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Abstract

Amidst the threat of World War II, President Roosevelt and his administration sought to unite Americans around the war effort by celebrating American ideas. Using concepts from his speeches and fireside chats, as well as official documents such as The Atlantic Charter, Roosevelt engaged Americans with rhetoric and language describing a wholly democratic world liberated by America’s Four Freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. After Pearl Harbor, Americans gained strength and motivation from these words and ideas, believing that the conflict allowed the United States to lead the world in a quest for universal peace and social welfare. Speeches, such as Vice President Wallace’s “The Price of Free World Victory: The Century of the Common Man,” echoed Roosevelt’s international agenda and reached working-class citizens in the United States, many of whom became inspired by New Deal rhetoric concerning the quest for worldwide peace and social justice.

Copland’s Fanfare for the Common Man, originally composed as a contribution to Conductor Eugene Goossens’s Fanfare series for the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra’s 1942–43 season, stands as a lasting symbol of an American idea during this time. By employing the rhetoric of Wallace’s speech in his title, Copland effectively adapted a genre historically employed in Britain to introduce and honor members of royalty to instead salute and pay tribute to the largest, most ordinary demographic, the common man. Fanfare for the Common Man, conceived at the hands of an American composer and commissioned by a British conductor, reflects the international agendas of the United States and Great Britain during World War II, yet does so in a uniquely American way.
that emphasizes the United States’ commitment in the 1930s and ’40s to equality and social welfare for all.

This study examines social, historical, and political perspectives of Copland’s contribution to the Goossens Fanfares, focusing on the circumstances surrounding the Fanfare’s conception, the socio-political climate that motivated its creation, and the wartime rhetoric that formed the basis for the Fanfare’s title. It also observes the ways that Copland modified and adapted the fanfare genre during a time of international conflict by selecting a poignant and appropriate title reflective of President Roosevelt’s determination to spread the American form of Social Democracy abroad and the general wartime sensibility of the country during World War II.
Acknowledgements

My research would not have been possible, nor quite so much fun, without the assistance of several resourceful and immensely supportive librarians, scholars, and friends. Many thanks are due to the librarians and staff of the Lilly Library at Indiana University for helping me secure and photocopy information and scores related to Goossens’s 1921 fanfare series in London. My fellow colleague and friend John Stine was gracious enough to escort me to his alma mater so I could retrieve these materials from Bloomington, Indiana and he must not be forgotten. Steve Kemple of the Cincinnati Public Library, as well as several of his colleagues, went to great efforts to assist me in locating newspaper reviews and program notes discussing the Goossens Fanfares. The very gifted librarians in the Performing Arts Division at the Library of Congress not only helped me gain access to several documents housed within the Copland Collection, but also enthusiastically shared in my first experience holding a score written in Copland’s own hand. During this trip to Washington, D.C., I also acquired two of the best research assistants any scholar could hope for: Mrs. Donna Melton, my mother, and our friend Mrs. Sheila Drain. Both of these women have since become two of my greatest and most cherished advocates.

I am indebted to several faculty members at the University of Cincinnati for inspiring me to pursue research in American music studies and encouraging my development as a musicologist. Special thanks are due to Dr. Jeongwon Joe and Dr. Robert Zierolf, both of whom read various drafts of my proposal and thesis, and provided recommendations that enhanced the final versions. I am especially thankful to have
acquired the advice and friendship of Dr. Stephen Porter through the course of writing this thesis. His enthusiasm and positive encouragement certainly helped me maintain stamina while in the research and writing process. My advisor, Dr. Bruce D. McClung, cannot be thanked enough. Our discussions about Copland and his *Fanfare* served as the inspiration for this thesis, and, in addition to keeping me honest as a scholar and editing my drafts, he continues to be a role model as I pursue a career in musicology.

Although they may have had little direct influence over the outcome of the final version, I must acknowledge the patience and understanding of two individuals who have become especially important to my life throughout the course of writing this thesis. Wesley Rish served as a devoted confidant, emotional compass, and much-needed distraction in some of the most crucial points of this thesis’s development. His endless support and love helps me remain optimistic about my future goals and dreams, both in and out of academe. My roommate, colleague, co-worker, friend, and honorary sister, Molly Cronin—soon to be Molly Williams, suffered through the emotional struggles and celebrated the triumphant successes by my side. I am certain that the field of musicology, not to mention life in general, would seem much more daunting if we were not in it together.

Finally, my parents, Al and Donna Melton, and my brother, Timothy Melton, have made incredible sacrifices to allow me the opportunity to study music and pursue my career. I am truly blessed and proud to be a daughter and a sister in a family that overwhelms me with unconditional love and support. Although I will never be able to adequately reflect my appreciation for everything they have done, I hope this thesis might be a small realization of my gratitude to them.
Table of Contents

Introduction. An American Idea: *Fanfare for the Common Man*..............................1

Chapter 1. Ideological Foundations: American Popular Front Culture and
International Agendas .................................................................15

Chapter 2. Patriotism and Post-War Agendas: Conception of *Fanfare for the Common Man* and the Goossens Fanfares........................................32

Chapter 3. The American Century: Socio-Political Rhetoric in Copland’s
Title for *Fanfare for the Common Man*........................................52

Chapter 4. Evoking the British Fanfare Genre: The Common Man’s
Entrance into Wartime America.......................................................63

Conclusion. An American Idea Endures: *Fanfare for the Common Man*.............78

Bibliography.........................................................................................83

Appendix 1. The Goossens Fanfares: Titles, Composers, Premiere Dates,
and Accompanying National Anthems.................................................93

Appendix 2. The Goossens Orchestra Concert Series at Queen’s Hall, London.........95
Introduction

An American Idea: Fanfare for the Common Man

For the 150th anniversary of The Atlantic magazine, the editors called upon various scholars, novelists, politicians, artists, and others to submit essays, drawings, and photographs that defined “the American idea,” described its future, and identified its current challenges.¹ The Atlantic, founded in November 1857 as a uniquely American and patriotic magazine devoted to literature, art, and politics, claimed that the forum not only provided a way to celebrate the long and vibrant life of one of America’s oldest intellectual magazines, but also emphasized that magazine’s long-standing “commitment to the open mind in pursuit of an [American] idea whose realization was partial and fragile 150 years ago, and still is.”² This idea was reflected in the forty-six contributions—ranging from a drawing depicting the Statue of Liberty dressed in Muslim garb by illustrator and author Istvan Banyai to senator Nancy Pelosi’s essay describing the intentions of the founding fathers reflected in America’s youth—that were selected and published in 2007 in the magazine’s 150th anniversary issue, each offering a distinctive take on what exactly constitutes “the American idea” and collectively forming a variety of interpretations on the future of America’s identity.³

Novelist and journalist Tom Wolfe penned the longest published essay, entitled Pell-Mell. He pinpoints the exact day and moment “the American idea” was conceived

² Ibid., 14.
and realized abroad, at 5 p.m. on Friday, 2 December 1803. That day marked President Thomas Jefferson’s State dinner and one of the most abashedly revealing, though perhaps contrived, faux pas made by a U.S. president in the presence of foreign dignitaries. As was customary at State dinners, the President invited a leading head of state from a foreign nation—in this case, the new British Ambassador Anthony Merry and his wife—as a distinguished guest.

A few days prior to the dinner, in typical nineteenth-century British fashion, Merry and his wife, Elizabeth Death, being the first foreign diplomats to visit and stay overnight in Washington, D.C., prepared for their initial meeting with President Jefferson in the grandest way. Wolfe describes Merry’s dress as “the whole aristocratic European ambassadorial getup” complete with “a hat with a swooping plume, a ceremonial sword, gold braid, [and] shoes with gleaming buckles.” Much to the Ambassador’s surprise and perhaps justifiably critical disappointment, the President received his honored guests not in the grand reception hall or famous library, but in a confining foyer, where Jefferson, dressed in what Wolfe describes as,

a very Hogarth of utter slovenliness from his head … to his torso, clad in a casual workaday outfit thrown together with a complete indifference to appearances and a negligence so perfectly gross, … down to his feet, which are stuffed, or mostly stuffed, into a pair of down-at-the-heels slippers, literally slippers and literally worn down at the heels in a way that is sheer Gin Lane.

The lack of respect displayed by Jefferson’s disheveled and informal greeting might have been enough to prompt Merry and Death to discontinue their visit to Washington altogether, though, as Wolfe explains, the couple arrived for the awaited

---

5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
State dinner promptly at 4:30 PM on 2 December 1803. After being escorted to the
drawing room where they mingled with various foreign dignitaries, U.S. Congressmen,
and other American guests, the entire party was invited into the dining room to take their
seats for dinner. Merry and Death waited for the President to take the arm of the Lady
Ambassador and seat her at a distinguished position at the end of the table, whereupon
Merry could take a seat next to her at the head. Yet, after realizing that Jefferson intended
to escort Dolley Madison, the wife of the U.S. Secretary of State and appointed White
House hostess after the death of Jefferson’s wife, the furious and insulted Death found
herself ushered into the dining room by Dolley’s husband, James, where she was seated
in “an obviously back-of-the-pack seat.”7

Her husband found himself among a group of individuals entering the dining
room in an “undifferentiated haunch-to-paunch herd of the titled, the untitled, the
eminences, and the not-muches entering the doorway”—pell-mell style—and taking their
seats anywhere, first-come, first-serve.8 Merry realized that even if he had wanted to try
to fight for a more advantageous seat at the table, he would have been hard-pressed to
find one as all of the tables were round, and having already been beaten out for a seat
next to the Spanish Ambassador’s wife by none-other than a lowly Congressman, he
swallowed his pride and took any seat he could find. Merry and Death never accepted any
invitations to dine at the White House again.

Since their trip to the White House, however, many foreign dignitaries have
enjoyed visits and taken part in many State dinners without humiliation. Pell-mell, named
for the confused, disorderly, and headlong rush of herding cattle, still remains the seating

7 Ibid., 59.
8 Ibid.
style at White House State dinners and all the tables are designed round so as not to
distinguish between the aristocratic guests and those that might be considered common.
While some foreigners may still find this practice puzzling, or even downright absurd, the
organization and arrangement of State dinners at the White House has become accepted
as a distinctly American way exercising freedom and equality, and a blatant reminder to
foreigners that there is no seat for the aristocratic class at the head of America’s table.

Thankfully, Jefferson’s perceived faux pas with the British Ambassador and his
wife did not produce any long-term conflicts for U.S. relations with Great Britain, and
since the War of 1812, the long-standing alliance between the two nations has proved to
be the strongest and most influential in history. Today, the United States continues to
retain many of the cultural and political practices that originated in Great Britain, such as
the State dinner, though Americans have made distinct, reformative modifications that
reflect a uniquely American identity.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as American orchestras became
established in various cities throughout the United States, orchestra companies looked to
the long-standing tradition of European classical music as a model for their own music
making and performing. American orchestras employed European conductors, including
Eugene Goossens of Great Britain, who served as resident conductor of the Cincinnati
Symphony Orchestra (CSO) from 1931–1947. Throughout his sixteen-year tenure with
the orchestra, Goossens retained his British flair and national origins by programming
massive choral works, recognizing British contemporary composers, and incorporating
traditional British genres, like the fanfare, the ode, and the English oratorio, in concerts
for U.S. audiences and composers.
On 30 August 1942, American composer Aaron Copland received a letter from Goossens asking for a composition in the form of a fanfare to honor the Americans and American allies supporting U.S. efforts in World War II. In addition to specifying that the fanfare be brief and easily performed by a small group of brass, woodwind, and percussion instruments, Goossens asked Copland to title his composition to reflect and pay tribute to a specific group of soldiers or an allied nation. Goossens explained that collectively these fanfares would help celebrate America’s composers, soldiers, and friends and their commitment towards the United States’ war effort.

Goossens’s commission was especially appealing to Copland, who had begun composing wholly and identifiably American compositions since his return from France in 1924. Beginning in the 1930s, Copland developed and adopted a compositional style that he called “imposed simplicity,” which addressed and appealed to the mass American public in an accessible, folkloric idiom found in such compositions as Appalachian Spring, El Salón México, and Lincoln Portrait. According to Copland, “The desire to be ‘American’ was symptomatic of the period.”

This period, also known as the Great Depression or Inter-war period, coincided with a socio-democratic movement called the Popular Front, which encompassed a cultural reaction to the economic crisis brought about by the infamous Stock Market Crash of 1929, the rise of a working class in industrialized America, and the increasing

---

9 Eugene Goossens, Cincinnati, to Aaron Copland, New York, 30 August 1942, transcript typed and signed in the hand of Eugene Goossens, in Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra: Centennial Portraits (Cincinnati: Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, 1994), 89.

The popularity of anti-fascism in the United States from around 1925 to 1950.\textsuperscript{11} The ideologies and methodologies of Popular Front activists, often referred to as “fellow travelers” or “wobblies,” were generated from leftist and even radically leftist communist and socialist political and socio-economic philosophies reflected in Roosevelt’s New Deal policies, the unions of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), anti-fascist agendas, and the industrialization of art and culture.\textsuperscript{12}

Copland was among some of the most active artists and composers of the Popular Front. In addition to supporting several radical causes in the 1930s, Copland openly admitted to his adherence with progressive philosophies and became involved in communist and left-wing circles, likely prompted by his involvement in the Composers Collective, friendships with left-leaning activists like Harold Clurman, Marc Blitzstein, and Hans Eisler, and his experiences in Mexico.\textsuperscript{13} In a 1979 interview with musicologist Vivian Perlis, Copland summarized his political allegiances by claiming that he never explicitly joined the American Communist Party, “but I was very sympathetic for the more radical side of things. It was a kind of feeling of the period, one was going to carry it along.”\textsuperscript{14}

Outside of the political arena, Copland used his highly accessible music to communicate and call attention to the progressive, socio-political views that had become


\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{13} Elizabeth B. Crist, \textit{Music for the Common Man: Aaron Copland during the Depression and War} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 17–19.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.; Typescript of interview with Vivian Perlis, September 16, 1979, Aaron Copland Collection, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC, 324.
a part of mainstream American culture by the 1930s. These sentiments are expressed in his proletarian worker song “Into the Streets May First,” which won the Workers’s Music League/ New Masses May Day song competition in 1934 and was subsequently published in the *Daily Worker* magazine.\(^{15}\) Indeed, Copland did not deny the political implications associated with the imposed simplicity style, which he adopted at the dawn of the Popular Front movement and abandoned quickly in the 1950s in attempts to thwart accusations from the House of Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.\(^{16}\) Instead, Copland supported the unionization of composers and named composers and artists as cultural workers for mass audiences, encouraging greater social consciousness between the composer and his or her listener.\(^{17}\)

Copland’s Imposed Simplicity style made its strongest appearances in his concert music. Despite the fact that most concert halls were traditionally filled with what John H. Mueller described as “a small, closely knit band of aristocrats and nobles, socially more or less acquainted with one another,” Copland’s compositions from the 1930s and ’40s reflect and symbolize the ideologies of the Popular Front movement, because they present traditional, European forms in a proverbial manner that can be easily understood and appreciated by concert audiences of all demographics.\(^{18}\) By infusing traditional classical genres with political symbolism and an accessible musical style, Copland

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 7–8.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., 8, 194.


increased the public appeal of high-brow concert music and permeated established, high-art culture with an emergent social consciousness that was rooted in Popular Front ideologies.\textsuperscript{19}

Goossens’s request for a fanfare titled and dedicated to reflect America’s contribution to the war effort was an ideal way for Copland to continue his personal commitment to the classical genres in a new, accessible context well-suited for American audiences. The fanfare, with its long-standing tradition in Great Britain, not only carries associations with the classical European tradition but also serves as an example of music created to honor the most aristocratic members of societies, which vastly differed from the democratic social order that Copland upheld in both his personal life and career.

Today, Copland’s \textit{Fanfare for the Common Man} is perhaps one of the best examples of the composer’s participation and contribution to the Popular Front movement through concert music and stands as a lasting symbol of an American idea during World War II.

This study examines Copland’s contribution to the Goossens’s Fanfares from social, historical, and political perspectives, observing the ways that Copland modified and adapted the British fanfare genre to suit America during a time of war by selecting a poignant and appropriate title reflective of both Popular Front culture and President Roosevelt’s determination to spread the American form of Social Democracy abroad. \textit{Fanfare for the Common Man}, conceived by an American composer and commissioned by a British conductor, echoes the international agendas of the United States and Great Britain during World War II, yet does so in a uniquely American way that emphasizes the United States’ commitment to equality and social welfare for all.

\textsuperscript{19} Crist, 10.
My study relies heavily on the research of Elizabeth Bergman and Michael Denning, as well as the methodological approaches defined by literary critic Fredric Jameson in his 1981 study *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Denning’s monograph *The Cultural Front: The Laboring of American Culture in the Twentieth Century* provides a comprehensive history of the Popular Front and offers an interpretive overview of the cultural politics and aesthetic ideologies that fueled this short and often overlooked social movement in U.S. history. Bergman’s monograph, *Music for the Common Man: Aaron Copland during the Depression and War*, published under the name Elizabeth Crist, places Aaron Copland, both his personal politics and music, within the framework of the Popular Front culture outlined by Denning, ultimately portraying Copland and his music during the Great Depression and War years as influenced by the movement. Her study details Copland’s personal participation in Popular Front politics through an examination of his documented association with left-wing political causes and parties, as well as his cultural contribution to the Popular Front movement through an analysis of several compositions that symbolize and communicate Popular Front ideologies.

Using Fredric Jameson’s model of “structural causality,” defined and outlined in the aforementioned study *The Political Unconscious*, Denning and Bergman differentiate between the external and explicitly organized type of “cultural politics” made through party membership and overt political engagement, and the symbolic political awareness, or “aesthetic ideologies” that can be expressed in a piece of music or artwork. The

---


cultural politics surrounding any artwork’s creation and the aesthetic ideologies presented within a formal analysis of the piece of art share a dialectical relationship, which can be connected through a process of mediation or historical interpretation that respects “the relative autonomy” of these two elements.22

My study, following Jameson’s model, establishes connections between Copland’s cultural politics, the cultural politics in America during the creation of *Fanfare for the Common Man*, and the aesthetic ideologies symbolized and communicated within the piece itself while maintaining that these three elements are independent and autonomous. Although Bergman’s study presents only a brief analysis of *Fanfare for the Common Man* as Copland reused it in his Third Symphony, my study will provide a more in-depth look at the composition as it was originally conceived for the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra’s 1942–1943 season and provide a historical interpretation specific to the piece and its surrounding cultural context, focusing mainly on the composition’s title and genre.

I have divided my study into four chapters, each devoted to a different aspect of Copland’s fanfare, and its history and conception. Chapter One deals specifically with the events, politics, and culture that surrounded the creation of Copland’s *Fanfare for the Common Man* by focusing on the events that defined the American spirit in 1942–1943, as well as Copland’s personal involvement in the politics of the time. He composed *Fanfare for the Common Man* during the peak of a short-lived movement in American history, the Popular Front, which reacted to the economic crises and industrial shifts had been occurring in America since the turn of the century. Without recounting a detailed history of the Popular Front in America, this chapter will focus on important

---
22 Jameson, 39.
demographic groups of individuals who played significant roles in shaping American Popular Front ideologies, namely political leftists and working-class unionists, and focus on their influence over composers and artists in America in the early 1940s. Using Bergman’s research and Copland’s own statements from and about the time period, I will then outline Copland’s personal affiliations with Popular Front politics and briefly discuss their influence over his works composed during the Great Depression through the premiere of *Fanfare for the Common Man*.

Chapter two considers the origins of *Fanfare for the Common Man* and its commission. Eugene Goossens’s idea to premiere a series of fanfares by primarily American composers during the 1942–1943 season of the CSO originated from a series of fanfares that Goossens programmed while conducting several concerts for a self-organized orchestra at Queen’s Hall, London in 1921. Although little documented information remains regarding these fanfares and their premieres, Carole Rosen’s book *The Goossens: A Musical Century* suggests that fanfares by composers Sir Arnold Bax, Emanuel de Falla, Julius Harrison, Hamilton Harty, Serge Prokofiev, Erik Satie, and Goossens himself premiered at the beginning of both the 27 October and 12 December performances. The fanfares received overwhelmingly positive reception from the press, provoking Goossens to published and preserved them in a music periodical called

---

23 Denning, 10.

24 *Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra Year Book: Symphony Concerts, and Ballet Programs, and Soloists: Forty-Eighth Season, 1942–1943*; *Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra*, 23; *Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra*, 89.

Fanfare. Rosen speculates that Goossens’s success with the London Fanfares caused him to commission a similar group of fanfares while conducting the CSO. Additionally, as recorded in existing letters from Goossens to select composers, he intended “to make these fanfares stirring and significant contributions to the war effort.” His program of American composers attests to his desire to commemorate the United States, even during times of crises. After detailing the origins of Goossens’s idea, this chapter will specifically examine the letters exchanged between Copland and Goossens during the commission and creation of Fanfare for the Common Man, which further explain Goossens’s intentions, specifications, and suggestions for the series of fanfares, and Copland’s composition in particular.

In Chapter Three, I discuss the origin of Copland’s title Fanfare for the Common Man and its sympathies with the American Popular Front movement. In his letters to Copland, Goossens offered several suggestions for Copland’s fanfare title including “‘A Fanfare for Soldiers,’ or ‘A Fanfare for Airmen,’ or ‘A Fanfare for Sailors.’” Copland, however, ultimately chose a title that would reflect his own political values and interest in the war. He considered such titles as “Fanfare for the Day of Victory,” “Fanfare for Future Heroes,” “Fanfare for the Post-War World,” “Fanfare for the Four Freedoms,” and “Fanfare for a Solemn Ceremony in which a Man’s Spirit is Rededicated to the

---


27 Rosen, 235.

28 Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, 89, and Rosen, 235.

29 Goossens, Cincinnati, to Copland, New York, 30 August 1942; Aaron Copland, New York, to Eugene Goossens, Cincinnati, 2 April 1943, in Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra; Eugene Goossens, Cincinnati, to Aaron Copland, New York, September 28, 1942, Aaron Copland Collection, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

30 Goossens, Cincinnati, to Copland, New York, September 28, 1942.
Proposition of a Better World,” all of which share an affirmative and hopeful tone for America’s future, with a progressive vision of social welfare and international solidarity, which reflected the culture of the Popular Front movement.\textsuperscript{31} While determining a title, Copland was influenced by the political speeches of President Roosevelt and Vice President Wallace, especially Roosevelt’s 1941 State of the Union address and a nationally broadcasted speech by Vice President Wallace on 8 May 1942, entitled “The Price of Free World Victory: The Century of the Common Man,” from which Copland took his title.\textsuperscript{32} Both Roosevelt and Wallace’s speeches argued for progressive political action, claiming America’s “supreme duty” was “sacrificing the lesser interest for the greater interest of the general welfare,” sentiments heavily advocated throughout the Popular Front movement.\textsuperscript{33} Although Copland claimed in a letter to Goossens that his title was meant to express patriotic sentiments, his personal affiliations with progressive politics and open support of Roosevelt and Wallace’s New Deal policies suggest that Copland may have been referencing Popular Front ideologies.\textsuperscript{34}

The final chapter provides a brief history of the fanfare genre in order to determine the significance of the fanfare in the United States and the implications of \textit{Fanfare for the Common Man} within the context of the Popular Front movement.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{33} Wallace, 483–84; Crist, 181.

\textsuperscript{34} Howard Pollack, \textit{Aaron Copland: The Life and Work of an Uncommon Man} (New York: Henry Holt, 1999), 360.
According to Henry George Farmer’s monograph *Military Music*, the fanfare was a genre that originated in England as a short passage for trumpets and other brass to be performed at coronations and royal ceremonies. The United States, however, being a democratic nation without monarchs or royal leaders, did not have practical uses for the fanfare as it was originally conceived, and the fanfare made its way into American musical culture as a signal call on the battlefield, in performances of military bands for the army, or by traveling circus companies. The Goossens Fanfares are unique because they were conceived in the United States and were not composed to be used on the battlefield or in any military band context. Instead, the fanfares function similarly to their original ancestors in England, because they were written for the concert hall and pay tribute to a specific group of people or nation. Copland’s choice to honor the common man, the largest, most typical group of Americans, speaks to his progressive views of social welfare and his support of Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms.

---


Eugene Goossens’s request for eighteen fanfares from prominent contemporary American composers fulfilled his intentions to allow musicians an opportunity to participate in the war effort and promote morale among the U.S. citizens at home. These fanfares were created during a time when the United States was finally experiencing financial relief from the devastating stock market crash of 1929. America’s hope for the future was supported by the increased jobs and booming market economy that emerged out of the United States’ involvement in the war. Middle-class workers, after banding together to endure the economic hardships of the last decade, had begun to form collective unions, which supported a unified vision of American social democracy and forced the government to recognize the working and middle classes as the largest and most powerful demographic. The progressive social values and liberal democratic system supported by this demographic developed into a new, national identity amongst U.S. citizens and permeated their politics, culture, and way of life. In the midst of one of the most culturally productive and politically charged fronts in American history, Goossens’s request provoked Copland to compose a fanfare whose title was infused with leftist and socially progressive ideologies, which had become essential to his cultural politics and aesthetics since the 1930s. Copland’s personal politics and compositional choices at this time reflect the growing national ideologies that had begun to define an America spirit motivating the quest for international peace at the end of the war.
In his study of the cultural achievements of this time period, *The Cultural Front: The Laboring of American Culture in the Twentieth Century*, Michael Denning conceptualizes the period of U.S. history between the 1920s through the ’40s, also known as the Popular Front movement, as a historical bloc where social forces allied together to create hegemony. According to Denning, “a moment of hegemony is when a historical bloc (in the sense of a particular alliance of class fractions and social forces) is able to lead a society for a period of time, winning consent through a form of representation, and thereby establishing a historical bloc (in the sense of a social formation).” Marxist historians like Antonio Gramsci support Denning’s analysis by considering a historical bloc a large social macrostructure built upon smaller cultural, political, and economic microstructures. In this sense, the historical bloc created during the Popular Front movement derived from the alliance of several dominant social forces of the 1930s through the ’40s, including labor unionists, the New Deal administration, anti-fascist agendas, and the cultural bureaucracy created through the industrialization of modern art and entertainment.

Denning’s description of the Popular Front offers a new perspective on the relationship between the American Communist Party (CPUSA) and social politics during this time. Other scholars, particularly Judy Kutulas and David H. Bennett, consider the Popular Front a social movement fueled by the Soviet Union, establishing Comintern

---


38 Ibid., 6.


40 Denning, 4.
influence on New Deal liberalism and progressive social politics.\textsuperscript{41} Both Kutulas and Bennett describe the Soviet Union’s attempts to capitalize on the socialist sympathies that existed in America after the first World War and during the Great Depression in order to unite various ethnic and politically diverse divisions of the American population in an international fight against fascism.\textsuperscript{42} Kutulas argues that, by the 1930s, the nation became divided between the People’s Front, or those who supported Soviet agendas, and the anti-Stalinists, who opposed them. While the majority of the People’s Front did not comprise radically left-leaning communists, the extreme opposition from the younger, more intellectual anti-Stalinist immigrant generation caused everyone who adopted political views even slightly left of center to be considered part of the Front.\textsuperscript{43} Bennett’s assessment of the 1930s political climate includes President Roosevelt and his New Deal administration, arguing that CPUSA support and promotion of New Deal policies caused a moderately liberal President to appear as the leader of a radical left-wing cause.\textsuperscript{44} Thus, a relatively small group of individuals made up the CPUSA, often referred to as the “red center” and instituted by the Comintern, or the controlling Socialist authority. This “red center” instigated the politically driven social movement of the 1930s, while a larger

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Crist, 421; Kutulas, 1.
\item Kutulas, 2–3.
\item Bennett, 39.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
body of less radical, non-partisan, soviet sympathizers, otherwise known as “fellow travelers,” made up the outer, “pink” periphery of the movement.45

Denning’s research provides a markedly different understanding of the structure of the Popular Front. Instead of viewing it as a social movement initiated by the anti-fascist agendas of the Soviet Union, Denning claims that the Popular Front was established as less radical political factions of the United States’ working-class population, such as the non-communist socialists, non-partisan leftists, and deep-seated progressives, united to advance similar social and political agendas, creating a historical bloc that brought together large cultural, aesthetic, and legislative structures without formally aligning themselves with any particular political party. According to Denning, the Popular Front is best understood as a native movement, organized around the collective ideologies of leftist and progressive working-class groups already in existence in America.46 Denning’s model of the Popular Front’s structure consequently marks the majority of its core, active members as pink, since many sympathized with communist and socialist agendas but were not committed to any specific political party, and disregards previous scholars’ notion of a red, Comintern center at the heart of the movement.47

Most of the non-partisan, leftist advocates of Popular Front ideologies drew from working-class, urban populations. Although scattered and dispersed throughout the country and unable to thoroughly unite in favor of one political party, legislative action,
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or method of organization, unionized wage earners constituted the largest structure within
the Popular Front and formed a substantial cadre within the movement’s historical bloc.⁴⁸
According to Harold U. Faulkner and Mark Starr, “Organized labor increased
tremendously—more than tripled—in the decade 1933 to 1943.”⁴⁹ By 1943, the nation’s
two largest organizations of labor unions, the American Federation of Labor and the CIO
had collectively acquired over eleven million dues-paying members, not to mention the
more than one million members of independent organized labor unions such as The
United Mine Workers and the Railroad Brotherhoods.⁵⁰ These figures show that by the
mid-1930s, at the presumed peak of the Popular Front social movement, approximately
one-third of wage earners were organized, and labor unions were increasingly becoming
an American way of life.⁵¹
Denning’s description of the structure of the Popular Front historical bloc not only
includes these unionized, working-class citizens who made up the majority of the Front’s
active members, but also accounts for the many artists and entertainers who, until this
time, had not conventionally been regarded as proletarian industrial workers.⁵² New Deal
legislation during this time, particularly the efforts of the Works Progress Administration
(WPA) to provide economic relief within important working sectors like the art and
entertainment industries, combined with the influx of native and immigrant working-class

⁴⁸ Denning, 6.
⁴⁹ Harold U. Faulkner and Mark Starr, Labor in America (New York: Harper & Brothers
Publishers, 1944), 162.
⁵⁰ Ibid.
⁵¹ Ibid., 162–63.
⁵² Denning, 4.
citizens then migrating to industrial urban centers in the United States in search of jobs, fueled the rise of a major microstructure within the Popular Front historical bloc, “the cultural apparatus.” The sociologist C. Wright Mills coined “the cultural apparatus” to describe the mass distribution of art, science, and entertainment in the 1930s and ’40s by various institutions and organizations such as schools, the corporate media, laboratories, museums, and radio networks. According to Mills, the mass production and consumerism of art and entertainment during the Popular Front created the need for a new form of “mental labor” in America that appropriated the skills of the industrial craftsman to produce accessible forms of American culture. The cultural artifacts produced during this time were used both to advertise and promote the manufactured goods of the profit-seeking, industrial revolution to a larger consumer public, and to provide art, leisure, and entertainment to the new wave of educated, working-class citizens in urban centers.

Serving both the advertising and entertainment industries in this way created a mass cultural market, which met the consumer demands of the dominating working-class population and their Popular Front ideologies. Such solicitation required that cultural manufacturers change their target audience from the educated, upper-class bourgeoisie to
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the middle and lower working classes, in effect creating more accessible and affordable “popular art” products geared towards a larger public with leftist ideals. As Denning explains:

Before the epoch of Fordism and modernism, the popular arts were generally ignored by the “educated classes,” the “cultured classes,” the “leisure class,” the various parts of the American bourgeoisie. The popular arts—dime novels, melodramas and vaudeville acts, blues singers and string bands, traveling circuses, minstrel shows, and tent shows, as well as the foreign-language cultures of immigrant neighborhoods—inhabited a different universe from the budding metropolitan high culture—“legitimate” theater, symphony orchestras, universities, art museums, the publishers and magazines like Charles Scribners and the Atlantic Monthly that published the novels and stories of Howells, James, and Wharton.56

The newly targeted, dominating working class formed a consumer audience that transcended the boundaries of “high” and “low” art. The Great Depression decreased the number of upper-class, cultured citizens who supported the art and entertainment industry as a leisure activity to satisfy their intellectual and worldly sensibilities, while the legislative and social reform movements that were enacted in the decade after the Great Depression helped to revive the economic status of lower-class citizens who were either too poor or uneducated to support the arts sector. Ultimately, a dynamic middle-class majority emerged in the 1930s that had the economic and intellectual means to support a cultural industry willing to re-form its products to appeal to the interests of a proletarian audience.

Denning views this shift in the art and entertainment industries’s target audience and efforts to re-form genres and artistic styles to conform to the popular, accessible tastes of the time as a significant microstructure, which he terms “The Cultural Front,” that contributed to the Popular Front historical bloc of the 1930s and ’40s. He explains:

56 Ibid., 40.
“The cultural front is thus the terrain where the Popular Front social movement met the cultural apparatus during the age of the CIO. From that conflict and conjuncture came the Popular Front ‘flavor’ of American mass culture, what I will call the laboring of American culture.”\textsuperscript{57} The “laboring of American culture” involved both high and low brow art genres adopting a “distinctly plebian accent,” which reflected the social and cultural status of both the consumers and the producers of the art industry in America during the Popular Front.\textsuperscript{58}

While Denning’s study of the Cultural Front examines artists and entertainers in the 1920s through the ’40s whose cultural politics, or personal political allegiances, and aesthetic ideologies conveyed in their works collectively contributed to the Popular Front historical bloc, his study focuses only on those artists who consistently utilized “low art” genres and styles that appealed to larger audiences even before the Popular Front became a dominating force within the American culture industries. Denning acknowledges, however, “much of the ‘cultural front’… was built on a ‘popularization’ of high culture and diffusion of ‘proletarian’ and ‘folk’ culture.”\textsuperscript{59} His choice to consider only Cultural Front musical contributions that are easily categorized as “low art” in terms of their style, genre, form, and intended performance venue, such as Marc Blitzstein’s \textit{The Cradle Will Rock}, Duke Ellington’s \textit{Jump for Joy}, and the migrant narratives composed by Woody Guthrie and Ernesto Galarza, among others, displays an obvious neglect of composers like Aaron Copland, who chose to continue composing for the concert hall in the genres

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 50.
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and forms of the “high art” European classical tradition and reformed the aesthetic idiom and ideologies of his pieces to appeal to a wider audience.

Elizabeth Bergman Crist was perhaps the first scholar to notice the absence of classical composers like Aaron Copland from Denning’s study of the Cultural Front. In *Music for the Common Man: Aaron Copland during the Depression and War*, Crist argues that Copland was an active participant in the Popular Front historical bloc in both his personal cultural politics and left-leaning political affiliations, as well as through the aesthetic ideology inherent in many of his compositions from the 1930s and ’40s. Her book provides a look into Copland’s own support of leftist social and political agendas, his association with the CPUSA, and his involvement in Popular Front causes to generate an informed reading of the general Cultural Front ideologies conveyed in pieces like *El Salón México* (1932), *The Second Hurricane* (1936), *Billy the Kid* (1938), *Lincoln Portrait* (1942), *Rodeo* (1942), *Appalachian Spring* (1943), and the Third Symphony (1944). Crist argues that ballets like *Billy the Kid, Rodeo, and Appalachian Spring* use the American Western frontier as a setting for “exploring social conflicts and cultural contradictions, given that the myth of the West has its own origins in conflict.” Instead of viewing the West as the epitome of American values and progress, Copland used sounds commonly associated with cowboy and prairie life to depict stories where tensions arise between individual liberties and collective security, ultimately warning that the Great American West can become a stage for capitalist exploitation and competitive
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individualism with no regard for the larger community.\textsuperscript{62} As Crist shows, Copland’s Western-tinged ballets reflect the more communitarian agenda that the Roosevelt administration attempted to put forth with regard to the American West during the Great Depression, advocating that the West be viewed as a land of “cooperation” as opposed to a land of pure “individual opportunity.”\textsuperscript{63}

Crist argues that Copland’s use of a newly adopted aesthetic idiom in the 1930s and ’40s, a style which he termed “imposed simplicity,” shows an attempt on his part to attract the middle-class and proletarian public to the concert hall and present previously viewed high brow genres in an accessible style akin to Popular Front ideologies.\textsuperscript{64} Copland’s imposed simplicity style is defined by both an aesthetic quality, which, according to Crist, reflects the Popular Front by appealing to large, working and middle classes, and a functional characteristic that shows Copland’s embrace of music’s new industrialized role in cultural society.\textsuperscript{65} In terms of aesthetics, Crist notes that the majority of compositions Copland considered to characterize his imposed simplicity style seem to share the inclusion of folk materials, either borrowed or imitated, and featured diatonic, simple harmonic and melodic structures, “privileging audible rhetoric over structural logic.”\textsuperscript{66} Copland often stressed the functional nature of the compositions, indicating that the imposed simplicity style implies a type of music with an intended, practical purpose, or specific audience, such an opera for school children (\textit{The Second
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Hurricane), film scores (The City, Of Mice and Men, and Our Town), or specific commissions (Music for Radio).⁶⁷

In his own prose, Copland admitted to the influence of politics on his compositional choices during this time and claimed that his adoption of the imposed simplicity style was “not without its political implications.”⁶⁸ His 1939 essay “Composer from Brooklyn,” published in the Magazine of Art, highlights Copland’s knowledge of the changing attitude towards high- and low-brow genres and his desire to attract the new wave of consumers from the middle and working classes to the concert halls:

I began to feel an increasing dissatisfaction with the relations of the music-loving public and the living composer. The old “special” public of the modern-music concerts had fallen away, and the conventional concert public continued apathetic or indifferent to anything but the established classics. It seemed to me that we composers were in danger of working in a vacuum. Moreover, an entirely new public for music had grown up around the radio and phonograph. It made no sense to ignore them and to continue writing as if they did not exist. I felt that it was worth the effort to see if I couldn’t say what I had to say in the simplest possible terms.⁶⁹

The general Popular Front ideologies that Crist convincingly argues are inherent to Copland’s imposed simplicity style compositions also show Copland’s tendency to follow the same themes conveyed in the social and political trends of the Popular Front social movement. Her analyses of Copland’s compositions composed between 1930 and 1945 can be taken one step further to show how Copland’s imposed simplicity style compositions can be easily divided to reflect the slight differences in Popular Front social and political agendas before and after the United States’ entrance into the war.


⁶⁹ Copland, “Composer from Brooklyn,” 160.
Crist’s analyses of Copland’s pre-war compositions, such as *El Salón México* (1932), *The Second Hurricane* (1936), *Billy the Kid* (1938), and his score for the documentary film *The City* (1939), display a remarkable thematic correlation with the ideas and visions that motivated the many microstructures within the Popular Front historical bloc before America’s entrance into World War II, especially the legislative goals and priorities outlined by President Roosevelt’s New Deal administration. For example, *El Salón México*, a symphonic work completed in 1936 after Copland’s visits to Mexico, includes melodies based on Mexican folk music, utilizes quotations from pre-existing Mexican popular tunes, and incorporates Latin American rhythms and timbral effects to achieve a dialectical relationship between rural and urban experiences within the music that highlights the grotesque contradictions of Great Depression-era culture.70

*The Second Hurricane*, also composed in 1936, evokes Popular Front ideologies in its functional and didactic nature, composed as an opera for high-school students, as well as its ability to directly confront difficult and frightening themes in the decade after the Great Depression, such as self-sufficiency, cooperation, liberty, and equality.71

As shown in Crist’s analyses, Copland’s compositions during this time consistently expose the societal failures that occurred during the Great Depression. Copland often juxtaposed a grotesque view of the self-serving, dehumanizing qualities of urban industrial life against the economically poor, yet culturally wealthy status of rural neighborhoods. These pre-war compositions express social and political messages, which highlight the need for social reform and economic recovery during the Great Depression
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years and show a consistent parallel with the agendas of Roosevelt’s New Deal administration before the war.

President Roosevelt’s left-leaning democratic administration formed another significant microstructure within the Popular Front historical bloc. Roosevelt gained significant support from American Soviet sympathizers and the CPUSA specifically during his campaign for president in 1933, 1937, and 1941. Despite the American Communist Party’s own presidential nominee in the 1938 election, the party pledged their full support of Roosevelt in published pamphlets and newspapers claiming, “We Communists welcome his speeches, agree with their central thoughts and quietly and calmly tell the President he has nothing to fear from us, on the contrary, he will receive our help.”

While American socialist leaders like Norman Thomas critiqued Roosevelt for his reluctance to embrace the concept of socialized property and fully implement the radical agenda of the Socialist Party, communists, left-leaning democrats, and Popular Front advocates favored Roosevelt because of his desire to reform the capitalist system into a new form of social democracy.

The most significant legislative contribution to the Popular Front came from Roosevelt’s New Deal initiatives. Scholars have consistently organized the New Deal policies ratified by Congress into two categories or waves of legislation. The first wave of Roosevelt’s New Deal legislation initiatives, such as the ratification of the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) on 16 June 1933, provided the first example of Popular Front legacies.
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Front legislation. Implemented with the overall goal of stimulating the American economy after the Great Depression, the NIRA encouraged workers to unionize and allowed the government greater authority to regulate industry, to permit monopolies, and to establish national public works programs. In a 1932 campaign speech, Roosevelt identified the desires and expectations of Popular Front supporters while foreshadowing New Deal initiatives to come by stating the need for economic equality and balance of corporate power regulated and imposed by the federal government:

We know, now, that [the great industrial and financial corporations] cannot exist unless prosperity is uniform, that is, unless purchasing power is well distributed throughout every group in the Nation…. Why business men everywhere are asking for a form of organization which will bring the scheme of things into balance, even though it may in some measure qualify the freedom of action of individual units within the business…. The Government must be swift to enter and protect the public interest.

Roosevelt’s direct call for federal action to disrupt the balance of power created by corporate capitalism made him the first President since Woodrow Wilson to advocate and to implement leftist reforms that advocated for the involuntary government regulation of business and appealed to Popular Front sensibilities. Bert Cochran, in Labor and Communism: The Conflict that Shaped American Unions, writes that once implemented, the 1933 New Deal policies became the catalysts for a new wave of hopeful workers, empowered by their union statuses, and “the bitterness and frustration that accumulated
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in the bleak depression years now exploded into a riot of union organization and
strikes.”

Popular Front support for Roosevelt and his New Deal administration increased
after Congress ratified his second wave of legislation acts from 1935 to 1938. As Basil
Rauch has shown in *The History of the New Deal 1933–1938*, Roosevelt’s second wave
of New Deal policies moved away from the goal of recovering from the economic
disparities of the Great Depression towards the goal of reforming the current government
system into a democracy governed by social welfare. As Rauch states, in the second New
Deal “reform was declared to be inseparable from recovery.” Discouraged by the failure
of the First New Deal and the NIRA in particular to effectively produce sound economic
recovery and as Roosevelt stated “weed out the overprivileged” and “lift up the
underprivileged,” the Roosevelt administration executed legislative initiatives
guaranteeing increased labor union support, substantial aide to the agriculture sector, and
social welfare for the unemployed and impoverished through relief programs like the
WPA and the Social Security Act. The second wave of New Deal legislation proved to
be even more inline with the leftist political ideologies of the Popular Front because of
their intentional capacity to change the American capitalist system into a broader form of
social democracy that benefited the lower and middle classes. Rauch even argues that
these policies were influenced by the increased public support of leftist and communist
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social leaders like Father Caughlin and Huey Long, who were key figures within the Popular Front.\(^{81}\)

While themes of recovery and social reform formed the basis of Roosevelt’s first and second wave of New Deal legislation initiatives, a few scholars have extended New Deal policies to include the international and humanitarian agendas of the Roosevelt administration after America’s entrance into World War II. Elizabeth Borgwardt, for example, argues that Roosevelt’s New Deal initiatives after the start of the war moved from being centered around domestic economic recovery and social reform towards a more internationally oriented vision of social democracy.\(^{82}\) She presents the war, as well as political events such as the signing of the Atlantic Charter and the creation of the United Nations, as factors that forced Americans to become more concerned with foreign policy agendas and less focused on domestic reform and recovery after the Great Depression.\(^{83}\) The economic destruction that American’s faced after the Great Depression permitted a more sympathetic response to the humanitarian wants and needs of nations facing the horrors of a fascists induced war conflict, and Americans became supportive of Roosevelt’s efforts to extend New Deal legislation initiatives beyond the borders of the United States. As Borgwardt explains: “For many Americans, the New Deal at home and the prospect of victory abroad had kindled optimism and hope, even as their world had been turned upside-down by massive economic suffering and total war. Together, these sets of transformative experiences served to prepare the minds of Americans for
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expanding the New Deal—with all its contradictions and limitations—to the rest of the world.\textsuperscript{84}

Copland began composing \textit{Fanfare for the Common Man} in 1942, just months after America had entered World War II, and the composition likely resulted in his first opportunity to musically express his political ideas that emerged after the start of the war. Ideologically aligned with the Roosevelt administration’s international agenda to spread the social and economic reform initiatives of the New Deal beyond the borders of the U.S. soil, Copland’s \textit{Fanfare for the Common Man} provides a unique look into the changing visions of American ideologies at the start of the war and the reliance on American nationalism to promote the international humanitarian agendas of the war effort.

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., 86.
Chapter 2

Patriotism and Post-War Agendas:

Conception of Copland’s *Fanfare for the Common Man* and Goossens’s Fanfares

About a year and a half before the premiere of Aaron Copland’s *Fanfare for the Common Man*, U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill met aboard warships on 14 August 1941, in Ship Harbor, Newfoundland at the Atlantic Conference to issue a joint declaration formally acknowledging each country’s commitment to a post-war world that would include the right to self-determination and social welfare. Although the United States did not officially enter the war until almost four months later, the document, which eventually came to be known as the Atlantic Charter, marked the United States’ first multi-lateral attempt toward promoting the international social and economic reform sought in the second wave of Roosevelt’s New Deal legislation initiatives. For Great Britain, the Atlantic Conference allowed Churchill to solicit much-needed support in the war effort, an act that confirmed the United States as the world’s new leading power.85

The United States had entered the war after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in the early morning hours of 7 December 1941. Roosevelt’s well-known address to Congress asking for a declaration of war may have marked the date as one that would “live in infamy,” though, at the time, many of the Allied powers, especially Great Britain, were relieved to know that the United States would finally be launching a full-scale military attack on Japan, inevitably provoking a defensive strike against Nazi Germany.

---

and the Kingdom of Italy. After officially proclaiming the need for U.S. support in the war effort at the Atlantic Conference, Great Britain rallied behind the United States’ entrance into the war, and British support for the U.S. war effort took many forms.

Likely influenced by the growing enthusiasm for the U.S. war effort and the alliance that had grown between his native and resident countries since the Atlantic Conference, then Resident Conductor of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra (CSO) Eugene Goossens, thematically linked the symphony’s first full subscription season after the Pearl Harbor attack to reflect the U.S. war effort and acknowledge Allied nations’s wartime contributions. Each concert that season featured a patriotic fanfare written by some of the most prominent contemporary composers, the majority of whom were native-born U.S. citizens. Goossens programmed these fanfares directly after intermission, following a performance of a national anthem of one of the Allied nations. Collectively, the fanfares represented Goossens’s efforts to promote and inspire patriotism, and musically they embodied the post-war vision of international peace outlined in the Atlantic Charter, a cause that he claimed all the participating composers shared “at heart.”

Goossens’s idea to premiere celebratory fanfares stemmed from a similar collection of fanfares he programmed as a young conductor in London during World War
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I. Before accepting the position as resident conductor for the CSO, Goossens struggled to establish a reputation in his native London. The Goossens’s family had produced several generations of world-renowned conductors, affording Eugene Goossens opportunities to be invited as guest conductor for famous orchestras like the Royal College of Music, the Queen’s Hall Orchestra, and the Beechem Opera Company Orchestra. By 1920, however, the London arts sector had suffered major financial losses due to rising wartime expenses. Thomas Beecham went bankrupt, ending Goossens’s guest conducting opportunities and putting a three-year hold on the generous financial support afforded to the Beecham Opera Company, as well as to three of London’s most prominent orchestras, the Hallé Orchestra, the London Symphony Orchestra, and the Royal Philharmonic Society.

In 1921 Goossens sought alternative means of music making and decided to organize his own orchestra. The group was known as The Goossens Orchestra and featured 105 instrumentalists, hand selected by Goossens himself to perform in a special series of concerts at Queen’s Hall. Several of the players were members of Goossens’s family, including his siblings Marie, Sidone, and Léon. According to Robert Elkin, a historian who documented the early history of Queen’s Hall, the Goossens Orchestra showcased “the finest players in London and constituted an exceptionally brilliant
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ensemble.”

It debuted at Queen’s Hall on 7 June 1921 with a program that foreshadowed the anti-romantic focus Goossens would later adopt as Music Director for the CSO. The program contrasted modern British works with contemporary Russian pieces, including John Ireland’s *Forgotten Rite* and the first concert performance of Igor Stravinsky’s *Le Sacre du Printemps*.

The Goossens Orchestra debut proved to be unanimously successful with the press and public. Stravinsky himself attended the concert and confessed to reporter Robin Legge, “It was the finest performance of *Sacre du Printemps*. The press was most impressed by Goossens’s conducting of *Le Sacre*, and London newspapers the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Observer* requested repeat performances. Alfred Kalisch of *The Musical Times* was especially praiseful, writing, “The performance was a great personal triumph for Mr. Goossens, who will now rank definitely as one of our best conductors.”

In an effort to capitalize on the success of his orchestra’s debut concert, Goossens planned four additional performances of contemporary music between the months of June and December at Queen’s Hall in 1921. Consistent with his desire to promote modern works and avoid nineteenth-century German Romanticism, Goossens continued programming modernist works by contemporary composers and gave many world and
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regional premieres throughout the course of this series, including the Bach-Elgar Fugue in C minor, Ireland’s *Symphonic Rhapsody*, three dances from Emmanuel de Falla’s *El Amor Brujo*, and Cyril Scott’s *Aubade*. Overall, the four concerts generated much publicity and critical acclaim with both the press and public, and encouraged Goossens to program additional concerts of new music.

In addition to the large scale orchestral works premiered during this concert series, Goossens also programmed fourteen small fanfares to be played at the second and last concerts of the series, held on 27 October and 12 December 1921. Although they may have been the smallest and most overlooked pieces by the press, considered merely “the extra bonus” of the concert series, these fanfares proved to have a significant influence on Goossens, who believed that the fanfares allowed modern composers a chance to reflect on and contribute to the war effort with spirited, celebratory music.

These fanfares, hereafter referred to as the London Fanfares, featured twentieth-century European composers including Sir Arnold Bax, Emmanuel de Falla, Julius Harrison, Sir Hamilton Harty, Gian Francesco Malipiero, Darius Milhaud, Francis Poulenc, Sergey Prokofiev, Albert Roussel, Erik Satie, Egon Wellesz, Felix White, as well as Goossens himself. Goossens intended the London Fanfares to inspire hope and optimism in Europeans during World War I, and many were given war-related titles such as Roussel’s *Fanfare pour un sacre païen* and White’s *Fanfare for a Challenge to Accepted Ideas*.
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On the insistence of author and editor Leigh Henry, Goossens published all of the London Fanfares in a new bi-monthly British periodical *Fanfare*, to reflect the unique compositions that Goossens published in it. Although this periodical produced a mere seven issues before merging with the more popular and better funded *Musical Mirror*, the overall desire to advocate new artists with modern artistic styles became a consistent theme in every contribution and echoed Goossens’s own sentiments in his concert programs. The London Fanfares made up the primary musical contributions in six of the seven issues and inspired Henry to promote a theme for the periodical’s short existence. In the premiere issue, Henry wrote of his vision for the magazine, claiming he hoped it would enfranchise the modern artist and “presage the advent of a new era which demands celebration by a new Fanfare.” These sentiments echoed Goossens’s original intentions in programming the London Fanfares as a way to not only further his personal career, but also to promote music composed in the wake of World War I.

After the debut concert series with his new orchestra, Goossens introduced London audiences to additional young, modernist composers such as Arthur Honegger, Darius Milhaud, Francis Poulenc, and Arnold Schoenberg. He was afforded opportunities to conduct at some of London’s most prestigious concert venues, allowing
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him to take part in famous London debuts such as the first British performance of Frederick Delius’s cello concerto at the Queen’s Hall on 3 July 1923. The year after his London concert series, Goossens found work conducting the Carl Rosa Opera alternate nights at Covent Garden and Diaghliev’s Ballets Russes at the Alhambra Theatre. In 1923 Goossens conducted the opening performance of Delius’s opera Hassan at His Majesty’s Theater. Despite the successes in London, Goossens’s determination to promote contemporary composers ultimately lead to economic failure, as many audiences favored more traditional classic works and found that Goossens’s concerts featured too much novelty. He was forced to declare bankruptcy in 1923.

That same year, at the invitation of George Eastman, founder of the Eastman Kodak Company, Goossens fled London for the United States and accepted the position as conductor for Eastman’s newly founded Rochester Philharmonic Orchestra. The United States’ audiences were far more accepting of Goossens’s love of contemporary music, and several U.S. orchestras offered him opportunities to appear as guest conductor on their programs. In January 1926, conductor Walter Damrosch invited Goossens to conduct two weeks of concerts with the New York Symphony Orchestra (NSO), an opportunity that not only allowed Goossens a chance to revisit his successful interpretation of the concert version of Stravinsky’s Le Sacre, but also afforded him the occasion to meet New York Philharmonic conductor Arturo Toscanini.
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Koussevitzky also invited Goossens to appear as guest conductor with the Boston Symphony Orchestra during the 1925–1926 season. Although Goossens initially retained his apartment in London and frequently returned to Britain with the hope of restoring his musical connections, by December 1925 he had secured a name for himself as both a conductor and composer in the United States and took up permanent residence in New York.\footnote{Ibid., 102–103.} He continued conducting the NSO while accepting guest conductor invitations with various regional orchestras, until finally, in 1931, he was appointed music director of the CSO and May Festival.\footnote{Rosen, “Sir Eugene Goossens.”}

As director of the CSO, Goossens fulfilled his goal to endorse contemporary composers and their music through his concert programs, though his programming strategies in Cincinnati tended to emphasize the works of modern British composers, including Sir Arnold Bax, Sir Arthur Bliss, Joseph Holbrooke, Roger Quilter, and Cyril Scott.\footnote{Rosen, \textit{The Goossens}, 147.} Determined to draw large audiences and overcome the economic challenges created by the Great Depression, he initiated a Sunday evening series of Pop Concerts that mimicked the lighthearted, accessible concerts of Henry Wood at Queen’s Hall in London.\footnote{Ibid., 148.} The challenges associated with directing one of the nation’s top orchestras, programming an annual festival, and maintaining an international conducting reputation required a hectic and strenuous schedule, and Goossens found little time for composition during his sixteen-year tenure with the CSO.\footnote{Ibid., 154–59.}
During the 1942–1943 season, Goossens once again found himself programming a series of concerts for a nation at war. Still striving to promote contemporary composers and their works, Goossens decided to resurrect and redesign the fanfare series. He contacted twenty-six different composers, either from or residing in the United States, requesting a fanfare to premiere at each subscription concert following a performance of a national anthem from one of the allied nations.\textsuperscript{119} Goossens’s letters to these composers outline his idea: “For the forthcoming season of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, it is my intention to revive an experiment which I originated at my concerts in London after the last war. At that time I invited the leading British composers to write a fanfare to be played at the beginning of each program after the National Anthem…. The Fanfares all proved sensational and scored a rousing success with the press and public.”\textsuperscript{120}

Just as many of the London Fanfares had been titled to commemorate World War I and inspire patriotism among audience members, so too were the Cincinnati Fanfares, later termed the Goossens Fanfares by the CSO, joined by a unifying theme that paid tribute to the U.S. war effort and the Allies. His letter to Copland, dated 30 August 1942 emphasizes the camaraderie and solidarity that he felt with American composers in a time of war and the important contribution that the fanfares would make to the united war effort: “I am now inviting you and some of your eminent colleagues to contribute a fanfare to be played at the opening of one of our concerts during the coming season. It is my idea to make these fanfares stirring and significant contributions to the war effort…. I


\textsuperscript{120} Goossens, Cincinnati, to Copland, New York, 30 August 1942, 89.
am asking you this favour in a spirit of friendly comradeship, and I ask you to do it for the cause we all have at heart.”

Twenty-four composers accepted the invitation, though Goossens premiered only eighteen fanfares during the season. Goossens’s decision to cut fanfare submissions was mandated by the fact that only seventeen subscription concerts were being offered that season. He extended the fanfare series into the Pops Concert season and premiered one fanfare, Bernard Roger’s *Fanfare for Commandos*, during the 20 February 1943 Pops concert, increasing the total number of performed fanfares to eighteen.

Roy Harris’s fanfare, entitled *A Fanfare for Forces*, though completed in 1942 and sent to Goossens, never made it on any CSO program that season. Considering Harris’s complete fanfare contained less than fifty seconds of musical material, it was presumably too short to warrant a performance. Although in his instructions to Copland, Goossens gave the composer some leeway, specifying that each fanfare be brief, since “obviously it would be difficult to prolong such a piece over a period of two minutes,” but informing Copland that he trusted his instinct when it came to the ultimate length of the piece.
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Goossens also eliminated Edgar Stillman Kelley’s fanfare, entitled *Salutations to Our Boys on Land, Sea, and Sky*, likely due to its title. In his correspondence to the composers, Goossens had indicated a certain uniformity among the fanfare titles to emphasize the wartime theme that united the entire fanfare series. His instructions to Copland clearly state, “I suggest that you give your fanfare a title as, for instance: ‘A Fanfare for Soldiers,’ or ‘A Fanfare for Airmen’ or ‘A Fanfare for Sailors,’ or some such heading.” The sample title headings that Goossens provided indicated that the fanfares should be dedicated to a branch of the armed forces involved with a title in the format, “A Fanfare for ____.” Goossens’s letter also explained that the fanfares, like the fanfares that he programmed in his London concert series of 1941, would be played at the beginning of a concert program following a national anthem. Subsequent letters suggest that Goossens had pre-selected titles for several of the fanfares and assigned them to certain composers so that all of the United States’ allied nations and military personnel might be represented. Goossens asked Deems Taylor, for example, to compose a fanfare in honor of Russia, and the composer subsequently decided to incorporate the Russian folksong “Dubinushka” into his composition.

Goossens also chose to cut Roger Sessions’s *Fanfare for the Dead of Bataan, Malta, Sevastopol, and Stalingrad*. Although Sessions’s title did meet Goossens’s
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specifications, its subject emphasized cities and colonies of allied nations that had faced tragic losses. Since Goossens’s primary goal in programming the fanfares was to make a contribution to the war effort, he might have felt that Sessions’s fanfare title was too sad and nostalgic to evoke a patriotic atmosphere.\textsuperscript{130}

Composers Ernest Bloch, Percy Grainger, and Randall Thompson also accepted Goossens’s invitation to compose fanfares for the CSO season, though none of their pieces ever appeared on any program. A \textit{New York Times} newspaper article dated 18 October 1942 announcing the fanfare series indicates that all three of these composers had not chosen a title for their fanfare at the time of the article’s publication.\textsuperscript{131}

Of the selected composers that made up the Goossens Fanfares, only two were not born or raised in the United States. One of these was Goossens himself, as he composed the final fanfare for the season, \textit{Fanfare for the Merchant Marine}. The second, Darius Milhaud, composer of \textit{Fanfare de la Liberté}, had been born in Marseilles, France. Although not native born, Milhaud resided in the United States at the time of the fanfare commissions and had been a professor at Mills College in Oakland, California since 1940. His decision to move to the United States was due to the German Nazi Regime in France, who persecuted Milhaud for having been born into an Orthodox Jewish family. Milhaud had been a cherished friend of the Goossens’s family before the war, and Goossens frequently programmed many of Milhaud’s works.\textsuperscript{132} Goossens had also chosen Milhaud as one of the composers for his London Fanfares series.
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fanfare had been performed in both the 27 October and 12 December concerts, making it
the only London Fanfare to be repeated after its premiere, suggesting that his fanfare had
been very well received.133

In Cincinnati, Milhaud’s *Fanfare de la Liberté* was the only fanfare to be
performed on a single concert. All of the other fanfares premiered on the Friday evening
subscription concert and were repeated on the same program the following Saturday.
According to *Cincinnati Post* reviewer Lillian Tyler Plogstdt, at the 11 December
concert, Goossens made an announcement after intermission that Paul Creston’s *Fanfare
for Paratroopers* would take the place of Milhaud’s *Fanfare de la Liberté*, which could
not be played “because something unavoidable made its performance impossible.”134
According to Goossens, the substitution on the 11 December concert was the result of a
special “request,” presumably by a prestigious audience member who heard Creston’s
fanfare premiere at the previous set of subscription concerts and desired an encore
performance.135 Milhaud’s fanfare premiered on the next day’s Saturday concert.

In his letters to Copland, Goossens indicated that he hoped to repeat the “rousing
success” that the London Fanfares had with the press and public, and provided a
description of orchestration and dynamic markings, which served as a sort of guide to
Copland when composing his own fanfare.136 Goossens did not specify how Copland
should conceive his fanfare; the actual sound of the piece—its style, sound, and tempo—
was not addressed in the letter. He only indicated that the fanfares should make “stirring
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and significant contributions to the war effort.” Goossens emphasized the importance of the fanfare titles and stressed their significance in his expressed desire to celebrate the United States’ future success in the war.

The Friday evening concerts were reviewed in Cincinnati’s major newspapers, including The Cincinnati Enquirer, the Cincinnati Post, and the Cincinnati Times Star. The Cincinnati Enquirer reviewer Mary Leighton, a retired performer, faculty member at the University of Cincinnati’s Conservatory of Music, and known philanthropist of the arts took a comparative approach to evaluating the fanfares, stating in her first review of the season that “comparisons will probably lend a better approach in judging their worth,” though she generally only provided one or two sentences about each fanfare in her reviews.

Howard W. Hess, also a retired faculty member at the Cincinnati Conservatory and music critic for the Cincinnati Times Star, a local newspaper that offered issues every day of the week except Sunday, reviewed only a select few of the Friday concerts from the subscription series and also offered some brief remarks on the Goossens Fanfares that appeared on those concerts. Similarly, pianist Lillian Tyler Plogstedt reviewed each Friday concert that season for the Cincinnati Post. Her reviews include mention of the fanfare and any notable features about its performance. Most of these reviewers focused on the major symphonic pieces performed at each
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concert, providing only a brief comment or two about the fanfare that premiered and its accompanying national anthem.

All of the reviewers noted when the fanfare’s theme or dedication complemented the other pieces on the night’s program. For example, the second set of subscription concerts featured Deems Taylor’s *A Fanfare for Russia*. Both Leighton and Hess noted that the fanfare was most likely chosen for this set of concerts because the program contained works by only Soviet composers, including Shostakovich’s Fifth Symphony, and, according to Hess, “Taylor’s fanfare suited the program perfectly for it had many frank references to the Russian style, both as to theme and as to orchestration.”

Leighton’s review goes on to explain, “Mr. Taylor’s composition turned out to be somewhat of a sketch instead of what is usually considered a fanfare,” but that it seemed a fitting patriotic piece to follow the Soviet national anthem. Plogstedt felt the fanfare provided a more didactic offering on the concert, especially considering it was “a brilliant piece of writing, scored for full orchestra and based on old Russian folk song … the Russian [National Anthem followed], which few of us are familiar, but well worth hearing.”

Hess seemed to judge the fanfares more critically as the season progressed. In his assessment of the opening concert fanfare, Wagenaar’s *Fanfare for Airmen*, Hess commented, “Wagenaar’s fanfare was brilliant and contained some harmonies essentially American,” but offered a slightly more critical review of Virgil Thomson’s *Fanfare for
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France, which premiered on 15 January 1943, claiming that his fanfare “tested the virtuosity of the brass choirs and the patience of the audience.”145 Plogstedt followed a similar pattern in her reviews, though she often provided much less information about each fanfare than Hess and even made comments that suggested she could not formulate adequate criteria for judging the fanfares. On 28 November 1942, after the premiere of Paul Creston’s A Fanfare for Paratroopers, she commented: “The fanfare is the work of Paul Creston. Our chief impression was of the brasses and woodwinds playing flocks of consecutive fifths, but these fanfares are always brief and difficult to evaluate.”146

Similarly, Leighton’s reviews of the concerts at the beginning of the season contain considerably more information regarding the fanfares, their merit, and the audience’s reception than her reviews of concerts later in the season. For example, she notes that Walter Piston’s A Fanfare for the Fighting French, which premiered on 23 October 1942, was “modern in tinge” and “structurally commendable,” and that “Piston’s contribution has patriotic purport and is well orchestrated for such.”147 The following concert review, published on 31 October 1942, described Henry Cowell’s A Fanfare to the Forces of our Latin-American Allies, as well received by the audience, “due in part to the judicious association (credit to Mr. Goossens) to the Brazilian national anthem selected to preface the program.”148 Leighton also wrote: “There was effectiveness in the
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treatment of the Latin-American flavored melody, commendably paraphrased and orchestrated in a fanfarish style.”149

Most of the later reviews in The Cincinnati Enquirer only mention the fanfare’s performance, offering little information in terms of the reviewer’s opinion or how Leighton gauged the audience’s reaction to the fanfare’s premiere. In the 19 December 1942 review of William Grant Still’s A Fanfare for American Heroes, Leighton did mention that the piece seemed too lengthy, but also “indicated possibilities for expansion.”150 She went on to excuse the composer for this aspect, explaining, “It is easy to overstate or understate in brief compositions of this type.”151 Leighton’s review of Morton Gould’s Fanfare for Freedom also contained slightly more information and a much more positive evaluation than other reviews from the middle of the season: “Mr. Gould’s ‘Fanfare for Freedom’ was enthusiastically received, and deservedly so. Tinged with just enough dissonance to make its purport keenly effective, with melodic fragments antiphonally stated, it proved stimulating and was admirably interpreted. Judging from first hearing, it could stand repetition.”152

All three critics felt that Goossens’s Fanfare for the Merchant Marine had been the most favorable fanfare performed that season. Plogstedt’s review of Goossens’s fanfare offered a summation of all the fanfares throughout the season, arguing, “At every concert this season we have heard a fanfare dedicated to some branch of the Armed forces. Some were very worthwhile, some fairly so, but it remained for our own director
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to compose the finest one of them all, and the only one for which was demanded, and we
mean just that, an encore, and given.” Leighton described Goossens’s fanfare as the
highlight of the program, claiming that in a concert that featured music from Wagner’s
*Parsifal* and Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, “Easily the high point of the afternoon was
the prolonged applause that greeted Eugene Goossens’s ‘Fanfare for the Merchant
Marine.’ It is a commanding miniature, human in its appeal, carrying significance as a
patriotic contribution to music literature. Skillfully scored for brass and percussion, it
held several moods, exaltation, pathos, sentiment, with a war-like tinge in a brief
sequence.” Since the majority of Leighton’s review focuses on the fanfare, she offers
several details regarding the composition and the basis for many of the its themes:

> Constructed on a firm foundation of two eighteenth-century tunes, “The Roast
Beef of Old England” (used as a dinner call on Cunarders as well as other trans-
Atlantic ships), and the song, “Heart of Oak,” both of which gave appropriate
flavor, the composition was effectively varied and hinged by balanced statements
from the percussion and brass choirs, and the playing of “taps” by a trumpeter
backstage.

Each critic’s review praised Goossens for an outstanding concert season and offered
many words of praise for his fanfare, owing to the positive reception Goossens’s received
throughout his tenure with the CSO.

Despite the positive reception of many of the Goossens Fanfares, Copland’s
*Fanfare for the Common Man* is the only one still performed regularly in concert halls
today. At the time of its premiere, Mary Leighton called *Fanfare for the Common Man*
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“the most strikingly original” of the Goossens Fanfares heard thus far and described it as having “deftness in its dramatic purport that evoked spontaneous applause from the audience.”

Hess remarked: “Aaron Copland’s ‘Fanfare for the Common Man’ was one of the best of the season. The percussion introduction and the consistent development of a thrilling climax from a trumpet flourish to the full use of the brass choir was decidedly to the point.”

Goossens wrote to Copland after the fanfare’s premiere, and his opinion of Fanfare for the Common Man echoed the press’s reviews: “It made a tremendous hit. I don’t hesitate to say that of all the fanfares we have played to date, it is conspicuously the finest and the most striking.”

The success of Copland’s Fanfare for the Common Man stands as a lasting symbol of Goossens’s vision and goal to both inspire patriotism and contribute to the U.S. war effort, which was celebrated by Goossens’s native country, Great Britain, as well as the other Allied Nations who had been fighting in World War II, a cause which he claimed all the fanfare composers shared.

The fanfare’s presence within the collective series of the Goossens Fanfares metaphorically united Great Britain and the United States in a way that musically reflected the future multi-lateral post-war agendas that each country had declared during the drafting of the Atlantic Charter. And the socio-political and nationalistic significance of the piece’s title and genre reflects the progressive
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ideological and cultural climate in the United States during the time of the Fanfare’s conception and premiere.
Chapter 3

Socio-Political Rhetoric in Copland’s Title for *Fanfare for the Common Man*

Copland did not begin working on his fanfare until after receiving Goossens’s second letter, dated 28 September 1942, asking for the composition and title. By the time Copland received this letter, Goossens had decided to program Bernard Wagenaar’s *A Fanfare for Airmen* at the season’s opening concert. He wrote to Copland informing him of his programming decision: “Don’t worry about the first concert for your fanfare. It doesn’t matter whether it is solemn or cheery so long as I get it eventually. I would love to have it at your earliest possible convenience. More I needn’t say.”

Goossens’s pleading seems to have finally motivated Copland to begin brainstorming possible titles for his fanfare. The bottom of the letter, underneath Goossens’s typed transcript, contains what appears to be the draft of Copland’s reply to Goossens. Lightly marked in pencil, Copland wrote the following words: “Have decided to call my contribution.” Below this he listed six titles that he considered using for his final composition:

- Fanfare for the Day of Victory
- Fanfare for the Future Heroes
- Fanfare for the Post-war World
- Fanfare for the Paratroops
- Fanfare for the Four Freedoms
- Fanfare for a Rededication of Man’s Spirit to the Creation of a Better World
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Included among these title drafts were various sketches of a much longer title, which is written larger and apart from the other five, indicating that Copland might have begun drafting titles that directly reflected the message he wished to convey as a sort of preliminary brainstorming practice, before developing a shorter, more practical title, that would convey this message through symbolism or textual reference.\textsuperscript{164} The title possibilities sketched out on this letter evince Copland’s struggle to develop the final title for the piece, a problem that the composer seemed to experience in many other works, particularly \textit{Statements} and the \textit{Piano Variations}, where sketches show that Copland drafted many titles before settling on the final name for each composition and movement.\textsuperscript{165}

The manuscript sketch of the score also contains three different titles and themes that Copland considered using for the final composition:\textsuperscript{166}

\begin{quote}
Fanfare for a solemn ceremony in which man’s spirit is rededicated to the proposition of a better world  
Fanfare to the Spirit of Democracy  
Fanfare for the Rebirth of Lidice
\end{quote}

These drafts show a similar struggle on the part of Copland to develop a title that was concise and poignant enough to convey his feelings about the war.\textsuperscript{167}

Copland likely considered “Fanfare for Paratroops,” drafted on the letter from Goossens, because it mimicked the three sample titles that Goossens included in his
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letter: “A Fanfare for Soldiers,” “A Fanfare for Airmen,” and “A Fanfare for Sailors.”\textsuperscript{168} All of the other titles show that Copland seemed less concerned with following Goossens’s specified format by honoring a specific military group or country and more interested in trying to convey themes that spoke to his own perspective on the war and the political climate of the time. As Elizabeth Crist writes, “Most of Copland’s titles encapsulated grander hopes of a post-war world in keeping with a progressive vision of social justice and international solidarity.”\textsuperscript{169} Titles like “Fanfare for the Day of Victory,” “Fanfare for Future Heroes [sic],” “Fanfare for the Post-War World,” and “Fanfare for the Spirit of Democracy” collectively demonstrate Copland’s optimistic hopes for the post-war period and the anticipation that peace might help to spread democracy and ensure international justice, ideals and hopes that were first officially declared for the allied nations in the Atlantic Charter.\textsuperscript{170} The confident and forward-thinking titles that Copland considered using for his fanfare expound upon the hopeful visions of victory, world peace, and democracy that fueled the Popular Front movement.

The inclusion of the possible title “Fanfare for the Rebirth of Lidice” shows that Copland was trying to promote an encouraging and hopeful attitude of international resurgence for the future, while still honoring and commemorating the tragic events occurring throughout the war. Lidice, a city in the Czech Republic southwest of Prague, had become the site of a horrific genocide. On 10 June 1942, roughly two-and-a-half months before Copland received Goossens’s invitation, the Nazis brutally murdered close
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to two hundred Czech men in Lidice over the age of sixteen as retribution for the assassination of the chief security officer for the Reich Main, Reinhard Heydrich, on 27 May 1942. The Nazi’s transported the remaining women and children of Lidice to concentration camps.

The massacre in Lidice had been well publicized throughout Europe and America, and allied nations emphasized the tragic nature of these events in anti-Nazi propaganda geared towards rallying public support for the war effort. The event and subsequent publicity sparked a heated response from anti-fascist and Popular Front supporters, particularly those associated with the CPUSA, who were interested in promoting social democracy and welfare throughout the world by eradicating fascist control. By September 1942, coal miners in Britain had banned together to form the Lidice Shall Live organization, which raised money to rebuild Lidice after the war. Several pre-existing and some newly developed towns, such as San Jerónimo-Lidice in Mexico City and Lidice Park, formerly called Stern Park and located near Crest Hill, Illinois, were named or renamed to commemorate the city’s loss. Many film directors in the United States and Great Britain released cinematic productions shortly after the massacre that detailed the tragic events.

The international attention and response provoked by the Lidice massacre evidently motivated Copland to consider titling his fanfare to memorialize the tragedy.
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Other composers were creating musical memorials to commemorate the event. The American League of Composers asked Bohuslav Martinů, a Czech nationalist composer, to premiere his *Memorial to Lidice*, an eight-minute orchestral work based on quotations from the Czech St. Wenceslas Chorale and Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, at Carnegie Hall on 28 October 1943. Likewise, Copland may have drafted the title “Fanfare for the Rebirth of Lidice” as a way of musically reflecting on the event with a title that embodied the hopeful projection for the future and the commemoration of the tragedy. These optimistic views not only provided justification and motivation for America’s involvement in the war, but also resembled common agendas to spread a form of social democracy, instigated by the Roosevelt administration and New Deal legislation initiatives, throughout the international community.175

Indeed, several of the titles Copland considered for his final composition directly reference recent speeches of President Roosevelt and Vice President Wallace. “Fanfare for the Four Freedoms,” for example, recalls President Roosevelt’s 1941 State of the Union Address, where he foreshadowed the initiatives he planned to enact in his second wave of New Deal legislation.176 Unlike the first wave of New Deal legislation, ratified by Congress in 1933, Roosevelt intended the second wave, finally enacted between 1935 and 1938, to adopt a strong international focus and promote an American form of social democracy abroad through greater involvement in international affairs and the war effort.177 Roosevelt’s State of the Union Address marked one of his earliest efforts to

175 Franklin D. Roosevelt, “Franklin Roosevelt’s Annual Address to Congress—The Four Freedoms,” speech delivered to Congress, Washington, DC, 6 January 1941.

rally American support for the internationally focused New Deal initiatives. To do this, Roosevelt prescribed a “new moral order” for the world that rested on four fundamental freedoms that should be granted to all individuals. These four freedoms—freedom from economic want, freedom from fear, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion—became the hallmarks of the Popular Front’s international efforts to secure worldwide social justice after the United States entered the war.

Copland’s ultimate title choice, “Fanfare for the Common Man,” also reflects these sentiments. After Roosevelt delivered his State of the Union address introducing the notion of the four freedoms, Vice President Henry Wallace began developing and reiterating his administration’s international agendas through speeches, public appearances, and radio addresses. In a speech given on 8 May 1942 and broadcast nationally on CBS radio, Wallace gave hopeful predictions for a future world lead by an American approach to social justice. His speech was not only titled “The Price of Free World Victory: The Century of the Common Man,” but repeatedly used the phrase “common man,” emphasizing the duties of everyday U.S. citizens to serve as international role models and call for progressive political action:

Some have spoken of the “American Century.” I say that the century on which we are entering—the century which will come out of this war—can and must be the century of the common man. Perhaps it will be America’s opportunity to suggest the freedoms and duties by which the common man must live. Everywhere the common man must learn to build his own industries with his own hands in a practical fashion. Everywhere the common man must learn to increase his
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productivity so that he and his children can eventually pay to the world community all that they have received. 181

The reference to “the ‘American Century’” recalls a highly influential and well-read article by the American publisher Henry Luce, which had been published in Life magazine in 1941.182 In the article, Luce defined the role of twentieth-century U.S. foreign policy after the war, echoing the international agendas of the Roosevelt administration to spread U.S. social politics worldwide. According to Luce, U.S. foreign policy called for “a sharing with all peoples of our Bill of Rights, our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, our magnificent industrial products, our technical skills,” effectively creating, “internationalism of the people, by the people, and for the people.”183

The communitarian rhetoric of Wallace and Roosevelt’s speeches thus recalls Luce’s article, where he pressed Americans to “accept wholeheartedly our duty and our opportunity as the most powerful and vital nation in the world and in consequence to exert upon the world the full impact of our influence, for such purposes as we see fit and by such means as we see fit.”184

Wallace’s CBS radio address on 8 May 1942 further developed Luce’s sentiments, reiterated Roosevelt’s concept of the four freedoms, and promoted the administration’s initiatives to gain national support for the war effort promoting an American form of social democracy after the war. By articulating and emphasizing the communitarian sentiments laden within these subjects, Wallace effectively underscored
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Popular Front reform objectives to strengthen the economic and social status of the working class around the globe through progressive political action. He stated: “When the time of peace comes, the citizen will again have a duty, the supreme duty of sacrificing the lesser interest for the greater interest of the general welfare. Those who write the peace must think of the whole world. There can be no privileged peoples…. We cannot perpetuate economic warfare without planting the seeds of military warfare.”

Evidence of how Wallace’s rhetoric paralleled the Popular Front cause is evinced by his willingness to draw similarities between the American and Russian revolutions, claiming, “Each spoke for the common man in terms of blood on the battlefield.”

While Copland claimed to have chosen the title it because “it was the common man, after, all who was doing all the dirty work in the war and the army,” audiences were certainly aware of the influence of Wallace and Luce on Copland’s title. Wallace’s radio address became a widely recognized symbol of American nationalism and patriotism during the war. After the broadcast, Dorothy Thompson, a weekly columnist in The Cincinnati Enquirer, devoted her entire column to praising Wallace for his eloquent delivery, his profound remarks about the war, and his projections for the future. In her summary of Wallace’s speech, Thompson refers to Wallace as a “prophet” who stressed “the essential revolutionary nature of this war.” She also associated Wallace’s agenda
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with Roosevelt and the four freedoms, writing: “Mr. Wallace does not claim that we, in some material ways the most advanced people, have yet fulfilled our possibilities or our mission. We have not abolished the fear of want, and that is a basic step in the march of the liberation of man.” Thompson mentions that Wallace’s speech would be published by the Free World Association and encouraged the wide distribution and discussion of its powerful message.

According to a July 1942 *Publishers Weekly* article, newspapers across the nation did, in fact, heed Thompson’s request by repeatedly printing Wallace’s speech, and it continued to receive increasing public attention after it was published in pamphlet and book form in 1943. Its wide distribution among farmers, academics, church-goers, authors, artists, and military groups makes it likely that the Cincinnati audience that heard the premiere of *Fanfare for the Common Man* in March 1943 would have readily associated the composition’s title with Wallace’s speech.

While the implications of Copland’s title might have easily reached the majority of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra’s audience, Goossens sought to induce some subtle humor by programming the piece in the middle of March. He wrote to Copland in
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November of 1942, explaining his feelings about the fanfare’s title and the date that it would be performed:

Thanks so much for sending me your “Fanfare for the Common Man.” Its title is as original as its music, and I think it is so telling that it deserves a special occasion for its performance. If it is agreeable to you, therefore, I shall reserve it for our pair of concerts of the 12th and 13th of March, for the common man will be paying his income tax two dates later (if he has anything left to pay it with), and this seems to me a fitting occasion to perform your tribute to him.194

Goossens’s response to Copland’s title, while in jest, pointed to one of the more realistic implications of Roosevelt and Wallace’s plans to ensure that everyone would be afforded the four inalienable freedoms. Freedom from economic want meant practical and monetary sacrifices from the American people, and Goossens’s idea to program Copland’s fanfare during tax season was perhaps a way of paying tribute to the five-percent increase in income taxes that befell Americans after Roosevelt’s enactment of the Victory Tax to help support troops over seas.195 After the fanfare’s premiere, Goossens reiterated his feelings about the premiere date in another letter to Copland, claiming, “The witty nature of the piece was much appreciated, particularly when I told them I had deliberately programmed it as near March 15th as possible….”196 Even Lillian Tyler Plogstedt, music critic of the Cincinnati Post, made mention of Goossens’s deliberate programming of the Fanfare around tax season and noted that it “brought a smile to the faces of everyone.”197
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Copland, however, was not amused by Goossens’s interpretation of his title. He replied on 2 April 1943:

That was an awful nice letter you sent me about the Fanfare. You may not have meant it flatteringly but I took it that way. There is just one detail I would like to clear up. The title was not meant to be funny. I got the idea from Vice-President Wallace’s speech in which he talked about the next century being the century of the common man. Even so, I think it was a swell idea to have played it around March 15th.198

Meant as a gentle reproach to Goossens’s programming, Copland’s letter confirms the serious tenor that the composer intended to convey with his fanfare title. Instead of honoring one particular military group or country involved in the war, as Goossens had instructed, Copland considered titles that shared themes of international social justice and optimistic predictions for the post-war world. His ultimate title choice echoed the Popular Front rhetoric of the time through its associations with Wallace’s speech and drew from the Roosevelt administration’s wartime attempts to endorse a foreign policy agenda that sought to make the United States a symbol of international social welfare.

198 Copland, to Goossens, 2 April 1943.
Chapter 4

Evoking the British Fanfare Genre: The Common Man’s Entrance into Wartime America

Although nearly all of the fanfare titles Copland considered reflect the socio-political climate in the United States in the fall of 1942, the reference to Wallace’s speech in Copland’s ultimate title, “Fanfare for the Common Man,” evokes the international wartime agenda that the United States began to formulate after its entrance into World War II. Encouraged by the booming economy and increased employment brought about by the war, the Roosevelt administration sought to expand the American form of social democracy beyond its boundaries in an effort to defeat fascism and rid the world of social injustice. Roosevelt had first formally declared these ambitious goals at the Atlantic Conference, where he met with British Prime Minister Winston Churchill to confirm their wartime alliance, discuss post-war goals, and sign the Atlantic Charter. While this alliance remained strong and both nations stood united behind their wartime agendas, Great Britain, like the other allied nations, suffered major economic losses during the war, causing them to take a backseat in many of the plans to enact the post-war visions of the Atlantic Charter. Although their practical participation in these goals was limited, Great Britain continued to support the alliance by endorsing U.S. efforts to secure the peaceful post-war world outlined in this charter.

*Fanfare for the Common Man*, a composition created by an American composer and commissioned by a British conductor, metaphorically evokes the wartime alliance between the United States and Great Britain during World War II. The piece serves as a uniquely American manifestation of a British genre and tradition that continues to inspire
patriotism in the United States today. Although conceived in a time and place that employed fanfares as purely concerted works without any utilitarian purposes, Copland’s *Fanfare for the Common Man* actually retains many of traditional qualities that defined the genre’s function.

Since the sixteenth century, the fanfare has served an important function as a processional piece in state and royal ceremonies, as well as an instructional tool directing military maneuvers on the battlefields. Despite its practical use, however, the fanfare has received little attention in musicological literature, likely owing to its common perception as a functional composition with little aesthetic value.\(^{199}\) The lack of attention placed on the fanfare poses challenges when trying to trace the genre’s history or even simply determine the musical characteristics of a typical fanfare.

Before developing its musical meaning, the word “fanfare” was used figuratively to signify a person with a prideful disposition.\(^{200}\) While most etymologists agree that the root, “fanfa,” literally meaning “vaunting” or “boastful,” derives from the Spanish language in the late fifteenth century, some argue that the word originated from the Arabic word “anfār,” meaning trumpet.\(^ {201}\) In either case, the word “fanfare” is believed to have developed its musical meaning from an onomatopoetic figuration for the trumpet’s sound.\(^ {202}\)


\(^{200}\) Ibid.

\(^{201}\) Ibid.

\(^{202}\) Ibid.
While musical compositions resembling fanfares likely existed as early as the 800s, the word was not used to denote a musical sound until 1546 in the French language and 1605 in the English language.\textsuperscript{203} In both cases, the word characterized the sound of a trumpet flourish by Johann Walther, a sixteenth-century German composer and poet. Although some historians, such as military music specialist Henry George Farmer, argue that the word may have been active even earlier, used to denote a hunting signal, scholars have yet to discover any historical accounts dated prior to 1564 that contain the word “fanfare” as a descriptor of a musical composition.\textsuperscript{204}

Save for these few instances, the word “fanfare” appears infrequently throughout historical accounts and continues to be used sparingly when describing a musical composition, while words and phrases such as “trumpet flourish,” “signal,” or “ceremonial sound,” are used to suggest compositions with fanfare-like qualities and function.\textsuperscript{205} The eighteenth-century scholar Johann Ernst Altenburg identified these characteristics and noted that Walther defined the fanfare as an improvised piece performed by trumpets and kettledrums consisting of repeated arpeggios and runs appropriate for celebratory or state occasions.\textsuperscript{206} Altenburg claims that the fanfare was


\textsuperscript{204} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{205} Tarr.

not highly regarded for musical merit, noting that “[it] indeed makes enough noise and strut­ting, but hardly smacks of art.”\textsuperscript{207}

In his dissertation, Herbert Heyde argues that similarly unexpressive forms of improvisatory trumpet playing, known as classicism or battlefield signals, paid tribute to political leaders during the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{208} Like their later counterparts, these pieces held commonplace positions within the musical hierarchy, and their pointedly loud and boisterous nature points to their presumed identity as purely functional works with little musical value. Heyde notes that approximately one hundred classicum-trumpet players are documented to have performed at the wedding of George the Rich in 1475, and they created “such a din … that one could hardly hear one’s own words.”\textsuperscript{209}

Farmer’s research on the origins of military music has revealed that the first reference to the use of trumpet and kettledrum flourishes appeared in accounts of Charlemagne’s crusade at the beginning of the 800s.\textsuperscript{210} The most notable of these accounts includes Pseudo-Turpin’s “Historica de vita Caroli Magni” and the famous English romance “Richard the Lionheart,” both of which describe the sound of the Saracens Army’s kettledrums as being so alarming that the Christians were forced to shield the eyes and ears of their horses.\textsuperscript{211} The sparse and varied accounts of military music during the crusades includes mention of particular instruments such as trumpets,
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horns, hunting horns, shawms, kettledrums, cymbals, and drums, that non-Christian armies frequently used on the battlefield to call crusaders to military functions.\textsuperscript{212}

Christian armies in the Third Crusade, from 1189–1192, used only the trumpet and the horn as their military instruments. The players performed signal calls, providing instructions to the rest of the army.\textsuperscript{213} Giraladus Cambrensis, an ecclesiastical author who became a member of the Royal Service from 1184–1194, detailed the logistical positioning of the players during signal calls in his \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae}, dated 1191. For example, he notes, “It had been resolved by common consent that the sounding of six trumpets in three different parts of the army should be a signal for a charge, two in front, two in the rear and two in the middle, to distinguish the sounds from those of the Saracens, and mark the distance of each.”\textsuperscript{214}

According to James C. Moss’s dissertation on British Military Band instrumentation and repertoire, British armies adopted the instruments of the Saracens, particularly the side drum and kettledrum, which became the English tabour and naker, respectively.\textsuperscript{215} In addition to these instruments, King Edward II added a bagpipe and trumpets, expanding the British military army of the fourteenth century to include “five trumpeters, two clarions, five pipers, three waits or oboes, and four others.”\textsuperscript{216} Moss
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indicates that later in the fifteenth century, King Henry V maintained the same types of instruments in his army band, adding five additional trumpeters.\footnote{Ibid.}

Beginning in 1660, King Charles II established a small section of Guard troopes, formally known as His Majesties Own Troope of the Guards or Life Guards, for the purpose of accompanying him during public appearances throughout London and another small group of musicians, named the Second Troope of the Guards, to escort the Queen in a similar capacity. Each group included four trumpeters and one kettledrum player who performed short flourishes resembling fanfares as the nobility rode through city streets.\footnote{G. R. Lawn, \textit{Music in State Clothing: The Story of the Kettledrummers, Trumpeters, and Band of the Life Guards} (London: Leo Cooper, 1995), 1.} These performers also served important roles in the court, attending to the king and queen during trips abroad or visits with ambassadors.\footnote{Ibid., 2.}

The jobs and duties assigned to the musicians of His Majesty’s Own Troope of the Guards reflects the duel role of most trumpeters and kettledrummers employed by members of royalty during this time. Beginning in the fourteenth century, military performers usually derived from the lower paid members of the king’s court, who regularly entertained the king and nobility in private or performed at state ceremonies and functions.\footnote{Farmer, “Crusading Martial Music,” 249; Altenburg, 30.} Thus, battlefield musicians usually held two different positions, the military ensemble and the court ensemble, suggesting a clear functional difference between the concerted music played by the king’s musicians at court and the military music performed by a handful of trumpeters and horn players belonging to the same
ensemble. In addition to trumpets and horns, the court ensemble included instruments that were not used on the battlefield, including trumpa, tubas, shawms, and tympani. These instruments were used in improvisatory, fanfare-like flourishes to welcome and introduce a king or nobleman during his procession to the throne or dinner, as well as other large-scale compositions composed in a much grander style. The early versions of concerted fanfares, therefore, related to battlefield music in that they utilized brass instruments and were associated with the king’s army, but developed as separate types of compositions due to their different function within the court and the need for additional instruments and performers.

Documents of the Lord Chamberlain from 1690 show that His Majesties Own Troope of the Guards expanded to include eleven trumpeters and one kettledrummer, and all of these musicians eventually served two primary functions for the King, as both a Guard in the royal army as well as a musician in the ordinary, or royal court. In the military, the musicians were expected to escort the king through town and perform at state occasions, such as coronation ceremonies. Their court duties involved attending to the King, his ambassadors, and members of the nobility. Whether serving their military or courtly duties, the Troope’s repertoire included concerted fanfares as a way to introduce the King or to accompany him in procession, as well as other stately works that likely contributed to the regal atmosphere demanded by the King’s public appearances.
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Since these compositions were included among the troope’s repertory and performed specifically at occasions when the King or Queen was presented to the public, the definition of a fanfare composition at this time, as a short, boisterously loud piece for brass and percussion, also indicated a functional quality.

Both Altenburg and Moss acknowledge that the British army musicians greatly influenced the formation of similar military performers in army troopes on the European continent, and these musicians, like their British counterparts, also performed fanfares as part of their military and courtly duties.\textsuperscript{226} Altenburg notes that, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, German concerted compositions denoted as “fanfares” were always used at festive, state functions to announce the procession of the King’s entrance or as he approached the dinner table.\textsuperscript{227} The band of the French National Guard, known as the largest band on the European continent in the eighteenth century, also performed short pieces for brass and percussion as part of their military duties when introducing a member of royalty or nobility, though these pieces were often referred to as “flourishes” or “signals” instead of fanfares.\textsuperscript{228}

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the fanfare genre continued to be used throughout Europe, particularly in England, as a way to announce the entrance of a royal person; however, the changing political climate and near disintegration of the court system throughout most of Europe, as well as the modernization of the British monarchy into a purely ceremonial institution, seems to have significantly altered the function of the

\textsuperscript{226} Altenburg.
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genre. Instead, composers began including short pieces resembling fanfares in their concerted works and operas. For example, Beethoven used a trumpet flourish in the last act of his opera *Fidelio* to announce the arrival of the Governor, and later incorporated it into the second of the *Lenore* overtures. In these instances Beethoven referred to the trumpet passage as a signal, rather than a fanfare.\(^\text{229}\)

Igor Stravinsky composed *Fanfare for a New Theatre* for the 1964 opening of the New York State Theatre, designated as the home of the New York City Ballet. In the tradition of the fanfare genre, Stravinsky scored this short piece for two trumpets and retained the historical practice of honoring specific individuals through a dedication, “To Lincoln and George,” meant for the Ballet’s administrator Lincoln Kirstein and choreographer George Ballanchine. Other pieces from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries designated as fanfares did not retain the functional nature of the genre as it had been originally conceived in Great Britain. For example, after completing his ballet *La Peri*, for a Ballets russes performance in 1916, Parisian composer Paul Dukas rewrote the introduction to include a three-part composition for brass and percussion, which he titled a fanfare. André Jolivet composed *Fanfare pour Britannicus* in 1946 for an outdoor performance celebrating the Théâtre de Fourvière, an ancient theatre in Lyons, France. Other notable twentieth-century concert fanfares include Goffredo Petrassi’s *Fanfare per tre trombe in do* (1944), an extended composition for three trumpets, and Alberto Ginastera’s *Fanfare* (1980), a piece for four trumpets.\(^\text{230}\)

Benjamin Britten’s *Fanfare for St. Edmundsbury*, published in 1959, functions very much like a traditional fanfare since it was composed for a pageant in the town of St.

\(^\text{229}\) Ibid.
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Edmundsbury; however, musically the piece does not resemble its earlier counterparts. Britten’s Fanfare is a polytonal work for three trumpets where each player performs notes from a single harmonic series in three different keys. The piece is more compositionally complex and difficult to perform than the loud, sudden bursts of improvised passages that constituted traditional fanfares of previous centuries. *Fanfare for St. Edmundsbury*, therefore, serves as one example of the ways that the fanfare genre transformed from its original form as functional British military music to a concerted work. Instead of being regarded as a purely functional piece, fanfares of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries took on the characteristics of aesthetically pleasing concerted compositions that could be admired as works where composers and performers could demonstrate artistry and skill. This change in perception regarding the genre and its function provoked more composers to create fanfares, which could be classified as art music intended specifically for the concert hall.

Similarly, in the United States the political climate and lack of existing royalty or court system generated few occasions for the performance of fanfares as they were traditionally conceived. The fanfare genre itself makes only murky appearances within American music history. Thus, the history of the fanfare in America is often expanded and conflated to include the history of concert and military bands, the two musical ensembles in America that share the instruments and flourishing sounds used by royal European court musicians when performing fanfares.\(^{231}\)

While both concert bands and military or marching bands performed the majority of American wind, brass, and percussion music in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries,

each ensemble served a very different purpose. According to Richard Franko Goldman, military or marching bands in America functioned differently from their European counterparts because they were not used on the battlefield to provide signals or instructions to soldiers; instead, they were intended to provide “cheerful noise-producing instruments to give a cadence for marching or as prescribed appurtenances of military ceremonies.”

Concert bands or civilian bands, on the other hand, performed “music of a self-sufficient sort at functions devoted entirely to music.” Their musical repertoire was designed to appeal to mass audiences, and band composers often incorporated popular music idioms commonly played by dance orchestras or arranged a recognizable classical music piece, such as a Beethoven overture, to accommodate the band in an accessible way. These bands were also employed by traveling circus companies in the early twentieth century, such as Carl Clair’s Grand Military Band and Orchestra, who performed trumpet and bugle music during The Barnum and Bailey’s Circus Company tour in 1906. Unlike early European military ensembles, which comprised musicians generated from the court, concert and military bands in America served utilitarian purposes first, serving functional purposes for the army. Concert bands developed as prototypes of the military band and even retained many military band practices, such as dressing in military attire, even though it served no purpose.
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Both concert and military band music contained short flourishes of repeated notes for brass instruments and percussion, which resembled European fanfares that court musicians performed to introduce royalty. These pieces, though often denoted as fanfares, did not serve the same function as the European fanfare genre, but were frequently played to evoke the traditional and recognizable sound of early brass military and court music. Thus, fanfare compositions in American band music signified and generally recalled the rich tradition of brass and percussion instruments in European history.

Whether Goossens purposely tried to generate a sense of the rich history and traditional character evoked by the stately sound of fanfare music or simply wanted to program short pieces to begin each concert, many of the eighteen Fanfares paying tribute to the U.S. war effort for the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra’s 1942–1943 subscription series demonstrate the musical characteristics traditionally associated with the fanfare genre—brevity, declamation, boisterousness, and instrumentation for brass and percussion. Copland’s Fanfare for the Common Man, however, also recalls the fanfare genre as it was traditionally conceived in Great Britain, as a piece dedicated one individual, the common man.

Instead of honoring a member of high-rank or nobility, Copland placed the common man in the dedicatory position traditionally assumed by the King in fanfares of the past. In this way, Copland elevated individuals within the largest, most typical, and diverse demographic to the supreme position of royalty, honoring them with the same respect and reverence given to European monarchs in traditional fanfare pieces. When viewed in light of the socio-political climate in the United States at the time and in consideration of Copland’s own associations with leftist social groups, as well as
Wallace’s efforts to promote a form of social democracy favored by Popular Front advocates, Copland’s dedication serves as a symbol of the prevailing desire to empower everyday, working-class U.S. citizens during the war and promote a collective society where every man—even the most common and downtrodden—deserves to be treated and honored with the same respect.

Much like previous fanfare compositions, which were created to accompany members of nobility during a procession or introduce them at their first appearance in a stately function, Copland’s *Fanfare* acknowledges the “the common man’s” participation in the war effort. In *Music for the Common Man: Aaron Copland during the Depression and War*, Elizabeth Crist explains that Copland’s title and dedication to the “common man” reflects the demographics of an everyday citizen and those persons enlisted in the army, since, during World War II, the underprivileged classes and minority groups contributed more soldiers to the draft than the other classes.²³⁷ Additionally, marginalized Americans like women and African Americans who did not enter the service during the war naturally assumed the role of the blue-collar worker and forced growing organized labor unions to restructure their membership rules to accommodate the sudden change in worker demographics. As the war required greater worker production, labor unions reaped the benefits of increased membership, and the economy boomed as a result of the new surge in production of wartime goods. Increased American involvement in the war caused Popular Front ideologies to resonate among working-class citizens regardless of race or sex; everyone was expected to fulfill the duty of the “common man” and make
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sacrifices for the war effort. Famous phrases like “Loose lips sink ships” resonated with every member of society as communitarian agendas were enacted to stipulate the cooperation of common citizens, fearing that one individual’s negligence could endanger the lives of American soldiers abroad.

By dedicating his fanfare to the common man, Copland may have echoed Popular Front initiatives to promote international and multinational solidarity after the war. His title might refer to the diverse, multiethnic demographics of the United States, especially when compared to racially defined European nations, many of which were now experiencing ethnic cleansing and genocide at the hands of Nazi Germany. However, by using Wallace’s speech, Copland’s “common man” effectively transcends the United States’ national borders to include a common man that is not associated with any one nation or nationality. Instead, the dedication expressed in his Fanfare’s title includes the common man of the transnational community, who, according to Wallace’s speech would be expected to unite in a multi-lateral effort to secure international peace in the post-war world.

Even without the recognizable reference to Vice President Henry A. Wallace’s speech, which Copland only revealed in a private letter, its title and use of the phrase “common man” places the backbone of the U.S. economy—the everyday citizen—in the position conventionally assumed by the King or Queen in traditional British fanfares before the nineteenth century. Copland’s title, therefore, serves to transcend America’s
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national boundaries and mode of progressive political action by calling to mind the Popular Front wartime hope of international peace through the collective leadership of “the common man.” It was in this same spirit of international solidarity and social welfare for all that Roosevelt and Churchill met in 1941 to establish the workings of the Atlantic Charter and affirm their countries’s commitment to fighting a war to extend democracy worldwide. Two years later, the United States and Great Britain’s alliance and commitment to the war effort was again metaphorically reified, though this time through a musical medium. Although it was Goossens’s decision to evoke the stately customs and sound of his native country in celebratory fanfares that honored the war effort, Copland viewed the commission as an opportunity to express the greater wartime agenda in his dedication and title. Wallace may have been the first to coin the phrase “common man” and rally his support behind the America’s war effort and foreign policy agendas, but Copland was the first to memorialize “the common man” in music, and he did so by honoring him with the highest symbol of respect and authority known to Western music history—a triumphant, celebratory fanfare.
Conclusion
An American Idea Endures: *Fanfare for the Common Man*

Since its premiere in 1943, Aaron Copland’s *Fanfare for the Common Man* remains the only Goossens Fanfare to continue in the classical canon and enjoy concert performances. The Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra (CSO) regularly features the Fanfare in subscription concerts and proudly recognizes the piece’s important origins at the hands of former conductor Eugene Goossens, citing the work as Copland’s “beloved *Fanfare for the Common Man*” on their website and program notes. For its 2011–2012 season, the CSO will collaborate with classical radio station WGUC to commission five new fanfares by contemporary composers. According to WGUC president Richard Eiswerth, these fanfares were chosen because they recall the unique history of the CSO and the Goossens Fanfares, “With WGUC’s tradition of commissioning new music and the CSO’s history of commissioning Aaron Copland’s *Fanfare for the Common Man*, the Anniversary fanfare commissions provide a perfect musical collaboration for celebrating both WGUC’s 50th Anniversary and Paavo Jarvi’s 10th Anniversary season.”

Outside Cincinnati, the Cleveland Orchestra featured Copland’s Fanfare in a free concert given in January 2009 as a part of their annual Martin Luther King Jr. Day Open House. *Fanfare for the Common Man*, with its overt connections to Wallace and Roosevelt’s speeches advocating for improved social welfare in the United States during World War II, seems a particularly fitting piece for a concert celebrating racial freedom.

---


Even more recently, the San Francisco Symphony (SFS) performed *Fanfare for the Common Man* on two separate concerts, one held in July 2009 during the regular subscription season and the other in April 2010 as a part of their Children and Youth Concert series. In both instances, the SFS cited the Fanfare among the most “splendid vintage American works.”

Copland’s *Fanfare for the Common Man* also receives performances in concert halls around the world through its appearance in the fourth movement of his Third Symphony. Composed for a commission from the Koussevitzky Music Foundation and performed by the Boston Symphony Orchestra in 1946, the Third Symphony stands as Copland’s symphonic attempt at capturing and appealing to an American audience through his politically inspired imposed simplicity style, similar to the accessible aesthetic that Copland recognized in Shostakovich’s controversial Seventh Symphony.

The opening of the fourth movement quotes *Fanfare for the Common Man*, resetting and reworking it into a large portion of the finale so that it offers thematic material for the slow introduction, forms an integral connection between various keys, and recalls familiar landmarks within the conventional sonata form structure. In 1946 Copland claimed to have included the Fanfare in the symphony merely to evoke an “affirmative tone,” though scholars like Elizabeth Bergman Crist argue that the Fanfare’s presence directly “relates [the symphony] to the war effort and the progressive political agenda as
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advanced by Henry Wallace.” Copland’s Third Symphony elevated *Fanfare for the Common Man* to recognizable status among the concert-going public and directly influenced the Fanfare’s appearance in concert programs since the symphony’s premiere.

Outside the concert hall, however, various versions of *Fanfare for the Common Man* have become familiar to rock and pop music lovers who hear semblances of the piece performed by bands like Emerson, Lake & Palmer in their 1973 *Brain Salad Surgery* album or folk singers like Bob Dylan, who often used the Fanfare as an opening number in concerts of American protest music. Popular British bands like The Rolling Stones opened their 1975 “Tour of the Americas” with a rock version of *Fanfare for the Common Man*, and the Progressive Rock band Styx composed a suite called *Movement for the Common Man* for their 1972 debut album, which contains quotations from Copland’s Fanfare.

In the motion picture industry, *Fanfare for the Common Man* features prominently in war and patriotic movies such as *Red Dawn* (1984), set for remake and release in November 2010 under the direction of Dan Bradley. In the original film, the Fanfare accompanies the opening credits, as well as patriotic scenes where young Midwestern adolescents gain the courage to fight against invading Chinese soldiers during the Cold War. In *Saving Private Ryan* (1998), an Academy-Award winning film depicting U.S. soldiers during the Normandy invasion, *Fanfare for the Common Man* provides non-diagnostic music for flashback scenes that depict soldiers’s courage and bloodshed during World War II. The Fanfare also accompanies the most heroic moments, when a team of American soldiers put themselves at risk to rescue an injured paratrooper. In these movies, *Fanfare for the Common Man* retains much of its original function as a
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piece meant to honor and commemorate American sacrifices. Its association with heroism, courage, and sacrifice related to war causes the Fanfare to be recognized as music embedded with patriotic and symbolic meaning.

The Fanfare appears in other overtly political and nationally inspired contexts, such as its use as background music accompanying the United States Navy’s recruitment advertisements of the 1990s or as the music for the closing ceremony celebration of New York’s Shea Stadium on 28 September 2008. In 2009, the Fanfare was performed at the beginning of President Barack Obama’s inauguration ceremonies in a concert entitled “We are One: The Obama Inaugural Celebration at the Lincoln Memorial,” which recalled the Fanfare’s use in a concert prior to former President Bill Clinton’s inauguration in 1992. Given Copland’s own desire to offer accessible musical contributions that reflect the politics and social condition of 1930s and ’40s America, Fanfare for the Common Man’s use in these contexts preserves the patriotic sentiment associated with the Fanfare’s conception and demonstrates its ongoing association with American nationalism.

These performances evince that Copland’s Fanfare for the Common Man, though conceived during the politically saturated climate of World War II and deeply connected to the progressive political agendas of the President Roosevelt’s administration, stands as a lasting symbol of an American idea. Just like the pell-mell seating style at U.S. state dinners, which has become a tradition since British Prime Minister Anthony Merry and Elizabeth Death’s visit to the White House in December 1803 and accepted by many foreign dignitaries as a symbol of the United States’ stance against class separation and dictatorial-style leadership, Copland’s Fanfare has endured in various forms as a
recognizable and nationally inspired symbol of an American idea. Every time Copland’s Fanfare is performed or remembered, whether in formal concert halls, stadium rock concerts, movie theaters, or political gatherings, audiences and listeners have an opportunity to experience Copland’s ongoing contribution to an American idea that endorses a classless society where all members have the right to freedom from economic want, freedom from fear, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion.
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Appendix 1

The Goossens Fanfares: Titles, Composers, Premiere Dates, and Accompanying National Anthem247

9 October 1942: *A Fanfare for Airmen*, Bernard Wagenaar
National Anthem: Great Britain

16 October 1942: *A Fanfare for Russia*, Deems Taylor
National Anthem: Russia

23 October 1942: *A Fanfare for the Fighting French*, Walter Piston
National Anthem: China

30 October 1942: *A Fanfare to the Forces of our Latin-American Allies*, Henry Cowell
National Anthem: Brazil

6 November 1942: *A Fanfare for Friends*, Daniel Gregory Mason
National Anthem: Mexico

27 November 1942: *A Fanfare for Paratroopers*, Paul Creston
National Anthem: Belgium

11 December 1942: *Fanfare de la Liberté*, Darius Milhaud
National Anthem: Canada

18 December 1942: *A Fanfare for American Heroes*, William Grant Still
National Anthem: Czecho-Slovakia

15 January 1943: *Fanfare for France*, Virgil Thomson
National Anthem: Greece

22 January 1943: *Fanfare for Freedom*, Morton Gould
National Anthem: Yugoslavia

29 January 1943: *Fanfare for Airmen*, Leo Sowerby
National Anthem: Norway

5 February 1943: *Fanfare for Poland*, Harl McDonald
National Anthem: Poland

---

20 February 1943: *Fanfare for Commandos*, Bernard Rogers  
Pops Concert, no national anthem

26 February 1943: *Fanfare for the Medical Corps*, Anis Fuleihan  
National Anthem: Panama

5 March 1943: *Fanfare for the American Soldier*, Felix Borowski  
National Anthem: New Zealand

12 March 1943: *Fanfare for the Common Man*, Aaron Copland  
National Anthem: Australia

2 April 1943: *Fanfare for the Signal Corps*, Howard Hanson  
National Anthem: Luxembourg

16 April 1943: *Fanfare for the Merchant Marine*, Eugene Goossens  
National Anthem: Guatemala
Appendix 2

The Goossens Orchestra Concert Series at Queen’s Hall, London

7 June 1921

Spanish Fantasy, Lord Berner

The Forgotten Rite, John Ireland

La Valse, Maurice Ravel

Le Sacre du printemps, Igor Stravinsky

27 October 1921

Fanfare pour une fête, Manuel de Falla

Sonnerie pour reveiller le bon gros Roi des Singes, Erik Satie

Fanfare pour une spectacle, Serge Prokofiev

Fanfare, Hamilton Harty

Fanfare for a Ceremony, Eugene Goossens

Fanfare, Darius Milhaud

Fanfare pour un sacre patien, Albert Roussel

Fanfare for a Challenge to Accepted Ideas, Felix White

Fugue in C minor, J. S. Bach–Edward Elgar

The Garden of Fand, Arnold Bax

Pastorale, Arthur Honegger

---

Beni Mora, Gustav Holst

Symphony no. 1 in C minor, Johannes Brahms

9 November 1921

The Siege of Corinth, Giocomo Rossini

Mêlée Fantasque, Arthur Bliss

The Builders of Joy, J. R. Heath

Alborada del Gracioso, Maurice Ravel

Five Orchestra Pieces, Arnold Schoenberg

Thus Spake Zarathustra, Richard Strauss

23 November 1921

Fugue in C minor, J. S. Bach-Edward Elgar

The Wild Sea-Fowl, Holbrooke

Aubade, Cyril Scott

El Amor Brujo, Emanuel de Falla

Rondes de Printemps, Claude Debussy

Antar Symphony, Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov

12 December 1921

Fanfare: Hosting at Dawn, Arnold Bax

Fanfare for a Masked Ball, Julius Harrison

Fanfare, Darius Milhaud
Fanfare for Fanfare, Gian Francesco Malipiero

Esquisse d’une Fanfare-Ouverture, Francis Poulenc

Fanfare, Egon Wellesz

Suite in G for Organ, Oboe, and Strings, J. S. Bach-Henry J. Wood

Symphonic Rhapsody, Mai Dun-Ireland

Oriente Immaginario, Gian Francesco Malipiero

Symphony for Wind Instruments, Igor Stravinsky

Le Sacre du printemps, Igor Stravinsky