

Essay Review

Reasons to be cheerful

Rock Over the Edge. Transformations in Popular Music Culture. Edited by Roger Beebe, Denise Fulbrook and Ben Saunders. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2002. 392 pp. ISBN 0–8223–2915–8 (paperback), 0–8223–2900–X (cloth)

I

The record industry, in Britain at least, has long been dependent on compilation albums for a significant part of its annual income. Compilations are treated with disdain by critics: *real* music lovers don't buy collections called *Floorfillers Volume 27* or *Smooth Classics – Do Not Disturb* or *The Very Best of New Woman*. But it's hard to think of a long-standing artist so commercially contemptuous as not to have released a hits package; and, after all, putting together our own compilations on tape or CD is one of the defining pleasures of being a music lover.

Having just edited a four-volume collection of academic articles for Routledge (Frith 2004), I'd say that the pleasure of compiling a book of popular music essays is much the same. There's something quietly satisfying about rescuing fine articles from obscurity and running together quite different arguments unexpectedly. The experience of commissioning *new* numbers for an album or articles for a book is, however, rather different.¹ And the results are more problematic for readers and listeners too. The excuse for gathering disparate new tracks together – the musicians are on the same label, come from the same geographic or generic community, are performing music by the same composer or raising money for the same charity – is rarely enough to make an album consistently interesting or aurally coherent.

This is to raise interesting questions as to why different artist tracks that have already established some sort of public presence (or indeed, as in the case of personal compilations, some sort of private presence too) can be jammed up against each other in a way that new tracks can't, but my concern here is book publishing. The fact is that my bookshelves are filling up with edited collections to be filed under the label 'popular music studies' or 'rock music – history and criticism'. And most of these books don't have the usual academic justification – they are neither conference proceedings nor *festschriften* – but are, rather, loosely 'thematic'. The ostensible reason why such books exist (and why I sometimes edit and contribute to them) is that they explore neglected research areas or develop particular theoretical or methodological approaches. The real reason, though, is that there are more pop and rock scholars out there looking to meet their annual publication quotas than there are journals to accommodate them, that edited collections anyway aren't peer reviewed to the same degree, and that publishers believe, probably rightly, that it's easier to sell edited collections than monographs to libraries.

From a passive academic consumer's point of view, this is just a fact of publishing. It's a rare edited collection that doesn't include something good or useful, and the photocopier is as important as the CD burner in a music scholar's life. But from an active academic reviewer's point of view, the edited collection is problematic. To cover the book fairly is to write a series of dull but descriptive paragraphs, like a well-meaning travel guide devoting time to every city on the bus route, however boring. To pick out just some essays, whether for praise or blame, feels too arbitrary, a reflection of the reviewers' particular interests at a particular time. The problem here, I think, is twofold. On the one hand, for all their editors' original plans and deployment of *post hoc* segueing skills, few collections have the conceptual coherence or consistent tone of a single authored monograph. On the other hand, to advance argument by collective voice, as it were, is to make exaggerated claims as to what a collection is actually contributing to a field of study. What's involved is not just the suggestion that a varied collection of essays represents the way forward but also that these essays can all somehow be distinguished from what has gone before.

In this respect, *Rock Over the Edge* is exemplary. It is just as varied in topic and quality as any other pop/rock collection but proclaims an overarching polemical purpose. I don't think this polemic does actually drive all the articles included, but it is an argument that everyone engaged in popular music studies should consider, and I will devote most of this review to it. But before getting onto this, a quick collector's point: I enjoyed four essays here very much, and will undoubtedly photocopy them for other people (and could imagine including them in any future compilation of my own). Robert Fink's 'Elvis Everywhere: Musicology and Popular Music Studies at the Twilight of the Canon' is a brilliant and continuously thought-provoking 'reconceptualisation' (Fink's own term) of musicology for the 'post-classical' era. Ian Balfour's 'Queen Theory: Notes on the Pet Shop Boys' is an elegant and witty reflection on a particular kind of homosexual sensibility. Michael Coyle's 'Hijacked Hits and Antic Authenticity: Cover Songs, Race, and Postwar Marketing' is a subtle and richly informed reconsideration of received accounts of black-to-white cover version. Jason Middleton's 'D. C. Punk and the Production of Authenticity' is a usefully detailed and sharply argued case study of Fugazi and the punk ideology of independence and community (to be read alongside Sara Cohen's classic study of Liverpool indie bands: Cohen 1991). I also learnt much from Josh Kun's survey of Mexican rock and Lisa Parks' study of Asian music videos.

II

Most of the other essays in *Rock Over the Edge* are more irritating than stimulating. All (if in varying degrees) are concerned (with more or less self-righteousness) to put right an 'orthodoxy' (of rock criticism or rock scholarship) but do so with a degree of sloppiness that suggests that such orthodoxy is their own construction. And this brings me to the book's polemic.

On the back cover, Duke University Press assert that 'this collection brings new voices and new perspectives to the study of popular – and particularly rock – music'. We need new approaches, it seems, because there is a crisis in the very idea of rock culture. To quote the blurb again, '*Rock Over the Edge* asks what happens to rock criticism when rock is no longer a coherent concept'. In the editors' words, 'The authors gathered in this volume are all situated after this deconstructive turn within

rock criticism, and the insights derived from this turn constitute the theoretical baseline from which their analyses proceed' (p. 2).

There are, to begin with, a number of definitional problems here. Is rock criticism the same thing as academic rock scholarship? (The editors compromise on this by adopting the notion of 'academic criticism'.) Is 'rock post "rock"' (p. 3) the same thing as 'contemporary popular music' (p. 4)? What is immediately clear is that despite the essays on Mexican music, Asian music videos and the very English Pet Shop Boys, what we might call the *problematic* of this collection is decidedly US-centric. This rather undermines the editors' dismissal of old approaches to popular music studies: little attention is paid here to how popular music has been written about in countries in which 'rock' has *always* been a problematic, foreign, and incoherent concept.

'Each author', in *Rock Over the Edge*, we learn, 'considers his or her subject not as it has traditionally been analysed – as a form or culture defined either through or against "rock" – but as a site of contestation marking the possible transformations of the musical and critical terrain' (p. 11). Whose 'tradition' is being invoked here? 'The authors in this volume', the editors suggest, 'focus on formerly neglected or overlooked musics (country, the Pet Shop Boys, rock en español, and so forth)', (p. 11) a list that makes me wonder where they've been. Country music has one of the richest bodies of scholarly work (academic and non-academic) of any popular genre; the Pet Shop Boys have long been beloved by academic commentators, if only because they can be used so easily to illustrate arguments about postmodernism; and rock en español has not exactly been neglected by ethnomusicologists, Latin-Americanists or, indeed, Spanish-speaking people (even if the music doesn't feature much in *Rolling Stone* or on MTV-USA).

Once I started on the essays, though, I realised that the editors' account of a discursive crisis in 'academic criticism' doesn't best describe what's going on in this collection. Another sentence in the back cover blurb is more revealing. This volume, it explains, takes seriously 'the implications of critical theory for the study of non-literary aesthetic endeavours'. Of the fifteen contributors here, five are from English departments; three from film/TV/media programmes; four from programmes including cultural studies in their title, one from an information school, just two from music departments (and none from sociology). What's at issue in this collection is not so much the present state of popular music studies as what is meant by 'critical theory'.

III

The keynote of *Rock Over the Edge* is the opening essay, Lawrence Grossberg's 'Reflections of a Disappointed Popular Music Scholar'. This is, in fact, the revised version of a paper that has already been collected (in Kelly and McDonnell 1999). The editors' decision to re-use Grossberg's work here is clearly strategic. 'The essays that follow Grossberg', they suggest, 'can be read as responses to his challenge' (p. 12). And, indeed, one might add that anyone engaged in popular music studies needs to respond to Grossberg's 'challenge', given that his paper is, if nothing else, a sustained assault on what had previously been thought to be the achievements of popular music scholars.

Grossberg is certainly unsparing of our feelings (if I may, for a moment, write collectively as a member of IASPM and the *Popular Music* editorial advisory board). 'I

must admit', he writes prissily, 'that I do not think I would give the vast majority of popular music studies very high grades on any of the dimensions I cared (or care) about' (pp. 27–8). 'I do not think', he goes on to complain, 'that writing about popular music has significantly changed (to say nothing of 'progressed') in forty years' (pp. 28–9). Not since 1960, that is to say, an indictment indeed! Not since the era before rock music and rock journalism, before British subcultural theory and cultural studies, before any of us now in the field had started publishing our work. All our scholarly efforts to so little end – why?² Whatever the reason, it affected popular music studies of all sorts and popular music writers inside and outside the academy alike. Grossberg certainly doesn't spare textual analysis from his strictures. Rock criticism, musicology and the semiotics of music have been equally disappointing: 'rarely am I surprised by the interpretive work; instead, my most common experience is that I have heard it before – been there, done that' (p. 33).

The problem, for Grossberg, is that popular music studies (PMS) has failed to develop an adequate – or even any – theory. This has had two consequences. On the one hand, 'I do not think we [Grossberg is writing collectively here] have developed (or even attempted to develop) a common vocabulary in which to argue about the differences between musics and musical cultures, and between critical analyses and interpretations' (p. 29). On the other hand, 'I am disappointed by how infrequently our engagement with popular music . . . has forced us to take up the new and urgent political struggles of recent decades' (p. 30). (The struggles he refers to are the struggles over the state of youth and children in the USA.) To put this second point another way, the lack of proper theoretical engagement with popular music has meant that the politics espoused by popular music scholars 'are rarely shaped by the knowledge they gain about what is happening in the world through their ongoing research into popular music cultures' (p. 30).

A couple of points can be made about these assertions immediately. First, when Grossberg suggests that popular music scholars lack a shared vocabulary, he doesn't actually mean that we lack a shared vocabulary. Rather he means that the shared vocabulary that we do have is not properly theoretical. Similarly, his suggestion that PMS is not political involves a judgement of what is properly political, not a measure of whether or not popular music scholars are engaged in politics informed by their research, around issues of censorship or state music policy, for instance. (And I am not clear whether Grossberg thinks that popular music scholars who are not from the USA should nevertheless be engaged with the US politics of youth or whether he believes that war is being waged against children in our lands too.)

This is, I would say, the rhetorical essence of Grossberg's argument. PMS is indicted not for what it has done, but for what it hasn't. Grossberg's beef is that popular music studies isn't – didn't become cultural studies.

IV

In my idiosyncratic collection of rock memorabilia there is a letter Lawrence Grossberg wrote me in 1982, following the publication of *Sound Effects*. We didn't know each other but he was coming to Britain, was 'a great fan' of my work, and wanted to meet. He explained: 'I am a professor at the University of Illinois teaching and writing on the topic of rock and roll. Having studied at Birmingham long ago, I guess my approach would be describable as "cultural studies"'. We duly met, became friends and worked together (in IASPM among other places). By 1984 (at a

conference on popular music and education where I reflected on the best academic approach to the field) Grossberg's influence on my thinking was apparent. I argued that the problem of popular music being studied in the 'nooks and crannies' of a multitude of different disciplines was 'a liberality of methodology which is not entirely helpful'. What was lacking was the systematic basis for 'some kind of coherence of interdisciplinary approaches'. Referring specifically to how popular music was being treated in sociology departments, I suggested that:

Instead of popular culture being treated as an object that needed its own forms of discipline, what was constituted as popular music was built on a theory that was not necessarily appropriate. Very similar things happen in communications departments.

'Popular music has been neglected' is a very clear statement, but we can't then say all we have to do is fit it into existing disciplines. In some ways the opposite is true: one of the reasons some of us got interested in popular music was because of our grappling to make sense of a cultural form that couldn't be made sense of in terms of existing separations.

If anything, the kind of term that makes best sense is something like 'cultural studies', that would take for granted that what is interesting is a certain sort of social process, the way in which ideologies work, and so on, and in which popular music can't be separated from other aspects of cultural production (quoted in Horn 1986, pp. 200–2).

In the mid-1980s, then, it seemed that popular music studies would be a core strand of cultural studies and vice versa; on this Grossberg and I were agreed. Fifteen years later Grossberg is reading my work (or, to be specific, *Performing Rites*) as being explicitly 'hostile' to theoretical self-reflection 'in the name of a rather anachronistic empiricism' (p. 42), while I am reading Grossberg's work (or, to be specific, this essay) as being explicitly hostile to popular music studies in the name of an equally anachronistic theoreticism. So why did this relationship go wrong?

Some clues can be found in a review essay written well before Grossberg's paper by Angela McRobbie (McRobbie 1995).³ McRobbie starts from two premises that prefigure Grossberg's position. She suggests, first, that popular music has occupied 'an unstable, uncertain' place within cultural studies and, second, that 'the accepted critical categories' in popular music studies are now 'urgently in need of revision' (p. 323). Rock, she argues, is in a state of crisis and popular music scholars (I'm named and shamed) are 'refusing' the challenges thus posed. Like Grossberg, McRobbie defines the problem of popular music studies as a theoretical failure. If music was once just under-theorised (compared, say, to film), popular music studies were now becoming *anti-theoretical*. By hanging on so stubbornly to 'rock paradigms', PMS were failing to engage with the emergence of race, ethnicity and gender as critical themes in cultural analysis.

This is to clarify, I think, Grossberg's more long-winded and opaque jeremiad. From my perspective, both McRobbie and Grossberg can be seen to be suffering from a 'disabling deference to the idea of "theory"', which, as Stefan Collini has pointed out, 'does not seem necessarily to lead those who write in its idiolect to any greater subtlety or richness of perception' (Collini 1999, p. 264). What, then, is this 'theory' that popular music studies so blatantly lack?

It seems to have three components. First, a level of abstraction that makes it impossible to relate its descriptive nouns to anything in musical experience that could be so described; second, a methodological imperative to pursue conceptual development rather than gather empirical data; third, what can only be described as a metaphysical belief in the existence of a grand statement of the connectedness of everything. When Grossberg writes, for example, that 'the musical apparatus

becomes a site of possible contestation and a point of articulation in its own right for other relations' (p. 34), he is assuming that readers know the meanings of the terms 'apparatus', 'contestation' and 'articulation', meanings which derive from theoretical apparatuses, contestations, and articulations rather than being grounded in any actual studies of music making. (I should confess, being crassly quantitative, that there is about 25 per cent of Grossberg's article that I simply do not understand.)

Giving his own example of what he means by proper theorisation, Grossberg points to what he takes to be a shared assumption of PMS, 'that a large part of the power of postwar popular music depends in part on the mechanisms and systems of identification . . . that it calls into existence and deploys' (p. 36). This is a reasonable assumption (though from the perspective of an anachronistic empiricist, the slippery term here is 'power'). To go further, Grossberg suggests, we need to develop 'a better theory of identifications' and 'a better vocabulary for making useful distinctions between apparatuses and economies of identification'. We can look to significant work done in other fields (such as film studies) but we also have to remember that the key questions concern the specificity of popular music: 'Does music operate through different practices or mechanisms of identification? Does it rearticulate practices that operate in other discursive materialities? Does it produce different possibilities of identification and of their structure and articulation into other dimensions of our lives?' (p. 37).

There are two kinds of comment to make about this. On the one hand, it is difficult to decide what one would need to do to answer Grossberg's questions to his satisfaction. What sort of research is required? There is, of course, much interesting empirical work by popular music scholars precisely on the issues of music and identification, whether at the personal, sub-cultural, local, diasporic, ethnic or national level. But this work is, presumably, irrelevant for Grossberg not so much because it is untheorised as because it uses the wrong theoretical vocabulary. On the other hand, Grossberg's questions reflect his ambition to develop a theory that makes sense of *all* cultural and aesthetic activity in the same (necessarily) abstract terms.⁴

There is also a suggestion here that for cultural studies, 'doing theory' means citing other theorists, and Grossberg is quite straightforward about this – this is how intellectual development works. Proper scholars of popular music should go off and think about the meanings of their terms until, with the help of much high theoretical study, they have produced a conceptual vocabulary and set of structural connections that can be used to understand the world. Empiricists, by contrast, immerse themselves in the everyday world and delude themselves that they can grasp its connections and contradictions by drawing eclectically on whatever theories seem to make sense of it (whether produced by 'theorists' or not) and failing to distinguish (in Grossberg's terms) between 'first-order (naïve, commonsensical) and second-order concepts' (p. 35).

V

Here we have it. For Grossberg, popular music studies briefly seemed to be a way of pursuing the theoretical grail of cultural studies but was, to his disappointment, found wanting – popular music scholars lack theoretical commitment and self-reflection. For me, cultural studies seemed for a moment to offer solutions to the cross-disciplinary problems of popular music research but, to my disappointment, turned out to lack interest in grounded data, in the concept-resistant confusion of

everyday cultural practice. In the end, popular music studies had to solve its methodological problems in its own terms.

And we do have our own terms. Read some of the essays in *Rock Over the Edge* and you'd think that popular music scholars hadn't done any thinking at all. In one of his odder assertions, Grossberg, while acknowledging the 'proliferation' of empirical PMS, suggests that 'only slowly are scholars beginning to realise that the musics and audiences that constitute popular music are much more diverse and multiple than we have been willing to admit' (p. 32). I am baffled by the 'we' in this sentence, and in the next: 'At the same time, even as we learn more about some aspects of popular music, we seem to know less and less about other absolutely crucial dimensions of its existence – namely, its institutional and economic conditions' (p. 32). One can only respond: 'speak for yourself, mate!'

We – popular music scholars – should not feel defensive in the face of a book like *Rock Over the Edge*. In my view, one of the great advantages of PMS's evolving disciplinary eclecticism and methodological pragmatism (eclecticism and pragmatism informed by all manner of what one might call everyday or *participatory* theory) is that they have dealt rather better with the relationship between text and context, production and consumption, institution and aesthetics than, say, film or TV studies. Concepts like 'genre', 'authenticity', and 'independence' may not be found in the work of continental philosophy, but they have emerged from (and made possible) rich studies of a variety of musical cultures, and, on the whole, popular music scholars have just as subtle and complex an understanding of such things as stardom and performance as our colleagues in other media studies. Indeed, I am certain that the best researched and the most theoretically suggestive accounts of cultural identity are to be found in popular music studies. To cite just one recent example, Rehan Hyder's new book on Asian pop/rock music in Britain, drawing on interviews with the musicians themselves (Hyder 2004), is a much richer and more complex account of ethnicity in contemporary Britain than those derived simply from theoretical positions, whether cultural or political.

Of course the multi-disciplinary nature of PMS still makes for problems in theoretical development, but the underlying argument between, say, musicology and sociology has been immensely fruitful for both sides in its very lack of resolution. Grossberg suggests that because 'the field of popular music studies is a relatively small and intimately connected body of scholars and students', it has perhaps been difficult 'for individuals to engage with and criticise each other's work' (p. 43). And he is not the only person to find IASPM conferences too cosy, not argumentative enough, but I'm not sure that this is a problem now for the field as a whole. Musicologists now take sociology seriously in ways they used not to and vice versa, which means, in my experience, not that they are more polite but that they are ruder, more robust at pointing out each other's false premises and conceptual confusions (in accounts of 'progressive' rock, for example). It is striking, I think, that ethnomusicology is now an essential part of popular music studies (having been itself clearly influenced by them), and symbolic that a scholar like Keith Negus can become a Professor of Music, moving (at Goldsmiths) from a media and communication to an established music department. It is certainly arguable, notwithstanding Grossberg's indictment, that popular music studies should be seen as a model for other kinds of cultural study rather than vice versa. They certainly seem to exemplify the positive side of cultural studies as described in Lynne Segal's recent retrospective overview (see Segal 2003).

* * *

But I want to end this essay by considering two other issues. First, the suggestion that we (popular music scholars) are somehow facing a discursive 'crisis'. This, as we have seen, was the editors' premise for *Rock Over the Edge* and Angela McRobbie's starting point in her 1995 review. What is the nature of this crisis? Well, it is not, it seems, a crisis as perceived by popular music scholars themselves – as McRobbie argues most explicitly, the problem for PMS is precisely that *it doesn't realise that there is a crisis!* The crisis is, rather, something happening in the world that popular music scholars haven't spotted. This seems, ironically, to be a rather empiricist assertion. As Grossberg puts it: 'the field of popular music studies has largely failed to describe and understand the significant changes occurring in popular music culture in the United States in the 1990s' (p. 43).

Grossberg argues that the 'rock apparatus' which 'emerged in the 1960s to become the dominant US cultural formation of 'American' youth at least until the mid-1980s, had, by the end of the 1980s, been displaced' (p. 45), 'The apparatus that is "becoming dominant" is a new mainstream' (p. 47), that 'cannot be described in the first instance as a musical formation, because its center is defined as much by other sorts of practices, activities and media – including film, television, video games, and computers – as by musical ones' (p. 48).⁵

The 'crisis', in short, is that the rock terms used to analyse American popular music from the 1960s to 1980s can no longer be applied to American popular music in the 1990s and 2000s. (McRobbie applies the same argument to British popular music.) This may be a problem for Grossberg, who invested much theoretical work in a cultural politics centred on the rock apparatus and its discourse of youth, but I'm not clear that it is a crisis for popular music studies. For PMS, the relationship between rock and other forms of popular music (and between rock studies and other forms of popular music analysis) has been an issue from IASPM's very foundation.⁶ Similarly, when McRobbie argues that cultural studies bring to popular music studies issues of race, sex and ethnicity that are otherwise neglected, I am not clear what she means by popular music studies. (If she were to define PMS as that part of the field that isn't concerned with sex, race and ethnicity, there wouldn't be much left to criticise – I don't think this would even be fair to rock studies, her real target.)

What is incontrovertible is, first, that rock music study was indeed, for a variety of reasons, crucial to the development of popular music studies (for discussion of this point see Frith 2004, pp. 1–3) and, second, that rock is best understood historically, as a strand of popular music rather than its dominant form. I believe that it would, though, be wrong 'to disparage the central role of rock scholars in the development of popular music studies . . . rock – because of its particular history, its particular ideology, its particular success – called forth a new kind of scholarship, involving a remarkable range of disciplinary approaches and questions, which eventually affected non-rock studies too' (Frith 2004, p. 3). That we live in a world 'post rock' is not, as the editors of *Rock Over the Edge* would have it, a crisis. We don't need to make a new theoretical start. The achievement of popular music studies is, precisely, that it is flexible enough to adapt ways of thinking and researching to new musical and cultural developments.

My final point is this. One of the peculiarities of rock studies as an academic topic (this was apparent in the early days of IASPM) was that it developed as a conversation not just across disciplines but also across occupations – academic and

non-academic, music-making and journalism, policy-making and teaching. From the start, that is to say, PMS drew on low as well as high theory, on concepts used by people producing and selling music, as well as listening to and talking about it. (Hence, for example, the importance of the ongoing argument – obvious in *Rock Over the Edge* – about ‘authenticity’.) This has certainly been a problem for PMS’s claims to scholarly authority, but it has also made, I think, for a necessary kind of scholarly humility. At one point in his essay, Grossberg says that he doesn’t believe that ‘the academic study of popular music is about making judgements’, or asserting the superiority of the scholar’s musical experience to that of their students. But, he adds, ‘That doesn’t mean that individuals cannot enrich or change their experiences by *being made to understand* the complexity of how such experiences and judgements are produced and how the music functions not only in their own lives but in the larger contexts of social relations of power’ (p. 31, my emphasis).

There’s a hint here, as so often in so-called critical theory, not so much of scholarly authority as of scholarly authoritarianism. Everyone in popular music studies should certainly read Grossberg’s essay. His starting point, at least, is spot on: ‘Every once in a while, people invested in a particular body of scholarly work should take stock’ (p. 25). But then they should read *Bright Balkan Morning. Romani Lives and the Power of Music in Greek Macedonia* (Blau, Keil and Feld 2002), lovingly produced by another American university press as a celebration of not just the power of popular music but also the power of popular music studies, the power to move us emotionally, physically and intellectually as much as the music itself. You won’t be disappointed!

Simon Frith

University of Stirling

Endnotes

1. I’ve just done this too – see Frith and Marshall (2004).
2. I’m not altogether sure Grossberg meant to write forty years. In a footnote he expresses surprise – dismay? – that people still cite my 1981 *Sound Effects* ‘as the latest statement of our understanding of rock’ (p. 54). Maybe he meant twenty years.
3. Ironically enough, two of the essay collections McRobbie treats critically here included both Grossberg and myself among the editors.
4. In resisting this call to arms I’m much cheered by Robert Fink’s comment in ‘Elvis Everywhere’: ‘This is the only real advice New Musicology (taunts of sloppiness and dilettantism from our own colleagues ringing in our ears) has to offer pop music scholars. Loosen up. We had analytical rigour, and it felt dangerously close to rigor mortis. Avoid totalising (framing) critical gestures altogether, whether in the service of autonomous form or cultural code; stop trying to put the whole piece together (musicology) or take it totally apart (popular music studies). Get in, say something that helps convey the immediacy of the musical experience, and get out. Stop marching through the music’s architecture – and dance a little’ (p. 95).
5. Grossberg’s evidence for this is ‘ethnographic research I conducted with a group of high school students during summer 1995 in Illinois’ (p. 59).
6. See, for example, Berland and Kompridis (1985/6), an excellent and pointed critique of early IASPM debates in North America.

References

- Berland, J., and Kompridis, N. 1985/6. ‘Disciplining the “Popular”’. *Music and pedagogy*, *Borderlines*, winter, pp. 26–9
- Blau, D., Keil, C., Keil, A.V., and Feld, S. 2002. *Bright Balkan Morning. Romani Lives and the Power of Music in Greek Macedonia* (Middletown, CT)
- Cohen, S. 1991. *Rock Culture in Liverpool: Popular Music in the Making* (Oxford)
- Collini, S. 1999. ‘Grievance Studies: How not to do cultural criticism’, in *English Past. Essays in History and Culture* (Oxford), pp. 252–68

- Frith, S. 1981. *Sound Effects* (New York)
- (ed.) 2004. *Popular Music. Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural Studies* (London and New York)
- Frith, S., and Marshall, L. (eds.) 2004. *Music and Copyright* (Edinburgh)
- Horn, D. 1986. 'The development of the study of American popular music in Britain and an overview of resources', *American Studies Library Newsletter*, Number 21, June, pp. 16–32
- Hyder, R. 2004. *Brimful of Asia. Negotiating Ethnicity on the UK Music Scene* (Aldershot)
- Kelly, K., and McDonnell, E. (eds.) 1999. *Stars Don't Stand Still in the Sky: Music and Myth* (New York)
- McRobbie, A. 1995. 'Recent rhythms of sex and race in popular music', *Media Culture and Society*, 17/2, pp. 323–31
- Segal, L. 2003. 'Theoretical Affliction: Poor rich white folks play the blues', *New Formations*, 50, pp. 142–56