspended E flat), although he concedes that it may have been compromised by his playback equipment.

781 Christopher Raeburn, draft typescript, BL/RA. The parentheses indicate Raeburn’s self-editing.
for records to be pressed. All, of course, without understanding what it was all about, as you quite obviously did not in the case of my work.

...I would point out that it is my business, and no one else’s, to take full and final responsibility for libretto texts...\(^{782}\)

Whether the error was made through his sheer exuberant enthusiasm for the product, or because of a limited understanding of how the role of supervising producer was incorporated into the layers of individual responsibilities within the process chain at Decca, is a moot point. Raeburn did, however, take heed of personal criticism, and amended his own recording booklet to include an appreciation of all those involved:

I believe that the combined efforts of the numerous people who have worked on the recording of Rosenkavalier, singers, musicians, technicians and literary editors, all experts in their fields, have produced a result of a quality all too rare to-day. The highly unfashionable pursuit of taking trouble and voluntarily contributing free time has I think produced something quite out of the ordinary.\(^{783}\)

The Decca publicity department had planned two high-profile events for the launch of *Rosenkavalier* in September 1969 at the State Opera House in Vienna and at the Austrian Institute in London, primarily for critics and trade magazines. Promotional postcards and a pamphlet produced ahead of these preview receptions proclaimed the recording to be ‘another landmark in the history of great musical performances,’\(^{784}\) made possible because of the thoroughness with which every aspect of the production and presentation had been considered:

Great performances of the past seem, to those not fortunate enough to have seen or heard them, to have a habit of enshrining themselves, perhaps a little too readily and immovably, on an altogether more lofty plane than anything which the present has to offer... Fortunately, the gramophone has changed the picture radically—evidence is at hand. And the evidence suggests that Decca’s magnificent new recording...is the kind of performance which will not need to be called ‘legendary’ to ensure its fame in twenty years’ time.\(^{785}\)

\(^{782}\) Peggie Cochrane, memo to Christopher Raeburn, 20 August 1969, BL/RA.

\(^{783}\) Christopher Raeburn, published version only. This credit was added after his draft article was written.

\(^{784}\) Decca promotional pamphlet, ‘Rosenkavalier-Decca Triumph!’, September 1969, BL/RA.

\(^{785}\) Ibid.
Decca’s publicity articulates what it saw as the democratising benefits of recording, and the intention of the company to create standards in the recording medium without the need of comparisons to live performances of the past. It also suggests, rather clumsily, that the production values allowed the quality recording to speak for itself, independent of marketing bluster and critical epithets to guide the consumer. It promoted Rosenkavalier as a recorded product in which the same level of insight, thought and care had been taken throughout the entire production process; from the pedigree of the conductor in the repertoire, and the assemblage of a cast not attainable by most opera houses, to evidence of the recording team’s dedication and the tangible attributes of the recording as an object of beauty and literary substance. The recording was promoted as a culturally-significant event, to be launched in London and Vienna in the presence of critics, the international press, artists, musicians, Decca management and special guests. In New York, London Records’ marketing director, Terry McEwen, was pursuing a more prosaic publicity and marketing campaign: ‘still working on some catch phrase...that the consumer would be able to comprehend.’ After the demise of the Sonicstage opera branding, Parry and Lock’s professed ‘new approach’ to recording opera offered an opportunity to create a new slogan with which to launch the product. But they appear to have been unwilling, or unable, to explain their methodology to inspire a new marketing campaign.

The Austrian Institute in London issued invitations to the first public ‘performance’ of the recording arranged for 18 September 1969. The guest list included Octavian and Arabella Hofmannsthal, the grandson and granddaughter of the librettist Hugo von Hofmannsthal, and extended to their own guests. Raeburn advised the technical department at the Decca Studios in West Hampstead of Gordon Parry’s specific list of equipment that was deemed suitable for optimum playback at the Austrian Institute, as Parry was of the opinion that the event ‘could well be the most important playback the Company has ever had,’ and was convinced that it should be played from disc rather than tape, to demonstrate to the audience the fidelity of the commercial product. Parry was concerned that the playback would vindicate the time, effort and expense at modifying the Sofiensaal facilities to his specifications in order to reveal the clarity and separation in

786 Terry McEwen, letter to Ray Minshull, 2 April 1969, BL/RA.
787 Christopher Raeburn, memo to Peter Goodchild (Decca publicity department), 21 August 1969, BL/RA. It estimated that Arabella Hofmannsthal would bring a dozen guests.
788 Christopher Raeburn, memo to Dave Frost, 27 August 1969, BL/RA. Gordon Parry’s list of technical requirements comprised two Studer S27 turntables for continuous playing (with specified output balance); volume control for each turntable via faders rather than switches to prevent clicks; two amplifiers (Q506) from the Acoustical Manufacturing Company and Altec-Lansing ‘Voice of the Theatre’ speakers.
balance and perspective that he (and Lock) had sought in creating a recording of ‘such high technical quality.’ Raeburn backed Parry’s requests, hoping that either the publicity department or the technical department would stand the cost of the equipment hire charges. Within a month of the playback in London, Raeburn and Parry received cautionary notification from the Sofiensaal management that the recent modifications to their recording installation (and most probably to the acoustic treatment of the Blauersaal) had been assessed by the Commission for Theatres in Vienna and found to have breached the terms of the tenancy, as neither Decca nor Herr Krypl, the intendant, had sought permission from the Sofiensaal management. The letter indicates that Decca would be required to improve, change or remove installations to comply with official regulations or be formally prohibited from making any future alterations.

The launch of Rosenkavalier in Vienna had been arranged under the auspices of the British Council and the Austrian Ministry of Education, to be included in a ‘British Music Week’ exposition; an event conceived to showcase British culture and that ‘the British really can boil up something more than tea.’ It was Raeburn’s idea to take advantage of the occasion and use his personal connections to persuade the British Council representative, A.C. Hawkins, and the director of the State Opera, Hofrath Heinrich Reif-Gintl, to schedule the Rosenkavalier playback into the timetable. As he represented a commercial rather than cultural organisation, Raeburn had to convince Hawkins that ‘nothing was further from his mind than a publicity stunt,’ and would ‘keep all that part muted [the advertising of a commercial product] and introduce the recording as a work of art.’ Held in the Gobelinsaal of the State Opera House, and as the photographs of the launch illustrate to great effect, the event presented the Decca team as cultural
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790 Sofiensäle Aktiengesellschaft, letter to Messrs. Parry, Raeburn and colleagues, 11 October 1969, BL/RA. There is no indication that further action was taken, or that Decca complied with or ignored the directive.
791 A.C. Hawkins, letter to Richard Rodney Bennett, and other featured composers, 29 May 1970, British Council papers, AUS/150/5, TNA. Held from 13-18 October 1969, British Music Week was part of a larger trade exposition devised by the British Government, comprising performances and debates, with Vienna used as a test-ground for the cultural exposition formula. Describing Vienna as the ‘hardest of all musical fortresses to take,’ it included appearances by some of the UK’s highest-profile music organisations, and personal appearances of composers Richard Rodney Bennett, Humphrey Searle, David Bedford, Harrison Birtwistle, Peter Maxwell Davies and Thea Musgrave. (See A.C. Hawkins, report, AUS/150/5, TNA.)
792 Reif-Gintl referred the matter to the Head of the State Theatres, and thence to the Minister for Education for permission. Raeburn is described by Hawkins as ‘known to us ever since he came to Vienna with an Austrian Government music scholarship.’ (Ibid.)
793 A.C. Hawkins, British Council papers, AUS/150/5, TNA.
ambassadors; their mission dignified with an exchange of gifts and solemn speeches delivered from a lectern decked with the Austrian triband, the Union Jack and the company flag of Decca. Reif-Gintl’s speech resonated with the historical significance that the opera house placed on its relationship with Decca:

The cultural relations that exist between Austria and Great Britain have always represented the keystone of friendly cooperation. May I remind you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that already in the Autumn of 1947, when Europe still suffered considerably from the after-effects of World War Two and Austria has [sic] only just regained its political and cultural independence, the Vienna State Opera was invited to give guest performances at Covent Garden in London, which were generously planned and executed. This spontaneous confirmation of Austrian cultural independence will never be forgotten by the Vienna State Opera and since then relations between these two countries have not only never ceased, but have been considerably intensified.

The Vienna State Opera is happy that it is a British Recording Company, namely Decca, which has established close contact with Vienna through its connections with the Vienna Philharmonic and numerous recordings of operas in which not only the Vienna Philharmonic, but again and again the most prominent members of the Vienna State Opera have participated.
and through which great success was achieved for Vienna’s musical life with critics and audience [sic].

Therefore the Vienna State Opera has happily taken up the suggestion of playing excerpts of the most recent recording made by Decca in Vienna during the British Week.

The Direction wishes to thank the Ministry of Education for making this possible and the British Council for its efforts in connection with the introduction of a recording of what I would like to call ‘the most Austrian’ opera of the recent past. 794
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Fig. 6.10 Presentation of a copy of *Rosenkavalier* at the State Opera House, Vienna, 12 October, 1969, BL/RA. (L-R: Christopher Raeburn, Gordon Parry, Hofrath Heinrich Reif-Gintl, James Lock.) Photo: Decca.

Raeburn thanked Reif-Gintl by letter for his introduction and his assistance in the presentation at the Vienna State Opera House, calling it a great success and adding that ‘it

794 British Council papers, AUS/150/5, TNA.
was most moving for me personally, loving your Opera House as I do and having attended over three hundred performances there.\textsuperscript{795} Hawkins reports that the audience were ‘lyrical in their praise of what Decca consider their finest technical achievement’ and that it was it was ‘a marvellous example of Anglo-Austrian musical collaboration.’\textsuperscript{796} William Mann, chief music critic of \textit{The Times} and a scholar of Strauss, was a guest at the formalities in Vienna, and his review describes the distinguished audience that Decca had assembled as comprising musicians and interpreters of \textit{Rosenkavalier}, past and present.\textsuperscript{797} He notes that when the music finished, the ‘burly figure of Ludwig Weber, for many years an ideal Baron Ochs, stomped from his chair and gave a warm handshake to Christopher Raeburn.’

\textsuperscript{795} Christopher Raeburn, letter to Hofrath Heinrich Reif-Gintl, 7 November 1969, BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{796} A.C. Hawkins, British Council Papers, AUS/150/5, TNA.
\textsuperscript{797} William Mann, \textit{The Times}, 7 November 1969, p.13.
Mann’s critique of the recording in his paper is perhaps the most unrestrained and ebullient of all Rosenkavalier’s reviews:

I could truthfully report that it is the most marvellous operatic recording I have ever heard, but far more to the point, this infinitely detailed opera...is interpreted as faithfully and scrupulously as perfervid enthusiasts and meticulous connoisseurs could wish...One hears details that years of devoted study hadn’t revealed, and the total performance puts the work in glorious perspective as a musico-dramatic entity.  

According to the rueful remarks of Harold Rosenthal in Opera magazine, Decca’s publicity department sent advance copies of the recording to only three ‘gramophone magazines,’ whereas Rosenthal and others had to wait several weeks to receive their copy. As Decca based its initial flush of publicity on these reviews, Rosenthal wonders what the ‘Decca publicity machine’ would have done if the reviews in Gramophone and Records and Recording had not been so rapturous. Regardless of the perceived shortcomings of Decca’s publicity department, they succeeded in creating European-wide interest and press coverage for Rosenkavalier, as Raeburn’s collection of reviews from mainstream and provincial publications attests. The review titles were notably effusive: ‘The Sensation of the Year’, ‘Régine Crespin revives memory of Lehmann’s perfection’, ‘Un chevalier à la rose...exceptionnel’, ‘The best of them all,’ ‘Doubts dispelled by a great Rosenkavalier,’ ‘Rosenkavalier in all its glory.’ Raeburn, undoubtedly, would have been thrilled at the flood of positive peer reviews for his first opera recording in Vienna as supervising producer since Culshaw’s resignation, and therefore kept every cutting. Sales were deemed healthy, and by early December 1969 it was reported that there was a turnover of 100 sets per week, after an initial release of 1500 in the first month.  

Most reviews of the recording do not venture far into analyses of the recorded sound, but offer meanings on the relationships between the characters; exercising their own taste in casting, characterisation and general tempi based on their familiarity with an opera that remains a mainstay of the European opera houses. There is unanimity in acclaim for the VPO’s playing as luminous, ebullient, sensuous and profoundly expressive in which Solti is totally committed: drawing life and feeling out of every phrase. But more detailed strands of commonality between reviews are difficult to draw. The most attentive and analytical reviews were written by critics receiving advance copies of test pressings: Alec
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799 Opera magazine, undated photocopy, BL/RA.
800 Peter Goodchild, letter to Gordon Parry, 9 December 1969, BL/RA.
Robertson for *Gramophone* (September 1969), Charles Osborne of *Classical Record Review* (undated) and [Thomas Heinitz] in *Records and Recording* (undated). These three publications may have lavished praise on the incisiveness and clarity of the recording, but they also provided more of a comparative, detailed perspective than other briefer opinions elsewhere. The three lead female voices attract a smattering of dissent in these reviews but share little consensus: Alec Robertson’s piece in *Gramophone*, an edited version of his article for the recording booklet, retains his slight misgivings on Donath’s musicianship, particularly for what he sees as a lack of attention to detail in critical moments, such as the Presentation of the Rose scene, where he criticises her dynamic control and her occasionally her intonation. Osborne, on the other hand, is indecisive about Crespin’s characterisation, describing her portrayal as rather sentimental but preferable to the ‘pallid’ Reining and ‘exaggerated’ Schwarzkopf. Minton’s Octavian, though esteemed as ardent and refined, is questioned in *Records and Recording* for her Viennese diction when disguised as Mariandl. There is a greater degree of consensus in criticism of Jungwirth’s Ochs, generally praised for his clarity of diction, variety of tone and restraint in turning the role into a caricature, but also regarded as ‘not quite fruity enough’. There is a feeling that these critics stop some way short of unreserved acclaim.

### 6.6 Critique

**Clarity and definition**

As critics reviewing this recording noted, the clarity and detail achieved is hugely successful, and the spatial depth and breadth of field of the orchestral balance that Parry and Lock strove to create is perceived to extend backward beyond the confines of the Sofiensaal, which gives the recording heightened dramatic impact. Front-to-back perspective was recognised by engineer Simon Eadon as important for a ‘spacious, opulent sound,’ and Parry and Lock achieved this with a large microphone array placed close to the sound sources to give precise control of all the elements. In comparison, the balance of Raeburn’s 1964 *Rosenkavalier* excerpts recording has an overall acoustic brilliance across the orchestra and voices, but the narrow stereo image confines the sound somewhat (comparing *Rosenkavalier* excerpts 1964 [CD track 1 ‘Wie du warst! Wie du bist?’] with the corresponding section in the 1968–1969 recording [CD1 track 2]. Despite the textural
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802 Simon Eadon, interview recorded 17 October 2016.
complexity and dynamic ebb and flow of the orchestral preludes to each of the three acts, details such as the harp pizzicati and percussion are defined without their being forced to the front of the sonic image. This is also true of the section in Act I where Octavian disguises himself/herself as Mariandl and is disturbed by the uproar of the approaching Ochs and his entourage [CD1 track 4 TC 03:03–03:25]. This section was created in a tracking session in early January 1969 and gives definition to each strand of the complex combination of the Marschallin’s solo voice at the front of the image, multiple distant voices and the orchestral *forte*. Likewise, the offstage band *Tafelmusik* at the beginning of Act III that Parry and Lock achieved in the modified Blauersaal [CD3 track 2 TC 00:53 – c.01:54] maintains a realistic physical distance from the ‘onstage’ action while retaining clarity.

**Use of reverberation and sound effects**

Parry and Lock’s tendency to use artificial reverberation on individual voices to create perspective in places where the text denotes movement, particularly between outside to inside, which is noticeable in Act I at the entry of Ochs [*‘Selbsverständlich empfängt mich Ihro Gnaden...’* CD1 track 5 TC 00:00–00:23], does not always succeed in conveying the desired effect. In this excerpt Ochs is strident and hollow, then immediately the vocal image is flattened and close (*‘Pardon, mein hübsches Kind!’*). This particular patch was singled out by Parry and Lock in their booklet article as an area of particular difficulty and is not fully resolved.

Raeburn’s restrained use of sound effects, allowing the music itself, its orchestral sound-effects and leitmotifs to convey the dramatic narrative, sets *Rosenkavalier* very much apart from the Sonicstage philosophy of Culshaw. Raeburn sanctioned the use of effects for precise references in the text rather than to create atmosphere, and they are indeed used very sparingly, which does not diminish the overall sense of drama of the recording. An example of this technique used to good effect can be found in Act I where the Marschallin recounts her dream to Octavian in which sounds come from the courtyard, but is unsure whether reality has permeated her dream. At this point the sound of jingle bells is heard [CD1 track 3 TC 02:40–02:57], which Raeburn has added in order to confirm that the sounds were real and not in the Marschallin’s imagination.
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803 Gordon Parry and James Lock, article for recording booklet, BL/RA.
Solo voices and vocal ensemble

In contrast with Culshaw’s Sonicstage technique of spotlighting vocal solos and panning voices across the stereo field to suggest dramatic action, the vocal parts in Rosenkavalier remain static and centrally-placed. In some of the ensemble pieces one feels that the levels of the individual voices are not matched in dynamic (for instance, Wirt, the landlord in the Tafelmusik section at the beginning of Act III [CD3 track 2 TC 00:32–c.01:31] appears receded and subdued in the image). Parry’s collated editing notes reveal that Solti made a number of requests to raise the dynamic level of Octavian throughout the opera, and these appear to have been altered successfully; reflected in Edward Greenfield’s description of Minton in The Guardian as a ‘superbly projected Octavian.’

A common observation among the recording’s critics is that the timbral contrast between the three principal female voices adds definition to the texture, a view that might be supported, but towards the end of the opera in the trio section of Act III (‘Heut oder morgen...Marie Theres’...[CD3 track 12 TC 02:31–track 13 04:25]) between the Marschallin, Octavian and Sophie, the timbre of Crespin’s voice is harder-edged, lacks brightness and appears to be set back in the audio image in comparison with the other two voice parts, which compromises the homogeneity of the trio of voices. Crespin labours her portamenti in this section which adds a sense of almost listless melancholy, which makes her singing feel heavy and ponderous.

The essence that might be drawn from the available critical sources is that although acclaimed for its dramatic intensity, the Solti Rosenkavalier is inconsistent in choice of cast and in the handling of the vocal balance. The Decca team perhaps tried too hard, and the constant revisions did not always work to their favour. However, as an opera with its own authorised theatrical performance tradition and anachronistic style, it was stylistically suited to the more restrained use of sound effects that it received.

---

804 Undated photocopy, BL/RA.
6.6 Conclusions

Raeburn’s recording ethos and continuity of production values

It was Raeburn’s objective to emulate the standards and attention to detail in recording opera that had been previously set by Culshaw rather than to provide a continuum of Culshaw’s methodology and aesthetics of the Sonicstage recordings. This is apparent particularly in his understated use of sound effects, and the central placement of voices in the image with minimal lateral movement. As such, Raeburn’s conception of Rosenkavalier follows the principles that he established in his 1966 recording of Tosca with Maazel. Although Raeburn’s Rosenkavalier is very much an ‘enhanced’ recording in which detail is heard that ‘years of devoted study hadn’t revealed,’ the priority was to uphold the authority of the details in the score without further interpretive action by the producer. Indeed, Rosenkavalier is an exemplar of Raeburn’s devotion to the concept of Werktreue—fidelity and respect for the work—made possible through his extensive pre-production research and collaboration with Solti and the recording team.

While Raeburn’s intention was to produce a recording in which the vocal and instrumental lines were as clear as possible, yet not perceived as distinct layers within the texture, he had little input in terms of how this was achieved technically. Relying on Parry and Lock to advise on and execute the most effective and expeditious technical solutions, Raeburn saw the benefits of a pragmatic approach, especially if it was likely to lead to critical approval and ‘a long life [for the recording] and to justify the large investment.’ The extensive use of multitrack and multi-microphone techniques was made for practical and qualitative reasons; to allow for unscheduled artists’ absences, and to extend the choice and control of effects and balance. Reserving any misgivings he might have had for the degree of technical intervention, Raeburn seems to have been quietly thrilled by the prospect of producing a technically-complex recording to rival Culshaw’s productions, but had no obvious intention of promoting and elevating the methods to the status of a dramatically expressive, self-conscious feature. As a consequence, no marketing device for a ‘new medium’ could be launched as a successor to the Sonicstage brand. Nonetheless, the outcome was successful and the early sales of Rosenkavalier augured well. Critical opinions of the sound were also laudatory, and Edward Greenfield wrote in The Guardian...
that ‘even by Decca standards the sound is glorious, characteristically clear and brilliant, but riper, rounder and fuller of atmosphere.’\textsuperscript{809}

*Rosenkavalier* was produced by essentially democratic means in which the recording team were consulted throughout the recording and post-production process. Raeburn’s collaborative style of working was underpinned by a series of personal aesthetic compromises: to Solti in terms of casting, and to the engineers in terms of the engineering concept. Raeburn was less collaboratively-minded and sensitive to the input of staff in other aspects of the recording process chain. His enthusiasm for the recording as a complete package of culture led him to overextend his influence beyond the responsibility for recording quality, leading to cross-departmental conflict. While producers may have exercised their aesthetic opinion on broader aspects of the final product in the early 1960s, by the end of the decade, as the recording of *Rosenkavalier* suggests, a cultural shift at Decca towards the standardisation and professionalisation of the company functions reduced the tolerance of staff for Raeburn’s desire for total artistic responsibility. But Raeburn’s personal connections in Vienna and with the music industry press were unmatched at Decca: his efforts elevated the promotion of *Rosenkavalier* from mere commercial presentation to intercultural event.

*Rosenkavalier* in the context of Decca’s evolving relationship with the VPO

At the time of Decca’s release of the Solti-Raeburn *Rosenkavalier* in 1969, the deferred proposal to record the opera for Columbia under Bernstein was reconsidered. The VPO’s determination to pursue the project was perhaps symptomatic of the changing recording landscape in Europe and America, which had potential consequences for the orchestra. In 1968, Decca ended its eleven-year UK and European distribution alliance with RCA. This arrangement, in addition to being lucrative for Decca, had allowed reciprocal access to each other’s exclusive artists, and through it the VPO had collaborated with conductors such as Erich Leinsdorf, Pierre Monteux and Fritz Reiner. According to Minshull, the VPO had wished to expand its symphonic output and reduce its opera recordings, ‘yet they were as reluctant to record symphonic works with Solti as he was with them.’\textsuperscript{810} The end of the agreement with RCA jeopardised the VPO’s contact with a wider range of international conductors, with the potential consequence of restricted repertoire development. The

\textsuperscript{809} Undated photocopy, BL/RA.
\textsuperscript{810} Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1998.
following year, Solti was appointed as music director of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, which limited the number of recording sessions and repertoire he could offer Decca in Vienna, and with ‘the consequence of nearly turning [Decca’s] relationship with the VPO upside-down.’  

Unable to justify the annual number of sessions with the VPO owing to Solti’s restricted availability, the contract was renegotiated in 1969 with the three joint beneficiaries of ‘exclusivity’ listed as Decca, Deutsche Grammophon and recordings for Columbia with Leonard Bernstein.

With the drift of European-based conductors to North American orchestras and opera houses in the 1960s, attracting Bernstein back to Vienna was strategically important for the VPO, given the enthusiastic reception for his previous appearances between 1966 and 1968. While Decca deepened its recording commitments in North America as it followed its relocated artists, recording Rosenkavalier with Bernstein for Columbia in 1971 was, no doubt, a genuine attempt by Decca at honouring its previous pledge and demonstrated a continuing commitment to the orchestra. This custom recording at the Sofiensäle was rescheduled to interlock with the revival stage performances conducted by Bernstein at the State Opera House. John Culshaw—now a BBC director—produced the recording with assistance from Decca producer John Mordler, and the same team of engineers that had worked on the Solti-Raeburn Rosenkavalier recording in 1968–1969.

As Culshaw’s account in his liner notes shows, the Bernstein Rosenkavalier, like Raeburn’s version, was an operationally complex recording that suffered from last-minute artist scheduling difficulties and lack of continuity, which he describes in his correspondence with Raeburn as ‘a nightmare.’ This was exacerbated by Columbia’s fixed annual recording allowance. Even though Culshaw had chosen to make the statutory cuts in Viennese performing tradition of the opera, the recording time available was considered

---

811 Ibid.
812 VPO schedule of contracts, Ray Minshull papers. The term of the 1969 contract was effective from 1971 with the allowances given as 40–42 sessions (Decca), 8–10 sessions (Bernstein for Columbia) and 20 sessions for Deutsche Grammophon. The exclusivity clause that included Bernstein was extended until 1976.
813 Custom recording by Decca personnel using Decca equipment was scheduled officially by the company under reciprocal agreements and for independent clients in the 1960s and 1970s. While unofficial, third-party work with relevant permissions had been tolerated by the company management, it was restricted in the mid-1980s under the aegis of PolyGram, and employees were barred from accepting work from major competitive classical labels (R. Minshull and T. Griffiths, memo to producers and engineers, 11 November 1985, BL/RA). By 1986, third-party recording was no longer permitted, with the exception of Lyrita (R. Klaassen, memo to producers and engineers, 14 November 1986, BL/RA).
815 John Culshaw, letter to Christopher Raeburn, 20 April 1971, BL/RA.
insufficient for contingencies for a complex opera like *Rosenkavalier*, prompting the VPO’s general manager to request that Maurice Rosengarten permit an advance from the following year’s session allocation. While sharing the same recording personnel, location and orchestra, there are specific sonic differences between the Solti-Raeburn and Bernstein-Culshaw recordings. Culshaw’s recording has less depth of field, greater use of vocal spotlighting, and sudden changes in vocal dynamic. Compared to Raeburn’s version, there is a perceived lack of clarity, precision and cohesion of the layers of sound that correspond to the components of the stage action, which is most apparent where the texture in the score is most dense. The appearance of Ochs and his entourage in Act 1 of the Bernstein-Culshaw version (CD1 03:05–03:45) is such a case, where the background commotion of the arriving crowd is lost against the bass line of the orchestra. The solo vocal tracks throughout the whole recording are more reverberant and vary more in dynamic level than in Solti’s version—a feature picked up in *Gramophone*, where Edward Greenfield describes the resonance as ‘a Crystal Palace echo.’ Controlling the amount of artificial reverberation to create perspective had challenged the team for Solti’s version, and remained an area that confounded the critics. Although Parry and Lock are likely to have retained reference notes on the equipment settings from their previous version with Raeburn, it seems that either the lack of time, Culshaw’s preferences, or a conscious decision to prevent too much acoustic similarity dictated how Bernstein’s recording was engineered. Culshaw’s own interpretation of the differences between the two versions of the opera, as reported in *The Times*, can be read as a veiled disparagement of Raeburn and Solti. ‘I think Solti’s was a very young sounding *Rosenkavalier*, both in cast and approach,’ commented Culshaw. ‘Bernstein’s may turn out to be more mature. Certainly we have allowed ourselves to wallow in the music from time to time.’ In his correspondence with Raeburn, Culshaw explains that *The Times* had misquoted him and he ‘didn’t mean to imply that George [sic] was immature.’ But his comments could be construed as a public reminder that Culshaw was the veteran in Vienna, and Raeburn the comparative novice.

The impression given by Culshaw in his liner notes to the recording was that the VPO was a heavily-overworked organisation beset with planning issues. Their ambitious schedule of subscription concerts, stage performances, chamber group work, tours and
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817 Referring to the Columbia (Sony) recording 1971 (catalogue no. 88843058662, remastered).
820 John Culshaw, letter to Christopher Raeburn, 20 April 1971, BL/RA.
rehearsals restricted their availability for recording during the day and induced a casual approach to prioritising recordings. By rotating principal players between recording sessions, the VPO also risked compromising standards and continuity,\textsuperscript{821} which was also the case for Decca’s own-label recordings. Correspondence between Decca staff and the VPO between the 1960s and the 1990s reveals a level of dissatisfaction with the inconsistent standard of the orchestra’s personnel, leading Decca to request and emphasise the necessity for the most experienced players to be engaged for recordings.\textsuperscript{822} Yet despite these variable standards, the VPO was crucial to the perception of Decca’s musical heritage, as according to Andrew Cornall ‘they still had the title the Vienna Philharmonic. It was a huge part of Decca’s profile and a huge commercial advantage to have that name on the record.’\textsuperscript{823}

Raeburn was able to lavish extra time and resources on his \textit{Rosenkavalier} to offset such issues because of the very generous fixed annual advances that Rosengarten had brokered with the VPO and the management of the Sofiensäle.\textsuperscript{824} It could be argued that Rosengarten’s patronage masked the true cost and difficulties of recording opera to the uncompromising standards that had been established at Decca during the previous decade. Culshaw, who had been responsible for pioneering the standards in opera production as a member of Decca’s staff, now struggled to emulate his previous successes from outside the Decca fold. Although the intentions of seeing through the Columbia \textit{Rosenkavalier} were essentially political and diplomatic, the recording provided Culshaw with an opportunity to assert his presence once again in the industry with a rival recording at the point Raeburn hoped to advance his own influence in Vienna. One is reminded, too, that in 1971, Culshaw was involved in covert criticism of Decca’s recording plans for \textit{Parsifal} with the VPO and

\textsuperscript{821} Ray Minshull notes that the orchestra ‘in theory were only available to perform as the “Vienna Philharmonic” in the afternoons,’ (unpublished memoirs, 1998).
\textsuperscript{822} See VPO archive and also Raeburn Archive papers. For example, in 1977, a Decca recording of Schoenberg’s \textit{Pelleas und Melisande} was abandoned because of the VPO were unable to provide a full complement of personnel, including ‘a number of the better strings’ during the planned recording period. Raeburn requests that if rescheduled, the recording should have consistent personnel with no substitutes. (Christopher Raeburn, letter to Paul Fürst, 25 April 1977, VPO Archive.) By the 1990s, the VPO maintained that ‘in principle, we don’t accept that a conductor or recording company choose their own special cast from the orchestra.’ (Walter Blovsky, letter to Christopher Raeburn, 24 September 1993, BL/RA.)
\textsuperscript{823} Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.
\textsuperscript{824} VPO schedule of contracts, Ray Minshull papers. In 1971, the VPO received an annual retainer of 1,450,000 Austrian Schillings paid in lieu of royalties.
Solti, which undermined both Raeburn’s artistic aims as producer, and Minshull’s A&R management control.825

*Rosenkavalier* had marked a turning point in Raeburn’s career, giving him an opportunity to raise his profile in Decca’s European recording interests in the post-Culshaw era, while Minshull concentrated on developing new strongholds in North America. But unlike Culshaw, Raeburn had no executive status, which led the VPO to conduct the majority of their correspondence with Minshull, Rosengarten and Felder, despite Raeburn’s supervision of around half of all Decca’s post-*Rosenkavalier* recordings in Vienna. With Rosengarten’s death in 1975, the loss of the orchestra’s most steadfast ally seriously weakened the commitment of the VPO’s management to a contract where Decca held the largest stake. Raeburn’s promotion to ‘artistic consultant with special responsibility for Vienna’ in 1976 seems to have made little real difference to the balance of power in Vienna, where Minshull took over contractual arrangements from Rosengarten. Despite Minshull’s earnest appeal to the VPO to prolong the exclusive arrangement after its expiration in 1979, as ‘members of the recording industry and the general public alike would conclude that there had been a serious breakdown in the relationship...which would be both untrue and damaging to both parties,’826 the orchestra desired real change, both artistic and economic. Their wish for ‘maximum artistic freedom’827 and a limited, royalty-based contract, for individual works without exclusivity to any one record company, along with standardised session fees for all companies, effectively ended the longstanding partnership at the end of the 1970s. Raeburn continued to sustain close background friendships with VPO personnel that had developed since the 1960s, which was described by Andrew Cornall as of huge benefit to Minshull in facilitating transactions.828 But a decade after Raeburn recorded *Rosenkavalier* with Solti, Decca’s commitments with the VPO had been reduced by more than a quarter, and the orchestra looked for a wider range of financially fruitful associations.829 Recording *Rosenkavalier* was a double irony, its themes metaphors for the evolving relationship between Decca and the VPO: the march of time, the preservation and relinquishing of the past, and the inevitability of change.

---

825 See Chapter 3, p.112, which describes Culshaw’s correspondence with Rosengarten and Edward Lewis on casting in the recording of *Parsifal* with the VPO without either Minshull’s or Raeburn’s knowledge.

826 Ray Minshull, letter to Paul Fürst and Alfred Altenburger, 1 November 1978, VPO Archive.

827 Paul Fürst and Alfred Altenburger, letter to Ray Minshull, 23 October 1978, VPO Archive.

828 Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.

829 The first contract negotiated by Minshull with the VPO in 1979 (to take effect in 1980) saw the annual allowance of recording sessions for Decca fall by twenty-five percent to maximum of thirty, with the remainder offered to other record companies.
In 2007, Gramophone awarded Christopher Raeburn a Special Achievement commendation for enriching the classical music catalogue for fifty years in his role as a recording producer. This was one of many personal accolades he received towards the end of a career that had borne witness to the entire company lifecycle of Decca; its growth, peak of activity and consolidation of its reputation, and steady demise. There can be no doubt that the music press, artists and peers considered Raeburn to have made a major contribution to recording, not just as a survivor of a changeable industry, but as a defender of standards and upholder of aesthetic values rooted in an earlier age. By the time Raeburn had received this valediction from the music industry, the notion of teams of specialist, permanent employees dedicated to creating recordings using proprietary technology was already an obsolete practice at Decca, having come to an abrupt end in 1997 at the commencement of sale negotiations of its parent company, PolyGram N.V., to The Seagram Company.\(^{830}\) In the words of Michael Haas, it had been replaced with recording teams ‘being assigned at twenty-four hours’ notice, or having different teams throughout a recording or remix…teams showing up only an hour before the recording starts and not having time to discuss what’s happening.’ Here, the untenured producer was reconciled to ‘spend[ing] months at a stretch remixing things that weren’t got right at the sessions.’\(^{831}\) Indeed, the ‘golden thread’ of a past era had been lost.

This thesis has aimed to reveal how classical recording production was practised at Decca over the lifespan of the house producer using a combination of archival research, unpublished memoirs and interviews conducted with ex-industry practitioners, musicians and agents. This has been investigated in three main ways. Firstly, it has examined how the role shaped and was shaped by Decca’s company culture, and in what ways it adapted to changing internal and external forces. Secondly, it has sought to anatomise the functions, aesthetic scope and outputs of the job. This has been approached chiefly in regard to illustrating Christopher Raeburn’s career, but also in relation to the dynamics of the company culture and with artists served by Decca. Finally, in the context of the recording


\(^{831}\) Michael Haas, email (print) to Christopher Raeburn, 11 October 2005, BL/RA.
legacy of John Culshaw, it has aimed to offer an exposition of the characteristics of Raeburn’s recording philosophy—how he hoped to transmit (the subject of recording) via the recording medium (the object of recording)—and the nature of his own legacy.

As a company founded on risk, unorthodoxy and technical empiricism, Decca had embraced the qualities of zeal and initiative in its workforce from the beginning. It relied on technocratic speciality as a means of assigning people to processes, but as an emerging industry, the ‘specialists’ Decca identified were those who had aptitude rather than knowledge of recording procedures. Potential recruits for the technical occupations were drawn from a wide range of backgrounds and trained through heuristic rather than a priori means. This promoted inventive and cooperative problem-solving, socialisation, and underpinned the concept of the Decca ‘team.’ The notion of the ‘team’ is central to understanding the company’s organisational culture, and from which the idea of an identifiable ‘house style’ of recording emanates. With Decca’s origins in manufacturing and technology, the artistic potential of recording was a corollary to its technical activities. It was the engineering director, Arthur Haddy, who determined the extent to which the sound ‘recordist’ should interact with the music and musicians in the studio, which was to be the first step to the strong delineation of roles in the Decca recording workforce. Haddy, by his own admittance, was convinced that musical competency was not a requirement of the recordist’s job, and moreover, a potential distraction from the principle focus of transferring the audio signal to the recording medium with the highest degree of fidelity.832

The need for the role of the producer was identified as a void that could not be filled by either the technical crew or administrative management. It was required to ensure more accurate and vivid musical performances to showcase Decca’s developments in sound technology, whether for ffrr or stereo. The producer’s role therefore arose via an expeditio definition; what it did not encompass, rather than what it did, which is reflected in the diverse levels of musical accomplishment and experience of the staff employed by Decca, particularly in the 1950s and 1960s. The only fixed criteria were that a producer would leave all practical technical decisions to the recordist, or engineer, and would be responsible and accountable for the technical and artistic outcome of the final recording. It is through these factors that the role of the producer was poorly understood even from within the company, and that the scope of the producer’s remit took some time to formalise. A similar genesis of the division of labour has been identified by Geoff Matthews in his study of the history of broadcasting production practice at the BBC, which arose as an

independent paradigm of work in the 1920s, and like Decca, was conceived in an effort to synthesise the work of technicians and artists. Matthews describes this as a ‘process of social interaction, in the course of which participants engaged continuously in attempts to define, establish, maintain and renew the tasks...they performed.’ The appearance of production sleeve credits at Decca, which were not fully realised until the 1980s, was a significant step in disclosing that a structure and process lay behind the final product, and final recognition that studio recordings, like other cultural works, ‘do not spring forth full blown.’

Raeburn was a product of an unreplicable point in time when there was no imperative for A&R staff to be fiercely educated in any theoretical or practical subject germane to music recording, but rather to have confident aesthetic opinions, a conscientious approach to detail, judicious discretion, and submit to the role as a way of life. These were attributes that aligned with the gentleman amateur enthusiast who engaged in ‘conspicuous leisure.’ Raeburn, whose background was built on intellectualism cultivated through an appreciation of opera and the theatrical arts, was an ideal candidate for the role from the mid-1950s. With no training in general recording operations available within the company for the producer, cultural experience, artistic personality and social background were key assets in how both music and musicians were approached.

The character of the recording producer of the 1950s and 1960s as a self-taught connoisseur can be seen as analogous to the description of the impresarial management style of the emergent fine arts administrator in the nineteenth century, as defined by Richard Peterson:

He (rarely she) was reared in an upper-class or upwardly aspiring family...He deported himself in a commanding and flamboyant style that was tooled to flatter the wealthy and tyrannize subordinates, but he related to people on a personal, individualistic basis. Finally, the impresario combined the appearance of selfless devotion to art with attention to the most minute managerial detail, thus personifying the

company in his every activity over what was often, by modern standards, an extremely long job tenure.\footnote{Richard Peterson, ‘From Impresario to Arts Administrator: Formal Accountability in Non-Profit Cultural Organizations’, in Paul DiMaggio (ed.), Nonprofit Enterprise in the Arts: Studies in Mission and Constraint, 1986, p.162. Peterson’s analysis is restricted to American arts organisations.}

Although intense and eccentric rather than tyrannical, Raeburn’s professional image—and indeed that of John Culshaw—closely resembles this portrait. Yet the impresario as characterised by Peterson developed as a ‘buffer role’ that separated aesthetic (such as theatre directors or orchestral conductors) from business functions in arts organisations, and whose key obligations were to provide behind-the-scenes coordination and create rapport with artistic persons. Certainly, the verdict of the interviewees for this study is that Raeburn’s greatest skill was in artist relations, and despite his capacity for intensity, was able to ‘spread emollient on the psyche of a performer.’\footnote{Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016.} The award of the Schalk Medal in 1988 to Raeburn by the VPO ‘for services to the orchestra over many years’ was undoubtedly made in recognition of the personal background relationships he maintained as much as for being the corporate ‘man in Vienna.’ Indeed, Raeburn’s name did not appear on any contract with the VPO, despite featuring as the toastmaster at contract-signing ceremonies.

Although essentially impresarial in its character, the staff producer’s role cannot be fully characterised using the impresario model. At Decca, the producer was wholly responsible for the artistic outcome and interpersonal management of recording, but had no financial liability. Raeburn did have entrepreneurial ambitions, but had little success in piquing the interest of management, marketing—or anyone who would listen—with recording project ideas that had originated from his circle of contacts. The only instance where he was given strategic free rein was when advising on Cecilia Bartoli’s early recording career, on account of his matchless experience in recognising artistic potential. The managerial limitations of the studio producer had been determined from the early 1950s by Frank Lee (as head of the artists’ department) and perpetuated by both John Culshaw and Ray Minshull. Their choosing to combine recording production with executive management (which Maurice Rosengarten thought to be an eccentric decision, given the extent of the management work)\footnote{As noted by Ray Minshull, unpublished memoirs, 1995.} gave them greater personal influence with artists as well as a monopoly over recording project management. But the limitations of the staff producer
were also a direct consequence of Rosengarten’s patronage and influence across Decca’s recording activity. Rosengarten provided Decca with the protection from risk that had enabled the recording producer to devote maximum energy and time in working until satisfied with both sound and performance, without their knowledge of the true costs. But the effect of this unique arrangement was that producers had little understanding of the economic realities of recording. While it created a ‘haven of creative bliss’ according to Minshull, and where the producer might develop informal and diffuse relations with artists, it rendered the producer’s corporate authority ambiguous.839 This was even the case for Culshaw, as head of A&R. As Minshull notes, while artists assumed that Culshaw ‘needed only to persuade Rosengarten of the artistic necessity of projects,’ in reality, Culshaw ‘could at any point be undermined by Rosengarten.’ Rosengarten, who had been ‘entrusted [with] the viability of the entire classical venture,’ by Edward Lewis, was fundamental to the success and vitality of Decca’s recording programme. Through his initiative, Decca developed a European recording presence, built its catalogue and enabled the team ethos to flourish. His death in 1975 had a profound effect on the company, both economically and operationally, and as a key figure in the socio-economic history of recording, his career deserves further research. These circumstances created a very different environment to that of EMI, whose early operations had been dominated by men with broad, practical experience in artistic, technical and managerial aspects of recording production. Alfred Clark, Fred Gaisberg, Walter Legge and David Bicknell had, at various stages of their careers, worked in the studio as ‘recording men’ and in strategic A&R management for EMI. Operationally, EMI had also been dominated in the pre-war era by an American-influenced management structure consisting of a series of interlocking committees dealing with artistic and financial matters.841 These factors had generated what interviewees for this study describe as a more formal working atmosphere at EMI compared with Decca, and more formal artist-staff relations.

In order to examine the role of the producer at Decca in detail in this thesis, it has been profitable to invoke the model of organisational culture developed by Edgar Schein.842 Comprising three levels in which the culture of an organisation is observable, Schein’s model considers the identity, internal relationships and task dimensions of a group, the ways in which the group responds to external stimuli, and the ‘basic assumptions’ that lie at

839 Ibid.
840 Ibid.
the deepest level of cultural identity. This has provided a structure through which to investigate both the visible phenomena of the producer’s role within the internal functions of the company (Chapter 3), and how the producer projected and interpreted their role outside Decca in their interaction with musicians and conductors (Chapter 4). The third level, described by Schein as ‘reality, truth, time and space’ in which the group’s values become essential and embedded, and which define its character in its most taken-for-granted form, is presented here to conclude the analysis. For Decca’s studio staff, the fundamental assumptions might be identified as the pursuit of quality, the maintenance of standards, individual responsibility and collegial trust. These were cognates of what might be referred to as the ‘house style,’ the agent of which was the Decca ‘team.’ Indeed, the concept of a ‘house style’—a durable, consistent (and perhaps even aurally-identifiable) mode of recording music—might be seen as a rationale/methodology as much as a system/method of recording.

Ex-Decca studio staff interviewed for this study emphasised that they had been inculcated at the start of their careers with the importance and expectation of achieving the best possible results within the frame of their jobs. This involved a moral commitment to work that was meticulous, resourceful and imaginative and that would result in recordings that would stand up against and exceed comparisons. The interviewees indicated that there were strong intrinsic motivators; the personal qualities they brought to the job, and an awareness that personal values were aligned with shared values. Recording editor Caroline Haigh remarked of feeling ‘very lucky to have started out there, because there was a high standard expected. When you started in the job you sat in with other people for a while, then you’d have a go yourself, and somebody would check over it. Nowadays that doesn’t happen. Time is so much more pressured. But if you didn’t have internal high standards anyway I think the job would drive you insane. You have to be picky.’ Her colleague, Nigel Gayler, commented that ‘it was fundamental that my work was [of] the absolute highest standard. I got that from day one. One of the reasons I think was that classical recordings were everlasting, and the work that we did in 1974 is still being enjoyed today...and the recordings are still being re-issued. I was working with Christopher [Raeburn] within weeks of my starting, and I could see what he was trying to achieve, and that goes with virtually all the producers and engineers. We had to strive for perfection, nothing short of that.’ Gayler’s observation is consistent with Raeburn’s belief

843 Caroline Haigh, interview recorded 26 September 2016.
844 Nigel Gayler, interview recorded 25 May 2016.
that their shared purpose was to create an artistic product of eternal value, destined for a
place in the catalogue for posterity. Raeburn intended that recordings would be regarded
as part of the continuum of the musical work’s performance history and capture the
essence of what the composer might have desired: that recordings were sounding forms of
the original intention. They were also perceived as cultural monuments that could be
interpreted as legacies of craft fellowship created with moral purpose. Reinhard Klaassen’s
lyrical tribute to Raeburn reinforces this idea:

I would like to mention... his commitment to what he does, his personal
approach. Every record he produces is like a hand-woven carpet, reflecting
all his deep feeling and right sense of accomplishment. His self-criticism is
severe, he is hardly ever satisfied with himself [•] living through the deep
valleys of dissatisfaction or on the high peaks of success. Such a life is
difficult, with one’s dedication and feelings as a tough taskmaster... Your
performance is recorded for posterity. It will forever colour our assets with
colours that cannot be copied, and remain the secret of their creator
[sic].

In the context of recording, quality expressed as a value was strongly allied to the
notion of expert, artisanal work. At Decca, recordings passed through successive hands of
staff working in restricted process specialisms—all essential to the final product—for whom
quality was identified and measured by different metrics, both pragmatic and subjective.
This varied considerably by the degree of technical precision associated with the job, such
as eliminating errors and deficiencies in the recording medium, to the choice of the musical
take that conveyed the expressive intentions of the artist. But the unifying factor was the
insight and high degree of care taken by all staff, which was largely unaffected (certainly
until the 1970s) by constraints of time or cost. This was institutional craft production, rather
than mass production, for all the semblance to an industrial manufacturing process. Rather
than focus on the goal of recording as a presentation of an ‘exemplary and blemish-free
performance,’ it could be interpreted equally as the product of multiple workers morally
disposed to produce their most careful work. This aligns with Howard Becker’s theory of art
which analyses cultural production from the perspective of collective action in the society
within which it forms—the ‘art world’—in which ‘all artistic work, like all human activity,
involves the joint activity of a number... of people. Through their cooperation, the art work

845 Reinhard Klaassen, ‘Christopher Raeburn: 25 Years with Decca’ (anniversary tribute), 1983, BL/RA.
846 Peter Johnson, ‘Illusion and Aura in the Classical Audio Recording’, in Amanda Bayley (ed.),
we eventually see or hear comes to be and continues to be. Indeed, to interpret a recording only in terms of its final, audible form, variously decried as ‘intentionally perfect, a triumph of technology in which the hazard of human engagement is neutralized,’ and as ‘fetishised objects of fixity...unchanging, perfected icons’ is to render the recording process itself invisible. Such emotional judgements are surely responses based on expectations and conventions of live performances, rather than knowledge of the activity of recording. This denies the artist’s ‘supporters’, to use Becker’s term, any credit for having made choices which have an effect on the final outcome. ‘Every participant in the cooperative network that creates the work...has some such effect,’ writes Becker, and such ‘art worlds affect the character of the works made by their members.”

Decca’s labour was consciously divided in order to produce specialist work. As Nigel Gayler remarked in interview, ‘I think the product was as top quality as you could ever achieve as we were specialists at our job, and the same can be said for engineers and producers and transcription engineers, we were all specialists. Consequently I think the product was of a very high quality, whereas in some cases in other companies where you had an engineer-cum-producer-cum editor, [it was] not quite the same because they would be doing bits and pieces whereas we were concentrating solely on our job.’ Perhaps if Decca had disclosed its recording methods more routinely in the public sphere, the persistent image and somewhat futile criticism of the production process as designed to mislead the audience might not have perpetuated.

The role of the Decca producer, as the ‘weaver’ of all the strands of production and performance, to use Klaassen’s metaphor, was to balance the tangible—the pursuit of accuracy and acoustic fidelity in the engineering disciplines—with the intangible—the pursuit of expressivity in the musical performance and the connection of the listener with the musical narrative, regardless of the listener’s environment. Therefore, it was necessary that the producer was sensitive to the recording as an object, and also as a performance, the subject of recording. There was no prescribed method for a producer to follow at Decca, which was ultimately determined by their personal response to the musical work in

851 Nigel Gayler, interview recorded 25 May 2016.
question, and the direction of their interests. While Culshaw was beguiled by the potential of Decca’s engineering technology to serve artistic, expressive ends and to strengthen the meaning of the text, Raeburn eschewed the self-conscious application of recording technology and focused on the primacy and authority of the score in which the recording medium had all but dissolved. Raeburn wanted recording production to be inferred, whereas Culshaw wished it to be audible. As Becker notes, when making art is interpreted as collective action, allocating the title of ‘artist’ within the ‘art world’ is neither straightforward nor immediately apparent.\textsuperscript{852} Culshaw saw his role as a producer in these creative terms, and cultivated this in his recording philosophy and writing. And indeed, when interviewed for this thesis, Evans Mirageas was emphatic in his regard for ‘producers and engineers [being] as much as artists as the performers themselves.’\textsuperscript{853} With his advanced awareness of stagecraft, sound design and production concept, Culshaw’s approach was certainly akin to that of a theatre director, perhaps rather than artist, in the recording studio. Raeburn, as a man of theatrical sensibility, was no less conscious of the importance of finding the means in the studio with which the listener might experience an emotional connection to the music and its interpretation. Although they did not articulate it, both Raeburn and Culshaw both recognised the loss of ‘aura’ in mechanically-produced art that Walter Benjamin describes.\textsuperscript{854} But for Raeburn, dependency on technology risked creating fake aura which separated the listener from the aural experience of the time and place of recording, and displaced the score as the authoritative source for interpretation.

Culshaw was a hugely powerful artistic influence as director of A&R and under his proprietorial approach to management there was relatively little scope for other producers to realise their recording aims in full. Culshaw provided a standard of care to emulate, but ultimately, Raeburn rejected his concept of recording, and considered Culshaw’s operas of the 1960s to have shattered the true theatrical illusion by exaggerating the stereo soundscape. Indeed, Raeburn’s Der Rosenkavalier, analysed in Chapter 6, is testament to a post-Culshaw aesthetic in which there is a conscious decluttering of spatial and narrative sound effects, and which places the listener in front of the action, rather than in its midst. As Raeburn remarked, ‘today we have grown out of such exaggerations [of the early 1960s] while maintaining a sense of the theatrical...I’m now totally old-fashioned...You must have a

\textsuperscript{853} Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016.
theatrical feeling, but not by means of irrelevant movement.” The problem was that Raeburn’s purist ideals were out of step with Decca’s pursuit of ever-greater possibilities in fidelity in sound reproduction and control in its audio systems. And as it has been shown in the analysis of Der Rosenkavalier, it was also problematic for Decca’s marketing to find a unique selling point with which to pique consumer interest in a society in thrall to technological innovation, particularly following on from the strong commercial identity of the Sonicstage recordings. Yet although Raeburn’s recording philosophy emphasised aspects of recording resistant to engineering intervention—such as the innate acoustic character of the recording location, adherence to only explicit directions in the score for sound effects, and choosing artists who had a native understanding of language—he was not requested to alter his approach or concoct a factitious philosophy to improve the marketability of his recordings.

Towards the end of his career in the 1980s, Raeburn found himself caught in a technology and marketing revolution that had direct implications for the future and nature of the recording producer’s job. Where Decca had once pioneered the field in recording excellence, it no longer had the economic resources to keep pace with the innovation in professional-standard audio within the evolving global electronics and technology industries. Stifled by a commitment to developing and using its own system and formats—which were not compatible with external systems—the ubiquity of recording technology, now widely commercially accessible, rendered the recording quality attained by Decca no longer unique. In the opinion of Andrew Cornall, Decca and PolyGram failed to react to developing internet technologies in the 1990s that revolutionised music recording, retailing and consumer access elsewhere. Had they re-focused their investment away from developing hardware systems and embraced the potential of internet-based technology and streaming services, ‘it would be a very different industry now,’ Cornall believes, where ‘the artists and the composer would be receiving income from the services. Streaming technically is halting the recording industry from making any money back. So the model on which the industry was based, which I grew up with and when Christopher [Raeburn] was there, has completely broken down [sic].”

---

856 For instance, Decca used a digital audio sampling rate of 48 kHz, while the red book standard was 44.1 kHz. Consequently, its workshops needed to build sample rate converters to produce masters for the CD manufacturing process.
857 Andrew Cornall, interview recorded 15 June 2016.
Becker notes that ‘an activity’s status as art or non-art may change in both directions,’ and is dependent on whether the approaches and methods (and by implication, technologies) remain particular or become commonplace. In such an environment, specialism and craft became harder to defend as touchstones of recording. As David Patmore has indicated, the consequential proliferation of competitive recordings from independent companies in the core classical repertoire created homogeneity and saturated the market, presenting an overwhelming choice for the consumer. Decca had to adapt its strategy, and indeed its product, to differentiate itself from its competition, which it strove to achieve in several ways. The company reignedited a commitment to specialist repertoire by investing in new and regenerated imprints—namely Argo and Entartete Musik—in 1990, which gave a younger generation of producers the opportunity to take an executive lead. Ray Minshull described the re-established profile of Argo as ‘adventurous and fairly contentious,’ but was prepared to allow a five-year investment before reviewing its future. While Raeburn was Decca’s nominal manager of opera production during the 1980s and 1990s and was kept apprised of the production plans for the opera and stage works recorded for the new Entartete Musik series initiated by Michael Haas, there is little indication of his having any direct managerial involvement. Indeed, Raeburn did not share a similar level of artistic and financial independence enjoyed by Cornall and Haas, his junior colleagues. It is perhaps indicative of a subtle departure from the profile of Raeburn’s ‘gentleman producer’ generation that both Cornall and Haas, who had received formative professional music and recording training, were given these opportunities as the company sought out new directions and new audiences.

In addition to diversifying its repertoire offer, Decca also considered further exploitation of its major asset: its exclusive artists. The company’s historic, collective purpose, developed from the early 1950s onwards, had been to create recordings of immutable value from ‘ideal’ interpretations with ‘luxury casts’ supported by the most advanced technology. But where pioneering technology married with peerless interpretations were no longer the primary currencies of unique value, Decca’s marketing

---

858 Howard S. Becker, ‘Art as Collective Action’, American Sociological Review, December 1974, Vol. 39 No. 6, p.768. Becker illustrates this idea with the example of the relationship of the popular music engineer to their use of technology, as described by Edward Kealy (‘Conventions and the Production of the Popular Music Aesthetic’, 1982).


860 See Chapter 5, pp. 166–167 for details of Argo and Entartete Musik.

executives and licencees looked to exploit the reputation of their exclusive artists to recover prestige, and moreover, sales. Wryly, Minshull had warned artists to beware requests to record Christmas albums, because it was an indicator of their poor economic performance. As Evans Mirageas commented, Decca were now obliged to their artists to make a set number of recordings per year, and in return for making more esoteric programmes, they were required to balance this with strategic concept albums designed to be quickly profitable rather than artistically meritorious.

There was, therefore, a shift in emphasis in the product from craft to consumer, and from interpretation to artist. Indeed, the artistic personality and reputation embodied the product, rather than the artist’s interpretation of the repertoire. The commodification of the artist ran contrary to Raeburn’s production philosophy, as stardom, in his view, was earned through artistic endeavour, as he felt had been achieved by Cecilia Bartoli. As it has been shown in chapter 5, for him it was not a contrivance of marketing and publicity in an artistic vacuum, created, as Walter Benjamin argued, as a substitute for the loss of aura in mechanically-produced art. Neither did it, as Theodor Adorno suggests, represent for Raeburn the triumph of populism created by the cultural industry to satisfy its own self-serving ends; the ‘cumulative success which...dates back to the command of publishers, sound film magnates and rulers of radio.’ But by rejecting Benjamin’s and Adorno’s theories of stardom, aura and art production—albeit unknowingly—Raeburn was, of course, acknowledging unconsciously the problems they identified.

The compelling paradox of Raeburn’s career lies in his appointment to the role of audio producer for the original 1990 Three Tenors Concert in Rome, ‘the biggest blockbuster hit in classical recording history’ as Luciano Pavarotti’s manager, Herbert Breslin, describes. As an unforeseen commercial sensation on a global scale, the artist-focused concept, populist repertoire and live worldwide television coverage in conjunction with the FIFA Italia ‘90 World Cup stimulated a new market on an unprecedented scale. As Decca’s commercial planning department analysed sales figures and re-worked projected profitability calculations, the management authorised settlements to Pavarotti that

862 Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016.
863 Ibid. See also Chapter 5, p.165 f.n. 569 which lists a selection of strategic albums devised to support the sales of core repertoire recordings of some of Decca’s most established artists.
included a retainer to cover his efforts to ‘develop, prepare and promote “event-type” recording projects and a premium for maintaining exclusivity’ in a bid to repeat the formula to provide an ongoing subsidy for the company’s operations. While ostensibly the Three Tenors concept was anathema to Raeburn’s recording ethos, his distaste for brutal commerciality and his desire for artistic control, his association with a live event of this magnitude brought the promise of personally lucrative, if artistically-unsophisticated, further work in his retirement from Decca in 1991, and with it a more pragmatic outlook.

Indeed, the spectacular commercial success of the 1990 Three Tenors Concert placed Raeburn in the top ten leading producers of the year alongside Nile Rodgers, Elton John, Phil Collins and Paul Simon in the UK Music Charts. As the only Decca producer who had worked previously with all three tenors—José Carreras, Placido Domingo and Luciano Pavarotti—and from the very beginning of conductor Zubin Mehta’s career, Raeburn was the paragon of trust and experience for such a high-profile project. Yet according to Michael Haas, Raeburn agreed to the Three Tenors project originally as a matter of necessity on the default of Ray Minshull, ‘who hated crossover [music repertoire] and wouldn’t trust any of us youngsters with it.’

Where the traditional role of the studio producer at Decca had been to further artistic relations between the artist and the company, the marketing executive now vied for the position of the closest person institutionally to the artist. And where the emphasis on star quality replaced artistic quality—where the recording benchmark was downgraded to ‘good enough,’ according to Jack Mastroianni—the relevance of the function of the producer as an artistic arbiter invited reappraisal. Some star artists, as Mirageas noted, preferred to develop closer relations with engineers, who they perceived to have a more direct influence on their sound—where their sound was now an exploitable property of their image—than the producer. This was manifest particularly in the case of live recordings, where the scope for a producer’s control of artistic content was considerably more limited. Minshull’s notes show that Pavarotti made as a condition of his participation

---

867 Tim Harrold (PolyGram executive Vice President) letter to Roland Kommerell, 22 January 1991, Ray Minshull papers. The annual retainer for Pavarotti is confirmed as US$100,000, in addition to his settlement for the 1990 Three Tenors Concert of a single payment of US$500,000.
868 In his retirement, Raeburn was appointed as audio producer for the 1994 Three Tenors Concert at the Los Angeles Dodger Stadium with Mehta, and for the 1998 Three Tenors Concert, Champ de Mars, Paris with James Levine, both for Warner Music. See correspondence between Raeburn, Jack Mastroianni and Peter Andry (Warner Music), 8 March 1994 – 23 June 1994, BL/RA.
870 Michael Haas, interview 10 May 2016.
871 Jack Mastroianni, interview recorded 21 July 2016.
872 Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016.
in the 1990 Three Tenors Concert in Rome the appointment of James Lock as the sound engineer, whereas there is no evidence to suggest that a specific producer was requested by name. However, artists such as András Schiff, Christoph von Dohnányi, Riccardo Chailly and Vladimir Ashkenazy, whose recording careers remained aligned to core repertoire rather than to strategic album production and marketing, were deeply committed to the artist-producer relationship. For Schiff, the integrity of this relationship remained a determinant in sustaining the contract. Having developed a fruitful and dedicated recording partnership—and friendship—with Raeburn since the mid-1980s in a series of solo and chamber music recital albums of Mozart, Schubert and Brahms, Schiff saw Raeburn’s retirement in 1991 as a catalyst in his own recording career prospects at Decca. Indeed, in correspondence with Ray Minshull, Schiff makes it clear that without the guarantee of Raeburn as producer he would rather resign than accommodate other styles of production.

Raeburn had presented a dependable and uncorrupt face within the music industry, dedicated to long-term artistic development and to building relationships with his collaborators. This was doubtlessly helped by Raeburn’s lack of executive power, which had liberated him from the necessity to represent the company’s business interests, unlike his colleague Ray Minshull. For this reason, and for their very different personalities, Raeburn and Minshull were an ideal foil for each other. The career-long credit of goodwill Raeburn earned through his efforts in making genuine personal artistic connections (for his own benefit, and also for the benefit of Decca) enabled him to work in his retirement after 1991 on projects and with people that satisfied his interests.

The existence of the studio producer as a discrete role might have been jeopardised from pressure on different sides from marketers and engineers. But ultimately, the structure of Decca’s organisation which was both compartmentalised and interdependent, and the specialisation of its workforce, meant that a singular job could not be absorbed across the organisation, or be made obsolete. The structure either survived intact, or it disintegrated entirely. When Evans Mirageas succeeded Ray Minshull as Executive Vice President, A&R, in 1994, it had been made clear to him by PolyGram’s board that his remit was to reduce the size of the company for it to survive as much as it was to find new talent.

---

and make critically-acclaimed recordings.\textsuperscript{875} The success of The Three Tenors had masked a major downturn in profitability, whereby opera and other large-scale projects were not making a return on their investment. Mirageas was directed to cut the number of new top-price recordings from one hundred per year to thirty, and scale down the number of exclusive artists. This, he says, was largely affected by expiration and attrition rather than by outright aggression. Decca was not, as Mirageas says, ‘a federally-subsidised charitable artistic organisation. This was a full-profit business. The shareholders wanted a return on their business.’\textsuperscript{876} Without the volume of income or workload to support a specialist workforce, Decca’s entire recording operation was disbanded in 1997 as part of PolyGram’s sale to Seagram, itself part of the steady oligopolisation of the music industry. Where in the introduction to this thesis it was shown that music itself was considered to be ‘not enough’ of a focus to sustain the company’s pre-war electronics and sound engineering prowess, music was now subordinated to the requirements of a global market. The arc of the company life cycle, and the rise and fall of the Decca team—including the producer—was complete.

As Raeburn noted himself, Decca had ‘always been a maverick company.’\textsuperscript{877} But his own nonconformism was, paradoxically, based on his attempts to resist recording trends rather than to eclipse them. While railing against technological interventionism on one hand, and the rise of the celebrity artist on the other, he had hoped to revive a romantic, purist ideal in recording that he felt had been lost during Culshaw’s era. Indeed, one of the recurring themes of Raeburn’s career that this thesis has exposed is an awareness of the remoter past, a quality he shared with other members of his personal network, including Andrew Porter. But of course, there had been no ‘loss’ to speak of, just change, which was an inevitable concomitant of the technology-driven, commercial music industry which moved in a singular direction: onwards. In fact, by his attempts to attain, wherever possible, the ‘equipment-free aspect of reality’ or the symbolic ‘blue flower [of Romanticism] in the land of technology’ of which Benjamin speaks,\textsuperscript{878} Raeburn might stand

\textsuperscript{875} Evans Mirageas, interview recorded 20 October 2016. This presents a possible reason why Mirageas chose not to combine his executive A&R position with studio production as Minshull and Culshaw had done, which would have created a conflict of interests.

\textsuperscript{876} Ibid. The archival material and papers that have been consulted lack substantive company financial data, including year-on-year sales figures and recording costs. This is attributable to restrictions on the type of information, to which Raeburn, as a producer, was privy. It also reflects Minshull’s self-limiting in withholding company documents for his own archive.

\textsuperscript{877} Christopher Raeburn, letter to Joan Sutherland and Richard Bonynge, 7 October 2007, BL/RA.

accused by Benjamin as having consigned recording to the ‘height of artifice.’ His notions of purity of experience for the listener in ‘bringing the score to life’ were, however, principled and well-intentioned, but were based on theatrical naturalism rather than audio realism. Armed with the principles of Werktreue and an unquenchable belief in the dramatic powers of the artist, his recording ethos was too subtle to break through the medium to create a truly auratic experience for the listener in the home environment. Perhaps Raeburn should have invented for himself a concept on which to hang his ideas and seal his legacy. But aware of his limitations, he relied too much on the support of his colleagues to navigate him through the bewilderments of recording technology, and on friendship with artists to strengthen his self-confidence in music, to devise for himself a Culshawrian-style creative image.

As Becker asserts, ‘the history of art deals with innovators and innovations that won organizational victories, succeeding in creating around themselves the apparatus of an art world, mobilizing enough people to cooperate in regular ways that sustained and furthered their idea.’ Although resistant to change and innovation, Raeburn was able to win his own, idiosyncratic victory: in building the cooperation and trust of those around him he was able to maintain working in the manner of his choosing. Decca’s unique organisational structure and culture, supporting collegial ideals and accommodating individual ideas, validates the notions that cultural artifacts are indeed ‘shaped by the systems within which they are created,’ and are made possible ‘through the complexity of cooperative [human] networks.’ While the written evidence of Decca’s corporate heritage remains out of reach, the strength of Raeburn’s enduring relationships that fed his desire to preserve a lifetime of correspondence has opened the door to the organisation and its culture of recording.

---

879 Ibid.
880 Howard S. Becker, Art Worlds, p.301.
**Appendices**

**Appendix 1: Decca recordings supervised or assisted by Christopher Raeburn**

Data for Raeburn’s recordings has been derived from the Philip Stuart Decca discography, 2014, with grateful permission. In a small number of instances, the Raeburn Archive has been able to resolve dates and repertoire, which Stuart has updated in the most recent version of the discography at <https://www.eloquenceclassics.com/discographies/>.

Greyed entries indicate recordings made with Raeburn as assistant producer and/or as stereo producer, where mono and (nascent) stereo were recorded simultaneously. All other entries indicate Raeburn as the supervising producer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Repertoire</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Artists/orchestra/conductor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>BOITO Mefistofele</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia, Rome</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia Academy Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Serafin, Siepi, di Stefano, Del Monaco, Tebaldi, Danieli, de Palma, Cavalli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>PUCCINI Madama Butterfly</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia, Rome</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia Academy Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Serafin, Tebaldi, Bergonzì, Cossotto, Sordello, Mercuriali, Washington, Nermo, Cazzato, Carbonari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>PUCCINI arias</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia, Rome</td>
<td>Virginia Zeani, Santa Cecilia Academy Orchestra/Patanè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>PUCCINI La fanciulla del West</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia, Rome</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia Academy Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Capuana, Tebaldi, MacNeil, Del Monaco, de Palma, Maionica, Giorgio Giorgetti, Guagni, Carbonari, Peruzzi, Carlin, Mercuriali, Cazzato, Morresi, Caselli, Casoni, Tozzi, Cesarini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>‘Voce D’Italia’: popular songs</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia, Rome</td>
<td>Orchestra/Oliveri, di Stefano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>BELLINI, GIORDANO, PUCCINI arias</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia, Rome</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia Academy Orchestra/Patanè, di Stefano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>VERDI, CILEA, GIORDANO Arias</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Moralt, Borkh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>ROSSINI repertoire</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall, London</td>
<td>London Symphony Orchestra/Gibson, Berganza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Orchestra/Conductor</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Works/Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Mckellar, Royal Opera House Orchestra/Boult</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>HANDEL and BACH Arias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>London Symphony Orchestra/Maag</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall, London</td>
<td>MOZART Overtures and serenades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Karajan</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>J. STRAUSS II Overtures and Polkas [RCA]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Monteux</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>BRAHMS Symphony No.2 in D Op.73, BEETHOVEN Symphony No.8 in F Op.93, HAYDN Symphony No.94 in G 'Surprise', HAYDN Symphony No.101 in D 'Clock' [RCA]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/W. Boskovsky</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>'Philharmonic Ball': J. STRAUSS II Waltzes, polkas and march</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Solti</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>SUPPÉ repertoire, BEETHOVEN Symphony No.3 in E flat Op.55 'Eroica'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Leinsdorf, Preger, Jurinac, Peerce, Dickie, Pröghof, Panscheff, Peters, Berry, Equiluz, Adam, Rysanek, Coertse, Rössl-Majdan, Maikl</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>STRAUSS Ariadne auf Naxos Op.60 [RCA]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Vienna State Opera Chorus, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Leinsdorf</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>MOZART Don Giovanni K257 [RCA]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Vyyyan, Procter, Pears, Emanuel School Choir, Royal Opera House Chorus, Royal Opera House Orchestra/Britten</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>BRITTEN Spring Symphony Op.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/W. Boskovsky</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>J. STRAUSS II Die Fledermaus and further repertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Reiner</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>BRAHMS eight Hungarian Dances Nos.1,5,6,7,12,13,19 &amp; 21, DVORAK five Slavonic Dances Op.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Vienna State Opera Chorus, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Karajan, Gueden, Koth, Resnik, Zampieri, Kmett, Berry, Waechter, Kunz, Klein, 'B. Fasolt,' 'Omar Godknow,' Björling, Price, Welitsch, B. Nilsson, Simionato, Bastianini</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>J. STRAUSS II Die Fledermaus and further repertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Slobodskaya/Newton</td>
<td>West Hampstead Studio 1</td>
<td>PROKOFIEF, RACHMANINOV, TCHAIKOVSKY seven titles, STRAVINSKY Three Tales for Children, SHOSTAKOVICH Six Spanish Songs Op.100, KABALEVSKY Seven Nursery Rhymes Op.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>VERDI Rigoletto</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia, Rome</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia Academy Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Sanzogno, MacNeil, Sutherland, Cioni, Siepi, Corena, Malagù, Di Stasio, Mercuriali, Morresi, Corti, Valle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>DONIZETTI repertoire</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia, Rome</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia Academy Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Solti, Sutherland, Merrill, Cioni, Siepi, MacNeil, Pelizzoni, Satre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>MOZART Divertimento in D K136 (K125a), Divertimento No.17 in D K334 (K320b)</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Octet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>HAYDN Symphony No.83 in G minor 'La Poule', Symphony No.100 in G 'Military'</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Münchinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>J. STRAUSS I &amp; II, ZIEHRER repertoire</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/W. Boskovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>FALL, KÁLMÁN, LEHÁR, STOLZ, STRAUSS I, STRAUSS II, ZELLER repertoire</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Gueden, Vienna Operetta Chorus, Vienna State Opera Orchestra/Stolz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>VERDI Otello</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Grosstadtkindermchor, Vienna State Opera Chorus, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Karajan/Del Monaco, Protti, Romanato, Cesaroni, Corena, Krause, Tebaldi, Satre, Arbace, Protti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>CESTI, CHERUBINI, Pergolesi, Scarlatti, Granados, Guridi, Lavilla, TURINA eight songs</td>
<td>West Hampstead Studio 3</td>
<td>Berganza, Lavilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>HOLST The Hymn of Jesus Op.37 H140</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>BBC Chorus, BBC Symphony Orchestra/Boult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>VERDI repertoire</td>
<td>Watford Town Hall</td>
<td>B. Nilsson, Royal Opera House Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Quadri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>MOZART repertoire</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Berganza, Parsons, London Symphony Orchestra/Pritchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>VERDI La traviata</td>
<td>Teatro Pergola, Florence</td>
<td>Maggio Musicale Fiorentino Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Pritchard, Sutherland, Truccato-Pace, Carral, Bergonzi, Merrill, de Palma, Pedani, Maionica, Foliani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>MOZART Divertimento No.15 in B flat K287 (K271H), M. HAYDN Divertimento in G</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Octet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>MOZART Symphony No.33 in B flat K319, Symphony No.39 in E flat K543, Clarinet Concerto in A K622, Flute &amp; Harp Concerto in C K299 (K297c)</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Prinz, Tripp, Jelinek, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/István Kertész/Münchinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>J. STRAUSS I &amp; II repertoire</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/W. Boskovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Venue 1</td>
<td>Orchestra 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td><em>The Age of Bel Canto, Volume 1</em>: Puccini, Handel, Shield, Mozart, Handel, Arne, Lampugnani, Boieldieu, Bononcini repertoire</td>
<td>West Hampstead Studio 3</td>
<td>Sutherland, Horne, Conrad, New Symphony Orchestra/Bonyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Verdi Falstaff: excerpts</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Corena, Capecci, Alva, Bowman, Langdon, Ligabue, Marimpietri, Resnik, New Symphony Orchestra/Downes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Verdi, Giordano, Leoncavallo Arias</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Merrill, New Symphony Orchestra/Downes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Ay-ay-ay: Spanish &amp; Latin American songs twelve titles</td>
<td>West Hampstead Studio 3</td>
<td>Alva, New Symphony Orchestra/Pattacini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Bach, Mozart, Gluck repertoire</td>
<td>West Hampstead Studio 3</td>
<td>C. Monteux, London Symphony Orchestra/P. Monteux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Bellini I puritani</td>
<td>Teatro Pergola, Florence</td>
<td>Maggio Musicale Fiorentino Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Bonyne, Sutherland, Foiani, Flagello, Duval, Capecci, de Palma, Elkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Rossini La Cenerentola</td>
<td>Teatro Pergola, Florence</td>
<td>Maggio Musicale Fiorentino Chorus &amp; Orchestra/De Fabritius, Benelli, Brusiantini, Montarsolo, Carral, Truccato-Pace, Simionato, Foiani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Adam Le Diable à quatre, ballet</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>London Symphony Orchestra/Bonyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Aubert, Drigo, Helsted, Minkus repertoire [RCA]</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>London Symphony Orchestra/Bonyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Bellini Norma</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>London Symphony Orchestra &amp; Chorus/Bonyne, Sutherland, Horne, Alexander, Cross, Minton, Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Rossini Il barbiere di Siviglia</td>
<td>Conservatorio, Naples</td>
<td>Naples Rossini Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Varviso, Benelli, Corena, Berganza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Mozart, Rossini, Donizetti, Meyerbeer Arias</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Horne, Royal Opera House Orchestra/Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Beethoven Fidelio Op.72</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna State Opera Chorus, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Maazel, Grobe, Scuitti, Böhme, B. Nilsson, Krause, McCracken, Prey, Equiluz, Adam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Strauss Der Rosenkavalier Op.59: excerpts</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna State Opera Chorus, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Silvio Varviso, Crespin, Söderström, Holecek, Gueden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Donizetti, Herold, Mailart, Offenbach, Rossini, Verdi, Wallace Overtures</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>London Symphony Orchestra/Bonyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Schubert Die Schöne Müllerin D795 Unpublished</td>
<td>West Hampstead Studio 3</td>
<td>Prey, Brendel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Performers/Ensembles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>GRIEG, SIBELIUS, RANGSTROM Songs</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>B. Nilsson, Vienna State Opera Orchestra/Bokstedt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>LEHÁR Der Zarewitsch: excerpts Der Graf von Luxemburg: excerpts</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Volksoper Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Schönherr, Gueden, Kmentt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>ROSSINI Semiramide</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Ambrosian Opera Chorus London Symphony Orchestra/Bonyenge, Sutherland, Horne, Rouleau, Serge, Malas, Langdon, Fyson, Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>BEETHOVEN Piano and Wind Quintet in E flat Op.16, MOZART Piano and Wind Quintet in E flat K452</td>
<td>West Hampstead Studio 3</td>
<td>Ashkenazy, London Wind Soloists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>PUCCINI Tosca</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia, Rome</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia Academy Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Maazel, B. Nilsson, Corelli, Fischer-Dieskau, Maionica, de Palma, Mantovani, Marriotti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>LISZT &amp; WAGNER Preludes</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Mehta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>VERDI &amp;PUCCINI Arias</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Weathers, Vienna Opera Orchestra/Quadri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>DONIZETTI La Fille du régiment</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Royal Opera House Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Bonyenge, Sutherland, Pavarotti, Malas, Sinclair, Bruyère, Garrett, Jones, Coates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>BELLINI Norma</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia, Rome</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia Academy Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Varviso, Souliotis, Cossotto, Del Monaco, Cava, Tavolaccini, Cesarini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>BEETHOVEN, WEBER, WAGNER Arias</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>King, Vienna Opera Orchestra/Bernet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>MOZART, WAGNER, BORODIN, ROSSINI, GIORDANO, LEONCAVALLO Arias</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Krause, Vienna Opera Orchestra/Quadri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>BIZET, MASSENET, SAINT-SAÉNS, THOMAS, BACH, HANDEL repertoire</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Horne, Vienna Opera Orchestra, Vienna Cantata Orchestra/Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>VERDI Messa da Requiem</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Sutherland, Horne, Pavarotti, Talvela, Vienna State Opera Chorus, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Solti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Artists, Conductors, Orchestras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>'Covent Garden 21st Anniversary Gala': BIZET, MOZART, BEETHOVEN, STRAUSS, VERDI, BRITTEN, BERLIOZ repertoire</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Carlyle, Jones, Kelly, Dobson, Robson, Minton, Langdon, Lanigan, Gobbi, Robinson, Howells, MacDonald, Bryn-Jones, Veasey, Royal Opera House Orchestra/Solti/Kubelik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>MUSSORGSKY, VERDI, PUCCINI repertoire</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Lanigan, Rouleau, Geraint Evans, Vaughan, Pellegrini, Bonhomme, Bryn-Jones; Royal Opera House Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Downes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>WALTON &amp; WAGNER repertoire</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Collier, Pears, Ward, Royal Opera House Orchestra/Walton/Goodall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>GLIERE, GRETCHANINOV, STRAVINSKY, CUI repertoire</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Sutherland, London Symphony Orchestra/Bonygne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>MOZART Don Giovanni K527</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Ambrosian Singers, English Chamber Orchestra/Bonygne, Gramm, Sutherland, Bacquier, Grant, Krenn, Lorengar, Horne, Monreale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>HEUBERGER, NICOLAI, REZNICEK, J STRAUSS II repertoire</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/W. Boskovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>DONIZETTI &amp; VERDI Arias</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Pavarotti, Vienna Opera Orchestra/Downes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>MOZART repertoire</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Mozart Ensemble, W. Boskovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>'A Tebaldi Festival': WAGNER MASSENET, SAINTE-SAENS, BIZET, VERDI, PUCCINI, ROSSINI, CARDILLO, DE CURTIS, LARA, TOSTI RODGERS opera and operetta arias</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Tebaldi, New Philharmonia Orchestra, Guadagno/Bonygne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>KODALY repertoire</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>London Symphony Orchestra &amp; Chorus/Kertész</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>WAGNER &amp; MAHLER Lieder</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Horne, Royal Philharmonic Orchestra/Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>SCHUBERT Symphony No.8 in B minor D759 'Unfinished'</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Krips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>'Vienna Imperial': J. STRAUSS II repertoire</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/W. Boskovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>BEETHOVEN repertoire</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Schmidt-Isserstedt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>BEETHOVEN repertoire</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Mozart Ensemble/W. Boskovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>ROSSINI, BELLINI, VERDI, CILEA repertoire</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Pavarotti, Flossman, Auger, Bunger, Lackner, Vienna Opera Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Rescigno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>HAYDN and MOZART Arias</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Fischer-Dieskau, Vienna Haydn Orchestra/Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>'Michael Kelly &amp; Mozart': documentary based on Kelly's Reminiscences</td>
<td>West Hampstead Studios (?)</td>
<td>Abrams, Klein, Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Composer/Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Performers/Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>DONIZETTI L'elisir d'amore</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Ambrosian Opera Chorus, English Chamber Orchestra/Bonyng, Pavarotti, Sutherland, Cossa, Malas, Casula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>LISZT Piano repertoire</td>
<td>London Opera Centre, Stepney</td>
<td>Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>MOZART-Wendt Le nozze di Figaro K492</td>
<td>West Hampstead Studio 3</td>
<td>London Wind Soloists/Brymer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>RACHMANINOV Piano Concertos 2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Ashkenazy, London Symphony Orchestra/Previn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>'Prima Donna in Paris' 1: BIZET, GLUCK, GOUNOD, HAHN, MASSENET, OFFENBACH, SAINT-SAÉNS Arias &amp; songs</td>
<td>Victoria Hall, Geneva</td>
<td>Crespin, Suisse Romande Orchestra/Lombard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>'Prima Donna in Paris' 2: MESSAGER, OFFENBACH, O. STRAUS, BERLIOZ, BIZET, CHRISTINÉ, HAHN, MASSENET Arias</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Crespin, Vienna Volksoper Orchestra/Lombard/Sebastian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>BRUCKNER Symphony No.3 in D minor (1890 version)</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Böhm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>SCHUBERT &amp; SCHUMANN Lieder</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Krenn, Werba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>'Vienna, Women and Song': DOSTAL, KÁLMÁN, KÜNEKE, MILLÖCKER, J. STRAUSS II, SUPPÉ, LEHÁR repertoire</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Holm, Krenn, Vienna Volksoper Orchestra/Paulik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>BRAHMS, SCHUBERT, SCHUMANN, STRAUSS, WOLF Lieder</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Jungwirth, Brenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>SAINT-SAÉNS &amp; RAVEL repertoire</td>
<td>Royce Hall, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Priest, Boyes, Robbins, Los Angeles Master Chorale, Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra/Mehta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>PIETRI, DONIZETTI, PONCHIELLI, BOITO, PUCCINI Arias</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Pavarotti, New Philharmonia Orchestra/Magiera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>PALESTRINA repertoire</td>
<td>St. John's College, Cambridge</td>
<td>St. John's College Choir/Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>'Christmas Festival'</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Tebaldi, Ambrosian Singers, New Philharmonia Orchestra/Guadagno, Thalben-Ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>DONIZETTI Lucia di Lammermoor</td>
<td>Royal Opera House Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Bonyng, Sutherland, Milnes, Pavarotti, Ghiaurov, Davies, Poli, Tourangeau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>SCHUBERT Symphonies Nos.3 , 4, 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Kertész</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>BORODIN, DARGOMÍZHSKY, GLINKA, RUBINSTEIN, TCHAIKOVSKY Songs</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>N. Ghiaurov, Z. Ghiaurov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Venue 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Symphonies Nos. 1 and 2</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>String Quintets</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Rossini</td>
<td>Excerpts</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Triple Piano Concerto No.7 in F K242 [b] Double Piano Concerto No.10 in E flat K365 (K316a)</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Szenen aus Goethes Faust WoO.3</td>
<td>Snape Maltings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Parsifal -</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Serenade No.7 in D K250 (K248b) 'Haffner'</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Herbst D945, Schwanengesang D957</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Bizet, Gounod, Verdi, Leoncavallo</td>
<td>Arias</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Brahms</td>
<td>Symphonies Nos. 25, 29, 35, 40</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No. 4 in E minor Op.98</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Verdi, Meyerbeer, Massenet, Thomas, Gounod, Bizet</td>
<td>Arias</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Violin Sonatas Nos. 1, 2, &amp; 9</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Serenade No.9 in D K320 'Posthorn'</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Brahms</td>
<td>Symphony No.1 in C minor Op.68, Symphony No. 3 in F Op.90, Variations on a Theme of Haydn Op.56a 'St Antoni'</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Vivaldi</td>
<td>Concertos</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Composer, works</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Artists/Ensembles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>SCHUBERT, WOLF, LOEWE, BRAHMS, STRAUSS Lieder</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Hotter, Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>MOZART Six Flute Sonatas K10-K15</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Schul, Medimorec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>WAGNER Overtures and Preludes</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>BERWALD Piano Quintet No.1 in C minor, Piano Quintet No.2 in A</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonia Quintet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>J. STRAUSS I &amp; II Waltzes and polkas</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna State Opera Chorus; Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/W. Boskovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>MOZART Violin Sonatas</td>
<td>All Saints, Petersham/Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Goldberg, Lupu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>DUKAS L'Apprenti sorcier, Symphony in C</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>London Philharmonic Orchestra/Weller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>BACH Partita No.2 in D minor BWV1004, Sonata No.3 in C BWV1005</td>
<td>All Saints, Petersham</td>
<td>K-W Chung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>GRIEG repertoire</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>National Philharmonic Orchestra/W. Boskovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>PUCCINI Madama Butterfly</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna State Opera Chorus, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Karajan, Freni, Pavarotti, Ludwig, Kems, Sénéchal, Rintzer, Schary, Stendoro, Helm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>SCHMIDT &amp; BRUCKNER Piano Quintets</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Mrazek, Prinz, Vienna Philharmonia Quintet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>VIVALDI, BRUCKNER, BEETHOVEN, WIENIAWSKI, WEBER, RIMSKY-KORSAKOV, HAYDN repertoire</td>
<td>Royce Hall, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Zentner, Zukovsky, Stevens, Dicterow, Harth, Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra/Mehta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>RACHMANINOV Preludes</td>
<td>All Saints, Petersham/Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Composers/Works</td>
<td>Performers</td>
<td>Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>STRAVINSKY The Soldier’s Tale (ARGO)</td>
<td>Tollington Park Studios/Argo Studios, Fulham Road.</td>
<td>Jackson, Nureyev, MacLiammóir, Gruenberg, ensemble/ Zalkowitsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>MOZART String Quartet in D K575, String Quartet in F K590</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Küchli Quartet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>MOZART Le nozze di Figaro K492 video [UNITEL]</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Soldi, Fischer-Dieskau, Te Kanawa, Freni, Prey, Ewing, Begg, van Kesteren, Caron, Montarsolo, Kraemmer, Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>STRAVINSKY The Soldier’s Tale (ARGO)</td>
<td>Tollington Park Studios/Argo Studios, Fulham Road.</td>
<td>Jackson, Nureyev, MacLiammóir, Gruenberg, ensemble/ Zalkowitsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>MOZART Le nozze di Figaro K492 video [UNITEL]</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonia Orchestra/Soldi, Fischer-Dieskau, Te Kanawa, Freni, Prey, Ewing, Begg, van Kesteren, Caron, Montarsolo, Kraemmer, Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>BRAHMS String Quartet No.3 in B flat Op.67, SCHUMANN String Quartet in A minor Op.41/1</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Musikverein Quartet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>MOZART Serenade No.5 in D D K204 (K213a), Serenade No.6 in D K239 'Serenata notturna', Divertimento for Strings in D K136 (K125a)</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Küchli, Vienna Mozart Ensemble/W. Boskovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>SCHUMANN Symphony No.1 in B flat Op.38 'Spring', Symphony No.4 in D minor Op.120</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Mehta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>BRUCKNER Te Deum in C, Mass No.2 in E minor</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Blegen, Litowa, Ahnsjö, Meven, Vienna State Opera Chorus, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Mehta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>MENDELSSOHN Symphony No.1 in C minor Op.11, Symphony No.5 in D Op.107 'Reformation'</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Dohnányi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>HAYDN Flute Trio in G H.XV.15, Flute Trio in D H.XV.16, Flute Trio in F H.XV.17</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Flute Trio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>MAHLER Symphony No.6 in A minor video [UNITEL]</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Bernstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>BERG Lulu (unfinished two act version)</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Dohnányi, Silja, Fassbaender, Schmidt, Pröglhöf, Laubenthal, Berry, Hopferwieser, Moll, Schenk, Hotter, Sramek, Zednik, Bence, Krenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>MENDELSSOHN Symphony No.2 in B flat Op.52 'Lobgesang'</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Ghazarian, Gruberová, Krenn, Vienna State Opera Chorus, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Dohnányi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>ELGAR Pomp and Circumstance marches, arr. ELGAR God Save the Queen (LPO concert version)</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>London Philharmonic Orchestra/Solti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>DEBUSSY</td>
<td>Violin Sonata</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>SCHUMANN</td>
<td>Frauenliebe und-leben Op.42, RACHMANINOV Piano Sonata No.2 in B flat minor Op.36</td>
<td>All Saints, Petersham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>MOZART</td>
<td>Piano Concerto No.17 in G K453 Piano Concerto No.21 in C K467</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>DONIZETTI</td>
<td>La Favorite &amp;</td>
<td>Teatro Communale, Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>BEETHOVEN</td>
<td>Septet in E flat Op.20</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>HAYDN</td>
<td>Arianna a Naxos – cantata H.XXVIb.2</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>MOZART</td>
<td>Clarinet Trio in E flat</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>KODÁLY</td>
<td>String Quartet No.2 Op.10, SUK String Quartet No.1 in B flat Op.11, WOLF Italian Serenade</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>MOZART</td>
<td>Piano Concerto No.19 in F K459, Piano Concerto No.22 in E flat K482</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>BELLINI, PONCHIELLI, VERDI</td>
<td>Arias</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>MOZART, MERCADANTE, BELLINI</td>
<td>Arias</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>RAVEL</td>
<td>Tzigane</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>HUMPERDINCK</td>
<td>Hänsel und Gretel</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>MOZART</td>
<td>Divertimenti, Serenade No.8 in D K286 (K269a)</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>MENDELSSOHN</td>
<td>String Quintet No.1 in A Op.18, String Quintet No.2 in B flat Op.87</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>BARTÓK &amp; LISZT</td>
<td>Songs</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>MOZART</td>
<td>Piano Concerto No.16 in D K451, Piano Concerto No.24 in C minor K491</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>BERG</td>
<td>Wozzeck Op.7</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>BELLINI</td>
<td>La sonnambula</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>BEETHOVEN</td>
<td>Violin Concerto in D Op.61, DVOŘÁK Symphony No.9 in E minor Op.95 B178</td>
<td>Paris Opera Chorus, National Philharmonic Orchestra/Bonyenge, Sutherland, Jones, Lambrics, Pavarotti, Manuguerra, Oliver, Summers, Tomlinson, Tadeo, Gardini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>BELLINI</td>
<td>La sonnambula</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Composer/Work</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Orchestra/Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.23 in A K488, Piano Concerto No.27 in D K595, Rondo in D K382</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.12 in A K414 (K385p), Piano Concerto No.27 in D K595, Rondo in D K382</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>MOZART Serenade No.10 in B flat K361 (K370a)</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Wind Solists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>MOZART Arias Recorded for Time-Life magazine</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Te Kanawa, Gruberová, Laki, Hőbarth, Berganza, Vienna Chamber Orchestra/Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>TCHAIKOVSKY Symphony No.5 in E minor Op.64</td>
<td>Mann Auditorium, Tel Aviv</td>
<td>L. Price, Israel Philharmonic Orchestra/Mehta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>BEETHOVEN, ROSSINI, TCHAIKOVSKY, RIMSKY-KORSAKOV repertoire</td>
<td>Mann Auditorium, Tel Aviv</td>
<td>Israel Philharmonic Orchestra/Mehta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>BOITO Mefistofele</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Trinity Boys Choir, London Opera Chorus, National Philharmonic Orchestra/De Fabritiis, Ghiaurov, Pavarotti, Freni, Condó, de Palma, Jones, Caballé, Leggate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.13 in C K415 (K387b), Piano Concerto No.27 in D K595, Rondo in D K382</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>SIBELIUS Songs [ARGO]</td>
<td>Rosslyn Hill Chapel, Hampstead</td>
<td>Krause, Gage, Bonell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>SIBELIUS &amp; TCHAIKOVSKY Songs</td>
<td>Rosslyn Hill Chapel, Hampstead</td>
<td>Söderström, Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.25 in C K503</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.15 in B flat K450, Piano Concerto No.27 in D K595, Rondo in D K382</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>VERDI Arias</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Nucci, National Philharmonic Orchestra/Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>WAGNER Excerpts</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Solti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>SCHUBERT Lieder</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Fontana, Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.20 in D minor K466</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall, London</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Orchestra/Conductor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Los Instrumentos de la Orquesta: excerpts</td>
<td>Brent Town Hall</td>
<td>London Philharmonic Orchestra/López-Cobos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.26 in D K537 'Coronation'</td>
<td>Kingsway Hall</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>WAGNER Das Rheingold, Die Walküre, Siegfried, Götterdämmerung Live recordings. Unpublished</td>
<td>Festspielhaus, Bayreuth</td>
<td>Bayreuth Festival Chorus, Bayreuth Festival Orchestra/Solti, Jerusalem, Haugland, Behrens, Fassbaender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>MOZART Arias</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Winbergh, Vienna Chamber Orchestra/Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>BEETHOVEN Piano Concertos No.1, 2, 3, 4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Ashkenazy, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Mehta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>PUCCINI Tosca</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Welsh National Opera Chorus, National Philharmonic Orchestra/Solti, Te Kanawa, Aragall, Nucci, King, de Palma, Martinez, Hudson, Folwell, Malas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Folk Music of the Region of Asturias</td>
<td>Henry Wood Hall</td>
<td>Pixa, London Philharmonic Orchestra/López-Cobos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.18 in B flat K456</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>MUSSORGSKY &amp; VERDI Arias</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Burchuladze, McLeod, London Opera Chorus, English Concert Orchestra/Downes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>MOZART Symphony No.40 in G minor K550, Symphony No.41 in C K551 'Jupiter'</td>
<td>Alte Oper, Frankfurt</td>
<td>Chamber Orchestra of Europe/Solti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>SCHUBERT Symphony No.5 in B flat D485, Symphony No.8 in B minor D759 'Unfinished'</td>
<td>Sofiensaal, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Solti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.8 in C K246</td>
<td>St. Barnabas, Woodside Park</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Christmas with Kiri: twelve titles</td>
<td>CTS Studios, Wembley</td>
<td>Te Kanawa, London Voices, Philharmonia Orchestra/Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Bel Canto Arias: ROSSINI, BELLINI, DONIZETTI, VERDI, MEYERBEER</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Sutherland, Welsh National Opera Orchestra/Bonyege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Con Amore: BRAHMS, CHAMINADE, CHOPIN, DEBUSSY, ELGAR, GOSSEC, KREISLER, NOVÁČEK, SAINT-SAËNS, TCHAIKOVSKY, WIENIAWSKI, etc. seventeen titles</td>
<td>Forde Abbey, Dorset</td>
<td>K-W Chung, Moll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.5 in D K175, Piano Concerto No.14 in E flat K449</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>STRAUSS Arabella Op.79</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Royal Opera House Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Tate, Gutstein, Dernesch, Te Kanawa, Fontana, Grundhever, Seiffert, Ionitza, Cachemaillie, Rydl, Bradley, Runkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.6 in B flat K238, Piano Concerto No.11 in F K143 (K387a)</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Bel Canto Arias: ROSSINI, BELLINI, DONIZETTI, VERDI</td>
<td>Abbey Road Studio 1</td>
<td>Nucci, English Chamber Orchestra/Masini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>MUSSORGSKY-RAVEL Pictures at an Exhibition, DEBUSSY-Ravel Dans - Tarantelle styrienne, DEBUSSY-Ravel Sarabande, RAVEL Bolero</td>
<td>Concertgebouw, Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam Concertgebouw Orchestra/Chailly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1984 & 1986  
MOZART Idomeneo K366, Don Giovanni K527: Dalla sua pace, Così fan tutte K588: Un'aura amorosa  
Grosser Saal, Konzerthaus /Walthamstow Vienna  
Vienna State Opera Concert Choir, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/John Pritchard, Pavarotti, Baltsa, Popp, Gruberová, Nucci, Jenkins, Storozhev

1986  
WAGNER Lohengrin  
Sofiensaal, Vienna  
Vienna State Opera Concert Choir, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Solti, Domingo, Norman, Németh, Randová, Fischer-Dieskau

1986  
MOZART Variations in C K265 (K300e), Variations in G K455, Minuet in D K355 (K576b), Adagio in C K356 (K617a), Rondo in A minor K511, Adagio in B minor K540, Gigue in G K574, Andante in F K616  
Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna  
Schiff

1986  
MOZART Piano Concerto No.1 in D minor Op.49, BACH English Suites BWV806-811  
Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna  
Schiff, Vienna Philharmonic/Dohnányi

1986  
DVOŘÁK Piano Trio No.1 in B flat Op.21 B51, Piano Trio No.3 in F minor Op.65 B130  
Schubert Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna  
Chung Trio

1987  
MOZART Piano Concerto No.1, 2, 3 & 4  
St.Barnabas, Woodside Park  
Philharmonia Orchestra/Ashkenazy

1987  
D. SCARLATTI fifteen Sonatas  
Walthamstow Assembly Hall  
Schiff

1987  
PUCCINI Manon Lescaut  
San Giorgio Poggiale, Bologna/ St.George the Martyr, London  
Bologna Theatre Chorus & Orchestra/Chaillly, Te Kanawa, Coni, Carreras, Tajo, Matteuzzi, Freschi, Zimmermann, de Palma, Tadeo, Gaifa

1987  
BEETHOVEN, WAGNER, VERDI Arias  
Teatro Communale, Bologna  
Dunn, Bologna Theatre Orchestra/Chaillly

1987  
MENDELSSOHN Piano Trio No.1 in D minor Op.49, BRAHMS Piano Trio No.1 in B Op.8  
Schubert Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna  
Chung Trio

1987  
Schubert Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna  
Berkes, Vlatkovic, Schiff, Takács String Quartet

1988  
BACH English Suites BWV806-811  
University Music School, Cambridge  
Schiff

1988  
ROSSINI Il barbiere di Siviglia  
Teatro Communale, Bologna  
Bologna Theatre Chorus & Orchestra/ Patanè, Matteuzzi, Fissore, Bartoli, Nucci, Burchuladze, Pertusi, Banditelli

1988  
Parlami d’Amore: DE CURTIS, DI CAPUJA, GASTALDON, TOSTI, etc. fifteen titles  
Teatro Communale, Bologna  
Nucci, ensemble/Marcarini

1988  
BRAHMS Piano Concerto No.1 in D minor Op.15, Variations on a Theme by Schumann Op.23  
Grosser Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna  
Schiff, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Solti

1988  
ROSSINI Arias  
Grosser Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna  
Bartoli, Arnold Schönberg Choir, Vienna Volksoper Orchestra/Patanè

1988  
SCHUBERT Schwanengesang D957 four Lieder D866/2, D870, D878 & D945  
Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna  
Schreier, Schiff

1988  
SCHUBERT Twelve Ländler D790, Allegretto in C minor D915, Four Impromptus Op.142 D935, Drei Klavierstücke D946  
Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna  
Schiff
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Orchestra/Conductor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Piano Concerto No.24 in C minor K491, Piano Concerto No.25 in C K503</td>
<td>Grosser Saal, Mozarteum, Salzburg</td>
<td>Schiff, Camerata Academica Salzburg/Végh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Verdi</td>
<td>Rigoletto</td>
<td>Teatro Communale, Bologna</td>
<td>Bologna Theatre Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Chailly, Nucci, Anderson, Pavarotti, Ghiaurov, de Carolis, Verrett, Mosca, de Palma, Scaltriti, de Bortoli, Antonacci, Laurenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Adagio in B flat K411 (K484a)</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Wind Soloists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>unidentified arias Unpublished</td>
<td>Grosser Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Heilmann, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Hager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Der Schauspieldirektor K486, Le nozze di Figaro K492: Overture</td>
<td>Grosser Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Pritchard, Gruberová, Te Kanawa, Heilmann, Jungwirth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Clarinet Quintet in A K581, WEBER Clarinet Quintet in B flat Op.34 J182</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Octet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Piano Concerto No.22 in E flat K482, Piano Concerto No.23 in A K466</td>
<td>Grosser Saal, Mozarteum, Salzburg</td>
<td>Schiff, Camerata Academica Salzburg/Végh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Die Schöne Müllerin D795</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Schreier, Schiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Piano Concerto No.20 in D minor K466, Piano Concerto No.21 in C K467</td>
<td>Grosser Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Schiff, Camerata Academica Salzburg/Végh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td>Lieder</td>
<td>Walthamstow Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Te Kanawa, Solti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Verdi</td>
<td>II trovatore</td>
<td>Teatro Communale, Florence</td>
<td>Maggio Musicale Fiorentino Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Mehta, Nucci, Banaudi, Verrett, Pavarotti, d’Artegna, Frittoli, de Palma, Scaltriti, Facini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Three Tenors: Cilea, Giordano, Lehár, Meyerbeer, Puccini, Cardillo, de Curtis, Lara, etc</td>
<td>senza titolo, Overture Terme di Caracalla, Rome</td>
<td>Carreras, Domingo &amp; Pavarotti, Maggio Musicale Fiorentino Orchestra, Rome Opera Orchestra/Mehta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Cilea</td>
<td>GIORDANO, CATALANI, ALFANO, ZANDONAI, MASCAGNI, PUCCINI Arias</td>
<td>Teatro La Fenice, Venice</td>
<td>Freni, Teatro La Fenice Orchestra/R. Abbado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Arias</td>
<td>Grosser Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Bartoli, Schiff; Vienna Chamber Orchestra/Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Menuet and Finale in F D72, Octet in F Op.166 D803</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Wind Soloists, Vienna Octet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>repertoire</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Schiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Rossini</td>
<td>Giovanna d’Arco – scena, La regata veneziana, Mi lagnerò tacendo: five settings, eleven songs</td>
<td>Schubert Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Bartoli, Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.5 in C minor Op.67, SHOSTAKOVICH Symphony No.9 in E flat Op.70 Live recording</td>
<td>Grosser Saal, Musikverein, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Solti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Performers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.5 in D K175, Piano Concerto No.6 in B flat K238, Rondo in D K382</td>
<td>Stiftskirche, Millstatt</td>
<td>Schiff, Camerata Academica Salzburg/Végh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>MOZART Lieder</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Schreier, Schiff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>STRAUSS Vier Letzte Lieder AV150</td>
<td>Grosse Saal, Vienna</td>
<td>Te Kanawa, Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra/Solti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>BRAHMS seventeen Lieder, Vier ernste Gesänge Op.121</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Holl, Schiff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.15 in B flat K450, Piano Concerto No.16 in D K451</td>
<td>Grosse Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Schiff, Camerata Academica Salzburg/Végh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>'A Portrait': MOZART, PERGOLESI, ROSSINI &amp; VIVALDI twelve titles Video [LONDON WEEKEND TELEVISION]</td>
<td>Savoy Hotel, London</td>
<td>Bartoli, Fischer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>SCHUBERT Piano Sonata in A Op.120, D664 Piano Sonata in B flat D960</td>
<td>Salle de Châtonnayere, Corseaux</td>
<td>Lupu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>ROSSINI Arias</td>
<td>Teatro La Fenice, Venice</td>
<td>Bartoli, Teatro La Fenice Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Marin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>PUCCINI II tabarro, Suor Angelica, Gianni Schicchi (Il Trittico)</td>
<td>Teatro Verdi, Florence</td>
<td>Maggio Musicale Fiorentino Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Bartoletti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>'Arie Antiche': CACCINI, CALDARA, CARISSIMI, CAVALLI, CESTI, GIORDANI, LOTTI, MARCELLO, PAISELLO, SCARLATTI, VIVALDI, etc. twenty-one titles</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Bartoli, Fischer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>BACH French Suites BWV812-817, Partita No.7 in B minor BWV831 'French Overture', Italian Concerto in F BWV971</td>
<td>Reitstadel, Neumarkt</td>
<td>Schiff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>SCHUMANN Liederkreis Op.39</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Holl, Schiff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>SCHUBERT Winterreise Op.89 D911, Auf dem Strom D943</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Schreier, Schiff, Vlatkovic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>BEETHOVEN Septet in E flat Op.20</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Octet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>ROSSINI La Cenerentola</td>
<td>Teatro Communale, Bologna</td>
<td>Bologna Theatre Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Chailly, Matteuzzi, Corbelli, Dara, Costa, Banditelli, Bartoli, Pertusi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>MOZART &amp; BEETHOVEN repertoire</td>
<td>Schubert Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna Wind Soloists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>HAYDN, MOZART, BEETHOVEN, SCHUBERT repertoire</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Bartoli, Schiff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>SCHUBERT Die Schöne Müllerin D795</td>
<td>Markgräflisches Opernhaus, Bayreuth</td>
<td>Heilmann, Levine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Musicians/Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>SCHUBERT Piano Sonatas</td>
<td>Brahmsaal, Musikverein, Vienna</td>
<td>Schiff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>'Great Sacred Songs': BACH, HANDEL, HAYDN, MENDELSSOHN &amp; MOZART</td>
<td>Paul Gerhardt-Kirche, Leipzig</td>
<td>Heilmann, Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra/Schreier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thirteen titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>MOZART repertoire</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Bartoli, Vienna Chamber Orchestra/Fischer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Concerto No.26 in D K537 'Coronation'</td>
<td>Grosse Saal, Mozarteum, Salzburg</td>
<td>Schiff, Camerata Academica Salzburg/Vegh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>MOZART Piano Quartet in G minor K478, Piano Quartet in E flat K493</td>
<td>Wiener Saal, Mozarteum, Salzburg</td>
<td>Shiokawa, Höbarth, Perényi, Schiff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>MOZART Piano and Wind Quintet in E flat K452</td>
<td>Mozart Saal, Konzerthaus, Vienna</td>
<td>Holliger, Schmid, Thunemann, Vlatkovic, Schiff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>HAYDN Piano Trios</td>
<td>Brahmsaal, Musikverein, Vienna</td>
<td>Musiktag Monsee Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>BEETHOVEN Lieder</td>
<td>Brahmsaal, Musikverein, Vienna</td>
<td>Schreier, Schiff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>'The Three Tenors in Concert, 1994': LEONCAVALLO, MASSENET,</td>
<td>Live recording Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Carreras, Domingo &amp; Pavarotti, Los Angeles Music Center Opera Chorus, Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra/Mehta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUCCINI, VERDI, DE CURTIS, LARA, RODGERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[licenced to WARNER MUSIC]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>‘Chant d’Amour’: VIARDOT, BERLIOZ, BIZET, DELIBES, RAVEL repertoire</td>
<td>Henry Wood Hall</td>
<td>Bartoli, M-W Chung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>ROSSINI, BELLINI, DONIZETTI songs</td>
<td>Markgräfliches Opernhaus, Bayreuth</td>
<td>Bartoli, Levine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>‘My World-Songs From Around the Globe’: BRODSZKY, DELIBES, DVORAK,</td>
<td>Henry Wood Hall</td>
<td>Gheorghiu, Martineau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FALLA, GRIEG, LEONCAVALLO, LISZT, MARTINI, MONTSALVATGHE, POULENC,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESPIGHI, SATIE, SCHUBERT, SCHUMANN, STRAUSS, etc. twenty-five titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>ROSSINI Il turco in Italia</td>
<td>Sala Verdi, Milan</td>
<td>La Scala Chorus &amp; Orchestra/Chailly, Bartoli, Polverelli, Vargas, Piccol, Pertusi, Corbelli, di Candia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>DONIZETTI, VERDI, MASCAGNI repertoire</td>
<td>Sala Verdi, Milan</td>
<td>Bartoli, Pavarotti, chorus, Giuseppe Verdi Symphony Orchestra/Chailly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Twenty-six titles</td>
<td>Champ de Mars, Paris</td>
<td>Carreras, Domingo &amp; Pavarotti, Paris Orchestra/Levine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Live recording</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>‘Live in Italy’: BELLINI, BERLIOZ, BIZET, CACCINI, DONIZETTI,</td>
<td>Teatro Olimpico, Vicenza Live recording</td>
<td>Bartoli, Thibaudet, Sonatori de la GioiosaMarca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIORDANI, HANDEL, MONTSALVATGHE, MOZART, ROSSINI, SCHUBERT, VIARDOT &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIVALDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Performer(s)</td>
<td>Repertoire</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Orchestras/Ensembles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>MOZART, ROSSINI, DONIZETTI</td>
<td>repertoire</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia, Rome</td>
<td>Bartoli, Terfel, Santa Cecilia Academy Orchestra/M-W Chung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>VIVALDI four titles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Künstlerhaus, Boswil</td>
<td>Bartoli, Il Giardino Armonico/Antonini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>VIVALDI twelve titles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephaniensaal, Graz</td>
<td>Bartoli, Arnold Schönberg Choir, Il Giardino Armonico/Antonini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>GLUCK repertoire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Babelsberg Film Studios, Berlin</td>
<td>Bartoli, Akademie für Alte Musik/Forck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>‘Maria’ (Malibran): BELLINI, HALÉVY, HUMMEL, MENDELSSOHN, PACINI, etc. twelve titles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kirche Oberstrass, Zurich</td>
<td>Bartoli, international chamber soloists, Orchestra La Scintilla/Fischer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2: Decca producer timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarton</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeomans</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olof</td>
<td>Victor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs</td>
<td>Terence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culshaw</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andry</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>D.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Erik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minshull</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raeburn</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremner</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raeburn</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordier</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnett</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallinson</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadland</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolcock</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horricks</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowcock</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding</td>
<td>Morten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comall</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hux</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowney</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayers</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirageas</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Blue: A&R staff member
- Light blue: working in another department
- Purple: freelance period
- Red: director of A&R
Appendix 3: A nomenclature of Decca production annotations: scores, libretti, session notes and editing instructions

The Raeburn Archive and the Jack Law Score Collection at the British Library contain between them scores, libretti and session notes relating to Decca recordings and their production. Common to all are markings that are peculiar to the Decca company, which require translation in order to better understand the process of recording. This list has been compiled from these sources, and defined with the assistance of the interviewees for this thesis. Since 1949 when Decca adopted magnetic tape as its recording medium and developed its own production system, it had been possible to play back and manipulate music excerpts using a rudimentary system of block and razor blade cutting. Editing remained a linear take assemblage (though not referred to as such at Decca) using its own proprietary systems after its developments in digital recording in the late 1970s, and score annotations were important in case of the need to reconstruct take sequences from scratch. The Decca digital recording system, on one-inch video tape, remained sequential even after the commercial development of computer-based random access, non-linear systems in the 1980s in the audio industry at large, and there were no other means of digitally capturing details of the parameters of edits made, such as timecode, crossfade duration (the Decca system was limited to symmetrical, linear crossfades only), dB level or use of audio manipulation devices.

In production scores, notes and libretti, the annotations listed below would have been made by producers and editors, as these scores were passed between both groups (and occasionally balance engineers, who made their own separate recording notes in ‘electrical record of session’ sheets) and used during playbacks in the presence of artists, hence the need to devise a coded language for studio diplomacy. Colour-coded annotations were written by both producers and editors (but very rarely by engineers) to indicate the number of the editing stage. Some were notes made for the producers’ or editors’ own reference, and some were to alert colleagues to particular issues with the sound, but the significance of this folk taxonomy would have been understood by all recording personnel.

883 Peter Van Biene (interview recorded 19 October 2016) has remarked that some engineers, such as Jack Law, used non-magnetic brass scissors to edit tape.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol/Acronym</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edit point – for singular, repeated and da capo (i.e. minuet and trio) passages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-EBU tape timecode of take/excerpt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often found in libretti as well as scores. Referring to the 5 microphone positions used by Decca to cover the sound stage in opera recordings. Used by the producer when devising the relative spatial positions of singers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘3-machine join’: real-time, ‘online’ recording of an edit between 2 takes made by playing 2 tapes simultaneously on 2 tape machines and fading one in and one out manually on mixing console and recording on to a third machine, rather than by cutting between takes. Difficult in the analogue system, the process was made more straightforward in digital recording.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambience: recorded empty hall noise (as opposed to ‘silence’) added between breaks/movements in music. Taken from session recordings and often looped to required length and equalised to remove/boost frequencies to match recorded background ambience. Noises removed by editing before and after noises rather than using software programmes (up to end of 1990s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take breaks down.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Beauty Shop.’ A term for subsequent rounds of editing following a first or initial edit, coined by Georg Solti (see Chapter 6, Der Rosenkavalier, Vienna 1968–1969). These would be referred to as 1st B/S (2nd edit), 2nd B/S (3rd edit) and so on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare with another take of the same passage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety copies of session material (tape) (also Dash 3s and Dash 4s in the 1960s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble playing is poorly synchronised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalisation used on inserted take. Often accompanied with settings (frequency and shape of filter used).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False start.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Brass split/cracked note i.e. ‘fish in brass.’ Use of this term can be traced to the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra. In John Culshaw’s Ring Resounding (2012, eBook, loc. 1466), he notes that ‘the
danger is that of one horn is unfortunate enough to crack (or, as the Viennese put it, make a ‘fish’)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final edited master</th>
<th>Last generation of edited master.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMM</td>
<td>‘Immoral’ edit: insert taken from a repeated section of identical music elsewhere in the piece, or in the previous edited version for covering noises, poor ensemble, intonation, wrong notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEX</td>
<td>Use of Lexicon digital reverberation unit across edit points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>‘Luxury.’ Edits to be made if possible, but not mandatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Master. Current version of master recording containing approved musical takes. Some scores use number+M to identify which master version to use. Occasionally, number+M confirms the original take number in the previous editing round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>‘The artist is being difficult in asking for these changes’ (offensive acronym).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms (appearing after numbers and applied to editing points)</td>
<td>Crossfade length in milliseconds (linear only). Refers to Decca’s proprietary digital editing system developed at the Recording Centre, Belsize Road in the late 1980s/1990s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>‘No bloody good’ (of take at specific point).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIX</td>
<td>Do not use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N or $&amp;$</td>
<td>Noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Not together: poor ensemble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Unity gain. Re-establishing the signal level of the audio (input/output levels the same). Marked after a fader increase or decrease in dB of recording signal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/O (PO)</td>
<td>‘Pull-off.’ Sections of multitrack back-up to be/have been rebalanced and mixed down to two-track before re-inserting into master.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss (P)</td>
<td>A contender for the editing sequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production master</td>
<td>Master from which copies of the recording to other media are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/U</td>
<td>Pulls up (breakdown of musical phrase during recording).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHS (LHS)</td>
<td>Changes made to dB level on right or left stereo channel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/S (RS)</td>
<td>Restart of recording, sometimes at an earlier or later point in the score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety copy</td>
<td>Master for storage only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>The ambience gap between recorded items on tape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St A, St B &amp;c</td>
<td>Indicates to use specific recorded false start in editing (when the recording has not been stopped and started because of errors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Section to be/that has been tracked (i.e. recording of an obbligato part to be used as an overdub [or less likely an underdub]) to the master tape. <em>TR+number</em>: the specific tracked section for editing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Decca annotations:

*Der fliegende Holländer*, VPO/Dohnányi, 1991
Le nozze di Figaro, Act III (Dove sono), VCO/Fischer/Bartoli, 1993
Fidelio editing notes, VPO/ Dohnányi, 1991

1. b.
2. I n. 3. (H. 30) make sure it is not clipped.
3. D p. 2. M at 23.16 use H. 150 at "the last" (planned Y11-H to L188).
4. D p. 2. M at 75.25 use H. 76 at 1.12. ("And das wäre?")
5. D p. 3. i (M) at 36.50 please level c. 0.48 in H. 76.
6. I v - I vi (nos. 8-79) look at H. 257 for in (find more lead into H. 31).
7. I viii - ix (M) at 55.44 (p. 111) odd in 3 x steps from 17.35 to h. 514.
9. I ii "Atte boelet?" (p. 5) use figura 2 steps from H. 575.
10. I v. no. 16. H. 427 - see that male is not clipped.
12. p. 248 listen to H. 49. (27.20) clipped.
Fidelio dialogue, VPO/Dohnányi, 1991
### Appendix 4: Bibliography of journal articles and sleeve notes by Christopher Raeburn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>‘Autumn in Vienna’</td>
<td><em>Opera</em> Vol. 5 No. 1 pp.17–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>‘The Valbrook Grand Opera Society: review of Cavalliera Rusticana and Pagliacci’</td>
<td><em>Opera</em> Vol. 5 No. 4 pp.243–45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>‘The European Festivals’</td>
<td><em>Music Mirror Magazine</em> pp.4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Review of <em>La Vie Parisienne</em> at the Royal College of Music</td>
<td><em>Opera</em> Vol. 5 No. 5 p.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>‘Italian Opera’ (as C.W. Raeburn)</td>
<td><em>Music Mirror Magazine</em> pp.4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>Operas reviewed at Covent Garden, with Paquita Trenchard and Anthony Lind</td>
<td><em>Music Mirror Magazine</em> pp.5–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>‘A Night at the Proms’</td>
<td><em>Music Mirror Magazine</em> pp.9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Austria – Vienna Festival review</td>
<td><em>Opera</em> Vol. 5 No. 9 pp.565–68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Report from Christopher Raeburn in Vienna</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Report on <em>Das Werbekleid</em> (Salmhofer)</td>
<td><em>Opera</em> Vol. 6 No. 1 p.32–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Report from Christopher Raeburn in Vienna</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Report from Christopher Raeburn in Vienna</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Report from Christopher Raeburn in Vienna</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Report from Christopher Raeburn in Vienna</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Austria – reports from Redoutensaal and Staatsoper</td>
<td><em>Opera</em> Vol. 6 No. 6 pp.373–374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>Report from Christopher Raeburn in Vienna</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Report from Christopher Raeburn in Vienna</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Readers’ Letters – <em>Figaro</em> at Glyndebourne and Vienna</td>
<td><em>Opera</em> Vol. 6 No. 9 p.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>‘The Vienna State Opera – Opera Tradition in Vienna’</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em> pp.23–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>‘Cosí’s Vicissitudes’</td>
<td><em>Opera News</em> 20/6, p 7, 26 (printed as ‘Anthony’ Raeburn. Altered by hand to ‘Christopher’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>‘Opera Feast in Vienna’</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em> pp.18–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>‘Figaro Dressed for Paris’</td>
<td><em>Opera News</em> Vol. 20 No. 22 pp.8–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>‘What they thought of Figaro’</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em> p.13, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td><em>Mozart Bicentenary Celebrations</em>: notes on Paumgartner’s edition used for production of <em>Idomeneo</em> in Salzburg</td>
<td><em>Opera</em> Vol. 7 No. 4 pp.225–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Article on the Beaumarchais costume directions for <em>Le nozze di Figaro</em></td>
<td><em>Opera News</em> (Metropolitan Opera Guild)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>‘A Note on the First German Performances of Mozart’s Italian Operas; News – Austria’</td>
<td>*Opera Vol. 7 No. 6 pp.346–49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>‘News: Austria’</td>
<td>*Opera Vol.*7 No.6 pp.356–57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>‘The First Performance of <em>Die Zauberflöte</em>, and Mozart and the Freihaus –Theater auf der Wieden’</td>
<td><em>Glyndebourne Festival Programme</em> 1956, pp.52-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>‘News: Austria’ (with Joseph Wechsberg). Review of world premiere of Frank Martin’s <em>Der Sturm</em> at the Vienna State Opera</td>
<td>*Opera Vol. 7 No. 8 pp.489–91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>‘Festival in Vienna’</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em> p.15, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>‘News: Austria’</td>
<td><em>Opera Vol.</em> 7 No. 9 pp.554–556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>‘Munich’s Accent on Opera’ (Festival review)</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em> p.17, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>‘News: Austria’</td>
<td><em>Opera Vol.</em> 7 No. 12 pp.740–41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956/57</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>‘Die Symbolik der Zauberflöte ist ein Problem...Etwas Neues über die Zauberflöte’</td>
<td><em>Blätter der Wiener Staatsoper</em> Spielzeit Vol. 2 Nr.4 p.15, 17, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>‘News: Austria’ (with Joseph Wechsberg)</td>
<td><em>Opera Vol.</em> 8 No. 2 pp.90–92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>‘News: Austria’</td>
<td><em>Opera Vol.</em> 8 No. 3 pp.156–158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>‘News: Austria’</td>
<td><em>Opera Vol.</em> 8 No. 4 pp 228–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>‘Le nozze di Figaro at Donauchingen’</td>
<td>Possibly unpublished. Part of joint article written with Hannspeter Bennwitz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>‘What is wrong with Vienna’s State Opera?’</td>
<td><em>Music and Musicians</em> p.9, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>‘News: Austria’ (with Joseph Wechsberg)</td>
<td><em>Opera Vol.</em> 8 No. 5 pp.291–93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Magazine/Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>‘Opera was the Star of Vienna’s Festival’</td>
<td>Music and Musicians p.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>‘News: Germany’ (review of Der Rosenkavalier at Ulm)</td>
<td>Opera Vol. 8 No. 8 pp.510–511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>‘News: Austria’ (with Joseph Wechsberg)</td>
<td>Opera Vol. 8 No. 8 pp.499–501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>‘This Year’s Wagner at Bayreuth’ (review of Tristan and Isolde and The Ring cycle)</td>
<td>Music and Musicians pp.18–19, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>‘Das Zeitmass in Mozarts Opern’</td>
<td>Österreichische Musikzeitschrift Vol. 12 Nr. 9, pp.329–333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>‘Die textlichen Quellen des Schauspieldirektors’</td>
<td>Österreichische Musikzeitschrift Vol. 13 Nr. 1 pp.4–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Twenty Five Years of Glyndebourne and A Scrapbook of Aspiration and Achievement’</td>
<td>Glyndebourne Festival Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
<td>Articles ‘The Creation of Rosenkavalier’, and ‘Leonore and Fidelio’</td>
<td>Glyndebourne Festival Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>‘Opera in Stereo/Regia per l’dischi’</td>
<td>Discoteca: rivista di dischi e musica, Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Nov–Dec</td>
<td>‘Wiederhergestellte Lucia di Lammermoor’</td>
<td>Phono Internazionale Schallplatten-Zeitschrift Vol. 8 Nr. 2 p.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sleeve notes for Hilde Gueden sings operetta evergreens (conducted by Robert Stolz)</td>
<td>Decca LXT5658 = SXL2295, released 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Article on ‘The earliest designs for Don Giovanni’</td>
<td>The Times, Monday 26 February, p.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1962</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sleeve notes for W.A.Mozart Concerto for Flute and Harp in C K.299, Clarinet Concerto in A K.622</td>
<td>Decca LXT6054 = SXL6054, VPO/Münchinger, (Original documents signed ‘Michael Raeburn’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sleeve notes for Teresa Berganza Sings Mozart</td>
<td>Decca LXT6045 = SXL6045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sleeve notes for Hilde Gueden recording Operetta Evergreens</td>
<td>Decca, Vienna State Opera Chorus and Orchestra/Stolz LXT5658 = SXL2295 April1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Jul–Aug</td>
<td>‘Le nozze di Figaro, Libretto und Vorbild’</td>
<td>Österreichische Musikzeitschrift Vol. 18 Nr. 7–8, pp.331–43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>'Mosel und Zinzendorf über Mozart', translated from English by Hermann Baron 'Gedanken über Mozarts Opern' (Fussnote), translated from English by Rosemary Koch</td>
<td>Festschrift Otto Erich Deutsch zum 80 Geburtstag Kassel, New York, Bärenreiter, pp.155–58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Teresa Berganza Sings Mozart, sleeve notes</td>
<td>Decca LXT6045 = SXL6045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Verdi's La traviata</td>
<td>Decca MET249-51 = SET249-51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Mozart flute music/Claude &amp; Pierre Monteux/LSO</td>
<td>Decca LXT6112 = SXL6112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Scenes from Der Rosenkavalier</td>
<td>Decca LXT/SXL 6146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>'Pierre Monteux: The Absolute Professional' (appreciation)</td>
<td>High Fidelity Vol. 14 No. 9, September 1964, p.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Mozart's Don Carlo</td>
<td>Decca MET305-8 = SET305-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>'Die Entführungsszenen aus Die Entführung aus dem Serail' (comparison of the text with its source Belmonte und Konstanze)</td>
<td>Mozarts Jahrbuch pp.130–137 (translated by Charlotte Untersteiner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Mozart and Beethoven Quintets</td>
<td>Decca LXT6252 = SXL6252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Aug 'Ring Twice and Ask for Mario'</td>
<td>High Fidelity Vol. 17 No. 8, pp.56–57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>May 'Die Frau ohne Schatten: the background of the opera and recording'</td>
<td>Audio Record Review p.357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Nov Mozart Piano Concertos K488 and K491, sleeve notes</td>
<td>Curzon/LSO/Kertész, Decca SXL6354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Der Rosenkavalier 1969, booklet article</td>
<td>Decca SET418-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Haydn and Mozart Discoveries, sleeve notes</td>
<td>Vienna Haydn Orchestra, Decca SXL6490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Mozart’s Operas (Figaro, Idomeneo, Die Entführung; Die Zauberflöte, Zaide, Così fan tutte, Il re pastore, Don Giovanni), sleeve notes</td>
<td>Teldec, Mozart Opera Festival (Popp/Fassbaender/Kertész et al) (DK11536/1–2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>‘The First Studio Recording of <em>Parsifal</em>’</td>
<td><em>Gramophone</em> Vol. 50 No. 599 p.1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Script for radio programme <em>The Birth of an Opera – La clemenza di Tito</em></td>
<td>For BBC Radio 3 (broadcast 31 August 1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘The First Performance of <em>Die Zauberflöte</em>’ (revision of 1956 article)</td>
<td>Glyndebourne Festival Programme 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980–81</td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Articles on Mozart soprano concert arias</td>
<td>Liner notes for Time Life recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mozart’s Tenor Concert Arias K21, K36, K209, K210, K256, liner notes</td>
<td>Decca 414 193DH, 414 193.1DH, Decca 430 112.2DM, 430 300.2DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Cecilia Bartoli Sings Mozart’ (with Schiff/Vienna Chamber, liner notes Orchestra/Fischer)</td>
<td>Decca 430 513.2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Renata Tebaldi tribute</td>
<td><em>Opera</em> Vol. 55 No. 2 pp.136–137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry on Bassi, Luigi</td>
<td><em>The Grove Book of Opera Singers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry on Benucci, Francesco, (rev. Dorothea Link)</td>
<td><em>The Grove Book of Opera Singers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry on Bussani, Francesco</td>
<td><em>The Grove Book of Opera Singers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry on Dauer, Johann Ernst (rev. Dorothea Link)</td>
<td><em>The Grove Book of Opera Singers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry on Gottlieb, (Maria) Anna</td>
<td><em>The Grove Book of Opera Singers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry on Laschi, Luisa</td>
<td><em>The Grove Book of Opera Singers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry on Mandini family of singers: Stefano; Maria &amp; (Antonio) Paolo</td>
<td><em>The Grove Book of Opera Singers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry on Saporiti, Teresa</td>
<td><em>The Grove Book of Opera Singers</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Details of interviewees

Bartoli, Cecilia, Cavaliere OMRI; mezzo-soprano

Cornall, Andrew, recording /senior/executive producer (Decca, 1974–2001), vice president A&R (EMI Classics), consultant artistic director (Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra)

Eadon, Simon, recording engineer (Decca, 1970–1997, and Abbas Records)

Fontana, Gabriele, Kammersängerin; mezzo-soprano, professor, Universität fur Musik und darstellende Kunst, Vienna

Gayler, Nigel, editor/editing manager (Decca, 1974–1997), editor (Finesplice), presenter/producer (BBC 3 Counties Radio), producer (Classic FM)

Haigh, Caroline, editor (Decca, 1990–1996, and Abbey Road Studios), teaching fellow (Surrey University IoSR)

Haas, Michael, recording/executive producer (Decca), vice president A&R (Sony), author, curator (Jewish Museum Vienna), research director (International Centre for Suppressed Music)

Johns, Stephen, editor (Abbey Road Studios), recording producer/editor (Floating Earth), recording producer/vice president classical A&R (EMI Classics), artistic director (Royal College of Music)

Lloyd, Julia, secretary to Ray Minshull (Decca, 1969–1994)

Marcus, Nella, secretary to John Culshaw, (Decca, 1959–1960), manager, classical administration (Decca, 1961–1972), general manager (English Chamber Orchestra )

Mastroianni, Jack, artist manager (vice president, Columbia Artists Management; founder, Mastroianni Associates; senior vice president and corporate consultant, IMG artists)

Mirageas, Evans, WFMT Radio Chicago, Boston Symphony Orchestra management, senior vice president (Decca 1994–2000), artistic director (Cincinnati Opera), vice president (Atlanta Symphony Orchestra)

Pope, Christopher, studio manager (BBC World Service), producer/vice president A&R (Decca 1990–1998; 2004–2007), management consultant, co-director (The Prince’s Teaching Institute)

Raeburn, Michael, publisher, brother of Christopher Raeburn. Employed at Decca in 1964 by John Culshaw

Van Biene, Peter, technical engineer (Decca, 1962–1974), sound technician (Cardiff University)
## Appendix 6: Interview plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Decca</th>
<th>Raeburn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background data</strong></td>
<td><strong>Personal recording philosophy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most important aspect of making a recording?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most important aspect of your job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Did Decca have certain standards and benchmarks, or was this left to the individual conscientiousness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Was your job was creative, technical, aesthetic or all of these?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Importance of public critical response to your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recording methodology/ preparation/research</strong></td>
<td>• Approach to making a recording: how much research would you do, what sort of preparation with conductors/artists?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Did recording method change rapidly, and was there a conscious feeling of decline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is following the explicit directions in the score fundamental to making a recording?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For voices, do you have preference for artists singing in native language?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of the listener</strong></td>
<td>• Are the needs of the listener important? Does this affect how you make recordings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decca policy/history</strong></td>
<td>• Did you have dealings with Edward Lewis or Maurice Rosengarten?</td>
<td>• Did Ray Minshull develop an artistic strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional and artistic hierarchies</td>
<td>• Is musicological authority shared between the conductor, artist and producer?</td>
<td>• Were recordings standardised in any way?</td>
<td>• Were Decca producers hired as specialists in particular repertoire, or for any other reason?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra</td>
<td>• Did you work with the Vienna Philharmonic? Was it a different experience from other orchestras?</td>
<td>• Was there a system of hierarchies for work with artists and locations?</td>
<td>• Is there hierarchy in a recording team? Who defers to whom? Did that change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in other foreign locations</td>
<td>• Importance of location for a recording. What factors influence this? Are acoustic properties of location important to recording for ‘authenticity’ rather than practicality?</td>
<td>• Were hall searches carried out for specific practical reasons, or for artistic ones?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Raeburn: Decca staff</td>
<td>• Was Raeburn respected by his colleagues? • Was Raeburn Decca’s ‘diplomat’?</td>
<td>• How did he work with/for Culshaw and Minshull?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was Raeburn influential to junior colleagues?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Was Raeburn supportive during recording?</strong> How? Was he ‘on your side’ rather than on Decca’s?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raeburn’s greatest strengths and weaknesses?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Do you think Raeburn worked any differently to other studio producers? How did he build trust?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raeburn’s attitude towards technology. Did it hinder him, or alter team dynamic?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Was it always a collaborative process, and if so, how was that achieved?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Star artists? Did ‘star-making’ cause tension?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What did you learn from him, and he from you?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A better artists’ manager than a producer?</strong></td>
<td><strong>How much research and preparation would you do with him prior to a recording taking place?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Working with Raeburn - artists</strong></th>
<th><strong>Did artists know how much time and detail was spent in post-production? Did producers handle expectations of artists successfully in the amount of post-production?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did artists know how much time and detail was spent in post-production? Did producers handle expectations of artists successfully in the amount of post-production?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Did he consult you in the post-production process, and make room for changing opinions?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the most important attributes of being a studio producer?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Did you share an artistic vision with Raeburn? What was he striving to produce in recordings?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary questions to specific interviewees</td>
<td>Michael Raeburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe family interests in music</td>
<td>• Did his interest in art have a direct impact on his musical lines of sight? Particular works that affected his opinion on music performance, and on recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did his interest in art have a direct impact on his musical lines of sight? Particular works that affected his opinion on music performance, and on recording</td>
<td>• Importance of maintaining close contacts with musicologists him in his career?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did he have want a career in academia, or did Mozart research fulfill a different need? Was research part of a collecting habit?</td>
<td>• Did he have want a career in academia, or did Mozart research fulfill a different need? Was research part of a collecting habit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did his research influence his recordings? Why did he record so little Mozart?</td>
<td>• Did his research influence his recordings? Why did he record so little Mozart?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe his diplomatic skills</td>
<td>• Describe his diplomatic skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was he European in outlook? What did that mean?</td>
<td>• Was he European in outlook? What did that mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Mastroianni</td>
<td>Jack Mastroianni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would Raeburn have made a better artists’ manager than a recording producer?</td>
<td>• Would Raeburn have made a better artists’ manager than a recording producer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was he supportive, and with a similar ethos and goals to you? Did you have any areas of disagreement?</td>
<td>• Was he supportive, and with a similar ethos and goals to you? Did you have any areas of disagreement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did you recommend to artists that they have mutual approval for a recording producer? Was this based on repertoire, or on personal qualities? Who would have a say?</td>
<td>• Did you recommend to artists that they have mutual approval for a recording producer? Was this based on repertoire, or on personal qualities? Who would have a say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Mirageas</td>
<td>Evans Mirageas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe main features of the role of A&amp;R Director at Decca. How did the role differ from Ray Minshull’s leadership, and did it change during your own tenure?</td>
<td>• Describe main features of the role of A&amp;R Director at Decca. How did the role differ from Ray Minshull’s leadership, and did it change during your own tenure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How much overlap was there between your role and the role of the Decca studio producer? Was there ever conflict between the two roles?</td>
<td>• How much overlap was there between your role and the role of the Decca studio producer? Was there ever conflict between the two roles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How much time did you spend on recording sessions?</td>
<td>• How much time did you spend on recording sessions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Eadon</td>
<td>Simon Eadon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does recording balance always begin with the conductor? Is the desired balance achieved at the recording session or in post-production?</td>
<td>• Does recording balance always begin with the conductor? Is the desired balance achieved at the recording session or in post-production?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe Raeburn’s knowledge and interest in sound engineering</td>
<td>• Describe Raeburn’s knowledge and interest in sound engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Raeburn Archive title page, British Library

Descriptive summary

Creator: Raeburn, Christopher Walter, 1928–2009

Title: Raeburn Archive, Mus. Dep. 2011/04

Dates of materials: 1946–2009

Extent: 7.5 linear metres, 103 boxes

Scope and content: Christopher Walter Raeburn (b.1928, d.2009) was an English classical music recording producer for the Decca Record Company from 1957 until his official retirement in 1991, after which he continued to produce recordings internationally in a freelance capacity. The Raeburn Archive consist of business documents relating to music recordings, loose notes, press cuttings, professional and personal correspondence, notes on musicological research, recording session notes, autobibliographic sketches, a small number of photographs, and annotated production score copies in the range 1954–2006. There are occasional uses of the pseudonym Walter Haydon in articles of music journalism.

Physical characteristics: Document forms are booklets, typescripts, handwritten notes, photocopies, Xeroxes, facsimiles, telexes, telegrams, email prints, programme brochures, libretti, music manuscript copies, and music scores.

Language: mostly English and German; some French and Italian.

Source of acquisition: Gifted to the British Library by Belinda Raeburn, daughter.

Related resources: Christopher Raeburn audio materials in British Library Sound Archive (currently not catalogued). The British Library Oral History of Recorded Sound interview by Christopher Raeburn made in 1987 (C1403). The Jack Law Score Collection (British Library) contains some works recorded with Raeburn as supervisor. Most recently (late 2018), the papers of Ray Minshull have been deposited (temporary deposit reference Mus. Dep. 2018/16).

Biographical sketch: Christopher Walter Raeburn was born 18 July 1928 in London. He read modern history at Worcester College, University of Oxford, and after several years working as a stage manager and music journalist, he joined the catalogue and publicity department of the
Decca Record Company in 1954. Raeburn received a Leverhulme Fellowship shortly afterwards, enabling him to take up studies in Mozart scholarship in Vienna, with the aim of writing a documentary history of the early productions of Mozart operas and the eighteenth-century theatre. He re-joined Decca in the Artists and Repertoire department under the management of John Culshaw in December 1957, working initially on experimental stereo productions and as the intermediary between control room and studio. Until the mid-1960s he maintained a parallel career as a researcher and music journalist, writing artist biographies for Grove Dictionaries and contributing to scholarship on the performance of Mozart’s *Marriage of Figaro*. During his career as a producer he supervised more than 400 audio recordings and opera film soundtracks, working across the range of musical genres recorded by Decca and forming close associations with Dame Joan Sutherland, Richard Bonyngge, Sir Georg Solti, Tom Krause, Teresa Berganza, Luciano Pavarotti, Dame Kiri Te Kanawa, Vladimir Ashkenazy, Marilyn Horne, Kyung-Wha Chung, Sir András Schiff, Christoph von Dohnányi, Cecilia Bartoli, and the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra. Raeburn also worked with external production companies, including Unitel and Mediascope, for which he produced opera film soundtracks with Karl Böhm and Herbert von Karajan, and during the 1990s was the audio producer for The Three Tenors concert performances in Rome, Los Angeles and Paris with Zubin Mehta, James Levine, José Carreras, Plácido Domingo and Luciano Pavarotti. With interests chiefly in opera and vocal performance, Raeburn became Decca’s Manager of Opera Production in 1977 and was a jury member for the Kathleen Ferrier Competition and the Richard Tauber Prize. In addition to his many awards for individual recordings from the international recording industry, a number of personal awards were bestowed, including the Franz Schalk Medal from the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra in 1988, the MIDEM Emile Berliner Lifetime Achievement Prize in 2006 and a Lifetime Achievement Award from *Gramophone* in 2008. He died in 2009.

**Abbreviations used in Excel inventory:**

- **CB** Cecilia Bartoli
- **CR** Christopher Raeburn
- **CvD** Christoph von Dohnányi
- **DGG** Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft
- **ENO** English National Opera
- **GS** Georg Solti
- **HCRL** H.C. Robbins Landon
- **JL** James Lock
- **KTK** Kiri Te Kanawa
KWC Kyung-Wha Chung
LPO London Philharmonic Orchestra
LSO London Symphony Orchestra
RM Ray Minshull
ROH Royal Opera House
SCO Scottish Chamber Orchestra
SMT Salzburger Marionettentheater
VPO Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra
VSO Vienna Symphony Orchestra
WNO Welsh National Opera

**Arrangement:** As shown in the inventory, the collection has been divided into 6 areas of interest that reflect the activities of Raeburn’s life and work. Decca recording projects, where identified, are given entry sequences as shown in the Decca Classical Discography created by Philip Stuart, the current version of which is available at <https://www.eloquenceclassics.com/discographies/>.

1) **Ar: Artist/organisation communications (23 boxes)**

   (a) Individual artists (general correspondence)
   (b) Orchestras
   (c) Agents
   (d) Publishers
   (e) Recording location administrators
   (f) Institutions
   (g) Opera companies
   (h) Media/film companies
   (i) Other record companies
   (j) Interviewers

2) **Co: Competitions &c. (5 boxes)**

   (a) Competitions – Ferrier, Tauber, Belvedere, Walther Grüner &c
   (b) Festivals/events
   (c) Concerts
   (d) Season brochures
   (e) Newspaper cuttings
3) **CR: personal papers/correspondence (21 boxes)**

   (a) Biographical information/memoir sketches
   (b) Research/articles
   (c) Personal correspondence
   (d) Personal Decca documents
   (e) Interview transcriptions

4) **D: Decca internal communications (13 boxes)**

   (a) Internal memos/correspondence
   (b) Recording administration/planning
   (c) Contracts
   (d) Technical data/instructions
   (e) Industry conferences
   (f) Communications with general public

5) **Non-Decca/collabs: projects conceived as co-productions with other media companies, projects supervised by Raeburn for companies other than Decca, and projects not appearing in the Stuart-Decca Discography (10 boxes)**

   (a) Recording correspondence/administration
   (b) Recording session production data
   (c) Technical data
   (d) Post-production data
   (e) Annotated production scores
   (f) Contracts

6) **Rec: Decca recording project data (31 boxes)**

   (a) Recording correspondence/administration
   (b) Recording session production data
   (c) Technical data
   (d) Post-production data
   (e) Annotated production scores

**Selected correspondents:**

**Organisations:**

- Accademia Nazionale di Santa Cecilia, Rome
- Anglo-Austrian Society
- Allied Artists

**People:**

- Amyot, Etienne
- Andry, Peter
- Ashkenazy, Vladimir
Keefe, Bernard
Kertész, István
Korngold, George
Krause, Tom
LaRue, Jan
Layton, Robert
Leigh-Enderl, Adele
Leinsdorf, Erich
Levine, James
Lupu, Radu
Mackerras, Sir Charles
Mann, William
Mastroianni, Jack
Mehta, Zubin
Minton, Yvonne
Moores, Sir Peter
Monteux, Claude
Mortier, Gerard
Pavarotti, Luciano
Pears, Peter
Pollitzer, Sigmund
Popp, Lucia
Porter, Andrew
Rech, Géza
Robbins Landon, H.C.
Robertson, Alec
Rosenthal, Harold
Sackville-West, Edward
Sadie, Stanley
Schiff, Sir András
Schoeffler, Paul
Schmidt-Isserstedt, Hans
Smith, Erik
Solti, Sir Georg
Souliotis, Elena
Sutherland, Dame Joan
Taliani, Odile
Te Kanawa, Dame Kiri
Wagner, Wolfgang
Wagner-Pasquier, Eva
Weller, Walter
Wellesz, Egon
White, Eric Walter
Appendix 8: Professional biographical details

As a staff recording editor at the Decca Record Company and at EMI Abbey Road Studios between 1989 and 2007, I worked on many hundreds of projects across a wide range of musical genres—from world-premiere symphonic recordings and large-scale operas to film sound tracks—and with many international artists in the studio, including Sir Georg Solti, Sir Simon Rattle, Sir András Schiff and Maurice Jarre. Although my work at Decca focused on new digital audio recordings across its sub-labels using the company’s proprietary technology, I also remastered historic opera and operetta recordings featuring Dame Joan Sutherland and Richard Bonynge. At Abbey Road, I worked with external commercial companies and independent producers in addition to contributing to a large body of recordings for EMI Classics. The majority of these were complex multitrack projects, and included sound-to-picture techniques.

I worked together with Christopher Raeburn on several recording projects in the years leading up to his official retirement from Decca in 1991. These included *Fidelio* with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra and Christoph von Dohnányi, and chamber music with the New Vienna Octet.

Further digital editing projects I completed for Decca labels include:

- **Arnold/Brouwer/Chappell**: works for guitar (Fernández/Wordsworth/ECO)
- **Birtwistle**: *Earth Dances/Panic* (Davis/Dohnányi/BBCSO/Cleveland/John Harle Band)
- **Bolcom**: Violin Concerto/Fifth Symphony/Fantasia Concertante (Davies/Luca/Hill/Moye/ACO)
- **Fitzkin**: *Slow/Huah/Frame* (Smith Quartet/Sutherland/Fitzkin)
- **Franck/Chausson**: works for violin, piano and string quartet (Amoyal/Rogé/Quatuor Ysaïe)
- **Handel**: *Riccardo Primo* (Rousset/Les Talens Lyriques)
- **Harbison**: Symphony no.2/Oboe Concerto (Blomstedt/San Francisco SO)
- **Haydn**: Complete Symphonies project (Hogwood/AAM)
- **Hindemith**: Kammermusik (Soloists/Chailly/Concertgebouw)
- **Mendelssohn**: *Elijah* (Terfel/Fleming/Daniel/OAE)
- **Mozart**: *Così fan tutte* (Fleming/von Otter/Solti/COE)
- **Maxwell Davies**: *Solstice of Light* (Cleobury/KCC)
- **Puccini**: *Il trittico* (Bartoletti/Freni/Maggio Musicale Fiorentino)
- **Ravel**: *Ma mère l’Oye* (Ashkenazy/Cleveland)
- **Schnittke**: Concerto Grosso no.3/Symphony no.5/Concerto Grosso no.4 (Chailly/Concertgebouw)
- **Shostakovich**: *The Jazz Album* (Chailly/Concertgebouw)
- **Tippett**: *Byzantium/Symphony no.4* (Solti/Chicago SO)
- **Ullmann**: *Der Kaiser von Atlantis* (Zagrosek/Gewandhausorchester)
- **Varèse**: The Complete Works (Chailly/Concertgebouw)
Bibliography

Archival sources

Christopher Raeburn Archive, British Library (BL/RA)  Deposit 2011/04
Jack Law Score Collection, British Library, Deposit 2015/01
Ray Minshull Papers, private collection. Donated to the British Library, September 2018
Temporary deposit Mus. Dep. 2018/16
The National Archives, Kew (TNA)
Files relating to British Council activities in Austria, 1962–1970:
Files BW 13/20, BW 13/21, BW 2/651, BW 2/756, AUS/150/5
Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra Archive, Haus der Musik, Vienna
Files relating to recording activity with the Decca Record Company:
Box no. 3, 1962–1968; box no. 4, 1969–1978 (boxes 1 and 2 missing from collection)
Walter A.L. Raeburn Archive, London School of Economics:

Discographies

Stuart, Philip, Decca Classical (2014) [online digital version only]. The most recent version is located at <https://www.eloquenceclassics.com/discographies/>

Original interviews for thesis

Bartoli, Cecilia 1 November 2016
Cornall, Andrew 15 June 2016
Eadon, Simon 17 October 2016
Fontana, Gabriele 12 October 2016
Gayler, Nigel 25 May 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haas, Michael</td>
<td>10 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haigh, Caroline</td>
<td>26 September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns, Stephen</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd, Julia</td>
<td>13 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus, Nella</td>
<td>25 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastroianni, Jack</td>
<td>21 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirageas, Evans</td>
<td>20 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope, Christopher</td>
<td>27 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raeburn, Michael</td>
<td>11 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Biene, Peter</td>
<td>19 October 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**British Library Oral History interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Accession No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Besson, Anita</td>
<td>C960/115</td>
<td>(2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicknell, David</td>
<td>C90/41/02</td>
<td>(1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, Christopher</td>
<td>C90/20/01</td>
<td>(1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borwick, John</td>
<td>C90/45/01</td>
<td>(1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkowitz, Peter</td>
<td>C90/100/02</td>
<td>(1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplat, Moran</td>
<td>C511/11</td>
<td>(1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebert, Peter</td>
<td>C511/11</td>
<td>(1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooch, Bob</td>
<td>C90/83/02</td>
<td>(1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffiths, Anthony</td>
<td>C90/82/03</td>
<td>(1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddy, Arthur</td>
<td>C90/16/01</td>
<td>(1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Frank</td>
<td>C90/74/08</td>
<td>(1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naegler, Karl-August</td>
<td>C90/98/01</td>
<td>(1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard, Anthony</td>
<td>C90/15/01</td>
<td>(1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raeburn, Christopher</td>
<td>C90/89/01</td>
<td>(1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roach, Maurice</td>
<td>C90/44/01</td>
<td>(1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwarz, Harvey</td>
<td>C90/08/01</td>
<td>(1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson, Tom</td>
<td>C90/34/03</td>
<td>(1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsley, Bill</td>
<td>C90/10/01</td>
<td>(1983)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audio/visual sources

*Cecilia Bartoli: A Portrait* [dir. by David Thomas], Decca/LWT DVD video 071 141-9, 1992


Erik Smith and Ray Minshull interviewed by Evans Mirageas, WFMT Radio Chicago, 1985, private copy

Interview with Sid McLauchlan, <https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=xOq2j4UW9cs> [accessed 15 February 2017]

‘Prince Philip Visits Decca Factories’, British Pathé newsreel, 1957

‘The Decca Boys’ [dir. by Humphrey Burton], BBC Radio 3, four episodes, 7–28 November 2004, cassette copy

*The Golden Ring* [1965, dir. by Humphrey Burton], Decca Classics DVD video 074 3196, 2007


‘The Record Producers’, Peter Wadland interviewed by Richard Osborne, Saturday Review, BBC Radio 4, 17 March 1990, British Library, C582/1/4

*The Salzburg Festival* [dir. by Tony Palmer], ORF DVD video DC10016, 2006

‘The Story of Decca in the 50s and 60s: John Culshaw, a Portrait’, Danmarks Radio 2001, British Library, C1403

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kVdYK5lDi6E> [accessed 1 February 2017]

Lectures/conference papers


Patmore, David, ‘The Golden Age of the Record Producer’ (University of Sheffield, 1999), facsimile copy

Porter, Andrew, ‘A Music Critic Remembers’ (Prince of Hesse Memorial Lecture, 53rd Aldeburgh Festival, 19 June 2000), transcript copy, Britten-Pears Library

Unpublished sources


Haas, Benjamin M., ‘Hitler’s musical Tabula Rasa – Restitution – Restoration’ (PhD by Public Works, Middlesex University, 2017)


Patmore, David, ‘The influence of recording and the record industry upon musical activity, as illustrated by the careers of Sir Thomas Beecham, Sir Georg Solti and Sir Simon Rattle’ (PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 2001)


Walker, Malcolm, Interview with Christopher Raeburn audio transcript, 1983, private copy

Wallace, Roy, Public lecture audio transcript, Paris, 7 June 1997, private copy

Academic journal articles

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S000768050008099>


Cluley, Robert, ‘Art Words and Art Worlds: The Methodological Importance of Language Use in Howard S. Becker’s Sociology of Art and Cultural Production’, Cultural Sociology Vol. 6 No. 2


Press articles and newspapers (print and online)

15 Questions with Chris Alder <https://www.15questions.net/interview/fifteen-question-interview-chris-alder/page-2/> [accessed 12 October 2016]


Billboard (15 August 1960), p.72
Billboard (31 October 1960), p.90
Billboard (20 April 1963), p.43
Billboard (10 November 1979), p.64
Billboard (27 September 1986), p.53

308

European Commission Seagram/PolyGram merger decision (21 September 1998), Office for Official Publications of the European Communities  

Fairman, Richard, Review of Maria Malibran tour, Financial Times (20 December 2007)  
https://www.ft.com/content/a65c7a0e-af14-11dc-880f-0000779fd2ac> [accessed 5 March 2018]

Finch, Hilary, Review of Haydn Orfeo ed Euridice, Gramophone online review,  
https://www.gramophone.co.uk/review/haydn-orfeo-ed-euridice> [accessed 3 April 2018]


Goodwin, Noël, ‘Majestic Sunset’ (review of Decca’s Götterdämmerung), Music and Musicians (July 1965), p.33

Gramophone Vol. 49 No. 584 (January 1972), pp.1255–1256

Heffer, Simon, ‘A Tony Palmer season should be music to the ears of classical fans’, The Telegraph (5 February 2011)  

Higgins, John, ‘Assignation with Mariandel’, The Times (15 April 1971)

Hoelterhoff, Manuela, ‘Chasing the Anti- Diva’, The New Yorker (August 24 & 31 1998)


Jolly, James, ‘Raeburn Award’, Gramophone Vol. 66 No .790 (March 1989), p.1389


Kasow, Joel, Interview with Richard Bonynge, OperaNet (1997)  

Kasow, Joel, An Interview with John Mordler, CultureKiosque Operanet (1997)  


Mann, William, ‘Solti, Champion of Strauss’, *Opera* Vol. 35 No.12 (December 1984), pp.1298–1308, 1394

Mann, William, Review of *Der Rosenkavalier*, *The Times* (7 November 1969)


Myers, Paul, Obituaries: Christopher Raeburn and James Lock, *Classic Record Collector*, Issue 56 (Spring 2009), p.8

*New York Herald Tribune* (12 November, 1961)

‘On the Excerpting of Operas’, *High Fidelity* Vol. 13 No. 12 (December 1963), p.43


Osborne, Richard, Cecilia Bartoli recital, *Gramophone* online review <https://www.gramophone.co.uk/review/cecilia-bartoli-rossini-recital> [accessed 2 April 2018]

Patmore, David, ‘At the Top of the Tree’: James Lock interview, *Classic Record Collector* Issue 51 (Winter 2007), pp.56–60

Patmore, David, Interview with Paul Myers, *Classic Record Collector* Issue 61 (Summer 2010), p.38
Patmore, David, Interview with Christopher Bishop, *Classical Recordings Quarterly* no. 72 (Spring 2013), pp.28–33

Raeburn, Christopher, ‘Regia per i dischi’ ['Opera in Stereo'], *Discoteca: rivista mensile di dischi e musica* (December 1960), pp.23–27

Raeburn, Christopher, ‘Ring Twice and Ask for Mario’, *High Fidelity* Vol. 17 No.8 (August 1967), pp.56–57


Robson, Richard, ‘Ray Dolby—initiator of the silent revolution’, *Billboard* (18 November 1972), pp.73, 78

Rosenthal, Harold, Review of *Der Rosenkavalier* excerpts, *Opera* Vol. 16 No. 7 (July 1965)


‘Sutherland on recording’, *Audio Record Review* (September 1967), p.15

Teachout, Terry, ‘Record Blues’, *Commentary* (January 1996), pp.55–58

Published books

Abbate, Carolyn, and Parker, Roger (eds), A History of Opera: The Last Four Hundred Years (London: Allen Lane, 2012)


Adorno, Theodor, The Culture Industry: Selected Essays in Mass Culture (Routledge, 2001)


Alten, Stanley, Audio in Media (Thomson-Wadsworth, 2004)


Barfe, Louis, *Where Have All the Good Times Gone? The Rise and Fall of the Record Industry* (London: Atlantic, 2005)


Beranek, Leo, *Concert and Opera Halls: How They Sound* (Woodbury, N.Y.: American Institute of Physics, 1996)


Citron, Marcia, *Opera on Screen* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000)


Ebert, Peter, *In This Theatre of Man’s Life: The Biography of Carl Ebert* (Lewes: The Book Guild, 1999)


Gaisberg, Frederick, *Music on Record* (London: Robert Hale, 1948)

Gheorghiu, Angela and Tolansky, Jon, *Angela Gheorghiu: A Life for Art* (Lebanon, NH: ForeEdge, 2018)


Kreuzer, Gundula, Verdi and the Germans: From Unification to the Third Reich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Langer, Susanne, Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art (New York: Macmillan USA, 1953)


Lewis, C.A., Broadcasting from Within (London: George Newnes, 1924)


MacRae, Stuart, Winston Churchill’s Toyshop: The Inside Story of Military Intelligence (Stroud: Amberley Publishing, 2012)


Martland, Peter, Since Records Began: EMI—the First 100 Years (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd)


Kommerell, Roland, *Protokolle [Minutes]* (Germany: privately published, 1976)


Read, Oliver, and Welch, Walter, *From Tin Foil to Stereo: The Evolution of the Phonograph* (Indianapolis: Howard Sams, 1977)


Schwarzkopf, Elisabeth, *On and Off the Record* (London: Faber and Faber, 1982)


Tschmuck, Peter, *Creativity and Innovation in the Music Industry* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2006)


Zembylas, Tasos (ed.), *Kurt Blaukopf on Music Sociology: An Anthology* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012)

**Websites**

<https://www.adaptTVhistory.org.uk> (Royal Holloway, University of London) [accessed 3 May 2016]

<https://www.aes.org> [accessed 15 February 2017]


‘Audio cataloguing in the British Library Sound Archives’,

Audio Engineering Associates: Decca Tree Manual C,
<https://www.opusklassiek.nl/audiotechniek/deccatreed2.pdf> [accessed 30 September 2016]


‘Council of Europe Compendium: Cultural policies and trends in Europe-Austria’,
<https://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/austria.php> [accessed 8 May 2017]

<https://www.csoarchives.wordpress.com/2012/01/19solti-93-meeting-richard-strauss/> [accessed 1 November 2017]

<https://www.day-ellison.com/phoenix/cecilia-bartoli/> [accessed 2 April 2018]


<https://www.kevindaly.org.uk> [accessed 2 March 2016]

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/nov/18/william-weaver> [accessed 23 May, 2017]

‘The Decca Sound: secrets of the engineers’,

<https://www.wagneropera.net> [accessed 10 January 2017]

<https://www.wienerphilharmoniker.at> [accessed 1 January 2016]

<https://www.york.ac.uk/management/centres/cswl/bg_rationale/> [accessed 2 April 2018]
Music recordings analysed

Strauss, *Der Rosenkavalier* excerpts, Varviso/Raeburn, Decca B0000042FJ, 1964, remastered

Strauss, *Der Rosenkavalier*, Solti/Raeburn, Decca 475 9988, 1969, remastered

Strauss, *Der Rosenkavalier*, Bernstein/Culshaw, CBS D4M 30652, 1971

Strauss, *Der Rosenkavalier*, Bernstein/Culshaw, Sony, 88843058662, 1971, remastered