

**Writing for Radio Listeners in the 1930s:  
National Identity, Canonization, and Transnational Consensus  
from New York to Paris  
(COPYEDITED VERSION)**

Jann Pasler

Between the two world wars, radio broadcast music to millions of new listeners, dominating 67 percent of the airwaves in the United States, [and](#) up to 84 percent in France.<sup>1</sup> Scholars have recently begun to study this medium, but largely ignore radio's musical repertoire and guides written to explain it. Here, I argue, more was at stake than simply "cultural uplift."<sup>2</sup> What were music listeners coming to identify as their own? Faced with the extraordinary and unprecedented choice of music offered daily by not only local, regional, and national radio but also [by](#) foreign stations broadcasting across national borders, they needed help.<sup>3</sup> Under the cover of "music appreciation" complex nationalist agendas [as well as](#) the terms for understanding foreign music took root. From New York to Paris, radio guides endeavored to shape taste and identity, canonizing listening practices and national composers. From these also emerged a transnational consensus, especially on the importance of jazz.

**[<A>](#)Forming New Listeners in Great Britain, Germany, the United States, and France**

At first, those writing for radio listeners sought to explain "the fundamental facts related to music," [the language of art music, its instruments, its forms, and its genres.](#)<sup>4</sup> In one of the first such works, *Everybody's Guide to Radio Music* (1925),<sup>5</sup> Percy Scholes (1877–1958), the music critic for the BBC in London, writes in the first person as if in spirited conversation with the reader. What encouraged this was the station's receptivity to letters from listeners. Scholes here engages empathetically with not only their questions but also [with](#) their anxieties about music and its meaning, their tastes, and how to listen to an orchestra. To appreciate Wagner and modern music, he suggests, simply "put yourself in

a receptive state of mind.” Although Scholes covers music history in his earlier music appreciation books and acknowledges the importance of “personality” and “nationality” in music,<sup>6</sup> such concerns find no place in his radio guide, the distant past coming up only in a list of recommended opera libretti “likely to be broadcast,” beginning with *The Beggar’s Opera*.<sup>7</sup> Scholes sought to help radio listeners distinguish between enjoying music as music and “for what it recalls” in one’s memories, especially between “good and bad” music, thus establishing an important role for the music critic. As he points out, “the future of Music” depends not on concertgoers, but on “the immense army of ‘Broadcatchers’ all over the country.”<sup>8</sup>

In the 1930s, as radio’s capacity to reach the masses expanded, radio became an important social and political force. In 1932, Rudolf Arnheim, who had written on radio in Weimar since 1927, pointed to radio’s capacity to bridge the divide between “cultured and uncultured peoples” and break down the “walls that currently segregate political and ideological groups, social, educational, economic classes, and geographical regions.” Indeed, such arguments supported the emergence of national public stations across Europe. In calling on radio to “select from existing art what is simple enough to be felt by everyone—which is precisely the quality of great art,” Arnheim implicitly set the terms for shaping national taste. At the same time, he worried about radio’s potential as “an important tool of power.”<sup>9</sup> Increasing numbers of stations brought competition, especially across national borders. With the Third Reich using radio to promote its agendas throughout the Western world, it was all the more important to take seriously the power of radio.

Whereas Adorno saw radio as “monopolized mass production of standardized goods,”<sup>10</sup> Arnheim explained, “Good can only come of [radio] if the listener does not let one broadcast after another pour out on him quite mechanically, but selects when and to what he shall listen entirely according to his individuality and his state of mind at the time in question”—a process made possible in England and France by the weekly publication of radio programming in the local press.<sup>11</sup> To help listeners negotiate these choices and understand their meaning, music appreciation texts oriented to radio listeners turned from focusing on *how* one should listen to *what* one should listen to. With this came composer biographies, analyses of works, and historical overviews, increasingly

recounted from a nationalist perspective.<sup>12</sup> Music by living composers began to get pride of place as that most invested with contemporary relevance.

Hazel Gertrude Kinscella (1893–1960), a midwestern music educator, author of six *Music Appreciation Readers* (1926–27), and recipient of an M.A. from Columbia University (1934), organized her *Music on the Air* (1934) around answers to questions posed in some “two million letters” an American broadcasting station received “within the past ten months.” She saw music as “leisure-time enjoyment” and believed that “all listeners, musically trained or not, will have their pleasure in any piece of music increased by knowing the meaning and interpretation the composer had in mind when he wrote,” whether preoccupied with its “formal beauty or its ‘story.’” In part thanks to radio—note the large “NBC network” of radio stations across the country (Figure 1)—music had become a “universal possession”; in the book’s introduction, Daniel Gregory Mason, music professor at Columbia, called it an “international language.” After a foreword by Walter Damrosch, conductor and music advisor to NBC, who thought [the book](#) would “fill a real need,” [it](#) begins with “everybody’s music”—favorites chosen from a list of two hundred by radio listeners from around the country and “all walks of life.” After Beethoven’s Minuet in G comes Macdowell’s “To a [Wild Rose](#)” and Dvořák’s *Humoresque*, [and](#), after Handel and Schubert, the Negro spiritual “Deep River.” Noting their “gracious simplicity” as the key to their appeal and using them to discuss the elements of music, form, and beauty, she then turns to “the voice of the people,” [that is](#), folk music and dance from around the world.<sup>13</sup> History emerges in presenting musical genres, beginning with song and opera—from Greek drama and its Italian origins through Wagner and radio drama—then music for choruses, the church, bands, orchestra, chamber music, piano, and organ. Through opposing tensions, such as “the classic” and “the romantic,” “absolute,” and “storytelling” music, she explains the principal forms.<sup>14</sup>

<insert Figure 1 near here>

Richly illustrated with numerous photos of composers and performers and in clear, accessible prose, this book also argues for a certain American musical identity, [which was](#) debated at the time. Unlike Deems Taylor, who refuses to consider folksongs,

Native American tunes, Negro spirituals, or jazz as “the basis of American music . . . they are not American—that is, in the sense of expressing the soul of the average white American,”<sup>15</sup> Kinscella sees these as important aspects of American music and supports this claim with short contributions from twenty contemporaries, including women and an African American. Folksong informs chapters on Russian music, ballet, French-Canadian melodies, Amy Beach’s contribution on song, Howard Hanson’s analysis of “tendencies in American music,” and Percy Grainger on “modern trends.” But the importance of indigenous music emerges especially in the personal memoirs of composers recounting what they learned from Native Americans in Kansas (depicted in a photograph of Pueblo Indians recording “tribal melodies” for Thurlow Lieurance); folk music in the mountains of Kentucky, Appalachia, and Virginia; and Negro song, the latter written by the black composer and baritone Harry Burleigh.<sup>16</sup> Kinscella also includes short analyses of jazz-inflected pieces, such as Gershwin’s *Jazz Concerto in F* and his *Rhapsody in Blue*, “a jazz symphonic poem”; John Carpenter’s *Skyscrapers* (1926), with its “exhilarating features of jazz”; and Louis Gruenberg’s opera *Emperor Jones* (1933), about an African American who escapes to the West Indies, recently staged at the New York Metropolitan Opera. In [another](#) contribution, besides discussing the music of William Grant Still as “justly one branch of American music,” Howard Hanson sees jazz, “compounded of many subconscious influences . . . Negro, Jewish, and urban,” as illustrating “how a national form of popular music may grow spontaneously and naturally.” Robert Bennett and Randall Thompson exemplify for him “the active influence of jazz on symphonic music in America.”<sup>17</sup> Lily Strickland’s short essay on music of the Orient (the composer had lived in India for ten years) expands on another of the book’s themes, Orientalism. After Kinscella’s balanced presentation of twentieth-century music in France, Russia, and Germany (a page each), Rudolph Ganz, like Scholes, recommends that listeners approach modern music in America with “an open heart and an open mind. . . . Be enthusiastic!”<sup>18</sup>

Part two of *Music on the Air*, especially its biographical sketches of composers and analyses of their “most frequently performed and universally admired compositions” (150 pages), forges a portrait of 1930s American values by its inclusions and exclusions. Although [Kinscella](#) recognizes the achievements of Debussy, Stravinsky, Prokofiev, Schoenberg, Berg, Hindemith, and Honegger, suggesting an openness to

“experimentation,” [she](#) totally ignores the music of Charles Ives, Henry Cowell, Virgil Thomson, and even Aaron Copland. Was this in response to her New York advisors or was she, teaching piano at the University of Nebraska, simply unaware of them? Yet Kinscella includes many minor American composers: Seth Bingham, Howard Brockway, Harry Burleigh, Charles Cadman, Rossetter Cole, Walter Damrosch, Louis Gruenberg, Howard Hanson, Philip James, Edgar Kelley, Walter Kramer, Franck La Forge, Thurlow Lieurance, Daniel Mason, Douglas Moore, John Powell, Charles Skilton, Lily Strickland, and Deems Taylor. Would listeners have known these composers from the radio? Also remarkable, she gives to Daniel Gregory Mason as much space as Beethoven (8 pages), Percy Grainger and Rossetter Cole (4 pages), more than Mozart (3), and Hanson, Lieurance, MacDowell, Debussy, and César Franck as much as Verdi and Wagner (2 pages) and more than Stravinsky (1.5).<sup>19</sup> Kinscella may agree with Hanson—“[T](#)he primary importance of the composer in the history of music is undebatable.” But what have we lost in focusing our music histories predominantly on the modernist composers? Kinscella, self-consciously populist, also gives space to marching bands alongside orchestras, the voices of female patrons, performers, and composers, the imprint of geography and indigenous musical traditions on American music, and Americans who are “musical without knowing it.”<sup>20</sup>

The following year in France, a high-powered and diverse collection of French critics and historians, including socialists, moderates, and far-right sympathizers, joined forces to publish an analogous volume, *L’Initiation à la musique à l’usage des Amateurs de Musique et de Radio*.<sup>21</sup> (See [Appendix for](#) contributors.) Despite the authors’ advanced careers and a different organization, the book, also around 400 pages, shares with *Music on the Air* a similar analysis of what radio listeners need to know: basic notions about music, instruments, and genres, especially song, as well as music history, composer biographies, analyses of works, and terms. The co-authors give no special attention to European folk or [o](#)riental music, although they do include jazz. But they too explore and express national values, especially in their historical syntheses and vastly expanded sections on twentieth-century music (almost 100 pages), accompanied by a lexicology of terms (46 pages), and a “dictionary of works” (164 pages) as carefully chosen as Kinscella’s list. Coming to agreement on the *L’Initiation à la musique’s* content and

approach was crucial, for [it was](#) published between the 1934 riots (during which the police fired on 30,000 political opponents) and the 1936 victory for socialists in the Popular Front. *L'Initiation à la musique* sits on the threshold between two opposed political ideologies within France and the cultures needed to support them. A strong, united sense of French identity was necessary to stand up to the formidable dangers of Nazism and its radio propaganda.<sup>22</sup>

In many ways, this book embodies *bleu-horizon* nationalism. The color of its cover, also used on the cover of *Music in the Air*, harks back to [the color change in](#) French military uniforms during World War I, a kind of camouflage intended to confuse the enemy, with French soldiers blending into the sky-blue horizon. This color came to signify the *union sacrée*, the political coalition achieved during the war.<sup>23</sup> From 1919 on, it was associated with nationalism tainted with nostalgia for the Belle Epoque.<sup>24</sup> In the 1930s, when many desired another *union sacrée*, the concept of *bleu horizon* was a flag under which they could reunite.<sup>25</sup> At the same time, this emblem of alliance was ambiguous, possibly anticipating the *réintégration patrimoniale* sought by the emerging Popular Front. With the lithograph of a young man or boy playing a drum on the cover and title page (see Figure 2), the publisher may have hoped to attract the attention of people in the provinces, major supporters of the political Right since the nineteenth century. Yet, with the instrument inaccurately represented and the hat-like object over his head resembling a mask of a commedia dell'arte character, the image combines elements from various contexts and periods to suggest multiple meanings. The boy, a kind of town crier with a message to deliver, suggests that [though](#) references to the past are significant, historical rigor or exactitude is not. What is important is merely that one listen.

<insert Figure 2 near here>

Arguably more than other books of its kind, *L'Initiation à la musique* sheds light on the processes of musical canonization in the 1930s: how authority is claimed, how writing constructs reality, and how canons are made and unmade according to some

underlying purpose. Like *Music in the Air*, it embodies the tastes, agendas, and tactics of its authors, who sought to rewrite the past as they shaped perception of the present. For the sake of “the success of a communal work,” its eight contributors were expected to “sacrifice any nuance of their personal opinion,”<sup>26</sup> including diverse political ideologies and opinions they had expressed elsewhere. Here they also put aside the first-person singular and explicit authorship of the individual chapters. In writing history together for the largest public imaginable, they came together as Frenchmen and conceived of Frenchness in broader terms than we [have](#) heretofore understood. The book suggests how intertwined the values of the Left and the Right [were](#) in 1935 and how, through music, nationalist sentiment could be used to build an alliance.

### [<A>](#) **Music on French Radio and Critical Advocacy in *Radio-Magazine***

In the spirit of rebuilding the country after the war, on 26 November 1921, a year after radio was born in Pittsburgh, the French experimented with their first “wireless telegraphy [TSF].” a concert, [which began](#) with the *Marseillaise*. Soon Radio Tour-Eiffel, run by the French Army Signal Corps, began broadcasting. Returning in February 1922 from his visit to the Pittsburgh radio station, Emile Girardeau proposed a private radio station that [would offer](#), as a public service, four daily concerts alongside news and diverse information. That November, eight days before the BBC did the same in London, Radiola started.<sup>27</sup> Victor Charpentier, the brother of Gustave, composer of *Louise*, became artistic director and conductor of the station’s orchestral concerts. In 1923 Radio PTT became the second [state-subsidized](#) station in France, and in 1924, now broadcasting as far as the United States, Radiola changed its name to Radio-Paris. More regulation came with the Service de Radiodiffusion in 1926, the Committee to Study Music in 1928, and the Commission on Radio Programming in 1929. [Serving on](#) the latter [were](#) the poet Paul Valéry—enthusiastic about the medium as embodying a new kind of time and space—the senator Jouvenel, the director of the Conservatoire Henri Rabaud, and the composers Maurice Ravel and Louis Aubert. To support improvements a tax of 50 francs was instituted on all radios in 1933. Radio formally became a public service and Radio-Paris was nationalized. At that point, fourteen state and ten private stations were on the

air in France, competing for audiences [and](#) often with innovative programming.<sup>28</sup> The [stations](#) broadcast to over a million radios (five million by 1939), mostly owned in the cities. In 1934 the Orchestre national de la Radiodiffusion was created, giving its 500th concert in March 1938.

Similarly, in the United States Walter Damrosch broadcast live classical music concerts of the New York Symphony beginning in 1925; the Federal Radio Commission was established in 1927, the FCC in 1934. Music programming on American radio was heavily oriented toward European art music, some hoping to “wipe away the stigma of class privilege borne by art music” with the aim of democratizing taste and encouraging “self-improvement.” According to Robert Hullot-Kentor, “WQXR in New York City played classical music 80 per cent of the time and in the other 20 per cent talked primarily about it and the other arts.”<sup>29</sup> This did not last and never had the same presence in rural areas, but it may help explain the significant place of American art music in Kinsella’s *Music on the Air*.

In the 1930s, radio programming in France consisted of from 53 to 84 percent music—with serious music ranging from 12 to 92 percent, reflecting the diversity inherent in the French radio system.<sup>30</sup> From Paris to North Africa, most stations had their own small studio orchestras, with six musicians at Radiola and Tour Eiffel in the 1920s, as in brasseries of the time. In Paris the microphone was often carried around to local orchestras, such as the Concerts Lamoureux. French station directors kept abreast of trends abroad, and, as in the Anglophone world, solicited the opinions and suggestions from their listeners.<sup>31</sup> In part in response to public demand, the musical repertoire on French stations varied. Stations soon began to specialize in complementary ways. When Radio Parisien split off from Radio-Paris in 1931, the latter’s “dance” orchestra, added in 1924, [having been](#) criticized as “appalling,” the former’s emphasis on variety and entertainment allowed the latter to become even stronger in its “cultural” orientation to musical and literary programs. By 1933, the nationalized Radio-Paris, “the only radio station of which the French can be proud,” became the “flagship national station that would represent France to its own citizens and to the rest of the world.”<sup>32</sup>

Radio listeners became an increasingly significant part of the public for art music in France, as elsewhere, especially as the appeal of live concerts decreased with the



growing popularity of cinema and sports.<sup>33</sup> Attendance at the Opéra-Comique also went down 50 percent between 1929–30 and 1935–36.<sup>34</sup> In 1930, André Coeuroy pointed to differences between listeners at concerts whose experiences of the music were shared and potentially bonding, and radio listeners who tended to listen alone and could turn the dial at any moment.<sup>35</sup> At the same time, radio offered new educational opportunities. Arguments from the early Third Republic, stressing the potential of art music to form and elevate public taste and the importance of reaching all classes, returned to the public sphere. If radio could penetrate daily life, Vuillermoz saw it as an “unconscious education of the ear.”<sup>36</sup>

One of the most important ways to educate new listeners were weekly radio magazines—*Radio News* (1919–59) in the USA, *Radio Times* (1923–2009) in the UK, and *Radio-Magazine* (1919–39) in France.<sup>37</sup> *Radio-Magazine* was advertised at the end of *L’Initiation à la musique* for its “complete programs, technical advice, independent critics, and constructive perspectives” (see Figure 3). Its fifty pages printed the daily radio programs of not only French and French-colonial stations, but also many from all over Europe, and these in far greater detail than those printed in newspapers such as *Le Figaro*.<sup>38</sup> As its editor, Francis Dorset understood that four-fifths of their listeners were fairly new to radio, its purpose was to form taste, refine what was inborn, and make it such that “all classes could differentiate between a melody of Fauré or Massenet and an air from *Paillasse*.”<sup>39</sup> Already in their second issue, Dorset, like Scholes, invited and responded to letters from listeners. One objected to including Ravel on their programs, his *Ma Mère l’oye* “a series of incoherent sounds.” Dorset jumped to Ravel’s defense. If Ravel’s music is “difficult” and does not tolerate “mediocre performances or transmissions,” it does need “a little initiation . . . some training.” Perhaps this listener was simply surprised by a kind of music to which he was not accustomed. Responding to one who detested jazz and feared it would “pervert French taste,” Dorset pointed to the thousands of bad recordings and called on radio stations to make intelligent choices of this “original” music that is “infusing new, young blood” in the music of “old Europe.”<sup>40</sup> Dorset hoped that through “daily listening to a vast repertoire,” “young peasants and young workers” would develop “love and understanding of the musical masterpieces.” Dorset also called on tolerance of “individual preferences.”<sup>41</sup>

< insert Figure 3 near here >

When it came to recordings, beginning in November 1928 Dominique Sordet, future editor of *L'Initiation à la musique*, contributed a weekly column of reviews addressed especially to intellectuals, collectors, and bibliophiles. *Radio-Magazine* expected him to comment on the “interpenetration” of radio and recordings, “the two arts called upon to overthrow the conditions of musical life.” Record collectors, faced with exploding growth in the recording industry, needed someone to help them avoid “ruinous expenses and interminable research.”<sup>42</sup> Radio stations, too, needed advice for regular programs with recordings. In his first article, Sordet explained his primary task as one of selection and offered his choice of twelve recordings “every amateur must possess”: songs from Italy, France, Spain (e.g. Falla), America (“Maybe”), England (a religious choir performing “Jerusalem”), and Russia; Liszt’s [S](#)econd [H](#)ungarian [R](#)hapsody conducted by Stokowski; *The Nutcracker* overture led by Oskar Fried; Debussy’s *Petite Suite* by Jacques Thibaud; “New Saint-Louis Blues”; Fantasy on the Name of Bach, performed on the Westminster organ; and Percy Grainger’s rendition of a Chopin sonata. Sordet saw stylistic and national diversity as one of the “greatest attributes” of the “*machine parlante*.”<sup>43</sup> In his next article, he laid out the recordings of instrumental music a serious collector should have, whether for the virtuosity of the interpreter or the timbre of their instrument, listing works by Tchaikovsky, Mendelssohn, Granados, Massenet, Handel, Scarlatti, and Saint-Saëns as well as lesser-known French contemporaries such as Georges Hüe and Henri Büsser.<sup>44</sup>

Next came a series of articles on recordings of various national traditions.<sup>45</sup> Sordet’s tastes were catholic and, even if each article gives a bit of history, his primary focus [was](#) on contemporary music, from Stravinsky and Casella to Schoenberg. Here one can surmise the critic’s preferences: his enthusiasm for Russian music and American jazz in particular, the latter dominating the article on American music, his longest. He later devotes articles to jazz and tango, showing remarkable knowledge of this repertoire and its performers.

Of signal importance to Sordet was the technical quality of recordings. A French nationalist, Sordet was nevertheless willing to admit that there were many very good recordings of German music. If Wagner “is the favorite of the average musician,” it could well be because his music works “marvelously” well on the “pick-up”; five recordings of Brahms’s music, he points out, were among the best of 1928. [Sordet’s](#) critique of “Austro-Hungarian music,” by far the shortest of [his](#) reviews (which he excuses because he had the flu), reflects in part the poor recordings available, as if their technical limits were enough to deter listeners. Schoenberg may have been a “chemist more than musician, a theoretician more than composer,” but since there were no recordings that adequately “reproduce his experiments in sound,” it was difficult to evaluate. Ravel’s *La Valse*, a pastiche on the Viennese waltz, [also](#) “doesn’t work on the phonograph,” nor do any recordings of Bruckner and Mahler—“too Germanic” in any case to appeal to a French public.<sup>46</sup>

The number of musicologists and critics writing for *Radio-Magazine* in the 1930s began to grow, including those who would later contribute to *L’Initiation à la musique*. Henri Prunières wrote on how recordings could be of use in musicology just as Vuillermoz, who had earlier written for *Cinémagazine*, began a weekly column reviewing sound films—music in film, films of such works as Dukas’s *Sorcerer’s Apprentice*, and eventually talkies. Maurice Emmanuel occasionally contributed, such as an essay on innovations in opéra-comique on 29 May 1932.<sup>47</sup> When it came to French music that listeners might encounter on the radio, *Radio-Magazine’s* collaborators tended to focus on the major modern composers. In spring 1932, Paul Landormy reviewed recordings of Debussy’s Quartet, Franck’s chamber music, [Ravel’s Piano Concerto](#), Saint-Saëns’s [Septet](#), and Cortot’s recording of Debussy’s piano music. From January through June 1932, Sordet devoted articles to new recordings of music by Massenet, Hahn, Debussy, Ravel, Fauré, Charpentier, Schmitt, Roussel, d’Indy, Lalo, and Grétry. The magazine gave little attention to the many minor French composers who were frequently included on French radio programs, such as Wormser, Vidal, Rhené Baton, Levadé, Ganne, Sévéric, Chaminade, Fourdrain, and others. Particularly significant is *Radio-Magazine’s* attention to Ravel, especially given that there was considerable resistance to Ravel’s

music among listeners, as noted earlier, and relatively little of it on many French stations during this period, despite the fact that Ravel was part of the state's Radio Commission.<sup>48</sup>

Understanding the problem, the editor and other contributors used *Radio-Magazine* as a forum to defend and promote Ravel.<sup>49</sup> In an article on the composer in January 1930, Dorset expressed his “affection” and “admiration” for the composer on the occasion of the Concerts Lamoureux’s upcoming performance of *Boléro*, then in February his enthusiastic appreciation of this concert, broadcast on French radio.<sup>50</sup> Around the same time, Sordet granted Ravel high stature in examining a recording of *L’Heure espagnole* alongside those of Wagner’s *Ring* and Stravinsky’s *Sacre du printemps*. If the Stravinsky deserves praise, it is the high quality of the performers; if the Ravel arouses criticism, it is the performers’ difficulty in capturing Ravel’s music on wax.<sup>51</sup> On 20 March 1932, Sordet again placed Ravel at the center of a prestigious triangle, framed by discussion of new recordings by Debussy and Fauré. Allying his agenda with that of Piero Coppola, director of Gramophone, Sordet explains that if Ravel’s *Sonatine* is “an aristocratic and refined art that speaks only to relatively few,” Cortot’s recording—and, implicitly, the radio—could do much to help Ravel to become better known and appreciated.<sup>52</sup> When Ravel’s Piano Concerto in G was first performed in January 1932, Sordet returned to the “problem” of Ravel’s music: if it is among the “most subtle” music and requires “a huge effort to pay attention to it,” we should be all the more happy that it has been engraved in wax. In reviewing Marguerite Long’s recording of the concerto, Landormy not only recognized the pianist’s “clear sonorities” and “dazzling technique,” he also pointed out the work’s indebtedness to Mozart, Saint-Saëns, Fauré, *Petrushka*, and jazz.<sup>53</sup> Ravel clearly needed such arguments to reach the larger public. As in 1905 when he lost the Prix de Rome to a far inferior competitor, Ravel’s admirers at *Radio-Magazine* used their critical platform to defend the composer, explain his music’s difficulties, and, with the advent of recordings, hold out hope for more understanding in the future. Perhaps in response to such advocacy, Ravel’s music increased threefold on French radio between 1925–30 and 1931–35.<sup>54</sup>

*Radio-Magazine* thus brought together some of France’s leading music critics and provided a context for taking new technologies seriously, addressing the aspirations associated with them, and promoting certain agendas. With the country teetering between

political extremes after the longest period of stability in recent French history, what could be shared was more important than what divided. But how to both satisfy connoisseurs and reach the broadest public? What works [would](#) initiate popular audiences and form a new generation of music lovers? What to present as quintessentially French? Radio criticism, together with radio programming, offers a fascinating and important source for investigating French nationalism in the 1930s, even if the wealth of material makes this daunting.

#### [<A>](#)Consolidating Taste and Writing History: *L'Initiation à la musique*

Two companies representing the radio industry, Ducretet and Thomson, [which](#) merged in 1930, sponsored *L'Initiation à la musique*.<sup>55</sup> In return for underwriting the book, they asked for something very unusual, if not unprecedented, in French publishing: twelve glossy pages of ads at the back of the book, the last of which is for *Radio-Magazine*, suggesting a close relationship. Five pages have long texts about the companies' histories, others feature evocative photographs. The ads explain that the Maison Ducretet, founded in 1864 to make laboratory instruments, attempted the first radio transmission in 1898. The Thomson-Houston Company, one of the oldest French makers of electrical materials, began to make *machines parlantes* (record players) in 1928 and somewhat later a *résonateur dynharmonique* (amplifying speaker). Both companies believed in the value of collaboration between technicians and musicians. Their administrative director, the great nephew of Gounod, formed a musical committee of professionals who “produce, interpret, and listen to music.”<sup>56</sup> This included the conductor-composers Gabriel Pierné, Désiré-Émile Inghelbrecht, and Walter Straram; the composers Maurice Ravel, Arthur Honegger, and Reynaldo Hahn; and the critics Emile Vuillermoz and Dominique Sordet (see Figure 4). These musicians were expected to “follow the work of the engineers and help them with their criticism and suggestions” so that “close cooperation” could help the company innovate in response to “new needs.”<sup>57</sup> By 1935, the companies had sponsored several musical events proposed by committee members, including a ballet by Pierné accompanied only by *machine parlante*. In 1939, they also sponsored a collection of memoirs by Ravel's friends,<sup>58</sup> produced by the same publisher in over seven thousand *de*

*luxe* copies.<sup>59</sup> They also sponsored a collection of recordings to “illustrate” *L’Initiation à la musique*.

<insert Figure 4 near here>

Three of same people who wrote for *Radio-Magazine* and served on the radio manufacturer’s advisory committee also collaborated on *L’Initiation à la musique*: Emile Vuillermoz, Reynaldo Hahn, and Dominique Sordet. Vuillermoz also served as president of the music section of the Central Committee for Broadcasting of the French Radio Service. Three historian-critics did most of the writing: Vuillermoz, Paul Landormy, and Maurice Emmanuel. As explained in the preface, the first two wrote the history sections [inspired](#) in part by their previous music histories, with Landormy covering the “classics,” Vuillermoz the modern and contemporary composers, and Emmanuel the 50-page lexography of terms. Emmanuel and Vuillermoz wrote the 164-page Dictionary of individual works, the latter responsible for works by living composers. Reynaldo Hahn, who taught song interpretation at the Ecole Normale, contributed a chapter on singing, Georges Chepfer one on song, and Maurice Yvain another on instruments. Hugues Panassié, a jazz critic, wrote the short jazz section and explained jazz terms. These names are on the title page, with Sordet noted as general editor only in the book’s introduction [\(see Appendix for short bios of these authors\)](#).<sup>60</sup>

The co-authors’ backgrounds suggest that, like the *bleu-horizon* coalition, they embraced a wide spectrum of political orientations. While Emmanuel and Landormy had close ties with socialists associated with the Popular Front, Sordet wrote for the reactionary newspaper *L’Action française*. Most had grown up disenchanted with their predecessors and were open to the latest modern technologies. Four had a history of fighting for new perspectives, voices, and musical paths, including jazz, though not always on the same sides of the issues.<sup>61</sup> Even if they promoted their opinions with zeal, nothing in this book suggests that it had fascist undertones or agendas, as Jane Fulcher has implied in situating it within her discussion of the “pro-Fascist” press.<sup>62</sup>

As with radio programmers at the time, when it came to making their selections, *L’Initiation à la musique*’s contributors believed that priority had to be given to modern

music—what music listeners would most likely hear on the radio. Consequently, in their “brief history of music” they devote only four pages to anything before the eighteenth century, despite the attention Prunières, Princesse de Polignac, Nadia Boulanger, Wanda Landowska, and others were giving to early music at the time. Only fifteen pages cover the eighteenth century; twenty-three pages concern the early-to-mid nineteenth century.

Most of the historical section—[fifty-four](#) pages—addresses the “European schools” of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. As one might imagine, French composers dominate, with 60 percent of the book devoted to them. Meanwhile, the works included in the [D](#)ictionary, chosen as “typical” and the most apt to instill “the taste for listening and the desire to understand,” are perhaps more representative of the music played on the radio.<sup>63</sup> 10 percent of the works are from before the eighteenth century, 50 percent from the eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth century, and 40 percent from the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.<sup>64</sup>

A common tactic used to assert authority is unconditional assertion. This begins in the opening section, “What is music?” To help listeners encountering unknown works, like Scholes, they give the following “general advice”: Don’t assume that music is just a question of taste and [that](#) all tastes are good—in music, as in wine, there is good and bad. Connoisseurs like us can tell the difference, so let us decide such things for you. Music that bores you or seems incomprehensible today you may later like.<sup>65</sup> This authoritative, paternalist style continues in the historical section, based in part on Landormy’s *Histoire de la musique* (1910):

Music is as old as humanity. . . . Man sang perhaps even before he spoke. . . . In all of antiquity, one sang solo or in choruses at the *unison* (or, when children’s voices were added to men’s voices, at the *octave*).<sup>66</sup>

Emmanuel, who had written his dissertation on ancient Greek music and dance, strangely has no voice here. And Landormy makes no mention of his own work on Greek philosophers that may have led him to mention Greek modes or Greek music’s effect on listeners’ character or behavior.<sup>67</sup> He continues:

Song in several parts, or *polyphony*, dates from the nineteenth century and was born in church. In the thirteenth century, it was an organized art coming from Notre Dame de Paris that spread across all of Europe. This is the origin of our [Western](#) modern art. . . . Until the sixteenth century, the *Franco-Belgian school* was the most important in the world. Many French and Flemish musicians worked for wealthy patrons in Italy.<sup>68</sup>

Landormy then lists a number of sixteenth-century composers—Josquin, Jannequin, Palestrina. That’s it: six centuries of music history condensed into less than a page.

To emphasize France's role in music history, the authors use consciously reductive vocabulary that implies colonialist expansion of French ideas to the rest of the [West](#) and admits no French debt to ideas from abroad. Missing is Gregorian chant, early Spanish polyphony, thirteenth-century English rondo, and Italian Arts nova. Landormy seems not to have learned anything more about chant or the Middle Ages since his *Histoire*, which suffers some of the same blind spots.

On page 2, Landormy leaps to the invention of opera. Here he admits that the French owe something to the Italians. But after a short paragraph on Monteverdi, he writes one of the most stunning assertions in the book:

Soon came its decadence. Little by little, opera became an interminable concert . . . music killed the drama. . . . Italian opera invaded all of Europe. Alone, France resisted.<sup>69</sup>

Such a statement—turning music into the material for invasions, battles, and triumphs—dictates the book’s tone and vocabulary. Emmanuel, too, in the book’s Dictionary entry on opera, describes the genre as a “reaction” against polyphony and the widespread “invasion” of choral music. Every change in style, every transnational movement, the authors see as the occasion for confrontation—choral music vs. operatic solo song, Lully vs. Cavalli, Rameau vs. opera-bouffe, French opera vs. Italian opera, Gluck vs. Piccinni. It also characterizes the way they discuss “conquests of thought, writing, and style.”<sup>70</sup> Works that had a hard time getting heard or winning public



approval, such as those of Bizet, Bruneau, Charpentier, and Roussel, were “battles.”<sup>71</sup> This attitude does not characterize Landormy’s earlier *Histoire de la musique*, but it does permeate most of Vuillermoz’s critical writing since the sacred battalion he helped organize for the premiere of Debussy’s *Pelléas et Mélisande*.<sup>72</sup> In his *Histoire de la musique* (1949), Vuillermoz explains:

All music history is only a series of canvassing, probing, discovering, emancipating, freeing, annexing, enlarging frontiers, enriching, perfecting . . . in short, perpetual conquests.<sup>73</sup>

Such a way of thinking could reflect growing French anxiety in 1935 about another potential war on the horizon.

In the rest of the eighteenth-century section, Landormy examines a series of composers, mostly German, beginning with J. S. Bach. Thereafter, a succession of biographies replaces history. This marks a significant difference with Emmanuel’s two-volume *Histoire de la langue musicale* (1911) on the evolution of music theory from antiquity to contemporary times. Perhaps because of the intended radio audience, Landormy stresses composers’ personalities and affairs with women (especially non-French composers), their productivity, and their strategies for success. Handel was “an impetuous man, with terrible anger . . . violently passionate; Beethoven’s father was a drunk; the composer’s passions made him “always unhappy,” and so on (25, 30–31).<sup>74</sup>

The nineteenth-century history focuses on German and Italian music—Beethoven through Schumann (10 pages), Wagner (4 pages), and Italian opera (4 pages)—with more limited discussions of composers in France—Chopin and Berlioz (2 pages each) and Meyerbeer (1 page). In what follows, “the European schools,” considerable space is again given to the “Germans” (Humperdinck, Brahms, Mahler, Richard Strauss, to Hindemith, 3 pages) and the Italians (Puccini, Léoncavallo to Rieti, 2 pages), but even more to the Russians (Russian Five to Prokofiev, 4+ pages). Each part ends with how the younger generation is reacting to its predecessors—in Russia those influenced by Bolshevism, in Germany those trying to get beyond Wagner, and in Italy those opposed to realism.

Interestingly, the descriptions are neutral to positive in tone rather than critical. Young

Russians seem to be inspired by themes arising from the mysticism of collective work and are having brilliant success depicting the life of factories and the lyricism of machines. Kurt Weill, who pursued an ideal of simplicity and “put his art at the service of political and pedagogical ideas” had to stop working when “Hitler abruptly interrupted compositional activity by Jewish composers” (55). Nonetheless, some of his works seem to “conform to the orthodoxy of the regime” (55). Hindemith is respected among the younger Germans, stimulating interest from musicians in “all countries” (56).

Given that foreign music occupied up to 40 percent of French radio programs, it was important to include a wide range of it in the book. Both major and minor composers from Spain, Belgium, Switzerland, and Czechoslovakia get remarkably serious treatment, followed by Romania and Poland, whereas [most of those](#) in Austria, England, and Hungary get very little—recalling their treatment from Sordet in *Radio-Magazine* (1932). The book omits Bruckner and describes the influence of the Second Viennese School as “limited,” its promise yet to be demonstrated. With only two sentences for Schoenberg, [it notes](#) his influence on “all the European avant-gardes” (65), but [explains](#) that the French public knew only his *Gurrelieder* and *Pierrot Lunaire*, the same works discussed in *Music on the Air*. Stravinsky gets a page and a half, his three ballets praised for their “legendary” innovations, “stunning victories,” and “bold conquests” whose “significance was considerable.” However, a certain reserve is implied in references to Stravinsky’s “aggressive and violent temperament” and to the “submissive/obedient” nature of the French response to this inspiration (60).<sup>75</sup> Some of his neoclassical works are dismissed as contradictory and “disappointing” to his early admirers (61), reflecting resistance to both his and Schoenberg’s aesthetic evolution in the 1930s.

When discussing modern French composers, the sheer number seems to support the book’s contention that “no other country can boast such a number of creators bringing new and exciting elements to the international art.”<sup>76</sup> Vuillermoz, responsible for this section, focuses on what they contributed to a French national sensibility. He begins with those touched by German Romanticism and associated with César Franck and his circle—Duparc, Chausson, Pierné, Dukas, Bordes, d’Indy, and his followers. Fulcher sees the book as characterized by “overt adulation of the ideals of the Schola Cantorum,”<sup>77</sup> but close study does not support this hypothesis. Emmanuel had written a

book on Franck, but both Vuillermoz and Landomy remained vigorously opposed to the Schola. Not surprisingly, of the eight pages for this discussion (one-quarter of the French section), less than three concern d'Indy's music, pedagogy, and students. D'Indy is hardly "lauded most extensively," as Fulcher contends.<sup>78</sup> Vuillermoz's tone is respectful, but not enthusiastic. He criticizes the composer's dogmatism, pointing to how much stricter and more formalized it was than the "pedagogical ideals" of Franck (74).<sup>79</sup> Vuillermoz also recognizes a certain irony in the double nature of the composer and his career, full of paradox.<sup>80</sup> D'Indy's best students were "not the most docile." His only students here discussed are Sévérac and Roussel, both of whom "clearly separated themselves from his influence" (76). Even d'Indy did not strictly apply his "intransigent dogmas" in his own music (75), which was much "less austere and rigorous than his pedagogy" and could have "pastoral poetry and a certain orchestral voluptuousness which is quite distant from the ascetic spirituality so fundamental in his doctrine."<sup>81</sup> *Initiation's* Dictionary includes analyses of d'Indy's *Symphonie cévénole* and *Wallenstein*, both early-career works written before the composer became controversial, but no music by other Scholists. Vuillermoz [acknowledges](#) the composer as a "passionate defender of the most affirmative musical nationalism"; however, he criticizes d'Indy for never freeing himself from the influence of Wagner.<sup>82</sup> Overall, d'Indy's music comes off as less interesting and important than that of Duparc and Pierné, other Franck students, each given more space here than d'Indy and praised in stronger terms.<sup>83</sup> As for the ongoing influence of the Schola, the world of radio was beginning to reach a far larger network of listeners than those who attended Schola concerts across the country.

Vuillermoz's second category of composers comprises those with "essentially French musicalities" (70), as if those in the first category were not essentially French. This includes Gounod, Delibes, Bizet, Lalo, Chabrier, Saint-Saëns, Massenet, Bruneau, Charpentier, Fauré, Messager, Debussy, Ravel, Schmitt, and others up through Jacques Ibert and Honegger. Such a list represents a wide variety of "means," "objectives," and political orientations: opportunist republicans like Saint-Saëns and Fauré as well as socialists like Bruneau, Charpentier, Ravel, and Ibert. What this group shares is their link to the "pure sap of our secular tradition that no foreign grafting will change."<sup>84</sup> Each has made a unique contribution to French music. Gounod's melodies contain "the seeds of an

entire national style that remains secretly faithful to this origin” (77). Ambroise Thomas’s numerous works, especially *Mignon*, “represent a minute characteristic of our national sensibility that has left its mark on popular sentiment” (78). Bizet’s “lively colors, nervous, personal rhythms, and surprising vitality” and Lalo’s “discreet feelings, poetic atmosphere, and delicate fantasies” represent other aspects of the “French genius” (78–79). Delibes and Chabrier are valued as precursors for what they taught to others.

The treatment of Saint-Saëns is the most complex in the book, fraught with contradictions. In their introduction, the authors reproduce a theme from his Third Symphony—the only musical example in *L’Initiation à la musique*—to illustrate a musical “thought” and their third definition of music as “the art of thinking with sounds” (3). Yet in the history section, the text about Saint-Saëns is full of pejorative implications. Even if, as he points out in 1923, the composer “defended the rights of pure reason, lucidity, and logic” and “his perfect writing will always inspire admiration from technicians,” Vuillermoz here finds his “mathematical spirit” troubling, his intelligence one that “paralyzes somewhat his feelings.”<sup>85</sup> Particularly unfair is the depiction of his career. Deprived of any real struggles to succeed, Saint-Saëns is little more than a “superior dilettante,” despite having written in every genre and achieved the “most difficult *tours de force*.”<sup>86</sup> Perhaps the composer’s “sarcastic and ironic” behavior with his peers motivated such derision. In any case, such a representation of his life and works makes it clear that the authors of *L’Initiation à la musique* respect the composer but wish to revise his reputation, demoting him from the quintessential French musician perhaps to make more room for their own musical heroes, discussed below. Ironically, that same year the French government encouraged numerous countries to celebrate the centennial of Saint-Saëns’s birth (1835) and many contributed toward a Saint-Saëns monument, thus testifying to the esteem in which many held the composer and his music.<sup>87</sup>

The book also takes aim at Massenet: he was as excessively sentimental as Saint-Saëns was “glacially distant.”<sup>88</sup> Although Vuillermoz acknowledges the importance of his class at the Conservatoire and finds the composer “profoundly musical,” he faults Massenet for bending to the capricious desires of his all-too-numerous public (82–83). And under *opéra-comique* in the lexicology of terms, Emmanuel omits mention of Massenet entirely, concentrating instead on his eighteenth-century predecessors. Such

treatment attempts to dethrone another of the most popular French composers on French radio. André Messager, who could be described in similar terms, gets more credit as “among the most remarkable artists of our time” and someone who “ennobled the genre” of comic opera, perhaps in part because of his influence on the “*musique légère*” of the 1930s (88).

Bruneau and Charpentier reap particular praise. Described as an independent among his contemporaries, Bruneau “ennobled French lyric art without ever seeking easy success” (84). His “sincere and ample landscapes” had no rivals. What Vuillermoz admires in Bruneau—his courage, honesty, and vigorous lyricism—is quite different than Fulcher’s assessment of him as a promoter of “rational values.”<sup>89</sup> Vuillermoz clearly esteems the socialist ideals and the musical depiction of contemporary society expressed by Bruneau and Charpentier.<sup>90</sup> Unlike the egoism or “*esprit de petite chapelle*” that motivated many of their contemporaries, Charpentier’s generosity stands out. Vuillermoz praises him for losing no opportunity to bring his art “to the poorest listeners,” “himself conducting outdoors for crowds of workers”—something “exceptional and instructive” in modern history.<sup>91</sup> Two Charpentier pieces are analyzed in the book’s [Dictionary of works](#). *L’Initiation à la musique* also acknowledges the debt of those who followed in this tradition, such as Francis Casadesus whose music also sings of the “beauty of the earth and the lyricism of modern life” (97).

Vuillermoz’s treatment of Fauré, Debussy, and Ravel is the book’s most salient feature. Calling these composers the three brightest “stars” of French music [represents a significant departure from Landormy’s \*Histoire\*](#),<sup>92</sup> which gives far less importance to Fauré and Ravel than to Debussy. Vuillermoz here brings the missionary zeal and critical strategies that characterize his other writing. His vocabulary is imperialist and promises secrets, magic, and miracles to the adventurous listener, a discourse resonant with writing about the radio as well.<sup>93</sup> “We have not yet discovered all the treasures in Fauré’s music. . . . In the realm of harmony, Fauré has opened extraordinarily fertile paths” (90). Debussy, too, moving in unpopular directions, “courageously cleared [*défricha*] the virgin forest.” Appropriating an expression generally used for Saint-Saëns, Vuillermoz praises Fauré for writing with great mastery in all genres. Debussy’s accomplishments seem almost miraculous and the extent of his influence “universal” and “unforgettable.” As

Vuillermoz acknowledges, Debussy continued the tradition of Rameau, returning to the “clarity, measure, and elegance he admired in our national classical art.” But, equally significant, many sentences are peppered with “new” or “novelty,” without the aggressivity associated with Stravinsky. Debussy’s “refined and powerful language” allowed him to express “the most secret movements of our soul, the most mysterious aspects of nature, and the most hidden secrets of the elements.”<sup>94</sup> Vuillermoz also praises Ravel’s “truly magical writing” which “conquered” the public of the concert hall and theater (94).<sup>95</sup> These composers deserve admiration for opposing the academic aesthetic of the time and for asserting their individuality.

Of the three, Vuillermoz holds his own teacher, Fauré, as “the most French of the musicians of France.”<sup>96</sup> “Everything in him is music and nothing but music. . . . No elements are borrowed from the other arts or scholastics” (90). Sweetness, delicacy, sensibility, charm, tact, and nonchalance as embodied in Fauré’s music here define the quintessentially French. And yet, as he admits, the composer, even by 1935, was “little known by the masses and almost entirely unknown abroad” (90).

To understand why Vuillermoz elevates Fauré above Debussy and Ravel, one must consider the context. Fauré was a figure of alliance. [Although](#) among the most active members of the Société Nationale in the 1870s and 1880s, respecting the compositional leaders of his generation such as Saint-Saëns and d’Indy, Fauré also supported the young composers who went off in new directions. Of symbolic importance, he served as honorary president of the Société Musicale Indépendente, which Ravel and his friends founded in 1909. Fauré was known as a composer “without dogmatism” and aloof vis-à-vis politics. From his class came “the best composers of the time—Ravel, Schmitt,” and many others “whose personality he knew how to develop without imposing his own on them” (90). In this, he differed from Debussy, whom Vuillermoz later describes as not only good at playing “games” in his career, but also “serenely egocentric.”<sup>97</sup>

With sympathetic colleagues in positions of power, Radio-Paris was in a position to help promote these composers. Its director of artistic programming [from 1924 to 1929](#) was André Messager, a pupil of Fauré and Saint-Saëns at the Ecole Niedermeyer and conductor of the premiere of Debussy’s opera *Pelléas et Mélisande*. In 1931 came Henri

Büsser, another Debussyste. After Radio-Paris was nationalized in 1933, Inghelbrecht—former *apache* and friend of Ravel and Vuillermoz—was put in charge of state radio programming. Inghelbrecht was also conductor of the Orchestre National, many of whose concerts were broadcast on the radio.<sup>98</sup> Perhaps not surprisingly, Bennet has found that Debussy, Ravel, and Faru  were among those most often broadcast on Radio-Paris in the 1930s, behind Mozart and Saint-Sa ns but ahead of Massenet, Schubert, Beethoven, Bach, and Berlioz.<sup>99</sup> In 1932, when listeners of Radio-Paris were asked to select their favorite recordings for broadcast, among the three modern composers chosen were Granados, Hahn, and Ravel ([for](#) his *Bol ro*).<sup>100</sup>

However, on the other stations, different composers thrived, suggesting that the programming at Radio-Paris was not representative of French tastes. At Tour-Eiffel, Paris PTT, the private station Poste-Parisien, and many provincial and colonial stations,<sup>101</sup> Mozart was most often broadcast, closely followed by Massenet, then Wagner, Beethoven, Schubert, and Debussy. In 1930, perhaps not surprisingly, the radio press devoted far more articles to Massenet (25), Wagner (23), Beethoven and Mozart (17) than to Debussy (15) and others. Debussy’s music appeared relatively often on these other stations, less so that of Ravel, and rarely Faur .<sup>102</sup> Thus Radio-Paris may have been helping listeners overcome “resistance” to the music of Debussy and Ravel, especially in the provinces, as Dorset suggests.<sup>103</sup> [Though](#) “little known by the masses and almost entirely misunderstood abroad,” Vuillermoz points, in *L’Initiation   la musique*, to the “great duty” French radio had “to remove this still confidential art of Gabriel Faur  from its aristocratic reserve” and give it the popularity it deserves.<sup>104</sup>

Such advocacy was an attempt to establish a new trinity of French music.<sup>105</sup> *Initiation   la musique* contributed to this canonization in significant ways. First, Debussy and Ravel dominate the musical references in the book’s introduction, used to illustrate many aspects of music. Second, when it comes to the number of indexed appearances, after Beethoven, Wagner, and Mozart, each with over thirty, Debussy and Ravel emerge as the most mentioned in the book and in a wide variety of contexts. Moreover, with Debussy referred to as often as Berlioz (19 times) and Ravel as often as Lully, Rameau, and Saint-Sa ns (18 times), the co-authors establish these composers’ historical stature and significance. Faur , with fourteen appearances, comes just after

Haydn with fifteen. With only eight appearances of d'Indy's name, and only in conjunction with his own or Frank's music, the book suggests that d'Indy's ongoing importance is modest.

Third, Vuillermoz points out that no one of this new trinity had easy or immediate success—each had to work for years to win public renown. As is frequently the case when arguing for artistic genius, such difficulties provide a certain proof of greatness. In this, Debussy, Ravel, and Fauré resembled Beethoven and Wagner who receive the largest sections in the Dictionary of works. Beethoven's symphonies, concertos, overtures, last quartet, Missa solemnis, Kreutzer Sonata, piano sonatas, and Diabelli Variations are described, movement by movement, as to compositional context, form, and effect. Alongside plot summaries, some rooted in French tales, Dictionary entries on Wagner's operas also address the form and “message” of each work; [for example](#), *Parsifal* suggests that all revolutions are in vain if each man does not seek his own regeneration through renunciation (329). However, the historical section focuses on the struggles that underlie their music. With his “detestable” father and poor health, as Landormy sees it, “all the drama” of Beethoven's internal life “passed into his work” (30–33), the “most extraordinary, moving, and grandiose ever conceived by the human genius” (32). Likewise, Wagner was “devoured by melancholy, ravaged by despair, and torturing himself and others around him,” and yet he attempted to “create the most grandiose, powerful, and rich works that Germany would produce in the nineteenth century” (52).

Fourth and most important, while major composers are represented in the Dictionary by only one work—Lully by an air from *Amadis*, Rossini by *Le Barbier de Séville*, and Offenbach by *La Belle Hélène*—the new trinity benefits from analyses of many works, disproportionate to both their historical importance and their popularity on the radio. After Beethoven's sixteen entries (13 pages) and Wagner's ten (12 pages), seven works by Mozart take up the next largest space in the dictionary (8 pages). Compare the data [in Table 1](#) to analyses of nine works by Fauré (4.7 pages), eight by Debussy (3.6 pages), and eight by Ravel (2.6 pages). The space given to Fauré's works is equal to that of J. S. Bach as well as Saint-Saëns, both with fewer pieces analyzed. The preponderance of works by the trinity in the book's Dictionary exaggerates the



significance of Fauré's, Debussy's, and Ravel's relative output to argue for their place in the canon of great composers.

Table 1. *L'Initiation à la musique*, Dictionary—French composers in boldface (selected)<sup>106</sup>

<u>Composer</u>	<u>Number of works analyzed (length in pages)</u>		
Beethoven	16 (13 pp)	Liszt	3 (3 pp)
Wagner	10 (12 pp)	Chopin	3 (2 pp)
<b>Fauré</b>	<b>9 (4.7 pp)</b>	Brahms	3 (2 pp)
<b>Debussy</b>	<b>8 (3.6 pp)</b>	Stravinsky	3 (1.8 pp)
Mozart	7 (8 pp)	<b>Lalo</b>	<b>3 (1.7 pp)</b>
<b>Ravel</b>	<b>7 (2.6 pp)</b>	<b>Franck</b>	<b>2 (2.3 pp)</b>
<b>Saint-Saëns</b>	<b>6 (4.5 pp)</b>	<b>Massenet</b>	<b>2 (2 pp)</b>
J. S. Bach	6 (4.3 pp)	<b>d'Indy</b>	<b>2 (1.6 pp)</b>
Schumann	6 (4 pp)	<b>Rameau</b>	<b>2 (1.3 pp)</b>
Schubert	6 (3 pp)	<b>Dukas</b>	<b>2 (1.3 pp)</b>
<b>Fl. Schmitt</b>	<b>6 (2.4 pp)</b>	<b>Pierné</b>	<b>2 (1.3 pp)</b>
R. Strauss	5 (2 pp)	<b>Rabaud</b>	<b>2 (1.3 pp)</b>
<b>Berlioz</b>	<b>4 (4.5 pp)</b>	<b>Honegger</b>	<b>2 (1 p)</b>
Mendelssohn	4 (3 pp)	<b>Gounod</b>	<b>1 (2 pp)</b>
Gluck	3 (3 pp)	<b>Bizet</b>	<b>1 (2 pp)</b>

In addition to this tactic for elevating their reputations, *L'Initiation à la musique* gives less attention than might be deserved to predecessors previously thought of as quintessentially French, especially Berlioz. In the historical section, Landormy writes pejoratively [that](#) of harmony and composition, Berlioz knew very little; his works were not well received and he lost faith; “his love life was as pathetic as his artistic life”; “his work was not better organized than his life”; his music impresses the listener and speaks to the imagination, but has no heart.<sup>107</sup> In the Dictionary, the authors analyze four of his

works, but in each case point to their failure with the public and the “pitiful character” that was Berlioz (193).

There are other dismissive entries and notable omissions as well. The composition teacher and Conservatoire director from 1896 to 1905, Theodore Dubois, is nowhere mentioned, though the composer with whom he shared the City of Paris Prize in 1878, Benjamin Godard, gets a paragraph as a “musician of charm and seduction” (83). So do his lesser-known contemporaries, the Hillemacher brothers and Xavier Leroux, “a slave to easy eloquence and therefore immediate success” (86). Also absent is Charles Lenepveu, composition teacher at the Conservatoire at the turn of the century, perhaps because he prevented Ravel from winning the Prix de Rome. This suggests that the authors, several of whom had studied in the Conservatoire, wished to remove Dubois and Lenepveu from history. Today’s reader might also object to the Dictionary’s inclusion of only one or two works by otherwise famous composers. Among them, at least the entries on Costeley, Couperin, Hérold, Jannequin, Josquin, Lassus, Méhul, Mussorgsky, Palestrina, Pergolese, Puccini, Scarlatti, Smetana, Johann Strauss, Vittoria, and Vivaldi begin with short biographies.

Particularly distressing, unlike in *Music on the Air*, women composers are almost totally missing from this volume, although, when Emmanuel was photographed with his composition students at the Conservatoire, three-quarters were women.<sup>108</sup> Augusta Holmès appears nowhere, and her late nineteenth-century career and renown far exceeded that of many composers discussed. Moreover, her music was occasionally broadcast on the radio. Especially surprisingly, given its frequent presence on radio programs from Paris to Rabat, the authors ignore Chaminade.<sup>109</sup> Also striking is the absence of Nadia and Lili Boulanger, for the book includes other composers whose careers consisted as much in their teaching as their composition ([for example](#), Fauré, Delibes, d’Indy, Leroux). The sole reference to a female is to Germaine Tailleferre, her name appearing in a list of “musicians without a pronounced personality” (100).

At the same time, like *Music on the Air*, the book offers a seemingly exhaustive review of minor male contemporaries (over fifty French composers, most of them given a few lines). To suggest the strength of the trinity’s lineage, Vuillermoz draws special attention to composers who worked with them or continued in their paths, [and](#) some, such

as Louis Beydts, [are](#) now forgotten.<sup>110</sup> Others, such as Maurice Delage, Jean Cras, and Alexandre Tansman, appear only by name. As for Satie, by 1935, in Vuillermoz's opinion, his charm had definitely faded. Satie, an "inventor of chords who seemed incapable of exploiting his discoveries," comes across as a bit of a charlatan. Vuillermoz claims he only became head of a new aesthetic by accident (99–100), his influence being contradictory and exaggerated.<sup>111</sup> Nonetheless, the composer gets a whole page here and, from the long list of his works up through *Relâche* and *Socrate*—perhaps a compromise made with Landormy who earlier had promoted him—Satie at least appears prolific.

Les Six, too, get a mixed review, not surprising given the opposing opinions of Landormy and Vuillermoz. Despite Landormy's earlier promotion of the group, dismissals abound, covering both ends of the political spectrum.<sup>112</sup> Among "musicians without a pronounced personality," the politically conservative Francis Poulenc, a Debussyste acknowledged for his "gracious and elegant" works, gets less than three lines; so does the future Popular Front sympathizer Georges Auric, described summarily as a child prodigy who wrote for theater and film (100). Other composers, also described in three or four lines of text, come across more positively. Jacques Ibert, recognized for his "originality and mastery," is someone "from whom one can expect a lot." The socialist Charles Koechlin, with his "prodigious culture," receives praise for his "prophetic lyrical works," perhaps in reference to their polytonality. In contrast, whereas elsewhere Vuillermoz had attacked Milhaud, here he expresses admiration for Milhaud and Honegger, "two musicians with vigorous temperament, albeit pursuing very different goals." Milhaud, who earlier had been championed by Landormy and would later thrive under the Popular Front, is "the only artist of the group with a clearly revolutionary spirit," his technique and style falsely associated with colleagues pursuing other paths. His "aggressive style," with "extreme dissonance, violent timbres, massive, brutal orchestration, and polytonality," however, suggest that he has not yet found his "definitive expression" (101). Milhaud's substantial and "very diverse" list of works here ends with *Poèmes juifs* and *Mémoires hébraïques*. Honegger's vigorous works, with ties to German aesthetics, have a "warm and direct eloquence." Like Kinsella, Vuillermoz singles out his most popular and accessible work, *Le Roi David*, for embodying orchestral polyphony (101).

The book's history ends with short, distinct sections on operetta, "an essentially French genre," and jazz. After noting the "French origin" of saxophones, Panassié points to jazz's "profound influence on all music today." Given its popularity and regular place on French radio, jazz here overshadows other American music.<sup>113</sup> Its inclusion at the end of the history section, and in a book that otherwise brushes aside all folk and popular music other than a passing reference to the Montmartre song tradition and the inclusion of the accordion in the instrument section, implicitly argues for jazz as the newest form of "art music."

For all their openness to contemporary composers, after this hundred-page discussion of "music's evolution," the co-authors, ironically, end with a latent anxiety about the future and point to the "troubling crossroads of tendencies, tastes, and ideas before which music today has ground to a halt."<sup>114</sup> "Young composers of today" have "unstable ideals," "often miss something in their technique," and sometimes overuse the "revolutionary practices" of atonality or polytonality—all this "the inevitable reflection of the troubled times in which we live" (107). Though interesting, so far their techniques have resulted in little more than experimentation "of which nothing seems definitive" (107)—quite an unusual comment, given the strong positions these authors have expressed elsewhere. With no further clarification, the reader is left wondering if the reference includes those unmentioned in the book, such as Varèse who had left for New York, Aaron Copland and Elliott Carter who had studied in Paris, or La Jeune France (Messiaen, Jolivet, and Lesur).<sup>115</sup> If the public is not yet accustomed to "such boldness," they suggest, it's understandable. Putting aside their role as musical advisors, and perhaps in the words of the editor, Sordet, the writers admit that no one can predict what will come and or know which tendencies will become genuinely important in the future.

Between this history and the analyses of works, terms, and instruments that follow come two chapters on song, the only genre singled out for examination. As radio scholars have observed, the genre of serious music most frequently broadcast on Parisian stations at the time was symphonic, followed by other instrumental music.<sup>116</sup> Moreover, some listeners felt that solo song on the radio could be "a little harsh."<sup>117</sup> However, of the named performers on programs, Bennet points out, after conductors came solo singers, and recordings of specific singers were eventually among the most requested by

audiences.<sup>118</sup> Perhaps in response to this emerging taste, *L'Initiation à la musique*, like *Music on the Air*, devotes considerable space to the voice (40 pages). Building on his years of contributing a regular column on song to *Radio-Magazine*, Hahn explains the nature of singing, its study and practice over the centuries. Unlike Landormy, who writes of early opera's eventual "decadence," he waxes enthusiastic about the advent of castrati at the Sistine Chapel, "incomparable singers" who created the art of "bel canto" that flourished until the eighteenth century. Under their influence, priority shifted to the "music itself" and listeners' interest to "soloists and their vocal prowess" (115–16). Hahn describes the talents of the most famous castrati, including Farinelli, and then opera stars from the Napoleonic era through the present, without ignoring the role played by local churches as incubators for singers. He ends with an outline of vocal types.

Chepfer, in contrast, analyzes a series of popular songs and focuses on the importance of radio in raising song's status and popularity. Patently prescriptive, as if addressing composers, he advises that "the public likes and will always like simple, melodic, and direct songs. . . . Pleasing, that's the secret of songs."<sup>119</sup> The charm and gaiety songs bring cannot demand any "mental work" in the listener. Chepfer, as if their teacher, also addresses singers, going over the interpretation necessary for each kind of song. In performing on the radio, singers' diction "must be impeccable" and "the listener must have the impression of sharing something confidential."<sup>120</sup> Such a section thus builds explicitly on the writer's personal opinion, though the first person is never used and the fundamental point is the same as that made in the historical section: love music, regardless of how it is defined and performed, listen with one's heart, submit to music's charm, and allow it to make us better.<sup>121</sup>

Embracing originality and individualism, especially in French music, these co-authors join in their nationalist fervor, but without implying fascist extremism. They write with the appearance of authority and create a sense of hierarchy in what they present, but they also preach tolerance for a wide range of styles and aesthetic perspectives. Their sense of tradition is neither reactionary nor royalist, hoping for music to return to the aesthetics of a previous era, nor [is it](#) strictly populist, elevating the needs and desires of the masses over those of elites. When it comes to French music, they devote equal space to those with opposed points of view, Saint-Saëns then Massenet,

d'Indy then Bruneau and Charpentier. What excites them are strong musical personalities and revolutionary contributions to the progress of music, even as they maintain reserve as to the ultimate value of Schoenberg, Stravinsky's, or even Milhaud's radical innovations. Advocating music from throughout Europe, they are strong European internationalists. On what was to become among the most divisive issue of the day, Judaism, they keep their distance, promoting the music of Hahn, Milhaud, and Kurt Weill and excluding from their collaboration Lucien Rebatet, an anti-Semitic writer whose columns appeared next to those of Sordet in *L'Action française* from 1929 through the 1930s.<sup>122</sup> Rebatet also contributed record reviews to *Radio-Magazine* in the mid-1930s, but did not share their enthusiasm for the musical trinity.<sup>123</sup> Faced with the growing division between the far Right and far Left, the alliances underlying *Radio-Magazine* and *L'Initiation à la musique* provided a context for coming to agreement on the past and articulating their own canon of French music.

#### [<A>](#) **Music Appreciation on the Radio: Damrosch, Vuillermoz, and Adorno**

In his review of *Initiation à la Musique*, Vuillermoz called it “the first time that musical science has been made available to the large public in a form as little intimidating and as easily assimilated as possible. It should be required in all our schools by our university authorities.”<sup>124</sup> Of course, this was not the first attempt to reach out to schools, though it anticipated the beginning of *radio scolaire* in France by a year. A BBC committee had proposed the use of radio as a form of adult education in 1929, and by 1930 “school radio,” with lectures on all subjects, was thriving as far as Australia.

Bringing together music performed on the radio and radio guides directed at school children, the NBC Music Appreciation Hour in the United States (1928–1942) was the most important. Walter Damrosch conceived four series of twelve thirty-minute concerts, broadcast every other week, as a “progressive four-year course”: series A for grades 3 and 4; B for grades 5 and 6; C for junior high; and D for high schools and colleges. Beginning in 1930, “instructor manuals” and “student notebooks” accompanied them. With a different approach to appreciation than that of Scholes, Kinsella, and the French here studied, “instructor manuals” by Will Earhart and Miss Susie Williams

reproduce Damrosch’s introductory comments and offer suggestions to “aid teachers in preparing their classes.” Foremost here was the centrality of listening and active engagement with music. For them, learning began with the familiarity that comes from “repeated” listening to recordings after radio broadcasts. In series A, wishing to develop the spirit of “fun,” for “the enjoyment of music resembles the enjoyment of a game,” the teacher “may discuss the piece and related matters *with* the children—not teach or quiz them.” In introducing the “student notebooks,” Charles Farnsworth suggests, “we get the most pleasure when we take part ourselves . . . but at the same time have some knowledge about what is going on. . . . Our pleasure in music is in proportion to our mental ability to play the musical game.” “To promote listener activity,” besides encouraging singing, these notebooks reproduce the themes of the five excerpts performed on each concert, pose a few questions, and, for series A, leave a blank page for student notes and clippings—“what you wish to remember about the concert, or [to] paste in any pictures or poems that seem to you to fit the music. Better still, draw your own pictures or write your own poems.” From Damrosch’s perspective, students, at least in the beginning, “should learn to love it as an expression of their own inner lives.”<sup>125</sup>

By 1934–35, the organizational principles for the four series had grown distinct. Whereas a short section on the materiality of music, its instruments, is almost lost in the middle of *Initiation à la musique*, Damrosch centers his series A on musical sound production, the “musical family” of the orchestral instruments (later called music’s “physical aspect”). Series B focuses on musical expression, “the imaginative aspect.” Series C, which in 1932–33 focused uniquely on the symphony, now covers various musical forms, “the intellectual aspect.” And Series D, as presented over the years, examines the lives and works of the “chief” (or “great” or “principal”) composers, “from the sixteenthth-century to the present day”: “the spiritual aspect.” Throughout, German music dominated—Damrosch was German-American and his father had been a friend of Wagner and Liszt. But French music closely followed (Rameau, Lully, Bizet, Saint-Saëns, Massenet, Debussy, Ravel, Honegger, etc.), especially in series A and B, then Russian and American music, and finally music from many other traditions.<sup>126</sup> With the variety of composers especially important in Series A, B, and C, only in series D does Damrosch give overwhelming pride of place to German composers. Bach, Haydn,

Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Wagner, and Brahms each get an entire concert, sometimes Handel, Mendelssohn, or Schumann as well. If history enters in series C in 1932–33 within the analyses, series D concerts give a sense of historical progression through their chronological organization, sometimes beginning with “early polyphonic composers” (Palestrina, Byrd, Rameau). Suggesting more importance than the authors of *Initiation à la musique* give to the composer, [Series D](#) also regularly included full concerts of Berlioz, as well as occasionally Liszt, Debussy, or “modern European composers.” The present [was](#) always represented by “contemporary American composers.” In 1933, this included [Philip](#) James’s *Station WGZBX* (1931), with its Chinese, Indian, and [jazz](#) sections and the “voice of a robot”; Powell’s music infused with the folksongs of the [Deep South](#); and in 1938 Gershwin’s *Concerto in F* (1925), commissioned by Damrosch. As in Kinscella’s *Music on the Air*, the American modernists Ives, Cowell, Thomson, and Copland are not included, but women have an important voice here, making up almost half of the [fifty-two](#)-person board in the 1930s, which included Howard Hanson, Hazel Kinscella, and Miss Sudie Williams, co-author of the teacher’s manuals.<sup>127</sup> Perhaps not surprisingly, as early as 1932, Damrosch saw the results of reaching seventy-one stations across the country: “Thousands of high school orchestras and choruses have been formed since our concerts were first inaugurated.”<sup>128</sup>

In contrast, until Vuillermoz created a new radio genre for children in 1941–42, called “L’Initiation à la musique,” and then wrote analytical notes for the weekly concerts of the youth organization Jeunesses musicales de France, later published as *Les Cahiers de l’initiation à la musique*,<sup>129</sup> music appreciation in France [was principally](#) oriented to adults. Between 1929 and 1934, Radio-Paris broadcast 150 lectures, including some on music by Emmanuel and Vuillermoz. Soon thereafter it began to publish lectures on music. Once per week for thirty weeks, Vuillermoz, Landormy, Emmanuel, and Hahn, as well as Prunières, Expert, Lalo, Laloy, Curzon, Gastoué, Mauclair, Boschot, Prod’homme, and others spoke on the early history of French lyric theater, from the troubadours to the Revolution. Vuillermoz wrote a conclusion, empathizing with the French public’s difficulty with the conventionality of early opera and the role the ballet played in its eventual acceptance. Two more lecture series and volumes followed.<sup>130</sup> Echoing Damrosch and Kinscella, Vuillermoz summed up their philosophy:



[<ext>](#)Modern music needs to be “explained.” . . . The innumerable army of music-lovers need sergeant-instructors . . . enlightened and disinterested guides who try to hold in their hands Ariana’s thread.<sup>131</sup>

What is distinctive about this French approach to music appreciation is its focus on history. Vuillermoz calls this “science,” which in French means knowledge or objective truth. French identity had long been based on a relationship between the old and the new. French musicologists continued to valorize progress in the form of a spiral, with the new building on the old—central to France’s image in the world. Even the musical forms in the book’s lexicology are defined in terms of their origins and accompanied by examples across time. Under sonata, for example, Emmanuel reviews its history and the forms it took in various countries from Scarlatti to Brahms. This historical orientation, in general, leads to longer and more complex entries than in the analogous lexicology published by Scholes that year.<sup>132</sup> A historical approach allows Vuillermoz and his colleagues to promote their ideas as normative truth and to canonize composers who were not yet widely popular, such as Fauré. When it came to their American contemporaries, Kinscella and Damrosch canonized similarly.

If these critics aimed to turn the commodity culture of radio and recordings into an advantage, particularly when it came to promoting their image of national identity, such “predigested values,” “standardization,” and “fetishism” disturbed Adorno.<sup>133</sup> Working in New York from 1938–41 for the Princeton Radio Research Project, he too had “read all those letters and cards,” but found the enthusiasm expressed therein “uncomfortable.”<sup>134</sup> Like Scholes and the French critics, but unlike Kinscella and Damrosch, he takes on the question of “good music,” but rejects the notion that music is “a realm of subjective tastes and relative values.” Most of all, he objects to “appreciation” as “based on the idea of music’s effect on the listener” and to the American emphasis on “pleasure,” which he calls “musical hedonism.” Adorno insists that art is a “world into itself,” different from “the empirical reality of one’s own existence.”<sup>135</sup>

Taking on Damrosch’s *Music Appreciation Hour* in 1939–40, Adorno criticizes most the importance ascribed to “the pleasure of recognition,” especially thematic

recognition, seeing this as reification, distinct from “the living musical process,” and as encouragement “not of the music itself, but of *the awareness that one knows the music.*” For Adorno, this is tantamount to transforming music into “property.” Such “commodity listening” he finds as “part of a general trend in contemporary American musical life and musical education.” Moreover, as he sees it, “behind the fun is drill,” with children “subjected to authority.”<sup>136</sup> However, Adorno shows no interest in the various age groups and capacities, nor the progressive approaches addressed by series A through D. Nor does he acknowledge that Damrosch’s notes for the C series include analyses of “the complex musical scheme” of the forms presented, and that in [the](#) D series Miss Williams explains, “to enjoy music most fully you need to accept it on its own basis.”<sup>137</sup> His focus is on “serious music,” particularly Beethoven, and an orientation to formal relationships [that](#) Rose Subotnik has called “structural listening.”<sup>138</sup>

Adorno begins by objecting to the representation of instruments as “personalities” in series A and “hero-worship” in general. He argues that the “psychological approach” necessarily clashes with “the structure of the music” and prevents bringing listeners into “an actual living relation with music.” [Though](#) Damrosch, in his introduction to series A concerts, occasionally refers to instruments as expressing feelings or stories, the citation to which Adorno refers is not one that had appeared before in these manuals, whose aim was to evoke curiosity rather than instruct. He admits, “Instrumental characterization . . . has gained headway only since the days of Berlioz, Liszt, and Wagner.” However, from Adorno’s perspective, none of this is “serious music” like a Haydn symphony, its “disembodied sounds” serving to “structure” the “whole.”<sup>139</sup> Given his later defense of “ugliness” in music, Adorno might have taken issue with Miss Williams’s explanation of “the material of musical art” as necessarily “pleasing in itself” and the statement, “If the tone is bad we cannot have pleasure. It would be unpleasant to hear *Annie Laurie* played with ugly tone.”<sup>140</sup> Not caring about the “physical” conditions of sound made him uninterested in the very premise of series A<sub>2</sub>, which gradually evolved from presenting “types of compositions” and attempting to train formal listening to introducing orchestral instruments, perhaps because this was more effective with young children.<sup>141</sup>

Adorno also takes aim at Miss Williams’s [s](#) suggestion that pupils hum the themes, because it shifts “attention from the whole to the part.” For him, the unity of a folksong is

not that of “serious music,” such as the classical symphony. He also finds wanting her attempt “to describe music as a structural unity.” Likewise, he rejects Damrosch’s musical examples as “uncharacteristic,” though without studying the series over time. Haydn should replace Bizet’s *Arlésienne* to exemplify the variation, he notes, without recognizing that Damrosch chose Haydn variations for this purpose in 1932–33. Verdi should not be used to explain the “development of a composer.” Adorno’s attacks seem based on his antipathy to anything except the German classical tradition, especially Damrosch’s eclectic tastes from Berlioz to Sibelius and Samuel Barber. He misses the fact that this music cannot be experienced or understood merely through the “logic” of what he calls “correct listening.”<sup>142</sup> In sum, Adorno’s text reveals most about his own values and preoccupations, developed in Germany.

Like Vuillermoz and his colleagues, Adorno shared an interest in composers who opposed the conventions of their times and asserted their individuality. British, American, and French critics agreed on the importance of Beethoven in this regard. Like the French, Adorno also believed one cannot study music without understanding the “broader social patterns” they reflect. However, whereas historical perspectives permeate *Initiation à la Musique*, analytical ones take precedence for Adorno. When he wants to explain a musical form here—a symphony, song, or quartet—he does so through a specific musical example. It is the “specific logic of any specific piece” that he thought necessary in understanding music. His definition of “context” is “the unity of a musical work.”<sup>143</sup>

It is ironic, then, to find perhaps more strident and exclusive nationalism in Adorno’s discourse than in *Initiation à la Musique*. He objects to Damrosch’s presentation of music “regardless of nationality.”<sup>144</sup> But in his own proposal for a “music education radio course,” the works he chose for analysis reflect pride in his predecessors and a complete disinterest in international inclusiveness: they are all by Germans—Beethoven, “considered the greatest of all composers,” Schubert, Schumann, Bach, and Mozart—except for “the simplest of jazz pieces,” here used as foils for “serious art.” As he explains, “The aim is to remove jazz from its position of dominance and objectively convince the listener of the meaning of true music.”<sup>145</sup> Unlike those of Damrosch, always international in scope, Adorno’s lectures might have been called “Appreciation of German Music Hour,” or “How to Listen to German music.” Moreover, in his own

inaugural one-hour radio program on WNYC (February 1940)—“part of a festival devoted to American music”—Adorno selected as “truly the most compelling and necessary” the music of four “Austrian composers currently living in America”—Schoenberg, “the true master among today’s composers,” Zemlinsky, Eisler, and Krenek. In the following lectures, he turned to Schubert, Haydn, Webern, Berg, and Wolpe.<sup>146</sup> So much for getting beyond personal taste and hero-worship. Adorno’s essays also show that nationalism can underlie not just definitions of “serious music” and the choice of what music to promote, but also listening practices. As he puts it, “Whoever listens to Beethoven correctly will also listen to Schoenberg correctly . . . for we inevitably listen to all music from our own situation.”<sup>147</sup>

In conclusion, except for Adorno, these radio critics could not resist the opportunity to promote “unity in multiplicity,” a kind of canonization amid diversity from a national perspective. Moreover, with radio an international medium, all except Adorno saw an important place for foreign music, especially because of the extraordinary access to it provided by foreign radio stations audible abroad. They may not have agreed on all that listeners in their countries should know—Kinscella and Deems Taylor disagreed on the merits of Wagner; neither Scholes, Kinscella, nor Damrosch concurred with the French on the significance of Fauré; and no one seemed ready to promote the recent works of Stravinsky and Schoenberg. Yet not just Beethoven and the German classical composers, but also Debussy, Ravel, and Honegger’s *Pacific 231* were widely appreciated.<sup>148</sup> So, too, except for Adorno, was American jazz, regularly broadcast on the radio from London and Paris to Rabat and Algiers and influencing art music composers on both sides of the Atlantic.<sup>149</sup> Such texts rebut the contentions by such scholars as Lawrence Levine that Western classical music is a “cultural bulwark” to jazz, which embodied the “disruptive forces of modern capitalism,” or Mark Katz, who sees classical music, an “agent of moral uplift,” as steering people away from “its presumed moral and aesthetic opposite: popular music, particularly ragtime and jazz.”<sup>150</sup> Through shared tastes that for many included jazz, a certain transnational culture was congealing, tragically interrupted by the next war.

In the new public sphere of radio, listening became a cultural practice to be studied, trained, and manipulated. Those hoping to attract the public’s ear not only

canonized “great” composers and works of art, but also gave voice to many minor ones, whose inclusion helped flesh out national tastes and values. Radio guides gave listeners a way of not only listening to music, but also thinking and talking about it, enshrining either the “pleasure” of knowledge and empathetic connections stimulated by the concerts organized by Damrosch or personal experiences as recounted in Kinscella’s *Music on the Air*, historical narratives as in *L’Initiation à la musique* or analytical observations as in Adorno’s *Current of Music*. Encouraging and enabling “appreciation” of music or endeavoring to create “initiation” to it, these texts with their various agendas are testaments to the power associated with radio in the 1930s and music’s role in national identities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hazel Gertrude Kinscella, *Music on the Air* (New York: Viking, 1934), 3. [Also see n. 30 below on music on the radio in France.](#)

<sup>2</sup> On “cultural uplift,” see Shawn Vancour’s Adorno-inflected essay, “Popularizing the Classics: Radio’s Role in the American Music Appreciation Movement, 1922–34,” *Media, Culture, and Society* 31/2 (2009): 288–307.

<sup>3</sup> By the late 1920s, for example, major French newspapers (e.g. *Le Figaro*, *Le Journal*, *Paris-Soir*) published the radio programs of not only French stations but also those broadcasting from London and Daventry as well as Brussels, Barcelona, Madrid, Milan, Rome, Langenberg, Stuttgart, Berlin, Breslau, Poznan, Stockholm, Vienna, Rabat, and Algiers. In Indochina, those who listened to concerts broadcast from Surabaya used these as an argument for establishing a station in Saigon.

<sup>4</sup> Kinscella, *Music on the Air*, 5.

<sup>5</sup> Percy Scholes, *Everybody’s Guide to Radio Music* (London: Oxford University Press, 1925; New York: Oxford University Press, 1926).

<sup>6</sup> [Percy](#) Scholes, *The Listener’s Guide to Music* (London: Oxford University Press, 1920), 84. See also his *Everyman and His Music* (London: Kegan Paul, 1917) on composers from various national traditions, [from](#) brass bands to Stravinsky; *The First Book of the Great Musicians* (London: Oxford University Press, 1922) which goes from the English Renaissance to Elgar and MacDowell; *The Listener’s History of Music* (1923); and later *The Oxford Companion to Music* (1938), eventually [published](#) in 189 editions.

<sup>7</sup> With the vast majority of operas on this list by Verdi and Wagner, Scholes seems to be suggesting their status at the time among Anglophone music lovers or perhaps among the large Italian and German populations in the [United States](#).

<sup>8</sup> Scholes, *Everybody's Guide to Radio Music*, 155–57.

<sup>9</sup> Rudolf Arnheim, *Radio* (London: Faber and Faber, 1936); [English version](#), trans. Margaret Ludwig and Herbert Read (New York: Arno, 1971). In his chapter, “Wireless and the Nations,” he bemoans that “radio proved from the day of its birth to be so obviously a monopoly instrument concerning the whole community that in most countries [other than the [United States](#)] it immediately came under the direct influence of the State.” See n28 below. A German Jew, Arnheim later emigrated to the United States and, in 1941–42 received a grant [from Columbia University](#) to study radio listeners. See Shawn Vancour, “Arnheim on Radio: *Materialtheorie* and Beyond,” in *Arnheim for Film and Media Studies*, ed. Scott Higgins (New York: Routledge, 2010), 182–84, 193n53.

<sup>10</sup> Theodor Adorno, “A Social Critique of Radio Music,” in his *Current of Music*, ed. Robert Hullot-Kentor (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009), 136.

<sup>11</sup> Rudolf Arnheim, *Radio*, 260–61. In *Everybody's Guide to Radio Music*, 165, Scholes points out that radio listeners could plan what they heard because of programs reproduced in advance in the six-cent *Radio Times*. See also notes 3, 37, and 38 below on radio programs in French publications.

<sup>12</sup> As Vancour points out in “Popularizing the Classics,” not everyone agreed with the efficacy of history and biography in music education (301–2).

<sup>13</sup> Two music appreciation books by [Kinscella's](#) predecessors also open with discussion of folk music after a short section on the elements of music: Daniel Gregory Mason and Thomas Whitney Surette, *The Appreciation of Music* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1913); and Walter Raymond Spalding, *Music: An Art and a Language* (New York: Schmidt, 1920).

<sup>14</sup> [Kinscella](#), *Music on the Air*, 3, 5, 7, 9, 92, 95, 98, 109.

<sup>15</sup> In this text parading as non-racial, *Of Men and Music* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1937), radio talks before the New York Philharmonic concerts in 1936–37, Deems Taylor concludes, “There is no American school and I doubt there will ever be one. . . . We Americans are not a race. America is a club, not a motherland. Her people have almost no common thoughts and feelings and instincts” (124–26, 129).

<sup>16</sup> Burleigh, who receives two pages in the book's “biographical sketches,” sang for Dvořák “both before and during” the composition of his *New World Symphony*. He is known for his arrangements of spirituals, especially “Deep River.”

<sup>17</sup> [Kinscella](#), *Music on the Air*, 91, 47–48, 189, 210, 211, 316–17, 327; and Howard Hanson, “Tendencies in American Music,” 210–11.

<sup>18</sup> Rudolph Ganz, “The Listener's Obligation Toward Modern Music,” in Kinscella, *Music on the Air*, 237.

<sup>19</sup> In contrast, Deems Taylor dedicates the first five chapters in *Of Men and Music* to Wagner.

<sup>20</sup> John Powell, “Virginia Finds Her Folk Music,” in [Kinscella](#), *Music on the Air*: “For we are, it seems after all, a musical people. . . . In addition, many people are musical without knowing it, indeed while

disclaiming it. . . . And it is to people who make no profession of musical education that the revival of folk music will mean much” (182–83).

<sup>21</sup> Maurice Emmanuel et al., *L’Initiation à la musique à l’usage des Amateurs de Musique et de Radio* (Paris: Edition du Tambourinaire, 1935). An earlier version of this article, focused on this book, was first presented at the conference “Nation, Myth, and Reality in the 1930s,” organized by Erik Levi at Royal Holloway University, London, 24 October 1998, and at the Workshop on Interwar French Music, organized by Christopher Moore and Barbara Kelly at the University of Ottawa, 6 November 2011.

<sup>22</sup> Emile Vuillermoz, “Pour le Plébiscite de la Sarre: La propagande du Reich par TSF,” *L’Excelsior*, 5 January 1935. He followed this with five articles on radio, beginning on 20 January with “Notre Radio d’Etat est en retard de plusieurs années,” a comparison with radio in Britain where he had just spent five days.

<sup>23</sup> In 1919 this coalition involved everyone except the far Left and royalists hoping to overthrow the Republic. René Rémond, *The Right Wing in France from 1815 to de Gaulle*, trans. James Laux (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1969), 255.

<sup>24</sup> The same year as *L’Initiation à la musique* was published, other books involving memories also recalled the *bleu horizon*: André Charpentier, *Le Livre d’or des journaux du front: Feuilles bleu horizon, 1914–1918: Souvenirs, récits et documents* (Paris: Imprimerie de Vaugirard, 1935); and then François du Ronchey, *Mon Escadron en bleu horizon* (Paris: L. Fournier, 1936).

<sup>25</sup> Some have called the period between the wars *l’époque bleu-horizon*. See Philippe Bernard, *La Fin d’un monde 1914–1919* (Paris: Seuil, 1975), 124.

<sup>26</sup> “Cet ouvrage est né d’une collaboration; et ses divers rédacteurs . . . ont consenti, chaque fois qu’il fallait le sacrifice de telle ou telle nuance de leur opinion personnelle, pour ne songer qu’à la réussite d’une œuvre commune dont ils espèrent qu’elle servira utilement la cause de la musique.” Emmanuel et al., *L’Initiation à la musique*, vi.

<sup>27</sup> René Duval, *Histoire de la radio en France* (Paris: Alain Moreau, 1979), 30–31, 36, 42, 44.

<sup>28</sup> Duval, *in Histoire de la radio*; Joelle Neulander, in *Programming National Identity: The Culture of Radio in 1930s France* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009), points out that while other European stations were public and all radio stations in the [United States](#) were private, France was the exception, the only nation (except Australia) in which both public and private stations competed for audiences. Like the French, “the British saw radio as a public service, to offer citizens education, entertainment, and high culture without an overt political party message. Radio was a democratic medium that served the state in its neutrality and openness.” In contrast, “Germans subsidized radios and required that all households have a means to tune into state broadcasts. German radio, by 1933, was integrated into state propaganda that centralized all programming. The French had no such program . . . it was only in 1935 that radio became . . . a true mass medium that millions of French people heard on a daily basis” (4–7, 72).

<sup>29</sup> Robert Hullot-Kentor, “Editor’s Introduction,” in Adorno, *Current of Music*, 5, 7. On the BBC’s origins and their promotion of classical music, see Jennifer Doctor, *The BBC and Ultra-Modern Music, 1922–1936: Shaping a Nation’s Tastes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

<sup>30</sup> On early radio in France, see Duval, *Histoire de la radio*; Christian Brochand, *Histoire générale de la radio et de la télévision*, vol. 1 (Paris: La documentation, 1994); and Christophe Bennet, *La Musique à la radio dans les années trente* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 2010). By 1938 Brochand documents 53 percent music programming on Paris PTT, 59 percent on Radio-Paris, and 67 percent on Tour Eiffel, but over 80 percent on stations in Marseille and Grenoble, perhaps because there were fewer opportunities to hear live music beyond Paris. Though broadcasting Saturday performances of the prestigious Société des Concerts du Conservatoire, “serious” music occupied only 55 percent of the music programming on Radio-Paris, less on Paris PTT (47 percent), but substantially more on Tour Eiffel (93 percent). Brochand, *Histoire générale de la radio*, 456.

<sup>31</sup> Jean Antoine, “La Musique et la TSF,” *Lumière et Radio* 8 (10 April 1930). Whereas the American magazine *Radio Broadcast* solicited feedback from radio audiences on music programming in a 1927 questionnaire (vocal vs. serious, light, or popular instrumental music), the French magazine *Lumière et Radio* 14 (10 October 1930) set up a competition and cash prizes for the best listener suggestions as to music programming, history lessons, and “seductive advertising”: “Nos concours: Pour l’amélioration des programmes de TSF.”

<sup>32</sup> Duval, *Histoire de la Radio*, 54, 71, 75; Neulander, *Programming National Identity*, 5.

<sup>33</sup> René Dumésnil notes a 40 percent decrease in concert attendance between the mid-1920s and the late 1930s in *La Musique en France entre les deux guerres, 1919–1939* (Geneva: Editions du milieu du monde), 75.

<sup>34</sup> Pascal Ory, *La Belle Illusion : Culture et politique sous le signe du Front populaire, 1935–1939* (Paris: Plon, 1994), 10.

<sup>35</sup> André Coeuroy, *Panorama de la Radio* (Paris: Kra, 1930), 13–14. Like Scholes, who differentiated the specialist public that collected and listened to recordings from the far larger radio public, Coeuroy also defined radio listeners as distinct from phonograph listeners. For him, the former were basically poets, those who think in terms of space and enjoy the “noises of life,” the latter principally musicians, those who focus on “sounds, beautiful sounds.” Of course, many stations in France and elsewhere featured regular broadcasts of recordings, but listening to records in private at home was the privilege of those who could afford this “costly sport,” which necessitated the purchase of recordings and a phonograph. Dominique Sordet, “L’Embarras de l’amateur,” *Radio-Magazine* (25 November 1928), 4. See also Scholes, *The First Book of the Gramophone Record* (London : Oxford University Press, 1924); Coeuroy and Robert Jardillier, *Histoire de la musique à l’aide du disque* (Paris: Delagrave, 1931); and Sophie Maisonneuve, “L’Art d’écouter la musique: Les commentaires discographiques des années 1910 à 1950: Genèse et paradigmes d’une nouvelle pratique analytique,” in *L’Analyse musicale: Une pratique et son histoire*, ed. Rémy Campos and Nicolas Donin (Paris : Droz, 2009), 241–80.



<sup>36</sup> Coeuroy, *Panorama de la radio*, 155; and Emile Vuillermoz, “La Musique mécanique et la culture française,” *Atti del primo congresso internazionale di musica*, Florence, 30 April–4 May 1933 (Florence: Felice le Monnier, 1935), 97.

<sup>37</sup> [Unlike analogous publications in France](#), American *Radio News* did not include programming. See <http://genome.ch.bbc.co.uk/> on the programs [in](#) the British *Radio Times*.

<sup>38</sup> Whereas the [state-supported](#) *Le Petit Radio* published the programs of the [state-supported](#) stations first—Tour Eiffel, [PTT](#), and later Radio-Colonial—and gave less space to those of Radio-Paris, *Radio-Magazine* published the daily programs of Radio-Paris first, and by far the most completely, [then](#) those [of](#) Tour Eiffel, [PTT](#), Radio L-L, Poste Parisien, Radio Vitus, and Paris Experiment, followed by those of French provincial and colonial towns, from Agen and Algiers to Toulouse and Tunis, then those of foreign stations from Germany and Russia to Switzerland. [As of 9 March](#) 1930, *Radio-Magazine* was printing 215,000 copies, 40,000 of them for subscribers. By 1935, each issue also included a section on “shortwave” radio, including the daily programs of Radio Colonial, the Vatican, and many foreign stations; Daventry, Moscow, Madrid, Pittsburgh, Rome, etc.

<sup>39</sup> Francis Dorset, “[É](#)ducation musicale et radiophonie,” *Radio-Magazine* (19 August 1928), 3; “L’[É](#)ducation du goût” (14 October 1928), 2, and (18 November 1928), 2.

<sup>40</sup> Francis Dorset, “Musiques d’hier et d’aujourd’hui,” *Radio-Magazine* (9 September 1928), 2.

<sup>41</sup> Dorset, “L’[É](#)ducation du goût” (14 October 1928), 2; and (18 November 1928), 2.

<sup>42</sup> “Il développera aussi . . . les rapports du disque et de la TSF et l’interpénétration de deux techniques et de deux arts appelés tous deux à bouleverser les conditions de la vie musicale.” “Une Chronique de phonographe,” *Radio-Magazine* (18 November 1928), 4; and Dominique Sordet, “L’Embarras de l’amateur,” *Radio-Magazine* (25 November 1928), 4.

<sup>43</sup> Dominique Sordet, “A Travers les Disques: Quelques chefs d’oeuvres, quelques réflexions,” *Radio-Magazine* (2 December 1928), 4.

<sup>44</sup> Dominique Sordet, “A Travers les Disques: Musique instrumentale,” *Radio-Magazine* (16 December 1928), 4.

<sup>45</sup> Under the title “A Travers les Disques,” Sordet published in *Radio-Magazine* on “Musiques russes” (30 December 1928), “Musique italienne” (6 January 1929), “Musique allemande” (13 January 1929), “Musique française” (27 January 1929), “Musiques américaines” (3 February 1929), and “Musique Austro-Hongroise” (10 February 1929).

<sup>46</sup> Schoenberg “est un chimiste plus qu’un musicien, un théoricien plus qu’un compositeur. Et il n’existe pas de disque qui reproduise ses expériences sonores. . . . Bruckner et Mahler, tous deux trop germaniques, trop diffus pour plaire à un public français encore que la personnalité du second soit attachante et son talent considérable.” [Sordet](#), “Musique Austro-Hongroise” (10 February 1929), 4.

<sup>47</sup> Général Cartier, Edouard Schneider, André Levinson, Bernard de Vaulx, Clément Vautel, and later Lucien Rebatet also wrote regularly for *Radio-Magazine*.

<sup>48</sup> In studying the word-searchable website of *Ouest-France* that reproduces the radio programs in Paris for this period [and over time more and more](#) foreign and provincial stations, I have found the following data for the number of days Ravel's music was broadcast on the radio: 1925 (11), 1926 (14), 1927 (16), 1928 (10), 1929 (17), 1930 (11), 1931 (28), 1932 (32), 1933 (32), 1934 (28), and 1935 (31). My thanks to Michel Duchesneau for drawing my attention to this site.

<sup>49</sup> This group also used record competitions to promote Ravel. The jury for the Grand Prix du Disque in 1932 included Ravel, Vuillermoz, Yvain, and Colette. The winning recording for symphonic music was Coppola's *Le Tombeau de Couperin* on Gramophone. See "Chronique phonographique," *Ouest-Éclair* (25 April 1932). Perhaps not surprisingly, there was a small increase in Ravel's music on the radio [in 1932 and 1933](#).

<sup>50</sup> Francis Dorset, "Maurice Ravel," *Radio-Magazine* (12 January 1930), 2; "Le Concerts Lamoureux du 2 février," (9 February 1930), 2.

<sup>51</sup> Sordet, "Wagner–Ravel–Stravinsky," *Radio-Magazine* (12 January 1930), 3. Sordet also wrote an enthusiastic review in *L'Action française*, 17 January 1930.

<sup>52</sup> "Un art aristocratique et raffiné qui ne s'adresse qu'à des cercles relativement restreints." Sordet, "A Travers l'Actualité: Debussy–Ravel–Fauré," *Radio-Magazine* (20 March 1932), 4.

<sup>53</sup> Bernard de Vaulx, summarizing Sordet's review in *Action française*, in his "Revue de la presse: Le Concerto de Ravel," *Radio-Magazine* (3 July 1932), 4; and Paul Landormy, "Le 'Concerto' de Ravel," *Radio-Magazine* (19 July 1932), 4.

<sup>54</sup> See [note 48 above on the frequency of Ravel's music on the radio during these years](#).

<sup>55</sup> The publisher was Etienne de Lassus Saint-Geniès, the president of the [Thomson-Houston](#) Company.

<sup>56</sup> "La Compagnie française Thomson-Houston," *L'Initiation à la musique*, advertisements, 6.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 5–6.

<sup>58</sup> [Colette et al.](#), *Maurice Ravel par quelques-uns de ses familiers* (Paris: Edition du tambourinaire, 1939). Roger Wild, an artist, illustrated both this book and *L'Initiation à la musique*. He also published his illustrations in radio magazines of the time.

<sup>59</sup> After *L'Initiation à la musique*, four publications followed: *Giration*, a luxury edition with text and illustrations of Pierné's choreographic divertissement, 35 [francs](#); *De la Musique avant toute chose*, with unpublished texts by Valéry, Cocteau, Bellaigue, Klingsor, and others, 60 [francs](#); and the book of memoirs of Maurice Ravel, printed in 7,275 copies.

<sup>60</sup> [Emmanuel et al.](#), *L'Initiation à la musique*, v.

<sup>61</sup> Consider differences in the composers Vuillermoz and Landormy championed, as explained in Barbara Kelly, *Music and Ultra-Modernism in France: A Fragile Consensus, 1913–1939* (Suffolk: Boydell, 2013).

<sup>62</sup> Jane Fulcher, "Musical Style, Meaning, and Politics in France on the Eve of the Second World War," *Journal of Musicology* (Fall 1995): 447, 447n58; and [Fulcher](#), *The Composer as Intellectual: Music and Ideology in France, 1914–1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 256–57.

<sup>63</sup> In his review of this book in *Ouest-Eclair*, 4 October 1935, Vuillermoz clarifies that they considered the Dictionary entries “the most often performed” music.

<sup>64</sup> [Emmanuel et al.](#), *L’Initiation à la musique*, iii, iv. In Bennet’s study, 47 percent of the composers performed on Radio-Paris in the 1930s were French (*La Musique à la radio*, 43).

<sup>65</sup> “Qu’est-ce que la musique?,” [in](#) *L’Initiation à la musique*, 6–8:

1. Gardez-vous de croire que toutes les musiques valent, que c’est simplement ‘affaire de goût’ et que tous les goûts sont bons puisqu’ils sont dans la nature.

2. La bonne musique se distingue aisément de la mauvaise et les vrais connaisseurs ne s’y trompent pas.... [L](#)a bonne musique demande généralement un effort de compréhension ... ne livre pas tout de suite son secret.

3. Il n’y a aucune raison de vous décourager si l’auditeur d’une oeuvre célèbre vous laisse insensible. La sagesse est de laisser à de mieux informés le soin d’en décider.

Une page qui vous ennuie aujourd’hui ... un morceau qui vous paraît incompréhensible parce qu’il change le cours de vos habitudes, vous surprendra moins dans six mois, lorsque vous le connaîtrez mieux, lorsque vous aurez un meilleur entraînement de l’esprit et de l’oreille. Et rien ne dit qu’un jour vous ne le prendrez pas en affection.

<sup>66</sup> “La musique est aussi vieille que l’humanité. L’homme chanta peut-être avant même de parler. . . . Dans toute l’antiquité, on chanta en solo et on chanta en chœur, mais à une seule partie, à *l’unisson* (ou, quand les voix d’enfants se mêlaient aux voix d’hommes, à *l’octave*)” (11–12).

<sup>67</sup> See Paul Landormy, *Histoire de la musique* (Paris: Delaplane, 1910), 7.

<sup>68</sup> “Le chant à plusieurs parties ou *polyphonie* date du IXe siècle après J.-C. et naquit à l’Eglise. Au XIIIe siècle, c’était un art organisé qui, de Notre-Dame de Paris, rayonna sur toute l’Europe. Telle est l’origine de notre musique occidentale moderne. . . . Jusqu’au XVIe siècle, *l’Ecole franco-belge* fut la première du monde. Les musiciens français et flamands peuplent les chapelles d’Italie” (12). In the book’s Dictionary, “chapelle” is defined as “compagnie de musiciens au service d’un souverain, d’un prince ou d’un riche personnage” (339). In his *Histoire*, Landormy likewise notes that Italians in turn “owe their early education to the Flemish and the French” (33).

<sup>69</sup> “Mais c’est bientôt la décadence. Peu à peu, l’opéra devient une sorte d’interminable concert. . . . La musique a tué le drame. . . . L’opéra italien envahit toute l’Europe. Seule, la France résiste” (13).

<sup>70</sup> “Il y eut une opposition constant entre l’opéra français et l’opéra italien: Lulli en face de Cavalli, Rameau contre les Bouffons, les ouvrages français de Gluck opposés à ceux de Piccinni” (357–58). Referring to Delibes, “C’est encore au théâtre que nous enregistrons un certain nombre de conquêtes précieuses de pensée, d’écriture et de style” (79).

<sup>71</sup> “C’est au théâtre que Georges Bizet (1838–1875) livra ses principaux combats et remporta ses plus brillantes victoires” (78).

<sup>72</sup> Jann Pasler, “A Sociology of les Apaches: Sacred Battalion for *Pelléas*,” in *Berlioz and Debussy: Sources, Contexts, and Legacies*, ed. Barbara Kelly and Kerry Murphy (London: Ashgate, 2007), 148–66.

<sup>73</sup> “Toute l'histoire de la Musique n'est donc qu'une suite de prospections, de sondages, de découvertes, d'affranchissements, de libérations, d'annexions, d'élargissements de frontières, d'enrichissements successifs, de perfectionnements . . . bref de perpétuelles conquêtes.” Emile Vuillermoz, *Histoire de la musique*, ed. Jacques Lonchampt (1949; [repr.](#) Paris: Fayard, 1973), vi.

<sup>74</sup> [Page numbers after citations within this article and its notes refer to those in \*L'Initiation à la musique\*.](#)

<sup>75</sup> “Notre jeune école française en particulier s’est inspirée docilement de ces trouvailles” (60).

<sup>76</sup> “En France, on peut observer, depuis la fin du siècle dernier, un foisonnement de talents absolument prodigieux. Aucun autre pays ne peut mettre en ligne une telle quantité de créateurs apportant tous à l’art international des éléments d’expression nouveaux et saisissants” (69).

<sup>77</sup> Fulcher, *The Composer as Intellectual*, 256.

<sup>78</sup> Fulcher, *The Composer as Intellectual*, 256.

<sup>79</sup> What Fulcher, in “Musical Style, Meaning, and Politics,” reads as praise for d’Indy in this book—“his elevation, his respect for the great classics, and his disdain for fashion” (447n58), *L’Initiation à la musique* explains as what the Schola claimed to be borrowing from Franck: “l’idéale pédagogie de la Schola se réclamait de la même élévation morale, du même respect des grands classiques religieux et profanes et du même dédain des engouements passagers de la mode” (74).

<sup>80</sup> “Étrange dualité d’une destinée d’artiste qui s’emprisonna lui-même dans un système dont son tempérament le portait peut-être secrètement à s’évader” (75).

<sup>81</sup> “Sa composition est beaucoup moins austère et rigoureuse que sa pédagogie. Elle est accessible à la poésie pastorale et à une certaine voluté orchestrale assez éloignée de l’ascétique spiritualité qui formait la base de sa doctrine”(75).

<sup>82</sup> Fulcher’s take on “the key point here” is “d’Indy’s reconciliation of his nationalism with his love of Wagner by means of anti-Semitism” (*The Composer as Intellectual*, 257). I find no support for this contention. There is no mention or hint of anti-Semitism in *L’Initiation à la musique* and Vuillermoz is critical of the fact that d’Indy “ne put jamais s’affranchir de l’influence de Bayreuth.”

<sup>83</sup> Pierné wrote in every genre with “une personnalité très marquée”; his exceptionally fruitful career “placée sous le signe du goût le plus pur et de l’élégance la plus raffinée,” and the composer enjoyed “partout de l’admiration et du respect de tous les musiciens” (72–73). Dukas’s writing was “aussi raffinée dans les détails et aussi sensualiste que celle d’un Debussy ou d’un Ravel”; the virtuosity of his instrumental writing was “légendaire,” his lyricism “puissant et tendu,” and, “avec une supériorité de pensée indiscutable, sa maîtrise orchestrale, et l’ampleur de ses édifices sonores,” he is a French Richard Strauss.

<sup>84</sup> “Ici, nous retrouvons, dans toutes les fibres, la sève pure de notre tradition séculaire qui n’altéra aucune greffe étrangère” (77).

<sup>85</sup> Saint-Saëns “a défendu, dans son art, les droits de la raison pure, de la lucidité et de la logique. . . . L’intelligence paralysait un peu en lui la sensibilité, mais la perfection d’écriture . . . fera toujours

l'admiration des techniciens. . . . Jamais on ne vit l'esprit mathématique triompher avec autant d'infallibilité dans le domaine de la création artistique" (81, 82).

Earlier, in his *Musiciens d'aujourd'hui* (1923), Vuillermoz promotes the very traits he here criticizes, finding in Saint-Saëns's late fugues "la 'défense et illustration' de la langue musicale française," even if such a form requires training to understand it (101–10). Later in his *Histoire de la musique* (1949), Vuillermoz portrays the composer in a positive light while referring to the same traits: "Saint-Saëns résume en lui quelques-unes des particularités caractéristiques du génie de notre race: le goût de la netteté, de la clarté et de la logique, l'amour de la pureté néo-classique, l'intellectualisme raisonneur et l'intransigeance nationaliste. . . . Il est certain que, dans la plus grande partie de sa production, son intelligence aiguë a joué un rôle plus actif que sa sensibilité. On ne saurait s'en plaindre en présence d'un chef-d'oeuvre aussi accompli que sa *Symphonie avec orgue* où rien n'est laissé au hasard" (308, 310).

For Ravel's and other colleagues' views on Saint-Saëns, see Michel Duchesneau, "The Fox in the Henhouse, or Saint-Saëns at the SMI," in *Camille Saint-Saëns and His World*, ed. Jann Pasler (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 324–33

<sup>86</sup> "Camille Saint-Saëns, qui n'eut pas à connaître les luttes difficiles de la plupart des musiciens de carrière, traversa l'histoire de notre art en dilettante supérieur, exécutant les tours de force les plus difficiles avec une déconcertante aisance" (82).

<sup>87</sup> See the letters from Pierre Laval, Ministre d'Affaires Étrangères, and Robert Brussel, director of the Association française d'Expansion et d'Échanges Artistiques, [concerning the](#) many concerts in 1935 organized in Saint-Saëns's honor in Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chili, Denmark, Great Britain, Hungary, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, Palestine, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Poland, Rumania Switzerland, [the United States](#), and Yugoslavia. Archives of the Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, La Courneuve, France.

<sup>88</sup> "L'un incarnait l'impassibilité glaciale et l'autre la sentimentalité poussée jusqu'à la sensiblerie" (82).

<sup>89</sup> The book's extended praise for Charpentier and Bruneau, whom Fulcher considers d'Indy's "anti-Dreyfusard nemesis," also defies her contention that the book's authors were promoting d'Indy's ideals. Fulcher, "Musical Style, Meaning, and Politics," 437.

<sup>90</sup> "[Bruneau's works] perpétueront le nom de ce musicien honnête et fort, dont le lyrisme vigoureux avait un accent très personnel et qui nous a laissé des notations musicales de paysages d'une sincérité et d'une ampleur dont on ne retrouve aucun exemple parmi ses plus illustres rivaux. . . . La carrière de Charpentier fut également un généreux combat contre certains préjugés. Préoccupé de la mission sociale de la musique, il voulut, lui aussi, consacrer dans ses oeuvres le lyrisme de la société et de la civilisation de son temps" (84–85). Vuillermoz also writes of music's "important democratic mission" in his *Musiciens d'aujourd'hui*, 196.

<sup>91</sup> "Doué d'un grand esprit de prosélytisme, Gustave Charpentier n'a négligé pratiquement aucune occasion de rapprocher son art des plus humbles de ses auditeurs. La foundation de son Conservatoire de *Mimi Pinson* et les nombreuses auditions de son *Couronnement de la Muse* qu'il organise et dirige lui-même en plein air devant des foules d'ouvriers, représentent, dans l'histoire de la musique de ce temps, des tentatives

tout à fait exceptionnelles et instructives, dont la générosité contraste avec l'égoïsme et l'esprit de petit chapelle qui semble de plus en plus orienter les créateurs d'aujourd'hui vers le suffrage des minorités" (85). Fulcher, in *The Composer as Intellectual*, depicts this section as "adulation of Charpentier's ability to evoke 'mass ecstasy'" and an emphasis "not on social reality and justice but rather on exaltation of the 'crowd'" (257).

<sup>92</sup> "Gabriel Fauré, Claude Debussy et Maurice Ravel sont trois astres qui ont brillé d'un si vif éclat au ciel de la musique française que les nouvelles étoiles découvertes chaque jour par nos astronomes, en voient leurs reflets atténués" (95).

<sup>93</sup> For example, Kinscella begins *Music on the Air*: "The story of radio broadcasting is a story of magic" (3).

<sup>94</sup> Ce langage raffiné et puissant lui a permis de tout exprimer, le conscient et l'inconscient, les mouvements les plus secrets de notre âme, les aspects les plus mystérieux de la nature et les confidences les plus cachés des éléments" (92–93).

<sup>95</sup> Sordet writes similarly of Ravel: "C'est étrange petit sorcier, ce paradoxal alchimiste, qui ne se contente pas d'être maître de tous les secrets de l'univers des sons, mais se crée à lui-même de nouvelles difficultés pour le seul plaisir de les vaincre, nous inspire une admiration aussi vive que sincère." *L'Action française*, 16 January 1931. Such an explanation tying difficulty to secrecy in Ravel's music is not one Fulcher entertains in her contention that references in *l'Initiation à la musique* to Ravel's "magiques sortilèges" are part of the "pro-Fascist" elevation of the "enchanted," which she sees as an "aestheticizing of the political." *The Composer as Intellectual*, 257.

<sup>96</sup> In his *Histoire*, Landormy also calls Fauré "very French" and compares his music with that of Claude LeJeune (321).

<sup>97</sup> Vuillermoz, *Histoire de la musique*, 377.

<sup>98</sup> Bennet, *La Musique à la radio*, 250, 255.

<sup>99</sup> From his study of programming at Radio-Paris each month of June in the 1930s, Bennet found these composers the most often programmed, in this order: Mozart (92), Saint-Saëns (87), Debussy (85), Ravel (69), Fauré (64), Massenet and Schubert (63), Strauss (59), Gounod, Beethoven, Bach, and Schumann (56), Messager (50), Wagner (47), Bizet and Chabrier (43), Hahn (41), Offenbach (37), Chopin (35), Berlioz (34), etc. He clarifies, [however, that](#) while Massenet, Lehar, and Johann Strauss enjoyed their popularity before 1935, after 1935 they were replaced on this list at Radio-Paris by Fauré, Pierné, and Schumann. *La Musique à la radio*, 57, 151.

Contrast the relative place of these composers on radio programs and in the radio criticism discussed [here](#) with Fulcher's assertion [that](#) "by 1938, Handel, Beethoven, and Berlioz are ostensibly ceding their places in the canon to Wagner, César Franck and Vincent d'Indy" ("Musical Style, Meaning, and Politics," 426).

<sup>100</sup> [Bennet, \*La Musique à la radio\*](#), 199.

<sup>101</sup> The programs of Radio Tour-Eiffel, Radio PTT, and Radio Parisien, started in 1932, were not included in Bennet's study.

<sup>102</sup> *Radio-Magazine*, 10 August 1930, 3. When taking into account the programming of the stations reproduced in *Ouest-Éclair*, from 1925 to 1935, we also find different results for Vuillermoz's "stars" than what Bennet found in studying only Radio-Paris. From 1925 to 1935, Fauré's music was broadcast on only 82 days, from once a year in both 1929 and 1930 to 8 or 9 days the other years, with a spike to 21 days in 1933. In that same period, Ravel had 230 broadcasts, with an average of 13 per year from 1925 to 1930, increasing to an average of 30 per year from 1931 to 1935, as noted above. In contrast, Debussy's music was broadcast on these same stations almost every day, twice as often as that of Berlioz, 14 times that of Ravel, and 114 times that of Fauré. D'Indy, not in Bennet's study, had only slightly more broadcasts as Ravel, but Franck had only 36 total during these ten years, of which more than half were in 1933 and 1934. Saint-Saëns, ever-present on French radio at the time, is not included on this list because his name was not dependably word-searchable.

<sup>103</sup> Dorset, "L'Éducation du goût," 2.

<sup>104</sup> "Peu connu de la grande foule et presque entièrement méconnu à l'étranger, ce créateur essentiellement français, parle un langage d'une délicatesse et d'une sensibilité qui n'ont pas encore triomphé de l'indifférence publique. . . . On n'a pas encore découvert tous les trésors que contient son oeuvre. . . . Tout en lui est musique et rien que musique. . . . La radiophonie française a un grand devoir à remplir: tirer de l'aristocratique réserve . . . l'art en qui on peut saluer le plus français des musiciens de France" (90).

<sup>105</sup> Vuillermoz later baptized them as such in his *Histoire de la musique* (1949).

<sup>106</sup> See also the space given to composers and their works in *Music on the Air* where Beethoven is also first, but Wagner is near the bottom with 1.5 pages; Debussy, Saint-Saëns, Franck, and Bizet each get two pages; Berlioz a page, Ravel a half-page, Fauré and d'Indy both a tiny paragraph, not much more than for Benjamin Godard.

<sup>107</sup> "De l'harmonie et de la composition, il ne savait pas grand'chose. Il suivait son instinct. . . . La vie sentimentale de Berlioz est aussi lamentable que sa vie artistique. . . . Son oeuvre n'est pas mieux organisée que sa vie. . . . Berlioz ne s'adresse qu'à notre imagination. Il ne touche pas profondément notre sensibilité. Il nous éblouit, nous éblouit, nous entraîne, nous étourdit. Cette musique, qui a tant de flammes, n'a pas de coeur" (48–49).

<sup>108</sup> In this photo, fifteen students are females, six males. See Emmanuel, "Lettres inédites," 75.

<sup>109</sup> Chaminade's music was often broadcast as far away as Radio-Alger and Radio-Maroc. In 1928, for example, the former featured her music in July and October; the latter broadcast it three times in August, six more that fall, five in 1929, then four in early 1930, in addition to an all-Chaminade concert there on 11 March 1930—far more than Ravel's music during this period on those stations. Holmès's music was also broadcast from Radio-Maroc, albeit less often than that of Chaminade.

<sup>110</sup> Louis Beydts, "distinguished and elegant musician" and operetta composer, here receives seven lines of text, the longest in a list that includes Widor, Ropartz, Février, Migot, and many others, perhaps because he

orchestrated some of Debussy's music. In comparison, the operetta composer Offenbach only receives eight lines, Lecocq seven lines (102–3) [in \*L'Initiation à la musique\*](#). Sordet, a fan of Beydts's music, had written on it in *Radio-Magazine* (3 January 1932). Reviewing his songs at the Concerts Colonne in 1935, he found them as “knowledgable” and “ingenious” as Ibert's Concerto, but “touching the spirit and enchanting the ear” far more. “La Musique, les concerts,” *L'Action française* (25 January 1935).

<sup>111</sup> “Les jeux de la politique musicale avaient transformé d'une façon arbitraire, Erik Satie en chef d'école” (99).

<sup>112</sup> On Vuillermoz's earlier objections to les Six and Landormy's support of them, see Kelly, *Music and Ultra-modernism*, 76–80.

<sup>113</sup> [In \*L'Initiation à la musique\*](#), Panassié mentions George Gershwin, Irving Berlin, and a number of performers such as Duke Ellington and Ray Ventura, but ignores other composers of American music, including Chadwick, and, like Kinscella in *Music on the Air*, the modernists Cowell and Ives, though his *Three Places in New England* had its Paris premiere in 1931. For a more complete essay on jazz by Panassié, see his “Le Jazz ‘hot,’” *Revue musicale* 105 (June 1930): 481–94, and his book, *Le Jazz Hot* (1934).

<sup>114</sup> “Ce rapide tableau de l'évolution musicale à travers les âges nous a conduits au troublant carrefour de tendances, de goûts et d'idées où se trouve immobilisée la musique d'aujourd'hui” (106).

<sup>115</sup> La Jeune France's first concert as a group was in June 1936, after [L'Initiation à la musique](#) came out. But Messiaen's exclusion is particularly puzzling, given his interest in the music of Debussy and Ravel, his first prize in music history (1929) coming out of Emmanuel's class at the Conservatoire, their respect for his composition teacher Dukas, and his organ music on the radio in the early 1930s. Perhaps he was just too young, his public debut with *Les Offrandes oubliées* coming only in 1931.

<sup>116</sup> When it comes to serious art music, Brochand documents the greatest presence of symphonic music on Radio-Paris (32 percent), with 12 percent for vocal soloists and 2.5 percent for choruses; however, Tour Eiffel broadcasted a greater percentage of instrumental music in general, with only 5 percent for vocal soloists and 0.5 percent choral music. In contrast, almost 30 percent of Radio PTT broadcasts of art music were with singers. [See \*Histoire générale de la radio\*, 457](#); see also Bennet, *La Musique à la radio*, 48.

<sup>117</sup> Cited in Général Cartier, “Radiophone rurale,” *Radio-Magazine*, 9 December 1928, 4.

<sup>118</sup> Bennet, *La Musique à la radio*, 199–200.

<sup>119</sup> “Le public aime et aimera toujours les chansons simples mélodiques, directes. . . . Plaire, voilà le secret en matière chansonnière” (143).

<sup>120</sup> “Que cet artiste chante une chanson . . . celui qui l'écoute doit avoir l'impression de recevoir une confiance. Avec la radio, l'attention de cet auditoire privé de vision est tout entière concentrée sur le son, la diction de l'artiste devra donc être impeccable” (146).

<sup>121</sup> “Chacun aime la musique à sa manière. L'essentiel est de l'aimer. . . . La musique, la bonne musique, est aussi un charme, un enchantement. Elle touche, elle ravit, elle enivre, elle exalte. Elle nous élève au-dessus de notre misérable condition humaine. Elle nous rend meilleurs. Il est permis, certes, d'en raisonner.



Mais il faut savoir s'abandonner sans résistance au flot des émotions qu'elle éveille en nous. Il faut savoir l'écouter avec son coeur" (6, 8–9).

<sup>122</sup> In the early 1930s, Radio-Paris showed ecumenism in regularly broadcasting lectures by Jewish rabbis, Protestant ministers, and Catholic priests. See "Le Mois radiophonique," *Les Cahiers de Radio-Paris* (April 1930).

<sup>123</sup> Rebatet had limited affection for the music of Debussy, as expressed in "La Musique, les concerts: Au temps du Debussysme," *L'Action française* (3 May 1935), and a "lukewarm" opinion of Fauré's music with its "feminine" aspects, some of which he felt, "le temps ne respectera pas aussi complètement que l'imaginent ses fervents." In "Virtuoses, Festival Fauré," *L'Action française*, 31 January 1930. But it was certainly not differences over the merits of d'Indy's music, about which Rebatet pointed out, "Nous n'avons jamais pu cacher notre déception devant un grand nombre d'ouvrages de M. Vincent d'Indy." "Les Concerts: La Musique française chez Lamoureux," *L'Action française*, 16 January 1931. Among his contributions to *Radio-Magazine* are "Les Disques de Borowsky" (10 November 1935), "Le Premier Acte de *Walkyrie*" (8 March 1936), and "Le Concerto pour piano en la de Mozart" (22 March 1936).

<sup>124</sup> E. Vuillermoz, "L'Initiation à la musique," *Ouest-Éclair*, 4 October 1935. This appeared directly under a long article on the Saint-Saëns centennial and the programs dedicated to it that week on Radio-Paris.

<sup>125</sup> David Goodman, in his excellent book *Radio's Civic Ambition: American Broadcasting and Democracy in the 1930s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), points out that calling on students to respond to the music personally echoed educators' desire to "develop individualism and personal opinions," conceived as central to the project of "producing democratic citizens," even if this seemed at odds with "the standardizing of judgment about musical greatness" that these programs otherwise encouraged (132–38). I also address this issue in my *Composing the Citizen: Music as Public Utility in Third Republic France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

<sup>126</sup> In 1936–37, Damrosch's repertoire was "German-Austrian (35.5 percent) and French (22.6 percent) composers," four Americans (Griffes, Harris, Stringfield, and Taylor,) and five folksongs. For more on Damrosch, his concerts, and these manuals, see Sondra Wieland Howe, "The *NBC Music Appreciation Hour*: Radio Broadcasts of Walter Damrosch, 1928–1942," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 51, no. 1 (Spring 2003): 69–70.

<sup>127</sup> Kinsella's *Music Appreciation Readers* were among the supplementary texts recommended to instructors.

<sup>128</sup> The citations in these two paragraphs come from *NBC Music Appreciation Hour, conducted by Walter Damrosch, Instructor's Manual* (New York: National Broadcasting Company) of 1932–33, 1934–35, and 1935–36; Walter Damrosch, "Foreword," v; Advisory Board, ix; "Suggestions to teachers," xii–xvi; and the descriptive notes for each of the concerts; and *NBC Music Appreciation Hour, conducted by Walter Damrosch, Student's Notebook*, prepared by Charles Farnsworth and Lawrence Abbott (New York: National Broadcasting Company, 1931–32 or 1937–38) for Series A, B, C, and D; Charles Farnsworth, "Introduction," 3; musical themes, questions, for each concert.

<sup>129</sup> Vuillermoz's series of weekly radio programs on Sunday mornings took the form of a dialogue between a twelve-year-old boy, Georges, who loves music so much that he hides out at orchestral rehearsals, and a percussionist who takes him under his wings, responds to his questions, and tries to initiate him to the "mysteries of music, technical details, and notions of history." In 1944, Jeunesses musicales published his *Les Cahiers de l'initiation à la musique*, accompanied by a Pathé-Marconi recording of the musical examples. Fonds Vuillermoz, Médiathèque Musicale Mahler, Paris (MMM).

<sup>130</sup> Ministère des PTT, Direction de la Radiodiffusion, Poste national Radio-Paris, *Conférences sur la musique : Histoire du théâtre lyrique en France, vol. 1: Des Origines à la Révolution* (Paris: Radio-Paris, n.d.), 242–48. Volume 2 took the genre up to 1900 (with, additionally, Koechlin, Roland-Manuel, Masson, and Mme Dussane); volume 3, [is](#) from 1900 until the present (adding Dukas, Casadesus, Le Flem, Dumesnil, Beydts, Laloy, and others). See [also](#) Bennett, *La Musique à la radio*, 176–78.

<sup>131</sup> Emile Vuillermoz, "Les Responsibilités de la critique," *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di musica*, Firenze-Cremona, 11–20 March 1937 (Firenze: Felice le Monnier, 1940), 181–84.

<sup>132</sup> Answering a listener's letter in the *Radio Times* in 1933, Percy Scholes published his "First-Aid for the Puzzled Listener," a lexicology of musical terms, [in](#) *The Radio Times Music Handbook* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), building on the glossary from his *Listener's Guide to Music* (1910). See the entries for opera (1 line), [opera-comique](#) (2 lines), and jazz (8 lines) by Scholes, with those for opera (72 lines), [opéra-comique](#) (28 lines), and jazz band (64 lines) by Emmanuel and Panassié [in](#) *L'Initiation à la musique*.

<sup>133</sup> In Adorno, *Current of Music*: "Radio Physiognomics," 94; "A Social critique of Radio Music," 137, 141; "Analytical Study of the *NBC Music Appreciation Hour*," 165. The latter was also published in *The Musical Quarterly* 78/2 (Summer 1994): 325–77.

<sup>134</sup> Adorno, "A Social Critique of Radio Music," 139–40.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, 134; Adorno, "Analytical Study," 191–97.

<sup>136</sup> [Adorno, "Analytical Study,"](#) 197–200.

<sup>137</sup> [Damrosch, \*Instructor's Manual\*, 1932–33, 42; \*Instructor's Manual\*, 1934–35, xv.](#)

<sup>138</sup> Rose Rosengard Subotnik, "Toward a Deconstruction of Structural Listening: A Critique of Schoenberg, Adorno, and Stravinsky," in *Deconstructive Variations: Music and Reason in Western Society* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 148–76.

<sup>139</sup> Damrosch's definition of "serious" is somewhat different. In his notes introducing the Minuet and Trio from Mozart's Jupiter symphony, he explains, "Realizing that even a serious composition should not be *too* serious, most composers have included in their symphonies one movement comparatively simple in their form and light—often humorous—in character." Then, after analyzing [the](#) history of Beethoven's "[Eroica](#)," he notes that the Scherzo is a "reminder that even great men have their moments of relaxation and amusement." *Instructor's Manual*, 1932–33, 42.

<sup>140</sup> *Instructor's Manual*, 1934–35, xiv. Subotnik, in "Toward a Deconstruction of Structural Listening," suggests that what drew Adorno to Schoenberg's music was the "ugliness, by conventional standards, of its sound" (167). My thanks to my student Gust Burns for pointing me to the passage in *Aesthetic Theory*,

trans. Robert Hullot-Kentor (New York and London: Continuum, 1997) [in which](#) Adorno proposes that beauty “originated in the ugly,” and elevates the “Category of the Ugly” as a kind of resistance, “requisite of an artwork if it is not to sink to that empty play dismissed by Hegel” (46–50).

<sup>141</sup> The other citations in the paragraph come from Adorno, “Analytical Study,” 169, 173, 201.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 170–71, 179, 191, 193, 196–97, 208. [Also in \*Current of Music\*](#), see “What a Musical Appreciation Hour Should Be: Exposé, Radio Programmes on WNYC,” 218, 220, for Adorno’s extended explanation of “correct listening” and “Radio Physiognomics,” 120–32, on the opposed nature of “atomistic” and “culinary listening.”

<sup>143</sup> Adorno, “Analytical Study,” 202; and “What a Musical Appreciation Hour should be,” 218.

<sup>144</sup> Adorno, “Analytical Study,” 203.

<sup>145</sup> [Adorno](#), “What a Musical Appreciation Hour Should Be,” 222, 225, 229–30.

<sup>146</sup> [Adorno](#), “What a Musical Appreciation Hour Should Be,” 231.

<sup>147</sup> [Adorno](#), “What a Musical Appreciation Hour Should Be,” 220. In “Notes from the Editor: Music, Technology, and the Public,” *Musical Quarterly* 78, no. 2 (Spring 1994), Leon Botstein suggests that Adorno’s “unself-critical and quite routine émigré sense of cultural superiority vis-à-vis America . . . seems to have merged with his intense desire to separate himself . . . from the very world from which he came” (180).

<sup>148</sup> Even Adorno praised the “concordance of word and tone” in Debussy’s early songs in “What a Musical Appreciation Hour Should Be,” 262.

<sup>149</sup> Throughout April and May 1928, Radio-Paris and Radio-Toulouse broadcast jazz regularly, as did Radio Maroc and, beginning in November 1929, Radio-Alger. In spring 1929, according to the French press, jazz was also broadcast on the Daventry Experimental and London stations.

<sup>150</sup> See Vaucour’s discussion of Levine’s *The Unpredictable Past: Explorations in American Cultural History* (1993); and Katz’s *Capturing Sound: How Technology Has Changed Music* (2004) in his “Popularizing the Classics,” 291–92.