

Créolité and *Francophonie* in Music: Socio-Musical Repositionings Where It Matters

*Line Grenier and Jocelyne Guilbault*¹

This paper focuses on contemporary cultural practices associated with the *créolité* and *francophonie* movements. More precisely, it examines the practices constitutive of zouk from the Caribbean and the popular mainstream from Québec as two of the most salient socio-musical articulations of *créolité* and *francophonie*, respectively.

The *créolité* and *francophonie* movements are located in distinct times and spaces. They have histories of their own, mobilize different population groups, and are analyzed and commented upon by contrasting groups of experts who traditionally work in self-enclosed milieux. But these disjunctured and, at times, opposed movements also intersect. Typical instances of borrowing, juxtaposition, and *métissage* (the process of appropriating and manipulating heterogenous elements), they both value creation as the transformation of a given. Moreover, in the context of the increasing anglophonization of the world and the ongoing reproduction of pervasive Northern-Western canons of purity, *francophonie* and *créolité* as well as their associated socio-musical practices can be viewed as distinct yet related ways of dealing with and experiencing power relations.

The object of our analysis is twofold: to examine

¹ While convention demands that authors' names appear one after the other, in this case, the order is in no way indicative of their respective investment of time and effort. This paper is entirely the result of collaboration. In fact, the authors have argued over every word and every comma!

how socio-musical practices can make a significant and original contribution to singular political or literary movements such as *créolité* and *francophonie*, which partake and emerge from diffuse realities; and to explore how distinctive musics, when viewed not in and of themselves but rather as integral parts of complex cultural and political configurations, can be instrumental in providing means for setting in motion new social relations, networks, and alliances, thereby creating alternative yet limited fields of possibilities and prescriptions.

We begin our discussion with a critical review of the respective origins of these movements and some of the controversies through which they have been articulated, in order to show how *créolité* and *francophonie* have been constructed as both objects and instruments of discourse. We then move on to examine the socio-cultural terrains where the two movements have developed as we turn our attention toward the musical practices of zouk and *Québécois* mainstream. More precisely, our discussion focuses on the narratives of alliances these musics have helped to establish, and the strategies of valorization through which their related products and producers have been positioned in international-oriented markets. As we will argue, the *créolité* and *francophonie* movements mediate the repositioning of local musics in ways which indicate that *circulation* is becoming the most pressing issue as new sets of rules are established and contested, providing criteria for defining who, where, and what matters politically and culturally within globalizing economies.

*The Movements of Créolité and Francophonie:
Créolité and Francophonie as Objects of Dis-
courses*

The *créolité* and *francophonie* movements have found support within particular local, national, and international scenes. Their respective goals and strategies have been the object of ongoing debates in the cultural and political arenas where these movements have come to occupy prominent positions. We propose to examine their origins by focusing on some of the discursive practices through which *créolité* and *francophonie* have been articulated.

More specifically, this section deals with the specific discourses that officialized the inception of the two movements into the public realm: a literary manifesto in the case of *créolité*, and a series of political speeches in the case of *francophonie*. Drawing from the work of Michel Foucault, we view these discourses as events that neither language nor meaning can quite encapsulate, as statements that are “linked to a writing gesture or to the articulation of speech,” but also allow for “a residual existence in the field of a memory, in the materiality of manuscripts, books, and any form of recording” (Foucault 1972, 28). The particular events under study differ from others in that, although each is unique, both have been subject to many repetitions, transformations, and reactivations, thereby mediating the incessant redefinition of the boundaries of the discursive space within which *créolité* and *francophonie* have been deployed. Consequently, we are not interested in discussing the “true” meanings of *créolité* and *francophonie*. Rather, we examine critically the procedures for the production and circulation of statements through which *créolité* and *francophonie* have been created as objects of discourse, and also what they have come to

stand for, for whom, and from what position of authority. We therefore use the term “discourses of inscription” to refer to the events that have helped officialize *créolité* and *francophonie*.

The discourse of inscription that officialized *créolité* was the publication of *Éloge de la créolité*, written in 1989 by linguist Jean Bernabé, and novelists Raphaël Confiant and Patrick Chamoiseau. Associated with the West Indies in general through the Creole language, *créolité* was officially formulated in Martinique. While *créolité* emerged at the end of the 1980s, its genesis dates back to the 1940s. In fact, it is inseparable from two intellectual movements which, each in their own way, helped to cast off the yoke of colonial domination and repression: *négritude* (1940s), which emphasized black identity and took pride in its specificity; and *antillanité* (1970s), which celebrated hybridity as the embodiment of the singular histories and cultures of the West Indies.

Éloge de la créolité was first presented at a conference held in Paris during the *Festival de la Caraïbe* in May 1988. However, it was only after the *Éloge* was published in 1989 by one of France’s most important publishing companies, Gallimard, that *créolité* had significant public exposure. It was in the materiality of a book that the discourse on *créolité* found its earliest echoes, simultaneously in France and Martinique, circulating afterward mainly among the intelligentsia of France’s Creole-speaking Départements (Guadeloupe, French Guyana, and La Réunion) as well as Mauritius and the Seychelles.

The book takes the form of a manifesto that incorporates a linguistic project designed to promote French-

based Creole,² a distinctive language rooted in orality and viewed as a counter-cultural testimony to forms of local resistance and survival:

True galaxy in the making around the Creole language as its core, *créolité* still enjoys a favorite form, orality.... Creole orality, although challenged in its aesthetic expression, encompasses a whole system of counter-values, a counter-culture; it testifies to the common genius used in resistance, devoted to survival (*Bernabé et. al. 1989, 34).³

The manifesto also promotes an aesthetic approach characterized by a particular way of apprehending the diverse, the complex, and the heterogeneous: that is, a *rapport au monde* (relation to the world) based on *diversalité*, after Edouard Glissant's coinage:⁴

And if we recommend to our creators such an exploration of our particularities, it is because [this exploration] brings back the naturalness of the world, outside of the Same and of the One, and because it opposes to Universality the possibility of a defracted yet re-composed world, the conscious harmonization of preserved diversities: *la DIVERSALITÉ* (*Bernabé et al. 1989, 54-55).

Éloge de la créolité also engages with identity politics articulated around the central issues of cultural *métissage* and of what its authors have called "an updating of the true memory," in other words, the recovery of a West Indian history lost in colonial narratives:

² In the Caribbean context, the expression French-based Creole refers to the language spoken in Martinique, Guadeloupe, French-Guyana, St. Lucia, Dominica, and Haiti. Unlike other Creoles of the English Caribbean, its vocabulary has been deeply influenced by French, whereas its structure has been mostly associated with African languages. For further references on this subject, see Bernabé 1983, Carrington 1988, and Prudent 1989a. While acknowledging the existence of various Creoles spoken in the Caribbean region, for the purpose of this discussion, we will refer to French-based Creole as "Creole."

³ An asterisk (*) indicates that the quotation has been translated from French.

⁴ Edouard Glissant, a famous writer from Guadeloupe, wrote *L'Antillanité* (1979)—a most influential book from which the authors of *Éloge de la créolité* borrowed heavily.

Given its constitutive mosaic, *créolité* is an open specificity.... To express it means expressing not a synthesis, not merely a *métissage*, or any other uniform thing. Rather, it means expressing a kaleidoscopic totality, that is, a non-totalitarian consciousness of a preserved diversity.... Our history, or more appropriately our histories, are buried in colonial History. Collective memory is our urgency. What we believe to be Antillean history is only the history of the West Indies' colonization (*Bernabé et al. 1989, 37).

As denoted by its inscription, *créolité* is defined in reference to a Creole literature, and portrayed in this context as a creative, transformative, and performative process. By incorporating various influences, this literature is said to create a new form of expression that combines the oral and written poetics and aesthetics of several languages, local experiences, and more conventional literary forms of narrative. Although written in French, it is nevertheless considered transformative because it put forward a *mode d'être* (way of being) that altered France's typical literary text. Moreover, Creole literature is promoted as having a performative character since it creates a decentralized space within which French no longer represents a hegemonic mode of expression, a way of perceiving and knowing the world imposed on colonial societies. *Créolité* is defined more emphatically through literature that has traditionally been viewed by Martinican and Guadeloupean intellectuals as the site *par excellence* where issues of identity are articulated:

To live simultaneously the poetics of all languages means not only to enrich each of them, but also to break away from the usual order of these languages, and to reverse their established meanings. It is this break that will allow the audience to expand its literary knowledge of itself (*Bernabé et al. 1989, 49).

Although the authors of *Éloge de la créolité* focus on political issues as sensitive as identity and the recovery of a history in the colonial context of the West Indies, they claim that *créolité* is not a political movement. Paradoxically, they

view the search for identity, conceived first and foremost in terms of “inner vision” and “self-acceptance,” as an essential prerequisite to political action, yet not as a political process in and of itself.⁵

In line with the non-political character of the movement as it was originally formulated, *créolité* was produced through discourses stemming almost exclusively from artistic milieux. As will be explained later, however, its discursive production has moved beyond the boundaries of the literary field. The movement was also very visible in musical milieux during the 1980s—the period during which it had its greatest currency in the French Départements and in France. Even though it has always drawn the attention of the political elite, *créolité* was not an integral part of the official political platform, even in Martinique where the movement received its widest, yet most controversial exposure.

By contrast, *francophonie* has always been steeped in politics. As a journalist from the French newspaper *Le Monde* and former member of parliament during the De Gaulle era once claimed, “Francophonie will be political or won’t be at all” (quoted by *Tétu 1992, 61-62). Discourse on *francophonie* has been produced mainly, though not exclusively, by heads of state, diplomats, and administrators from various governmental and para-governmental agencies. It has also been a key site for discussing the political agenda of the polyilateral organization known today

⁵ This paradox can best be understood in relation to Martinican politics, which, as of the mid-1980s, was seen by some to be putting the question of identity, and not that of national independence, at the center of most debates. Among the various reasons for this shift were, on the one hand, the strategic decentralization policies set in motion by France’s recently elected President of the Republic, François Mitterand, and on the other hand, the moratorium on independence presented by the Parti Progressiste Martiniquais (PPM) and orchestrated by Aimé Césaire, poet and leader of the party.

by English-speakers as the Francophony.⁶ While the discourses that officialized *francophonie* surfaced some eighty years after the term was coined by geographer Onésime Réclus in 1880, their genesis is inseparable from the movements of decolonization and national identity assertion that emerged in Africa after the Second World War.

There is, however, no one material record that, as in the case of *créolité*, launched the official entry of *francophonie* in the public domain, but rather a combination of written and predominantly oral statements. The most significant discursive events were public speeches delivered by African intellectuals and political leaders in both Africa and Québec between 1962 and 1969: Léopold Sédar Senghor, the first president of the Senegal Republic who stayed in power from 1961 to 1981; Habib Bourguiba, president of Tunisia from 1956 (when the country became independent) to 1987; and Hamani Diori, president of the Republic of Niger from 1960 to 1974 and also the chair of the Organisation commune africaine et malgache (OCAM), a multilateral organization created to promote cooperation among independent African countries. Another important discursive event was the 1962 special issue of France's influential journal *Esprit* devoted to French as a modern language. This publication contained articles by well-known linguists and cultural theorists from France, as well as poets and cultural activists from Africa, including the aforementioned Senghor, a reputed spokesperson for *francophonie* and also a renowned writer and poet.

Within these discourses, *francophonie* has been articulated in four distinct but related ways. First, defined in

⁶ Throughout this paper, the English form Francophony is used to refer to the international political organization, whereas the French form, *francophonie*, is used to refer to the cultural, social, and economic movement as a whole.

linguistic terms, the term refers to the diffusion of French as one of the world's oldest and most widespread modern languages. Second, it is constructed as a geographical entity: *francophonie* denotes the whole territory occupied by individuals who speak French, albeit in different contexts of use. This territory is said to have a changing geometry but also, to use Xavier Deniau's expression, a stable "gravitation triangle" (*Deniau 1992) comprised of Europe (France, Switzerland, Belgium, and Luxembourg especially), Eastern North-America (particularly Québec), and Northern and Central Africa (from Senegal to the former Zaïre). Third, *francophonie* stands for a language- and culture-based pluralistic community described by the editors of the 1962 issue of *Esprit*, as "a site of *métissage* and hybridization," an experience of solidarity, fraternity, and fellowship. In a speech delivered in 1969 at Niger's capital, Niamey, Diiori claimed that the notion captures the feeling of belonging to a spiritual community that an increasing number of people have come to share despite their differences: geographical distances, diversity of races, beliefs, and standards of living, and various relationships to other groups or communities. In his influential contribution to *Esprit*, Senghor wrote:

Francophonie is this integral humanism that is woven around the world: this symbiosis of "stagnant energies" from all continents and races that are revitalized by the heat of their complementarity (quoted by *Tétu 1992, 68).

A few years later, at the Université Laval in Québec City, during a ceremony in which he was presented with an *honoris causa* doctoral diploma, Senghor insisted that, although this community is founded on shared values and culture through language, it can only survive through the respect of the different singular identities (rooted in specific regions, nations, continents, locales, and histories) that give *francophonie* its specific character.

Within *francophonie's* discourses of inscription, the promotion of the French language is therefore not viewed as a goal in and of itself, but rather as a means both to consolidate the community of French speakers and to facilitate communication among its members. Exchange and communication have therefore been established as the underlying rationale of this community which has, however, been said to lack the means to establish and maintain relationships among its members. Accordingly, in its fourth articulation, *francophonie* has taken on an institutional face as it is used to describe the various public and private associations and organizations that aim at promoting and facilitating multilateral cooperation in various sectors of activity (including culture, trade, technology, science, and education) among peoples and nations who share the usage of French. The most salient and influential organization is the Francophony, which includes the heads of state and government leaders of forty-seven countries, nations, and regions that use French.⁷

Thus, the official governmental body of the Francophony movement was created in the 1980s, but its genesis cannot be dissociated from the project of a structured yet flexible hierarchical international organization originally formulated in the 1960s by Senghor and further developed by Bourguiba. Considered founding fathers of the organization, these two African leaders have been committed to the creation of the Francophony, an institution designed primarily to create and promote cultural as well as economic multilateral relations, networks, and

⁷ Its members meet every two years during what has become known as the *Sommet Francophone* (the fifth and most recent one was held in Mauritius in 1993); they establish orientations and formulate policies that are carried out by two organizations known as the key operators of the institutional francophonie, the Conseil permanent de la francophonie (CPF) and the Agence de coopération culturelle et technique (ACCT).

agreements among French-speaking population groups. They viewed this institutional project as a strategic way to consolidate *francophonie* as a community of both language and history concerned with issues of spiritual solidarity and economic development. Their efforts are said to have rallied previously skeptical African leaders, many of whom were not enthusiastic about reestablishing relationships with the French language and culture that seemed to embody a still recent colonial past. Bourguiba expressed the view that the notion of *francophonie* helps one think beyond the national independence of African countries without impinging on it. He argued that, given that "colonization is not an exclusively negative phenomenon" (quoted in *Tétu 1992, 72), Africans had to learn how to build from this experience. In 1967, in front of an audience of African intellectuals and political leaders, he urged all Africans to participate in the project since, in his view, "Not to defend our shared past would mean to repudiate a part of who we are" (*Tétu 1992, 72).

Since its discursive inscription, *francophonie* has been constructed as a complex movement that is defined at once as a linguistic group, a geographical territory, a solidarity-based cultural community, and an institution of polyilateral cooperation. It has promoters not only within the political realm, but also in artistic and cultural milieux. The discourse on *francophonie* is especially prominent in the field of music, which is considered by many as its cultural flagship *par excellence*. Over the last few years, many organizations have been created to promote Francophone artists and repertoires through the production, distribution, and marketing of the numerous and extremely di-

verse musical products from what is called the Francophone space.⁸

Créolité and Francophonie as Discursive Operators

We have examined how *créolité* and *francophonie* have been constructed as objects of discourse by focusing on their respective moments of inscription. As we have already indicated, these discursive events have been subject to numerous repetitions, transformations, and reactivations. By examining this iterative process, we have named the specific realities that these events have discursively produced: *créolité* designates a linguistic project, an aesthetic process, and an updating of a lost memory, and *francophonie* denotes a linguistic grouping, a geographical territory, a community, and an organization. This “naming” process does not, however, exhaust the phenomena under study. Far from being reducible to the discursively objectified reality to which they refer, *francophonie* and *créolité* also appear to act as devices that are used, within the discursive spaces where they are deployed, to produce statements through which other objects are constructed, and hence other sets of issues addressed. Consequently, we argue that *créolité* and *francophonie* can be viewed as “discursive operators.” We borrow this concept from Jean-Michel Berthelot who created it to describe a discrete discursive

⁸ Two of the most important musical organizations that participate in institutional Francophony are the Conseil francophone de la chanson (CFC), which was founded in 1986, and whose goals are to encourage international exchange and cooperation among the creators and producers of popular music; and the Marché des arts du spectacle africain (MASA), which was created in 1993 in order to provide a forum for discussing the current and future state of development of African cultural industries and establishing contacts between African artists and producers as well as tour organizers from different parts of the world.

unit whose “referent...no longer works as an object of knowledge but rather, through the mediation of a linguistic sign, functions as an instrument for the construction of a discourse” (Berthelot 1992, 17). Berthelot adds that these operators, as manifestations and effects of discourses, are both informative and normative: “under the auspices of a shared referential evidence, to talk simultaneously about something else means, more often than not, not only to talk but to plead” (Berthelot 1992, 11-2). In other words, they describe as much as they prescribe. In fact, he further claims that, while the operators are not essential in and of themselves, the meaning and efficiency of the statements made through them are; for this reason, these discursive operators ought to be viewed in semantic as well as in pragmatic terms.

We intend to demonstrate that talking about *créolité* and *francophonie* means talking about much more than *créolité* and *francophonie*, that in many cases it involves vindication; furthermore, we will show that the statements made through these discursive operators produce particular sets of meanings and situated ritualized actions. To do this, we concentrate on the terrains where the controversies raised by *créolité* and *francophonie* intersect: language, place, and subjectivity. By focusing on these terrains, we will identify the specific issues constructed in the discourses to which they contribute, and the particular pleas or vindications through which these issues are articulated. As we will show, on the terrain of language, controversial issues dealing with the respective status of French and Creole are addressed, and identity claims are played out. On the terrain of place, issues related to forms and instances of solidarity are debated within discourses that vindicate the importance of locality. On the terrain of subjectivity, the role of France within different networks of exchange is at the center of heated debates through

which participants claim their right to be subjects rather than objects of their respective histories. As we will argue later, although these issues and vindications have been formulated through literature and politics, they have found resonance in other fields of practice, especially music.

Controversies Over Language

Francophonie and *créolité* have been articulated in linguistic terms. While the centrality of the French and Creole languages is taken for granted by both political leaders and community members, the respective status, role, and uses of these two languages—seen as means of expression and hence, means of control—have raised questions.

All the definitions of *francophonie* outlined so far involve sharing the French language. However, the ways in which Francophones relate to French depend profoundly on whether it represents a mother tongue, an official and/or vernacular language, or a language used in education, commercial trading, and everyday life. For some people, these differences constitute both an asset of and a driving force behind the development of a *francophonie* viewed as a unified yet plural linguistic grouping based on the “coexistence and conviviality of the many languages that exist alongside French” (*Haut Conseil de la Francophonie 1993, 496) within the francophone space. Others have argued that this idea, referred to as “Franco-polyphony,” is utopian: since the promotion of French is often done at the expense of local languages that are no less important for particular communities’ indigenous economies, politics, and cultures, it thereby threatens their very survival. Ali Moindjie from the Comores has claimed that “French is an instrument of power used by an elite to push aside a population, which destroys particularities and creates a certain uniformity” (quoted in

*Tétu 1992, 216). Many African Francophony members strongly believe that as long as French remains the predominant language, a colonial influence is bound to be felt and resented by large sections of local populations. But as Thchikaya U'Tsami, a writer from the former Zaïre, has pointed out in reference to various appropriations of French in African literatures, the colonial influence experienced through language need not be unidirectional: "The French language colonizes me, but in turn, I colonize it" (quoted in *Tétu 1992, 224).

Debates concerning whether or not French is killing local languages exist alongside arguments over the kind of French promoted within the Francophone space. Some consider that *francophonie* is not about French but rather about the diversity of French, where "French" denotes both the concurrent forms of French and the cultural *métissage* that results from their ongoing transformation. Others believe that a prevailing imperialist view of France's French as the ultimate, purest, and most sophisticated form leads to the canonization of the forms of writing and of speech associated only with the Hexagone. This ethnocentric attitude is said to lead to the rejection of other forms of French as mere idiosyncrasies, regionalisms, or colloquialisms. Many Francophones from outside of the Hexagone feel that they are the only ones who are asked to adapt, despite the fact that they far outnumber the Francophones from France. This opinion is also shared by some French intellectuals. In an issue of the magazine *Le Point* devoted to the ways in which France is perceived from abroad, the editors have argued that there exists "an incredible contradiction between the influence that [France] hopes to exercise or claims it has, and its real impact on the world" (Michel Colomès quoted in Hugues 1995, 43).

In the case of *créolité*, there are similar questions

about whose Creole should prevail. These questions are mediated by the particular position occupied by the Creole language in the French West Indies: even though Creole is the vernacular language of the majority of the population, French remains the only official language. Despite great efforts made by independentist politicians and intellectuals in the 1970s to promote the language as a key symbol of Antillean identity, Creole has been denied any official institutional recognition. Combined with the notion that French is the language of prestige and power, this has even led some French West Indians striving for respectability and social mobility to prohibit the use of Creole in their own households. In the 1980s, new attempts at promoting Creole as the written language of a specifically Creole literature, while receiving wide support among some intellectuals and writers, have not challenged its otherwise marginal status.

Controversies surrounding language with regard to the *créolité* movement need to be examined in this context. The fact that from the outset the debates surrounding this movement have largely taken place in books and journals published in French, has thus provoked the scorn and outrage of many. As Annie Lebrun (1994) ironically indicated, so did the fact that the second edition of *Éloge de la créolité* was not published in French and Creole, but rather in French and English. Moreover, the various ways in which Creole has been used in some of the most prominent literary works associated with *Créolité* have been the subject of much debate. For example, Lebrun has questioned the criteria used by some critics to evaluate the level of “purity” of Creole that they deem unsatisfactory in the works of writers such as Patrick Chamoiseau. She claims that those who believe they have the authority to decide which Creole is better, hence legitimate, are all “witch hunters,” be they “Whites, Blacks, or Métis”

(*Lebrun 1994, 20).

In both cases, through controversial statements concerning language, protagonists do more than talk about French or Creole. They also plead to have their distinct situated identities acknowledged and protected, an essential condition for their being either Francophones or Creoles—and hence for their taking part, in the *francophonie* and *créolité* movements, respectively.

Controversies Over Place

As indicated previously, *créolité* and *francophonie* are also defined in reference to specific geographic territories. The “places” they designate, however, are determined by and through different forms of solidarity. From this perspective, questions have been raised as to which individuals and groups are or can be included in and/or excluded from these places. We will show that, through these controversies, issues pertaining to the boundaries of the respective spaces of *créolité* and *francophonie*, as constructed from within these movements, are in fact being addressed.

Bernabé, Confiant, and Chamoiseau have argued in *Éloge de la créolité* that

We, Antillean Creoles, bear a twofold solidarity. An Antillean solidarity with all the people of our archipelago regardless of our cultural differences: our *antillanité*. A Creole solidarity with all African, *Mascarins*, Asian, and Polynesian peoples who show the same anthropological affinities: our *créolité* (*Bernabé et al. 1989, 32-33).

Within this discourse of inscription, *créolité* is thus said to imply not only a geopolitical solidarity, but also an anthropological (cultural) one. Accordingly, the spaces of *créolité* could be said to extend beyond its situated place (the West Indies). This very argument, however, has been challenged on the grounds that, despite the authors’

claim, their approach to *créolité* typically reflects a Martinican experience. As Haitian writer René Depestre has argued, *créolité* remains first and foremost a Martinican business: created by and for a Martinican intelligentsia, it does not speak to other Creole-speaking West Indians in the same way. Depestre calls into question the notion that *créolité* describes a generic Antillean reality. In his view, the distinct *états de créolité* (states of *créolité*) characteristic of the different Caribbean societies cannot be fused and confused as though they were interchangeable experiences and realities (Depestre 1994, 160).

The so-called anthropological solidarity of *créolité* has also engendered deep controversies. As Martinican Fred Réno has noted, the definition of creolization (a term used interchangeably with *créolité* by the authors of *Éloge de la créolité*)⁹ prevailing throughout the French Caribbean differs markedly from that which exists in the English Caribbean. The main difference, he has claimed, lies in the centrality of Africa as the key to the authentic identity of the Caribbean region. In French Caribbean literature on *créolité*, the African contribution is acknowledged but is not considered the determining factor as it is in English Caribbean literature.¹⁰

⁹ As argued by Réno (1994), among others, and confirmed by many during interviews conducted by Jocelyne Guilbault in Martinique between May and August 1994, one of the critiques made by opponents of the *créolité* movement has been to point out the significant difference between *créolité* and creolization, terms which they claim refer to a state and a process, respectively. In their view, by conflating the two terms, the promoters of *créolité* are proposing an ambiguous, if not contradictory, project which combines both a static and dynamic approach to Antillean identity.

¹⁰ This argument is at the bottom of the conflict between intellectuals associated with the *négritude* and *créolité* movements. Whereas in *négritude* African ancestry is seen as central to the construction of Caribbean identity, in *créolité* it constitutes only one aspect of its genesis since, for instance, the East Indian experience is also recognized as playing a key role in this process. For further discussion on this

In the case of *francophonie*, the criteria for exclusion and inclusion have caused harsh disputes, especially as regards the institutional Francophony. To this day, the governmental body comprises forty-seven members who, however, do not all enjoy the same status. France and Canada are among the "full" members, a status which Cambodia, Bulgaria, and Romania received only recently after having long been mere "observers"; Moldavia, in turn, is still an observing member; non-governmental organizations such as the *Assemblée internationale des parlementaires de langue française* (AIPLF) are, in contrast, among the "associated" members. The membership policy of the Francophony has been subject to so much criticism that participants at the 1993 Summit felt the need to question how the organization could further expand its membership. Reporting on this discussion, CPF's chair, Shirin Aumeeruddy-Cziffra, claimed that the Francophony had never been more open, and that while such a democratic trend was highly positive, it raised important questions: "In which direction are we heading? Should the Francophony be a private club?... Will we be able to find an appropriate balance between a defensive attitude and our eagerness for openness?" (*Aumeeruddy-Cziffra 1994, 18).

Similar controversies have been raging over the boundaries of the Francophone community. There have been deep concerns about the current practice of linguists and geography experts who, in their assessment of Francophone populations, have tended to differentiate between "full-time" and "occasional" Francophones (Fahy 1991, 14), between Francophones and Francophiles (Lalanne-Berdouticq 1993), and thus between "real" and "fake" Francophones. Do such distinctions mean that

there are different orders of *francophonie*? Are there criteria that could be used to measure an individual's or group's degree of solidarity with French-language or Francophone cultures, and hence of belonging to the Francophone community? Furthermore, critics have expressed the view that there might be an insurmountable gap between, on the one hand, the ideological rationale of solidarity among equals that informs the notion of a pluralistic community and, on the other hand, the sheer reality of *francophonie* as the chief terrain where economic and political inequalities between North and South are reproduced. In an interview published in *Antilla* magazine, African writer Bernard Doza vehemently attacked the idea of *francophonie* because of its severe impact on the economies of most Francophone African countries. Developed in detail in his book, *Liberté confisquée* (Confiscated freedom)—which he claims has been boycotted by the French media—his central argument is that so-called multilateral cooperation translates into a systematic exploitation by industrialized countries (especially France) of African countries, whose leaders, Doza says, are often in their pay (Doza 1992).

At stake here is a central question: who benefits from *créolité* and *francophonie*? These controversies, we argue, point to the crucial importance of locality in the debates surrounding the respective spaces of *francophonie* and *créolité*. The particular instances of solidarity by and through which these spaces are produced tend to be articulated in ways that emphasize the “local” in relation to the “non-local.” Whether “locality” indicates district, region, or country, it is not conceived in oppositional but rather in relational terms. It represents a territorialized way of existing within a broader space as much as a distinct way of experiencing a deterritorialized community—be it Francophone or Creole.

Controversies Over Subjectivity

The third and last set of controversies we want to examine concerns subjectivity. More precisely, we wish to explore some of the subject positions articulated through the debates over the networks of exchange through which *francophonie* and *créolité* are discursively produced.

The two movements are defined at an intersection of networks maintained through ties of varying strengths. Some networks function exclusively within the respective confines of *créolité* and *francophonie*: this is the case for the Carrefour des opérateurs culturels de la Caraïbe and for the Organisation commune africaine et malgache. Others operate across the boundaries of *créolité* and *francophonie*, thereby connecting them with other political and economic networks (constitutive, for example, of the United Nations and European Economic Community) and also with cultural networks (such as those formed by and around the broadcast Eurovision song contest and the *Francofolies* music festivals held annually in different cities—including La Rochelle, Spa, and Montreal).

Given these various networks, to be both Creole and Francophone is neither impossible nor contradictory. As Raymond Relouzat has explained, the promotion of Creole does not offend *francophonie*, it rather “reinforces it and gives it a privileged meaning that authorizes us to reserve the Caribbean *francophonie* a special and promising place within the Francophone concert” (*Relouzat 1994, 191).

While the necessity of these networks and their potential advantages for individual participants and each of the movements as a whole may be taken for granted, the role and status of France within these various networks is open to passionate debate. Given that France is an important member of the institutional Francophony

and that the French West Indies are French Départements, France's political representatives and various cultural and economic organizations participate in most of the networks of exchange through which *créolité* and *francophonie* are defined. The presence of France is almost inevitable, but many individuals and groups involved in each movement share the view that France represents an unequal partner with whom they experience a love/hate relationship. The motivations and rationale underlying this view vary greatly, and appear to be related to the actors' political positions within the networks.

France is perceived differently by those who occupy a position of relative dependence and by those who enjoy a greater independence with regard to *francophonie* or *créolité*. In the former case, controversial issues are raised as France is often accused of adopting a typically colonial attitude toward its overseas Départements in the West Indies—that is, of keeping the Creole-speaking populations under its control while still taking advantage of the fact that they are not “from the continent” when it suits French interests. While some consider the political sovereignty of the French Caribbean nations as the only solution to such problematic and often deteriorating relations, others argue that the reason these populations benefit from a fairly high standard of living is precisely because they are French Départements. From a different perspective, in the Canadian province of Québec, France is itself a subject of controversy. Some *Québécois* see themselves as France's cousins from the other side of the Atlantic. They cherish the fact that they can claim common ancestors, historical and cultural heritage, rich language, and values of equality, sister/brotherhood, and liberty; they are also proud of the traditional political and cultural support that France has given to Québec. Others argue that, although more than two centuries have passed since Québec was a

colony—it was lost to England in the late eighteenth century—France still treats it as a poor relative, and thus maintains an imperialist attitude. They claim that this attitude explains why France has traditionally (especially in cultural domains) treated Québec as just an extension of its domestic market and, at times, has also adopted protectionist measures vis-à-vis *Québécois* products. France is indeed accused of systematically refusing reciprocity, of being paternalistic (for instance, by adding subtitles to French-language films and dubbing Francophone television series made in Québec) and therefore of negating the specificity of Québec's distinct yet fully developed Francophone cultures.

In the case of individuals or organizations from Europe and Africa who occupy positions of relative independence within the *créolité* and *francophonie* networks, controversies over France's role and status take a slightly different turn. On the one hand, they widely acknowledge that France takes too much room, so to speak, tends to interfere in everybody's business, often lacks respect, and has a tendency to act in a protectionist way—in short, that it adopts a typical neo-colonialist attitude. On the other hand, they see France as a crucial ally in the common fight against both the anglophonization of the world and the uniformizing threats also posed by the increasingly powerful Islamic and industrial Asian blocs.

By and large, France is considered to be the least Francophone member of the Francophony, supporting the cause of Creole only when convenient. The fact that France is constructed as an unfair partner within both *créolité* and *francophonie* probably stems from the central role it has played (as a colonial, neo-colonial, or post-colonial power) in the development of the various groups and societies involved in these networks. In this context, talking about *créolité* and *francophonie* means talking about

the respective histories of the persons, groups, and organizations engaged in these networks but in less conventional terms, that is, by refusing to sanction France as the sole underlying driving force behind their respective development, or in many cases, underdevelopment. In other words, to talk about *créolité* and *francophonie* means to claim a discursive position from which some people can produce their own histories as situated subjects, not merely as more or less passive objects.

The Musical Practices of Zouk and the Québécois Mainstream

From Prescriptive Discourses to Socio-musical Practices

Based on our examination of *créolité* and *francophonie* as objects of discourse and discursive operators, we argue that the discourses through which they are produced (and reproduced) constitute prescriptive discourses on identity, locality, and history—that is, discourses which lay claim to multiple and open identities; to deterritorialized and territorialized localities; and to situated, subject-driven, recovered histories. These discourses articulate specific power relations in different ways; more precisely, they elaborate strategies that could be instrumental in transforming the power relations in which individuals and population groups involved in *créolité* and *francophonie* take part. Our assumption is that music can play a role in this transformation since socio-musical practices are among the situated ritualized interactions through which the distinct statements made through *créolité* and *francophonie* find

their effectivity. As Sara Cohen (1994) demonstrated, music can exercise localizing power insofar as it gives people a sense of place—and, we would add, a sense of “space.” In a similar way, we argue that music can be said to exercise “belonging power” by providing people with a sense of their singularized identities and their “desires to belong” (Probyn 1994, 63). Furthermore, since music engages people as historically situated subjects whose distinct ways of being in the world matter, music can also be said to exercise subjectifying power.

In the following section, our discussion focuses on how socio-musical practices, namely *zouk* and *Québécois* mainstream, considered to be situated articulations of *créolité* (Guilbault 1994) and *francophonie* (Grenier and Morrison 1995) exercise such powers.¹¹ It examines, on the one hand, the ways in which *zouk* and the *Québécois* mainstream operate as oriented/prescriptive musical narratives of alliance. On the other hand, it also explores how these narratives inform distinct strategies of valorization of *zouk* and the mainstream in Québec on a variety of markets—markets that they help configure, and through which they are, in turn, reconfigured. Our main argument is that *zouk* and the mainstream are instrumental in transforming the power relations involved in the production and positioning of these musics in so-called international-oriented markets.

¹¹ These practices do not thoroughly exhaust how these movements are musically articulated. They are, however, strategic sites from which to observe how the complexities of *créolité* and *francophonie* are played out by those directly involved in events or organizations explicitly related to either movement.

Zouk and the Québécois Mainstream as Narratives of Alliance

The Narratives of Zouk

Zouk emerged in the early 1980s in Guadeloupe and Martinique, but it partakes of many local, regional, and international musical genres. These include primarily three popular musics from the Creole-speaking islands (*biguine*, *compas direct*, and *cadence-lypso*), but also musics from some Francophone African countries (*soukous*) and Spanish Caribbean islands (salsa), as well as from the Anglo-Saxon world, especially the United States (rock, soul, and other “funk” musics). Zouk is the first Creole music to have achieved commercial success not only in the Creole-speaking Islands and the Caribbean as a whole, but in Europe and Francophone African countries as well (Guilbault 1993a).

Zouk is a genre that asserts and promotes Antillean-Creole identity. It does so by relying exclusively on Creole for lyrics and on *métissage* for instrumental composition. Thus, zouk derives its assertive character and puts forward a sense of identity by means of a particular language and a distinctive aesthetic process. In keeping with the notion of *diversalité* used in the *Éloge de la créolité*, zouk is produced through a qualified *métissage*, that is, a creative process centered on the appropriation, manipulation, and reordering of heterogeneous elements. This process is experienced in zouk not only in compositional practices, but also in the creation and performance of staged choreographies, dress codes, and lyrics.

Métissage, it should be noted, is nothing new, especially in the Caribbean, where borrowing, mixing, and reordering have necessarily been an integral part of music

making. What is original about zouk, however, is that it has given *métissage* a new political meaning which has altered the criteria used in defining so-called "authentic" Antillean-Creole music. Prior to zouk, hybridity had long been associated with the "impure," the degenerate, and the inferior. The leading exponents of zouk have taken issue with this view inherited from the colonial regime. They have promoted *métissage* as a positive and enriching process and, by so doing, have rendered it legitimate.

There are many ways in which zouk has allowed the recovery of Martinican and Guadeloupean specific histories. In contrast with most traditions of Creole-language popular musics, zouk lyrics typically deal with the everyday life of/on the islands, especially in its most common, "banal," and least sensational forms. Through the media, zouk has articulated the notion of *antillanité*. For instance, a zouk singer once explained that the aim of this music is to make the Antilles known as a series of distinct yet related populations, cultures, and histories rather than as two dots on the map, a mere combination of sun, sand, and sea (Jocelyne Bérourard quoted in Aumis 1987, 15). At yet another level, zouk has involved a multi-racial discourse that aims at counteracting the exclusion and marginalization of those who, throughout colonial history, were defined as "the Other." In this regard, the group Kassav, zouk's chief exponent, made a highly publicized statement by featuring a heterogeneous musical formation that includes Blacks and Whites, Martinicans and Guadeloupeans, Antilleans and Africans, Creole-, French-, and Arab-speakers.

Musical practices constitutive of zouk have thus helped to establish affinities at several levels: linguistic, sonic, historical, and racial. It is precisely through such affinities, we argue, that zouk has produced a narrative of alliance among population groups from different Creole-

speaking islands, other minority groups faced with a growing xenophobia within the Hexagone, and other musical communities with whom zouk shares some of its most salient characteristics, such as rhythmic patterns, instrumentation, lyric structure, and promotion strategies.

The Narratives of the Mainstream in Québec

Francophonie can refer to a variety of musics relative to a wide range of genres and traditions that are sung in various languages, use different instrumentation, and are produced by artists from at least four continents.¹² There are thus contrasting socio-musical articulations of *francophonie*: musicians in Burkina Faso probably imagine and experience Francophone music differently from those in Switzerland.

The socio-musical appropriations of *francophonie* in Québec will be our sole concern here. In our view, however, neither the plurality of contemporary musical practices involved, nor the full implications of their construction as Francophone can adequately be grasped in terms of musical genres. Rather, these phenomena can best be accounted for as patterns of relationship between musical practices (Straw 1991) unfolding within Québec as a historically situated space (Grenier and Morrison 1995). More precisely, we will examine the relationships between heterogeneous local products enjoying great commercial success and forming a diffuse yet recognizable whole. These relationships link the songs that get both the widest exposure and broadest diffusion and that stand, within the confines of Québec, for the ever-changing familiar,

¹² It can thus evoke, for example, the respective repertoires of Ray Lema from the former Zaïre, Céline Dion from Québec, Youssou N'Dour from Senegal, Zap Mama from Belgium, Ismaël Lo from Senegal, Francis Cabrel from France, and Édith Butler from Eastern Canada.

popular, common, and “middle-of-the-road” in music. The *Québécois* mainstream designates this complex set of economic, social, and cultural relationships, as it unfolds in Québec. It mediates a form of musical communication that revolves around songs considered to be discrete, relatively homogeneous (3-5 minutes in length), and independent meaningful units, which constitute the raw material out of which albums, concerts, videos, radio, and television programs are fashioned.

The emergence of the *Québécois* mainstream (Grenier 1993a) has been the result of and a key driving force behind the development of the indigenous music industry over the last fifteen years or so. Since the mid-1970s, this young industry has experienced a significant growth, thanks in part to the political and ideological consolidation of a corporate milieu formerly divided into two opposite factions associated respectively with the France-derived *chanson* and United States-derived pop-rock genres. The opposition between *chanson* and pop-rock is characterized by the conflation of politics, musical genres, and performing styles. While this conflation has made other sites of differentiation such as age, gender, ethnicity, and region secondary, if not irrelevant, it has furthermore been instrumental in the construction of *chanson* as the sole embodiment of “true” *Québécois* music. It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine in detail the various forces that led to the attenuation of this iterative opposition. Let us only say that, as of the early 1980s, the *chanson* versus pop-rock opposition lost its centrality, and the criteria for defining authentic *Québécois* music became controversial. Formerly viewed as cultural symbol *par excellence* of *Québécois*-ness, *chanson* has been attributed a new status as it has become a generic label applied to Québec’s musical terrain as a whole.

The *Québécois* mainstream has been characterized

by an unprecedented blurring of genres (for example, *chanson française*, pop, rock, blues), a combination of different types of musical ensembles (from piano solo to a six-piece combo), and the use of varied musical forms (such as verse-refrain, strophic, call-and-response). It has also involved a significant transformation in the status of French, hitherto the sole linguistic and, hence, identity trademark of any true *Québécois* popular music. While French remains by far the most common language of song lyrics, it is no longer the only one. For example, some popular artists are pursuing singing careers in French as well as in English, albeit to varying degrees of success, and one successful local duo has even recorded several albums exclusively in their native Innu language: their respective music can be said to be *Québécois* insofar as it is created by Francophone artists—that is, individuals who share the usage of French, whether or not it is their mother tongue. This phenomenon is indicative of how, within the *Québécois* mainstream, issues of identity in music are no longer addressed strictly in linguistic terms, but more and more in ethnic and cultural terms.

To the extent that it actualizes and, in turn, reconfigures the specific Francophone heritage of Québec, the mainstream can be said to articulate a twofold notion of Francophone community. On the one hand, it derives its sense of purpose from the affective links it establishes between current musical practices and the musical traditions that render these practices appropriate to the context of contemporary Québec. Songs associated with the mainstream have appropriated and mixed various local traditions prominent during the mid- to late-1960s (including *chansonnier*, *yé-yé*, and cabaret music) or 1970s (rock, *musique de variété*, folksong à l'américaine). By so doing, they have contributed to the ongoing exploration of genres and styles deemed central to the geographically rooted

socio-musical history of Québec as both a people of French descent and a French-speaking population group in North America. The *Québécois* mainstream articulates a notion of community whose boundaries correspond to the province's geographical limits, thus allowing its members to develop a territorialized sense of place. On the other hand, the mainstream's sense of purpose is also articulated through the affective linking of musical practices from Québec and from other Francophone musical cultures. These affinities are instrumental in the construction of practices and products of Québec's artists as integral parts of a larger international music scene, a space within which they occupy a position viewed as similar to that of artists from other Francophone areas. It is also through such "affective alliances" (Grossberg 1992) that songs created by some Canadian Francophone artists from outside the province find a niche within the *Québécois* mainstream.¹³ From this perspective, the *Québécois* mainstream can be said to produce yet another notion of community, one whose boundaries coincide not with Québec's territory but rather with those of *francophonie* as a pluralistic yet unified entity. Insofar as it articulates this "imagined" community, the mainstream can also be said to give musical audiences a sense of space founded not exclusively on territory but on culture and history as well.

In addition to articulating affective alliances, the mainstream has also involved economic alliances experienced through a series of organizations which contribute to its configuration. In keeping with the process of institutionalization that culminated in the founding of the Francophony, some of the most important organizations

¹³ For example, the musics of Daniel Lavoie from Manitoba, and Roch Voisine from New Brunswick, associated with the 1980s-90s musical "middle-of-the-road," are both labeled *Québécois*.

established in Québec to develop and promote the Francophone musical space have become key components of the socio-economic and communication networks and infrastructures constitutive of the *Québécois* mainstream. This is the case, for instance, with the *Francofolies de Montréal*, perhaps the most famous and influential privately funded institution involved in this process.¹⁴ Its 1994 season included over 160 free outdoor and paying indoor concerts, featuring more than 1,000 artists and musicians from about twelve countries whose diverse genres and styles “represent various facets of the Francophone musical space” (*Simard 1994, 6). The audience was estimated to be half a million people, and the festival’s revenue is said to have reached close to fifty million Canadian dollars. While the Festival may aim at promoting Francophone musical cultures, it is in no way a philanthropist enterprise. As organizers pointed out in several press conferences, unlike public-funded organizations the Festival is held in Montreal because it is a good means “to make cultural business” (*Lemieux, 1993: C-8). Responding to journalists who criticized the Festival’s 1993 programming for its lack of new or unknown acts, the president of the *Francofolies* has argued that its events were not merely an artistic fantasy, but part of a strategic industrial process:

It is a deliberate choice of the *Francofolies de Montréal* to create an in-

¹⁴ Created in 1989 by the chief executives of the Spectra Scène group (also producers of the acclaimed Montreal International Jazz Festival), this annual week-long festival is modeled on France’s *Francofolies de Larochelle*, which, interestingly enough, according to its founder, were inspired by two *Québécois* organizations: the 1974 *Superfrancofête*, a festival aimed at promoting cultural exchanges among young Francophones from around the world, and sponsored in part by the ACCT; and the *Festival d’été de Québec* created in 1967, which took over the Francophone mandate of the *Superfrancofête* during the mid-1970s and became the oldest major annual festival exclusively devoted to Francophone musics from the province and abroad.

dustrial impact with the artists we include in our programming. Even when we attempt to promote a new artist, we make sure that his/her participation has some economic impact.... We work hand in hand with our corporate partners from the recording and live entertainment industries, we encourage synergy among the various sectors of show business (*Brunet 1993).

The Festival, it could be argued, represents an increasingly important forum where artists, record producers, agents, and concert promoters from different regions, especially of the Francophone world can meet, exchange and discuss, and (hopefully) sign business deals. Some of the contacts established through this network have resulted, for instance, in the participation of *Québécois* artists in music festivals and tours in Europe, and the signing of distribution contracts with influential European artists by Québec-owned firms. Moreover, in keeping with the Festival's comprehensive coverage by local as well as foreign print and electronic media, some musical ensembles from Québec have expanded their audience at home, while some groups from outside Québec (including, interestingly, Antillean Zouk Machine) have acquired new fans in yet another locale.

Strategies of Valorization of Zouk and the Québécois Mainstream

As we have attempted to show, zouk and the *Québécois* mainstream can be viewed as singular articulations of *créolité* and *francophonie*, respectively, and from this perspective, they can be said to produce distinct yet related narratives of alliance. These narratives are articulated on a variety of planes, from the aesthetics of music composition and performance to the poetics of lyrics, by means of affect, politics, history, and economy, and therefore

they put forward contrasting alliances which vary in form, as much as in rationale and intensity. In these final sections, we examine how such narratives of alliance mediate the strategies of valorization of zouk and the *Québécois* mainstream and, hence, their positioning on various markets.

On Targeting Singular Situated Audiences

The qualified cultural *métissage* in zouk and the unprecedented blurring of genre distinctions in the *Québécois* mainstream represent two distinct instances of musical alliance each of which has some bearing on the audiences constructed by and through these practices. By mixing and multiplying the cultural, linguistic and musical traditions in which they participate, zouk and the mainstream have broadened and diversified their potential audiences. One can be a *biguine* fan and still like zouk, or be a devoted folk lover and find at least part of the *Québécois* mainstream appealing.

Through the respective affective links they articulate, both these socio-musical phenomena are constructed in strictly relational terms: they are in keeping with musics from “elsewhere” with which they are affiliated without ever being confused with them. Although it borrows from and is affiliated with *compas direct*, zouk cannot be mistaken for this Haitian musical genre; and while many songs draw at least partially from United States’ folk pieces, no one song related to the *Québécois* mainstream is ever going to qualify perfectly as an American folk song. While both sets of practices emphasize linguistic issues through lyrics, they nonetheless encourage a more comprehensive approach to music that also involves stage choreography, sound materials, and organization techniques. The multi-racial composition of zouk musical

groups is as important as the groups' depiction of everyday life in Creole lyrics; similarly, the smallest and most important common denominator of the songs constitutive of the *Québécois* mainstream is not the language or even the meaning of their lyrics, but rather the fact that most of them cannot be readily associated with a single musical genre or style. In light of these alliances, we suggest that the strategies of valorization of zouk and the mainstream target diversified yet specifically situated audiences, strengthen relations with newly discovered "relatives" from "elsewhere," and promote music as a global multifaceted experience.

The narratives of alliance articulated through zouk and the *Québécois* mainstream have oriented not only their socio-cultural valorization but also their institutional valorization. In this respect, the increasing number of local and international-oriented festivals and competitions featuring zouk or Francophone music cannot be overlooked. While the respective roles of such organizations have yet to be fully assessed, it seems reasonable to infer, first, that they have significantly helped artists, genres, songs, and records to gain the official recognition of music-related industries at home and abroad; and second, that they have contributed to the establishment of the measures designed to evaluate success and define popularity within the industrialized confines of the musical domain. If this is the case, it could be argued that these organizations have helped construct the places occupied therein by the practices whose recognition and popularity they have helped consolidate.

Local Musics on "International" Markets

The processes of valorization we have briefly described also inform how musical commodities related to zouk and

the *Québécois* mainstream have been promoted and distributed. More precisely, they can be viewed as integral parts of the specific marketing strategies involved in positioning these commodities in highly competitive markets. Drawing upon the multiple forms of alliances articulated through zouk and the *Québécois* mainstream, these strategies have involved the construction of various target markets which, we want to emphasize, do not necessarily form a fixed hierarchically organized series, but rather heterogeneous groupings of different orders of markets. There is indeed no unique, readily accessible, and taken for granted market for zouk or *Québécois* mainstream musical commodities. Furthermore, record sales, radio airplay, and other indicators pertaining to the scale of diffusion of these commodities are not necessarily the only criteria used for configuring and defining their respective markets; linguistic affinities, shared histories, socio-economic and geographic proximities, and converging political agendas also appear to play a significant role.

We argue that the practices of zouk and the *Québécois* mainstream have contributed to the production, transformation, and consolidation of a wide range of so-called international markets. This does not mean that the widely acclaimed zouk artist Michel Rotin has found or will ever find a niche in Seattle, Washington in the United States, nor that the latest release of *Québécois* superstar Richard Séguin is known or will ever be known in Amsterdam. What it means is that the popularity of zouk and *Québécois* mainstream artists such as Rotin and Séguin has developed far beyond the confines of their respective countries or regions of origin, in ways which, we argue, would qualify them to be international artists. We are fully aware that this last statement defies the usual definition of what is generally called the "international market." But we call into question this very definition in order to attempt to

account more adequately for the strategies of valorization articulated by musics such as zouk and the *Québécois* mainstream.

Our approach rests upon three key assumptions that challenge the ways in which the “international” has been defined. First, the boundaries of the so-called international market do not correspond to those of the so-called advanced industrialized world. Northern-Western capitalist countries have not necessarily been the sole participants in economically and culturally meaningful markets. Countries or regions usually discriminated against because of their supposedly less viable economies have also been involved, albeit to varying degrees, in both the economic and the cultural development of various musical practices and commodities. Second, different singular articulations of the “international” coexist. As polyilateral exchanges among countries or regions from the Southern hemisphere suggest (Guilbault 1994), “international” patterns and forms of exchange do not have to involve individual and corporate partners from the “overdeveloped world” (Gilroy 1990). Third, the “international” constitutes the meeting place of groups or entities which need not be defined in strictly political terms. An international market may involve exchanges among nation-states, but bilateral or multilateral exchanges among localities/communities can also assume a no less important role in its mapping.

In light of these assumptions, we deem it more appropriate to speak of “international markets.” By using the plural form we want to emphasize the co-presence of various forms and patterns of exchange that constitute distinct markets. Some of the articulations of the “international” elaborated within these markets can usefully be referred to as “inter-national” to mean exchanges among groups whose collective identity is posited as nation—

whether or not its political realization takes the form of the nation-state; and "inter-local" to mean exchanges among communities whose members' sense of belonging can be imagined in linguistic, religious, racial, and gendered, as well as ideological and aesthetic terms.

What does framing international markets in the way we have suggested imply for zouk and the *Québécois* mainstream? We contend that the alliances constitutive of these musical practices have allowed their valorization within the specific inter-national and inter-local markets that they have helped produce or expand.

To acknowledge the importance and specificity of inter-national markets means to understand better the role zouk has played in further developing cultural and commercial relations among various national groups of the Southern hemisphere. For example, at the Music Festival of Cartagena where zouk has been given pride of place, artists from Martinique and Guadeloupe as well as from Columbia and Venezuela (among others) have been able to meet annually, to perform for increasingly diversified audiences, and to sell records to a wider range of buyers. While the *Québécois* mainstream has not yet played any significant part in relations between national (or regional) markets from the Southern hemisphere (as American jazz has in some circumstances), many other socio-musical articulations of *francophonie* have. It is the case of popular musics from the former Zaire, Madagascar, and Cameroun whose artistic and corporate producers have had increasing opportunities of meeting through specialized forums such as the MASA, where they also come in contact with their Southern and Western counterparts.

The musical practices in this study have also been central in the reconfiguration of already inter-national markets. For instance, the popularity of zouk has been instrumental in redefining musical relationships between

Martinique and Guadeloupe on one side, and Haiti on the other. The fact that Martinican and Guadeloupean zouk has become popular in Haiti has counterbalanced the predominance Haitian *compas* music had in the French Départements during the period 1960-80. Similar reconfigurations have occurred within inter-national markets involving France. Although the popularity of zouk has not revolutionized the relationships between France and its Départements in the West Indies, it has to some extent given the musical cultures of Martinique and Guadeloupe a much brighter place under the sun of the Hexagone. This phenomenon can be observed at various levels: French artists have recorded zouk songs, Caribbean artists have been designated to represent France in inter-national song contests, and Caribbean musics have been getting more airplay on France's radios and greater visibility on television. In a similar way, the advance of the *Québécois* mainstream can be said to have participated in modifying France-Québec relations, hitherto a one-way cultural exchange where Québec has been solely at the receiving end. New phenomena—such as the increasing number of versions of *Québécois* songs recorded by French artists and the implementation in France of the French-language vocal music radio broadcasting requirement that has made corporate music lobbying groups from Québec famous (Grenier 1993b)—signal that *Québécois* musical cultures as well as industrial and political expertise have gained more prominence in France.

Moreover, the socio-musical articulations of *franco-phonie* and *créolité* under study have contributed to the configuration of emerging inter-local markets. This has been the case for some of the markets of the *Québécois* mainstream, which have been constructed through new exchange programs between the *Québécois* and Walloon French-speaking communities. It has also been the case

for already existing markets shared by the French Antillean and African artistic communities in Paris, which have been further strengthened as zouk has acquired greater commercial and cultural value worldwide.

Toward New Regimes of Circulation

In this paper we have sketched zouk and *Québécois* mainstream practices as specific socio-musical articulations of *créolité* and *francophonie* with a view to analyzing how singular configurations of particular so-called local musics are produced, and to gaining a better understanding of the power relations at play. Our analysis has shed some light on the ways in which zouk and the mainstream are negotiated and articulated through the interplay of complex economic, linguistic, racial, political, and aesthetic forces foregrounded by the discourses through which the *créolité* and *francophonie* movements have been officialized. It has also shown that these particular musical practices and distinct cultural/political/economic movements have contributed to the continuous legitimization of the separate yet related spaces which they helped create and within which they have unfolded. These discursive spaces, we have indicated, allow for the emergence and consolidation of new alliances and strategies of valorization which could be said to respond to the imperatives of the contemporary global cultural economy as a “complex, overlapping, dis-junctured order” (Appadurai 1990, 296). The ordering of the various flows of capital, commodities, politics and policies, ideologies, technologies, and expertise that these new alliances render possible is the object of our final remarks.

We argue that the most pressing issues within increasingly globalized musical terrains do not concern pro-

duction, distribution, promotion, and marketing strategies so much as circulation. More precisely, what appears to be at stake is the emergence of new “regimes of circulation”: particular systems of power/knowledge (Foucault 1991) viewed as conjunctural linkings of institutions and discourses that allow the regulation of who or what circulates, and how, where, or why this circulation takes place. We use this notion to emphasize the fact affinities, alliances, and affiliations articulated by and through zouk and *Québécois* mainstream as singular expressions of *créolité* and *francophonie* in music are conjunctural, and historically contingent. The strategies of valorization through which these musics are produced and marketed are monitored and controlled. While we suspect these socio-musical practices to have become “dangerous crossroads”—that is, intersections “between the undeniable saturation of commercial culture in every area of human endeavor and the emergence of a new public sphere that uses circuits of commodity production and circulation to envision and activate new social relations” (Lipsitz 1994, 12)—we are convinced that such crossroads are policed.

How are such crossroads policed? How is circulation limited? What are the situated political, economic, cultural, and musical agencies at play? We have no comprehensive answer to offer, only a few analytical guidelines to suggest in hopes of initiating the critical study of emergent regimes of circulation we deem pressing.

Regimes of circulation, we propose, may be analyzed in terms of the discursive and non-discursive practices which regulate, sanction, and legitimate the configuration of movements, trajectories, and rituals of passage. First, circulation implies movement insofar as it refers to the process of changing position or place. Regulating circulation therefore means limiting the positions a given music can occupy, the “places” between which it can

move back and forth—given that “places” can designate not only geographical territories or landscapes, but ethnoscapas, mediascapas, technoscapas, finanscapas and ideoscapas as well (Appadurai 1990). It also means sanctioning the material forms through which musics move (commodities, experiences, individuals, expertise, and policies, for instance) and the types of exchange entailed in this process (sale retailing, loan, home taping, reselling, barter, conversation, instrument making, and others). Second, given that circulation implies movement within a circumscribed space, it could be argued that the more or less formalized circuits through which musical spaces are institutionally and discursively produced are also regulated. We call the ordered circuits at play in the circulation of musics “trajectories,” and differentiate between “extensive” and “intensive” trajectories depending on whether circulation mobilizes a variety of circuits or is confined to the systematic exploitation of a limited number of circuits. Third, the circulation of music can also illustrate how music gets spread among and used by various people. For want of a better term, “rituals of passage” is the expression we use to denote the conventional ways in which music is “passed along”: on the one hand, to the legitimization of certain patterns of reproduction/dissemination of music; and, on the other hand, to the regulation of practices through which traditions are invented (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983), memories created and activated, and traces left behind by “moving” musics retained and reactivated therein.

While these propositions remain to be further developed, they are in keeping with a critical examination of zouk and *Québécois* mainstream musics that has made us realize that their current and future development depend not only on whether or not they will sell and how much, but perhaps more importantly, on whether they will circu-

late, where they will circulate, by what means, and for how long.

References

- Agence de coopération culturelle et technique, under the direction of Michel Tétu. 1992. *L'année francophone internationale 1991*. Québec: Groupe d'études et de recherches sur la francophonie.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." In *Global Culture. Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, ed. Mike Featherstone, 295-310. London: Sage.
- Aumeeruddy-Cziffra, Shirin. 1994. "Le sommet francophone de Maurice." In *L'Année francophone internationale 1994*, 11-20. Québec: Groupe d'études et de recherches sur la francophonie.
- Aumis, Alain. 1987. "Special Kassav." *France-Antilles* (Martinique), 30 May, 16-18.
- Bernabé, Jean. 1983. *Fondal-Natal*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Bernabé, Jean, Patrick Chamoiseau, and Raphaël Confiant. 1989. *Éloge de la créolité*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Berthelot, Jean-Michel. 1992. "Le corps comme opérateur discursif." *Sociologie et Sociétés* 24: 11-19.
- Brunet, Alain. 1993. "Les Francofolies: Du 26 novembre au 4 décembre, une dizaine de spectacles par jour, dont cinq événements spéciaux." *La Presse* (Montréal), 20 October, E-12.
- Carrington, Lawrence D. 1988. *Creole Discourse and Social Development*, Manuscript Report no. 212e. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- Cohen, Sara. 1994. "Identity, Place and the 'Liverpool Sound.'" In *Ethnicity, Identity and Music: The Musical Construction of Place*, ed. Martin Stokes, 117-34. Oxford and Providence: Berg Publishers.
- Deniau, Xavier. 1992. *La francophonie*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Depestre, René. 1994. "Les aventures de la créolité." In *Écrire la "parole la nuit": la nouvelle littérature antillaise*, ed. Ralph Ludwig, 159-70. Paris: Gallimard.
- Doza, Bernard. 1992. "Une interview avec Bernard Doza, auteur du livre *Liberté confisquée*." *Antilla* 502: 22-24.
- Fahy, Paul, ed. 1991. Dossier "La Francophonie." In *Dialogues*, no. 34

(October): 9-30.

- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon.
- . 1991. "Politics and the Study of Discourse." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 53-72. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gilroy, Paul. 1990. "One Nation Under a Groove: the Cultural Politics of 'Race' and Racism in Britain." In *Anatomy of Racism*, ed. D. T. Goldberg, 263-82. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Glissant, Edouard. 1981. *Le discours antillais*. Paris: Seuil.
- Grenier, Line. 1993a. "The Aftermath of a Crisis: Québec Music Industries in the 1980s." *Popular Music* 12: 209-28.
- . 1993b. "Policing French-language Music on Canadian Radio: The Twilight of the Popular Record Era?" In *Rock and Popular Music: Politics, Policies, and Institutions*, ed. Tony Bennett et al., 119-41. London: Routledge.
- Grenier, Line and Val Morrison. 1995. "Le terrain socio-musical populaire au Québec: 'Et dire qu'on ne comprend pas toujours les paroles!'" *Études littéraires* 27 (special issue: "Poétiques de la chanson"): 75-98.
- Grossberg, Lawrence. 1992. *We Gotta Get Out of this Place*. London: Routledge.
- Guilbault, Jocelyne. 1993a. *Zouk: World Music in the West Indies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1993b. "On Redefining the 'Local' Through World Music." *The World of Music* 35, no. 2: 33-47.
- . 1994. "Créolité and the New Politics of Difference in Popular Music in the French West Indies." *Black Music Research Journal* 14, no. 2: 161-78.
- Haut Conseil de la Francophonie. 1993. *État de la francophonie dans le monde*. Paris: La documentation française.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hugues, Pascale. 1995. "Point de vue allemand: Le poison des arrières-pensées." *Le Point, Spécial France*, no. 1167: 43-44.
- Lalanne-Berdouticq, Philippe. 1993. *Pourquoi parler français?* Paris: Fleurus Essais.
- Lemieux, Louise. 1993. "Contrairement au Festival d'été, les Francofolies de Montréal misent plus sur les gros noms," *Le Soleil* (Québec), 2 December: C-8.
- Lebrun, Annie. 1994. *Pour Aimé Césaire*. Paris: Jean-Michel Place.
- Lipsitz, George. 1994. *Dangerous Crossroads. Popular Music, Postmodernism and the Poetics of Place*. New York: Verso.

- Probyn, Elspeth. 1994. *"Love in a Cold Climate": Queer Belongings in Québec*. Montreal: GRECC, Concordia University and Université de Montréal.
- Prudent, Lambert Félix. 1989a. "Écrire le créole à la Martinique: norme et conflit socio-linguistique." In *Les créoles français entre l'oral et l'écrit*, ed. Ralph Ludwig, 65-80. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- . 1989b. "La Pub, le zouk et l'album." *Autrement*, no. 41: 209-21.
- Relouzat, Raymond. 1994. "Caràibe, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Guyanne." In *L'Année francophone internationale 1994*, 185-93. Québec: Groupe d'études et de recherches sur la francophonie.
- Réno, Fred. 1994. "Introduction." In *Les Antilles-Guyanne au Rendez-vous de l'Europe*, ed. Fred Réno and Richard D. E. Burton, 5-17. Paris: Economica.
- Simard, Alain, ed. 1994. *Programme officiel: Les Francofolies de Montréal*. Montréal: Les Francofolies de Montréal.
- Straw, Will. 1991. "Systems of Articulation, Logics of Change: Communities and Scenes in Popular Music." *Cultural Studies* 5, no. 3: 369-88.
- Tétu, Michel. 1992. *La Francophonie*. Montréal: Guérin Universitaire.