

Petersburg, where he studied with Tcherempine, Glazunov, and Vitol.

In 1918 he was graduated from the Peter the Great High School there, and from 1918 to 1920 he was a student at the University of Riga. When the Kurtz family was later forced to flee Russia because of the Revolution, the young musician resumed his studies at the Stern Conservatory in Berlin, with special classes in conducting under Carl Schröder, and was graduated in 1922. His first big opportunity has come in 1920 when at the last moment he was asked to substitute for Arthur Nikisch as conductor of a recital by Isadora Duncan. A highly successful debut brought the novice an immediate guest contract for three performances with the Berlin Philharmonic.

During the next several years Kurtz followed a heavy schedule which took him to forty-eight German cities and later to Italy and Poland. Then, in 1924 he was appointed chief conductor of the Stuttgart Philharmonic and musical director of the radio station servicing all southern Germany. In these posts Kurtz remained for nine years, until the rise of the Nazis to power. His activities, however, were not confined to Stuttgart. In 1927, for instance, Anna Pavlova, the dancer, heard his conducting and engaged him to conduct her ballet company at Covent Garden. The ten-day season was followed by a South American tour with the Pavlova Ballet, during which period Kurtz also conducted symphony concerts in Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro. The South American engagement led to an invitation to wield the baton in Australia, and the Australians were so enthusiastic that they extended to him three separate offers to remain. Kurtz, however, preferred to return to Europe. While permanent conductor at Stuttgart he also filled engagements in Holland, Belgium, and other European countries, and in 1931 and 1932 he conducted a series of Handel concerts at the Salzburg Festival.

In 1933 Kurtz, a Jew, left Germany for France. There, in Paris, Colonel Wassily de Basil asked him whether he would aid in an emergency by conducting the Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo without rehearsal, and on the strength of his performance appointed Kurtz musical director of the Ballet Russe. This position the young conductor was also to occupy for nine years, touring extensively throughout Europe, South America, and the United States, and at intervals appearing as guest conductor in Melbourne and Sydney, Australia, with the New York Philharmonic-Symphony Orchestra at Lewisohn Stadium for several seasons, and with the Los Angeles Philharmonic, the NBC Symphony, the Cleveland Orchestra, the Detroit Symphony, the Philadelphia Orchestra, and others. His ballet work encompassed both the classical repertoire and new choreographies some composed to the music of the great symphonies. Although, unlike some balletomanes, he believes that the latter should be included in the repertoire, or ballets utilizing symphonic scores the Ballet Russe's former musical director was on one occasion reported to have remarked, "Oh, I never see them. I keep my eyes closed. But it is not so cruel to use the music that way, because it is experimental. [Although] it is true that when I am conducting something like Brahms's Fourth I do not want to see a Mickey Mouse come out and cavort."

Kurtz has, however, written seriously of ballet. "The ballet as an art form," he said in 1941, "offers to the conductor problems which are inherent in the combination of two heterogeneous elements: bodily movement and tone. The ballet requires absolute synchronization of music and physical movement, and in this synthesis lie the problems

peculiar to the ballet. . . . I am a conductor and a musician first, but ever since the days when I was associated with Anna Pavlova I have been impressed by the manifold possibilities involved in the relationship of music and the dance. If the conductor is sensitive to the problems involved, he might very well come to the point where he doubts his ability to preserve the highest standards of musicianship while, at the same time, maintaining interpretation, synchronizing the accompaniment to the movements of the dancers, and fully expanding the choreographer's ideas. . . . When one conducts classical ballet, he must follow the dancer in finest detail. He must be thoroughly conversant with the steps of the dancers; more, he must have developed an intuitive feeling for equilibrium. . . . All the problems involved in classical ballet are pertinent to the modern with an additional important element. As contrasted to the classical ballet which is merely the projection of a mood, the modern is conceived for the execution of a story. . . . Composer and choreographer have produced the modern ballet in closest collaboration. Tempo becomes a matter of a work's content, of a dance's very essence. The dancer becomes the instrument of the choreographer who, in turn, is a much the servant of the composer's ideas as the composer is willing to integrate his composition with the potentialities of pantomiming. . . . Music originally written as ballet music is without doubt better than music arranged for ballet. The possibilities for young composers in the field of ballet music are tremendous."

Kurtz has been called "the finest of ballet conductors," but although he enjoyed his work with the Ballet Russe, he readily admitted his preference for symphonic conducting. In the autumn of 1943, therefore, he accepted an invitation to become conductor of the Kansas City Philharmonic Orchestra, to succeed Karl Krueger who had left for Detroit. The next season Kurtz was re-engaged for another two years. His first thought on taking over in Kansas City, he has said, was how to bring his music to the masses, how to make them come to understand and like it; and despite opposition he began to offer "pops" concerts featuring good music at very low prices, annual free concerts, "name" soloists, and special concerts for school children in an endeavor to attract audiences. "The most important thing is to get them in," he said, "and then sell myself and the orchestra." The response proved that he was right, for by the end of his second season the orchestra was out of the red for the first time in many years and seemed well on its way to becoming self-sufficient.

He moves Kansas City audiences, it is said, because "he knows how to inject his dramatic flare into programming, at the same time maintaining the highest musical standards." Both in Kansas City and during his guest appearances it is his habit to include modern compositions and the works of the Russian masters on his programs, and he has won commendation for his conducting of these works as well as of the standard repertoire. (Igor Stravinsky<sup>40</sup> Kurtz has known for many years; he has seen "many of the composer's works come into being and has been their consistent advocate.") He is likewise eager to foster new instrumental and vocal talent, in this regard being a sponsor of Carol Brice, contralto, and William Kapell, pianist, both of whom have been especially well received by the critics; and for 1947 he planned engagements for eight young American soloists during the Kansas City winter "Pops" season. In 1944 Kurtz's Kansas City Philharmonic was selected as the first orchestra to be presented on NBC's new radio program Orchestras of the Nation, with reappearances scheduled for the following seasons.

In addition to his regular tasks Kurtz has led a specially assembled orchestra for several Warner Brothers' shorts of the Ballet Russe and has conducted the London Philharmonic Orchestra in the scores for two motion pictures starring Elisabeth Bergner. A "tall, gaunt Russian," Kurtz was married in 1933 to Katherine Jaffé, whom he describes as an authority on cooking, ceramics, and painting. Kurtz himself makes a hobby of art, specializing in water colors and caricature. So well known has his interest in art work by children become that, it is pointed out, mothers now send him the paintings of their talented offspring for criticism. In addition, he collects letters from famous contemporaries, possessing many from Einstein<sup>41</sup>, Hindemith<sup>42</sup>, Prokofiev<sup>43</sup> and others; and he has built up an unusual collection of stamped letters which have some interesting historical significance. Of one of his constant companions, his French poodle Dandy, the conductor says, "You can talk to him and he understands, but he doesn't answer. That is so good sometimes."•

#### AN ARAB IDENTITY IN THE CAPITAL

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the issues that will eventually have to be confronted is the status of Jerusalem.

No Israeli Government can survive that divides Jerusalem. We should understand that, and we should not create false impressions among our Arab friends that there is going to be any other status.

Unfortunately, we have seen a recent President and Secretary of State unnecessarily raise doubts about Jerusalem.

But there will have to be some practical, symbolic adjustments made. Recently, I saw an article in the Jerusalem Post by Abraham Rabinovich, a member of the Jerusalem Post editorial staff, which had some observations. I am not, at this point, ready to endorse those observations, but what they do involve is fresh and practical thinking on this issue.

My own guess is that the current peace negotiations will stumble ahead. It will not be a graceful march, but Israel will be ahead and the Arab people, of whatever nationality, will be ahead. A full-scale war will gradually diminish as a probability.

But wars can erupt again and frequently erupt over symbols as much as over substance. The Rabinovich article is one that, I believe, merits reading by people who are looking for practical answers.

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Jerusalem Post, May 27, 1995]

#### AN ARAB IDENTITY IN THE CAPITAL

(By Abraham Rabinovich)

The terrifying scent of sanctity mixing with politics in the mountain air probably accounts for the fatuousness from normally sober politicians on the subject of Jerusalem.

Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin sought to justify this month's expropriations in east Jerusalem as an attempt to meet the needs

of an expanding population. Foreign Minister Shimon Peres suggested that it was an even-handed taking from Jews and Arabs in order to build for Jews and Arabs. Mayor Ehud Olmert said that any housing shortage in the Arab sector is their fault—even as he raises funds for Jewish messianists who, like detonators, insert themselves ever deeper into Arab quarters. The expropriations, of course, have nothing to do with urban considerations or even-handedness. They are the opening shots in what Housing Minister Binyamin Ben-Eliezer has called the battle for Jerusalem.

What makes this relatively small expropriation different from previous massive ones is that the latter were made in a context of political confrontation, while the current one comes in the midst of a delicate and troubled peace process. The controversy may serve a useful purpose, however, if it jars us collectively into beginning to think about the unthinkable: finding a political solution for Jerusalem.

An undivided city under Israeli sovereignty is a slogan, not a solution. There will be no solution unless Arab and Moslem sensitivities concerning Jerusalem are taken into account. Rabin's pledge of religious freedom will not carry far. The Arabs, who have lived here for 1,400 years, want political rights too, not just religious rights.

Jerusalem's Arabs are already entitled to almost 30% of the seats on the City Council, although they have thus far chosen not to take up the option. It is entirely conceivable that, in the not-too-distant future, an Arab-haredi coalition will leave Israel's capital in the hands of a non-Zionist city governments (a possibility hastened by the current expropriation, which the government says is intended for haredim and Arabs).

The Arabs, however, want more than that. They want an expression of their national identity in Jerusalem as well. It is possible to give it to them without endangering Israel's dominant status.

Creative diplomacy could permit the Palestinians to have their capital in a place called Jerusalem without negating Israel's position that it will not share its capital with them.

Eizariya, for instance, is outside the city limits—outside Israel, in fact—but is closer to the Old City, the heart of Jerusalem, than is the Knesset.

What if the Palestinians were to call this Jerusalem too—even if Israel does not acknowledge it as such—and establish their seat of governance there?

Boroughs and areas of jurisdiction that partly overlap and partly don't are other elements that have been proposed for a Jerusalem solution. The Temple Mount remains the core of the problem. Moshe Dayan's proposal to permit an Arab flag to fly there is still one of the most constructive on the table. The current boundaries of Jerusalem are not biblical writ. They were drawn up in our own time by mortal men, guided by strategic and demographic, not religious, considerations. The new boundaries of 1967 tripled the size of Israeli Jerusalem by incorporating not only Jordanian Jerusalem, but numerous Arab villages around it. There is no reason those boundaries could not be fuzzed in working out a solution both sides can live with. Israeli construction in east Jerusalem has far surpassed what was envisioned in the immediate aftermath of the Six Day War. The main objective then was to link west Jerusalem—via Ramat Eshkol and French Hill—with the isolated Hebrew University campus on Mount Scopus. When this had been achieved and the diplomatic sky did not fall, bolder expropriations were carried out.

Eventually one-third of east Jerusalem was expropriated. In addition, a corridor left

open east of Jerusalem in anticipation of a Jordanian solution was eventually sealed off by Ma'aleh Adumim. As geo-political strategy, this policy worked brilliantly. The main-stream Palestinian camp, watching the hills in Jerusalem and the territories being covered with Israeli housing finally sued for peace. Such heavily charged skirmishing, however, and even war itself or intifada, seems simple compared to the prospect of Jews and Arabs trying to share the city in political peace.

The absence of an assertive Arab political voice since 1967 has made it relatively easy for Israel to run Jerusalem. A Jewish-Arab council is easier to imagine as a cockpit of rancorous conflict than of co-existence. (It is rancorous enough, let it be said, as an all-Jewish council.) For the Arabs, there will be an ongoing grievance at least as massive as the Jewish housing estates covering the hills around Jerusalem. For the Jews, the most authentic Arab voice will long remain the one that drifted over the walls of the Old City from the Temple Mount loudspeakers on the first dawn of the Six Day War—itbach alyahud, slaughter the Jews.

It will not be easy. With wise leadership on both sides, ever mindful that we are lying down and rising up together in a mine field, it may be possible.

#### DISMANTLING THE COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I have been a longtime advocate of streamlining government and making it more effective to address the challenges of the global economy and information age as we move into the 21st century. While I have focused on these issues for many years as chairman and former ranking Republican of the Governmental Affairs Committee, I have never witnessed as great an interest in this critical issue than I have this Congress. I welcome this interest because I believe it offers great opportunity to achieve major and overdue structural reform of the executive branch. We can and will achieve the goal of smaller, better, and less costly government.

Most recently, attention has centered on eliminating the Commerce Department. It is endorsed as part of the budget resolution. The proposal introduced recently by Senator ABRAHAM, the majority leader, and others provides a specific plan on how to dismantle the Department.

I have long endorsed the idea of dismantling the Commerce Department in the context of elevating, streamlining, and reconfiguring major trade functions in the executive branch. It is very difficult to defend the status quo as it exists today at the Commerce Department, and I believe the initiatives that have been introduced are an important step toward the establishment of a government that is structured to deal effectively with the challenges of tomorrow, not yesterday.

I have worked on organizational issues for many years and I realize how difficult it is to bring about needed and constructive change. Turf usually overwhelms the process, whether it is in the administration or Congress, and the private sector is often either

unexcited about the issue, or they don't want to upset those with whom they have to work in the current structure. So it is not surprising that the recent legislation is controversial and that the trade provisions have engendered the greatest amount of concern. I, too, have concerns about certain provisions.

I would like to turn briefly to some of the trade concerns that have been raised in the initial debate on this issue so far. First, I firmly believe a vast majority of us agree on the vital importance of trade to this Nation and recognize that our Government plays a crucial role in this area. This role includes performing key functions as negotiating agreements to open markets, enforcing and implementing trade agreements, administering trade laws and facilitating exports.

For many years now, I have called for significant reform of executive branch trade functions and the case for reform has never been stronger than today. Uniting major trade responsibilities under the clear leadership of one person and establishing a more effective trade voice for our Nation is the direction in which we should head. It is time to recognize that much of the Commerce Department's trade activities are integrally involved with those of the USTR. There is no clear dividing line between them, except for the divided lines of authority. This has caused, and continues to cause, wasteful duplication of effort, confusion as to who is in charge, serious turf battles, and divide-and-conquer tactics by our trading partners. It is time that they become part of the same team with one coach in charge.

I have heard some disturbing accounts of how our trading partners take advantage of our divided trade leadership. For example, I've been told of instances where the lead trade negotiator from one of our fiercest trading partners would play the USTR and Commerce trade negotiators off one another by telling one that the other was willing to agree to something that the other would not agree to.

Ambassador Kantor's recent testimony before a House Appropriations subcommittee demonstrates the blurred nature of responsibilities between the International Trade Administration [ITA] and the USTR. He stated that the USTR's three top priorities are to ensure that the Uruguay round agreements are implemented fairly, to enforce trade agreements, and to expand trade to new markets that offer the greatest potential for increased exports of American products. That sounds a lot like what much of the ITA is doing.

I have an extremely high regard for the dedicated and talented staff at the USTR, but it is unrealistic to expect that they can continue to manage effectively a trade agenda that is ever more demanding and complex, under the current structure of divided trade leadership and responsibility. The fact