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This thesis examines the complexities of the Inter-American Music Festivals, and how the festivals subsequently affected noted Argentine composer, Alberto Ginastera. These festivals, held in Washington D.C. and sponsored by the Organization of American States, arose during the height of the United States-Soviet conflict, when hemispheric solidarity presented the best defense against communism’s encroachment. As such, these festivals employed music to cultivate an inter-American alliance within the Cold War environment. Further, they constructed an image of American unity that could be projected around the globe.

Inter-Americanism has existed since the 1830’s, yet a definition remains elusive—and controversial. It has taken on a myriad of meanings for various scholars and politicians, contingent upon the time period and the user’s proximity to power. Despite its nebulous qualities, inter-Americanism does have one distinguishing feature. Its importance increases exponentially when the United States is involved in a crisis. During the 1950’s, inter-Americanism provided an antidote to Latin American political nationalism. Some U.S. politicians felt that this “third-world nationalism,” if left untreated, could develop into an all-out communist infestation. The Organization of American States (OAS) imbued their various economic and diplomatic strategies to subvert communist activities in Latin America with inter-American rhetoric. Similarly,
inter-American tropes also surface in the discourse surrounding the Inter-American Music Festivals, endowing the event with political connotations.

The festival’s inter-American aims affected the music selected, which also had repercussions for the composers participating in the first festival. Ginastera’s career offers the most intriguing intersection of politics of inter-Americanism and creative impetus. In 1958, Ginastera was on the cusp of a stylistic change from nationalism to serialism. In his Second String Quartet, commissioned for the first festival, Ginastera assimilated international trends into his markedly Argentinean style. By the second festival of 1961, Ginastera had completely immersed himself in avant-garde techniques, earning him critical praise and worldwide recognition. Ginastera’s switch to a highly dissonant, serialist style, when placed within the context of Cold War inter-Americanism, sheds new light on the composer and his compositions.
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INTRODUCTION

The fostering of an inter-American alliance has long been at the political and cultural forefront of the countries of the Western Hemisphere, even more so during times of crisis. As the Cold War escalated, the U.S. government promoted hemispheric cooperation as a way to stave off Soviet encroachment in Latin America. The Inter-American Music Festivals, beginning in 1958, presented a musical manifestation of American solidarity at a time when unity constituted an utmost priority. In addition to their displays of “inter-American amity in action,” the festivals also premiered pivotal works from some of the greatest composers in North and South America. The debuts of Alberto Ginastera’s Second String Quartet (1958), Piano Concerto no. 1 (1961), and *Cantata for Magic America* (1961) under the Festivals’ auspices did much to secure his international reputation. \(^1\) Ginastera’s Second String Quartet also announced his third stylistic period, marked by the dominance of serial techniques. This thesis examines the political context surrounding the Inter-American Music Festivals and Ginastera’s music within that context.

Some scholars have considered Ginastera’s early works in the *gauchesco* idiom as well as his controversial opera, *Bomarzo*. \(^2\) Others have explored the technical aspects of

---

the composer’s later style. Yet, scholars have largely avoided the middle area of Ginastera’s career, when his abstract, dissonant language emerged from a folk-influenced tonality. Likewise, little work has been done on Ginastera’s relationship to the Inter-American Music Festivals, which introduced the composer to an international audience, garnering him commissions and important connections. Situating Ginastera within this context will present a fuller picture of a composer whose influence continues to this day.

Reviews and primary source information from this period help bring the picture into focus. The festival’s programs from 1958 and 1961 are an invaluable resource as are Gilbert Chase’s writings on Ginastera in the years leading up to the first Inter-American Music Festival. Likewise, critiques by Chase, Robert Evett, Howard Taubman, Irving Lowens, and Pola Suárez Urtubey offer insights into both the musical and extra-musical features that made Ginastera’s compositions so successful. Ginastera’s own comments on the Festival and his compositions illuminate the possible effects of inter-Americanism upon his career.

---


Despite the lack of critical discussion of the festivals themselves, there is scholarship on the two major organizations responsible for the festival, the Pan American Union and The Organization of American States (OAS). While most of it pertains to their diplomatic functions, some information is music related. For example, Charles Fenwick details music’s role in the promotion of cultural interests as one of the important functions of the OAS. Likewise, John Haskins and Leila Fern have penned brief but informative overviews of Music Division’s formation within the Pan American Union. Likewise, several musicologists have explored music’s connection to the Cold War. For instance, Martin Brody investigates Milton Babbitt’s relationship to Cold War theories of mass culture. Jennifer DeLapp’s dissertation dissects the Copland-McCarthy hearings with provocative results. Amy Beal delves into the interaction of U.S. cultural diplomacy and avant-garde music in postwar Germany. Ian Wellens discusses U.S. cultural intervention during the Cold War through the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Peter Schmelz examines Cold War policies within a Soviet context and the consequences of writing avant-garde music. Most recently, David Paul illuminated Henry and Sidney

Cowell’s construction of Charles Ives as a Cold War exemplar.\textsuperscript{14} Scholars have yet to tackle the Latin American side of Cold War politics, however. Nor have any significant Latin American composers been considered in this context.

Chapter One delves into the history—and controversies—of inter-Americanism. This elusive ideal is best described by the phrase, “unity with diversity.” In the political arena, leaders sought to unite the Americas without infringing upon any one country’s sovereignty. In the musical sphere, critics carefully divested inter-Americanism of any hegemonic implications, emphasizing equality and liberty. This amalgam would “succeed in achieving not one world, nor one musical language, but a familiar mixture of tongues, commonly known and commonly understood. For that is Panamericanism, in music.”\textsuperscript{15}

Chapter Two discusses the network of governmental organizations responsible for promoting hemispheric cooperation, focusing on the Pan American Union and the Organization of American States. I detail the creation of a music division within the Pan American Union, and how the Union subsequently employed music to promote continental cohesion. Additionally, I examine precursors to the Inter-American Music Festivals, namely the Latin American Music Festivals held in Caracas, Venezuela in 1954 and 1957.

Chapter Three begins with an assessment of the Cold War musical climate and how these values interacted with inter-Americanism. I also explore the polemics of nationalism, perhaps the most sensitive topic in this environment. Drawing upon both


\textsuperscript{15} Haskins, “Pan-Americanism,” 47.
political and musical viewpoints, I consider the connotations surrounding nationalism, from its suspected alliance with communism to its artistic sublimation. This discussion sets the stage for the Inter-American Music Festivals. After an introduction to the key players, I examine the complexities of the festival, with its debates about nationalism, serialism, autonomy, and what inter-Americanism meant.

Chapter Four devotes itself to Ginastera and his relationship to the festival. I also chronicle his stylistic change from a nationalistic idiom to a more avant-garde expression. Two pieces, his Second String Quartet and his Cantata for Magic America, highlight his serial development. Finally, I delve into the consequences of Ginastera’s involvement in the festivals and the impact they made on his creative life. Chapter Five reflects on the significance of the Inter-American Music Festivals in Latin American composer’s careers. It also offers a glimpse into the complexities that arise when art becomes diplomacy.
CHAPTER I.
UNDERSTANDING PAN-AMERICANISM

Latin American and U.S. relations have a long, twisted past, spawning many “isms” along the way. Pan-Americanism, interchangeable with inter-Americanism, is perhaps the most important and enigmatic. Many governmental organizations, such as the Pan American Union and Organization of American States (OAS), devote themselves to pursuing Pan-Americanism. But what is this elusive ideal? In its simplest reduction, Inter or Pan-Americanism is a set of practices seeking to strengthen relationships among the countries of the Americas. Pan-Americanism has also accumulated other connotations, making it a complex—and controversial—subject. Many U.S. political leaders have cast Pan-Americanism in a positive light. For example, 14 April or Pan American Day, marks the creation of the inter-American system in 1890. According to the 1930 resolution, this day celebrates “the voluntary union of all in one continental community.”

When Pan-Americanism was revived in the 1950’s, President Eisenhower loftily described it as hemispheric “unity, peace, trust and fellowship.” Recent scholars, however, state that the reality of Pan-Americanism is far from ideal. Gordon Connell-Smith, for example, argues that Pan American Day, and Pan-Americanism in general, is a hollow attempt at unity since the United States rarely follows through with its promises to

---

Latin America. Moreover, the United States only shifts its focus southward when there is a challenge to its hegemony.\(^{18}\) Eldon Kenworthy notes that certain critical moments, such as World War II, renewed the U.S.—Latin American partnership; however, the camaraderie was fleeting.\(^{19}\) Some Latin American composers echo these sentiments. Panamanian composer Roque Cordero, Guggenheim recipient and former director of the National Institute of Music of Panama, has recently stated “As many of my colleagues say, ‘The United States looks East and West, but never South.’”\(^{20}\) Yet, during the Cold War, the United States needed a neighborly alliance and as such, increased interest in Pan-Americanism. This desire gave birth to the Inter-American Music Festivals, which sought hemispheric solidarity and inter-American amity through music. These festivals require contextualization within a broader schema, beginning with one of the earliest inter-American interactions, namely the Monroe Doctrine.

**The Beginnings of The Inter-American System**

It seems improbable that such a short document drafted in 1823 should have a far-reaching impact on inter-American relations. Yet for over a century, the Monroe Doctrine has been a cardinal guide for U.S. diplomacy toward Latin America.\(^{21}\) The doctrine meant to forge an independent continent and save newly sovereign South American countries from European intervention or re-colonization. It also stressed the divide between the New World and the Old, stating “We should consider any attempt on their


\(^{20}\) Roque Cordero, Taped Interview by Alyson Payne, 29 Sept. 2006.

part [European powers] to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as
dangerous to our peace and safety.”

For a moment, it appeared that the doctrine would encourage and assist American unity. However, the equitable inter-American system that many envisioned vanished when the United States declared that it wanted no permanent entanglements with its sister republics. At this juncture, the United States was more invested in keeping Europe at bay and strengthening its own burgeoning political might. In fact, several decades passed before establishing any hemispheric alliance among the Americas once again became important.

One of the first significant attempts at hemispheric unity occurred at the First International Conference of American States (1889-1890). The conference had ambitious aims but few successful results. The most important outcome was the creation of the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics. The Bureau dealt with economic issues, such as inter-American trade and customs regulations. It was headquartered in Washington D.C. under the supervision of the U.S. Secretary of State. Despite its small beginnings, this organization became pivotal in subsequent years, developing into a powerful force.

During the intervening years, the Commercial Bureau grew. So much so that in 1910 at an Inter-American Conference in Buenos Aires, a motion passed that created out of the much enlarged Commercial Bureau, an organization re-titled the Pan American Union. The name for this retooled organization was aptly chosen because of its focus on advancing Pan American unity. The Union would promote inter-American cooperation

23 Aguilar, Pan-Americanism, 28.
in all areas, not just economic, but social, cultural, and diplomatic.\textsuperscript{24} The value of this inter-American friendship appreciated when hard times rocked the hemisphere.

The stock market plunge of 1929 threw the United States into a deep economic depression. During this crisis, the United States softened its aggressive stance on Latin American relations, trading in the “Big Stick” of one Roosevelt for the “Good Neighbor Policy” of another. Franklin D. Roosevelt’s inter-American diplomatic approach sought to restore respect and fairness toward Latin America.\textsuperscript{25} This re-kindling of good relations came at an opportune moment, and when ominous clouds formed over Europe, the U.S. drew upon Latin American support. Truly, the threat of war hung heavily over the Eighth International Conference of American States when it met in Lima in December of 1938.\textsuperscript{26} The conference reaffirmed the importance of hemispheric solidarity, stressing the defense of continental integrity through a collective security agreement.\textsuperscript{27} This agreement, known as the Declaration of Lima, stated that the American republics would now act in concert if one nation fell under attack.\textsuperscript{28} This declaration marked a momentous shift in the inter-American system. For the first time, hemispheric military defense became part of inter-Americanism. While initially a reaction to outside threats, the concept of hemispheric security would soon apply to internal subversive elements as well.

After the close of the Second World War, conflict again appeared on the horizon. Germany’s defeat and the destruction wrought in Europe created a political vacuum. The

\textsuperscript{25} Aguilar, \textit{Pan-Americanism}, 69.
\textsuperscript{26} Fenwick, \textit{The Organization of American States}, 62.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 63.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
balance of power had shifted, tipping precariously toward the Soviet Union. As the
Soviet Union extended its reach into Western Europe, the United States became
increasingly concerned with Stalin and his territorial aims. It was against this polarized
backdrop that the need for hemispheric solidarity and the containment of communism
came so sharply into focus.

This Soviet encroachment affected the Ninth Conference of American States, held
in Bogotá on 30 March-2 May 1948. During the conference, the delegates addressed the
“new menace of international communism” and other issues stemming from growth in
Soviet power. The consensus called for a fortification of American strength that would
keep the Soviets in check. This resolution resulted in the creation of the Organization of
American States (OAS), which forged a more powerful hemispheric alliance than its
predecessor, the Pan American Union. The countries involved in the OAS would work
together to “achieve an order of peace and justice, to promote their solidarity, to
strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity,
and their independence.”

In addition to increased cooperation and protecting each country’s sovereignty,
the OAS charter also contained a resolution addressing the spread of communism.
According to the resolution, The Preservation and Defense of Democracy in America,
international communism was “seeking to distort the true and free will of the peoples of
this continent.” The resolution further condemned communism declaring:

29 Ibid., 260.
30 Ibid., 82.
31 Organization of American States, “Charter, Resolution no. 32: The Preservation and
That by its anti-democratic nature and its interventionist tendency, the political activity of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine is incompatible with the concept of American freedom.\textsuperscript{32}

The sentiment of the resolution was simple: keep communism out of the Americas. Achieving this task, however, was more complex. The U.S. government and the OAS took a multifaceted approach, enlisting military, economic, and cultural strategies to combat communism. As such, music became an accessory to the hemispheric cooperation necessary to the maintenance of “American freedom.”

\textbf{Pan-Americanism in Music}

The Pan American Union and OAS realized that, in some instances, they could build more friendships with concerts than conferences. However, music’s incorporation into the inter-American system took time. A formal Music Division within the Pan American Union came about only after decades of work. Beginning in 1924, Franklin Adams, counselor of the Pan American Union, proposed a Latin American concert series. The concerts began with Adams’s arrangements of pieces for the United States Army Band: compositions such as the overture to \textit{Il Guarany} by Carlos Gomes of Brazil, \textit{El Cóndor Pasa} by Daniel Alomía Robles of Peru, and \textit{Inca Steps} by Carlos Valderrama of Peru.\textsuperscript{33} The Union presented approximately ninety-three performances from 1924-1939 and while most were band concerts, the Union also featured recitals by a variety of Latin American artists.\textsuperscript{34} Moreover, the Union transmitted many of these concerts to other

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{34} Salas, \textit{Notes}, 30.
American Republics through short-wave radio, enhancing inter-American musical 
exchange.35

Music’s value in inter-American relations became increasingly apparent as the 
need for solidarity intensified. For example, although impending war monopolized the 
Eighth International Conference of American States (Lima, 1938), music wriggled its 
way into the conversation. Resolution 69 affirmed music’s importance stating, “a wider 
reciprocal knowledge of the important contribution of the American Republics in the 
field of music may constitute a valuable means of strengthening the relations between 
their peoples.”36 The conference then requested that the Pan American Union oversee 
the creation of a music center.37 To that end, on 18-19 October 1939 in Washington D.C., 
the State Department held a meeting entitled “Conference on Inter-American Relations in 
the Field of Music.” Top Latin-American music scholars attended, most notably Charles 
Seeger, Carleton Sprague Smith, and Nicolas Slonimsky.38 The participants stressed the 
need for an inter-American music center, a hub devoted to cataloguing, preserving, and 
sharing the classical and folk music of the Western Hemisphere. Through their efforts, 
and with the aid of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Library of Congress, 
the Council of National Defense, and a sizeable grant from the Carnegie Corporation, the 
Music Division of the Pan American Union, also known as the Inter-American Music 
Center (IAMC), came into being in 1941.39 Seeger became its first chief.40

36 Salas, Notes, 24.
37 Ibid.
Relations in the Field of Music,” (Washington, D.C.: Department of State, Division of 
Cultural Relations,1940), 2.
39 Charles Seeger, “Inter-American Relations in the Field of Music,” Music Educators 
Journal 27 no. 5 (1941), 17.
This position suited Seeger, for it combined his knowledge of Latin America with his experience in government. Seeger had previously served as a musical technical adviser to Roosevelt’s Resettlement Administration from 1935-1937. Later, from 1937-1941, he worked as the deputy director of the Federal Music Project of the Works Progress Administration.  

Under Seeger, the Music Division developed several ways to enhance inter-American cooperation. These included a continuing concert series featuring Latin American composers and performers, music education programs, and the publication of scores, books, and quarterlies on Latin American topics. These books, perhaps the Music Division’s most enduring legacy, were often published in Spanish and English, and authored by those within the organization. For example, Vannet Lawler served as a consultant to the Music Division while she was associate executive secretary to the Music Educators National Conference (MENC). She also authored *Educación Musical en 14 Repúblicas Americanas/Music Education in 14 American Republics*, which stimulated interest in Latin America among educators.  

While at the Music Division, Seeger straddled the fine line between promoting the arts and blatant propaganda. Seeger thought the arts occupied a prominent place in

---

40 Haskins, “Pan-Americanism,” 44.  
42 Fern, “Origin,” 14. Lawler also chronicled the visits of prestigious educators to U.S. in the spring of 1942. Antonio Sá Pereira of Brazil, Domingo Santa Cruz of Chile, Luis Sandi of Mexico, José Castañeda of Guatemala, Esther Neira de Calvo of Panama, and Juan Bautista Plaza of Venezuela were invited by the Pan American Union, with funds provided by the Rockefeller Foundation, to tour various educational institutions. The crux of their visit was to attend the MENC conference held 27 March-4 April 1942 in Milwaukee, WI.
international relations, and could foster communication among nations. However, he also
realized the inherent problems of using the arts for political ends. As he stated in 1949:

> This is, in a nutshell, the dilemma faced by art programs in the foreign relations of
all national governments: to gain the best reception they must appear to be
objective, but to have continued financial support they must propaganda.
Obviously, it is only upon rare occasions that they can succeed in being both.43

The Inter-American Music Festivals organized by Seeger and his colleagues
strove to be free of political connotations; still, as long as the festivals received support
from a political organization, they could only feign objectivity. The festivals, while
appearing impartial, actually projected the ideals of inter-Americanism as encouraged by
the OAS. Yet, it was such a “rare occasion,” as Seeger described, since the political
subtext of the festivals went largely unnoticed by participants and audiences alike.

In 1949, the Music Division received another invaluable addition, Guillermo
Espinosa.44 A consummate conductor, Espinosa had expertise in coordinating music
festivals, having almost single-handedly organized the Ibero-American Music Festival
(1938) in Bogotá. He also helped create the Festival of Cartagena de Indias in his native
city of Cartagena. Espinosa’s experience and enthusiasm would prove vital to the
creation of the Inter-American Music Festivals.

With Espinosa on board, the Music Division expanded, and in 1950 began
publishing a magazine, the *Boletín de Música y Artes Visuales* (Music and Visual Arts
Bulletin) that circulated throughout Latin America free of charge. Once the *Boletín*
obtained more than 6,000 subscribers, the Division dropped the visual arts component to
focus on music. The renamed bulletin, *Boletín Interamericano de Música* (Inter-

---
43 Charles Seeger, “The Arts in International Relations,” *Journal of the American
Musicological Society* 2 no. 1 (1949), 41.
44 Haskins, “Pan-Americanism,” 45.
American Music Bulletin) offered in-depth coverage of musical life in the Americas and achieved modest popularity. An English equivalent, The Inter-American Music Bulletin, did not appear until the late 1950’s.⁴⁵

Seeger eventually retired from his position in 1953, and Espinosa succeeded him as chief. With Seeger’s sound foundation and Espinosa’s leadership, the Music Division’s responsibilities increased until the need for a new, sub-organization arose. This organization, established in 1956, was called the Inter-American Music Center (IAMC), and in 1960, renamed the Inter-American Music Council/Consejo Interamericano de Música (CIDEM). In both instances, the Music Division continued to act as its secretariat.⁴⁶ The Inter-American Music Center and the Music Division shared many of the same objectives, although the Center’s projects mainly concerned the interchange of musicians throughout the Americas. In fact, the Inter-American Music Center, under the auspices of the OAS, was an integral part of the First Inter-American Music Festival, which took place in 1958 in Washington, D.C. The officers of the IAMC who made the first festival a reality included: Jesus Durón, president; Chase, first vice-president; Aurelio de la Vega, second vice-president; Ginastera, third vice-president; and Cordero, general secretary.⁴⁷

Although all of these men greatly contributed to the festivals, Chase and Ginastera perhaps played the most prominent role. Born in Havana, Chase (1906-1992)
was one of the foremost scholars on Spanish and Latin American music. He was also a prominent critic; his reviews of the Inter-American Music Festivals and his commentaries on Ginastera did much to mold public and scholarly opinions on these two subjects, as we shall see. Moreover, when the Inter-American Music Center was renamed the Inter-American Music Council in 1960, Chase became its first president. He also served on the commissions committee for the first two festivals.

The Inter-American Music Festivals, sponsored by the Pan American Union, the Inter-American Music Center, and the OAS, sprang from the diligence of all involved. Espinosa, Seeger, Chase, and a host of others contributed to this undertaking. And what a daunting task it was! Lack of financial support and a dearth of enthusiasm for contemporary or Latin American music presented very real obstacles. During the fourth Inter-American Music Festival (1968), Ginastera reflected upon the disbelief once faced by Espinosa, as he gathered resources for the Festivals. As Ginastera commented, “At the beginning, only a few people trusted in the wild projects of the idealistic Guillermo Espinosa. Many called him crazy, while the more charitable called him unrealistic.”

Espinosa assembled dedicated patrons and enlisted the help of those familiar with organizing large festivals. He borrowed some of the same people and pieces from previous festivals held in Latin America, such as the Festival of Latin American Music

---

held in Caracas. This festival served as a template for the Inter-American Festivals of Washington.

The Festival of Latin American Music

Exploration of this precursor illuminated some of the choices made for the Inter-American Festivals, particularly concerning personnel. The Festival of Latin American Music was first held in Caracas from 22 November—10 December 1954. The Institución José Angel Lamas, a cultural organization directed by Inocente Palacios, sponsored the events as well as a composition competition.\(^{51}\) All of the compositions featured were by Latin Americans, although the U.S. did send two representatives, Virgil Thomson and Aaron Copland. Despite the festival’s grand scale, it garnered scant U.S. press coverage. Indeed, Copland’s report on the festival provided the bulk of the U.S. commentary. His laudatory review, published in both the *New York Times* and *Tempo*, focused on the festival’s composition winners, namely Juan José Castro of Argentina for his *Corales Criollos*, Carlos Chávez of Mexico for his *Sinfonía No. 3*, and Julián Orbón of Cuba for his *Three Symphonic Versions*. Although the overall quality of the festival pleased Copland, he did note the absence of dodecaphonic music. Tellingly, he pointed out that “The program planners seemed to me to over-emphasize the folk-lore inspired side of South American music.”\(^{52}\)

The second Festival of Latin American Music, held 19 March—6 April of 1957 in Caracas, was again organized by the Institución José Angel Lamas under the direction of Palacios. For the second festival, Palacios delegated some tasks to Cuban author and


musicologist Alejo Carpentier, who stepped in as executive secretary. As with the previous festival, Palacios provided much of the funding for the events. As Chase stated, “The moving spirit behind all this activity—financial and otherwise—is Inocente Palacios.” Thanks in part to Palacios’s generosity, the second Caracas festival was also larger in scope, and received more attention in the United States, perhaps because of its inclusion. While the first festival lacked any United States compositions, the second devoted an entire concert to works from the United States. Critic Howard Taubman explained the gesture, “The Latin American Festival turned over the whole program to the United States, which, because it is a guest, was the only country in the Americas so treated.” The concert consisted of Gail Kubik’s Thunderbolt Overture, Copland’s Lincoln Portrait, Samuel Barber’s Adagio for Strings, Roy Harris’s Third Symphony, Thomson’s Suite from Louisiana Story, and Charles Ives’s The Unanswered Question. Surprisingly, the U.S. offerings were rather conservative. As Chase remarked, “[Ives’s] was the most modern piece of all, though it was written in 1908!”

Despite Ives’s post-mortem modernity, Copland garnered the most success of any U.S. composer at this festival. Although he had been merely an observer before, Copland now judged the entries along with Chávez, Ginastera, Juan Bautista Plaza, and Domingo Santa Cruz. Additionally, his “Fanfare for the Common Man” opened the festival, while his Lincoln Portrait greatly pleased the audience. As Taubman reported:

---

56 Chase, “Caracas,” 12.
57 Ibid.
The piece that stirred the audience most last night was Copland’s “Lincoln Portrait.” It had a rousing effect for several reasons: the honesty of its feeling as music, the conviction of its performance, and the challenge of its extra-musical message.\(^58\)

Copland’s *Lincoln Portrait* also caused a stir in the U.S. because of its extra-musical associations. The composition’s removal from Eisenhower’s inauguration in 1953 sparked the investigation of Copland by Senator McCarthy.\(^59\) The deletion had little to do with the musical content; Copland’s suspected communist sympathies overshadowed any aesthetic concerns.\(^60\) Many in the music world protested the ban, with Taubman calling the work “deeply patriotic.” Likewise, Claire Reis, chair of the board of the League of Composers (1923-48), defended Copland’s music as “pure Americana.”\(^61\) Yet, Copland would endure much ridicule and suspicion from the government for years to come.\(^62\)

Other composers scored hits with their less politically charged compositions. For example, Cordero’s Symphony no. 2 and Blas Galindo’s Symphony no. 2 both won top prizes in Caracas. These pieces later received their U.S. debut at the first Inter-American Music Festival (1958). Likewise, Mozart Camargo Guarnieri of Brazil shared an award for his *Choro* for piano and orchestra. Interestingly, Chase noted that Guarnieri’s piece, the most conservative Latin American entry, was also, in his words, “the most

\(^{58}\) Taubman, “Music: Magical Impact,” 12.
\(^{60}\) Ibid., 66.
\(^{62}\) For example, records indicate that in the fall of 1957 the FBI was still monitoring Copland as he taught in Buffalo (DeLapp, 173).
\(^{63}\) Chase, “Caracas,” 11.
controversial of the four prize-winning scores.” Guarnieri’s composition shocked audiences because of its accessibility, which set it apart from the dissonant and difficult pieces of his peers. Chase explained, “Those who tended to disparage the work claimed that it was a Brazilian mixture of Gershwin and Rachmaninoff.”

It was Cordero’s Symphony no. 2, however, that shone brightest among the entries. Moreover, it foreshadowed the musical requirements of inter-Americanism during the Cold War. While inter-Americanism intertwined with the contemporaneous aesthetic of abstraction, individualism, and internationalism, its preoccupation with hemispheric unity distinguished it from the prevailing trends. In one sense, inter-Americanism required that music be free from local influences, and use “international” techniques. On the other hand, a composer should not abandon his roots. An international style should incorporate nationalistic touches, creating an amalgam of the local and the global. This conflation of cultures best represented the “diversity and unity” to which inter-Americanism aspired.

Critical responses to Cordero’s symphony reflected some of those tenets. For example, critic Richard Goldman commented that “The Symphony is international in style, if by that term one is entitled to mean that it shows awareness of the century’s leading ideas and is not devoted to local color or musical ethnology.” Additionally, Cordero imbued these international techniques, mainly serialism, with individuality. Cordero did not strictly adhere to the rhetoric of serialism; rather he adapted it to his own
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voice. As Taubman declared, “Señor Cordero is a twelve-tone man, but he is also his own man.”

In the Americas, using abstract techniques and avoiding the folkloric were two traits common in the Cold War era. The question of identity, however, was almost exclusively inter-American. In his critique of Cordero’s Symphony no. 2, Chase addressed this question as he considered national elements within the international, and also what it meant to be “American”:

There was some discussion as to whether the work [Cordero’s Symphony no. 2] is in any sense “American.” Actually, it contains some allusion to typical Panamanian rhythms, such as that of the tamborito. But such allusions would pass unnoticed by an outsider. Whatever national elements this music may embody have been sublimated in the composer’s creative consciousness and emerge as aspects of his total personality. This is, perhaps, the goal toward which most “American” music aspires today.

By disguising local influences and integrating national elements into one’s personality, a composer could reach the goal of being American, in the broadest sense of the word. In the mid-1950’s, the ideal Latin American was a hemispheric citizen with an international view. A composer would still profess allegiance to his or her country; however, these feelings would have to be sublimated into less overtly nationalistic forms. Last, he or she would be an individual; he or she would value freedom and autonomy, and not be swayed by the masses. If a Latin American fulfilled all the requirements, the United States could now consider him or her an (inter)-American, deserving of hemispheric recognition. The Inter-American Music Festivals showcased this intersection
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of music and politics, when Cold War values, inter-Americanism, and creative freedom collided.
CHAPTER II.

FORGING FRIENDSHIPS DURING THE COLD WAR

During the late 1940’s and early 1950’s, the musical landscape of the United States slowly changed. The patriotic fervor kindled by World War II faded from many composers’ minds as the United States entered a colder war. As such, the conspicuous use of Americana, whether through text or music, declined significantly in the post-war years. No longer so concerned with an “American” sound, composers sought other means of expression, turning away from the tonal—and more populist—language of the 1930’s and 1940’s. Numerous composers began favoring dissonant, highly chromatic idioms and often incorporated twelve-tone techniques, which were strongly associated with an international style. These preferences for dissonance, abstraction, an international rather than national style, and individualism shaped the prevailing musical climate in United States during the post-war period. In some cases, the characteristics enumerated above represent a form of musical posturing by encouraging music that was the antithesis of Soviet aesthetics.

The Cold War Climate

At times, American music during the Cold War seemed diametrically opposed to Soviet style. The Soviet Union also eagerly denounced artistic developments in the
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United States, calling the art decadent, perverse, and formalistic.71 These taboo “formalistic” traits, though purposely nebulous, included serialism or anything deemed experimental.72 In 1948, Thomson, in his capacity as a music critic for the New York Herald Tribune, provided a laundry list of formalistic musical characteristics that Soviet composers should avoid:

In Soviet aesthetics, however, undesirable subjects and sentiments are assumed to be inseparable from “formalistic” expression. And “formalistic” expression (also equitable with “individualistic”) is recognizable in music by excessive dissonance, harsh instrumentation, unusual instrumentation (of a kind not available in provincial orchestras), percussive instrumentation, too much counterpoint, “linearity” in general, slow tempos, failure to employ folklore themes, the distortion of folklore themes, failure to follow “classic” models, distortion of classic models, and the use of any device or texture for its intrinsic interest rather than for directly expressive purposes.73

The majority of Thomson’s formalistic traits were the hallmark of American composition during the 1950’s. Tellingly, Thomson equated these formalistic expressions with individualism, making individuality undesirable from a Soviet standpoint. Further, Thomson’s inventory implied that real art should be difficult and progressive. These connotations carried over into the polarized rhetoric of the era. Music that had popular appeal, quoted folk material, or was just too “easy” became associated with the Soviets. Conversely, abstract music symbolized the American ideals—freedom, internationalism, and individuality—and provided a stark contrast to Soviet social realism.74
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In addition to signifying creative freedom, abstract techniques, notably serialism, symbolized intellectual and moral integrity in the United States.\(^{75}\) Serialism’s intellectual connotations perhaps derived from its relative complexity and inaccessibility to an average listener. Serialism’s supposed moral superiority could stem from the constraints placed on Soviet music through the doctrine of social realism and the idea that governmental control compromised artistic expression. This diplomatic capital made serialism a potent vehicle for anti-Communist propaganda. The United States had already employed serialism’s visual counterpoint, abstract expressionist painting, as a deterrent to communism with the traveling exhibit *Twentieth-Century Highlights of American Painting*. Organized in 1958 by the United States Information Agency (USIA), the show included reproductions of works by Jackson Pollock, Mark Tobey, and Arshile Gorky, artists all deeply identified with abstract expressionism. Unlike previous attempts at sending art overseas, this exhibit targeted a Latin American rather than a European audience.\(^{76}\) The show achieved great popularity, especially in Argentina, where it drew a crowd of thousands in the first week.\(^{77}\) The USIA hoped the exhibit would bring a breath of democracy to countries reportedly teeming with communists.\(^{78}\)

In the same year, the USIA also filmed a highlights reel of the First Inter-American Music Festival for distribution in Latin America.\(^{79}\) The festival, featuring mostly serial works, could be analogous to the *Twentieth-Century Highlights* exhibit. Both presented the best talent of the Western Hemisphere and displayed an art divergent
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from Soviet ideals. However, unlike the painting exhibit that only included artists from the United States, the Inter-American Music Festival incorporated members of the Latin American artistic community. Together, through the musical solidarity of inter-Americanism, the countries of this hemisphere could stand fast in the face of communism.

As we shall see, individualism, internationalism, and abstraction safeguarded American creative freedom during the Cold War. Conversely, nationalism and populism acquired communist connotations in the political and musical discourse of the era. One of the protectors of said freedom, individualism, had been gaining importance since the Romantic period. A belief founded on self-reliance and independence, this concept deeply resonated with Western values, and presumably conflicted with Soviet ideology. As Thomson noted, formalism, the Soviet buzzword for Western decadence, and individualism were practically inseparable. Others, such as Chávez, reflected upon the importance of the individual as an agent of artistic progress. For instance, in 1958, the New York Times printed one of Chávez’s lectures given at the University of Buffalo to publicize the upcoming Inter-American Musical Festival. It is appropriate that the Times chose a lecture that dealt with individualism. Interestingly, Chávez credited the individual as the overriding force in artistic creation. As he wrote:

Art is, essentially, an individual expression. It is true that the individual is influenced by his surroundings and his traditions, but it is only in this way that the individual should express his community, his fatherland. The importance of the individual should be further emphasized when we realize this. The traditional background in art, though it appears as a collective outcome, has, however, been formed, in the course of years and centuries, by the constant addition of infinite, single, individual contributions.  

By bestowing paramount importance upon the individual, Chávez downplayed the role of the people in shaping the music of a nation. In this light, individualism was an antidote against the masses. It was the individual, the solitary figure of the artist pursuing his own course, who would give voice to the musical identity of a country. As Chávez stated, “The great art, the great music of, let us say, Brazil or Mexico, just as well as that of France or Norway, will not be achieved by means of nationalistic procedures, but by the genius or the talent of the great individual composers of such lands.”

Chávez’s negation of “nationalistic procedures” as a means of achieving great art goes against the grain of his earlier views on nationalism. Chávez, described by Gerard Béhague as “the most accomplished practitioner of the nationalist movement,” had a deep interest in incorporating Mexican-Indian melodies and musical aspects into his early compositions, such as in *Sinfonía India* (1936). Chávez also drew upon contemporary folk music, such as his use of the *huapango* and *sandunga* rhythms in his *Caballos de Vapor* (1932). Despite his previous use of Indianist, folk, and popular elements, Chávez distanced himself from these influences, and from nationalism in general by writing:

> Localism has always existed, but limitations, over and over again, have been the product of littleness, maliciousness, fear, or mere shyness. It is for this reason that to seek originality through the path of so-called nationalism has been an error. Conventional nationalism is, and always has been, inspired by localism and limitation. Quite clearly, the North or South American man of today is as universal as any other.
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In this case, nationalism was not merely a stepping stone on the path to a “universal” expression; it was a stumbling block best forgotten. By the 1950’s, the nationalistic style employed by composers such as Chávez, Cordero, Ginastera, and Copland seemed a distance memory. Though stylistic change can stem from internal factors, such as maturity, one must also consider the social context for such shifts. It was perhaps no wonder that the move toward an austere expression coincided with a backlash against nationalism in the both the political and musical arenas.

During the 1950’s, political nationalism in Latin America began to fall into disrepute. In 1952, noted foreign correspondent Herbert L. Matthews, famous for his coverage of the Spanish Civil War, described the causes of unrest in Latin America. He stated that nationalism, along with militarism, was the foremost threat to peace. As he explained:

Nationalism is an ally of militarism. But this is not nationalism as we understand it, not patriotism or even the exaltation and aggrandizement of one’s own country, but a destructive and above all an “anti-Yanqui” force.85

Tellingly, Matthews distinguished between patriotism, a positive, all-American force, and nationalism, which is disruptive and anti-United States. The “anti-Yankee” component of Latin American nationalism troubled the United States the most. The resentment that many Latin American countries harbored toward the United States could easily be used by agitators to chip away at hemispheric unity. Thus nationalism, rife with anti-U.S. sentiment, was another tool for communists. Moreover, Matthews noted this connection between nationalism and communism when he stated, “Communism plays on

the extremes of wealth and poverty and on economic distress, and it also makes a close association with nationalism.”

Though communism seemed to be around every corner, detecting communist elements remained a problem. Nationalism and communism soon became indistinguishable and the intertwining of the two grew more pronounced during the decade. In the early spring of 1953, President Eisenhower sent his brother, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, on a Latin American tour to assess the political climate. Dr. Eisenhower’s findings echo the sentiments of his contemporaries: nationalism was a subversive and possibly Communist force.

The degradation of nationalism as well as its resulting link with communism surfaced again in President Eisenhower’s address to the Organization of American States on 12 April 1953. During his speech, the President pledged his support to Latin America and praised hemispheric relations, saying, “The special merit of the Pan-American achievement is to have triumphed as well as we have over the temptations of heedless nationalism.” Again, nationalism was portrayed an obstacle, something that needed to be overcome. Moreover, nationalism will derail hemispheric solidarity and contribute to communism’s strength. As the New York Times declared:

In truth, the greatest threat to Pan-American unity and peace is precisely nationalism. Communism is the menace that it is in Latin America chiefly because it utilizes and exasperates the already existing momentum of nationalism, with its predominant expression of anti-Yankeeism.
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The link between communism and nationalism in Latin America continued throughout the decade. For example in 1959, headlines declared that “U.S. Envoys Note Latin Red Threat, Ten Ambassadors Declare Communists Step Up Drive Against Americas’ Unity.” Of greater importance was the ambassadors’ assertions that “extreme nationalistic attitudes were encouraged and exploited by the Communists in their efforts to prevent a rational solution to basic economic problems.”

If Latin American political nationalism exemplified corrosive, “anti-Yankee,” and possibly Communist elements in the political arena, can the same be said for the musical sphere? While overtly derogatory statements about musical nationalism were rare, U.S. and Latin American critics and scholars definitely discouraged its use. Not surprisingly, each country had its own reasons as to why nationalism should be relegated to the past. From the perspective of the United States, Latin American musical nationalism represented an evolutionary step, a stop on the path toward an international idiom. In 1959, Chase presented a rather evolutionist viewpoint when summarizing the creative trends in Latin American music:

In the twentieth-century panorama of Latin American music the key words are: Provincialism, Nationalism, Universality. Some countries are still in the first stage, others in the second, and a few have made the transition from the second to the third. While progress will eventually remove provincialism, the consensus seems to be that the preservation of national character is essential to the achievement of true universality.

While Chase placed universality as the ultimate goal, it cannot be reached by sacrificing national identity for a monolithic style. To become universal, a country’s (or
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composer’s) musical expression must retain some hint of nationalism, albeit a tamed version. Barbara March echoed Chase’s conclusions in her summary of Latin American music for the *Inter-American Music Bulletin* in 1961. She observed that, “Most of today’s [Latin American] composers are looking for a musical language, which although it retains a somewhat nationalistic flavor, has progressed well into a universally understandable music.”  

Similarly, some Latin American composers struggled to balance national identity with a desire for an inter-American audience. Argentine composer and critic Roberto García Morillo summarized the Latin American musical dilemma as felt in his own country. For Argentina’s music to remain relevant, Morillo hypothesized, composers must, “create music which is intrinsically Argentine in form and content and which at the same time has universal validity.” This amalgam of the national and universal goes to the heart of Inter-Americanism, which strove to create unity without sacrificing diversity.

Latin Americans also took stock of their own musical development. For example, in an exhaustive overview of Latin American musical trends, composer and critic Juan Orrego-Salas assessed the stylistic currents in Latin America, dividing composers into two camps. Some composers fit under the rubric of universalism, which extended to styles that use atonality, serialism, and neo-classicism, while others fell into the category of nationalism. Tellingly, he noted that Ginastera provided the best example of universalism. Orrego-Salas based this statement on Ginastera’s musical output, citing his String Quartet no.2, *Cantata for Magic America*, and Concerto for piano and orchestra.
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for their combination of second Viennese school techniques with “an unmistakable American accent.” Ginastera also exuded this quality because of his ability to “project his influence beyond the frontiers of his own country.”

Orrego-Salas then discussed the pros and cons of nationalism, admitting that some nationalistic works have merit. As he stated, “Regardless of how positive and outstanding the examples traced in the sphere of universalism in Latin America may be, these cannot exclude from the picture of contemporary music the best accomplishments of nationalism.” However, there was a correct way to be nationalistic. Composers who tempered nationalism with individualism, such as Cordero, or those who used folk idioms in an abstract manner, such as Galindo, made outstanding examples. Those who quoted directly from folk sources and used conventional forms, such as Harold Gramatges and Edgardo Martin of Cuba and César Guerra-Peixe of Brazil, received admonishment and risked having their music labeled as communist. As he stated:

Through such delayed and farfetched positions they [overtly nationalistic composers] also appear attached to the backwash of the Romantic and Impressionistic aesthetics and to techniques that might have seemed radical by the early twenties but that can no longer scandalize anybody. To a certain extent these ideas fit into the patterns of “social realism” promoted by the Communists.

If writing in a nationalistic vein signaled adherence to the tenets of social realism, those compositions deemed populist fared no better. Music with a broad appeal—music for the common man—was frowned upon by those composers striving for a legitimate
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artistic expression. As Chase explained days before the first Inter-American Music Festival:

A composer, unless he is a hack or a hustler, does not write for the general public. That public is an amorphous monstrosity, corrupted by commercialism and the moronic media of mass entertainment. No self-respecting artist cares about pleasing the public.99

In other words, music for the masses was not the domain of a serious artist.

Although debates about a composer’s obligations to the public continue today, during the 1950’s, the discourse surrounding elitism and populism, as well as nationalism and internationalism, intensified. Several composers took notice of this growing divergence. For example, Cordero also underwent a style change in the 1950’s, from his nationalistic Rapsodia Campesina (1953) to his use of serial technique in his Second Symphony (1956), which, as noted, won second prize at the Caracas Festival in 1957. Cordero explained his view on nationalism, “My music is not nationalistic in the sense of being deliberate exploitation of the folklore of my country.”100 Rather than quoting a rhythm or melody verbatim, Cordero searched for the essence of the Panamanian spirit. His music mixed his country’s language with the lingua franca of serialism, which created an expression that did not have to “beat the drum to proclaim its nationality.”101 Additionally, Cordero aligned himself with an elitist viewpoint when he added, “I don’t try to write ‘pretty’ music in order to please the public.”102
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If both nationalism and populism had taken on a negative connotation, inter-Americanism provided a remedy for these damaging associations. John Haskins poured the foundation for how inter-Americanism related to music during the Cold War. On 20 September 1957, Haskin’s article, “El Panamericanismo en la Música (Pan-Americanism in Music),” appeared in *Buenos Aires Musical*, an influential periodical founded by Enzo Valenti Ferro in 1946. It was quickly translated for publication in *Notes* and reprinted in the English and Spanish versions of the *Inter-American Music Bulletin/Boletín Inter-Americano de Música* in 1958. Haskin’s definitions of Pan-Americanism in music shaded subsequent discourse about the music of Americas.

For Haskins, unity was the utmost goal of Pan-Americanism because solidarity offered the best defense against Soviet encroachment. As Haskins stated, “In our time, the arguments for a hemispheric unity have assumed a compelling force under the pressure of events.” This “pressure of events” (read: communist infiltration) did indeed propel inter-American cooperation to a priority status. However, unity needed careful cultivation. Although the United States often treated Latin America as if it were a single, well-defined entity, the reality was different. Hemispheric unity must strike a balance with diversity lest it become a monolithic requirement smacking of totalitarianism. This amalgam of one-and-many was the core of Pan-Americanism. As Haskins explained, “A music of the Americas should evolve as a complex art of many sources, not one language but many, understood by all.” Though paradoxical, this statement correctly mixed the universal and national, allowing the many sources or
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countries to retain some of their identity while participating in an international expression. Haskins re-emphasized this point in his closing paragraph:

May they [the Music division of the Pan American Union and the Inter-American Music Center] both prosper, and may they succeed in achieving not one world, nor one musical language, but a familiar mixture of tongues, commonly known and commonly understood. For that is Panamericanism, in music.  

**The First Inter-American Music Festival**

Haskins’s prediction for the two organizations materialized with the first Inter-American Music Festival, which exemplified Pan-Americanism in music. The first Inter-American Music Festival took place on 18-20 April 1958 in Washington, D.C. Originally, New Orleans planned to host the festival, but the event was soon transferred to the nation’s capital. Reasons for the change were vague, but perhaps the move gave the festival more power and legitimacy. For example, holding the final concert at the Hall of the Americas in the Pan American Union could do more to symbolize Pan-Americanism than most other venues.

The festival had a number of private sponsors as well ranging from individuals, such as Nelson A. Rockefeller, to large corporations. There were numerous corporate sponsors, including: Bank of America, Pan American World Airways, Sears, Roebuck & Company, and the Ecuadorian Purchasing Company. Additionally, some foundations lent support, most notably the Koussevitzky Foundation, Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation, and the Reader’s Digest Foundation.

The festival involved an interesting mix of Washington politicians, musicians, and scholars. For example, Spruille Braden, the former U.S. ambassador to Argentina and
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Assistant Secretary of State, chaired the festival’s sponsoring committee. In January of 1946, Braden gained notoriety for his “blue book” about Argentina, which charged the country’s government with helping the Axis powers during World War II. The book intended to generate negative publicity for presidential candidate, Juan Perón, but had the opposite effect, becoming instead a symbol of U.S. hegemony. “Perón v. Braden” became a rallying cry during the election, which Perón won by an overwhelming margin.

The festival’s Commissions Committee consisted of Chase, Seeger, and Smith. Likewise, the Program Committee included familiar names such as Espinosa, Chief of the Music Section of the Pan-American Union; Palacios, organizer and sponsor of the Latin American Music Festival in Caracas (1954, 1957); and Howard Mitchell, conductor of the National Symphony Orchestra of Washington, D.C.

Though the festival only lasted a weekend, it involved a plethora of performers and compositions, all highlighting the Inter-American outlook. The National Symphony Orchestra of Washington D.C., conducted by Mitchell and the Orquesta Sinfónica Nacional de México, conducted by Luis Herrera de la Fuente shared performing duties. The Juilliard String Quartet performed an entire concert of world premieres as did the Claremont String Quartet. The Howard University Choir rounded out the performing forces.
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Surprisingly, the composers chosen for the first festival reflected a less than cosmopolitan conglomeration. Violet Archer was the only Canadian and Normand Lockwood, Russell Woollen, and Quincy Porter represented the U.S. constituency. The majority of the composers hailed from the South, fourteen out of the eighteen presented on the festival. Many Latin American composers had previous U.S. connections, some through Guggenheim fellowships such as Cordero, Ginastera, Orrego-Salas, and Héctor Tosar.

The union of these impressive ensembles, conductors, and composers created a festival truly Inter-American in scope. This display of musical hemispheric cooperation would hopefully transfer to other areas. The preface of the program booklet, authored by Haskins, stressed this need for alliance, calling upon commonality to triumph over differences:

The countries of this hemisphere have been placed in a special position by geography and history, and they are bound together politically in the oldest international organization in the world. Culturally, the differences between these countries are matters of mutual attraction, not division, and nowhere is this more clearly obvious than in a festival of inter-American music.  

Haskins called upon the trope of America’s exceptionalism. This idea stemmed from a recurring theme that God/History has endowed the United States with privileges beyond that of other nations. Usually reserved for the United States, Haskins extended this right to all the countries of the hemisphere. He also appealed to the past, namely to the creation of the Pan-American Union, as a source of political unification. Finally, he stated that although cultural differences exist, they should be a source of fascination and not fear.
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The compositions also aptly demonstrated inter-American unity, mainly through amalgamating the local and the hemispheric. Many pieces incorporated serialism or other abstract techniques, while still maintaining subtle national references. Cordero’s Symphony no. 2, with its rhythmic allusion to the tamborito, and Ginastera’s malambo influenced String Quartet no. 2 were good examples of this trend. Composers with strong nationalistic tendencies, such as Antonio Estévez of Venezuela, entered works that were less localistic than their typical style. Tellingly, the festival’s program lauded Estévez’s Concerto for Orchestra as “a composition more international in character than his usual output.”

In fact, compositions in an overtly nationalistic vein were largely absent from the festival. Similarly, works in a populist style were practically nonexistent. In Irving Lowens’s review of the festival, he applauded the fact that, “The rum and coca-cola school of Latin American composers was, happily, not represented.” Moreover, composer and critic Robert Evett remarked of the first festival:

> Of the 18 composers heard, all but four are citizens of Latin-American countries; and of these, only one—Mozart Camargo Guarnieri of Brazil—submitted a work in the old Rum-and-Coca Cola manner. The others—even including the self-styled “nationalists”—lend themselves to analysis within the contexts of one or another of the international modern styles.  

It is evident through Evett’s critique that styles directly incorporating folklore have fallen out of fashion. Even the “nationalists” tempered their music with international techniques. Yet, what stands out is Lowens’s and Evett’s disparagement of styles that sound too popular. Both mentioned the Rum-and-Coca-Cola style, which refers to a
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Caribbean tune popularized by the Andrews Sisters in 1944. Any work evoking this association could hardly be viewed as high art. By comparing these compositions with a pop tune, the critics relegated them to tastes of the masses. At best, art music with popular appeal could be considered too commercial and therefore lacking artistic merit. Or as Chase stated, “Art for mass consumption is trash; it always has been and always will be.” At its worst, however, this type of music could border precariously on “music for the masses.”

The Second Inter-American Music Festival

The second Inter-American Music Festival built on the success of the first. The festival expanded from five concerts crammed into a weekend to week-long event. It was held on 22-30 April 1961 in Washington D.C., with concerts at Coolidge Auditorium in the Library of Congress, Cramton Auditorium at Howard University, and of course, the Hall of the Americas in the Pan-American Union. The venues were chosen to accommodate the larger scale of the festival, but were not entirely free from secondary motives. Tellingly, critic Ross Parmenter wondered “how attendance will be affected by the fact that Howard is a Negro University.” Parmenter concluded that the outcome will be positive. As he stated, “Certainly, it is likely to make a favorable impression on
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the many Latin-Americans who will participate, for it will demonstrate racial broad-mindedness.”119

The second festival included more weighty names in Washington than the first. For example, Jacqueline Kennedy was named Honorary Chair of the festival, and penned a brief statement for the festival’s program. The Sponsoring Committee nearly doubled its size, and consequently split into two groups. Kenneth Holland, president of the Institute of International Education chaired the National Sponsoring Committee, which included Chase, Smith, John Drier, former ambassador to the OAS, and José Antonio Mora, Secretary-General of the OAS. There was also a separate sponsoring committee for Washington D.C., which consisted of governmental officials. This committee was chaired by John W. Hanes, commissioner and chairman of the U.S. section of the Caribbean Commission. Mora and Drier pulled double duty, serving on both the National and Washington D.C. sponsoring committees.120

The Commission committee for the second festival remained the same, consisting of Chase, Seeger, and Smith. The Program committee had a few new additions along with Espinosa and Palacios. They were joined by Howard Hanson, dean of the Eastman School of Music; Herrera de la Fuente, music director of the National Symphony Orchestra of Mexico; Luis Sandi, chief of the music department of the Institute of Fine Arts of Mexico; and Geoffrey Waddington, director of music for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.121 The second festival also recognized technology’s growing
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capabilities by including a Radio and Television committee. Chaired by Harold Boxer, music director of the Voice of America, the committee included Oliver Daniel, director of contemporary music for BMI, and Bruce Raymond, director of programs for the Canadian Broadcasting Company.\footnote{Ibid.}^{122}

Whereas the first festival needed many corporate and private sponsors, the second relied on foundations, such as the Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation, the Fromm Foundation, and the Serge Koussevitzky Foundation. The Organization of American States contributed the largest amount, as its suborganization, the Inter-American Music Council, organized the festival. The National Institute of Fine Arts of Mexico and the Institute of Contemporary Arts of Washington D.C. also supported the festival.\footnote{Ibid, 13-16.}^{123}

As the festival had grown in size, more ensembles were needed. The National Symphony Orchestras of both Mexico and Washington D.C., as well as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Symphony, and the Eastman Philharmonia added to the performing forces. In addition, the festival’s planners created a special Festival Chamber Orchestra using local musicians. Smaller ensembles included the Claremont String Quartet, the Coro de Madrigalistas de México, and the Philadelphia Woodwind Quintet.\footnote{Ibid, 38-41.}^{124}

The festival involved many of the same composers represented in 1958 and incorporated young composers such as Mario Davidovsky and Antonio Tauriello of Argentina. U.S. participation also increased through the addition of Henry Cowell, Daniel

Though the scope of the festival had widened, the second Inter-American Music Festival had the same primary goal as the first: to advance hemispheric cooperation through music. In fact, the program now had a mission statement proclaiming the festival’s purpose:

To promote closer relations and understanding among the American republics by recognizing and stimulating the development of the music of the Americas.¹²⁵

The emphasis on unity came at a time when conflict between the United States and Soviet Union headed toward its zenith. Two days before the festival, on 19 April 1961, the U.S. reeled from the botched Bay of Pigs invasion.¹²⁶ The unsuccessful coup demonstrated two things: that Castro had more military might than believed and more importantly, it showed that the United States had blatantly violated nonintervention regulations of the OAS.¹²⁷ Further, it fueled Castro’s defiance and set the stage for the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962.

Despite the occasional failure, the Kennedy administration took Latin America and its troubles seriously. The administration hoped to strengthen hemispheric solidarity through the Alliance for Progress, a quasi-Marshall Plan for Latin America that focused on the economic rehabilitation.¹²⁸ Though the Alliance concentrated on improving economics, health care, and education, the Kennedy administration also employed the arts as a tool for diplomacy. In her statement for the second Inter-American Music Festival:

¹²⁵ Ibid, 1.
¹²⁶ Gil, Latin American—United States Relations, 233.
¹²⁷ Ibid.
Festival, Jacqueline Kennedy recognized “the power of music to abridge accidental
differences of environment, circumstances, or language, and to bring hearts and minds
into closer accord.”\textsuperscript{129} During this era, winning the hearts and minds of Latin Americans
constituted an utmost priority.

In fact, Donald Mintz, author of the program’s preface, may have had Kennedy’s
Alliance for Progress in mind as he concluded his remarks in the booklet. As Mintz
noted, “It seems most likely that the nations of the western hemisphere are entering a new
period of unprecedentedly close cooperation in cultural and social as well as political and
economic matters, a period which will almost surely be marked by a joint attack of
hitherto unknown vigor on hemispheric problems.”\textsuperscript{130} This “unprecedentedly close
cooperation” would create a strong, unified hemisphere, capable of staving off Soviet
encroachment, or if need be, some sort of attack against Communist aggressors.

Despite the festival’s optimistic tone, brief turmoil troubled the Inter-American
musical world. The disturbance occurred when a concert of all Brazilian works was
deleted from the festival’s schedule at the last moment. The change, though it created
discontent, supposedly did not have any larger significance. As Parmenter explained,
“There were no political implications behind the cancellation—the problem was lack of
money.”\textsuperscript{131} Still, Parmenter observed that, “it is sad that the musical demonstration of
Pan Americanism should start off with a strike against it.”\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{129} Jacqueline Kennedy, “Program Booklet,” \textit{The Second Inter-American Music Festival},
(22-30 April 1961), 2.
\textsuperscript{130} Donald Mintz, “Preface,” \textit{The Second Inter-American Music Festival}, program
booklet (22-30 April 1961), 20.
\textsuperscript{131} Ross Parmenter, “Brazil is Dropped From Music Fete,” \textit{New York Times}, 23 April
1961, pg. 85.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid
The second and more significant disturbance involved the deletion of the third movement of Chilean composer Gustavo Becerra’s Piano Concerto. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Symphony Orchestra, with Mario Miranda of Chile at the piano, premiered the work. Reasons for the Piano Concerto’s truncation were unclear; however, the orchestra did substitute another piece, *Serenata Concertante* by Canadian composer Murray Adaskin. The switch caused a minor fury and the substitute piece earned critical scorn. Parmenter, for example, denounced it as “tea room music.” Likewise, he added, “So far the works presented at the festival have been craggy, earnest modern works. Mr. Adaskin’s bland *Serenata* was like a throwback to traditional tunefulness.”

Indeed, the festival was a hotbed of “craggy, earnest, modern” works. Even more so than the first festival, the majority of the second festival’s music catered to the intellect and presented the antithesis of the pleasing, populist, Latin American compositions familiar to U.S. audiences. Evett acknowledged the pervasive stereotype, stating that most U.S. audiences assumed that the “Latin-American musician is still supposed to wear tight pants and rattle gourds.” Additionally, critic Charles Crowder described the fete, noting the absence of “jungle drums”:

> The great portion was nervous, noisy, and percussive, but in a peculiarly sophisticated way: the texture of the music was of a complexity geared to challenge the intellect rather than to please the senses. […] No jungle drums here, but rather a highly intellectual exercise for performer and listener.

---

134 Evett, “New Music,” 23.
While Crowder emphasized the sophistication of the compositions, others noted an increase in serial techniques among the composers of the Americas. For example, Mintz stated in the program that “International styles of composition, especially those more or less related to serial techniques, have been gaining adherents throughout our hemisphere, and these styles, as Henry Cowell writes elsewhere in this brochure, eliminate national stylistic elements.”136 Cowell did assert that serialism negates national styles. As he stated, “Dodecaphonic internationalism eliminates everything that has been developed as a national style in the handling of musical materials.”137 Thus serialism, equated with the international, overrode folk or local influences. The festival also marked a transition, namely the last gasp of Latin American musical nationalism in the form of a work by Guarnieri. As Chase declared:

As far as revealing trends in Latin American composition today, I believe the most significant factor was the almost total absence of music that could be described as “nationalistic” or “folkloric.” With the exception of Guarnieri’s variations on a Brazilian folk theme, none of the works in the Festival had any particular “national” character, at least not in the obvious sense of the term; nor did any of them draw on the folk or popular music of their respective countries. This would seem to confirm the view that musical nationalism is a phase that has passed in Latin American composition. The younger men are completely international in their outlook, interested in twelve-tone writing, in electronic music, and in other modern trends that are entirely international in character.138

One of the aims of inter-Americanism, an international style, appears to have been fulfilled. For the most part, Latin American composers had abandoned the overt use of folk or popular music in favor of international techniques. Yet, traces of the national remained. As will be discussed in the next chapter, some composers, such as Ginastera,

found ways to mediate between the international and the local, developing a style that was both austere and Argentine within an inter-American context.
CHAPTER III.
GINASTERA AND THE INTER-AMERICAN MUSIC FESTIVALS

Most scholars agree that with the debut of his Second String Quartet (1958), Ginastera entered his neo-Expressionist stylistic period, evidenced by full chromaticism, serialism and other abstract techniques, such as aleatory. Most importantly, the absence of nationalism distinguishes this period from his early and middle style.\(^\text{139}\) There are many possible explanations why Ginastera switched to a serial style during the 1950’s, distancing himself from the nationalism of his youth. Some of these reasons are private, influenced by personal growth and creative maturity. However, one must also consider the possibility of larger political and social influences on this stylistic change.

**Prelude to Inter-Americanism**

Ginastera began to shift away from an overtly nationalistic style as early as the mid-1940’s. During his middle period (1947-1957), some critics noted Ginastera’s growing predilection for a hemispheric expression. For example, in his review of Ginastera’s *Twelve American Preludes* Seeger stated:

> It is a relief to see in the title of this work a turning-away from the much abused cult of music-nationalism. By the word “America” Ginastera—as do Latin-Americans generally and Argentines in particular—refers to the whole New World or at least to the southern continent. It would seem that a music-regionalism might establish itself as valid concept upon the very grounds where music-nationalism fails to do so—that of a continuity over a period of years of common stylistic traits among enough composers to distinguish them from the composers of another region, in this case, of the region of Europe.\(^\text{140}\)


\(^{140}\) Charles Seeger, “12 American Preludes,” *Notes* 4 no. 1 (1946), 103.
With the Preludes, Ginastera embarked on a more experimental path, testing new approaches to rhythm and meter, exploring polytonality, and using folk materials in an abstract manner. He also made the work more “American” by including musical tributes to composers such as Argentines Roberto García Morillo and Juan José Castro, Brazilian Heitor Villa-Lobos and Copland. Seeger’s review also hinted at some of inter-Americanism’s premises. First, he has framed nationalism with a negative connotation, referring to it as “cult” and expressing relief that Ginastera was forsaking it. Moreover, Seeger advocated for a regional—that is, Pan-American style. This musical regionalism could surpass the imperfections of nationalism, creating a distinctly New World sound that would liberate the Americas from European musical domination. Seeger additionally pointed out that Ginastera was already taking a hemispheric outlook, given that Ginastera himself saw “America” in its most inter-American sense. Seeger’s review also foreshadowed the critical response to Ginastera’s Cantata para América mágica (Cantata for Magic America, 1961), hailed for its individuality, its Pan-Americanism, and its break with European tradition.

As Ginastera’s reputation expanded beyond his homeland, his name began popping up frequently in the press. Chase devoted much ink to his friend, praising Ginastera in his survey of Latin American music for Musical America in 1957. As he wrote, “I should like to emphasize the growing stature of Ginastera as one of the truly outstanding composers of Latin America today.” Further, Chase seconded Seeger’s opinion that Ginastera’s move away from overt nationalism was a good choice. For example, Chase noted that Ginastera’s First String Quartet (1948) and his Variaciones

Concertantes (1953) “clearly reveal the composer’s evolution from folkloristic nationalism to a style at once more individual and more universal.”\textsuperscript{142} Whereas nationalism impeded individuality, international styles helped a composer personalize his expression. By being both individual and universal, one fulfilled the goals of inter-Americanism, which emphasized hemispheric unity without comprising each nation’s individual rights. Chase also lauded Ginastera’s Sonata for Piano (1952), a piece “where the national element is sublimated rather than realistic or literal.”\textsuperscript{143}

In the same year, Chase authored two articles on Ginastera to introduce him to a larger audience. One, in Tempo, chronicled Ginastera’s early attraction to nationalism, the then dominant school, and his subsequent shift toward an international expression.\textsuperscript{144} For instance, Ginastera’s recent Pampeana No. 3 (1954) used abstract practices to evoke the pampas. Chase remarked that the “technical procedures [of Pampeana No. 3], such as polytonality and twelve-tone writing, are so thoroughly identified with current international practice that they tend to undermine, or at least counterbalance, the local-national factors in the composition.”\textsuperscript{145} As in his Musical America piece, Chase commended Ginastera’s Sonata for Piano because it “reaches heights of sublimation hitherto unattained by Ginastera, or by any other Argentine composer.”\textsuperscript{146} Chase found this particularly so in the sonata’s second movement where “the spirit of the malambo [an Argentine dance] is present, but sublimated to the ‘nth’ degree.”\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{142} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{144} Gilbert Chase, “Alberto Ginastera: Portrait of an Argentine Composer,” Tempo no. 44 (1957), 11-17.
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid., 13.
\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., 15.
\textsuperscript{147} Ibid., 14.
chose a word rich in Freudian meaning when referring to national elements, undoubtedly a commentary on nationalism’s social acceptability.

Yet, Ginastera himself reaffirmed the importance of the national, especially when addressing his countrymen. As he said in the Buenos Aires daily *La Razón* in 1957, “Any work of talent, as has always happened in the history of the arts, is in the final analysis ‘national’ even though it may not have begun by being ‘folkloric!’” For Ginastera, even compositions devoid of folklore still carried a national accent. However, the accent must soften in relation to the inter-American aesthetic. As such, Ginastera began to amalgamate his identity into both an international and Argentine figure, conforming to the inter-American ideal of unity within diversity. He retained a sublimated piece of his Argentine identity while embracing international avant-garde techniques.

Ginastera’s music received more in-depth coverage in Chase’s next article, which contained additional biographical information and comprehensive musical analysis. Chase stressed Ginastera’s and Argentina’s predominantly European heritage, and the cosmopolitan nature of Buenos Aires, comparing it with that of New York. In doing so, he eliminated the otherness that might alienate Ginastera from a United States audience. Chase’s description of Ginastera’s personality also mirrored the Cold War’s emphasis on strength. Chase employed phrases such as “stolid and intensely serious,” “reserved in manner,” “speaks with deliberation,” to paint a portrait that reflected the gravity of the times.

---


Ginastera’s String Quartet no. 2

As noted, the Inter-American Music Festivals boosted Ginastera’s reputation in the United States, earning him commissions and critical praise. Ginastera himself cited these festivals, and his Second String Quartet, as defining moments in his career. As he wrote, “In 1958, I received one of the first important commissions in my career—a Coolidge Foundation commission which resulted in my 2nd String Quartet.”150 The city itself, Washington D.C., also greatly impacted Ginastera. Critic Paul Hume commented that “Ginastera feels particularly drawn to Washington where he has enjoyed an unusual number of memorable personal successes. It is Washington, he says, that has given him his great chance.”151

Ginastera’s fruitful association with the Inter-American Music Festivals began at 11:00 A.M. on Saturday 19 April 1958, with the premiere of his Second String Quartet. It immediately found favor with audiences and critics. Lowens called it the “undoubted sensation of the entire Festival.”152 Likewise, Chase reported that “To judge by the ovation it received, Alberto Ginastera’s String Quartet no. 2 (1958) was probably the acme of the festival.”153 Posterity has affirmed the quartet’s status, for it is often referred to as the composition that cemented Ginastera’s international reputation.154

After the quartet’s premiere, some critics noted Ginastera’s previous nationalistic style had a more international inclination. For example, Taubman’s review commented that “In his rhythmic ideas, Señor Ginastera refers to the idiom of Argentina, but

150 Ginastera, “Why The Inter-American Must Be a Festival of Youth,” 7.
otherwise his quartet reflects not a local landscape but personal vistas."

Lowens also hypothesized that Ginastera’s style may have been shifting. As he wrote, “In the past, Ginastera has been a composer of strongly nationalistic inclinations, but in recent years, those who have followed his career closely have detected signs of new outlook.”

Though the robust flavor of nationalism had weakened, Lowens, like Taubman, suspected that Ginastera’s Second Quartet contained traces of Argentine nationalistic traditions. Lowens continued:

> Although I could find nothing in the String Quartet no. 2 to lead me to believe that Ginastera was mining indigenous Argentine ore, it is quite possible that close study of the score will disclose clear signs that he has by no means abandoned the national tradition with which he has always happily associated himself.

Ginastera’s quartet retained some national references, albeit in an abstract form. As Taubman aptly observed, Ginastera’s rhythmic ideas allude to an Argentine dance, the *malambo*. A fast tempo, 3/4—6/8 ambiguity, syncopated rhythms, repetition, and passages that feature constant eighth-note motion characterize this dance.

The *malambo*, also closely associated with the gauchos, is, as Chase describes, a dance “of manly strength and vigour.” It exerted much influence over Ginastera’s compositional style. For example, he often used it as a finale, such as the third dance, “Danza del gaucho matrero (Dance of the Fugitive Gaucho)” from his *Danzas Argentinas* (1937). Béhague also noted that the finale scene, “Dance of the Warriors,” from his ballet, *Panambi* (1937) employed *malambo* rhythms. Perhaps the best known example comes

---

157 Ibid.

The *malambo* even found its niche in Ginastera’s later compositional style. David Wallace points out that the first and fifth movements of the String Quartet no. 2 exhibit the *malambo*’s metric hemiola, fast tempo, and characteristic rhythmic gestures. The program booklet of the festival anticipated this claim by stating, “In his [Ginastera’s] rhythmic development, he has used certain elements of native Argentine music.” Additionally, Ginastera states that the first movement is in sonata form, with one harsh theme and the other, tranquil. The “harsh” theme (mm. 1-98) displays the *malambo*-like qualities best. The rhythms, unlike those of his earlier compositions, only approximate the dance. For example, in mm. 4-15, Ginastera mimics the eighth-note motion, but he also includes rests to heighten the rhythmic interest. Similarly, in the quartet’s fifth movement, during mm. 36-45, the constant eighth-note figure in violin I & II is diminished to sixteenths under which Ginastera’s projects typical *malambo* patterns with slight rhythmic embellishments.

---

162 The Pan American Union, “The First,” 47.
163 Ibid.
In addition to the rhythmic allusion to the *malambo*, the melodic material also refers to folklore. As Chase observes, “In the third variation [of movement four], *Lento*, for viola, the composer quotes from the “Triste” of his *Cinco Canciones Populares Argentinas*—a gentle reminder that has not forgotten his native land and its pampas in the midst of the advanced international techniques that he now uses.”\textsuperscript{164} The *triste* is a sad love song, usually for voice and guitar and was popular among the gauchos.\textsuperscript{165} This genre also surfaces in other composition such as *Twelve American Preludes*, no. 2 “Triste.”

\textsuperscript{164} Chase, “New World Music,” 12.
However, the “Triste” quote in movement four is more than a nod to Argentine nationalism. Rather, the movement embodies some of the song’s characteristics. On the surface, movement four retains the same flavor as “Triste,” with its expression markings indicating melancholy and rubato. Digging deeper, one finds other similarities. For example, the theme from movement four shares a similar contour with the opening melody of “Triste.” For example, both not only begin and end on G, but emphasize that pitch. The descent a third and subsequent return to G in mm. 13-15 of “Triste” is echoed by the first few notes of movement four, albeit with some embellishment. Further, both prominently feature a downward leap from C/C♯ to G, as shown in Examples 2a and 2b.

Example 2a: String Quartet no.2, mm. 1-4

Example 2b: “Triste” from Cinco Canciones Populares Argentinas, mm. 10-16

Ginastera also employs the theme’s tonal implications to evoke the song elsewhere in the work. For example, in movement four (mm. 13-14), Ginastera constructs chords using stacks of open fifths. These chords, C- Eb-G-B in the cello and viola, and G-B♭-D-F♯ in violin II, recalls the C and G minor axes of the song. Furthermore, the strummed chordal texture alludes to a guitar, the accompanying instrument in the triste genre. (See Example 3).
Toward the end of movement four, Ginastera inserts a phrase from “Triste.” As we shall see, Ginastera’s literal quotation of his “Triste” melody is the most obvious—and perhaps most interesting—folk element. The quartet’s overall serial design ensures that in the pre-compositional planning, Ginastera tailored his theme to fit the tonal needs of the song. Otherwise, the quote’s seamless integration into the material would not have been possible. Examples 4a and 4b compare the fragment from “Triste” with the quartet’s quote of the vocal line.
Example 4b: String Quartet no.2 (1958 version), mm. 51-54

Ginastera removed this four-measure “Triste” quote when revising the quartet in 1968. He also omitted the quote from his *Concerto per Corde* (1966), an arrangement of the String Quartet no. 2.\(^{166}\) Despite the deletion, the fourth movement remained indebted to the song because of its textural and musical similarities. Thus between the *malambo*, the *triste*, and serial procedures, Ginastera’s String Quartet no. 2 reflected “local landscapes” within an international framework.

The quartet made such a splash that in the last days of 1959, while summarizing the musical achievements of the decade, Taubman included Ginastera alongside the patriarch of American music, Copland. Taubman recognized Copland and Ginastera as two prominent composers now attracted to the serial style. As he wrote:

> Increasingly composers sought to find individual ways to adapt serial techniques to their own styles. Aaron Copland, in his Fantasy for Piano and Alberto Ginastera of Argentina, in his String Quartet, were among the leading figures, who, like Stravinsky, found themselves drawn into the dodecaphonic orbit and who were contributing to a fresh view of it.\(^{167}\)

Tellingly, Taubman’s summary mentioned Copland and Ginastera in the same breath, asserting Ginastera’s new notoriety. Within a few short years, Ginastera had become a “leading figure,” significantly contributing to the serial canon. Although Ginastera had only one serial work to his credit, he was eager to explore the possibilities

---


that this technique offered. After all, as Taubman commented, “Hardly anyone, save the composers in the Soviet Union, was untouched by the ferment of twentieth-century developments.”

The Cantata for Magic America

The Second Inter-American Music Festival of 1961 featured two new Ginastera compositions, Piano Concerto no. 1, commissioned by the Koussevitzky Foundation and Cantata para América Mágica (Cantata for Magic America), commissioned by the Fromm Foundation. Both pieces received enthusiastic reviews, garnering Ginastera more accolades and enhancing his international status. Further, the Piano Concerto and Cantata for Magic America demonstrated Ginastera’s deeper engagement with classical serialism. Unlike the String Quartet no. 2, the fourth movement of which contained tonal references, the Piano Concerto and Cantata used a strikingly dissonant language, and the rows lack overtly tonal implications. Ginastera’s serialism was stricter than before; he approached technical aspects with more rigor, exhausting the row’s possible permutations, as in section II of the Cantata. The major difference, however, between the String Quartet and these later works was the decrease in national allusions. By 1961, Ginastera was more concerned with establishing an individual identity, albeit within a hemispheric context. As he stated in 1962:

I am not so much interested in finding an intrinsically Argentine language any more because I know that if I achieve a personal musical idiom, this will be the inevitable expression of my own surroundings. So I am no longer searching for a national style, but a personal style. If I am on the way of achieving this in my

most recent works such as the *Piano Concerto* and the *Cantata para América Mágica*, it is not for me to say.\textsuperscript{170}

The Piano Concerto no. 1 premiered on Saturday 22 April with João Carlos Martins at the piano and Howard Mitchell conducting the National Symphony Orchestra. Parmenter reported of the concerto that, “The piece that made the biggest hit—and that was certainly the liveliest and most entertaining—was Alberto Ginastera’s Piano Concerto. The performance was a nice example of Pan-Americanism in action.”\textsuperscript{171} This phrase perhaps referred to the collaboration between an Argentine composer, a Brazilian pianist, and an U.S. venue and conductor. However, the Piano Concerto also epitomized subtler inter-American values, such as mixing the hemispheric with traces of the national, avoiding populism in favor of an abstract, difficult idiom, and displaying the composer’s dogged individuality.

Ginastera’s personal style also shone through with his *Cantata for Magic America*. The *Cantata* closed the Second Festival and inspired headlines such as, “Ginastera Emerges as Giant in Music Festival’s Finale.”\textsuperscript{172} Ginastera’s most glowing review came from Lowens where he stated, “Good as the Festival was, there was still one figure who plainly towered head and shoulders above his gifted colleagues—Alberto Ginastera.”\textsuperscript{173} Lowens then described the composer’s new style. As he wrote, “One must conclude, from the evidence of the two masterful works performed here, that the Argentine composer has now definitely abandoned the *gauchesco* nationalism of earlier

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
years in favor of a violently dissonant idiom of a uniquely personal nature.”

In sum, the subtle hints of folklore were all but obscured by the dissonant, avant-garde style of 1961.

Lowens supported Ginastera’s standing as a composer of the Americas. As he stated, “With this work [the Cantata], Ginastera becomes a hemispheric and not a nationalistic composer. For this is unmistakably music of the Western Hemisphere, for all its debt to the Old World, and it is difficult to imagine a composer of the European tradition writing it.”

This relates to Seeger’s earlier supposition that music-regionalism offered a solution to Europe’s overpowering influence. As Ginastera composed the Cantata, he also hoped that he would be able “to break away, if only for an instant, from the ties that bound me to my European tradition.”

The Cantata’s very title invited a hemispheric outlook, as the word America can refer to the whole continent and not just one country. Moreover, Ginastera’s inclusion of word magic lifted the title from a geographically definable region and transformed it into an entity without borders. Ginastera enhanced the hemispheric unity by choosing texts from the Mayan, Aztec, and Inca civilizations, thus representing all the major indigenous cultures that spanned Latin America before the creation of artificial national boundaries. Also, the poetry derived from the pre-Conquest era and was consequently devoid of European influences. This added to text’s perceived purity and subsequent American character.

\[^{174}\text{Ibid.}\]
\[^{175}\text{Ibid.}\]
\[^{176}\text{Alberto Ginastera, “Personal Viewpoints: Notes by Five Composers,”} \text{Tempo no. 81 (1967), 27.}\]
The inter-American qualities of the music manifest themselves in subtle ways. For example, Ginastera arranges the percussion instruments as to be more conducive to serialism, clustering them, as Wallace explains, “so that a series of pitch levels from low to high—in groups of six—is possible.” Additionally, by conflating native instruments, such as the reco-reco and chocalho, with Western instruments, such as kettledrums and piano, Ginastera blends the indigenous with the international. He preserves the diversity of American culture while constructing an expression of unity.

If the Cantata’s text and instrumentation have traits of inter-Americanism, can the same be said for the music? In the Cantata, Ginastera’s materials lack the rhythmic or melodic folkloric implications of the Second String Quartet. The work’s six sections are a study in avant-garde techniques. The pointillist texture of section II, “Nocturne and Love Song,” the large-scale mirror form of section IV, “Fantastic Interlude,” the Sprechstimme and microtonal techniques of section V, “Song of Agony and Desolation,” and the use of limited aleatory in section VI, “Song of Prophecy,” confirm the Cantata’s international character. Yet Ginastera balances serialism’s homogenizing tendencies by infusing the Cantata with indigenous life, notably in section I, “Prelude and Song to the Dawn,” and section III, “Song for the Warriors’ Departure.”

In section I “Prelude and Song to the Dawn,” two ostinato patterns provide much of accompaniment. The first pattern, occurring in celesta during mm. 28-33, is the horizontal realization of a trichord, D—E♭—C♯, presented in pianos I & II. In m. 31, Ginastera states the row in its entirety against the background of the ostinato. The progressive unfolding of the row contrasts with static nature of the ostinato; the latter

exemplifies the cyclic, pre-Columbian conception of time. Ginastera employs a different three-note ostinato in mm. 44-48, over which the soprano presents the retrograde and retrograde inversion of the row. The original ostinato returns in m. 69 and continues until the end of the section I in m. 78.

Section III, “Song for the Warriors’ Departure,” relies heavily on ostinato, both for coherence and to generate melodic material. Ginastera uses a synthetic scale to structure this section, a technique he employed in other Indianist compositions, such as Panambi (1937) and the symphony Ollantay (1947). Knowing the driving, dance-influenced rhythms of Panambi’s finale, “Dance of the Warriors,” one might expect to find parallels in section III of the Cantata. The rhythms of both works share an agitated, percussive quality, but that is where the similarities end. The vocal line of the “Song for the Warriors’ Departure” evokes the most primitive associations, as it takes on a chant-like quality with much pitch repetition within a narrow range. The vocal line also emphasizes the intervals of the minor third and major second, which when combined hint at a pentatonicism. While the Cantata is devoid of folkloric implications, Ginastera does integrate indigenous touches into his serial soundscape.

Effects of the Festivals

Ginastera earned the joint praise of U.S. and Latin American critics. In 1964, Cuban composer, critic and musicologist Aurelio de la Vega wrote:

Alberto Ginastera is now a world figure whose scores and records circulate all over the globe. He is a clear example of how Argentina has evolved musically in a few years. From his first nationalistic attempts (Impresiones de la Puna, Argentine Dances, Estancia) to his recent magnificent creations (Second Quartet for Strings, Concerto for Piano, Concerto for Violin, Don Rodrigo), he has followed an ascending trajectory, gradually assuming dodecaphonic hues and

universalist trappings, until he has come to mark a milestone in New World composition.\textsuperscript{179}

Thus, Ginastera fulfilled Chávez’s assertion that a country’s national music will be forged by one great genius. His music did not employ “nationalistic procedures”; rather, it embraced a universally valid style.

Through the Inter-American festivals, Ginastera also strengthened friendships with future collaborators, such as conductor Mitchell and Hobart Spalding. Ginastera’s friendship with Spalding proved instrumental in the creation of the composer’s best known—and most debated—opera, \textit{Bomarzo}.\textsuperscript{180} As Ginastera explained:

Last, but not least, it was through the festivals in Washington and their “wild projects” that I met Hobart Spalding, president of the Opera Society of Washington. Thanks to his enthusiasm and support, I wrote my opera \textit{Bomarzo}, and decided to explore new paths, developing my ideas in an attempt to renew that old but everlasting form, opera.\textsuperscript{181}

The impression left by the festivals on Ginastera’s compositional life was such that his absence at the Fourth Inter-American Music Festival (1968) was conspicuous, which forty-seven composers attended, twelve of them Ginastera’s students. As Lowens stated, “Nevertheless, it turned out that the Festival’s dominant figure was really a composer whose music was not presented in the program—Alberto Ginastera.”\textsuperscript{182}

Ginastera’s absence raised a few questions. “Why was the man who emerged from the first three Inter-American Music Festivals as one of the major creators of our time absent

\textsuperscript{181} Ginastera, “Why The Inter-American,” 8.
in the fourth?” Lowens queried. Ginastera decided to bow out because he felt that the Festival should showcase young composers from the Americas, not artists who had already earned their stripes. Yet Ginastera’s influence endures, especially when the polemics of inter-Americanism, national identity, and twentieth-century techniques intertwine.

183 Ibid.
CHAPTER IV.

REFLECTIONS ON “PAN-AMERICANISM IN ACTION”

Since its inception, the Inter-American system has evolved from an interest in hemispheric trade and political solidarity to a broader outlook that included cultural cooperation. Music gradually became a part of this system, offering new possibilities for inter-continental collaboration. The Music Division of the Pan American Union as well as the Inter-American Music Council did much to increase the interchange of music within the Americas. As I have argued, the ramifications of inter-Americanism affected Ginastera’s career.

Clearly, the Inter-American Music Festivals merit further study. These festivals affected other composers’ careers, notably Cordero who had credited the festival with “opening many doors” for him. Likewise, these festivals also influenced the careers of De la Vega and Orrego-Salas as many of their pivotal works premiered there. The festivals demonstrated that Latin American composers could produce more than just pleasing “rum and coca cola” compositions, thereby elevating the status of Latin American art music in the United States. The festivals also provided another example of how a politically motivated set of policies yielded unexpected artistic results.

The festivals, heavily imbued with the rhetoric of inter-Americanism, also fit within the larger context of the Cold War. The festivals emphasized the Americas “common heritage” and stressed the division between the New World and the Old. The

---

184 Cordero, Interview, 2.

festivals also selected compositions that employed abstract techniques and frowned upon “easy” music to “please the senses,” which contrasted with social realism’s emphasis on music with mass appeal.

Nationalism was a trickier topic. If in the United States political nationalism in Latin American came dangerously close to communism, in the musical world it was not immediately equated with communism. While some U.S. critics, such as Chase, considered nationalism as one step of an evolutionary process toward “universalism,” others, notably Latin Americans, saw the matter differently. Critic and scholar Pola Suárez Urtubey argued that national identity constitutes an integral part of one’s personality, whatever its pejorative connotations. As she wrote, “We discover that no man, like no branch of the human creation, can divorce oneself from his national personality, which is so unique and not transferable, like individual personality.” This sense of identity may become more acute when one’s country is on the periphery: to this day, Cordero inscribes “Panamanian Composer” under all his correspondence. Accordingly, the Inter-American Music Festivals encouraged nationalism in a “sublimated” form.

Ginastera’s monumental compositions premiered at a politically sponsored festival and at a politically charged time. Considering the rhetoric of inter-Americanism in relation to Ginastera’s serialism casts new light on the composer’s style and enriches our view of a composer who continues to influence the Latin American musical landscape into the twenty-first century.
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