

violence in such media does not necessarily seem to give the United States a negative and unattractive image?

2. How might television help to preserve and reenergize cultural traditions? Are cultural traditions always worth preserving? How would you judge?

3. How do you evaluate the rapid growth in television exports from some Third World nations, especially Mexican and Brazilian *telenovelas* (soap operas), or the longer-established export of Indian films? How would you compare their impacts on cultural identity with the impact of U.S. media exports?

22 Popular Music

Between Celebration and Despair

KEITH NEGUS

Popular music is one of the most important components of mass communications. But is "popular" music really popular—does it really represent the people—or is it merely a commercial emanation of big business concerns that produce and disseminate it?

In this chapter, Negus reviews the ways media analysts have considered this problem and offers a new perspective of his own. What he has to say relates strongly to the audience analyses presented by Ang (Chapter 12) and Gandy (Chapter 13) as well as the discussion of culture presented by O'Connor and Downing (Chapter 1).

Questions about popular music take us to the front lines of media analysis. Beginning at the "despair" end of the scale, adherents of the influential Frankfurt school pessimistically view popular music as the product of a "culture industry" designed to numb the minds and facilitate the domination and manipulation of the "masses." A similar view is held by others who harbor a more populist belief in the potential of popular music, but who despair that this creative and cultural potential is inevitably corrupted by the entertainment industry.

At the other end of the spectrum, those who "celebrate" popular music argue that audiences are not passive "masses," but active entities able to transform and reclaim commercially produced music for their own use.

These polar views of despair and celebration give all the power in popular music either to commercial interests or to audiences, respectively.

One way out of lending extreme emphasis to either music listeners or the music business is to see how the various elements of popular music—performers, texts, audiences, industry, and their symbols—"articulate" with one another. For Négus, articulation means the way that the many aspects of producing and listening to music link up with the background culture. Articulation joins together elements that are not necessarily related, but that can and do affect each other profoundly. During the 1960s, for instance, popular music was used at festivals, demonstrations, "be-ins," and "happenings" for antiauthoritarian, political, and blissful purposes that were radically at odds with the ideology and motivations of the commercial sources that produced the music. Similarly, in the 1980s and 1990s, hip-hop and rap styles have deconstructed musical forms, intents, and artifacts to create a vital new synthesis characterized both by high artistry and unusually incisive social commentary. In both cases, radical, subversive, and antestablishment forms have been extruded out of the commercial establishment's own product.

Négus refers to the career of popular singer/songwriter Sinéad O'Connor as an instance of how images and intent can articulate with both industry and audiences to create new meanings. Is O'Connor's bald head a protest against sexism, a gesture of solidarity with Fascist skinheads, an expression of outrage at the world's injustice, or a valuable logo co-opted by the entertainment media? Négus concludes that O'Connor's identity—and, popular music—cannot be comprehended by reference to the recording industry, the audience, or the artist alone. Neither despair nor celebration is conceptually comprehensive enough to avoid pitfalls in cultural analysis. The concept of articulation, linking artist, industry, texts, and audience, promises fruitful routes for meaningful research and analysis.

When we study popular music, it is often hard to separate our own musical tastes, aesthetic judgments, and political commitments from our arguments. Rhythms, lyrics, and melodies not only move us physically and emotionally, but may evoke a sense of belonging to or solidarity with particular communities. We may identify strongly with

certain performers and musical sounds, and may make "academic" arguments that directly connect with our own and many other people's experiences as fans. We may listen to some music and despair at the repetition and banality of a standardized formula and declare that the audiences for such music are merely being manipulated by advertising and marketing. In contrast, we may engage with the activities of musicians on the street or participate in an event in a concealed basement club and delight in the spontaneous and imaginative creation of an alternative to Top 40 pop. Such everyday musical experiences and judgments connect directly to enduring intellectual questions about popular music as a form of culture and as a medium of communication.

I take as my theme for this chapter the idea of celebration and despair that I have just evoked, as arguments about popular music often lead to such conclusions. There are two basic variations on the theme of despair. One is derived from the "mass culture" critique that emerged in the 1930s and 1940s and, as applied to popular music, is strongly associated with the writings of Theodor Adorno. This is, in many ways, the pessimistic lament of the cultural elitist, dismayed at the homogeneity and vulgarity of mass taste, concerned that production has become standardized and consumption passive. The other version, which shares a number of assumptions with this position, comes from writers who have more populist beliefs in the potential of popular music. However, such writers, employing arguments from the theoretical tradition of political economy, often end up despairing that any creative or cultural possibilities have been corrupted by the corporate entertainment industry.

There are many versions of celebration (one only has to look at the numerous biographies of musicians that fill the shelves of bookstores, for example), but the theory that has become most prominent in media and cultural studies concerns the audience. It is an argument about how consumers are able to reclaim and transform the products that have been produced by a commercial industry. Audiences are not passive; rather, they engage in vibrant, creative, and diverse forms of cultural activity.

In this chapter I shall briefly set out these positions and argue that they tend to privilege either production or consumption. I will then introduce the concept of *articulation* and argue for an approach that attempts to overcome this division by studying the connections between production and consumption. I will illustrate this with reference

to the performer Sínead O'Connor, and in doing so raise some questions about the "mediations" that connect the industry, artists, audiences, and texts of popular music.

The Route to Despair: The Mass Culture Argument

One of the most significant and influential accounts of how culture, and particularly popular music, is produced and consumed was developed by Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer. These two theorists were members of a group of predominantly German-Jewish intellectuals who have become widely known as the Frankfurt school and who produced a substantial body of analysis between the 1930s and the 1960s. To understand why Adorno and Horkheimer reached such pessimistic conclusions about culture, and to appreciate the context in which they were writing, a bit of background detail is necessary. Both writers had lived through the futile bloodshed of World War I in Europe. Both had also observed the failure of the working-class revolutions that had spread across Europe after the Russian Revolution of 1917 and were questioning the potential of working-class movements to bring about progressive social change (as anticipated by Marx). While Stalin was starting to twist Marx's utopian ideas into a dogmatic orthodoxy that supported an authoritarian dictatorship, Adorno and Horkheimer were also acutely aware that Fascism was spreading throughout Europe. In 1933 Hitler and the Nazis seized power in Germany. Being both Jewish and Marxist, Adorno and Horkheimer had to flee from Germany and eventually relocated in the United States.

This historical context is very important for how Adorno and Horkheimer's cultural theory developed. As they observed what was occurring across Europe, Adorno and Horkheimer asked how the development of modern European thought, instead of progressing toward a more human and liberated society, was leading to "a new kind of barbarism", the cold rational logic of totalitarianism and Fascism.

Adorno and Horkheimer were not only attempting to understand how this was occurring in Europe. When forced into exile, they were dismayed by the "vulgarity" of the commercial culture they found in the United States: Movies, jazz music, inexpensive high-circulation

magazines, dance crazes, and radio were far more widespread in their new home than they had been in Europe. This seemed a stark contrast with the high cultural tradition that they had left behind. Adorno and Horkheimer considered that this "mass culture" had emerged as a result of processes similar to those that had given rise to Fascist totalitarianism in Europe. Hence they were explicitly concerned with how forms of culture could contribute to authoritarian forms of domination. So, in their argument, the domination and manipulation of the "masses" becomes explicitly connected to the production and dissemination of a particular form of "mass culture."

It is in this context that Adorno and Horkheimer, in collaboration, and Adorno individually, developed an argument about popular music. Writing against those who believed that the arts were somehow independent of industry and commerce, Adorno and Horkheimer (1947/1979) asserted that popular music was produced by a "culture industry" that was no different from the industries that manufactured vast quantities of consumer goods. All products were made and distributed according to rationalized organizational procedures and for the purpose of profit maximization. The culture industry was nothing more than an "assembly line" producing standardized products (as also discussed by Kellner in Chapter 19). Key terms that recur continuously throughout their work are *standardization*, *repetition*, and *pseudo-individuality*. For Adorno and Horkheimer (1947/1979), the concept of pseudo-individuality means that everything produced by the culture industry is the same; it only *appears* to be different. They argue, "Pseudo individuality is life: from the standardised jazz improvisation to the exceptional film star whose hair curls over her eye to demonstrate her originality" (p. 154).

All individuality is an illusion that is actively fostered by the culture industry to provide diversion from the drudgery of working life and the exploitative conditions created by the capitalist system. By making this argument, Adorno and Horkheimer explicitly link a political and economical analysis of standardized production to a social psychological theory of the experience of consumption. As mass culture, popular music requires the listener to make very little effort. Indeed, popular music actually causes the "regression of listening." In one of his characteristically despairing condemnations of popular music, Adorno (1991) asserts that "there is a neurotic mechanism of stupidity in listening; the arrogantly ignorant rejection of everything unfamiliar is its sure sign. Regressive listeners behave like children" (pp. 44-45).

Adorno castigates those who like to hear familiar harmonies, rhythms, and melodies. Good music must be difficult and demanding. It must challenge us and demand complete attention. There is no place in Adorno's scheme for entertainment, popular music merely provides a form of diversion and prepares workers for the next working day of drudgery. (In some of his writings Adorno attempts to make a direct connection between the rhythms of jazz and the operations of machinery in factories.) Popular music as "mass culture" and entertainment leads to passivity; it makes people accept the status quo and engenders obedience toward authoritarianism. Adorno (1976) seems quite certain of this when he asserts that "popular music constitutes the drege of musical history. . . . it sets up a system of conditioned reflexes in its victim" (p. 29).

Adorno and Horkheimer present a powerful argument about what happens to music when it is subject to industrial capitalist production. Music becomes merely a standardized and repetitive element of "mass culture." It has no aesthetic value whatsoever and leads to a very specific type of consumption that is passive, obedient, and easily manipulated. Does this type of argument sound familiar? Have you ever defended your own music as complex and demanding? Have you sized other forms of music as standardized and repetitive? Have you heard people explain the worldwide popularity of performers such as Michael Jackson or Madonna by arguing that the audiences are being manipulated by the record industry? Such everyday arguments are common and indicate how residues of the "mass culture" argument still permeate discussions of popular music, both inside and outside the academy.

Partial Despair: Co-Optation by the Corporations

Steve Chapple and Reebee Garofalo (1977) have similar things to say about how capitalist corporations turn popular music into a commodity. However, unlike Adorno, who can see no value in popular music as a cultural form, these writers do wish to claim some value for it. Like many intellectuals who have written about popular music since the late 1960s, Chapple and Garofalo are members of a generation that grew up with rock and roll and developed a belief in the radical social potential of rock music when connected to youthful rebellion

Popular Music

385

against authoritarianism or when harnessed to political campaigns (such as the civil rights movement and the protest movement against U.S. involvement in Vietnam). Popular music thus does provide numerous possibilities for individual or collective expression and for communicating and engendering political solidarity. However, such possibilities are either not realized or severely restricted because of the impact of the music industry.

In an extensive historical account of the record industry in the United States, Chapple and Garofalo (1977) argue that the concentration of ownership among a few major companies that control access to the means of recording and reproducing pop music has enabled capitalist corporations to "colonize leisure." Performers and recording industry personnel have become absorbed into an entertainment business that is an integral component of the corporate structure. The prospects for creative artists or politically radical performers are bleak. Any possibilities that might arise in the production of popular music are absorbed and "co-opted" by a ruthless and exploitative commercial system.

A similar argument has been made by Nelson George (1988) concerning the impact of the record industry on the music and cultural identities of Black performers. For George, the white-dominated industry has been directly responsible for transforming Black forms of expression into a commodity and for contributing to "the death of rhythm and blues." Tracing the appropriation of rhythm and blues styles by white performers and the commercial packaging and promotion of Black artists throughout the twentieth century, George reaches similar conclusions about the ways in which cultural and political possibilities are destroyed when subject to the corporate system. Like Chapple and Garofalo, he is particularly concerned about the racialization and restructuring of the record industry that gained momentum during the late 1960s. This has been decisive. It has ripped apart the connections established among Black musicians, independent Black and white businesses, and the Black community. In their place it has instituted the "conglomerate control of black music." According to George, commercial imperatives and corporate domination have forced Black artists to adopt a "crossover mentality" if they are to reach a mass white audience. In doing so, Black musicians have often reneged on their previous political commitments and altered both their music and their appearance. In the process, they have compromised their cultural identity.

George's argument raises important questions about the connections between popular music and issues of race and racism. Just what does it mean if Black performers appear, over time, with lighter skin tones? (George gives the examples of Michael Jackson and George Benson.) Is "crossover" [music that moves across different categories, but specifically in this case from the rhythm and blues/urban charts into the Top 40] simply about trying to appear more acceptable to white audiences? Are performers diluting or denying their racial identities? Are Michael Jackson and Prince, with their "disquieting androgyny," presenting "alarmingly un-black and unmasculine figure[s]," as George suggests (p. 174)? Or are these artists, in their songs and images, challenging the racial, sexual, and ethnic categories that have become associated with musical expression? Such questions are by no means straightforward, and they connect directly with issues of race and gender discussed elsewhere in this book.

Apart from these specific questions that arise from George's argument, do you find the general perspective presented here a useful explanation of the impact of the music industry on popular music? Does corporate ownership directly determine the way in which popular music is produced? Is it simply a tale of compromise and co-optation—the "sellout" to the system? This type of argument seems to suggest that the working practices of thousands of people employed in the record industry, the sounds of musicians, and ultimately the activities of audiences become little more than responses to the commercial power of corporations.

Celebrations of Consumption: Fans and Active Audiences

Rejecting the despair of such conclusions, writers such as Iain Chambers and Lisa Lewis have attempted to shift the focus away from the corporations and onto the audiences, emphasizing how popular music is actively used. From this alternative perspective, audiences are not the passive victims suggested by previous theorists.

Chambers (1985) proposes that although record companies might control how music is produced, they are unable to control the way it is used or the meanings invested in its texts and technologies by audiences. He asserts that the commodities of the music industry are transformed as they are "appropriated" by various groups and indi-

viduals and used for the expression of individual identities, symbolic resistance, leisure pursuits, and forms of collective and democratic musical creativity in everyday life. Drawing examples from the 1960s, when hippies used music at festivals, demonstrations, and various "happenings," to the reuse of vinyl records, turntables, tape machines, and mixers in rap and hip-hop in the 1980s, Chambers emphasizes the diversity of pop music styles. Throughout these changes, popular music has been central to audiences' and listeners' lives, and often has had direct impacts on the surrounding society and culture (the Woodstock festival of 1969, the punk period of 1976-1979, and the activity that became focused on the Nelson Mandela Concert in 1988 are just a few examples). This is the complete opposite of Adorno's model of standardization, repetition, and passivity. It is an account in which the texts and technologies of popular music continually provide opportunities for a wider range of people to participate in aesthetic, political, and cultural activity.

Like Chambers, Lewis (1990, 1992) emphasizes the activity of audiences by focusing on the viewers of MTV and the activities of fans at concerts and various other public events. Against writers such as Adorno, she argues that fans are not regressive obsessed individuals, nor are they a manipulated "mass." Instead, fans are imaginative, discriminating people who are capable of making a number of fine distinctions and who actively participate in creating the meanings that become associated with popular music. Fans contribute an integral element to our understanding of popular music and particular artists. Lewis suggests that fans create communities with collective, shared senses of identity built around their appreciation of particular performers. Such groups produce important "reservoirs of knowledge" that directly contribute to the meanings attributed to performers. [How could we understand the enduring popularity of Bob Dylan, for example, without reference to the legions of highly intelligent people who have followed him around for years and who have continued to find profound meanings in even his most banal utterances?]

Lewis shares Chambers's emphasis on the way popular music is "polysemic"; despite the corporations' best efforts, it cannot simply have one meaning. Many possible audience members who are able to use it at the same time, and it is ultimately audience members who predominate. "Appropriate" these and determine which meanings will predominate. Not only is this a more optimistic theory, it provides important insights into how people receive music in different ways. In doing so,

it challenges the idea that audiences are passive. From this perspective audiences are very active. But where does such a theory lead us? Is the music industry producing so much choice? Are we all sovereign consumers, free and spontaneously creative? The problem here is that the impact of the corporations and the production and marketing methods of the music industry seems to disappear from view. Such a perspective completely avoids the issue of how the activities of consumption might be shaped by the recording industry. It ignores how musical products are made available for "appropriation" in the first place, and the connections that are established with specific audiences.

Between Production and Consumption: Mediations and Articulations

A number of writers have attempted to steer a course between these positions, most notably Simon Frith in Britain and Larry Grossberg in the United States. In a prolific body of work that is difficult to summarize or condense into a single argument, Frith has emphasized how production tends to predominate and has argued that it is the products we consume (see, e.g., Frith, 1988b). However, the corporations cannot "control" popular music in any simple way; artists and audiences frequently play important roles in shaping how music is both produced and consumed (see Frith, 1986). Frith has written extensively about performers, industries, and audiences (see Frith, 1983, 1988a), and has highlighted the different values, beliefs, terminology, and judgments that are made by performers, by those within the corporations, and by audiences (and, incidentally, by academics). Much of his work points to the distinctive breaks that seem to appear in the experience of music among the fan, the performer, and the record industry worker. Frith contends that we cannot simply read off, deduce, or understand one from another.

The implication of Frith's work is that there is no *necessary* connection between a form of production and a way of consuming music. A connection has to be created; production is not simply standardized and dominating, but neither are audiences passive or always spontaneously creative. This is a theme that has been pursued, albeit in a different way, by Grossberg (1992), who has also produced a sophisticated theory about the position of music within North

Popular Music

American culture. Grossberg argues that studying popular music does not simply involve following the linear communication of musical messages from producers to consumers. Instead, it requires the examination of processes of "articulation" in which particular sounds have to seek out, be sought by, and connect with particular audiences. During such a complex social process, the meaning of music and any social effects it may generate arise out of a process in which performer, industry, text, and audience "articulate" with each other and with the surrounding culture and social-political system.

The concept of *articulation*, which is useful for raising questions about the relationship between production and consumption, has two senses. First, we articulate to communicate. We always express ourselves by articulating to some person or group (using language, but also employing other cultural codes—nonlinguistic expressions, bodily gestures, and so on). Our articulations are directed toward others; we do not articulate in a vacuum. When applying this concept to popular music, we can argue that an artist is always articulating, through various intermediaries, to audiences who are always part of the process of articulating cultural meaning.

The second aspect of articulation derives from the general definition of the term as involving the linking together of two elements. For example, an articulated truck is made of two separate sections: a tractor and a trailer connected by a pivot bar. The act of articulation involves a process of bringing together. As Grossberg (1992) points out, articulation involves "the practice of linking together elements which have no necessary relation to each other" (p. 397).

By adopting the concept of articulation, we can start to examine how the meanings of popular music arise not only out of how artists and audiences articulate, but out of the various audio, visual, and verbal elements that are combined and connected at the same time. Think of rap and hip-hop, for example. These styles of music involve the combining and connecting of a number of elements that do not have any necessary connection with each other until they are combined into these forms of music. These styles involve particular ways of using technology: scratching and mixing, using turntables to create new sounds from elements taken from existing recordings. This is combined with a particular way of using language that draws on the traditions of "toasting" in African American and Caribbean culture and fuses this with contemporary street slang and the rejuvenated clichés of pop. This is combined further with specific ways of transforming

sports clothing [reversed baseball caps, oversized pants and sweat-shirts, and so on] and very specific ways of using the body. Performances by both producers and their audiences bring together elements from dancing to soul music with traces of robotic mime and ironic (and not so ironic) gestures of macho male prowess. Further elements include the specific subjects of songs, which often have social messages, and the ways in which particular samples are used (James Brown, for example) to articulate particular senses of history.

I want to conclude by illustrating the process of articulation in slightly more detail by reference to the performer Sinéad O'Connor. My argument is that focusing on processes of articulation and the mediations that link production and consumption can help us to raise critical questions about popular music. Meanings are not simply imposed by production or appropriated in the act of consumption. Meanings are created, constraints are imposed, and possibilities are continually opened up through the processes that connect artists, industry, audiences, and texts.

Sinéad O'Connor: The Articulation, Mediation, and Interpretation of Musical Meaning

Sinéad O'Connor enjoyed considerable celebrity toward the end of the 1980s and beginning of the 1990s. Through three intense, emotional albums, a series of equally passionate stage performances, and some controversial media appearances, she provoked strong reactions of both support and condemnation. In her sounds, words, and images she continually drew attention to instances of social injustice and raised questions about Irishness, sexuality, childhood and motherhood, religion, and racism.

Our understanding of Sinéad O'Connor and her music and the ways these themes are communicated is derived from our engagement with how she "performs" (and is reported to perform) across the range of media texts that contribute to our knowledge of her identity. Such performative texts include interviews, personal appearances, public activities, music videos, and all the public communicative actions that contribute to how we understand and interpret her music. We can rarely know any artist directly. The relationship between artist and audience is always mediated by the gatekeepers and intermediaries of the music and entertainment industries, and I want to give just a brief indication of this process here.

As fans, our first contact with a new singer or band may be with the music alone, or perhaps with the music as it accompanies the iconography of a video. Frequently, however, our first contact is with an image: on a poster, album cover, or magazine cover, or in a photo within the print media. We often see the face and body before we listen to the sounds and read the words. These images are carefully put together. Their construction involves the artist's collaboration with a range of personnel, such as publicists, marketing staff, photographers, stylists, and video directors (Negus, 1992). The image defines an artist in a specific way, as a particular type of human being and as a product placed within the genre categories of the music industry. The image also helps to explain how an artist's music should be understood.

The initial visual image of any recording artist is therefore crucial to the production and consumption of popular music. The visual image connotes a type of music, an attitude toward life, and a lifestyle; it denotes the artist as a particular type. One of the reasons Sinéad O'Connor was so immediately recognizable and a focus of attention was that she had shaved her head. She was a bald woman. This was immediately visible as an act of choice. Women do not usually go bald; O'Connor had chosen to make herself bald. Whether or not she realized the effect that this would have is hard to tell, but she was certainly called upon continually to explain it. In 1991 she told a rock newspaper that she had adopted the hairstyle in a fit of temper because the directors of her record company had asked her to wear high-heel boots and tight jeans, and to grow her hair. Two years later, while commenting on the abuse of children, she told a journalist that she had shaved her head as an expression of her anger and outrage at injustice in the world.

O'Connor's head became a focus of attention and was subject to various interpretations (see Hayes, 1991). Its associations with Fascism and the British youth cult of the skinhead was noted, as was its connection with the adoption of this style by lesbians as a refusal of male definitions of beauty and femininity. When trying to find meaning in O'Connor's music, some journalists connected the confessional nature of many of her songs to the shaving of the head by religious groups as an act of penance or contrition. Others referred to the shaved heads of asylum inmates and prisoners (society's victims) when describing the anger vented in much of her music. The image was actively used as a guide and articulated with the meanings of the music, particularly on the albums *The Lion and the Cobra* (1988) and *I Do Not Want What I Haven't Got* (1990).

My point in mentioning these connections and attempts at interpretation is not to try to identify whether any particular explanation is true or false. It is to highlight how the reason for the shaved head became an integral part of the articulation of O'Connor's identity. She was continually called upon to explain this act to various journalists, who then interpreted and mediated the information to audiences, became part of how her music was understood (confessional, angry, narrating the victim, refusal, and so on).

As I have mentioned, O'Connor publicly declared that her hairstyle was partly an oppositional gesture against record company executives who wanted her to adopt a more conventionally feminine image. However, in rejecting this she then frequently had to confront media representatives who made this very act a central issue. In trying to negate a gender stereotype, she emphasized her deviation from the conventional, and this became part of the way in which her gender identity was often reinforced in the mainstream media. There are important questions here about the different ways in which male and female performers are presented and promoted. Female performers tend to be asked far more questions about their appearance than do male artists. As a consequence, this becomes part of the way in which their identity is articulated and their intentions are understood by their audiences.

The bald head became an instantly identifiable sign of Sinéad O'Connor, and was marketed by the recording industry as a "brand image," placed across the music-related entertainment media. However, it did not become just a commodity; O'Connor was not simply co-opted by the corporations. This style was simultaneously adopted and imitated by audiences and used as a sign of identification and expression of solidarity by fans attending concerts. It was used to signify identification with the performer, but also to create and communicate affiliations with other fans sharing in the music and its associated values and beliefs. The meanings adopted by fans did not coincide with those of the industry, but neither were they spontaneously created. A process of articulation occurred that linked together artist, industry, and audience.

I have concentrated on the head in this discussion because it has been the most consistent, conspicuous, and commented upon element of O'Connor's visual image, and it was integral to the way she was marketed and mediated during the promotion of her first two albums. My comments here are intended as a brief and partial illustration of

how a performer's identity cannot be understood simply by reference to the industry, the audience, or the artist alone; rather, it must be understood through a process in which the artist's identity is articulated across a web of mediations that link the conventionally separated spheres of production and consumption. Such an approach, pursuing the connections between the artists and audiences for popular music, may provide routes for further research and analysis that can weave between the twin pitfalls of despairing at the power of corporations and celebrating the joy of consumers.

Further Questions

1. What are the communication differences between attending a rock concert and listening to the same concert by yourself on headphones?
2. What does it mean for our understanding of music and communication that American popular music, currently very influential in many parts of the world, has very strong African and African American roots and fertilization?
3. Why is it that some of the most vital popular music often has to fight to be aired by mainstream radio and recording companies, and usually begins in small alternative media?