

Adorno is a punk rocker - negation and 80s alternative rock music

It is a “rite of passage” for the aspiring pop music scholar, myself included, to refute Theodor Adorno’s well-known condemnation of popular music (Gendron, 1986; Toynbee, 2000: 3-8; Middleton, 1990: 34-63). But why has the Adorno refutation remained so central to our critical endeavour? Isn’t it time we moved on? Few scholars now would dispute the reductionism of Adorno’s equation of assembly lines with popular music production, his too-easy dismissal of audience, and the inadequacy of elitist high modernism to assess popular music’s many uses, values and pleasures. But these refutations are also open to critique: they assume that popular music is monadic, and that the kinds of critical judgements about high and low culture that interested Adorno are somehow irrelevant in pop culture. Both these points are highly debatable - popular music is highly fragmented, in terms of diversification of genres, markets etc. but more importantly it is a highly stratified, hierarchical and diverse set of fields in which consumers, genres and practitioners struggle for legitimacy, continually positioning themselves through acts of judgements, and deployment of cultural and subcultural capital (Frith, 1996: 3-6; Thornton, 1995).

What interests me is the way that an Adorno-esque, high modernist perspective has become part of the standard critical repertoire of attitudes *within* popular music: “the themes that haunted modernist writers and critics at the beginning of the 20th century [their “high” cultural concern to be true to their art, to disdain mere entertainment, to resist market forces . . .] still haunt popular music” (Frith, 1996: 66). Adorno continues to strongly flavour assumptions about value and critical judgment of music.

80s alternative guitar rock culture provides an example of such attitudes. The scenes I studied (NZ, US and UK) all shared a similarly Adorno-esque contempt and

suspicion of the mainstream: “Seduced by sugary hooks and blatantly obvious rhythm tracks, you wander blindly through the stunning mediocrity of it all until someone of objectively immaculate taste, such as myself, opens your poor sagging eyes and shows you the light [. . .]” (Knox, 1986: 54; Bannister, 2006b). Chris Knox, a founding member of NZ indie Flying Nun and the associated Dunedin Sound, has a high modernist disdain for the machinations of the culture industry, and this implies a corresponding belief in the relative autonomy of his music, expressed in terms of its non-commercial nature, its independence, its locality, originality, purity, and negation or criticism of modern society. This attitude is largely reproduced in many accounts of indie scenes (Arnold, 1995: 4-11; Azerrad, 2001: 3-11; Felder, 1993; Gilbert, 1999; Harrington, 2002: 373-393; Reynolds, 1990: 11-13).

To even identify alternative guitar rock as a genre is arguably to undermine a cornerstone of indie ideology – that indie is authentically autonomous and unique, produced in isolated, marginal, local scenes, uncaptured by ideology, free of commercial and other pressures, but also of high culture elitism (Kruse, 2003:1). NZ alternative rock has been viewed in precisely this way: “the Dunedin Sound was generated through a cultural geography of living on the margin, producing ‘a mythology of a group of musicians working in cold isolation, playing music purely for the pleasure of it’” (Shuker, 1998: 103-4; McLeay, 1994: 39). Further examples of this “autonomy” can be seen in the way that indie music was seen as spontaneous, original, unschooled, as musicians “just doing it” (Robertson, 1991: 9).

In contrast I see 1980s indie guitar rock occurring all over the First World, from the US to the UK to Australia and New Zealand, marked by a comparative stylistic homogeneity partly attributable to the recurrence of similar influences, mainly punk and 1960s white pop/rock, but also to the dissemination and globalisation of

alternative/avant-garde aesthetics of popular culture. Will Straw has argued that “the unity of alternative rock no longer resided in ... stylistic qualities” (1997: 496) however, I am dealing mainly with alternative *guitar* rock. I agree with Straw that similar influences were important, but he underestimates the impact of what he identifies himself as the exclusion of black musical influence, which was clearly discernible in musical style (497; Reynolds, 1989: 246; Cavanagh, 2000: 228). This “whitening” of indie relates to its deferral to basically high art concepts eg indie as rock classicism, or Adorno’s derisive remarks about jazz (Straw, 1997: 501; Adorno, 1990: 308-9).

Alternative rock’s “autonomy” is in fact historically constructed: theories of punk and alternative music had been debated in rock media since the late 60s, and that these theories drew on high art classical, modernist and romantic aesthetic theory, so Adorno, as much as Andy Warhol, Lester Bangs or Eno, is part of a tradition of avant-garde thought about art’s oppositional and negational social role (Bangs, 1987; Tamm, 1995; Koch, 1974). I want to historicise alternative rock by showing a tradition (art rock) which begins in the 60s with the Velvets and Andy Warhol. Viewing alternative rock’s negation of the mainstream as part of a tradition makes us review its claim to autonomy, in the same way that we would today be critical of Adorno’s claims about the autonomy of art music.

This awareness of history was already in indie (Straw, 1997: 496-7), as demonstrated by the importance of record collections and collectors to indie; citation of similar influences (an “art rock” canon) which usually starts with 60s mavericks like the Velvet Underground and continues through 70s glam rock to punk; and the importance of “mentors” within indie scenes, 60s “survivors”, whom emulating perhaps “seminal” collector, critic and punk theoretician Lester Bangs, schooled and

directed young musicians excited by punk towards this punk art rock canon, performing educational and regulatory functions (Bannister, 2006a). If this hidden history of indie has yet to be written, it is precisely because it contradicts the received wisdom about rock culture, that it is a “youth” culture, embodying spontaneity, naivety, purity, and rebellion. Similarly, citation of influences in indie scenes was initially restricted by the need to present alternative rock as new and original form of artistry (Azerrad, 2001: 15-16).

In *No Respect*, Andrew Ross describes two main intellectual strategies by which popular culture’s value is justified as “art”: the “hip” and the “camp” (1989: 5). The former relates to the justification of alternative rock above, in terms of its authenticity, autonomy and locality, its “street cred”. This argument also draws on a “folk culture” discourse, and hence goes back to rock’s supposed “roots” in black American music, what Ross calls the “hip” justification. Although alternative rock did not draw particularly on a specifically ethnic myth of origins as earlier rock culture, it did practice a similarly folk-inflected romanticism (Keightley, 2001: 121; 126–7).

Ross then considers “camp”, which could be seen as the opposite of “hip”, although it has similar effects. If “hip” is ultimately about folk authenticity, then “camp” introduces art criteria. But because rock is a popular form, straight high-art elitism is too risky; it has to be a “pop art” approach - ironic and self-reflexive. Hence the “trash” aesthetic: artists, rather than claiming authentic truth, comment ironically and subversively, often by employing elements of “mainstream”, pop or “trash” culture in collage, pastiche or other supposedly postmodern approaches. This model contradicts the authenticity model on almost every point. Indeed we could say that it turns the authenticity model upside down (but this in turn suggests that it inverts the model rather than revising it). Instead of authenticity it proclaims inauthenticity,

instead of purity it proclaims heterogeneity, instead of clear-cut distinctions it mixes everything together, it inverts the hierarchy of received cultural values.

There are then two ways alternative music culture can make a claim to “art”, either that it is more authentic because less commodified, or that it is more authentic because it is ironically self-aware that authenticity is a lie – it comments on the fallacy of naive true belief. Both these approaches work off the concept of a corrupt or degraded mainstream, although constructed in contradictory ways – as either inauthentic because commodified or alternatively falsely authentic because it believes absolutely in its own fictions. I want to argue that both these categories can be traced to Adorno’s concept of art music as negation in *Philosophy of Modern Music*, and that his elitist account of how art works in relation to society has been uncritically reproduced in most recent accounts of alternative and avant-garde culture.

Adorno claims that negation is the opposite of affirmation, which “conceals alienation by mystifying the true relations of production in society” (Paddison, 1993: 102-3). He argues that because of the oppressive conditions of modern society, true art to adequately represent social reality has to be difficult and negative in character – uneasy listening. Work that is popular in approach, accessible and affirmative denies the truth of modern society – its suppression of individuality, the reality of suffering, commoditisation etc. Schoenberg’s works express this through their inaccessibility, atonality, lack of a fixed key centre, serialism, and repetition.

Neil Nehring applies this concept of negation to UK punk rock in *Flowers in the Dustbin*: “as a critique of conformist common sense” (1993: 2), a protest against the status quo. He also attacks postmodernist critiques that suggest that punk rock has lost this “edge” through commodification and incorporation. However, Nehring largely ignores Adorno’s second tenet: that negation questions the presence of the author in

the work. Adorno suggests that in modern society, it is increasingly difficult to reconcile individuality in art with an increasingly repressive social structure (Adorno, 1973:19–21). The author can no longer simply “express himself”, because this “false consciousness” would imply a freedom that is not borne out in reality. Hence he has to disappear from the work in an act of self–negation (Subotnik, 1976:253– 4).

The musical subject ... had to yield to and assimilate the formal features of objective reality to a far greater extent than ever before ... “by increasing the explicitly formal character of music, the subjective could acknowledge its own underlying dependence on a foreign source of authority, objectivity, without ever going beyond the autonomous processes of musical construction” (Subotnik, 1976:256). To put it simply, the musical subject had to disappear from the music; and Adorno accordingly claims that in the late Beethoven corpus it almost never appears directly. Henceforth, “the very absence of a subject from a musical configuration necessarily constituted an integral component of that configuration” (1976:256), and Adorno believes that the subject in Beethoven’s third period maintained its identity exactly through its own negation (Verster, 1995).¹

Beethoven’s career, for Adorno, is prophetic of the trajectory of authentic music in a modernising society. The composer’s presence in his own work is radically reduced –

¹ Verster, F (1995) “Mann, Adorno and Beethoven: triangles in the disappearance of the musical”, <http://www.uwc.ac.za/arts/english/interaction/94fv.htm>, accessed 10 Oct.

he has become a spectator to the spectacle of modernity. Such an attitude questions the idea of socially engaged, political art (see Adorno's (1973) criticisms of Brecht in this light).

The two key principles of negation are parallel to Ross's hip and camp positions:

- A rejection of popular or mainstream work in favour of the authentic, which may defy popular taste (hip)
- An ironic distancing or removal of the author from the work (camp)

Alternative rock aesthetics (Warhol, art rock, punk) are similarly structured around the concept of negation: we find a similar removal of the author occurring (self-negation); the music is declared autonomous from the mainstream, and negative and critical in character. Ideas of the artist's investment in his work change. Indifference becomes supreme power, and this leads towards a validation of the polysemic, ironic, "open" text. For example, according to David Gilbert, the Velvet Underground "treated the moment of over-amplification as a moment at which the musician's individual control is *problematised* ... by the materiality *and* collectivity of sound" (Gilbert, 1999:42). Sound problematises authorship. It decentres rock's logocentricism through *jouissance*, which breaks down rational binaries. However, Bourdieu states that far from seeing such works as subversive "[t]he production of an 'open work', intrinsically and deliberately polysemic, can ... be understood as the final stage in the conquest of artistic autonomy ... To assert the autonomy of production is to give primacy to that of which the artist is master, i.e. form, manner, style rather than 'subject' ... which involves subordination to functions ... of representing, signifying, saying something" (Bourdieu, 1984: 3).

Art Rock

Indie is a development of a tradition of “art rock”. Historically the term has described at least two related, but distinct types of rock music, arising in the late 60s. The first, progressive rock, emulates European classical tradition: extended pieces, orchestration, complex harmonies and meters, and “grand concepts” – Yes, Genesis, later Pink Floyd (Moore, 2001:65). This was the “boring hippy music” that punk rockers hated, and was not a great influence on indie.

On the other hand, art rock also described those who rejected psychedelia and the hippy counterculture and followed the more “radical” path blazed by the Velvet Underground, which identified not so much with classical as avant-garde, and used techniques such as collage, *musique concrete*, irony and pastiche. The glam rock of David Bowie, Roxy Music and Lou Reed “offered an aesthetic perspective that was markedly different from that of progressive music. Its ‘artistry’ went beyond traditional European aesthetic canons, and, like ‘Pop Art’, looked to ... modern industrial life and its continual reproducibility” (Chambers, 1985:114). So although art rock is a disputed term, the common point is that it tries to incorporate various kinds of ideas of art, whether imported from classical or modern periods.

Ellen Willis sums up the distinction:

... there was a counter-tradition in rock and roll that had much more in common with high art – in particular avant-garde art – than the ballyhooed art-rock synthesis [progressive rock]; it involved more or less consciously using the basic formal canons of rock and roll as material (much as pop artists used mass art in general) and refining, elaborating, playing off that material to produce ... rock-and-roll-art ... rock-and-roll art came out of an obsessive

commitment to the language of rock and roll and an equally obsessive disdain for those who rejected that language or wanted it watered down, made easier ... the new wave has inherited the counter-tradition (1996:73).

Art rock (which, for Willis, refers basically to the Velvet Underground and a punk tradition of negation) takes the popular as its “material”, apparently collapsing traditional distinctions between high and low culture; and between Romantic, classical or modernist ideologies of art as autonomous and intellectual and the bodily pleasures of mass culture. Again we see Adorno’s negation operating – the combination of difficulty with a removal or distancing of the “artist” from the work. The extract also echoes Adorno’s notion of “formalisation” – the introduction of self-consciously formalist elements, for example the canon in Beethoven, is a way of erasing the author, similar perhaps to the blank parody or pastiche that was also a feature of alternative rock (for example, the Spector girl group and Beach Boys references in the Jesus and Mary Chain).

But although the materials of the artist change, his attitude towards them remains in important ways the same – distanced (Bourdieu, 1984:53–5). Robert Christgau claims that art rock “relates to rock and roll not organically but intellectually” (Christgau, 1973:285; Landau, 1972:129-134). This mind/body dichotomy belongs to high culture. Ellen Willis states of the Velvet Underground:

While the original primal impulse of rock'n'roll was to celebrate the body [. . .] (Lou) Reed's temperament was not only cerebral but ascetic [. . .] the self-conscious formalism of his music [. . .] was an attempt to purify rock'n'roll, to purge it of all association with material goodies

and erotic good times (Willis, 1996:77).

One might wonder which version of the band Willis is discussing (I say “band” to avoid Willis’s implicit auteurism), as the Velvets oeuvre has at least two “periods”, basically with and without John Cale; the latter featuring more generally upbeat, apparently celebratory numbers such as “Rock and Roll” and “Sweet Jane” (1970); the former the painful, plagal grind of “Heroin”, “Venus in Furs” and “Sister Ray” (1967,1968). I think Willis is focusing on the second strand (basically the first two albums), and this seems reasonable enough given the way that Cale, with his European high art credentials, pushed the band towards avant-garde alienation – lyrics that insisted on sex and music as not fun, but pain, humiliation and perversity, through their extreme musical minimalism, being painfully out of tune, unorthodox recording and mixing practices, and finally their very ungroovy, unsyncopated approach to rhythm – all of which were key influences on alternative rock culture.

The second point is that the Velvets were clearly reacting to the utopianism of 60s rock culture; they wanted to “express uptightness and make the audience uptight” hence the hostile reaction they received in California, where they were described as “psychosis” and “the urban evil of New York” (Frith and Horne, 1986:112; *Dancing in the Street* “Hang onto Yourself”). So however it much be possible to reclaim retrospectively a love and celebration of rock and roll from some of their work (most obviously their last album *Loaded*), they were neither primarily perceived as, nor even viewed by themselves as a “good time”. Again, the idea of formalism is present as a means of increasing emotional distance between performer and music. Finally, and not surprisingly considering the battery of modernist alienation techniques they used,

they were hugely unpopular, which of course, gave them impeccable credentials for membership of the avant-garde.

Similarly Adorno championed difficult, challenging music. For example, he hears Stravinsky (Schoenberg's modernist contemporary and Adorno's *bête noir*) as "arousing only bodily animation instead of offering meaning. He is attracted to that sphere in which meaning has become so ritualized that it cannot be experienced as the specific meaning of the musical act. The aesthetic ideal is that of unquestioned fulfilment ... 'bodily art' becomes the watchword ... a competence defined in artisan terms" (1973:140-1). Adorno regards Stravinsky as failed negation. In contrast "Schoenberg, through his purification of the expressive language of bourgeois music, and through pursuing the consequences of that language to the extreme, had raised expression to a new level ... into which no social function falls ... which even severs the last communication with the listener ... through his extreme clarification and rationalisation of the material of bourgeois art music" (Paddison, 1993: 105). Indie commentators similarly wrote about the aesthetic "purity" of white noise in terms of Barthes' *jouissance*. Abstract, impersonal "pure noise" replaces 'fixation with meaning' (Barthes, 1990; Reynolds, 1990: 12).

For Adorno, "modern music" began with Schoenberg: for Lester Bangs and so many punk/indie, it's the Velvets (Heylin, 1993: 3; Gilbert, 1999: 36). Such innovative work alienates and defamiliarises hegemonic assumptions about art. Andy Warhol and the Velvet Underground are an example of the combination of the disembodiment, "distance" and refinement of high culture with the "immediacy" of mass cultural forms like rock and roll. Warhol's aestheticisation of life was withdrawal from direct emotional contact with others, and the removal of emotional affect from his work - the attitude of Baudelaire's *flâneur* (Smith, 1988: 88, 291-2).

Similarly “the symbolic identification of both the Velvets and their fans is not with the junkie, the paranoiac, the hustler or the freak, but with an idealised image of the detached observer who can walk through this urban twilight” (Gilbert, 1999: 39).

Clearly this idea of the artist as “absent” represents Warhol’s response to Adorno’s problem of how the artist could continue to create in an inhuman, mechanised world. Adorno argued that the artist (subject) had to disappear from his work (object). Warhol accomplished this by removing his intention from the artistic process, creating the work through his perception, his “vision”. Warhol ironised and problematises the relationship of performer to author – but as Ross states, this ambiguity “was neither exactly complicit or dissenting, since it was based on an outright refusal of the act of judgment ... an attitude of pure *indifference*” (Ross, 1989:150).

This apparent suspension of judgment is double-edged – its noncommittal passivity is also its claim to superiority – it is “above these things”, as in Bourdieu’s “distance from necessity” (1984:5). It is also a commentary on bourgeois art, as in Bourdieu’s “pure taste”: “a systematic refusal of all that is “human” ... the passions, emotions and feelings which *ordinary* people put into their *ordinary* existence” (1984:31– 2). It does not necessarily imply a free-for-all polysemy; rather categories of camp and bad taste became institutionalised in a burgeoning alternative rock discourse, as its “pseudo-aristocratic patrilineage” (Ross, 1989:145). Warhol’s camp irony becomes a form of elitism.

Warhol’s approach reverberates throughout art rock, most obviously in the cool detachment of the Velvet Underground, and thus the characteristic impassivity of the male indie rock star, “cultured and autistic” (Arnold, 1995:163). His famously non-existent sex life became symbolic of a kind of renunciation of the body for the

higher end of worldly fame, and his “naive” celebration of mass culture was taken up by artists such as Jonathan Richman. Profoundly negational ideas of the death of authorial intention, and autonomy through renunciation of emotional involvement and the body are all themes that can be related back to Adorno and indeed more generally western intellectual culture’s division between self/other, mind/body etc. One might object that this is to deny any kind of social function or critique to such work. But it is precisely this style of apolitical blankness that characterises indie cultural production, from the indifference of Linklater’s *Slacker* through to the radical ambivalence of bands like Steve Albini’s Big Black, in which taboo subjects like rape, ultra-violence etc are all subjected to the same indifferent gaze (Azerrad, 2001: 324–6, 331). The implication is that in a world saturated with media, all one can do is *watch*. And this in turn is an attitude comparable to Adorno’s high art, which is defined by its indifference to and autonomy from social and historical conditions (Green, 1988: 111, 115). Analogously:

Independent rock and roll does not present itself as a challenge [. . .] to the dominant culture although it may function as such. It apparently exists outside of its relation to the dominant culture; it does not want the world. It seeks to escape, to define a space which neither impinges upon nor is impinged upon by the hegemony: "we want our world" (Grossberg, 1997: 241).

This is a utopianism that Adorno would recognise: art acts “as the last preserve of human yearning for that ‘other’ society beyond the present one” (Jay, 1973: 179). The implication is that alternative rock participates in a tradition of thinking about avant-garde art that ultimately derives from high culture. In this sense, perhaps we could say

that 80s alternative rock culture was a new “classicism”, enforcing a set of hierarchical distinctions which legitimated it as the new elite (Straw, 1997, 501). Perhaps this explains my opening query – the reason pop music scholars still need to refute Adorno is because he is always there.

Bibliography

- Adorno, T (1990) "On Popular Music", in Frith, S and A Goodwin (eds) *On Record: Rock, Pop and the Written Word*, New York: Pantheon, 300–314
- — — (1973) *Philosophy of Modern Music*, trans. A G Mitchell and W V Bloomster, London: Sheed & Ward
- Arnold, G (1995) *On the Road to Nirvana*, London: Pan
- Azerrad, M (2001) *Our Band Could Be Your Life: Scenes from the American Indie Underground 1981-1991*, Boston: Back Bay
- Bangs, L (1987) *Psychotic Reactions and Carburetor Dung*, New York: Vintage
- Bannister, M (2006a) "Loaded: indie guitar rock, canonism, white masculinities", *Popular Music* v25n1: 77-95
- — — (2006b) *White Boys, White Noise Masculinities and 1980s Indie Guitar Rock*, Aldershot: Ashgate
- Barthes, R (1990) "The Grain of the Voice", in Frith, S and A Goodwin (eds), *On Record: Rock, Pop and the Written Word*, New York: Pantheon, 293–300
- Bourdieu, P (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Cavanagh, D (2000) *The Creation Records Story: My Magpie Eyes Are Hungry for the Prize*, London: Virgin
- Chambers, I (1985) *Urban Rhythms: Pop Music and Popular Culture*, London: Macmillan
- Christgau, R (1973) *Any Old Way You Choose It: Rock and Other Pop Writing, 1969–73*, Baltimore: Penguin
- Dancing in the Street* (1996), UK: BBC.
- Felder, R (1993) *Manic Pop Thrill*, New York: Echo

- Frith, S (1996) *Performing Rites: On the Value of Popular Music*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University
- Frith, S and H Horne (1987), *Art into Pop*, London, New York: Methuen
- Gendron, B (1986) "Theodor Adorno Meets the Cadillacs", in T Modleski (ed) *Studies in Entertainment: Critical Approaches to Mass Culture*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 18-38
- Gilbert, J (1999) "White Light/White Heat: Jouissance Beyond Gender in the Velvet Underground", in A Blake (ed) *Living through Pop*, London: Routledge, 31–48
- Green, L (1988) *Music on Deaf Ears: Musical Meaning, Ideology and Education*, Manchester: Manchester University
- Grossberg, L (1997) "Another Boring Day in Paradise: Rock & Roll and the Empowerment of Everyday Life", in Gelder, K and S Thornton (eds), *The Subcultures Reader*, London, New York: Routledge, 477–93
- Harrington, J. 2002. *Sonic Cool: The Life and Death of Rock'n'roll*, Milwaukee: Hal Leonard.
- Heavenly Pop Hits: The Flying Nun Story* (2002) dir. M Hawkes, NZ: Satellite Media.
- Hesmondhalgh, D (1999) "Indie: The Institutional Politics and Aesthetics of a Popular Music Genre", *Cultural Studies* 13: 34–61
- Heylin, C (1993) *From the Velvets to the Voidoids: A Pre-punk History for a Post-Punk World*, London, New York: Penguin
- Jay, M (1973) *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*. Berkeley: U of California.
- Keightley, K (2001) "Reconsidering Rock", in Frith, S, W Straw, J Street (eds), *Cambridge Companion to Pop and Rock*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 109–142
- Koch, S (1974) *Stargazer: Andy Warhol's World and His Films*, London: Calder and Boyars

- Knox, C (1986) "Top Tetanus", *New Zealand Listener*, 1 Jun., 53–54
- Kruse, H (2003) *Site and Sound: Understanding Independent Music Scenes*, New York: Peter Lang
- Landau, J (1972) *It's Too Late to Stop Now*, San Francisco: Straight Arrow
- McLeay, C (1994) "The 'Dunedin Sound': New Zealand Rock and Cultural Geography", *Perfect Beat*, v2n1, 38–50
- Middleton, R (1990) *Studying Popular Music*, Buckingham: Open University.
- Moore, A (2001) *Rock: The Primary Text*, 2nd ed. Aldershot: Ashgate
- Nehring, N (1993) *Flowers in the Dustbin: Culture, Anarchy and Postwar England*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan
- Paddison, M (1993) *Adorno's aesthetics of music*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Reynolds, S (1990) *Blissed Out: The Raptures of Rock*, London: Serpent's Tail
- — — (1989), "Against Health and Efficiency", in McRobbie, A (ed.), *Zoot Suits and Second Hand Dresses*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 244–55
- Robertson, C (1991) "It's OK, It's All Right, Oh Yeah: The 'Dunedin Sound'? An Aspect of Alternative Music in New Zealand 1979–85", Honours diss. University of Otago
- Ross, A (1989) *No Respect: Intellectuals & Popular Culture*, New York: Routledge
- Shuker, R (1998) *Key Concepts in Popular Music*, London, Routledge
- Smith, P (1988) *Warhol: Conversations about the Artist*, Ann Arbor: UMI Research
- Straw, W (1997) "Communities and Scenes in Popular Music", in Gelder, K and S Thornton (eds), *The Subcultures Reader*, London, NY: Routledge, 494–505
- Subotnik, R (1976) "Adorno's Diagnosis of Beethoven's Late Style: Early Symptom of a Fatal Condition", *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, v29n2, 242–75
- Tamm, E (1995) *Brian Eno: His Music and the Vertical Colour of Sound*, New York: Da Capo

- Thornton, S (1995) *Clubcultures: Music, Media and Subcultural Capital*, Hanover and London: Wesleyan.
- Toynbee, Jason (2000), *Making Popular Music: Musicians, Creativity and Institutions*, Arnold: UK.
- Velvet Underground (1970), *Loaded*, Cotillion.
- — — (1969), *The Velvet Underground*, Verve/Polygram.
- — — (1968), *White Light/White Heat*, Verve/Polygram.
- — — (1967), *The Velvet Underground and Nico*, Verve/Polygram.
- Willis, E (1996) “Velvet Underground”, in Marcus, G (ed.), *Stranded: Rock And Roll for a Desert Island*, New York: Da Capo, 71–83