

University of Wisconsin Milwaukee UWM Digital Commons

Theses and Dissertations

December 2012

The Congress for Cultural Freedom, La Musica Nel XX Secolo, and Aesthetic "Othering": An Archival Investigation

Shannon E. Pahl

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.uwm.edu/etd>

 Part of the [History Commons](#), and the [Music Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pahl, Shannon E., "The Congress for Cultural Freedom, La Musica Nel XX Secolo, and Aesthetic "Othering": An Archival Investigation" (2012). *Theses and Dissertations*. 40.
<https://dc.uwm.edu/etd/40>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by UWM Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UWM Digital Commons. For more information, please contact open-access@uwm.edu.

THE CONGRESS FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM, *LA MUSICA NEL XX SECOLO*, AND
AESTHETIC "OTHERING": AN ARCHIVAL INVESTIGATION

by

Shannon E. Pahl

A Thesis Submitted in
Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Music

at

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

December 2012

ABSTRACT
THE CONGRESS FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM, *LA MUSICA NEL XX SECOLO*, AND
AESTHETIC "OTHERING": AN ARCHIVAL INVESTIGATION

by

Shannon E. Pahl

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2012
Under the Supervision of Professor Dr. Gillian Rodger

Between 1950 and 1967, the Congress for Cultural Freedom, an organization of anti-totalitarian intellectuals funded by the United States government, hosted conferences and festivals regarding the pursuit of intellectual freedom. In 1952 and 1954, the Congress for Cultural Freedom hosted two music events. While the first festival has been researched considerably, the 1954 conference has not been documented comparably. While unexplored, this conference has been the cause of much speculation on the political connotation of dodecaphonic and avant-garde techniques in postwar Europe. This project explores archival evidence related to the 1954 conference, with a focus on internal memoranda, correspondence, program lists, budgets, and invitation lists from the Congress for Cultural Freedom. This information is synthesized to provide logistical information regarding conference organization as well as the political ramifications of the conference.

© Copyright by Shannon E. Pahl, 2012
All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: The Formation of the Congress for Cultural Freedom	7
Chapter Two: <i>L'Œuvre du XXe Siècle</i>	25
Chapter Three: <i>La Musica nel XX Secolo</i>	44
Chapter Four: Commentary	78
Works Cited.....	92
Appendix A: Manifesto of the Congress for Cultural Freedom.....	98
Appendix B: <i>L'Œuvre du XXe Siècle</i> List of Works Performed.....	102
Appendix C: <i>La Musica nel XX Secolo</i> List of Possible Works Performed.....	108
Appendix D: Discussions held at <i>La Musica nel XX Secolo</i>	113

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACCF	American Committee for Cultural Freedom
AIF	Americans for Intellectual Freedom
CCF	Congress for Cultural Freedom
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
COI	Coordinator of Information
IACF	International Association for Cultural Freedom In footnotes this denotes the archives of the IACF, held at the Special Collections Research Center of the University of Chicago.
IOD	International Organizations Division
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OPC	Office of Policy Coordination
OSS	Office of Strategic Services
PCF	<i>Parti Communiste Français</i>
RAI	<i>Radio Audizioni Italiane</i>
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis advisors Dr. Gillian Rodger and Dr. Judith Kuhn for their support on this project. Thanks go to both of them as well as Dr. Mitchell Brauner and Dr. Martin Jack Rosenblum, for making my graduate school dream a financial reality. A special thanks goes to Dr. Kuhn who possesses the strength of mind to read (and re-read) drafts of this project, give honest feedback, teach me how to do original research, and force me to be a better writer even when I am feeling contrary. Additionally, thanks goes to the University of Chicago Libraries and the staff who helped me with this project.

I would also like to thank my family for their support during my relentless search for the life experiences that fulfill me most—even when that means quitting a full-time job to be a poor graduate student who serves coffee on the weekends. To my mother who encouraged me to dream big and trust the universe, my father who taught me to work hard and trust myself, and my sister who has listened, advised, and assured me I could balance whatever came my way, I cannot thank you enough.

Finally, I would like to extend my utmost gratitude to my partner, Beth, whose love, optimism, patience, and helpful spirit have always helped carry me through difficult projects. Thank you for listening to me read everything aloud and teaching me grammar lessons I missed in 19.5 years of school. You are the best.

Introduction

Between the late 1940s and the early 1990s, the United States was engaged in a Cold War with the Soviet Union—a period of cultural, political, and military tension. Following the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union, interest in Cold War studies has increased and scholarly journals such as the *Journal of Cold War Studies* have emerged. Recent publications by Frances Stonor Saunders, Mark Carroll, Ian Wellens, David Caute, Hugh Wilford, Giles Scott-Smith, Anne C. Shreffler, and Volker R. Berghahn reflect the growth in research exploring the so-called “cultural Cold War”—the use of intellectual and cultural propaganda by governmental organizations on both sides of the conflict.¹ These publications, all dated from 1999 on, show the growth in Cold War studies during the past decade.

¹ “About the *Journal of Cold War Studies*,” Harvard University, accessed May 6, 2012, <http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~hpcws/journal.htm>; Frances Stonor Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters* (New York: New Press, 2000); Mark Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Ian Wellens, *Music on the Frontline: Nicolas Nabokov’s Struggle Against Communism and Middlebrow Culture* (Burlington, VT : Ashgate, 2002); David Caute, *The Dancer Defects* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Hugh Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008); Giles Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Anne C. Shreffler, “Ideologies of Serialism: Stravinsky’s *Threni* and the Congress for Cultural Freedom,” in *Music and the Aesthetics of Modernity*, ed. Karol Berger and Anthony Newcomb (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), 217-245; Volker R. Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe: Shepard Stone between Philanthropy, Academy, and Diplomacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

Some of these researchers, most notably Saunders, Wellens, and Carroll, have focused on the use of music as propaganda during the cultural Cold War. One area of musicological research on the cultural Cold War focuses specifically on profiling the activities and characters involved in the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF), a United States organization of anti-Communist intellectuals supervised by the National Security Council and funded covertly through the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).² From 1950-1967, the CCF expanded from one office in Paris to thirty-five international offices used to organize conferences and sponsor journals. Among the conferences organized by the CCF were several festivals and conferences for the arts, the largest held in 1952 with the first follow-up in 1954.³ The 1952 festival, *L'Œuvre de XXe Siècle*, was organized in Paris and was the first festival held by the CCF after its founding in 1950. The following music conference, *La Musica nel XX Secolo* (1954), was held in Rome. The General Secretary of the CCF, Russian émigré composer Nicolas Nabokov, coordinated both festivals.⁴

While these festivals are not the only music events that the CCF sponsored, they have been of interest to scholars and some have questioned the difference in event goals and political outcomes between the 1952 festival and the 1954 conference. While the goals and details of the 1952 festival are well documented, evidence to support any claim regarding the motivation of the 1954 conference not yet been comparably documented. The underlying issue is whether the CCF may

² Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 2-3; Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 39, 86; Central Intelligence Agency, "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom," Last modified June 27, 2008, <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/95unclass/Warner.html>.

³ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 1; Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 1.

⁴ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 1.

have played a deliberate role in shaping the mid-twentieth century prestige of elite, difficult, dodecaphonic and avant-garde music by presenting these techniques as a politically driven contrast to Socialist Realism during the 1954 conference.

Frances Stonor Saunders has suggested that there was a “clear political message to be imparted by promoting music that announced itself as doing away with natural hierarchies.”⁵ Anne C. Shreffler has suggested the “compositional avant-garde” gained politicization through its endorsement of personal freedom rather than political influence.⁶ Shreffler goes on to explain that both the Soviet Union and the United States were sending messages concerned with “freedom.” However, Western Europe and the United States claimed a “moral superiority” in crusading for individual freedom, a superiority that made certain artistic aesthetics (e.g. cubism, surrealism, dodecaphony, and existentialism) almost “compulsory” for artists.⁷ The question is whether promoting “liberated” music as a counterpoint to Socialist Realism—essentially “othering” the populist Soviet musical aesthetic, whether explicitly or implicitly—was a politically calculated move on the part of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, one that encouraged the use of dodecaphonic, serial, and avant-garde techniques, especially among composers who had no previous experience with them (e.g. Stravinsky).

While the political motivation of the Congress for Cultural Freedom as well as the 1952 festival is fairly well documented in both published literature and archival documents, my research explores archival evidence related to the 1954 conference

⁵ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 223.

⁶ Shreffler, “Ideologies of Serialism,” 217.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 224.

and begins to document the available facts, opening a discussion of that archival material with regard to the political undertones of the Congress for Cultural Freedom's message. I have consulted the International Association for Cultural Freedom (IACF) archives at the University of Chicago Special Collections Research Center. The IACF was the organization that replaced the CCF from 1967-1977, after the CIA's covert funding of CCF was revealed to the public and new sources of funding were secured.⁸ The records span 1950-1979 and include the CCF years. The archive is comprised of 384.5 linear feet broken into seven archival series (large categories) of documents:

- Series One: Correspondence from 1953-1968
- Series Two: Additional correspondence and area files from 1950-1978
- Series Three: Seminars
- Series Four: Financial files from 1951-1968
- Series Five: Documentation
- Series Six: Latin American Institute of international relations
- Series Seven: *Preuves* (the CCF's first literary publication) papers⁹

Within the records, Series Two and Three proved the most helpful for information on this topic. The Seminars Series contains information from a variety of programming the CCF engaged in, including information related to the 1952 festival and the 1954 conference. In Series Three, Boxes Five and Six are dedicated almost

⁸ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 3; Christopher Lasch, "The Cultural Cold War," *The Nation* 205 (6): 198-212; Max Frankel, "C.I.A.: In the End, It May of Outsmarted Itself," *New York Times*, May 14, 1964, E4.

⁹ "Records 1950-1979 (inclusive)," University of Chicago Lens, Accessed July 18, 2012, <http://lens.lib.uchicago.edu/?q=IACF>.

entirely to information concerning the 1954 conference. Likewise, Boxes Three and Four are dedicated to the 1952 festival. IACF documents are written in multiple languages, the majority in English, French, Italian, and German. For this project, I consulted English language documents and correspondence related to the 1952 festival and 1954 conference with the exception of documents where only the title appeared in a foreign language (e.g. invitation and participant lists). However, the available English language archival materials provided information on the 1954 conference that was previously explored only superficially. I have supplemented and compared printed brochures and internal memoranda with correspondence from key players in the CCF, press releases, meeting reports, and critical reviews of both the 1952 festival and the 1954 conference.

By supplementing information found in the archives with established research on the CCF and its 1952 festival, a preliminary descriptive portrait of the 1954 conference becomes possible. This thesis describes the primary documents in the context of other research on the CCF, while acknowledging that areas of discrepancy or ambiguity remain. Facts about the 1954 conference are explored and discussed against the contextual background of the CCF's formation and the overtly political 1952 festival. The final chapter of this thesis explores the current state of research on the two CCF events, investigating the documents for evidence of clear political connections and makes suggestions for future research. This essay does not purport to describe the official, or only, interpretation of the available facts and, presumably, as more research is conducted, a clearer picture of the CCF, its relations to the CIA, and its goals for dodecaphonic music will develop. What this

project attempts to do is further the discussion of the actions of the CCF and question how firmly we can determine the desired outcome of an event as big as the 1954 conference.

An important fact to note is that the IACF archive was undergoing reprocessing by the University of Chicago staff, as of November 2012. While document titles and locations are cited as specifically as possible to facilitate additional research on the topic, it is possible that some of these documents may be shifted to new boxes and some boxes may be renumbered entirely. The benefit of reprocessing is that it may allow for the recreation and digitization of the finding aid for this collection that, at the time of this project, was only available in two print volumes. Likewise, reprocessing could increase usability of the collection by providing descriptive folder labels and more thorough chronological organization of correspondence, resolving problems I encountered while working with this collection. Researchers should consult directly with the staff at the University of Chicago should problems arise in locating documents during, or after, reprocessing.

Chapter One: The Formation of the Congress for Cultural Freedom

In the aftermath of World War II, the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF) was created in 1950. The creation and funding for the organization was part of an increase in funding and legislation for strategic intelligence services and psychological warfare in United States foreign policy after the war. The political environment and United States involvement in Europe helps shed light on the reasons why the CIA chose to fund the CCF and the political backdrop for the CCF's musical activities.

The United States took its first steps in the use of intelligence as a political tool in July 1941. Franklin Delano Roosevelt appointed William J. Donovan as Coordinator of Information (COI), to collect and organize intelligence information on matters of national security between differing United States government agencies. The office of the COI became the first peacetime, non-departmental intelligence organization.¹⁰ While originally led by a small civilian staff, President Roosevelt moved the COI under the Joint chiefs of Staff, renaming it the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), after the December 1941 Pearl Harbor attack and, by 1944, OSS employed almost 13,000 people.¹¹ President Harry S. Truman disbanded the OSS in September 1945 following the war.¹²

¹⁰ "COI Came First," Central Intelligence Agency, Accessed September 17, 2012, <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/books-and-monographs/oss/art02.htm>.

¹¹ "What Was OSS?" Central Intelligence Agency, Accessed September 17, 2012, <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/books-and-monographs/oss/art03.htm>.

¹² Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 34.

As a separate but related government endeavor, psychological warfare, aimed at shaping political and cultural opinions and beliefs, was also used by the United States during and after World War II. It was during this time that some of the major figures in the organization of the CCF began their careers in government intelligence and psychological warfare. Michael Josselson, an Estonian émigré and future CCF Administrative Secretary, was drafted in 1943 and assigned to the Army's Intelligence Section-Psychological Warfare Division in Berlin.¹³ Josselson spoke four languages and used them as an interpreter and Nazi interrogator.¹⁴ After Josselson's discharge in 1946, he remained involved in intelligence during the 1940s as a Cultural Affairs Officer and, later, as a Public Affairs Officer with the State Department.¹⁵

During this time, Russian émigré composer and future CCF General Secretary Nicolas Nabokov also worked as a cultural advisor for the military.¹⁶ In 1945 Nabokov moved from his original post in the Morale Division of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey Unit to the Information Control Division of the Army where he worked alongside Josselson. Nabokov was part of the music section where he worked to expose and expunge Nazis and nationalism in German musical life.¹⁷

¹³ Ibid., 12.

¹⁴ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 11-12; "Michael Josselson: An Inventory of His Papers at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center," University of Texas at Austin, Accessed September 17, 2012, <http://research.hrc.utexas.edu:8080/hrcxtf/view?docId=ead/00064.xml>.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 12; "Nicolas Nabokov: An Inventory of His Paper at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center," University of Texas at Austin, Accessed September 17, 2012, <http://research.hrc.utexas.edu:8080/hrcxtf/view?docId=ead/00097.xml>.

¹⁷ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 13.

When the war ended in 1945, much of Europe remained politically and economically damaged. The defeated German territory was divided among the United States, France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. Berlin, entirely surrounded by territory occupied by the Soviet Union, was divided into four sections controlled by the World War II Allied Powers with the East section controlled by the Soviet Union.¹⁸ In 1947, a harsh winter interrupted German utility service and food supplies; livestock died off, unemployment rose, and rubble in the cities remained as a symbol of the horrific war.¹⁹ While the Soviet Union controlled part of Berlin, a Democratic mayor, Ernst Reuter, was elected in June 1947.²⁰

Italy experienced similar instability in postwar leadership after the Allied powers invaded and dictator Benito Mussolini was ousted in 1943. Despite growing membership in various political factions, most notably the Italian Communist Party, Democratic representatives took control in the 1948 elections with the help of the United States government.²¹ France also emerged from Nazi occupation politically unstable and suffering from a lack of food and goods.²²

While the Soviet Union, the European Allies, and the United States had formed an alliance to defeat Hitler, the bond between the United States and the Soviet Union disintegrated after the war, adding to postwar turmoil. In 1946, the Soviet Union rejected the Baruch Plan, an agreement created to allow the United Nations to establish safeguards and control in the use of nuclear technology. This

¹⁸ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 10.

¹⁹ Ibid., 7-8.

²⁰ Peter Coleman, *The Liberal Conspiracy*, (New York: The Free Press, 1989), 17.

²¹ Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*, 112, 123.

²² Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 9.

rejection, as well as the suspicion that the Soviet Union was influencing the civil war between the Greek government and the Greek Communist Party, led to a shift in United States foreign policy.²³ President Truman declared that totalitarian regimes posed a threat to international peace and, therefore, the United States. He declared that the policy of the United States would be to support free people resisting “subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.”²⁴ This stance became known as the Truman Doctrine and created financial support for Greece as well as other nations that pursued democratic ideals as the United States took an active role to combat the expansion of Soviet totalitarianism.²⁵ While President Truman had disbanded the OSS in September 1945, he revived the idea of strategic intelligence to support his Doctrine, creating the National Security Council, a group of advisors on matters of national security, as well as the National Security Act.²⁶ The National Security Act, passed in 1947, created the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), an agency designed to collect intelligence abroad and promote national security.²⁷

To support containment policy, the National Security Council released directive NSC-4 in December 1947. This directive sanctioned covert psychological

²³ “Milestones 1945-1952 Truman Doctrine,” U.S. Department of State, Accessed September 17, 2012, <http://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/TrumanDoctrine>.

²⁴ Harry S. Truman, “Recommendation for Assistance to Greece and Turkey,” H.R. Doc. No. 80- 171, 1947.

²⁵ “Milestones 1945-1952 Truman Doctrine,” U.S. Department of State, Accessed September 17, 2012, <http://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/TrumanDoctrine>.

²⁶ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 34; “Milestones, 1945-1952 National Security Act of 1947,” U.S. Department of State, Accessed September 17, 2012, <http://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/NationalSecurityAct>.

²⁷ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 34; “About CIA,” Central Intelligence Agency, Accessed September 17, 2012, <https://www.cia.gov/about-cia/index.html>.

activities that supported anti-Communist policies. Another directive, NSC 10/2, drafted by director of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, George Kennan in 1948, went further, sanctioning propaganda, sabotage, and assistance to Communist resistance movements.²⁸ Kennan's NSC-10/2 directive created a staff specifically for these covert operations, entitled the Office of Policy Coordination (OPC). The OPC was under the supervision of the CIA but Kennan and the State Department's Policy Planning Staff held ultimate jurisdiction over the OPC's activities.²⁹ The OPC grew exponentially in the coming years, eventually overseeing the CCF in the early 1950s.³⁰ .

In 1950, over President Truman's veto, Congress passed the Internal Security Act of 1950, also known as the McCarran Act.³¹ The Act required Communist organizations and members in the United States to register with the Attorney General's office and allowed, in specific circumstances, for the deportation and detention of immigrants who had previously held Communist affiliation.³² Coupled with the Smith Act of 1940 that prohibited membership in organizations that threatened to overthrow the government, the McCarran Internal Security Bill represented a threat of legal action to anyone who held Communist ideals or membership in the United States.³³

²⁸ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 39.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 39.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 41.

³¹ Ellen Schrecker, *The Age of McCarthyism*, (Boston: Bedford Books, 1994), 192.

³² Walter LaFeber, *America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-1996*, 8th Ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1997), 112.

³³ *Ibid.*

To protect the country from Communist influence abroad, the United States began denying some foreign scholars and scientists entry to the United States for professional conferences. In some cases, foreign mail and publications to the United States were blocked.³⁴ In other cases, the government banned books and music by Communists and suspected Communists from the United States's libraries overseas.³⁵ Eventually, the United States would become involved in overt Communist containment in Asia through the Korean War in 1950.

In addition to strategies intended to dissuade Communism, the United States initiated a plan for economic recovery in Europe in 1948 intended to combat the widespread housing shortages, hunger, infrastructure problems, and unemployment following the war.³⁶ The Marshall Plan (also called the Economic Cooperation Act) created by Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, was intended to help restore the "political stability" and "healthy world economy."³⁷ The Plan promised aid to European nations to rebuild Europe.³⁸ The United States spent \$13.3 billion to aid nearly every Western European country except Spain (then led by dictator Francisco Franco) and Soviet bloc countries that rejected participation.³⁹ This Plan

³⁴ Cate, *The Dancer Defects*, 25-26.

³⁵ Ibid., 26.

³⁶ "For European Recovery: The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Marshall Plan Introduction," Library of Congress, Accessed September 12, 2012, <http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/marshall/mars0.html>.

³⁷ "Featured Documents: The Marshall Plan," National Archives and Records Administration, Accessed September 17, 2012, http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured_documents/marshall_plan

³⁸ "For European Recovery: The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Marshall Plan Introduction."

³⁹ "Ibid.;" "For European Recovery: The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Marshall Plan Soviet Opposition to the Marshall Plan," Library of Congress, Accessed September 17, 2012, <http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/marshall/mars8.html>; "Map from *The*

benefitted the United States by supporting the growth of free-market economies and democratic governments favorable to the interests of the United States during European reconstruction.⁴⁰ In this sense, the Marshall plan differed from aid dispersed immediately after the war because it tied funding to certain policies that softened the influence of Communism.⁴¹ For example, as a condition for receiving aid, Eastern European countries would need to orient their economies away from Communism.⁴² By formatting the Marshall Plan in this manner, the United States government put economic pressure on countries to adopt political systems that were most beneficial to it.

In response to the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, Joseph Stalin, leader of the Soviet Union, called a conference in late 1947 and created the Soviet-led Communist Information Bureau (Cominform), an international group of European Communist party members, to coordinate resistance to the United States.⁴³ The Cominform revived the legacy and tactics of Communist International (Comintern), a 1930s Moscow-based organization that coordinated events to resist the growth of fascism in Europe.⁴⁴ In October 1947, Cominform organized its first event, the German Writers Congress, in Berlin. At the Congress, speakers painted

Marshall Plan at Mid Mark, 1950," Library of Congress, Accessed September 17, 2012, <http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/marshall/mars5.html>.

⁴⁰ "For European Recovery: The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Marshall Plan Introduction."

⁴¹ Michael Cox and Carole Kennedy-Pipe, "The Tragedy of American Diplomacy? Rethinking the Marshall Plan," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 7 (2005), 109.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 110

⁴³ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 86.

⁴⁴ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 87, 420-421; Christopher Moore, "Socialist Realism and the Music of the French Popular Front," *The Journal of Musicology* 25 (2008): 475-476.

the United States as a war-mongering nation that threatened post-war stability. The Soviet Union, by contrast, was presented as a force for peace, and speakers emphasized the role of cultural activity in the struggle for social emancipation.⁴⁵ At the conference, Polish-American journalist and ex-Communist supporter Melvin J. Lasky spoke out for expression that was free from government involvement, catching the attention of the guests, including Michael Josselson.⁴⁶ Lasky worked with the military government and, in December 1947, he proposed an “American Review” in Germany to showcase western ideals, spirituality, and intellectual achievement as a counterweight to active Cominform propaganda.⁴⁷ The resulting journal, *Der Monat*, founded in Germany in 1948, was funded through the Marshall Plan and, later, the CIA.⁴⁸

Josselson, meanwhile, had attended the Writers Congress as an agent of the Office of Policy Coordination (OPC), which had recruited him to work in intelligence in Berlin in 1946.⁴⁹ Among Josselson’s colleagues in Berlin were educational consultant Sidney Hook, a Brooklyn native who, in 1939, had organized the Committee for Cultural Freedom against the appropriation of intellectual expression for political purposes, and New York University professor James Burnham, a consultant to the OPC on anti-Communist political warfare.⁵⁰ While American influence was growing by way of increased OPC staff in Europe, the Cominform

⁴⁵ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 87.

⁴⁶ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 90, 100; Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 28.

⁴⁷ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 30.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 42.

⁵⁰ Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 74; Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 100.

remained a steady influence and followed the 1947 Writers Congress with the Cominform World Congress of Intellectuals for Peace in Wroclaw, Poland in September 1948. The Soviet Union also retaliated against American involvement in Berlin by creating a blockade around East Berlin from 1948-1949, preventing the delivery of supplies, provoking an airlift by the United States and Great Britain that provided goods to the city.⁵¹

In 1949, the Cominform planned their first peace conference in the United States. While the United States refused visas for some European participants in March 1949, the conference took place at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City with the cooperation of the socialist organization the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.⁵² Eight hundred intellectual figures and thousands of supporters rallied for peace between the United States and the Soviet Union.⁵³ While many prominent artists and intellectuals such as Arthur Miller, Aaron Copland, Norman Mailer, Albert Einstein, Leonard Bernstein, Charlie Chaplin, and Dmitri Shostakovich supported the conference, it was met with resistance.⁵⁴

Sidney Hook, drawing on his previous experience opposing political appropriation of the intellectual expression, organized the Americans for Intellectual Freedom (AIF) to challenge the conference. Hook rented the

⁵¹ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 93; Coleman, *The Liberal Conspiracy*, 17; Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 73.

⁵² Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 70; Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 94.

⁵³ "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1949-1950," Central Intelligence Agency, Accessed September 17, 2012, <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/95unclass/Warner.html>.

⁵⁴ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 94; "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1949-1950."

honeymoon suite in the Waldorf-Astoria and organized counter-demonstrations, broadcasting the speeches to crowds in Bryant Park.⁵⁵ Michael Josselson and Nicolas Nabokov were among those in attendance.⁵⁶ Taking note of the counter-demonstrations at the Waldorf-Astoria, Frank Wisner, head of the OPC, and Carmel Offie, his assistant, secured funds to hold similar demonstrations for Cominform's upcoming World Peace Congress in Paris.⁵⁷ Appealing to the Economic Cooperation Administration (the managers of the Marshall Plan funding), Wisner and Offie secured \$16,000 that was distributed through a dummy sponsor, political activist David Rousset's newspaper, *Franc-Tireur*.⁵⁸ The conference, an International Day of Resistance to Dictatorship and War, was held in Paris on April 30, 1949 to counteract the Cominform World Peace Congresses being held in both Paris and Prague.⁵⁹ The Marshall Plan funds that supported the Paris conference derived from "counterpart" funds—funds deposited by the countries receiving Marshall Plan aid. Under the Marshall Plan, countries seeking aid from the United States deposited amounts equal to the United States contribution into the central bank. Once deposited, five per cent of these "counterpart" funds deposited by the aid-seeking country became property of the United States and, amounting to about \$200 million per year, was at the disposal of the CIA.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 71, 73.

⁵⁶ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 96.

⁵⁷ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 67; Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 96.

⁵⁸ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 68.

⁵⁹ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 96-98; "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1949-1950."

⁶⁰ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 105-106.

While intended as a counterweight to the Cominform-funded Peace Congresses, the OPC's conference focused on a neutral, rather than pro-democratic stance, leading some to call for more aggressive tactics.⁶¹ Hook asserted, after the Paris conference, that the "re-education of the French Public" and the denigration of neutralist politics were among the most pertinent issues for American involvement in France.⁶² Cominform, meanwhile, was undeterred by the counter-Congress, and continued its peace movement, establishing the American Continental Congress for Peace in Mexico City in 1949 and the World Peace Congress in Stockholm in 1950.⁶³

In August of 1949, Melvin Lasky met with Ruth Fischer and former Comintern member Franz Borkenau to brainstorm a permanent fixture of resistance against Cominform in Europe.⁶⁴ It is unclear whether OPC agent Josselson attended this meeting, but it was Josselson that proposed a plan for a Berlin Congress to the OPC in January 1950.⁶⁵ Lasky, unaware of Josselson's proposal, gained the support of the National Committee for Free Europe and the Mayor of West Berlin, Ernst Reuter, and began issuing invitations for a conference in Berlin to organize like-minded individuals against Cominform.⁶⁶ Lasky, clearly tied to the United States government as editor of government-sponsored *Der Monat*, was too high profile for the tastes of Frank Wisner of the OPC.⁶⁷ In an effort to prevent the suspicion of government involvement in the upcoming Berlin conference, Wisner approved

⁶¹ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 96-97.

⁶² Ibid., 98.

⁶³ Ibid., 98.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 71.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 71-72.

⁶⁶ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 101; "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1949-1950."

⁶⁷ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 101.

\$50,000 for the conference on the condition that Lasky be kept out of the public profile.⁶⁸ Despite this, Lasky publicly declared himself as the General Secretary of the forthcoming conference, entitled the Congress for Cultural Freedom.⁶⁹

The Congress took place June 26-29, 1950 at the Titania Palast in Berlin and, according to CCF information, involved 118 delegates.⁷⁰ As part of the financial support for the conference, the United States government provided travel expenses for many attendees. James Burnham's travel to Germany was financed by the OPC, as was Sidney Hook's substitute at New York University during his absence for the Congress.⁷¹ Nabokov traveled to Berlin via charter plane from Youth Argosy, a CIA intermediary, and the travel of several foreign delegates was also funded by the United States.⁷²

Writer, Arthur Koestler, and Italian Socialist, Ignazio Silone, both prominent ex-Communists who contributed to the 1949 collection of anti-Communist essays, *The God That Failed*, were speakers at the Congress.⁷³ Despite disillusionment from both Silone and Koestler toward Communism, these men had different philosophies on responses to its "failure." Koestler, supported by James Burnham, advocated for

⁶⁸ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 72; "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1949-1950."

⁶⁹ "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1949-1950."

⁷⁰ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 101; Informative Brochure, "The Congress for Cultural Freedom," ca. 1952, Series 3, Box 6, Folder 7, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago. This collection hereafter cited as IACF.

⁷¹ Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 79.

⁷² Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 74, 76.

⁷³ "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom"; Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 88; Richard Crossman, ed., *The God that Failed*, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949).

aggressive tactics, using overt propaganda to undermine Cominform efforts.⁷⁴ Silone favored a subtle approach.⁷⁵ Reportedly, Nabokov and Josselson both favored Silone's "soft-sell" approach as well as appealing to intellectual elites through culture engagement in hopes of a trickle-down effect.⁷⁶ This approach would support the United States by "fostering a sense of cultural community between America and Europe" while also dispelling any existing prejudice toward the United States as a producer of mass-culture.⁷⁷ After discussion at the 1950 Congress the Manifesto for the Congress for Cultural Freedom (Appendix A) was drawn up by Koestler, signed by delegates, and read at the closing rally of the Congress.⁷⁸ Advocating for freedom and peace as inseparable ideas, the Manifesto asserted the importance of tolerance, the necessity of free expression, and the ability of the people to critique their government,⁷⁹

In 1950, the single conference entitled the Congress for Cultural Freedom became a full-fledged organization.⁸⁰ The fledgling organization was given the code name QKOPERA under the direction of the OPC.⁸¹ Wisner named Josselson Administrative Secretary and Irving Brown, a former OSS member with a history of busting Communist trade unions in Europe as an American Federation of Labor

⁷⁴ Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 80.

⁷⁵ "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1949-1950."

⁷⁶ Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 80; Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*, 113-134.

⁷⁷ Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 80-81; Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*, 134.

⁷⁸ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 82; 1950 Manifesto printed inside CCF Pamphlet, "The Congress for Cultural Freedom," ca. 1952, Series 3, Box 6, Folder 7, IACF.

⁷⁹ 1950 Manifesto printed inside CCF Pamphlet, "The Congress for Cultural Freedom," IACF.

⁸⁰ "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1949-1950."

⁸¹ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 87.

organizer, was named as a member of the steering committee.⁸² Brown worked an American Federation of Labor representative in Europe under Jay Lovestone, the supervisor for the CIA's covert work with the labor movement. In an interview with Frances Stonor Saunders, Tom Braden, another CIA employee, later described Brown as the "paymaster" who would direct CIA money to the CCF under the guise that it came from labor unions.⁸³ New CCF Administrative Secretary Josselson lobbied to institute Nicolas Nabokov as the General Secretary and, after some pay negotiations with Irving Brown, Nabokov was appointed General Secretary by January 1951.⁸⁴ However, Nabokov's name had been circulated on a list of psychological warfare personnel recommended for employment by the Office of the Secretary of the Army as early as 1950.⁸⁵

OPC head Frank Wisner refused to involve Lasky in the administration of the CCF despite his formative influence in the 1950 CCF conference and threatened to withdraw funding if Lasky remained involved.⁸⁶ Wisner also relocated the organization from Berlin to Paris to avoid the risk of infiltration from the Soviet occupied portion of Berlin.⁸⁷ Despite being edged out of a public role with the CCF initially, Lasky remained involved in the periphery of the CCF and his journal, *Der Monat*, became the headquarters for the German affiliate of the CCF as the

⁸² Ibid.; Walter Bennet, "The Most Dangerous Man," *Time*, March 17, 1952, 23.

⁸³ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 87.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 93-94.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 94.

⁸⁶ Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 80.

⁸⁷ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 86-87.

organization expanded.⁸⁸ By 1957, the CCF acquired *Der Monat* and Lasky was named editorial advisor for CCF publications.⁸⁹

A meeting of 38 people was held in Brussels in November 1950 to further define the aims of the CCF.⁹⁰ A meeting report from November 1950 communicated the organization's concern for freedom of intellectual inquiry, stating that

The Congress for Cultural Freedom declares that the abolition by the totalitarian countries of all free cultural exchanges between their peoples and the peoples of the rest of the world constitutes a major threat to the preservation of peace and freedom, to free inquiry, and to free creative expression in the arts and letters.

The Congress also stresses the danger of increasing restriction on free cultural exchanges which, under the totalitarian pressure, have been established by certain governments of the free world. As a particular example, the Congress deplors the measures taken under recently adopted legislation by the United States government, which have in some cases obstructed the free travel of intellectuals, writers and artists to and from the United States.⁹¹

To meet the Congress's goal of free intellectual exchange, the international committee stated that specific measures should be taken to ensure the safety of intellectual freedom, including:

- Free travel of artists, writers, scholars, students and intellectuals without visas or passports
- Teacher and student exchanges between the Soviet and non-Soviet spheres

⁸⁸ Ibid., 94.

⁸⁹ Scott-Smith, *Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 92.

⁹⁰ Informative Brochure, "The Congress for Cultural Freedom," ca. 1952, IACF.

⁹¹ Meeting Report, "Meeting of the International Committee 29 November 1950, Resolution on Free Cultural Exchanges between the Soviet Sphere and the Non-Soviet Sphere of the World," Congress for Cultural Freedom International Committee, November 29, 1950, Series 3, Box 2, Folder 5, IACF.

- Abolition of all censorship
- Exchange and uninhibited circulation of newspapers, periodicals, and books
- Exchange of scientific and cultural information
- Equivalent radio time for differing ideas
- Unsanctioned discussion of all cultural concerns through press or public debate⁹²

In an undated document entitled “Essential Aims of the Congress: The Report,” Nicolas Nabokov described the CCF as an organization with two aims: to fight against totalitarianism in free countries and to work against it in Communist countries and the Soviet Union. In free countries, Nabokov wrote, the way to work against totalitarianism is through the exchange of ideas, use of personal contacts, and public debates. Nabokov explained that uniting intellectuals for the exchange of ideas was imperative to this plan.⁹³

In late 1950, former OSS officer Tom Braden was recruited to the CIA by Allen Dulles, the Deputy Director of Operations.⁹⁴ It was Braden who suggested that the OPC was overwhelmed with too many projects and advocated for the creation of the International Organizations Division (IOD), a division that focused specifically on uniting people against the Soviet Union. The CCF, with known animosity toward

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Report, “Essential Aims of the Congress: The Report,” Nicolas Nabokov, n.d., Series 3, Box 2, Folder 2, IACF.

⁹⁴ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 95.

Soviet totalitarianism, was, logically, moved under the IOD and Braden's jurisdiction.⁹⁵

In February 1951, Nabokov suggested the CCF's first magazine, *Preuves*, as a counterpoint to philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre's popular leftist publication, *Les Temps modernes*, in Paris. François Bondy, a Swiss writer, ex-Communist, veteran of *Der Monat*, and director of CCF publications was named editor of *Preuves* and, in October 1951, the first issue was released.⁹⁶ In early 1951, the CCF also began to plan the first of many events that it organized between 1950 and 1967. Nabokov contacted executive committee member Irving Brown regarding a plan for a major festival of the arts and Tom Braden approved the plan in April of 1951.⁹⁷ In October 1951, \$40,000 was deposited into a "festival account" at Chase National Bank at Rockefeller Center under the control of Sidney Hook and Pearl Kluger, the leaders of the CCF's American arm, the American Committee for Cultural Freedom (ACCF). The ACCF served as the original conduit for CIA funds and dispersals made to the CCF abroad.⁹⁸ In addition to the \$40,000 deposited by the OPC, \$200,000 in "counterpart" Marshall Plan funds acquired by Irving Brown were earmarked for the CCF's 1951 salaries and administrative expenses.⁹⁹ However, funding through the ACCF would soon be replaced by alternative fronts for CIA funding.

While it is clear that multiple circumstances contributed to the founding of the CCF, not all contributing factors can be discussed in full detail here. It is clear,

⁹⁵ Ibid., 97, 98.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 101-102.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 113, 115.

⁹⁸ Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 85.

⁹⁹ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 106.

however, that the CCF reflected the growing concern of CCF members and government officials toward the influence of the Cominform, the desire to protect intellectual freedom, the increasingly anti-Soviet foreign policy of the United States, and the willingness of the United States to fund operations that vilified Communism. While composed largely of intellectuals concerned with protecting intellectual endeavors from governmental appropriation, the CCF was a useful endeavor for the CIA and the United States. Run by people with a vested interest in personal freedom as well as a background in intelligence, psychological warfare, and anti-Communist advocacy, the CCF became the primary foil to Cominform influence and propaganda. By funding the CCF, the United States could protect its political and economic interests in Europe and elsewhere by negatively portraying governmental involvement in intellectual endeavors. It is no surprise that, given these overtly political goals, the CCF's first festival in 1952 initially sought to negatively portray the validity of arts in Soviet Union by celebrating the artistic achievements of Western Europe and the United States.

Chapter Two: *L'Œuvre du XXe Siècle*

After funding for a CCF festival was secured in April 1951, planning began.¹⁰⁰ In May 1951, Secretary General Nicolas Nabokov arrived at a meeting of the CCF executive committee with an outline for an arts festival in Paris, complete with his preferred events, composers, works, and orchestras.¹⁰¹ Historian Giles Scott-Smith has suggested that Nabokov's plan differed from previous Cominform propaganda because it appealed to elite intellectuals through mutual interest rather than explicitly presenting opinions that may come across as propagandistic.¹⁰² Nabokov commented on this himself when he wrote to Irving Brown, former OSS officer, American Federation of Labor representative, and CCF executive committee member, that no amount of verbal debate could prove the validity of Western culture like the "products of the culture itself."¹⁰³ The festival, declared Nabokov, would go beyond the CCF's publications like *Preuves* that were intended to appeal to the anti-Communist base; instead, the festival would be directed at undecided intellectuals.¹⁰⁴

This approach seems logical considering that there was a contingent of undecided intellectuals in France that Nabokov could hope to appeal to. During World War II, the Soviet Union had provided assistance to defeat fascism, making an anti-Soviet stance difficult on recently occupied French soil.¹⁰⁵ Some non-

¹⁰⁰ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 113, 115.

¹⁰¹ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 113, 115; Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 122.

¹⁰² Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 122.

¹⁰³ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 87, 114.

¹⁰⁴ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 51.

¹⁰⁵ Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*, 118-119.

Communist French intellectuals and publications, such as Jean-Paul Sartre's journal *Les Temps Modernes* and Albert Camus's newspaper *Combat*, advocated French neutrality in the dispute between the United States and the Soviet Union as well as the growth of socialism in Europe.¹⁰⁶ Communist publications such as *Les lettres françaises*, *Ce soir*, and *L'Humanité* actively were providing French readers with news and commentary with a Communist slant in the early 1950s. *L'Humanité*, in particular, was the official publication of the *Parti Communiste Français* (PCF), the Communist party in France.¹⁰⁷

To combat leftist and neutralist influence in France, the American Psychological Strategy Board, a committee comprised of members of the Executive Branch of the United States government, began recommending that France outlaw Communist organizations and publications and limit Communists from public office. About \$2 million in CIA funds went toward this mission as well as to support French participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a newly founded military alliance.¹⁰⁸ The United States government also broadcasted Western European and American culture and news via its official broadcaster in Europe, the Voice of America, to France as well as other European countries.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 97, 147; Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 5.

¹⁰⁷ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 5.

¹⁰⁸ Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950–1955, The Intelligence Community, 1950–1955, Document 125," Accessed September 24, 2012, <http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1950-55Intel/d125>; Scott Lucas, *Freedom's War: The U.S. Crusade Against the Soviet Union 1945-56* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 137.

¹⁰⁹ Lucas, *Freedom's War*, 25.

The strength of the PCF and Communist publicity, the neutral stance advocated by people such as Sartre, and Paris's role as the CCF's headquarters made the French capital a logical and strategic choice for Nabokov's festival.¹¹⁰ The festival could provide support for anti-Communist initiatives in France as well as shore up France as a stronghold for intellectual freedom. As plans for the festival came to fruition, however, some of the French public opinion remained wary and *L'Humanité* featured articles suggesting that it was anti-Soviet sentiment, rather than advocacy for shared culture, that motivated the festival.¹¹¹

As evidenced above, of course, *L'Humanité's* skepticism was not without merit. In a 1951 festival progress report, Nabokov stated that the festival would present the important works of art in the twentieth century, with emphasis on the output of countries free from Communism. The purpose, he stated, was to create a comparison between the works produced under tyranny and the works produced under freedom. He projected that the CCF would be seen as a protector of intellectual freedom and that the festival would appeal to undecided intellectuals through cultural engagement, endearing them to the CCF's political persuasion.¹¹²

New Methods of Funding

In a quest to support the CCF's political mission without exposing the CIA as funder, the CIA began experimenting with the creation of foundations with rich leaders to serve as fronts for funds. In January 1952, Julius "Junkie" Fleischmann,

¹¹⁰ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 8.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹¹² Progress report, Nicolas Nabokov, 1951, Series 3, Box 4, Folder 2, IACF.

the heir of a Cincinnati fortune as well as an opera, ballet, and theatre patron, became involved in the CCF's endeavors. Fleischmann, who had previously been involved in the National Committee for a Free Europe, Radio Free Europe, and the OSS, became the president of the Heritage Foundation (renamed the Farfield Foundation in August 1952).¹¹³ The stated purpose of the foundation was to aid in the preservation of cultural heritage in the free world through the support of organizations that were engaged in such preservation.¹¹⁴ OPC agent Albert Donnelly was named Fleischmann's assistant, providing a convenient explanation for his increasing involvement in the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, the CCF's United States affiliate, and Nabokov's upcoming arts festival.¹¹⁵ This arrangement would allow for the CIA to support the CCF without the public, or some of the CCF employees, knowing.

A nine-person committee was formed to organize the festival but Nabokov took on the majority of the responsibility.¹¹⁶ Assisting Nicolas Nabokov were Julius Fleischmann, Denise Tual, Fred Goldbeck, Hervé Dugardin, Roger Caillois, René Tavernier, François Bondy, James Johnson Sweeney, René Huyghe, and Pierre Bolomey.¹¹⁷ Fleischmann and the Farfield Foundation executive board met to approve payments to the CCF for the festival, but the approvals were largely for show.¹¹⁸ From the outside, the *New York Times* reported the Farfield Foundation

¹¹³ Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 86; Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 91.

¹¹⁴ Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, 86.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 85-86.

¹¹⁶ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 132.

¹¹⁷ English language printed program from 1952 Festival, "Masterpieces of the XXth Century," 1952, Series 3, Box 4, Folder 6, IACF.

¹¹⁸ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 49.

raised \$500,000 to fund the festival through what was described as a mix of private sources and Fleischmann's private foundation, the Fleischmann Foundation.¹¹⁹ An undated press release from the American Committee for Cultural Freedom stated that Fleischmann used "private philanthropic sources" to raise only eighty-five per cent of the \$500,000.¹²⁰ However, scholars such as Ian Wellens have maintained that the philanthropic funding was fictional, despite the fact that it was carefully maintained, even to even CCF insiders like Nabokov, until 1966.¹²¹

The connection between the CCF, the CIA, and the Farfield foundation is undeniable. The Foundation served as a conduit for CIA funds for 15 years, replacing previous methods of directing funds through trade unions, the ACCF, or anonymous "donors."¹²² While I concur with Wellens about Nabokov's ignorance of CIA involvement, it is accepted that Josselson was aware of the extent of the CIA's involvement. When the *New York Times* revealed the funding in 1966, Josselson attempted to resign from the CCF and declared that maintaining the secret of the CCF's funding was a "grievous burden" for him.¹²³ It is unclear how many others in the CCF knew of the CIA funding but Tom Braden, the CIA agent that oversaw the CCF, admitted to the *New York Times* that the CIA had placed agents in the CCF. He went on to explain that he found it annoying that people were playing ignorant the

¹¹⁹ *New York Times*, "Notes of Discord Mar Festival in Paris; Communists Call it 'Caricature of Culture,'" *New York Times*, May 1, 1952, 29.

¹²⁰ Undated Press release, American Committee for Cultural Freedom, Series 2, Box 101, Folder 10, IACF.

¹²¹ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 49.

¹²² *Ibid.*

¹²³ Gloria Emerson, "Cultural Group to Keep Director," *New York Times*, May 15, 1967, 19.

truth of CCF funds.¹²⁴ Braden, contrary to Josselson, took pride in governmental funding of anti-Soviet endeavors and even spoke about it in an op-ed in the *Saturday Evening Post* in 1967.¹²⁵

L'Œuvre du XXe Siècle

Nabokov's festival, named *L'Œuvre du XXe Siècle* (Masterpieces of the Twentieth Century) opened in Paris in April 30, 1952 and lasted a month.¹²⁶ It included music, discussions on art and literature, and—as further evidence to the competitive nature of Cold War conferences—an exhibition of paintings and sculptures that ran concurrently with a Soviet-supported exhibition of Mexican art at the Paris Museum of Modern Art.¹²⁷ While Nabokov stated that he was concerned with making a “big bang” in the art world, music became the true centerpiece of the festival.¹²⁸ Nabokov wrote in 1975 that in planning the 1952 conference he felt that music and art had been “victims” of Stalin's oppression and aesthetic preference just as they had been under Nazi influence.¹²⁹ This opinion, coupled with his background as a Russian émigré and composer, explains the emphasis on music and,

¹²⁴ Max Frankel, “CIA: In the End, It May Have Outsmarted Itself,” *New York Times*, May 14, 1967, E4.

¹²⁵ Tom Braden, “I'm Glad the CIA is Immoral,” *Saturday Evening Post*, May 20, 1967, 10, 12, 14.

¹²⁶ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 177-185.

¹²⁷ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 8; Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*, 135.

¹²⁸ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 132; Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 47.

¹²⁹ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 47, citing Nicolas Nabokov, *Bagázh: Memoirs of a Russian Cosmopolitan* (New York: Atheneum, 1975), 243.

we can assume, gave Nabokov insight in festival programming as well as how best to exploit the artistic limitations Soviet composers were up against.¹³⁰

In Nabokov's 1951 festival progress report, he emphasized the underlying political nature of using cultural propaganda. Nabokov stated that politically driven conferences, such as those the United States and Cominform had arranged in the past, appealed to the base but failed to convert undecided intellectuals to either side. Nabokov was well aware that Soviet propaganda as well as the United States's actions had damaged the American image, painting it as imperialistic and culturally deficient. A culturally driven festival could have disproved claims that the United States lacked sufficient cultural prowess, and, therefore, appeal to intellectuals who remained unaffiliated in the Cold War.¹³¹ With this purpose in mind, Nabokov listed that to the goals of the festival:

- Establish the CCF in Europe and the world at large as a powerful association of intellectuals united by a broad program to defend our culture against any form of totalitarian control
- Draw as completely as possible, within its limited framework, a picture of our present day culture as it is reflected by the most important works of the creative minds of our century
- Prove that this culture, with all its richness and variety, even with its contradictory elements, could have been born only in a climate of freedom

¹³⁰ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 8.

¹³¹ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 51.

- Establish the CCF as a watchdog of this freedom, the *conditio sine qua non* of true culture
- Attract to the Congress new members from among American and European intellectuals, thus broadening and strengthening the Congress's field of action and influence
- Exhibit the artistic achievements of our century to the world at large (including the peoples of the Soviet Union and satellite countries via radio) so that all persons will be able to compare these fruits of freedom to the sorry output of writers, poets, painters and musicians living under tyranny, stifled by their rulers and reduced to sycophancy and conformism¹³²

Nabokov acknowledged that, while the cultural impact should come first, the political aim of the festival was “inherent to the program” and should be revealed gradually.¹³³ The festival, Nabokov stated, would not be aimed at “amusing and entertaining the Parisian snobs and international tourists.”¹³⁴ Rather, the festival would prove that Western culture could only be born out of freedom, allow others to see its merit, and establish the CCF as the guardian of that freedom.¹³⁵ To meet these aims, Nabokov's planned concerts “made up of virtually all works forbade or rarely performed in the USSR or ‘satellite countries’,” illustrating the intentionally anti-Soviet strategy at play.¹³⁶

¹³² Progress report, Nicolas Nabokov, IACF.

¹³³ *Ibid.*

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

Concert Series

The music performances for *L'Œuvre du XXe Siècle* took place on two stages. The *Théâtre des Champs-Élysées* series was made up of high-profile symphonic, ballet, and operatic performances while the *Comédie des Champs-Élysées* held a chamber music series.¹³⁷ Nabokov planned the *Théâtre* series while the *Comédie* series was programmed by Fred Goldbeck, a music critic and correspondent for the CCF journal *Preuves*, whom music historian Mark Carroll has described as a cheerleader for avant-garde music.¹³⁸ The conference began with a concert dedicated to the “victims of tyranny in the twentieth century” where 200 former prisoners of Germany, Russia, and Spain were hailed as guests of honor.¹³⁹

The symphonic, operatic, and ballet (*Théâtre*) series performed almost every day for the entire month.¹⁴⁰ The works represented composers of various backgrounds with the majority from France, Italy, Germany, and Russia.¹⁴¹ The Boston Symphony Orchestra traveled to Paris and performed courtesy of CIA funding.¹⁴² Other orchestras and choirs such as *L'orchestre de la Suisse Romande*, *L'orchestre National et Choeurs de la Radiodiffusion Française*, and the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra performed alongside the New York City Ballet, featuring choreography by George Balanchine. Famed American soprano Leontyne Price was

¹³⁷ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 9.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 2, 87.

¹³⁹ New York Times, “Notes of Discord Mar Festival in Paris,” 29.

¹⁴⁰ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 177-185; Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 135-139.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.* For a full listing of works performed, please see Appendix B.

¹⁴² Braden, “I’m Glad the CIA is Immoral,” 10.

also featured as a soloist.¹⁴³ Alban Berg's, *Wozzeck*, Benjamin Britten's, *Billy Budd*, and Arnold Schoenberg's, *Erwartung* all had their Paris premieres at the festival.¹⁴⁴

Meanwhile, Goldbeck's chamber (*Comédie*) series featured only seven performances and showcased composers that, at times, overlapped with those on the *Théâtre* series and, at other times, represented a younger and more avant-garde generation.¹⁴⁵ The chamber series featured the premiere of Pierre Boulez' totally serial work *Structures 1a*, epitomizing the growing postwar interest in atonal, serial, and avant-garde techniques.¹⁴⁶ A program for all concerts, compiled from the appendices of works by Ian Wellens and Mark Carroll, is available in Appendix B.¹⁴⁷ Appendix B was created through a cross comparison of the two programs and some of the names of works have been altered from the generalized names that appeared in the original programs to the standardized names and dates cited by Oxford Music Online. In some cases, where the name of the work is too generalized in the program to identify, dates have not been inserted to avoid misconstruing the program. For example, it is unclear whether the performance of Busoni's *Turandot* was incidental music or the opera itself.

While both programs included a diversity of composers, certain composers were favored. Stravinsky, for example, had nine works performed in the *Théâtre*

¹⁴³ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 177-185.

¹⁴⁴ Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*, 135.

¹⁴⁵ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 135-139. For a complete list of the works performed, please see Appendix B.

¹⁴⁶ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 91.

¹⁴⁷ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 135-137; Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 177-185.

series, far more than any other composer at the festival.¹⁴⁸ The next most performed composers were Ravel (five pieces), Bartók (four pieces), and Debussy (four pieces), while other composers at the festival were represented by one to three pieces each.¹⁴⁹

The prominence of Stravinsky can be explained through a variety of theories. Born Russian, Stravinsky spent a good deal of his professional life in Paris before and after the Russian revolution in 1917 until his immigration to the United States in 1939. The 1952 festival marked Stravinsky's first postwar return to Paris.¹⁵⁰ While the composer was absent from Paris from 1938-1952, Stravinsky's music was used in the 1945 commemoration for the liberation of Paris. Musicologist Mark Carroll has suggested that the use of Stravinsky's music at the 1945 occasion associated his work with freedom and, therefore, could have contributed to its appropriation and emphasis at the 1952 CCF festival where an association between the CCF and freedom was being emphasized.¹⁵¹

Mark Carroll has also described Nabokov's respect for Stravinsky's neo-classical works.¹⁵² Nabokov later wrote favorably of Stravinsky in his book, *Old Friends and New Music* describing Stravinsky as a "craftsman" and the "unquestionable leader of modern music in Paris and the West" during the 1930s.¹⁵³ As a foil to Stravinsky, Nabokov discussed Schoenberg as an important figure in

¹⁴⁸ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 139.

¹⁴⁹ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 135-137; Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 177-185.

¹⁵⁰ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 10.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 12.

¹⁵³ Nicolas Nabokov, *Old Friends and New Music*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1974), 192-193.

twentieth-century music, but also a “dogmatician, a theorist.”¹⁵⁴ As evidenced from the program of the festival, Nabokov only programmed two works by Schoenberg.¹⁵⁵ This discrepancy could be explained through Nabokov’s personal preferences but it is important to note that each composer represented a very different aesthetic—Stravinsky a composer who dabbled in atonality as well as neo-classicism, and Schoenberg, the serialist.

While Stravinsky’s works were disproportionately represented, the festival failed to showcase his newest music and presented a range of work from the early 1900s to the 1940s, including well-known works like *Le Sacre du Printemps*, a work whose premiere at the *Théâtre des Champs-Élysées* incited a riot in 1913.¹⁵⁶ The choice to program early Stravinsky so heavily led musicologist Anne C. Shreffler to assert that Stravinsky was presented “more as a legendary historical figure than as a living composer.”¹⁵⁷ Considering his history in Paris and the riot that *Le Sacre du Printemps* initiated, it could be argued that a twentieth-century festival without Stravinsky would be inappropriate. However, as a celebrated Russian figure that chose to pursue his craft outside the totalitarian sphere, perhaps Stravinsky also personified the goals of the festival and lent legitimacy to the United States as a haven for creativity.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 177-185; Nabokov, *Old Friends and New Music*, 193.

¹⁵⁶ Anne C. Shreffler, “Ideologies of Serialism: Stravinsky’s *Threni* and the Congress for Cultural Freedom,” In *Music and the Aesthetics of Modernity*, edited by Karol Berger and Anthony Newcomb (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), 228; Nabokov, *Old Friends and New Music*, 190.

¹⁵⁷ Shreffler, “Ideologies of Serialism,” 228.

While the *Théâtre* series emphasized Stravinsky, the *Comédie* series was more varied and musicologist Mark Carroll has suggested that comparing the programming choices of Nabokov to the choices of Goldbeck show different goals between the two men. Carroll argues that Goldbeck's choices represented works that were less readily accessible to audiences. While the *Comédie* series was not publicized as the *Théâtre* series (in *Preuves* particularly, where the *Comédie* series was ignored), it included *musique concrète* as well as a larger proportion of French composers.¹⁵⁸ Some composers featured in the chamber series, specifically Pierre Boulez, challenged traditional aesthetics through their music. Boulez advocated for reducing the materials of music down to their most elemental state.¹⁵⁹ This strategy can be seen through Boulez's expansion of serial technique to rhythm, mode of attack, and dynamics in *Structures 1a*.

Mark Carroll has suggested that this approach represented (and advocated) a change in established tradition and cultural heritage.¹⁶⁰ The extended serial technique reduced the burden of culture, allowing the composer to focus on musical materials alone.¹⁶¹ Carroll has described the 1950s as a time when there was uncertainty about the future direction of music; composers were stuck somewhere between Schoenberg's twelve-tone technique and Stravinsky's neo-classicism.¹⁶² Carroll has suggested that choosing to remove acculturation from the purpose of music could border on a political act by advocating cultural neutrality in a time of

¹⁵⁸ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 88-89.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 92.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 92.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 148.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*

Cold War confrontation.¹⁶³ While some may construe the works of Boulez and others as forward thinking, Carroll explained that forward-thinking “neutral” music was contrary to the goal of the festival. The goal was to show European audiences where high culture currently stood rather than where it was going, to project the “known” historical achievements in a time of uncertainty.¹⁶⁴ By making the choice to showcase Stravinsky and downplay newer techniques through an unpublicized chamber series, Nabokov sent a message against the cultural neutrality implied by atonal and serial works. Considering the 1954 conference reflected a shift in programming that was friendlier toward dodecaphony, it is important to understand the implications of such music when the CCF programmed the 1952 festival.

Festival Feedback

Praise for the festival was largely limited to the performance quality. For example, *New Yorker* columnist Janet Flanner was complimentary of the New York City Ballet’s performances.¹⁶⁵ In a *New York Times* review of the festival, the Boston Symphony Orchestra was hailed as the “star.”¹⁶⁶ In *Musical America*, Edmund Pendleton celebrated the achievements of musical performers and conductors in the festival, as well as the New York City Ballet.¹⁶⁷ Olin Downes even complimented Nabokov’s ability to coordinate the festival as well as the “generosity” of Julius

¹⁶³ Ibid., 150.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 97.

¹⁶⁵ Janet Flanner, “Letter from Paris,” *New Yorker*, May 31, 1952, 73.

¹⁶⁶ *New York Times*, “Notes of Discord Mar Festival in Paris,” 29.

¹⁶⁷ Edmund Pendleton, “The Paris Festival: Two Views,” *Musical America*, July 1952, 5, 20, 25.

Fleischmann.¹⁶⁸ Unfortunately, many negative reactions explored theories in the motivation of the festival, criticizing the programming choices as well as questioning the goals of the CCF.

In a *New York Times* article, Olin Downes criticized the festival programming. Citing examples such as *Lied von der Erde* by Gustav Mahler, *Prélude à l'Après-Midi d'un Faune* by Claude Debussy, and *Don Juan* by Richard Strauss, Downes described the programming as overshadowed by works and style of the nineteenth century.¹⁶⁹ Downes seemed critical of the prominent role of Stravinsky and reported that, despite Stravinsky's stated admiration for atonalists, he remained, to date, a neo-classicist with no real work in atonal techniques.¹⁷⁰ While Downes acknowledged that Stravinsky's *Le Sacre du Printemps* represented the breakdown of nineteenth-century aesthetics, he also argued that any music prior to 1910 was essentially nineteenth-century in nature and not representative of the great works of the twentieth century, as the name of the festival implied.¹⁷¹

Critic Everett Helm wrote in the July 1952 issue of *Musical America* that the "mammoth" festival encouraged controversy and "ended in a blaze of dissatisfaction." Helm reported that attendees did not see the music as representative of the aims of the Congress.¹⁷² Meanwhile, some American composers noted a disappointment in the lack of American music in the festival. Other festival attendees questioned the choice of featuring nine works by

¹⁶⁸ Olin Downes, "Paris Exposition in Sum," *New York Times*, June 15, 1952, X7.

¹⁶⁹ Olin Downes, "Shadow of the Past," *New York Times*, May 25, 1952, X7.

¹⁷⁰ Downes, "Shadow of the Past," X7.

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Everett Helm, "The Paris Festival: Two Views," *Musical America*, July 1952, 5, 25.

Stravinsky. Helm reported that others, specifically Europeans, found the festival propagandistic and American.¹⁷³ The PCF denigrated the festival in *L'Humanité* as the CCF's perceived attempt to recruit Europeans into cultural warfare.¹⁷⁴ *Combat* dubbed the affair "NATO's festival" and, rather than praising the United States, called attention to the history of American racism as well as the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee.¹⁷⁵

American journalist Janet Flanner, writing as Genêt, for the *New Yorker* described the festival as an "extremely popular fiasco."¹⁷⁶ Calling the festival the "largest propaganda effort, either private or governmental, since the war," Flanner explained that the anti-totalitarian focus of the festival is "naturally anti-Communist" since the restrictions that Hitler and Mussolini had placed on the arts were no longer an issue for composers.¹⁷⁷ Flanner also criticized the size of the festival, stating that it would be virtually impossible to see and hear all the available material.¹⁷⁸ More recently, musicologist Anne C. Shreffler has echoed this sentiment, arguing that the attention paid to the festival was largely due to its size and length rather than popular interest or a shift in political opinion.¹⁷⁹ Flanner noted a perception of propagandist motivation in stating that no members of the French intelligentsia were asked to serve on the festival committee and tickets for

¹⁷³ Ibid.

¹⁷⁴ Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*, 135.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 136.

¹⁷⁶ Flanner, "Letter from Paris," 72.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

¹⁷⁹ Shreffler, "Ideologies of Serialism," 228.

the opening night ballet averaged an expensive five thousand francs.¹⁸⁰ Meanwhile, Serge Lifar, at the Paris Opera Ballet, spoke out against the choice to bring the New York City Ballet to the festival rather than use the local French company.¹⁸¹

In addition to drawing negative feedback from attendees and critics, the festival programming appears to have divided the musical community along aesthetic lines. More established composers were featured and publicized prominently in the festival while dodecaphony, *musique concrète*, and avant-garde works were represented only in Goldbeck's chamber series.¹⁸² This divide between generations of composers became palpable when young composers booed Stravinsky's neo-classical *Oedipus Rex* when it followed a performance of Schoenberg's atonal *Erwartung*.¹⁸³ Reportedly, Stravinsky answered in kind by calling the premiere of Boulez's serial work, *Structures 1a*, "arrogant."¹⁸⁴ The editor of *La Revue Musicale*, Albert Richard, went so far as to call the chamber series the "true festival," while describing the *Théâtre* series as "superficial."¹⁸⁵ It is no surprise, considering the reaction of the musical community, that the programming of the 1954 conference was different than that of the 1952 festival.

Based on negative reviews in America and abroad, the impact of the festival on the international intelligentsia seems lackluster. While designed to appeal to a shared appreciation of and desire to protect culture and support for the CCF, the

¹⁸⁰ Flanner, "Letter from Paris," 72.

¹⁸¹ New York Times, "Notes of Discord Mar Festival in Paris," 29.

¹⁸² Alex Ross, *The Rest is Noise* (New York: Picador, 2007), 420.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 420-421, citing Robert Craft, *Stravinsky: Chronicle of a Friendship* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1994), 82.

¹⁸⁴ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 90.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 97.

programming choices divided the audience between views for the musical future and provoked commentary on its size and political motivation. By showcasing older works, the festival did not accurately portray the present state of culture, leaving some distaste in the minds of the younger generation who, after the war, were redefining musical aesthetics with recent history in mind. The political stance adopted by some of the French media encouraged a skeptical read of American involvement in Paris and, thus, the festival was not received as Nabokov intended. The festival did present a variety of quality performances, but it does not seem that critics compared them directly to music created under Soviet rule as the CCF had hoped. Likewise, the negative reactions failed to establish the CCF as the protector of intellectual freedom and it did not escape the British journal *Tempo* that the CCF, supposed bastion of intellectual freedom, failed to speak out against the French censorship of *Le colonel Foster plaidera coupable*, a play that took a critical read of the Korean war.¹⁸⁶

Despite all the negative outcomes of the festival, it appears that Nabokov was undeterred. In July of 1952, Nabokov wrote to Sidney Hook, saying,

I think, despite what it may have looked like to people reading the French press, the festival was a psychological success in the complex and depressingly morbid intellectual climate of France. Of course, in any other country we would have had both more sympathy and more support. We would also have had a finer press reaction, but then again the action we had undertaken was aimed at this area, and I still believe that it was the only kind of action we could have undertaken here in Paris which would have established the Congress in the minds of European intellectuals as a positive, and not only a political, organization. I sincerely believe that now that Congress is not only well-known, but is respected by many intellectuals who don't agree with us. And it is a fact that many other intellectuals who were

¹⁸⁶ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 17, citing Colin Mason, "The Paris Festival," *Tempo* 24 (1952), 15.

afraid of us before have come to us now as friends and colleagues.¹⁸⁷

If nothing else, the sheer size and press coverage of the festival undeniably established the CCF within the complex dialogue on intellectual freedom. The CCF would only continue to attempt to solidify this position in subsequent endeavors.

¹⁸⁷ Coleman, *The Liberal Conspiracy*, 56 citing Nicolas Nabokov to Sidney Hook, July 3, 1952, IACF.

Chapter Three: *La Musica nel XX Secolo*

With the 1952 festival behind them, the CCF continued with its work. In July 1953, the CCF sponsored a conference entitled “Science and Freedom,” the first conference to branch out of the arts.¹⁸⁸ The CCF would sponsor conferences on various topics throughout the 1950s and 1960s but repeatedly returned to the arts. Following the CCF’s July 1953 “Science and Freedom,” conference, a 1954 conference in Italy became the second in a series of events dedicated to artistic expression. This conference, while less overtly political, was not isolated from the tense political environment between the United States, the Soviet Union, and their respective supporters.

Why Italy?

While Italy was a democratically governed nation by 1954, like France it had a history of Communist and United States governmental involvement. Following World War II, membership in the Italian Communist Party was larger than that of France.¹⁸⁹ The Italian Communist party, the Socialist Party, and the Christian Democrats all represented political factions vying for power in the nation as it emerged from fascist rule.¹⁹⁰

In June of 1947, the newly formed CIA conducted its first special evaluation for the National Security Council and summarized its findings in a document titled “Review of the World Situation as it Relates to the Security of the United States.” In

¹⁸⁸ Congress for Cultural Freedom, *Congress for Cultural Freedom, 10 Years June 1950-June 1960* (Paris: Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1960).

¹⁸⁹ Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*, 122.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 122-123.

the document, the CIA concluded that the Soviet Union was incapable and unlikely to launch a military strike against the United States but was conducting unspecified political, economic, and psychological warfare against United States interests.¹⁹¹

The document stated that greatest danger to security in the United States was the threat of European economic collapse and Communist takeover. One way to prevent such a collapse was to support the continued recovery and stabilization of Western Europe with capitalist economies and democratic governments.¹⁹²

To support the recovery, the National Security Council concluded in its first policy paper that military activity may be necessary to “undermine” the Italian government, should Communism take over.¹⁹³ In March 1948, as the Italian elections approached, Truman sanctioned the use of covert tactics to influence the outcome of the vote.¹⁹⁴ A total of \$10 million was diverted from the Exchange Stabilization Fund, a U.S. government fund used to provide financing to foreign governments, and was directed to non-Communist parties, unions, and groups in Italy.¹⁹⁵ The United States also launched anti-Communist propaganda via the Voice of America, an official United States radio broadcaster in Europe, warning the Italian people against Communism and the loss of Marshall Plan aid should Communism

¹⁹¹ Lucas, *Freedom's War*, 43; “Review of the World Situation as it Relates to the Security of the US: Summary” Central Intelligence Agency, September 26, 1947, Accessed October 18, 2012, <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/books-and-monographs/assessing-the-soviet-threat-the-early-cold-war-years/5563bod1.pdf>.

¹⁹² “Review of the World Situation as it Relates to the Security of the US Summary.”

¹⁹³ Lucas, *Freedom's War*, 43.

¹⁹⁴ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 72.

¹⁹⁵ Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*, 72; Lucas, *Freedom's War*, 44; “Resource Center-Exchange Stabilization Fund,” United States Department of the Treasury, Accessed October 9, 2012, <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/international/ESF/Pages/esf-index.aspx>.

take over.¹⁹⁶ The extent of influence these of these initiatives and others had over the election is difficult to prove but it is clear that the Christian Democrats took power of the Italian government in 1948.¹⁹⁷

Aside from explicit U.S. government involvement, the Congress for Cultural Freedom also had connections in Italy, having founded the Italian Association for Cultural Freedom in 1951 under the leadership of author Ignazio Silone.¹⁹⁸ Silone, an Italian Communist Party member from 1921-1931, contributed an essay to the 1949 book, *The God That Failed*, a collection of critical essays by ex-Communists, before becoming involved with the CCF in 1950.¹⁹⁹ Despite Silone's anti-Communist stance, Nabokov accused the Italian CCF arm of lethargy under Silone, noting that Italian intellectuals were too receptive to rumors, presumably about American motivation behind the organization, and stating there was a need to take extreme measures to get "blood into the Italian 'apparatus'."²⁰⁰

It is unclear if Nabokov's assessment of the Italian arm of the CCF was the motivating factor in the choice of Italy for the 1954 CCF conference. However, it is clear that the United States government continued to attempt to shape the political environment of early 1950s. In 1952, the United States Psychological Strategy Board initiated a plan that sought to reduce the strength of the Communist Party in Italy by reducing its resources, influence on the government, and influence in trade

¹⁹⁶ Lucas, *Freedom's War*, 44-45.

¹⁹⁷ Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*, 122-123.

¹⁹⁸ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 102.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 65-66, citing Richard Crossman, ed., *The God that Failed*, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949).

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 102-103, citing Nicolas Nabokov to Irving Brown, September 3, 1951, Irving Brown Papers, American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Relations, George Meany Center, Washington, DC.

unions.²⁰¹ In 1952, the United States began to freeze or even cancel offshore procurements funded through the Mutual Security Program on a political basis. Orders from the Galileo firm of Florence were cancelled due to Communist presence in the factory there and an order to Fiat was frozen while internal elections for shop leadership were held.²⁰² While these instances represent a few circumstances where the United States was involved in the political climate of Italy, it is clear that the government had interest in Italian politics and, feasibly, could have influenced the choice of Italy as a setting for the CCF's 1954 conference.

Archival Evidence and Conference Goals

To examine the motivation in choosing Italy as well as the goals of the conference, I went directly to archival documents in the IACF archives. In assembling factual information regarding the 1954 conference, however, it is important to note that the CCF documents cited here, like many organizations' documents, do not always specify date, author, or even intended use. This makes an accurate chronology or authoritative interpretation of the documents difficult. My research for this thesis consisted of an examination of documents that were likely circulated within the CCF and were explicitly related to the festival. At times these documents are supported by correspondence, reviews, and press releases. However, more information exists and will likely deepen our understanding of the CCF and its role in Italian conference. In particular, I did not translate the

²⁰¹ Mario Del Pero, "The United States and 'Psychological Warfare' in Italy, 1948-1955," *The Journal of American History* 87 (2001): 1315.

²⁰² Del Pero, "The United States and 'Psychological Warfare' in Italy, 1948-1955," 1315, 1316, 1325.

correspondence available in Italian, German, and French. With that in mind, the facts presented here are based on a review of English-language documents in the IACF archives and any discrepancies or omissions of authorship or date is noted.

The 1954 conference, *La Musica Nel XX Secolo*, held April 4-15, 1954 in Rome, was smaller than the month-long festival in Paris and consisted of concerts, discussions, and a composition contest.²⁰³ Nicolas Nabokov partnered with the European Centre of Culture of Geneva, a group that Frances Stonor Saunders describes as the cultural arm of the CIA-funded European Movement, to organize the conference.²⁰⁴ Saunders describes the European Movement as the “principal pressure group” for advancing the idea of a united Europe in partnership with America.²⁰⁵ Nabokov also partnered with the national Italian radio and television networks, *Radio Audizioni Italiane* (RAI), to produce the event.²⁰⁶

While Nabokov spoke out regarding the need for increased energy in Italy’s CCF affiliate, there is little direct evidence suggesting that Italian setting played some role in the larger goals of the conference.²⁰⁷ In a 1953 letter to John Marshall of the Rockefeller Foundation, Nabokov explained the conference location choice, noting that:

- Rome had long been a center for the arts, but has done little in terms of international productions
- Rome was an inviting setting for a competition at Easter;

²⁰³ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 166.

²⁰⁴ Ibid., Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War* 329.

²⁰⁵ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 329.

²⁰⁶ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 166.

²⁰⁷ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 102-103.

- Rome had a good climate in spring and has few festivals that would compete with the CCF's initiative;
- Rome had historic and artistic attractions as well as good music in its many churches;
- Room and board will be easy to arrange;
- RAI promised to supply conference halls, studios, and recording facilities.²⁰⁸

While there is always the possibility that political motivation was behind the location choice based on the United States's historical involvement in the country and the CCF's historical opposition to Communism, this document makes no mention of this motivation. The English-language material I examined did not support the theory that the choice of Italy was motivated solely by political considerations; the evidence that directly tied the political situation in 1952, the 1952 festival, and the French public together was absent in 1954. It is always possible that influence from Michael Josselson or others in the CCF influenced, or ultimately made, the choice, but I have not found definitive evidence that that was the case. What the document cited here suggests is that, if nothing else, Nabokov had multiple reasons in mind as to why Italy was a positive move and the most pertinent of those reasons is not clear.

An undated seven-page internal memorandum outlines the conference, using the title, "Music in XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers, and Music Critics." It is possible that this document was organized by

²⁰⁸ Nicolas Nabokov to John Marshall, February 3, 1953, Series 3, Box 6, Folder 5, IACF.

the executive committee of the conference, a group that is listed prominently at the end of the document. However, authorship is not attributed to a single person. The document's unnamed author shied away from direct political justification and justified the need for the event by noting that young composers were isolated from the larger musical community. The author of the document stated that, in addition to their isolation from the established musical community, young composers were often isolated from each other, leading to little knowledge of contemporary trends in other geographic areas or within a country. This isolation, the author argued, forced composers to "cling more closely" to the techniques of the previous generation. The author described a barrier between performers and composers created by the great history of music and the "slow evolution of public taste," leading orchestras and soloists to program less contemporary music.²⁰⁹ As a result, the music critic was unable to appreciate contemporary works because they were performed sporadically. The author argued that the critic's lack of familiarity with the modern styles inhibits him from interpreting new techniques for "undiscriminating audiences."²¹⁰

The 1954 conference, under the working title "Conference of Composers, Music Critics, and Performers", had three stated goals to address these concerns:

- To enhance the opportunity for young composers to be heard and appreciated;

²⁰⁹ Undated memorandum, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics," Series 3, Box 6, Folder 7, IACF.

²¹⁰ Ibid.

- To enhance the repertory of available works for orchestras, operas, and soloists by new and existing composers, and
- To provide a meeting place for musicians and composers for networking purposes.²¹¹

In an undated post-conference created by the CCF entitled “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954,” the unnamed author described the conference and the reactions to it in detail over more than forty pages. In the document, the author cited an additional goal for the conference: to provide discussions that handled problems of the composer, performer, and critic of the time.²¹² In 1960, Nabokov retrospectively commented on the purpose of the conference in an informational brochure about CCF activities, stating that the 1954 conference was meant to serve as a supplement to the “forward-looking” 1952 festival, that had failed to showcase “younger talents, still struggling to make their way.”²¹³

Invitees, Funding, and Organization

Between 1952 and 1954, proposed numbers for official invitees to the conference appears to have varied. A one-page document entitled “Tentative Budget” from November 1952 gave estimates for the cost of 112 and 62 participants while an undated but more detailed memorandum detailed a plan for the invitation

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² Post-conference report, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954,” Congress for Cultural Freedom, n.d., Series 3, Box 6, Folder 10, IACF.

²¹³ Congress for Cultural Freedom, *Congress for Cultural Freedom, 10 Years June 1950-June 1960* (Paris: Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1960).

of 75-100 people, from “various countries of Europe and America” to the conference.²¹⁴ In a February 1953 funding request to the Rockefeller Foundation, Nabokov described a list of 100 invitees consisting of 50 composers, 30 performers, and 20 critics, with preference given to younger composers, performers, and critics whose “association with and fight for contemporary music is well known.”²¹⁵ While the letter to the Rockefeller Foundation describes 100 invitees, the post-conference report states that “hundreds” of guests and public were participants.²¹⁶ Considering this evidence, it is unclear what, if any, difference existed between an invitee, a participant, and a public attendee. A list of invitees from April 2, 1954 lists almost 350 composers, performers, and critics, suggesting that invitations were sent to many people.²¹⁷ However, a seven-page printed brochure, entitled “*Partecipano Al Convegno*” shows between 200-300 people as participants.²¹⁸

Despite a lack of clarity on the number of invitees, archival evidence shows that the CCF had some role in arranging the transportation and lodging of many guests. About forty pieces of correspondence to and from CCF Treasurer Pierre Bolomey, concern guests' travel arrangements, whether guests were travelling

²¹⁴ Proposed budget, “Conference of Composers, Music Critics and Performers, Congress for Cultural Freedom Tentative Budget,” November 3, 1952, Series 3, Box 6, Folder 5, IACF; Undated memorandum, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics,” IACF.

²¹⁵ CCF press release, Congress for Cultural Freedom, February 17, 1954, Series 3, Box 6, Folder 7, IACF.; Nicolas Nabokov to John Marshall, February 3, 1953, IACF.

²¹⁶ Post-conference report, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954,” IACF.

²¹⁷ Invite list, “Conférence Internationale de Musique Contemporaine,” February 2, 1954, Series 3, Box 5, Folder 9, IACF.

²¹⁸ Undated Brochure, “La Musica Nel XX Secolo Partecipano Al Convegno” No Author, Series 3, Box 6, Folder 7, IACF.

alone, and how they would like to be reimbursed for their travel expenses.²¹⁹

Additionally, in a letter to composer Virgil Thomson, Pierre Bolomey states that Thomson's travel expenses, in the amount of \$545 were covered.²²⁰ In a letter to soprano Leontyne Price, Nabokov states that her lodging reservation and ticket were taken care of and that he would be at her "disposal" during the conference.²²¹

While travel forms from Bolomey are limited only about forty attendees (e.g., composers Virgil Thompson, Racine Fricker and Hans Henze) and that prevents any conclusion on the extent of CCF travel reimbursement, it does demonstrate that the CCF provided travel assistance and, in some cases, per diem payments for some invited guests. Nabokov's 1953 funding application to the Rockefeller foundation on behalf of the European Centre of Culture corroborates this fact as Nabokov requested \$10,000 to help cover to cost of "transportation of approximately 80 delegates to the conference" as well as living expenses for these delegates.²²² Nabokov's letter also stated that the CCF would also contribute to the requested publicity and secretarial fees for the conference.²²³

Radio Audizioni Italiane (RAI), the public broadcaster in Italy, also contributed to the organization of the conference and was responsible for the finances associated with production of the concerts, including soloists' and conductors' fees. Nabokov's letter to the Rockefeller foundation stated that RAI

²¹⁹ Series 3, Box 5, Folders 10-14, IACF contain correspondence and travel forms between Bolomey and conference invitees concerning travel expenses in Italian, French, and German.

²²⁰ Pierre Bolomey to Virgil Thomson, March 3, 1954, Series 3, Box 6, Folder 4, IACF.

²²¹ Nicolas Nabokov to Leontyne Price, March 25, 1954, Series 3, Box 6, Folder 1, IACF.

²²² Nicolas Nabokov to John Marshall, February 3, 1953, IACF.

²²³ Ibid.

arranged for concert spaces, conference halls, recording studios, and meeting rooms for the conference.²²⁴ While the European Centre of Culture handled travel expenses and RAI handled performance fees, the CCF was only responsible for some travel expenses, the composition competition prizes, and unspecified secretarial/publicity fees.²²⁵ A report on a January 13, 1953 meeting of the conference executive committee contains a budget outlining CCF responsibility for travel and per diem expenses of a dozen composers—those to be included in composition contest at the conference.²²⁶ In this report, the European Centre of Culture was projected to provide \$12,900 in conference costs while RAI was projected to finance \$14,000. The CCF was slated to contribute the smallest amount of the three sponsors named in 1953—\$10,000 out of a project budget of \$36,900, with \$6,000 of the \$10,000 furnished by Fleischmann’s Farfield Foundation.²²⁷ It is unclear from this document where the CCF’s remaining \$4,000 came from or why the CCF contributed so little of the funds. It is also unclear where the European Centre of Culture and RAI received their funds, though Frances Stonor Saunders asserts, without clearly cited evidence, that the European Centre of Culture received CIA money.²²⁸ The document does state that the European Centre of Culture hoped to bring down costs by securing private donations but it is unclear if these desires were realized or truthful.²²⁹

²²⁴ Ibid.

²²⁵ Ibid.

²²⁶ Executive Committee Meeting Report, January 13, 1953, Series 3, Box 6, Folder 5, IACF.

²²⁷ Executive Committee Meeting Report, January 13, 1953, IACF.

²²⁸ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 329.

²²⁹ Executive Committee Meeting Report, January 13, 1953, IACF.

Despite ambiguity in the details of the 1954 funding, it is clear that the conference included lectures, discussions, and concerts. In 1953, when Nabokov solicited funding from the Rockefeller Foundation, the conference was projected to include symphonic and chamber music concerts, lectures, and forums in nearly equal amounts (i.e. 4-5 of each event type).²³⁰ However, the final organization of the conference varied slightly:

- 2 General meetings of participants
- 6 Symphonic concerts
- 7 Chamber concerts
- 1 Opera program
- 3 Recitals
- 1 Composition contest
- 6 Discussion panels²³¹

Nabokov oversaw the conference just as he oversaw the 1952 festival. Alongside Nabokov, an executive committee was in charge of inviting guests.²³² It is unclear from the archival evidence how this executive committee was chosen or how often they met, if at all. What is clear from the memorandum concerning the conference is that sometime before March of 1953, the committee formed with the participation of the following people:

- Boris Blacher (1903-1975), German composer

²³⁰ Nicolas Nabokov to John Marshall, February 3, 1953, IACF.

²³¹ Post-conference report, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954," IACF,

²³² Undated memorandum, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics," IACF.

- Luigi Dallapiccola (1904-1975), Italian composer, pianist, and writer
- Fred Goldbeck, French music critic
- Mario Labroca (1896-1973), Italian composer and critic
- Igor Markevitch (1912-1983), French composer and conductor
- Denis de Rougemont (1906-1985), French intellectual, president of European Centre of Culture
- Henri Sauguet (1901-1989), French composer
- Virgil Thomson (1896-1989), American composer and critic
- Gian Franco Zaffrani [Possibly affiliated with RAI]

Conference Concerts

According to the undated conference memorandum, the executive committee was charged with the construction of the program for the conference. Rather than feature two different concert series as the Paris festival did, the program featured one series of concerts with pieces chosen to represent the following groups:

- Works of young European or American composers
- Rarely played works by celebrated modern composers
- Modern works that have been neglected
- Older works that had an influence on the development of trends in the past 25 years²³³

²³³ Ibid.

In stark contrast to the programming choices of 1952, the 1954 program emphasized recent compositions rather than works established as culturally meaningful masterpieces.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to say with any certainty what was performed at the conference. There is some discrepancy in the CCF evidence as to which pieces actually made it to performance. The archive holds at least two lists of composers to be performed (one typed and one printed) and only the typed one, entitled “Music in the XXth Century Program,” specifies the names of the pieces. One list, contained in a printed tri-fold brochure entitled “Music in the XXth Century,” lists composers without work titles and includes a disclaimer that works are subject to change.²³⁴ The other, a four-page typed list, looks less official but lists composers and works, and differs from the composers listed in the brochure (e.g. Carter, Delvincourt, Henze, Tosatti).²³⁵ A list comparing both documents is included in Appendix C.²³⁶

Despite the official appearance of the printed brochure, I am keen to believe the typed list because it is supported by reviews of the concerts at the conference. For example, in *Musical Quarterly*, Fedele D’Amico commented on works by composers not listed in the printed brochure and mentioned specifically that

²³⁴ Undated Brochure, “Music in the XXth Century,” Congress for Cultural Freedom, Series 3, Box 6, Folder 7, IACF.

²³⁵ Undated program list, “Music in the XXth Century Program,” Series 3, Box 6, Folder 9, IACF.

²³⁶ Undated brochure, “Music in the XXth Century,” IACF; Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 121; Allen Hughes, “Rome Conference Selects Prize Scores,” *Musical America*, May 1954, 3, 20; Undated program list, “Music in the XXth Century Program,” IACF; List of Composers Selected for the Competition, Congress for Cultural Freedom, n.d., Series 3, Box 6, Folder 7, IACF; Undated brochure, “Music in the XXth Century,” IACF.

Vaughan-Williams was left out of the conference.²³⁷ If one only examines the printed brochure, one would conclude that unspecified works by Vaughan-Williams were included in the conference, but Vaughan-Williams's name does not appear on the typed list.²³⁸ These discrepancies lead me to believe that the typed list represents a more accurate portrayal of the chosen works than the printed brochure simply because post-conference reviews corroborate the composers listed. However, there is certainly the possibility that the typed list was subject to change before the conference began and it, too, is flawed.

According to the archival evidence, Stravinsky was a major contributor to the 1954 conference just as he had been in Paris. He served on the musical advisory board, a board that worked alongside the executive committee and was responsible for choosing works for the conference's composition contest, and also presented the awards to the competition winners in the absence of Farfield Foundation front man Fleishmann who was too ill to attend.²³⁹ Stravinsky's works were featured in the typed program list, including a performance of *Septet* (1953) for clarinet, bassoon, piano, horn, violin, viola, and cello and an all-Stravinsky program featuring *Orpheus*, *Scherzo à la Russe*, *Norwegian Moods*, *Scènes de Ballet*, and *L'oiseau de feu* at the final conference performance.²⁴⁰ While Stravinsky may have enjoyed the spotlight in 1954 just as he had in 1952, the rest of the festival was balanced in terms of age and

²³⁷ Fedele D'Amico, "Current Chronicle," *Musical Quarterly* 40 (1954): 590.

²³⁸ Undated brochure, "Music in the XXth Century," IACF.

²³⁹ Undated memorandum, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics," IACF; Post-conference report, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954," IACF.

²⁴⁰ Undated program list, "Music in the XXth Century Program," IACF.

style of the composers. According to the post-conference report, musical works represented twenty-three countries and, as Fedele D'Amico stated in his review of the conference, almost all composers were represented by only one work.²⁴¹

Of those composers included in both the typed and printed programs, composers such as Elliot Carter, Luigi Dallapiccola, and Luigi Nono represented a younger generation of composers that Saunders describes simply as “progressive avant-garde” in the sense that they were focused on atonal and dodecaphonic composition.²⁴² Saunders additionally cites Racine Fricker, Lou Harrison, and Mario Peragallo as composers influenced by twelve-tone composition.²⁴³ All three Second Viennese School composers, Arnold Schoenberg, Anton Webern, and Alban Berg, were included, as well as German composer Boris Blacher who began writing serial music in the 1940s and Italian composer Goffredo Petrassi who used twelve-tone music occasionally.²⁴⁴

That being said, as music historian Ian Wellens has argued in his book, *Music on the Frontline*, serialism was not the sole focus of the 1954 conference. Many people represented at the conference’s concerts, Wellens has argued, such as Benjamin Britten, Dmitri Shostakovich, Samuel Barber, Ralph Vaughan-Williams,

²⁴¹ Ibid.; D'Amico, “Current Chronicle,” 588; Post-conference report, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954,” IACF.

²⁴² Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 223.

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 121; Josef Häusler, “Blacher, Boris,” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed October 17, 2012, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/03180>; Enzo Restagno, “Petrassi, Goffredo,” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed October 17, 2012, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/21457>.

and Darius Milhaud represented aesthetics very different from the avant-garde or atonal school. Serial works were represented, Wellens reports, but not more heavily than other stylistic choices, especially when taking into account the aesthetics of the composers represented over time.²⁴⁵ It seems possible, from Wellens's citations, that he retrieved his information from the aforementioned printed brochure and not the typed list, casting doubt on his conclusions. For example, Vaughan-Williams and Shostakovich do not appear in the typed list or in any reviews I read, making it difficult to cite them as definitive examples of non-avant-garde aesthetics.²⁴⁶ If Wellens is indeed referring only to the printed brochure, it is also difficult to say what aesthetics were represented because this brochure lists composers, not pieces.

In *Musical America*, Allen Hughes declared that out of approximately seventy pieces, more than one-third had dodecaphonic characteristics, but makes no assessment as to whether this constitutes an emphasis on dodecaphonic compared with other techniques.²⁴⁷ Meanwhile, in *Musical Quarterly*, the conference was described as "eclectic anthology" not "dedicated to any particular trend or trends or even to certain composers."²⁴⁸ In light of this evidence, it seems that at least some attendees found the program varied and balanced.

²⁴⁵ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 121.

²⁴⁶ Undated program list, "Music in the XXth Century Program," IACF.

²⁴⁷ Allen Hughes, "Rome Conference Selects Prize Scores," *Musical America*, May 1954, 20.

²⁴⁸ D'Amico, "Current Chronicle," 588.

Composition Contest for Young Composers

In addition to the concerts, the conference also featured a composition competition. According to the conference memorandum, a musical advisory board of twelve composers made decisions regarding the competition. The musical advisory board consisted of:

- Igor Stravinsky (1882-1971), Russian-born, living in the United States
- Samuel Barber (1910-1981), United States
- Boris Blacher (1903-1975), Germany
- Benjamin Britten (1913-1976), England
- Carlos Chavez (1899-1978) Mexico
- Luigi Dallapiccola (1904-1975), Italy
- Arthur Honegger (1892-1955), Switzerland, France
- Francesco Malipiero (1882-1973), Italy
- Darius Milhaud (1892-1974), France
- Frank Martin (1890-1974), Switzerland
- Virgil Thomson (1896-1989), United States
- Heitor Villa-Lobos (1887-1959), Brazil²⁴⁹

According to an undated conference memorandum, the musical advisory board approved the choice of twelve composers who were invited to compete for three

²⁴⁹ Undated brochure, "Music in the XXth Century," IACF; Undated memorandum, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics," IACF.

monetary composition awards at the conference.²⁵⁰ However, I found no documents concerning meetings or correspondence from the musical advisory board. Despite a lingering lack of clarity regarding the musical advisory board's activities, the composers that participated in the competition were:

- Yves Baudrier (1906-1988), France
- Conrad Beck (1901-1989), Switzerland
- Bernd Bergel, (b. 1909), Israel
- Peter Racine Fricker (1920-1990), England
- Camargo Guarnieri (1907-1993) Brazil
- Lou Harrison (1917-2003), United States
- Giselher Klebe (1925-), Germany
- Jean Louis Martinet (1912-2010), France
- Mario Peragallo (1910-1996), Italy
- Camillo Togni (1922-1993), Italy
- Wladimir Vogel (1896-1984), Switzerland
- Ben Weber (1916-1979), United States²⁵¹

Competing compositions were entered in one of three categories to be judged by a jury for the following monetary prizes furnished by the Fairfield Foundation:

- Concerto for violin and orchestra—12,000 Swiss francs
- A short symphonic work—8,000 Swiss francs

²⁵⁰ Undated memorandum, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics," IACF.

²⁵¹ List of Composers Selected for the Competition, Congress for Cultural Freedom, n.d., Series 3, Box 6, Folder 7, IACF; Undated brochure, "Music in the XXth Century," IACF.

- Chamber music for voice and instrument—5,000 Swiss francs²⁵²

In addition to the monetary prizes, the CCF arranged for the performance of each of the winning works at three concerts in Europe and another three in the United States.²⁵³

According to the post-conference report, Nabokov's executive committee chose fourteen nominees for the competition's jury, and conference attendees elected the jury's seven members from the nominees. Members of the musical advisory board and Nabokov's executive council were ineligible for the competition jury.²⁵⁴ The competition pieces were played without announcement of the composer.²⁵⁵ The final jury included:

- Paul Collaer (1891-1989), Belgian musicologist
- Aaron Copland (1900-1990), American composer
- Roland Manuel (1891-1966), French composer and writer
- Rollo Myers (1892-1985), English music critic
- Goffredo Petrassi (1904-2003), Italian composer
- Robert Soetens (1897-1997), French violinist

²⁵² Nicolas Nabokov to John Marshall, February 3, 1953, IACF; Post-conference report, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954," IACF.

²⁵³ Post-conference report, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954," IACF.

²⁵⁴ Ibid.; Nicolas Nabokov to John Marshall, February 3, 1953, IACF; List of Composers Selected for the Competition, IACF; *New York Times*, "Copland is on Jury to Pick Best Music," *New York Times*, April 6, 1954, 35.

²⁵⁵ Undated memorandum, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics," IACF.

- Heinrich Strobel (1898-1970), German music critic²⁵⁶

Interestingly, documentation from the CCF archives describes dissent in the election of the jury for the competition. The post-conference report describes un-named journalists from unspecified but “known Communist media outlets” raising concerns about the jury selection process and whether it was done fairly. However, the report gives no further details about the objections.²⁵⁷

A November 1952 CCF document outlined one of the competition’s aims as the addition of high quality contemporary works to the repertoire. For the author of this 1952 document, the “guiding question” in the selection process for the competition was to be “what is most needed by the repertoire at this time? What can the repertoire use best?”²⁵⁸ A document describing the competition plans also explained that the money allotted per category correlated to the time it required to compose a work in that category as well as to its importance.²⁵⁹ The questions that were to guide the selection of the works were broad and vague, and it is unclear if these criteria were made available to the jury that selected the winners nearly two years later, making it difficult to say whether the winning works were chosen for these, or other, reasons.

²⁵⁶ Martin Anderson, “Obituary: Robert Soetens,” *The Independent*, December 5, 1997; Post-conference report, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954,” IACF.

²⁵⁷ Post-conference report, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954,” IACF.

²⁵⁸ Undated memorandum, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics,” IACF; Document, “Plans for a Limited Prize Winning Competition in Music Sponsored by the Congress for Cultural Freedom,” Congress for Cultural Freedom, November 21, 1952, Series 3, Box 6, Folder 7, IACF.

²⁵⁹ Document, “Plans for a Limited Prize Winning Competition in Music Sponsored by the Congress for Cultural Freedom,” IACF.

The winners were: Mario Peragallo, (Concerto for violin and orchestra), Wladimir Vogel and Giselher Klebe (sharing the prize for short symphonic work), and Jean Louis Martinet and Lou Harrison (sharing the prize for chamber music for voice and instrument). Of the three categories, only Peragallo took a full prize; the other two prizes were each divided between two winners.²⁶⁰ No further information appears to be available on why two of the prizes were shared. Journalist Michael Steinberg reported, however, that all of the pieces awarded prizes in the competition were dodecaphonic works.²⁶¹ As the competition compositions were referred to only as “competition works” in the printed brochure, and left out of the typed program entirely, it is also difficult name all of the pieces entered in the competition. Lou Harrison’s piece was likely an excerpt from his opera, *Rapunzel*, as one reporter referred to the Rapunzel story in relation to a competition work and Harrison had written an opera on the Rapunzel story.²⁶² However, this is just one interpretation of the facts.

Discussions at the conference

While the 1952 Paris conference included six literary round table discussions on themes such as “isolation and mass communication,” “revolt and human fellowship,” and “diversity and universality,” over a one-month period, the 1954 conference also included six discussion in half the timeframe and it appears they

²⁶⁰ Post-conference report, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954,” IACF.

²⁶¹ Michael Steinberg, “Conference of Musicians in Rome,” *New York Times*, May 2, 1954, X7.

²⁶² Michael Steinberg, “Leontyne Price Soloist in Rome,” *New York Times*, April 15, 1954, 34.

played a more prominent role.²⁶³ Within each discussion session, a speaker gave a prepared paper and a panel of composers, performers, and critics responded.²⁶⁴ Discussions were translated into English, German, French, and Italian for conference attendees.²⁶⁵ Transcripts of the discussions were made available to newspapers in Rome as well as American and European “press agencies,” according to the post-conference report.²⁶⁶ However, I have not found these transcripts. The post-conference report and printed festival brochure list the topics at the discussions and the prepared speakers as:

- Music and contemporary society—Roland Manuel, French composer and writer
- Style, aesthetics, and technique—Fred Goldbeck, French music critic
- Composer, performer, and public—Roman Vlad, Italian pianist, composer, and writer
- Music and politics—Rollo Meyers, English music critic
- Composer and critic—Virgil Thomson, American composer and critic
- The future of opera—Henri Sauguet, French composer²⁶⁷

A full list of the discussion topics and panelists as it appeared in the post-conference report is included in Appendix D.²⁶⁸

²⁶³ English language printed program from 1952 festival, “Masterpieces of the XXth Century,” IACF.

²⁶⁴ Post-conference report, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954,” IACF.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*; Undated brochure, “Music in the XXth Century,” IACF; Undated memorandum, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics,” IACF.

The discussion topics explored some of the tension that existed between the modern compose, tradition, and the role of the composer in political dialogue. Critic Fred Goldbeck's paper compared the modern composer writing dissonant music to the nineteenth-century romanticist rebelling against the tradition of his predecessors. The post-conference report's summary of the paper stated that Goldbeck saw atonal music as the final stage in a legacy of defying tradition, first begun by Romantic music of the nineteenth century. Atonal composers, the summary stated, wanted to move beyond tradition, but had little unexplored territory. Although, according to Goldbeck, the "spell of dissonance has faded," the public had not developed an attitude that would allow dissonant music to bring pleasure to the listener, leaving the composer to fear isolation from the listener by writing music that the listener would interpret as simply "ugly."²⁶⁹

In the "music and politics" discussion, critic Rollo Meyers argued, according to the post-conference report's summary of his paper, composers should concentrate on self-expression rather than the expression of a certain political agenda. Meyers suggested that the musician has an obligation to his own ideals, far above a political persuasion. In fact, Meyers claimed, "art and politics have no common factor."²⁷⁰ While the composer should not ignore the social problems, Meyers stated, he should not see his artistic expression as motivated by it. In the "composer, performer, and public" discussion, pianist Roman Vlad argued the

²⁶⁸ Post-conference report, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954," IACF.

²⁶⁹ Post-conference report, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954," IACF.

²⁷⁰ Ibid.

connection between composer and public, while difficult, should not lead the composer to compose to fit the public. Instead, Vlad explained, it was the duty of the composer to “seek the truth” in himself as an artist, only to unveil it to a public who must assimilate it.²⁷¹ It is the job of the critic, stated composer and critic Virgil Thomson, to help explain contemporary musical trends to the public, rather than simply judge their merit. Meanwhile, Roland Manuel’s paper for the “music and contemporary society” discussion, stated that it is important for the composer to understand that composing is like working in a scientific laboratory. Some experiments are best carried out in the laboratory, he said, but musical experiments should always be conducted with the notion of presenting them to the public eventually—even a public that is listening with ears more suited to the music of previous generations.²⁷²

While the discussion sessions are not explicitly tied to the programmatic choices of the conference, the choice of topics is telling. It is obvious that the participants of the conference were struggling with the role of the composer in the larger context of society. The papers grapple with whether music should serve the artist, the public interest, or a political agenda, and in what ratio. While there is no way to link these discussions specifically to programmatic choices, it is an interesting insight into the mind of those who were planning and choosing speakers for the conference. The fact that people within the conference were willing to discuss whether music should serve a political purpose suggests openness to multiple opinions, although the discussion largely advocated for the protection of

²⁷¹ Ibid.

²⁷² Ibid.

music from political appropriation, a Western value. In one exception, the post-conference report documented a disagreement inside one of the panel discussions, wherein panelist and critic Mario Zafred (reportedly from a Communist-associated journal, *Unita*), challenged the view that music should serve no political purpose.²⁷³ Journalist Michael Steinberg reported that Zafred specifically targeted the political pressure on artists in the United States, including the dismissal of artists with Communist associations.²⁷⁴ Zafred attacked the conference for “excluding” composers from Soviet countries and was reminded that invitations to composers from the Soviet Union, Poland, and Romania (e.g. Dmitri Kabalevsky, Aram Khachaturian, Dmitri Shostakovich, Zoltan Kodaly, Laszlo Lajtha, Andrezej Panufnik) had gone unanswered.²⁷⁵ This response seems to be corroborated by an invitation list from April 4, 1954 that listed the above composers, with the exception of Shostakovich.²⁷⁶

The fact that Zafred was invited as a panelist on such a topic is unexpected given the CCF's history of opposition to the political appropriation of music, the link between the Communist Soviet Union and state-monitored music, and Zafred's reported affiliation with *Unita*. However, Zafred's freedom to speak out was counter-balanced, if not outweighed, by the number of speakers prepared to deliver papers on the composer as an uninhibited creative force, independent of politics,

²⁷³ Ibid.

²⁷⁴ Michael Steinberg, “Rome Music Fete Upset by Turmoil,” *New York Times*, April 9, 1954, 19.

²⁷⁵ Post-conference report, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954,” IACF.

²⁷⁶ Undated invite list, “Conférence Internationale de Musique Contemporaine,” February 2, 1954, Series 3, Box 5, Folder 9, IACF.

critics, and audience. It is also worth noting that the panel discussions were open to public attendance but, “paying guests” were not allowed to participate in the discussions, suggesting that discussion of the role of music was reserved for the elite invited panelists rather than public debate.²⁷⁷ Obviously, the choice of panelists could influence the direction of the discussion and it is important to keep this fact in mind, even if it is unclear how and why the speakers were chosen. It goes without saying that the organization of the panel discussions was more favorable to Western conceptions of individual freedom than those advocated in the Soviet Union.

Reactions to the Conference

Public reactions to the conference concerts and discussions were mixed. Michael Steinberg, of the *New York Times*, published a series of reports on the conference from Rome. In January 1954, he announced the upcoming conference and, initially, critiqued the CCF’s claim that that the conference would present a synopsis of music of the twentieth century. Examining a prospective program from an unnamed source, he noted that Stravinsky was over-emphasized. However, Steinberg also noted that works by composers with varied compositional backgrounds such as Belá Bartók, Arnold Schoenberg, Georges Auric and Henri Sauguet were also to be represented. On the whole, Steinberg described the programming as “not bad,” but certainly not “synoptic,” especially if works by Danish composer Carl Nielsen (1865-1941), Dutch composer Willem Pijper (1894-

²⁷⁷ Undated memorandum, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics,” IACF.

1947), Finnish composer Jean Sibelius (1865-1957), and German composer Hans Pfitzner (1869-1949) were ignored.²⁷⁸

Throughout his articles during and after the conference, Steinberg applauded performers like soprano Leontyne Price, and composers like American avant-garde composer Elliot Carter.²⁷⁹ He focused on musical criteria and did not comment on the programming or social role of the festival as 1952 critics had. For example, when Steinberg critiqued the final entries for the competition in chamber music for voice and instruments, he took issue with one competition entrant's text setting of Sartre's novel, *La Nausée*, and did not discuss the meaning behind the text or Sartre's political affiliation.²⁸⁰ Likewise, Steinberg criticized Samuel Barber's *Hermit Songs* (1952) for its musical style, wishing for more dissonance, and commenting that perhaps the medieval Irish text was not suited to Barber's compositional style.²⁸¹ In assessing one of the competition works and criticizing the use of an unspecified Webern-like technique, Steinberg's concern was not the technique itself but in its application to a longer work than Webern's technique was appropriate for.²⁸²

Steinberg reported that most major concerns held by conference participants arose from the competition portion, the main frustration being that only twelve works were featured in the competition and competition entrants had to be invited

²⁷⁸ Michael Steinberg, "Contemporary Conference in Rome in April," *New York Times*, January 17, 1954, X7.

²⁷⁹ Michael Steinberg, "Rome Fete Hearts 3 Chamber Works," *New York Times*, April, 13, 1954, 40; Steinberg, "Leontyne Price Soloist in Rome," 34.

²⁸⁰ Michael Steinberg, "Leontyne Price Soloist in Rome," 34.

²⁸¹ Michael Steinberg, "Leontyne Price Soloist in Rome," 34.

²⁸² Michael Steinberg, "Bach Brightens Conference in Rome," *New York Times*, April 14, 1954, 25.

to participate. Italian critics, he said, took issue with the choice of the Italian composers, but Steinberg did not explain why.²⁸³ In fact, Julius “Junkie” Fleischmann and Nicolas Nabokov disagreed on the competition portion of the conference in terms of the number of entries and countries represented. Fleischmann suggested that the competition be expanded to thirty-six pieces with a wider range of international composers. Nabokov disagreed, citing the financial cost and that only twelve pieces could be performed, making it a waste of the other twenty-four applicants’ time. Nabokov also disagreed with Fleischmann’s suggestion that “Orientals who write in a Western manner” be included on the grounds that such techniques were too new to the East and those composers would be at a disadvantage. Nabokov reassured Fleischmann, stating that the twelve-composer contest was carefully planned with the help of Virgil Thomson and Samuel Barber.²⁸⁴

Steinberg reported that, while the conference attempted to keep the competition pieces anonymous, a “well-informed person” would have no trouble matching the competition entries to composers based on the biographical notes for each competition composer that were featured prominently in the program.²⁸⁵ While he applauded Mario Peragallo as the winner in the violin concerto category, Steinberg concluded that there was “no work good enough” in the other two

²⁸³ Steinberg, “Conference of Musicians in Rome,” X7.

²⁸⁴ Julius Fleischmann to Nicolas Nabokov, October 10, 1952, Series 2, Box 101, Folder 10, IACF; Nicolas Nabokov to Julius Fleischmann, October 16, 1952, Series 2, Box 101, Folder 10, IACF.

²⁸⁵ Michael Steinberg, “Conference of Musicians in Rome,” X7.

categories to justify one winner, hence the sharing of the prizes.²⁸⁶ His language here suggests that the works entered into the competition were underwhelming, at least in his opinion. It is unclear if the jury's rationale for splitting the prizes was a result of underwhelming entries or not. Allen Hughes of *Musical America* echoed Steinberg's disappointment in the competition, suggesting that the choice to award multiple prizes in two categories was a clumsy attempt to protect the pride of as many nationalities as possible.²⁸⁷

Considering the fact that some scholars, such as Saunders, have emphasized the importance and political implications of dodecaphonic music at the conference, it is surprising that many reviewers regarded the programming as evidence that twelve-tone music was no longer a divisive element in the musical community of the time. It seems that if dodecaphonic music was political code for Western values, it would have been a more divisive issue than it appears. In *Musical America*, Allen Hughes noted that the executive board and the musical advisory council contained members who, while unspecified, had not always been friendly toward twelve-tone music and, as such, the programming choices were "surprising, but encouraging" in terms of the growth in respect for dodecaphonic music.²⁸⁸ Hughes also asserted that varied conference programming demonstrated that the "demarcation between the tonal and atonal camps" was beginning to disappear. Additionally, Hughes declared that the disappearance of strict adherence to technique was a welcome advancement for music because both atonal and tonal aesthetics had made

²⁸⁶ Ibid.

²⁸⁷ Hughes, "Rome Conference Selects Prize Scores," 3.

²⁸⁸ Hughes, "Rome Conference Selects Prize Scores," 20.

important contributions to music and composers should be able to use the “expressive advantages” of either style.²⁸⁹ If the CCF truly meant to emphasize the use of dodecaphony as a symbol for Western freedom, it seems illogical that critics would see the conference as soothing the division between twelve-tone and tonal composers.

Steinberg, however, acknowledged that the conference participants showed a “tendency to indulge in devitalizing discussion on the subject ‘twelve tone or not.’”²⁹⁰ Despite this admission, Steinberg echoed Hughes’s praise for the decreasing polarization between atonal and tonal composers in the conference programming. For Steinberg, the discussion of the merit of dodecaphony was pointless because the conference proved that good music comes from good composers rather than the use of a specific technique.²⁹¹ It is good to note here, however, that all five of the winnings works used dodecaphony, suggesting that the competition jury may have had a different interpretation than Steinberg.²⁹²

That being said, Steinberg also reported that, at an April 13 performance of works by Bach, Scarlatti, Couperin, and Handel there were contented smiles that had not been seen for “days now,” calling the performance “refreshment” for the “shaken fears of those attending” the festival.²⁹³ It is unclear from the report whether this concert was part of the festival or just an adjacent concert that, presumably, some conference attendees attended. Since none of these composers appear in the

²⁸⁹ Ibid.

²⁹⁰ Michael Steinberg, “Conference of Musicians in Rome,” X7.

²⁹¹ Ibid.

²⁹² Ibid.

²⁹³ Michael Steinberg, “Bach Brightens Conference in Rome,” 25.

program documents I have investigated, it is confusing as to whether Nabokov also planned this concert. Either way, this comment suggests that not all of those in attendance at the conference were excited about the use of dodecaphonic technique or agreed with Steinberg's assessment that the conference proved that good music could come from any technique.

The most outspoken person regarding the conference was someone who appears not to have attended. Composer Pierre Boulez wrote a letter to Nabokov in 1954 attacking both the 1952 and 1954 festivals. Boulez took issue with the use of prizes as incentive for composers and suggested that it would be more honest to give them direct handouts rather than go through the competition, which he called the "spectacular public gestures of a Cincinnati banker," presumably referring to Fleischmann.²⁹⁴ Boulez also denounced the motivation behind the CCF's festivals and conferences in general. He explained that achievement belongs to individuals and that no amount of conferences would produce fruitful musical achievements. He likened the participants to puppets and denounced the idea of a committee sitting in judgment over creativity. To participate in the competition, Boulez said, would be a humiliation.²⁹⁵ This seems to suggest that Boulez represented a school of thought that took the composer as an individual creative force to an extreme beyond even that of the CCF or discussion panelists.

While some critics, Boulez specifically, disliked the conference, the post-conference report explained that ninety per cent of the press coverage was neutral to favorable. Most coverage of the festival came from Italy, with lesser coverage in

²⁹⁴ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 224.

²⁹⁵ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 124.

the United States, Germany, and France.²⁹⁶ Complaints were vaguely documented, but were related to the organization of the conference, the selection of the participants and jury, the purpose and goals of the conference, the quality of the program, the use of Italian organizations and money to promote a foreign conference, the use of languages other than Italian for official communication, the promotion of “Western Culture,” and the hidden motives of the conference planners.²⁹⁷ As was the case of the French press in 1952, suspicion of anti-Communist motivation was documented early on by journalists such as Desmond Shawe-Taylor who suggested that a conference based on debate and “public linen washing” to improve musical composition, performance, and criticism had a “familiar Soviet ring,” referring, presumably, to the conferences of the Cominform.²⁹⁸

Certainly the conference met of its stated goal of allowing musicians and critics to network as well as adding music to the repertoire from younger composers. The competition certainly encouraged the composition of new music but whether that music was good, popular, or long-lived is up for debate. Fedele D’Amico of *Musical Quarterly* described Klebe and Martinet’s winning works as “uninteresting” but praised Peragallo’s work for the “sense of well-being the listener derives from it.”²⁹⁹ When Mario Peragallo’s winning concerto was performed in the United States, however, the reviews were unfavorable. Critic Rudolph Elie stated that the piece had “few, if any, winning qualities,” and described a soloist that

²⁹⁶ Post-conference report, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954,” IACF.

²⁹⁷ Ibid.

²⁹⁸ Desmond Shawe-Taylor, “The Arts and Entertainment, A Summons from Rome,” *The New Statesman and Nation*, March 13, 1954, 312.

²⁹⁹ D’Amico, “Current Chronicle,” 592-593.

neither “conquers or fails” in the piece, but is “merely there.”³⁰⁰ *Boston Daily Globe* critic Cyrus Durgin called the piece “musician’s music. And perhaps not for all musicians, at that.” The “partial 12-tone style really seems without logic, purpose or effect,” stated Durgin, “if you write strong dissonance in measures that have the speed of molasses in January, you are doomed to failure.”³⁰¹ Regardless of the public reaction to the fruits of the conference, CCF Administrative Secretary Michael Josselson must have been satisfied as he awarded Nabokov an increase in salary shortly after the conference that Julius Fleischmann, in a letter to Josselson, also deemed appropriate.³⁰²

³⁰⁰ Rudolph Elie, “Symphony Concert-The American Premiere,” *Boston Herald*, October 16, 1954.

³⁰¹ Cyrus Durgin, “Music-Fuchs Violin Soloist with Boston Symphony,” *Boston Daily Globe*, October 16, 1954.

³⁰² Julius Fleischmann to Michael Josselson, August 14, 1954, Series 2, Box 101, Folder 11, IACF.

Chapter Four: Commentary

It is difficult to paint a complete picture of the event or to conclude whether the organizers of the 1954 conference had a clear political goal in mind with regards to programming based on the documents I examined that were related to the event. The extent of influence the CIA had on the choices the CCF made in their programming is also unclear. Likewise, it is difficult to make a case that this one conference influenced the growth and prestige of elite dodecaphony in the years that followed. The limited chronology explored in this project, the lack of dates and authors on conference documents, unexplored foreign language material in the archives, and incomplete commentary from people involved in the CCF make any neatly drawn conclusion on the CCF's political goals and outcomes suspect. While it is impossible to make a definitive case based on the documents examined here, Frances Stonor Saunders, Ian Wellens, and Mark Carroll have all contributed preliminary opinions on the role of politics in the 1954 conference programming based on their own research of the IACF as well as other archival collections.

Frances Stonor Saunders has argued in her book, *The Cultural Cold War*, that the 1954 conference favored the aesthetic direction of “the progressive avant-garde of Alban Berg, Elliott Carter, Luigi Dallapiccola, and Luigi Nono.”³⁰³ She described a “heavy concentration” of atonal and dodecaphonic music at the conference. Saunders, the most conclusive of the scholars discussed here, has argued that conference was clearly political in nature. “For Nabokov,” stated Saunders, “there was a clear political message to be imparted by promoting music which announced

³⁰³ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 223.

itself as doing away with natural hierarchies, as a liberation from previous laws about music's inner logic."³⁰⁴ In this sense, Saunders has argued that the political advantage of this conference was not derived from overt propaganda but from the values that the chosen musical techniques represented. There is some support that there were political implications in the programming of the 1954 conference, however, the support does not go so far as to accuse Nabokov of perpetrating those implications or having such a political "motive."

Mark Carroll agreed with Saunders that Nabokov's CCF endeavors took a pointed turn after 1952. Carroll identifies a shift from "an aggressive defense of the supposed nobility of Western culture to a more liberal policy of cultural enrichment, one that embraced more vigorously the ideas of diversity and innovation that were paid lip-service in Paris."³⁰⁵ While Carroll acknowledged this shift in programming style between 1952 and 1954, he stopped short of any accusation that this shift had obvious political ramifications. Carroll did suggest that large financial support for the 1954 festival from the Rockefeller Foundation lent legitimacy to avant-garde music in the same way that the Rockefeller Foundation upheld abstract expressionist visual art through financial support. Carroll has identified this support as integral to dispelling the popular myth that abstract art was a "communist plot to undermine Western values."³⁰⁶ While the endorsement of the Rockefeller Foundation may have increased the prestige of the music presented in 1954, Carroll has described the programming shift as a move away from "overt

³⁰⁴ Ibid.

³⁰⁵ Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*, 166.

³⁰⁶ Ibid., 167.

propagandizing to a rational discourse, one that nevertheless maintained its pro-Western imperative."³⁰⁷ In this way, Carroll acknowledged a shift and acknowledged the pro-Western slant of the CCF, but did not portray the programming as a conspiracy solely to contrast the Soviet Union with the United States. Rather, the CCF was engaged in a discourse, albeit a slanted discourse, on the future of intellectual freedom as it was defined and illustrated by the CCF.

Ian Wellens, whose book, *Music on the Frontline*, specifically focused on the endeavors of Nabokov, flatly disagrees with the idea that the 1954 conference was a political move or that the 1954 conference was slanted toward serial and avant-garde aesthetics.³⁰⁸ Wellens based his opinion on a lack of evidence that Nabokov chose works based on their political meaning. In fact, Wellens has suggested that there is evidence that directly contrasts the notion that the CCF or CIA directed support of an aesthetic of atonalism or other modern techniques. For example, Wellens argues that Nabokov's thirteen-year tenure as Secretary General, in spite of his noted preference for more conservative and tonal musical trends, undermines the idea that the CIA wanted to encourage "cutting edge" music.³⁰⁹ Wellens explains that Nabokov, in an article for *Partisan Review*, advocated for Stravinsky's *Le Sacre du Printemps* as a true turning point in modern harmony, where rhythm would play the prominent role, undermining the importance of atonalists like Schoenberg in the musical timeline.³¹⁰ An inspection of Nabokov and his writings, Wellens has argued,

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 167.

³⁰⁸ Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 121.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., 125.

³¹⁰ Ibid., 122-123.

simply “does not support” Saunders’s thesis that “the CIA promoted ‘cutting edge’ modernism.”³¹¹

Wellens is quick to point out, however, that a rejection of Saunders’s thesis should not reject the importance of Nabokov in the politics of Western music in the midcentury.³¹² Wellens suggests that Nabokov was concerned not with the growth of Communism as a political force, but by the growth of “middlebrow” culture—the mass distribution and appreciation of what was once considered “high” culture to a rising middle class through the gramophone and the radio.³¹³

Despite disagreement, the academic community benefits from an exploration of various interpretations of the 1954 conference. This essay provides documented evidence that enhances the discussion without drawing definitive conclusions. Based on the evidence presented in Chapter Three, I agree that the musical choices of Nabokov and CCF supporters may have had sincere political implications, but their motivations concerning the 1952 festival and the 1954 conference were too nuanced, multifaceted, and unknowable to distill into a simple argument. It is impossible to imply that CCF choices were driven solely by anti-Communist sentiment though it does seem probable that it played a role in defining the CCF’s concept of intellectual freedom. While the CCF’s undeniable and suspicious ties to the CIA prove a financial connection, they do not prove the extent to which the CIA’s desired political outcomes influenced the CCF’s decisions. The CIA certainly had something to gain in sponsoring an organization that publicized Western culture as

³¹¹ *Ibid.*, 122.

³¹² *Ibid.*, 125.

³¹³ *Ibid.*, 126.

a positive influence for mankind, but that sponsorship is not enough to prove their direct intervention in advocating certain musical aesthetics over others. Likewise, the shift away from overt political rhetoric in the 1954 conference leaves scholars to contemplate what remains unsaid by CCF officials. While the programming choices indirectly aided Western interests by consciously upholding aesthetics denied in the Soviet Union, no evidence suggests that this outcome was the only reason behind the programming choices. That does not mean, however, that the programming changes that occurred between the festival and the conference are meaningless to those that experienced them. These changes provide insight into the political and cultural landscape of the early 1950s, allow us to connect CCF values with the musical artworks that best illustrated them, and leave room for extended research on this topic.

What is clear from the archival evidence and established research is that the goal of the 1952 festival was explicitly anti-totalitarian and the CCF intended for the presented works to be favored when mentally compared to works in totalitarian areas. Nabokov's 1951 festival progress report stated that the festival was designed to attract like-minded individuals to the pro-Western organization and establish the CCF as a defender of Western cultural ideals from any totalitarian influence.³¹⁴ This language portrays the 1952 festival as a means to an end. The goals of the festival were not cultural but, rather, a political wolf in sheep's clothing intended to support the CCF's growth and Western ideals. This sentiment is echoed in a CCF work plan

³¹⁴ Progress report, Nicolas Nabokov, IACF.

for August 1951-August 1952 that explicitly included goals for the organization such as:

- The defense of cultural freedom, the affirmation of the permanent values of “our” civilization
- The struggle against totalitarian doctrine and its effect
- The establishment and development of a worldwide organization uniting intellectuals on a broad anti-totalitarian platform for constructive cooperation activity³¹⁵

Nabokov mentioned in his 1951 progress report that he would draw on works forbidden or rarely performed in the Soviet Union and satellite countries to meet festival goals.³¹⁶ With other works, the festival was aimed to give an overview of the state of highly respected Western European culture in 1952, essentially a revue of the century’s greatest works, so they could be compared to the current works of totalitarian countries.³¹⁷ Stravinsky, as a respected Russian composer and anti-Communist who had composed primarily outside Soviet influence, was utilized as an example of the artistic possibilities outside the Soviet Union; upholding him as a master of his craft implied that his ascent to mastery was facilitated by “freedom.”³¹⁸ Stravinsky’s history in Paris encouraged familiarity and commonality between the

³¹⁵ Memorandum, “Work Plan of the International Secretariat of the Congress for Cultural freedom: For the Period from August 1, 1951 to August 1, 1952”, Series 2, Box 10, Folder 5, IACF.

³¹⁶ Progress Report, Nicolas Nabokov, IACF.

³¹⁷ Memorandum, “Masterpieces of our Century,” July 20, 1951, Series 3, Box 3, Folder 3, IACF

³¹⁸ Progress Report, Nicolas Nabokov, IACF.

French and the United States through this shared cultural figure, one that had clear political benefits for the United States.

While the 1952 festival explicitly names its anti-totalitarian aims, the 1954 conference makes no such mention. In a document stating the motives and purposes of the conference, the author explained that inequity in access to music and performances from composers of all ages was a guiding motivation of the conference. Additionally, listed goals of the conference focused on international exchange, the addition of works to the repertory, and networking for musicians and critics.³¹⁹ In keeping with these goals, correspondence from Nabokov, Josselson, Fleischmann, and others involved in the 1954 conference remained focused on the duties and activities of the CCF, with no mention of directives from the CIA, the preferences of the Farfield Foundation, or the political leverage at stake. Archival documents regarding programming choices for the 1954 conference directly support the stated cultural goals of the conference. The conference patronized young composers, commissioned new works, and increased the public knowledge of such composers through public performance of winning compositions.³²⁰

In appearance, the goals of the 1954 conference were geared toward the protection of intellectual freedom rather than the advocacy of democratic systems of government. While the CCF was founded under government funding and spoke against totalitarianism, a focus of intellectual freedom is consistent with the first

³¹⁹ Undated memorandum, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics," IACF

³²⁰ Undated memorandum, "Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics," IACF.

point of the CCF Manifesto which names such freedom as an unalienable right.³²¹ However, totalitarian states, as inhibitors of this freedom, were enemies by default. The CCF's mission to protect intellectual freedom inevitably aligned it with CIA initiatives and illustrates that the support of individual freedom (and techniques that showcased it) can be a personal conviction with political implications.

Scholar Anne C. Shreffler has examined this possibility and suggests a new framework that can be used to interpret the role of the Cold War in culture. In her work on Stravinsky and his connections to the CCF, Shreffler has suggested that the traditional view of politics as the "specific actions of governments and the impact of these actions on individuals" needs to be expanded to include the impact of individuals on institutions and governments.³²² Shreffler goes on to explain that artistic decisions are never made on an entirely personal basis but, rather, function within a framework of accepted values.³²³ Politics and art share concepts, Shreffler states, that can be interpreted based on their cultural context. For example, during the 1950s, the concept of "freedom" was equated with the values of democracy in the United States, while "freedom" in the Soviet Union was synonymous with liberation from an oppressive ruling class through egalitarianism. In both cases, political ideology had "endowed" a concept with a certain meaning and interpretation.³²⁴

³²¹ 1950 Manifesto printed inside CCF Pamphlet, "The Congress for Cultural Freedom," IACF.

³²² Shreffler, "Ideologies of Serialism," 289.

³²³ Ibid.

³²⁴ Ibid., 290.

In the same essay, Shreffler also states that the meaning of any artwork extends beyond its creator to what it has meant for those receiving it.³²⁵ In that sense, the artistic choices of those featured at the 1954 conference, as well as the artistic choices of those programming it, had meaning for the audience. That being said, the dodecaphonic slant of the programming could be construed as an endorsement for an aesthetic of “objective” (i.e. “formalist”) music, which conjures up an endorsement for the political system that supported that concept of “freedom.” While the CCF may not have stated pro-Western aims in their goals for the 1954 conference, the celebration of certain techniques that called to mind one interpretation of “freedom” implied an orientation toward a political scheme, endorsing it by proxy rather than explicitly. For the audience, the use of “objective” music had political connotations and therefore cannot be construed as lacking political context.

It is this possibility that makes me hesitant to agree with Saunders’s statement that Nabokov had a “clear political message” that was communicated through an international conference showcasing dodecaphonic music.³²⁶ I believe that Saunders is going beyond what Shreffler argues to conclude that promoting dodecaphonic techniques—showcasing politically unaffiliated music as opposed to state-sanctioned Socialist Realism—was a calculated political move to convert hearts and minds away from Stalin’s influence. It is impossible to know if that is what Nabokov had in mind. As Shreffler suggests, the situation could have been

³²⁵ Ibid., 289.

³²⁶ Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, 223.

more nuanced than simply performing dodecaphonic music to get a political outcome.

While the CCF's concept of "freedom" may have earned government support in hopes of political benefit, I do not think that the CCF calculated its choices based solely on political outcomes. Saunders's statement implies that the CCF had a particular political outcome in mind in programming certain works and that, so far, is impossible to prove. The situation is nuanced, predicated on celebrating and selling a particular interpretation of the concept of "freedom" as a value. A strategy to gather like minds against a perceived enemy by exploiting shared cultural values cannot ever be as "clear" as Saunders states. Perhaps if the political message were so "clear," the conference may have been received as negatively as the propagandistic 1952 festival. However, as shown in Chapter Three, reviews were less focused on the political implications in 1954 than 1952. As Allen Hughes of *Musical America* declared, the conference illustrated that the "demarcation between the tonal and atonal camps" was disappearing.³²⁷ Perhaps the conference contributed to the visibility and respect of dodecaphonic music while disguising the political message it implied, selling and celebrating one interpretation of cultural and political "freedom" without explicit propaganda.

While the political implications of the conference choices are of note, there are still areas that invite increased research. The dodecaphonic slant in winning competition works suggested an endorsement of the "objective" aesthetic but no work was hailed universally as a masterpiece or lived on in infamy. It seems strange

³²⁷ Hughes, "Rome Conference Selects Prize Scores," 20.

that a large organization with international influence and large financial backing was unable to present works that hailed the advent of a new musical norm.

Likewise, the marginalization of dodecaphonic works at the 1952 festival seems counterintuitive if such works could be appropriated to represent “freedom.” This seems to invite more research regarding the use of dodecaphonic and avant-garde music over the lifespan of the CCF for evidence of its prominence and reception.

Other possible research could explore whom the CCF chose to connect through networking. The 1954 conference had a stated goal to facilitate networks between composers and critics across international lines. This type of international exchange was consistent with the CCF’s stated value of personal liberty and the CCF’s 1950 condemnation of the United States government for imposing travel restrictions on intellectuals.³²⁸ That being said, the topic of 1954 invitees (and the countries they represented) warrants investigation, especially those invited into positions of power such as the executive committee, musical advisory board, or jury for the 1954 competition. For example, American composer Aaron Copland served on the jury responsible for selecting the winners of the composition contest.³²⁹ However, Copland was subject to smear campaigns for his involvement with the 1949 Cominform conference in New York, and as late as 1953, Copland’s work *Lincoln Portrait* was cancelled from the inauguration of President Eisenhower as a

³²⁸ Undated memorandum, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Composers, Performers and Music Critics,” IACF; Meeting report, “Meeting of the International Committee, Brussels 29 November 1950; Resolution on Free Cultural Exchanged between the Soviet Sphere and the Non-Soviet Sphere of the World,” IACF.

³²⁹ Post-conference report, “Music in the XXth Century International Conference of Contemporary Music Rome: April 4-15, 1954,” IACF.

result of political accusations.³³⁰ It would be interesting to examine archival evidence regarding the CCF and Copland within the context of his personal evolution as a composer.

Based on the evidence presented in this project, the works performed at the 1954 conference are still unclear. Additional research targeting the program would be immensely informative. While this project did not allow for the investigation of each individual work that could have been performed, it would be interesting to investigate the meaning behind a few works with Shreffler's concept of audience reception in mind. It would be especially interesting to examine those opposed to conference performances and why. For example, the performance of *Boulevard Solitude* by German composer Hans Werner Henze was booed by what journalist Michael Steinberg called "clearly organized opposition," including "hoots, whistles, coughs and remarks from the first scene on" raising interesting questions on audience attitudes and reception of the conference.³³¹ Additionally, Ian Wellens has pointed out that Nabokov's greatest antagonist, composer Pierre Boulez, took more issue with the pompousness and lack of authenticity of the conference than with the political implications, communicating an additional perspective on the conference from composers outside the list of participants or invitees.³³²

³³⁰ "Red Visitors Cause Rumpus," *Life*, April 4, 1949, 39-42; Howard Pollack, "Copland, Aaron," *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed October 22, 2012, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/06422>.

³³¹ Steinberg, "Rome Music Fete Upset by Turmoil," 19.

³³² Wellens, *Music on the Frontline*, 126; Undated Brochure, "La Musica Nel XX Secolo Partecipano Al Convegno" IACF; Undated invite list, "Conférence Internationale de Musique Contemporaine," February 2, 1954, IACF.

The Manifesto (Appendix A) of the CCF, at least in 1950, presented the defense of individual freedom and the fight against totalitarianism as inextricably linked. The preservation of intellectual freedom was inherently tied to the preservation of peace, making it difficult to parse out which motivation was leading at which time.³³³ The Manifesto is driven by cultural values and political choices that support those values. In this sense, it is impossible to suggest that politics played no role in CCF endeavors such as the 1954 conference, but it is also difficult to assess the balance between the concern for individual creativity and the concern for a political environment that fostered that creativity in this particular case.

The benefit to this investigation is that primary documents often lead to questions as well as answers. The examination of documents from the 1954 conference increases understanding of the CCF as a cultural and political organization but does not solve every concern raised by current scholars. In cases where cultural trends and political change are at play, it is impossible to quantify the influence of any one factor in CCF endeavors. The CCF, while an organization, was made of people and it is impossible to read the mind or motivation of each person involved in the process of the 1954 conference. With many confounding variables, it is difficult to directly compare the political initiatives of the CCF in 1952 and 1954 as circumstances were, and always are, fluctuating. The 1952 festival, planned against the backdrop of post-war Europe and the Korean War, cannot be directly compared to the 1954 conference planned against Stalin's death in March 1953, the Korean War ceasefire in July 1953, and 1952 festival backlash. However,

³³³ 1950 Manifesto printed inside CCF Pamphlet, "The Congress for Cultural Freedom," IACF.

the documents examined provide increased context on a largely unexplored portion of CCF history and will hopefully facilitate the expansion of research for historians, political scholars, and musicologists.

Works Cited

- Anderson, Martin. "Obituary: Robert Soetens." *The Independent*, December 5, 1997.
- Bennet, Walter. "The Most Dangerous Man." *Time*, March 17, 1952.
- Berghahn, Volker R. *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Braden, Thomas W. "I'm Glad the CIA is Immoral." *Saturday Evening Post*, May 20, 1967.
- Calico, Joy H. "Schoenberg's Symbolic Remigration: A Survivor from Warsaw in Postwar West Germany." *The Journal of Musicology* 26 (2009): 17-43.
- Carroll, Mark. *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Caute, David. *The Dancer Defects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Central Intelligence Agency. "COI Came First." Accessed September 17, 2012. <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/books-and-monographs/oss/art02.htm>
- Central Intelligence Agency. "A Look Back, The National Committee for Free Europe, 1949." Accessed September 17, 2012. <https://www.cia.gov/news-information/featured-story-archive/2007-featured-story-archive/a-look-back.html>.
- Central Intelligence Agency. "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1949-1950." Accessed September 17, 2012. <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/95unclass/Warner.html>.
- Central Intelligence Agency. "Review of the World Situation as it Relates to the Security of the United States Summary." September 26, 1947. Accessed October 18, 2012. <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/books-and-monographs/assessing-the-soviet-threat-the-early-cold-war-years/5563bod1.pdf>.
- Central Intelligence Agency. "What Was OSS?" Accessed September 17, 2012, <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/books-and-monographs/oss/art03.htm>.
- Central Intelligence Agency. "About CIA." Accessed September 17, 2012. <https://www.cia.gov/about-cia/index.html>

- Central Intelligence Agency. "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom."
 Accessed June 27, 2008. <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/95unclass/Warner.html>
- Chafe, William. *The Unfinished Journey: America Since World War II*. 5th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Clements, Andrew. "Boulevard Solitude." *The New Grove Dictionary of Opera*. *Grove Music Online*. *Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed October 22, 2012, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/O900745>.
- Coleman, Peter. *The Liberal Conspiracy*. New York: The Free Press, 1989.
- Congress for Cultural Freedom. *Congress for Cultural Freedom, 10 Years June 1950-June 1960*. Paris: Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1960.
- Cox, Michael and Carole Kennedy-Pipe. "The Tragedy of American Diplomacy? Rethinking the Marshall Plan." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 7 (2005): 97-134.
- Crist, Elizabeth B. "Aaron Copland and the Popular Front." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 56 (2003): 409-466.
- Crossman, Richard ed., *The God that Failed*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Cull, Nicholas J. *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- D'Amico, Fedele. "Current Chronicle." *Musical Quarterly* 40 (1954): 587-594.
- Del Pero, Mario. "The United States and 'Psychological Warfare' in Italy, 1948-1955." *The Journal of American History* 87 (2001): 1304-1334.
- Downes, Olin. "Paris Exposition in Sum." *New York Times*. June 15, 1952.
- Downes Olin. "Shadow of the Past." *New York Times*. May 25, 1952.
- Durgin, Cyrus. "Music-Fuchs Violin Soloist with Boston Symphony." *Boston Daily Globe*, October 16, 1954.
- Elie, Rudolph "Symphony Concert-The American Premiere." *Boston Herald*, October 16, 1954.
- Emerson, Gloria. "Cultural Group to Keep Director." *New York Times*, May 15, 1967.

- Flanner, Janet. "Letter from Paris." *New Yorker*, May 31, 1952.
- Frankel, Max. "CIA: In the End, It May Have Outsmarted Itself." *New York Times*, May 14, 1967.
- Gienow-Hecht, Jessica. "How Good Are We? Culture and the Cold War." In *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe 1945-1960*, edited by Hans Krabbendam and Giles Scott-Smith., 269-282. Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2003.
- Harvard University. "About the *Journal of Cold War Studies*." Accessed May 6, 2012. <http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~hpcws/journal.htm>.
- Harvard University. "Faculty, Anne C. Shreffler." Accessed May 6, 2012. <http://www.music.fas.harvard.edu/faculty/ashreffler.html>
- Häusler, Josef. "Blacher, Boris." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed October 17, 2012, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/03180>.
- Hughes, Allen. "Rome Conference Selects Prize Scores." *Musical America*, May 1954.
- Kaplan, Fred. "When Ambassadors Had Rhythm." *New York Times*, June 29 2008. Accessed May 6, 2012. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/29/arts/music/29kapl.html?pagewanted=all>
- Helm, Everett. "The Festival in Paris: Two Views." *Musical America*, July 1952.
- Hughes, Allen. "Rome Conference Selects Prize Scores." *Musical America*, May 1954.
- International Association for Cultural Freedom Records, 1950-1979. Special Collections Research Center. University of Chicago.
- LaFeber, Walter. *America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-1996*. 8th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1997.
- Lasch, Christopher. "The Cultural Cold War." *The Nation* 205 (6): 198-212.
- Library of Congress. "For European Recovery: The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Marshall Plan Introduction." Accessed September 17, 2012. <http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/marshall/mars0.html>
- Library of Congress. "For European Recovery: The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Marshall Plan Soviet Opposition to the Marshall Plan." Accessed September 17, 2012. <http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/marshall/mars8.html>

- Library of Congress. "Map from *The Marshall Plan at Mid Mark, 1950.*" Accessed September 17, 2012. <http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/marshall/mars5.html>.
- Life Magazine. "Red Visitors Cause Rumpus." *Life*, April 4, 1949.
- Lucas, Scott. *Freedom's War: The U.S. Crusade Against the Soviet Union 1945-56.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- Moore, Christopher. "Socialist Realism and the Music of the French Popular Front." *The Journal of Musicology* 25 (2008): 473-502.
- Nabokov, Nicolas. *Old Friends and New Music.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1974
- National Archives and Records Administration. "Featured Documents: The Marshall Plan." Accessed September 17, 2012. http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured_documents/marshall_plan
- New York Times. "Copland is on Jury to Pick Best Music." *New York Times*, April 6, 1954.
- New York Times. "Notes of Discord Mar Festival in Paris; Communists Call it 'Caricature of Culture.'" *New York Times*, May 1, 1952.
- Pendleton, Edmund. "The Festival in Paris: Two Views." *Musical America*, July 1952.
- Pollack, Howard. "Copland, Aaron." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online.* Oxford University Press, accessed October 21, 2012, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/06422>.
- Psychological Strategy Board. "Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950–1955, The Intelligence Community, 1950–1955, Document 125." Accessed September 24, 2012. <http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1950-55Intel/d125>.
- Ross, Alex. *The Rest is Noise.* New York: Picador, 2007.
- Restagno, Enzo. "Petrassi, Goffredo." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online.* Oxford University Press, accessed October 17, 2012, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/21457>.
- Saunders, Frances Stonor. *The Cultural Cold War.* New York: New Press, 2000.

- Schmelz, Peter J. "Introduction: Music in the Cold War." *The Journal of Musicology* 26 (2009): 3-16.
- Schrecker, Ellen. *The Age of McCarthyism*. Boston: Bedford Books, 1994.
- Scott-Smith, Giles. *The Politics of Apolitical Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Shawe-Taylor, Desmond. "The Arts and Entertainment: A Summons from Rome." *The New Statesman and Nation*, March 13, 1954.
- Shreffler, Anne C. "Ideologies of Serialism: Stravinsky's *Threni* and the Congress for Cultural Freedom." In *Music and the Aesthetics of Modernity*, edited by Karol Berger and Anthony Newcomb, 217-245. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Silverberg, Laura. "Between Dissonance and Dissidence; Socialist Modernism in the German Democratic Republic." *The Journal of Musicology* 26 (2009): 44-84.
- Sprout, Leslie A. "The 1945 Stravinsky Debates: Nigg, Messiaen, and the Early Cold War in France." *The Journal of Musicology* 26 (2009): 85-131.
- Steinberg, Michael. "Bach Brightens Conference in Rome." *New York Times*, April 14, 1954, 25.
- Steinberg, Michael. "Conference of Musicians in Rome." *New York Times*, May 2, 1954, X7.
- Steinberg, Michael. "Contemporary Conference in Rome in April." *New York Times*, January 17, 1954, X7.
- Steinberg, Michael. "Milhaud Directs Concert in Rome." *New York Times*, April 7, 1954, 41.
- Steinberg, Michael. "Leontyne Price Soloist in Rome." *New York Times*, April 15, 1954, 34.
- Steinberg, Michael. "Peragallo Work Wins Rome Prize." *New York Times*, April 16, 1954, 17.
- Steinberg, Michael. "Rome Fete Hears 3 Chamber Works." *New York Times*, April 13, 1954, 40.
- Steinberg, Michael. "Rome Fete Upset by Turmoil." *New York Times*, April 9, 1954, 19.

Truman, Harry S. "Recommendation for Assistance to Greece and Turkey." H.R. Doc. No. 80- 171, 1947.

University of Chicago. "Records 1950-1979 (inclusive)," Accessed July 18, 2012. <http://lens.lib.uchicago.edu/?q=IACF>.

University of Texas at Austin. "Michael Josselson: An Inventory of His Papers at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center." Accessed September 17, 2012. <http://research.hrc.utexas.edu:8080/hrcxtf/view?docId=ead/00064.xml>.

University of Texas at Austin. "Nicolas Nabokov: An Inventory of His Papers at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center." Access September 17, 2012. <http://research.hrc.utexas.edu:8080/hrcxtf/view?docId=ead/00097.xml>.

United States Department of State. "Milestones 1945-1952 National Security Act of 1947." Accessed September 17, 2012. <http://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/NationalSecurityAct>

United States Department of State. "Milestones 1945-1952 Truman Doctrine." Accessed September 17, 2012. <http://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/TrumanDoctrine>.

U.S. Department of the Treasury. "Resource Center-Exchange Stabilization Fund." Accessed October 9, 2012. <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/international/ESF/Pages/esf-index.aspx>.

Wellens, Ian. *Music on the Frontline: Nicolas Nabokov's Struggle Against Communism and Middlebrow Culture*. Burlington, VT. : Ashgate, 2002.

Wilford, Hugh. *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Young, James S. "Communist Vulnerabilities to the Use of Music In Psychological Warfare." In *Music Since 1900*, edited by Nicolas Slonimsky, 1085-1096. New York: Schirmer Books, 1994.

Appendix A

Manifesto of the Congress for Cultural Freedom
Voted unanimously at Berlin, June 30, 1950 [sic]

1. We hold it to be self-evident that intellectual freedom is one of the inalienable rights of man.
2. Such freedom is defined first and foremost by his right to hold and express his own opinions, and particularly opinions which differ from those of his rulers. Deprived of the right to say "no," man becomes a slave.
3. Freedom and peace are inseparable. In any country, under any regime, the overwhelming majority of ordinary people fear and oppose war. The danger of war becomes acute when governments, by suppressing democratic representative institutions, deny to the majority the means of imposing its will to peace. Peace can be maintained only if each government submits to the control and inspection of its acts by the people whom it governs, and agrees to submit all questions immediately involving the risk of war to a representative international authority, by whose decision it will abide.
4. We hold that the main reason for the present insecurity of the world is that policy of governments which, while paying lip-service to peace, refuse to accept this double control. Historical experience proves that wars can be prepared and waged under any slogan, including that of peace. Campaigns of peace which are not backed by acts that will guarantee its maintenance are like counterfeit currency circulated for dishonest purposes. Intellectual sanity and physical security can only return to the world if such practices are abandoned.

5. Freedom is based on the toleration of divergent opinions. The principle of toleration does not logically permit the practice of intolerance.
6. No political philosophy or economic theory can claim the sole right to represent freedom in the abstract. We hold that the value of such theories is to be judged by the range of concrete freedom which they accord the individual in practice. We likewise hold that no race, nation, class, or religion can claim the sole right to represent the idea of freedom, nor the right to deny freedom to other groups or creeds in the name of any ultimate ideal or lofty aim whatsoever. We hold that the historical contribution of any society is to be judged by the extent and quality of the freedom which its members actually enjoy.
7. In time of emergency, restrictions on the freedom of the individual are imposed in the real or assumed interest of the community. We hold it to be essential that such restrictions be confined to a minimum of clearly specified actions; that they be understood to be temporary and limited expedients in the nature of a sacrifice; and that the measures restricting freedom be themselves subject to free criticism and democratic control. Only thus can we have a reasonable assurance that emergency measures restricting individual freedom will not degenerate into a permanent tyranny.
8. In totalitarian states restrictions on freedom are not longer intended and publicly understood as sacrifice imposed on the people, but are on the contrary represented as triumphs of progress and achievements of a superior civilization. We hold that both the theory and practice of these

regimes run counter to the basic rights of the individual and the fundamental aspirations of mankind as a whole.

9. We hold the danger represented by these regimes to be all the greater since their means of enforcement far surpasses that of all previous tyrannies in the history of mankind. The citizen of the totalitarian state is expected and forced not only to abstain from crime but to conform in all his thoughts and actions to a prescribed pattern. Citizens are persecuted and condemned on such unspecified and all-embracing charges as “enemies of the people” or “socially unreliable elements.”
10. We hold that there can be no stable world so long as mankind, with regard to freedom, remains divided into “haves” and “have-nots.” The defense of existing freedoms, the reconquest of lost freedoms, and the creation of new freedoms are parts of the same struggle.
11. We hold that the theory and practice of the totalitarian state are the greatest challenge which man has been called on to meet in the course of civilized history.
12. We hold that indifference or neutrality in the face of such a challenge amounts to a betrayal of mankind and to the abdication of the free mind. Our answer to this challenge may decide the fate of man for generations.
13. The defense of intellectual liberty today imposes a positive obligation: to offer new and constructive answer to the problems of our time.

14. We address this manifesto to all men who are determined to regain those liberties which they have lost and to preserve and extend those which they enjoy.

Appendix B

L'Œuvre du XXe Siècle List of Works Performed
 * denotes *Comédie des Champs-Élysées* Series Work

Georges Auric (1899-1983)

Coup de Feu (1952)
 A cappella choral work*

Johann Sebastian Bach (1685-1750)

Magnificat [likely 1732-1735]
 Cantata no. 6

Henk Badings (1907-1987)

A cappella choral work*

Samuel Barber (1910-1981)

Sonata for Piano* (1949)
 Overture: *The School for Scandal* (1931)

Elsa Barraine (1910-1999)

Suite for Violin and Piano*

Henri Barraud

*Le Testament Villon** (1945)

Béla Bartók (1881-1945)

Deux Portraits (1907-1910)
 Divertimento for Chamber Orchestra (1939)
 Piano Concerto no. 2 (1930-1931)
 Suite de Dances

Yves Baudrier (1906-1988)

*Mélodies**

Alban Berg (1885-1935)

Wozzeck (1922)

Hector Berlioz (1803-1869)

Overture from *Le carnaval romain* (1844)

Boris Blacher (1903-1975)

Variations on a Theme of Paganini (1975)

Pierre Boulez (b. 1925)

*Music for Two Pianos (Structures, Book I)** (1951-2)

Benjamin Britten (1913-1976)*Billy Budd* (1950-1)**Ferruccio Busoni (1866-1924)***Turandot***André Caplet (1878-1925)**

Septet for Cords, Vocal and Instruments* (1909)

Alfredo Casella (1883-1947)*Paganiniana* (1942)**Emmanuel Chabrier (1841-1894)***Bourée fantasque* (1891)**Ernest Chausson (1855-1899)***La jardin aux lilas* (1882-1890)**Aaron Copland (1900-1990)**Clarinet Concerto, *The Pied Piper* (1947)*El Salón México* (1932)**Luigi Dallapiccola (1904-1975)***Canti de Prigionia* (1938-1941)**Claude Debussy (1862-1918)***Trois Images* (perhaps *Images pour orchestre* (1905-1912))*La Mer* (1903-1905)*Prélude à l'Après-Midi d'un Faune* (1891-1894)'*Syrinx*' for Solo Flute* (1913)**Claude Delvincourt (1888-1954)**

A cappella choral work*

Sem Dresden (1881-1957)

A capella choral work*

Henri Dutilleux (b. 1916)

Chorale and Variations for Piano*

Manuel de Falla (1876-1946)

Concerto for Harpsichord and Six Instruments* (1926)

Suite from "*The Three Cornered Hat*" (1916-1921)

Gabriel Fauré (1845-1924)

Second Quintet for Piano and Strings* (1921)

Jean Francaix (1912-1997)

Double Variations for Cello and Strings*

Paul Hindemith (1895-1963)

Four Temperaments (1946)

Nobilissima visione (1938)

Symphonic Metamorphosis (1943)

Arthur Honegger (1892-1955)

Symphony no. 2 (1940-1941)

Symphony no. 5 (1950)

Anthony Hopkins

A cappella choral work*

Charles Ives (1874-1954)

*Concord Sonata** (1916-1919, rev. 1920-1940s)

Leos Janáček (1854-1928)

Concertino for Piano and Instruments* (1925)

André Jolivet (1905-1974)

String Quartet* (1934)

Zoltán Kodály (1882-1967)

A Capella choral work

Psalmus Hungaricus (1923)

Charles Koechlin (1867-1950)

Piece for Solo Flute*

Constant Lambert (1905-1951)

Concerto for Piano and Nine Instruments* (1930-1931)

Arthur Louriè (1891-1966)

Little Gidding, Four Intonations for Tenor and Instruments* (1952)

Gustav Mahler (1860-1911)

Das Lied von der Erde (1908-1909)

Francesco Malipiero (1882-1973)

La Terra (1946)

Roland Manuel (1891-1966)

Suite in Spanish Style for Harpsichord, Oboe, Bassoon and Trumpet* (1933)

Frank Martin (1890-1974)

Concerto for Violin and Orchestra (1950-1951)

Bohuslav Martinu (1890-1959)

Sonate di Camera, for Violoncello and Orchestra (1940)

Olivier Messiaen (1908-1992)

“Les Visions de l’Amen” for Two Pianos* (1943)

Darius Milhaud (1892-1974)

Les Choephores (1915-1916)

Finale *“Les Euménides”* (1917-1923)

Protée, Suite No. 2 (1919)

Roman Palester (1907-1989)

*Trois Sonnets à Orphée** (1951-1952)

Walton Piston (1894-1976)

Toccata (1948)

Ildebrando Pizzetti (1880-1968)

A cappella choral work*

Francis Poulenc (1899-1963)

Stabat Mater (1950-1951)

Serge Prokofiev (1891-1953)

Scythian Suite (1914-1915)

The Prodigal Son (1925-1926)

Symphony no. 1 (1916-1917)

Willem Pijper (1894-1947)

Symphony no. 3 (1926)

Serge Rachmaninoff (1873-1943)

Piano Concerto no. 2 (1900-1901)

Maurice Ravel (1875-1937)

Alborada del gracioso (from *Miroirs*, 1904-1905, 1918)

Piano Concerto (1929-1931)

Rhapsodie Espagnol (1907-1908)

La Valse (1920)

Valses Nobles et Sentimentales (1912)
Daphnis et Chloé, Suite No. 2 (1909-1912)

Ottorino Respighi (1879-1936)

Fontane di Roma (1915-1916)

Vittorio Rieti (1898-1994)

Don Perlimplin (1949)

Albert Roussel (1869-1937)

Suite in F (1926)
Bacchus et Ariadne (1930)

Erik Satie (1866-1925)

*Socrate** (1917-1918)

Henri Sauguet (1901-1989)

Cordélia (1952)

Arnold Schoenberg (1874-1951)

Erwartung (1909)
 String Quartet no. 2* (1919)

William Schuman (1910-1992)

Symphony no. 3 (1941)

Alexander Scriabin (1872-1915)

Sonata no. 10 for Piano* (1912-1913)

Dmitri Shostakovich (1906-1975)

Concert Suite from "*Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk*" (1930-1932)

Richard Strauss (1864-1949)

Til Eulenspiegel (1894-1895)
Don Juan (1888-1889)
 Excerpts from *Der Rosenkavalier* (1909-1910)

Igor Stravinsky (1882-1971)

L'oiseu de feu (1909-1910)
Orphée (1947)
Le Sacre du Printemps (1911-1913)
Concerto in D (1946)
Scènes de ballet (1944)
Oedipus Rex (1926-1927)
Symphony in C (1938-1940)
Capriccio for Piano (1928-1929)

Symphony in Three Movements (1942-1945)
La Cage [Ballet based on Concerto in D for String Orchestra (1946)]

Alexander Tansman (1897-1986)

A cappella choral work*

Peter Tchaikovsky (1840-1893)

Swan Lake (1875-1876)

Virgil Thomson (1896-1989)

Four Saints in Three Acts (1927-1928)

Michael Tippett (1905-1998)

A cappella choral work*

Edgard Varèse (1883-1965)

*Ionisation** (1929-1931)

Heitor Villa-Lobos (1887-1959)

"Chôros" for three horns and trombone* (1926)

Johann Wagenaar (1862-1941)

A cappella choral work

William Walton (1902-1983)

"Façade" for Narrator and Instruments*

Anton Webern (1883-1945)

A cappella choral work*

Five Pieces for String Quartet*

Ralph Vaughan-Williams (1872-1958)

Fantasy on a Theme of Thomas Tallis (1910)

Five Variants of *"Dives and Lazarus"** (1939)

Henry Zagwin

A cappella choral work*

Appendix C

La Musica nel XX Secolo List of Possible Works Performed

First column denotes composer listed in printed brochure
 Second column denotes composer listed in typed program list

Printed Brochure	Typed List
Georges Auric (1899-1983)	
Samuel Barber (1910-1981)	Samuel Barber (1910-1981) <i>Hermit Songs</i> (1952-3)
	Béla Bartók (1881-1945) <i>Cantata Profana</i> (1930)
Alban Berg (1885-1935)	Alban Berg (1885-1935) Three Pieces for Clarinet
Boris Blacher (1903-1975)	Boris Blacher (1903-1975) <i>Variations on a Theme of Paganini</i> (1947)
Benjamin Britten (1913-1976)	Benjamin Britten (1913-1976) <i>Michaelangelo</i> (1940)
	Ferruccio Busoni (1866-1924) <i>Berceuse élégiaque</i> (1909)
	Elliot Carter (1908-2012) String Quartet (1950-1951)
Alfredo Casella (1883-1947)	Alfredo Casella (1883-1947) Serenade for five instruments (1927, rev. 1930)
	Carlos Chávez (1899-1978) Symphony no. 5 (1954)
Aaron Copland (1900-1990)	Aaron Copland (1900-1990) Quartet for Piano (1950)
Luigi Dallapiccola (1904-1975)	Luigi Dallapiccola (1904-1975) <i>Canti Greci</i>

	Claude Delvincourt (1888-1954) String Quartet (1953)
Gottfried von Einem (1918-1996)	Gottfried von Einem (1918-1996) <i>Danton's tod</i> (1947)
Andrea Gabrieli (1510-1586)	
	Giovanni Gabrieli (ca. 1554-1612) <i>In Ecclesiis</i> (1615)
Manuel de Falla (1876-1946)	Manuel de Falla (1876-1946) Concerto for Harpsichord (1923-1926)
	Giorgio Federico Ghedini (1892-1965) <i>L'alderina</i> (1950)
Karl Amadeus Hartmann (1905-1963)	Karl Amadeus Hartmann (1905-1963) Concert for Piano
	Hans Werner Henze (1926-2012) <i>Boulevard Solitude</i> (1952)
Paul Hindemith (1895-1963)	Paul Hindemith (1895-1963) <i>Concerto for Orchestra</i> (1925)
Arthur Honegger (1892-1955)	Arthur Honegger (1892-1955) <i>Symphonic Movement</i>
Jacques Ibert (1890-1962)	Jacques Ibert (1890-1962) Concerto for Oboe (1948-1949)
Leos Janáček (1854-1928)	Leos Janáček (1854-1928) Concertino for Piano and Seven Instruments
Gian Francesco Malipiero (1882-1973)	Gian Francesco Malipiero (1882-1973) <i>Elegy-capriccio</i> (1953)
Riccardo Malipiero (1914-2003)	Riccardo Malipiero (1914-2003) <i>Seven Variations for Voice and Piano</i> (1951)

Frank Martin (1890-1974)	
Olivier Messiaen (1908-1992)	Olivier Messiaen (1908-1992) <i>Sonata for Piano</i> <i>Cantiyo d'jaya</i> [sic] (1949)
Darius Milhaud (1892-1974)	Darius Milhaud (1892-1974) Symphony no. 5 (1953)
Claudio Monteverdi (1567-1643)	Claudio Monteverdi (1567-1643) <i>Magnificat</i>
	Riccardo Nielsen (1908-1982) <i>Sonatina</i>
Luigi Nono (1924-1990)	Luigi Nono (1924-1990) <i>Piece for Solo Flute and String</i> [probably <i>Epitaph for Garcia Lorca</i> no. 2 (1951-1953)]
Goffredo Petrassi (1904-2003)	Goffredo Petrassi (1904-2003) <i>Coro Dei Morti</i> (1940-1941)
Ildebrando Pizzetti (1880-1968)	Ildebrando Pizzetti (1880-1968) Choral Works
Francis Poulenc (1899-1963)	Francis Poulenc (1899-1963) <i>La Messe a la Vierge Noire</i> (1947)
Sergei Prokofiev (1891-1953)	Sergei Prokofiev (1891-1953) Four [sic] Songs, based on poems by Akhmatova [possible misprint of <i>Five Poems</i> (1916)]
Alan Rawsthorne (1905-1971)	Alan Rawsthorne (1905-1971) Concerto for Piano
Vittorio Rieti (1898-1994)	Vittorio Rieti (1898-1994) Partita for Harpsichord and Six Instruments (1945)
Albert Roussel (1869-1937)	Albert Roussel (1869-1937) Concerto for Orchestra

Erik Satie (1866-1925)	Erik Satie (1866-1925) <i>Socrate</i> (1917-1918)
Henri Sauguet (1901-1989)	Henri Sauguet (1901-1989) <i>La Voyante</i> (1932)
Arnold Schoenberg (1874-1951)	Arnold Schoenberg (1874-1951) Arrangement of Brahms Piano Quartet, op.25 (1937)
Dmitri Shostakovich (1906-1975)	
Igor Stravinsky (1882-1971)	Igor Stravinsky (1882-1971) <i>Orpheé</i> (1947) <i>Scherzo à la Russe</i> (1945) <i>Norwegian Moods</i> (1942) <i>Scènes de Ballet</i> (1944) <i>L'oiseu de Feu</i> (1909-1910) Septet (1953)
	Vieri Tosatti (b. 1920) <i>Il Sistema della Dolcezza</i> (1951)
Virgil Thomson (1896-1989)	Virgil Thomson (1896-1989) <i>Orchestral Pictures</i>
Guido Turchi (b. 1916)	Guido Turchi (b. 1916) String Quartet (1940)
Fartein Valen (1887-1952)	Fartein Valen (1887-1952) <i>Pastorale</i> , op.11 (1930)
Edgard Varèse (1883-1965)	Edgard Varèse (1883-1965) <i>Octandre</i> (1924)
Ralph Vaughan-Williams (1872-1958)	
Anton Webern (1883-1945)	Anton Webern (1883-1945) <i>Das Augenlicht</i> (1935)

Competition composers

Yves Baudrier (1906-1988)
Conard Beck (1901-1989)
Beroud Bergel, (b. 1909)
Peter Racine Fricker (1920-1990)
Camargo Guarnieri (1907-1993)
Lou Harrison (1917-2003)
Giselher Klebe (b. 1925)
Jean Louis Martinet (1912-2010)
Mario Peragallo (1910-1996)
Camillo Togni (1922-1993)
Wladimir Vogel (1896-1984)
Ben Weber (1916-1979)

Appendix D

Discussions held at *La Musica nel XX Secolo***Music and Contemporary Society**

Chairman:

Domingo Santa Cruz, Chilean critic and UNESCO delegate

Prepared speaker:

Roland Manuel, French composer

Panelists:

Fedele D'Amico, Italian critic

Massimo Mila, Italian critic

Darius Milhaud, French composer

Alan Rawsthorne, English composer

Nicolas Nabokov, Russian-American composer

Style, Aesthetics, and Technique

Chairman:

Paul Collaer, Belgian director of "Radio Brussels"

Prepared speaker:

Frederick Goldbeck, Dutch critic

Panelists:

Boris Blacher, German composer

Elliot Carter, American composer

Massimo Mila, Italian critic

Riccardo Malipiero, Italian composer

Mario Labroca, Italian performer

Roman Vlad, Italian performer

Composer, Performer, and Public

Chairman:

Aaron Copland, American composer

Prepared speaker:

Roman Vlad, Italian performer

Panelists:

Jack Bornoff, English UNESCO delegate

Yvonne Lefebure, French performer

Edward Lockspeiser, English critic

Goffredo Petrassi, Italian composer

Erwin Stein, English critic

Music and Politics

Chairman:

Nicolas Nabokov, Russian-American composer
(replacing Claude Delvincourt, French composer)

Prepared speaker:

Rollo Meyers, English critic

Panelists:

Jacques de Menasce, American composer

Roman Palester,

Hans Stuckenschmidt, German critic

Mario Zafred, Italian critic

Composer and Critic

Chairman:

Gian Francesco Malipiero, Italian composer

Prepared speaker:

Virgil Thomson, American critic and composer

Panelists:

Henri GagnebiL, Swiss composer

William Glock, English critic

Frederick Goldbeck, Dutch critic

Guido Pannain, Italian critic

Heinrich Strobel, German critic

The Future of Opera

Chairman:

Sir Stuart Wilson, English critic

Prepared Speaker:

Henri Sauguet, French composer

Panelists:

Gottfried von Einem, German composer

Hans Werner Henze, German composer

Rolf Liebermann, Swiss composer

Gian Francesco Malipiero, Italian composer

Humphrey Searle, English critic