
H-France Forum, Volume 5, Issue 2 (Spring 2010), No. 5

Jann Pasler, *Composing the Citizen. Music as Public Utility in Third Republic France*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2009. xxii + 789 pp. Illustrations, notes, appendices, index. \$60.00 U.S. (cl). ISBN 978-0-5202-5740-5.

Response Essay by Jann Pasler, University of California, San Diego.

When the subject is a society in flux, full of complexity, contradiction, ambiguity and irony, it is impossible to expect reviewers to fully grasp a book's many aspects. And, as Charles Rearick points out, there are always risks involved in interdisciplinary work. Will historians be able to get beyond the perspectives in which they are invested to read the book as a companion to Pierre Nora's *Les Lieux de mémoire*,^[1] a path-breaking history of France in seven volumes that leaves out music altogether? Will musicians be willing to leave behind the prejudices of the generation responsible for previous music histories of this period, especially those who needed to turn their back on the Belle Epoque to move beyond it? Before addressing specific questions that came up in the reviews, I begin with a general response that will serve as an introduction to the various layers of *Composing the Citizen: Music as Public Utility in Third Republic France* and how music and musical practices help us to understand French history.

* * *

From the beginning, the omnipresence of the word "useful" throughout discussions of music in France between 1871 and 1903 was as disconcerting to me as it may be to many readers. It forced me to deconstruct many of the premises underlying my previous work on French modernism. This included the composer's centrality in the musical world and modernists' rejection of early mass culture. To get beyond elites and the histories their agendas have dominated required taking seriously the musical tastes of amateurs as well as professionals and studying concerts at the zoo, department stores, public parks, the world's fairs, and the overseas colonies as well as at the Opéra and the major theaters. Performances of opera fantasies by various bands from Paris to Alger *before* the operas themselves reached major French theaters encouraged me to reconsider "trickle down" theories of cultural hegemony.^[2] I also had to come to grips with fundamental differences between the musical establishment and the government and with the role of progressive aristocrats in the emergence of modernism. In *Composing the Citizen*, I thus turned to history to write it anew.

Reviewers for the most part grasped the central focus of the book, the French concept of public utility—which is, as Charles Rearick observes, by no means its only focus. In France today, one often finds the expression "reconnue d'utilité publique" on posters in the Paris metro alongside the names of various private foundations and concert societies recognized as serving the public good and thus capable of receiving subsidies or taking tax deductions. During the Third Republic, *utilité publique* functioned as one of the widest ranging criteria of value. The idea arose when, after centuries of monarchy and a society based on inequalities, Enlightenment philosophers began to consider what it would take for human beings to live together as equals. From this came the radical idea that people had needs as a people. Underlying usefulness for the French is a social relationship, an ethical position, and a political

belief that, through addressing shared needs, one can build shared interests. Jolanta Pekacz mistakenly equates utility with “state control and interference in public life.” Rearick, in contrast, gets the point in part because he is willing to entertain its implications in the musical world: “In republicans’ minds, public utility meant usefulness to the many, not the few. It held out the standard of the public good, in place of luxury, frivolous distraction, or mere entertainment.” Also important is Jeffrey Jackson’s observation: as people in the modern period evaluated the hierarchy of their needs, “utility became a way of navigating the tensions between collective and individual interests,” that is, of responding to changing circumstances and holding public institutions accountable. As such, it helped those who espoused democracy to come to grips with society’s needs and—this is important—to respond to them in a dynamic fashion.

Utility was a valuable tool in the discourse about the French nation. Since utility implies its own contingencies, like Rousseau’s notion of the general will [3] it allows us to rethink citizenship and the nation as having multiple and fluctuating identities dependent on a diversity of needs and desires that change over time—still relevant today. Of course, the concept risked being powerfully normalizing, even prescriptive of how desires can be educated and needs constructed to constitute the general interest. Republican attitudes toward women remained problematic, as expressed in Augusta Holmès music, which, despite its forward-looking Wagnerian-inspired harmonies, promotes women’s value primarily as mothers to future soldiers. Many continue to object to *utilité publique* in justifying expropriation of buildings and land for public projects. But debates over what was in the country’s general interest were not limited to republicans. Arguing for the glory of France at home and abroad, monarchists insisted on continuing state support for the opera, and they prevailed, despite the fact that the institution’s elitist orientation flew in the face of republican aspirations to break down traditional hierarchies. In the late 1880s, the debates involved far-right nationalists, who threatened to return the country to monarchy, and in the early 1890s, political alliances between conservative republicans and royalists, both of whom were fearful of anarchist attacks and rising socialism. Indeed, *utilité publique* articulated the site of contention where conflicting interests inevitably clashed, the space of negotiation for everything political.

This focus has been particularly helpful in studying music as it encourages us to get beyond the notion that art music is and always has been, fundamentally, of and for elites. It has also oriented the discussion to the function of concerts in this contentious culture, in some cases, as Rearick points out, providing the French “with a way of working through complex and divisive political questions or of creating cross-class unity.” At the same time, Barbara Kelly correctly observes that if “the particular purpose to which music could be deployed changed over the decades from 1870 to the 1900s,” music also had a continuing function: it gave people a mode in which to “create a sense of community and by extension national identity,” that is, to practice tolerance and work out consensus beginning in the imagination.

The book opens with a walking tour of Paris, accompanied by ten period photographs. Contemplating great monuments can help us understand a country’s aspirations and achievements. However, I suggest, to appreciate “le quotidien du passé,” we also need “denarrativized” wandering not only in Montmartre—a terrain already familiar to French historians—but also the rest of the city, in the department stores, neighborhood parks, primary schools, churches, theaters, and concert halls, paying attention to the lives and practices of ordinary people.[4] The introduction to the book, which comes in the middle, presents a call to acknowledge the fleeting as well as durable aspects of culture. Like other cultural historians, I advocate studying ephemera—in this case, concerts, concert programs, and transcriptions for amateur ensembles—as well as masterpieces in their original form. I also examine popular and elite expression as interrelated phenomena. This brings a postmodern sensibility to the study of musical meaning as contingent on not just composer intentionality, but also when and in what form music reaches its various publics.

Composing the Citizen began as a three-chapter introduction to *Useful Music*, a book offering close analyses of a large number of compositions, situated in history, from 1871 to 1903. As I increasingly realized the need to examine music as history, these chapters grew, and *Useful Music* became a music-focused, second volume on the topic. At the same time, besides what I learned from decades of research in public archives in France, certain private archives created a series of earthquakes in my previous understanding of the period, most notably those of the Concerts Colonne, the Bon Marché department store, the Paris zoo, the Garde Républicaine, and the Countess Greffulhe's Société des Grandes Auditions. Coming to grips with these also took time, during which I published preliminary case studies of these organizations;[5] a third volume of sociologically-oriented analyses, *Useful Performance*, is also projected. While its focus is on the way in which music was an integral part of historical, socio-political, and intellectual developments in France, *Composing the Citizen* draws on these other two books.

Rather than organize the book around a number of distinct themes, I have chosen diachronic analysis, based on a series of historical "moments" (Rearick). At first there are the revolutionary festivals in which music played such an important role that, for reasons of *utilité publique*, the Convention voted in 1795 to create the Conservatoire. Other close analysis comes in 1873, 1877, 1886-87, and 1890-92. In 1873 and 1886-87, musical compositions, musical scholarship, and day-to-day performances in popular as well as elite settings reveal that return to monarchy was perceived as inevitable. However, in 1877, similar analysis of the musical world suggests that republican values were sufficiently embraced in the population that the crisis of May 1877 was unwarranted—a view confirmed by the elections in October. Study of public taste as reflected in concerts can make an important contribution to our understanding of crucial moments of history and how attitudes and structures change over time.

Anticipating resistance to the French notion of music as public utility because of both the predominance of German idealism in Americans' understanding of musical value and the use of music by totalitarian states in the twentieth century, *Composing the Citizen* begins and ends with criticism of this idea. Many of us who grew up admiring the holy "trinities"—Debussy, Fauré, and Ravel in French music;[6] Baudelaire, Verlaine, and Mallarmé in French literature—have taken their criticism of the Republic to heart. Yet comments like Debussy's, such as "art is absolutely useless to the masses" (p. 92), suggest that objections were not related to state manipulation or the use of music as propaganda. Rather they were addressed to the increasing accessibility of music to the masses advocated by republicans, the implications for public taste, and elites' need for distinction. With his *Furniture Music* (1920), Erik Satie took direct aim at "music designed to satisfy 'useful' needs... Art has no part in such needs. Furniture music creates a vibration. It has no other goal" (pp. 54-55). Who would have known that such music would later inspire John Cage and Brian Eno? Modernists' innovations are all the more remarkable when understood not as reactions to a lame or corrupt Republic, but as reasoned critical responses to strong and vital forces within it, including those centrally important in French democracy. As Jackson points out, "one of the purposes of this book is to suggest that modernism was not just an evolutionary development in music and poetry, it also arose in part out of a reaction to very powerful socio-political currents in France."

To get beyond modernists' disdain for this period, I had to take republican aspirations seriously.[7] These included assuring education for all, including music in school curricula, rewriting history—not just the history of republicanism, but a history that acknowledged traditions such as opera, associated with the monarchy, and values such as elegance and grace, associated with the court—encouraging competition to level the playing field and reward talent, making the country's resources available to everyone, and reviving French pride. All were complex and difficult projects for the Republic. If I sometimes appear as an "enthusiastic guide" (Rearick), empathy for all sides was necessary to get beyond the bickering in the discourse and grasp the larger issues. Ironically, empathy also empowered critical distance, not the kind that draws on one's prejudices to write self-fulfilling conclusions, but rather one that enabled me to theorize about consequences. After finishing several complete drafts of the book, as a fellow at the National Humanities Center, I devoted an additional year to thinking about its

implications. Kelly is right to draw attention to my chapter on music's role in strengthening "France's international profile." Nation-building is equally the result of participation in a global culture.[8] Study of the export of French music encourages us to understand Western culture as the dynamic product of national distinctions and international competition, national pride and international cooperation.

By the nature of the period's intense debates and controversies, critical analysis was inherent to the project. As reviewers note, I not only "acknowledge that musical practices had many agendas behind them" (Jackson), I also address "difficult questions adroitly at many points, carefully noting subtle complexities and offering multiple answers, all of which may be valid to varying degrees" (Rearick). Analysis of contradictions inherent in French culture begins in the walking tour where I question the heterogeneous architecture bordered by grand, homogeneous boulevards, below-ground realities and above-ground appearances, and the cost of hiding much from public view. Challenges to the importance of usefulness, various counter-discourses to republicanism, and anti-republican countercultures permeate each chapter. The first, on utility as a theory of musical value, examines the tensions between the beautiful and the useful in eighteenth-century aesthetic theory, the art for art's sake movement, and the debates over luxury vs. utility in political theory, revived and transformed in the Third Republic. The second chapter on the legacy of the Revolution studies how its festivals served various political factions and stimulated constant debate over what should be their nature. As festival music grew increasingly complex, requiring rehearsals and collaborations with professionals, the nature of the festival experience as essentially popular was thrown into question and forced people to recognize music's capacity for distracting as well as instructing.

Readers of H-France know well that the major controversies in the early Third Republic derive from the fact that no one group was in power for very long, that factions were characterized by contentious internal differences, and each government resulted from compromises. Royalists held the majority under the Moral Order of the 1870s, but only through fragile compromise between Legitimists, Orléanists, and Bonapartists. Republicanism was an ideology of resistance, as under the Second Empire. Even after they captured the majority and the presidency in 1879, as Jackson points out, "republicanism was not static, but an ever-changing political philosophy, nor was the republic a homogeneous entity but a set of competing political persuasions which evolved in the years after its founding in 1870." [9] When it came to supporting music, these differences had consequences. Opportunist republicans tended to favor laissez-faire free enterprise (even if this meant leaving control of the opera to traditional elites), while radical republicans advocated some protectionist intervention and extreme leftists considered state intervention a necessary condition for free expression (thereby supporting creation of an *Opéra populaire*). Just as contradictions within republicanism undermined efforts at achieving consensus on national identity, the musical world was also fraught with paradox. Despite France's defeat to Prussia in 1871, there was significant enthusiasm for Handel and Wagner, and despite republican anti-clericalism, most composers continued to write music for the Catholic church (more on this below). Study of the musical world thus reveals gaps between political ideals and political realities, not a story of "predictability" or "social engineering by the state" (Pekacz).

The last third of the book explores the limits of republicanism beginning in the 1880s and the extended critique of it from within France by anticolonialists, anti-establishment artists who called themselves *les Incohérents*, Wagnerians, far-Right protectionists, and royalists hoping to return to monarchy. I thus take issue with Jackson, who suggests that I "downplayed the potential power of those countervailing currents." In the 1880s, I show that music promoting certain values, especially *revanche*, was used by the *Ligue des patriotes* to mount a challenge to *républicains opportunistes*, and by the far right to build anti-republican sentiment. In the 1890s, like Debora Silverman, I point to the increasing role of the aristocracy in cultural life, particularly how, as Kelly points out, elites "resisted and reworked aspects of music's utility." [10] Critique of republican values in the musical world grew in part because republicans had undervalued and failed to understand what music contributed to one's internal universe. Wagnerism and its appeal to elites is one of the book's themes. I also examine the contestation of Conservatoire

values by those at the Schola Cantorum and the musical world's response to the religious revival in the 1890s. Two programs of concerts in the Eglise Saint-Gervais are reproduced, featuring Renaissance music alongside premieres of contemporary music. What becomes evident is not so much that republicans were "loading excessive expectations onto music" (Rearick), but rather that, with republicans firmly in the majority, republicanism, for both conservatives and progressives, became an ideology to protect. In this context, music and musical reception began to embody and represent a shift of values in French society. In the 1890s, the mutually exclusive meanings associated with *chansons populaires* as emblems of the French "race" fueled debate over identity from the perspective of racial origins.[11] The critical reception of music also suggests an increasingly masculine self-image, which scholars such as Bram Dijkstra have shown in the visual arts.[12] With anxiety over depopulation and sphyllis and an emerging racial panic after 1900, the notion of what was healthy—what would contribute to the health of mind, body and society—began to replace what was useful as a primary criterion of value. When the first public health legislation was passed in 1903, the discourse of health put emphasis on prevention, protection, and control—far different than negotiating people's conflicting needs and desires. Thus, while acknowledging the ongoing importance of the concept of public utility in France up through the present, the book ends here.

* * *

Before responding more specifically to reviewers' comments, I would like to express my gratitude to historians Charles Rearick and Jeffrey Jackson as well as musicologist Barbara Kelly for their thoughtful, perceptive reviews. Each has grasped the essence of the project well. They have engaged with republicanism as a cultural practice, Rearick acknowledging that music could be "socially and politically transformative" and Jackson generously concluding that music was "not just the faint soundtrack in the background of the era's political drama; it was the rousing chorus which tied those dramas together." Jackson's summary of the book's three major themes—"the development of national culture through music, which involves the imagination of community," "the creation of a democratic culture," and "an alternative interpretation of musical modernism"—is brilliant. Rearick, who brings immense knowledge of the period, points out insightfully that the book also concerns more than music as political culture. Indeed, as I show, music of and for the mind inspired in symbolist poets and avant-garde painters new approaches to their art as well as other ways of fusing poetics and politics. The book aspires to be both "a new, synthetic narrative of the political culture of the early Third Republic" (Jackson)[13] and a "*tour d'horizon* of the late nineteenth-century musical world" (Rearick).

Kelly discusses some of the music featured in the book and digs into topics overlooked by the others: music's role in cultural diplomacy, the relationship between musical exoticism and colonial policy, and music's role in "projecting and negotiating a more unified sense of the past." Although the juxtaposition of *la musique ancienne et moderne* functioned differently under the Moral Order, in the later 1880s, this involved broad participation across tastes and classes. Not only did royalist sympathizers organize dance parties in period attire (as shown in illustrations 71-73), such republicans as Saint-Saëns and Fauré, young progressives like Debussy, Ravel, and Satie, and even popular composers such as Desormes (music director at the Folies-Bergère) published sarabandes and pavanés.

I'm particularly grateful to Kelly for suggesting the "relevance and immediacy" of such issues beyond the early Third Republic. Jackson too raises the important question of what happens between music and republicanism after the war—a topic deserving another book—but Kelly shows how the book helps her think about the reputations of Ravel and Debussy after 1918 and Stravinsky's non-linear understanding of the past. Most importantly, Kelly underlines how "the privileged position music holds in French culture, not only during the Third Republic, but even today . . . goes some way toward explaining the ongoing commitment of the French state to subsidize artistic institutions, while other nations struggle to make the case for non-commercial music's broader purpose and appeal." As she points out, part of my purpose is to encourage people to "examine the status and function of music in our various national

cultures today” (Kelly). If music during the early Third Republic helped the French negotiate their differences, reconcile mutually exclusive values, and build community, this story may be useful to emerging democracies. My short discussion of the Fête de la Musique (celebrated annually in France since 1982) may not have convinced Rearick that inviting the musical participation of everyone and all musical genres could have “demonstrable carryover effect on everyday civic life.”[14] Still, one should note that this festival is now celebrated in over 250 countries, more than half of which have no contact with France or its department of cultural affairs.

In contrast to the other reviews, that of Jolanta Pekacz is deeply problematic. Already in the first paragraph the language she associates with “art serving public purposes”—i.e., “high level of state control and interference in public life that is supposed to be beneficial for the people” — is descriptive of totalitarian regimes such as “the history of the post-World War II East European Soviet Bloc,” to which she makes reference. However, such language, used later to describe the early Third Republic,[15] misrepresents the nature of the French liberal state and support for the arts under its democracy. The review is also characterized by hostility to the basic thesis of the book (as if it should be about “music as manipulation, political indoctrination, ... social engineering”) and by anti-Revolutionary attitudes[16] that prevents the author from objectively considering the subject matter. In reducing “revolutionaries” to a monolithic entity, she ignores that the Revolution was a succession of governments promoting very different ideologies, as I show in the evolution of festivals and their music.[17] She takes no interest in what the Revolution meant to musicians. Insisting (twice) on the “blatant violation of Rousseau’s political theory” by revolutionaries, she misses my discussion of what Rousseau meant in the Third Republic (there are two inches of references to Rousseau in the index). She also uses language, particularly with the frequently recurring expression “state co-optation,” to link the Third Republic with the Revolution and thus condemn it. Republicans never denied “the extravagant abuses of power of the revolutionaries” and were determined that France not fall back into violence. But my book is not about the Revolution. What concerns me here is its legacy, which Pecacz never considers.

Most significant, Pekacz ignores the complexities that characterized the early Third Republic and my approach to musical culture as “contested terrain, a site of conflict and heterogeneity” (Pekacz)—the book’s main theme. If I do not take adequate inspiration from others’ analyses of “revolutionaries’ linguistic abuses,” it is because, as explained in the introduction, discourse in France often veils reality. More important, in my view, is analysis of practices and critique in the form of alternative practices, such as those discussed above. Practices involve discourse, but also much more. Moreover, I have been careful throughout to show ironies and contradictions within those practices. If revolutionaries’ “expropriation of the church” is not a topic of my book, I nonetheless discuss how, despite republican anticlericalism, many musicians, including major republican composers like Saint-Saëns, Fauré, and Théodore Dubois, were organists and wrote much religious music, including masses and motets.

Leaving aside all discussions of music (the only composer she mentions is Bach, not a subject here [18]), Pekacz missed the book’s central arguments and the evidence on which the arguments are based. She does not even engage with challenges to republican values in the music of Wagner, Debussy, and others despite the fact that, as Rearick points out, “much of the music discussed in [my] book does not neatly fit into” the concept of public utility. If Pekacz had taken seriously the Wagnerism I examine beginning in the 1880s and if she had taken note that the French premieres of *Tristan* and *Götterdämmerung* were produced by the Société des Grandes Auditions, perhaps she would not have asserted that it was “ambiance” and “a high admission fee” that attracted its members to join the society (a supposition she offers without substantiation, as elsewhere in her review). Avoiding aesthetics altogether, the relationship between aesthetics, ethics, and politics passes without comment by Pekacz. Her approach to the Third Republic and her resistance to engage with the book’s content led to frequent misrepresentations and an unrelenting focus on minutiae, normally the concern of copy-editors. If I supposedly wrote, “art was not accessible to the poor,” why then contradict this later in acknowledging that I wrote, “Pasdeloup’s concerts seats were available to workers”? Ticket prices, in fact, are on the

bottom of most concert programs reproduced in the book, including those of Padeloup (Illustrations 45, 48). To understand what the “buying power of this money” meant, I mention that most of the seats at the Concerts Padeloup “cost only a little more than bus fare” (p. 159). Her attempt to correct my “errors” is ironic, since most of the time her “corrections” are wrong and her text is laced with its own errors.[19] As for her close-reading of punctuation, search for typos, and apparent rejection of the University of California Press copy-editing norms, I refer the reader to what Donald McKenzie and Roger Chartier have written about the nature of texts.[20]

For whatever reasons, the book has left reviewers confused in two areas that need to be addressed: (1) the nature of the French state in the early Third Republic, together with its relationship to music, and (2) the nature of the popular among republicans.

First, the state. I use the word to mean national government. The arts were part of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine-Arts since 1870 and considered public services. This gave them certain responsibilities in terms of education, broadly understood. With the government in constant flux in the fledgling French democracy, its arts ministers changed twenty-seven times from 1872 to 1900. Only those who went on to become Prime Minister, such as Jules Ferry and Léon Bourgeois, were able to push through important policies, such as including music in primary school education and Conservatoire reform. The government’s power was thus limited. Whether in the minority or the majority, republicans pushed for three major policies: (1) increased access of the country’s resources (including the opera) to the population as a whole, including the *petite bourgeoisie* and workers, and to young composers for performance of their works; (2) increased competition through prizes and other means to reward talent instead of inherited privileges; and (3) measures that would insure more aesthetic diversity and tolerance, sometimes with the appointment of advisory committees with broad social, political, and aesthetic representation, such as the *Conseil supérieur des Beaux-Arts* [21] The role of the state, as Pekacz’s physiocrats could have observed, was “to provide the right conditions for the unfettered activity of all its citizens,” not just its elites.

In the musical world, the government was important to the extent that it granted subsidies. Unlike in the other arts, it commissioned no works. The *Chambre des députés* considered music once per year during annual budget decisions, mostly to vote on generous subsidies of the *Opéra*, the *Opéra-Comique*, and the *Conservatoire*. In return for these subsidies, the government expected high-quality performances and contribution to national glory. However, since *Opéra* administrators managed “à leurs risques et à leurs périls,” financial concerns and conservative audiences tended to determine its repertoire choices. In short, there was little governmental interference in opera during this period.[22] The government also occasionally gave small subsidies to private concert societies, who remained responsible for their own decisions and budgets. Its purpose was to recognize and encourage private contributions to the public good.

The real problem that Debussy and other musical progressives had was less with the government than with the establishment, especially the *Académie des Beaux Arts*, which tended to be very conservative. To take on the *Académie*, the republican-dominated City of Paris established alternative prizes to the *Prix de Rome* in music and the other arts, rewarding a broader range of aesthetic values.[23] When government officials wanted to encourage reform at the *Conservatoire*, they appointed a committee with a wide range of composers, including the anti-establishment Vincent d’Indy. To trace the emergence of republican values in the musical world, then, I could not concentrate on the *Opéra* and *Conservatoire* concerts whose audiences were dominated by traditional elites who imposed their tastes through subscriptions, often handed down within families over the generations.[24] Rather, I studied organizations without large subscription audiences: those dependent on the market, whose performers worked for the take at the door, and whose public, ever in flux, influenced repertoire through ticket sales. Since the archives of the *Concerts Colonne* maintained records of how much each concert cost and earned in ticket sales, I was able to track the evolution of public taste week-to-week over a forty-year

period.[25] Only beginning in the 1890s did Colonne receive a small state subsidy and this because of the large quantity of new music he premiered. The contributions concerts made to strengthening republican values thus came largely from the plethora of “unconventional music making” (Kelly) throughout the country, initiated and run by private individuals such as Edouard Colonne, who was Jewish and republican, as well as Aristide Boucicault, founder of the Bon Marché, acting within markets. If republicanism thrived and grew, politicians’ speeches may have established the climate, but it was in private practices, including “fashion and commercial success” (Kelly) that it took root. Furthermore, as Kelly observes, market competition was not limited to republicans: “the distinctive marketing prowess of [the Concerts] Lamoureux, with its concentration on Wagner for the wealthy, contributed to its success.” Not surprisingly, then, given that he has concentrated mostly on subscription concerts which, in France, performed a largely older repertoire demanded by its older audiences, my conclusions about public taste differ from what William Weber has found earlier in the century and especially in other parts of Europe.[26] I also show that programming decisions have implications far beyond music history.

Although the nation benefited in important ways, cultural diplomacy during this period too was a function of individuals with commercial concerns. Publishers promoted the export of French music, especially opera, and singers profited most of all. At the same time, decisions by foreign singers and institutions to perform French music suggest the extent to which French taste was extensively appreciated abroad and earned the nation admirers and friends who could turn into political allies. French music’s popularity with the courts of Europe, especially those resistant to Wagner’s music, gave the Third Republic credibility abroad, despite its anti-monarchist policies at home.

Second, the popular. Jackson considers the analysis of “popular alongside art music” as “one of my strengths.” Rearick, meanwhile, objects to the “little on the popular songs of the time.” With comments such as “Republican unease with the popular was plainly strong and deep,” we can gather that for Rearick popular means the music of the café-concerts and *chanteurs de rue*. Deputies in the Chambre indeed often moaned about the deleterious moral effect of café-concerts. It was an objection monarchists and republicans shared and that republicans often used to build support for *concerts populaires*, inexpensive concerts of classical music, as alternative entertainment. The notion of using music to “elevate the plebs,” as Rearick puts it, is a good description of this discourse under the Moral Order of the 1870s. However, when republicans came to power in the 1880s, other values took hold, including the desire to democratize pleasures. In chapter eight, I examine the impact of economic liberalism on the musical world, positive and negative, not only in competition among orchestras (here compared to competition among department stores), but also through support for popular entertainment, such as the café-concerts, cabarets, and music halls from Paris to Hanoi and Algiers. If under the Moral Order, the conservative government feared such places as breeding grounds for political dissent, under republicans, as Susanna Barrows has shown, the focus of police records shifted from politics to *moeurs*, i.e. “Eros.”[27] In the late 1880s, there was a notable exception. I open chapter nine with an extended analysis of “En revenant de la revue,” the most popular café-concert song of the decade, and its use as propaganda for General Boulanger’s campaign. If, as Jackson suggests, Montmartre was known for resistance and social critique, I show its cabarets also capable of propaganda. Chapter twelve reproduces an illustration from a shadow puppet play on Jeanne d’Arc at the Chat Noir that promotes militarism and *revanche*. When it comes to negotiating musical relationships between art and love for the absurd at the Chat Noir, I examine the music of Satie, a cabaret pianist before he was embraced by the next generation for his iconoclastic ways. Kelly shows how, in his *Histoires naturelles* (1907), Ravel did the same, but was criticized for what he borrowed from the music hall. Rearick’s definition of the popular breaks down when one considers that songs were only one popular genre at the time, albeit long fascinating historians. There was also dance music (polkas, waltzes, etc.), salon music, as well as operetta, all equally “popular” if this means having broad appeal, reaching all classes, and participating in the growing commodification of music as a consumer product.

After 1870 and the frivolous abuses of the Second Empire, those espousing republican ideals wished to redefine the function of leisure, conceiving it as a fundamental component of the “good life” for all classes. Leisure, for them, included performing and listening to art music in one form or another. In *Composing the Citizen*, as reviewers note, I focus particularly on the popularization of this music. With so many examples provided, including concerts “with some ten to twenty thousand people,” it puzzles me how Rearick could conclude that “most of those musical experiences were still limited to the few—or even to traditional elites.” While it would be difficult to know how many workers attended the weekly Concerts Padeloup in the circus—there may have been more petit bourgeois in those cheap seats—it’s hard to imagine many “traditional elites” on hard circus benches when they could hear some of these same works performed in the comforts of the Conservatoire. Moreover, orchestras providing low-cost *concerts populaires* sprang up in most French cities in the 1870s and 1880s.[28] Likewise, with their orchestral concerts organized as a form of music history beginning in the 1880s, the Concerts Colonne specifically targeted middle-class women (their success evident in the large increase in women among the honorary members, by 1885 exceeding the number of men). In the 1890s, twice weekly in the afternoon, the new green house at the zoo too presented concerts oriented to women—“promenade concerts” of classical, dance, and contemporary music to entertain them as they knitted and their children played. Thousands of people several times per week also listened to neighborhood, municipal, and military bands, sometimes up to a dozen on any Sunday, performing marches, polkas, and opera fantasies in the country’s urban parks. These concerts familiarized anyone who walked by with tunes from the most recent works by contemporary composers. If one thinks that popular songs were necessarily distinct from art music, consider that, by 1894, two tunes from the opera *Mignon* had become so popular they were sung at weddings and village ceremonies throughout the country.[29] Did this familiarity come from attending the opera? Probably not. From band transcriptions or choral arrangements? Maybe. The new accessibility of art music to the petite bourgeoisie and middle classes through low ticket prices encouraged the huge growth in concert life at the time.

Ordinary people also participated in the *supply* for music—perhaps the best way to “assess the results ... of republicans’ hopeful thinking” (Rearick). We know who and how many participated in thousands of amateur ensembles because of membership lists, required of all private societies, and annual competitions around the country. As their statutes note, the working-class Choral de Belleville, which often won first prize in national orphéon competitions, built their membership of those who were determined to prove that the poor were capable of producing as well as appreciating beauty. My point: elites were not alone in determining the evolution of musical tastes.

One more response to Rearick. Proving “that social divisions and cultural chasms were being eliminated or reduced through such musical experiences” would be difficult unless one understands culture as addressed to the imagination and that changes often need to occur there before they can occur elsewhere. I particularly disagree that republicans “readily accepted the traditional cultural distinctions of high and low—the binaries of art music and the unrefined, the serious and the light, the noble and the frivolous.” Among the many examples that contradict this conclusion, the most provocative and illuminating is a concert at the Bon Marché department store with which I open chapter eight. Each year in fall and winter, beginning in 1883, the store cleared out the merchandise on its main floor, installed a platform for 400 performers, and invited a public of 6000 made up of customers, employees, their family and friends. On stage were not only the store’s choral society and wind band, made up entirely of employees, but also two Opéra stars and the two most popular café-concert superstars, Paulus and Mme Theresa. The program consisted of marches, opera fantasies, and even Liszt’s Hungarian Rhapsody transcribed for wind band, interspersed with opera arias from Gounod and Thomas (composer-members of the Académie des Beaux-Arts), and “comic chansonnettes.” I don’t see such an event, as Jackson suggests, as an activity designed only to “unify people to the national cause.” Boucicaut certainly used such occasions to promote his sale merchandise. Still, the image of the store was also on display. With the juxtaposition of amateurs and professionals on stage, of employees and customers in the audience, and of serious and popular repertoire, performance here indisputably

mediates differences of class, culture, and taste, encouraging tolerance, at the very least. Illustration 57, depicting audiences at a wind band performance outside the store, also documents that these concerts attracted not only the middle and upper classes, but also workers and women.[30]

The issue of assessing musical reception is more troubling to historians than musicologists, mostly because the latter have tended to use them to understand the range in meanings attributed to works whereas the former are more interested in the audiences themselves. As for the Concerts Padeloup to which Jackson refers, observations on their reception come not only from various published reviews, but also the Archives of the Préfecture de la Police (p. 159 n.1 and p. 161 n. 5). The other comments, from the chapter's first paragraphs, should be understood as an introduction to the issues. They are the result of having spent decades reading and publishing on the French press, not only the musical press here cited but also the popular press (such as the *Chat Noir* and *Orphéon* journals), the so-called penny press, and newspapers directed at various kinds of elites.[31] Rearick's question about the whether republican values came through in music is difficult to answer in the abstract. Although I address this question in specific pieces, usually by suggesting a number of plausible interpretations, my purpose in this book, as Kelly notes, is to take the debate "to a more fundamental level." In the case of the opera *Samson et Dalila*, as I show in the last chapter, what sections were transcribed, which excerpts performed by orchestras, and what songs presented in Conservatoire exams—all before the opera appeared on stage—tell us about what audiences actually heard. This was principally music about charm and exoticism, not music emphasizing the *femme fatale*. To the extent that different excerpts were transcribed and performed in the more misogynist 1890s, we need to revisit the question of meaning.[32] The historical contingencies affecting musical meaning fascinate me as a historian.

Of course, one can never fully document how ideals and values permeate the *moeurs* and minds of a people. The book reproduces 25 concert programs among its 103 illustrations to allow readers to consult for themselves documentation of the book's arguments. The editor and I felt that extensive, on-the-page footnotes and a 52-page index would be far more useful than a bibliography which—given the extensive primary sources consulted and my reading in not only history, musicology, and ethnomusicology, but also political science, sociology, art history, philosophy, economics, gender studies, cultural theory—would have made the book impossibly long. Finally, "What was unique to music?" Jackson asks. Perhaps this is best explained by the tension Jackson identifies in the book: music was both a "common, neutral ground on which the French could negotiate the issues of the day" as well as being "deeply political." This was not because it was "thoroughly politicized by the government itself," but because people espousing different values looked to it to reflect their own ideals. For nostalgic monarchists, music was capable of assuring that their values would survive the end of their hopes for returning to power. For republicans, the nature of free expression, critical thinking, tolerance, and most of all fraternity lent themselves to democratization through music. My point was never to exaggerate the importance of music in comparison with other aspects of republican culture, nor to underestimate the role of music in people's private lives, a subject beyond the scope of this book. Rather, I hope to have begun to fill in a most significant gap long ignored by historians, providing a firm foundation on which others can revisit the period and its meaning into the future.

My sincerest thanks to Venita Datta and *H-France Forum* for this extraordinary opportunity to reconsider my book through the perspectives of the reviewers and to share my thoughts in this very congenial format.

NOTES

[1] Paris: Gallimard, 1992.

[2] In his "Fashion," *International Quarterly* 10 (1904): 130-55, Georg Simmel explains as unidirectional the process of "subordinate social groups" seeking new status claims by imitating the tastes of "superordinate groups."

[3] As Tracy Strong explains it in his *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: The Politics of the Ordinary* (1994; Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), "Far from being the expression of a single, unitary overarching collective consciousness, the general will is in fact the expression of the multiplicity and mutability of my being. . . . [it] is the thought of the humanness of the human being, ontological rather than (merely) moral . . . what I see when I see myself in you, you in me, and me in myself. . . . When acting on the general will, I encounter myself as what I share with others, as human. This is what is meant by political society" (pp. 79-85).

[4] See Michel de Certeau, "Walking in the City," in id., *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven F. Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984); Christopher Prendergast, *Paris and the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1992), 209-11; and Pierre Nora, "Entre mémoire et histoire," in *Les Lieux de mémoire*, ed. id., I: xxxiii.

[5] See my "Building a Public for Orchestral Music: Les Concerts Colonne," in *Le Concert et son public: Mutations de la vie musicale en Europe de 1780 à 1914*, ed. Hans-Erich Bödeker, Patrice Veit, and Michael Werner (Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme, 2002), 209-40; "Four organizations, four agendas: Expanding the public for serious music in late 19th-century Paris," *Organisateurs et formes d'organisation du concert: institutionnalisation et pratiques*, eds. Hans-Erich Bödeker and Patrice Veit (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2008), 333-56; "Material Culture and Postmodern Positivism: Rethinking the 'Popular' in late 19th c. French Music," in *Historical Musicology: Sources, Methods, Interpretations*, ed. Roberta Marvin, Michael Marissen, and Stephen Crist (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2004), 356-387; rpt. in Jann Pasler, *Writing through Music: Essays in Music, Culture, and Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); and "Countess Greffulhe as Entrepreneur: Negotiating Class, Gender, and Nation" in *The Musician as Entrepreneur, 1700-1914 Managers, Charlatans, and Idealists*, ed. William Weber (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 221-255; rpt., in Pasler, *Writing through Music*.

[6] Emile Vuillermoz—an admirer of Debussy, student of Fauré, and friend of Ravel—popularized this notion of the new trinity of French music in his *Histoire de la musique* (Paris; Fayard, 1949), available since 1973 as a *livre de poche*.

[7] In his *The Decline of Modernism*, trans. Nicolas Walker (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), Peter Bürger, using Walter Benjamin's terminology, might refer to this kind of criticism as "redemptive critique." It seeks to preserve, not just destroy, and does this not with the grand masterpieces, but with what other historians have left aside. Like Bürger, my purpose is not just to recognize certain truths about the past, but also to reveal something about our own time (pp. 26-29).

[8] While I devote much of chapter four to the export of French music, a recent volume edited by Christophe Charle, *Le Temps des capitales culturelles, XVIIe-XXe siècles* (Paris: Champ Vallon, 2009) comes to some similar conclusions in studying the export of French theater.

[9] My notions of republicanism build on Gabriel Hanotaux, *Contemporary France* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1905), Claude Nicolet, *L'Idée républicaine en France* (Paris; Gallimard, 1982) and *La République en France* (Paris; Seuil, 1992), Maurice Agulhon, *The French Republic, 1879-1992*, trans. Antonia Nevill (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), and especially Philip Nord, *The Republican Moment* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995). Also useful were Jean-Marie Mayeur and Madeleine Rebérioux, *The Third Republic from its Origins to the Great War, 1871-1914*, trans. J.R. Foster (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), François Furet, *La Révolution de Turgot à Jules Ferry*,

1770-1880 (Paris: Hachette, 1988), Pierre Michel, *La Troisième République* (Paris: Fayard, 1989), Robert Gildea, *The Past in French History* (New Haven, Ct: Yale University Press, 1994), Jérôme Grévy, *La République des opportunistes: 1870-1885* (Paris: Perrin, 1998), and Charles Sowerine, *France since 1870: Culture, Politics and Society* (New York: Palgrave, 2001).

In the arts, Antonin Proust, *L'Art sous la République* (Paris: Charpentier, 1892), Gustave Larroumet, *L'Art et l'Etat* (Paris: Hachette, 1895), annual speeches that the Ministers made at the Conservatoire each August when they delivered the prizes, and recent art histories, such as Miriam Levin, *Republican Art and Ideology in Late Nineteenth Century France* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1986), Patricia Mainardi, *The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), and Tamar Garb, *Sisters of the Brush* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1994), have been helpful.

[10] Parts of my chapter eleven echo Debora Silverman, *Art Nouveau in Fin-de-Siècle France* (Berkeley: University of California, 1989): many members of the Union centrale des beaux-arts, at the heart of her discussion, were also members of the Société des Grandes Auditions.

[11] I am grateful to Kelly for her suggested reading in natural history, useful in the book I am currently writing on music, race, and colonialism in France, 1880-1920.

[12] Bram Dijkstra, *Idols of Perversity: Fantasies of Feminine Evil in Fin-de-Siècle Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

[13] My concept as political culture is indebted to James Lehning who, in *To be a Citizen* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001), defines it as “expressed not only through institutional and constitutional arrangements, but also in cultural representations of and discourses about the Republic” (p. 4).

[14] Rearick might be interested to learn that, according to Olivier Donnat’s interviews (« Les Français et la Fête de la Musique : Résultats d’une enquête menée fin juin 2000 », available on the website of the Fête), people attending it, at least in Paris, have been more adventurous than he may have thought: 62 percent of those interviewed noted that they had gone « à la découverte, sans connaître vraiment le programme de la Fête » and 87 percent gave « une importance » ou « très grande importance » to « découvrir des genres de musique qu’on ne connaît pas bien ou pas du tout. »

[15] “Pasler is trying to prove that the republican government, despite its interference and control, was nevertheless culturally liberal by ‘allowing’ a variety of aesthetic approaches ...”]

[16] For example, “the principle of public utility was used to justify the most extravagant abuses of power of the revolutionaries, including the expropriation of the church (in this case, it was done in the name of ‘public necessity’).” Readers of *H-France Review* may also have noticed similar preoccupations in other H-France reviews by Pekacz. Whereas here she associates the notion of “utility” with “mere political propaganda,” in her review of Kern Holoman’s exemplary study of the Société des Concerts du Conservatoire (*H-France Review*, vol. 5 [August 2005], No. 85), she takes aim at the book for not being sensitive to “problems of propaganda and concealment” in his archival sources. In both cases, her definition of “critical analysis” comes down to unveiling hidden propaganda.

[17] In making reference to the concept of “active” and “passive” citizens as an example of how “revolutionaries promulgated inequality and made a mockery of the sovereignty of the people,” she misses my discussion of this very point on p. 112, n. 61, when I cite William Sewell’s work on the topic and note “for this reason the 1791 Constitution was overturned.” What interests me here is how

festivals changed from 1790 to 1794, becoming what “seemed to be about equality, but were a world of coexistence in which everyone had a role” (112).

[18] Readers interested in Bach reception in France before 1885 should consult, Antoine Hennion and Joël-Marie Fauquet, *La Grandeur de Bach: L'Amour de la musique en France au XIX siècle* (Paris: Fayard, 2000).

[19] For example, because Pekacz apparently has not read Tiersot's *Histoire de la chanson populaire* or Pougin's *Rousseau*, she can't imagine that they might contribute to contemporary understanding of the Revolution. 1677 is indeed the date of the first use of the word “utilité publique.” And because I once refer to the heiress of the Singer Sewing Machine Fortune by her American name, Winnaretta Singer, rather than by her French title, Princesse de Scey-Montbéliard until 1892 and thereafter the Princesse de Polignac, she assumes the woman “was not an aristocrat” (an error that could have been corrected by reading the index). Not only was the practice of buying titles common during this period, many marriages consisted of exchanging title and money. After World War I, the Princesse became the most important music patron in Paris. See Sylvia Kahan's captivating and informative biography, *Music's Modern Muse: A Life of Winnaretta Singer, Princesse de Polignac* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2003).

[20] See Roger Chartier, *Inscrire et effacer. Culture écrite et littérature (XIe - XVIIIe siècle)* (Paris: Gallimard/Le Seuil, 2005), 9-10, in his discussion of Donald F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the sociology of texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999): “La production, non pas seulement des livres, mais des *textes* eux-mêmes, est un processus qui implique, au-delà du geste de l'écriture, différents moments, différentes techniques, différentes interventions: celles des copistes, des libraires éditeurs, des maîtres imprimeurs, des compositeurs, des correcteurs. (...) Le processus de publication, quelle que soit sa modalité, est toujours un processus collectif, qui implique des acteurs nombreux et qui ne sépare pas la matérialité du texte de la textualité du livre.... Pourtant, les variations multiples imposées aux textes par les préférences, les habitudes ou les erreurs de ceux qui les ont copiés, composés ou corrigés, ne détruisent pas l'idée qu'une œuvre conserve une identité perpétuée, immédiatement reconnaissable par leurs lecteurs ou auditeurs.” My thanks to Pierre-Michel Menger for this reference.

[21] Marie-Claude Genet-Delacroix's *Art et Etat sous la IIIe République: le système des beaux-arts, 1870-1940* (Paris: Sorbonne, 1992) presents an in-depth study of this organization.

[22] See Frédérique Patureau, *Le Palais Garnier dans la société parisienne, 1875-1914* (Liège: Mardaga, 1991) for a close study of the Opéra's administration.

[23] See also Michael Orwicz, “Anti-Academicism and State Power in the Early Third Republic,” *Art History* 14, 4 (December 1991): 571-92.

[24] D. Kern Holoman's *The Société des Concerts du Conservatoire, 1828-1967* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004) is the definitive study of this organization.

[25] See my “Building a Public for Orchestral Music: Les Concerts Colonne.”

[26] See, for example, “From Miscellany to Homogeneity in Concert Programming,” *Poetics* 29/2 (July 2001): 125-34.

[27] Susanna Barrows, “Parliaments of the People: The Political Culture of Cafés in the Early Third Republic,” in *Drinking: Behavior and Belief in Modern History*, ed. id. and Robin Room (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 89, 95. See also Concetta Condemi, *Les Cafés-concerts* (Paris: Quai Voltaire, 1992).

[28] See my “Democracy, Ethics, and Commerce: the *Concerts populaires* Movement in late 19th-century France,” in *Les Sociétés de musique en Europe, 1700-1920. Structures, pratiques musicales et sociabilités*, eds. Hans-Erich Bödeker and Patrice Veit (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2007), 455-479.

[29] Julien Tiersot, “*Mignon* et la chanson populaire,” *Méneestrel* (20 May 1894): 155-56.

[30] I’m grateful to Michael B. Miller for kindly providing this image.

[31] For example, I analyze roughly four-dozen reviews of *Pelléas et Mélisande* in its first two weeks on stage in my “*Pelléas* and Power: Forces behind the Reception of Debussy’s Opera,” *19th-Century Music* 10, 3 (spring 1987); rpt in id. *Writing through Music*.

[32] See my “Contingencies of Meaning in Transcriptions and Excerpts: Popularizing *Samson et Dalila*,” in *Approaches to Meaning in Music*, ed. Byron Almén and Edward Pearsall (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 170-213.

Jann Pasler
University of California, San Diego
jpasler@ucsd.edu

Copyright © 2010 by H-France, all rights reserved. H-France permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. H-France reserves the right to withdraw the license for redistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of *H-France Forum* nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France.

ISSN 1553-9172

H-France Forum, Volume 5, Issue 2 (Spring 2010), No. 5