



**GRAAT On-Line issue #13 March 2013**

**British Invasion and the Breaking of America**

Raphael Costambeys-Kempczynski  
Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris 3

*Introduction*

In popular music terms the expression “British Invasion” refers to the period following the Beatles arrival in the United States of America on 7 February 1964. First coined by the *CBS Evening News* journalist Walter Cronkite who stated “The British Invasion this time goes by the code name Beatlemania” (Dougherty 1991), the wave of British acts of the beat boom that went on to know success in America included The Animals, Petula Clark, Freddie and the Dreamers, Herman's Hermits, Manfred Mann, The Rolling Stones, Dusty Springfield, The Troggs, The Who, The Zombies, etc.

Twelve months earlier, on 11 January 1963, the Beatles had released their second UK single, “Please Please Me,” accompanied by Brian Epstein's press release claiming that this was “the record of the year” (Lewisohn 25). This left the *New Musical Express* journalist and future *Ready Steady Go!* presenter Keith Fordyce somewhat sceptical as there were still fifty weeks of the year left. His incredulity at what he called Epstein's “exaggeration” (Fordyce 4) could be excused as the group's previous release in October 1962, “Love Me Do,” had known limited success peaking at number 17 in the UK charts (Roach 48). In his review of “Please Please Me,” however, Fordyce did demonstrate both a critical understanding of the Beatles' originality and significant foresight regarding their impending cultural and

commercial impact:

[T]his vocal and instrumental quartet has turned out a really enjoyable platter, full of beat, vigour and vitality—and what's more, it's different. I can't think of any other group currently recording in this style [...] I shan't be in the least surprised to see the charts *invaded* by the Beatles. (Fordyce 4; my emphasis)

Nevertheless, the initial American release of the single a month later on 25 February 1963 saw the record fail to reach the Billboard Hot 100. It was not till the following year, when the single was re-released on 3 January 1964 with the B-side "From Me to You," that it finally became a hit in the US, reaching number 3. At this point in time, however, the Beatles were already holding the number one position in the charts with the single "I Want to Hold Your Hand."

By 9 February 1964, when the Beatles stepped out in front of the cameras on the *Ed Sullivan Show* for the first of three appearances, the four young men from Liverpool had staked their claim on American soil and opened the door to the first British Invasion. Seventy-three million people watched the Beatles on the *Ed Sullivan Show*, an American television record. By 4 April 1964, The Beatles held all five top positions on the Billboard Hot 100 with "Can't Buy Me Love," "Twist and Shout," "She Loves You," "I Want to Hold Your Hand," and "Please Please Me." This feat has never been matched since.

This first British Invasion had been helped by American media markets benefitting from the powerful post-war dollar as well as more and more affordable transatlantic aviation. What proved to be the catalyst for the second British Invasion in the 1980s was the new American media market of the music video. The cable channel MTV was launched at midnight on 1 August 1981 and the first music video it broadcast was "Video Killed the Radio Star" by the English new wave group, The Buggles.

In Britain there was already a growing catalogue of musical short films made to

accompany singles whereas in the United States of America these types of recordings were less frequent and tended to focus on live performances. The MTV schedule therefore comprised a large number of music videos released by British New Wave artists recording at the time. By September 1982 MTV was broadcasting in both New York and Los Angeles and that autumn the Liverpoolian band, A Flock of Seagulls, had a Billboard Hot 100 top ten hit with the song "I Ran (So Far Away)" promoted by an elusive music video where the band are seen performing in a hall of mirrors which is understood to be a reference to the album cover of Brian Eno and Robert Fripp's 1973 *No Pussyfooting*. The song failed to reach the Top 40 in the UK allowing the conclusion to be drawn that MTV's recurrent programming of the video did much for the single's success in America. Bands such as Culture Club, who had inherited their strong visual imagery from the punk era, and Duran Duran, with their story-lined glossy videos filmed on 35mm in exotic locations, became staple acts of MTV's playlist, and where MTV was available demand for music by these British bands increased. On 10 November 1983 *Rolling Stone* published an "England Swings" special issue with Boy George on the cover and the tag line "Great Britain *invades* America's music and style. *Again*" (my emphases). And on 23 January 1984, Annie Lennox and Boy George featured on the cover of *Newsweek* with the by-line "Britain Rocks America – *Again*" (my emphasis).

The mid-1990s were marked by the advent of Britpop, the third British Invasion, which itself could be seen as a reaction to the "American Invasion" of grunge at the beginning of the decade. Though success in America for the bands that made up the Britpop contingent, most notably Blur and Oasis, compares less favourably to the preceding invasions, Courtney Love, Kurt Cobain's widow, was prompted to post on the internet in February 1996 the comment: "Oasis must die. Do not buy Oasis records. They will come to rape and pillage our women and *invade* America" (my emphasis) (quoted in Hoskyns 1996: online).

### ***1.0 The Special Relationship or the Hegelian mortification of the 'thing' through symbolisation***

The term "British Invasion" poses at least two difficulties. Firstly, to what extent

is “invasion,” that is the notion of a hostile incursion or pathogenic spread, an appropriate term? A British popular music act’s global, commercial and, sometimes, artistic success is often judged by whether or not they are able to “break America,” that is move beyond recognition in the Metro cities and penetrate what the US record industry calls America’s secondary market, towns like Bristow, and Virginia. Secondly, though called “British,” the groups identified with these invasions are primarily English. This article contends that contrary perhaps to other place-specific music of the British Isles, it appears that the sense of Englishness in popular music is often constructed *against* a perceived American identity.

The terminology is of particular interest for two countries engaged in what Winston Churchill claimed was a special relationship (Churchill 1946: online). What particular interest do British artists have in *breaking* America and why do the American media periodically return to this notion of a British *invasion*? Why adopt such language as “invasion” and “breaking” (or “cracking”) America which betray a certain violence?

It is widely accepted that one of the great difficulties that British bands encounter when aiming for commercial success in America is the constant touring that it requires. Regardless of developments in modern communication and travel, the sheer scope of the country still remains daunting and the lack of immediate recognition for artists that have already played concerts in sell-out arenas in Britain, Europe and Japan, is often extremely discouraging. Though the American market may still offer the promise of great capital return, the immediate reality of trying to break America is one of unglamorous concerts in small towns of middle America.

The terms “invasion” and “breaking” carry with them connotations of domination and submission and in a British-American context cannot help but refer to imperialism and by extension cultural imperialism. When it comes to popular culture, however, it is largely conceived that America is guilty of cultural imperialism, of mediating its own set of social and political values through a cultural production so massively produced that it has become pervasive. Placing itself at the centre, America has become the dominant global force notably thanks to its economic weight constructed through its transatlantic and transpacific trade routes. In the

1970s Larry Shore already pointed to a “strong indication of a predominantly one-way flow of music from the United States, and to a lesser extent Britain, to other parts of the world” and focusing on the bilateral relationship between America and Britain Shore continues, “[t]here is more of a two-way flow between the US and Britain although the flow is greater from the US side” (Shore 264). In this asymmetrical model then Britain appears as peripheral to America's centrality. Keith Negus however, reminds us that:

[T]he concept of imperialism does not necessarily imply a “centre-periphery” model in the first place. What it suggests is that there is a dynamic of power struggle which does not rule out the possibility of considerable resistance. (Negus 170)

Following on from Negus it is possible to define one aspect of the notion of breaking America as a manifestation of resistance against American cultural imperialism. The type of resistance to which Negus is referring requires some form of definition of one's own cultural identity, in this instance a definition of Britishness or Englishness. Cultural identity is not something simply limited to the construction of place, but is something that gives us a sense of space that equally allows us to understand our relation to the other on a global scale. It is in this context that Negus's notion of “spatial rivalry”<sup>1</sup> can be of use to us, adding a further dimension to the notion of the special relationship between Britain and America. It appears, then, necessary to understand how British or English bands define their cultural identity, their cultural performance, their very quiddity, against America.

In his 1996 article “The Third Invasion: Britpop Strikes!” published in *Musician*, music critic Barney Hoskyns confirms this sense of spatial rivalry:

“Britishness” in pop has always enjoyed a chequered history. Ever since our first national “hit parade” was instigated by the *New Musical Express* in 1952, America has directly and indirectly determined much of the pop music made in

Britain. From the post-Elvis school of pretty-boy rockers in the late '50s to the myriad entities making techno records in South London basements in the '90s, British pop has essentially fashioned music out of its response to America. (Hoskyns 1996: online)

In a 1992 *New Musical Express* feature on the Britpop band Suede, singer Brett Anderson and bassist Mat Osman remarked vehemently on the constant comparison between American and British bands. In line with the Hoskyns notion of “response to America,” Anderson and Osman underline their commitment to resistance:

It pisses me off immensely that America has kidnapped British music, and I find the idea of British bands singing in American accents horrifying. All great British pop artists from The Beatles to The Fall have celebrated Britain in some way. Whereas to me, America is exemplified by some dullard like Bruce Springsteen ... Let's face it, The Beatles were a huge one-nil. (Quoted in Harris 77)

Taking a stance against British groups that try to mimic their American counterparts, Anderson and Osman express here, in such terms as “kidnapped,” their defiance in the face of a perceived American cultural imperialism. In fact, Anderson and Osman go as far as to construct a sense of the special relationship anchored in a rivalry that seemingly opposes the old continent versus the new:

I'm not Anti-American but I've never been impressed by it. I'm not remotely attracted to New York, I mean, all the streets are laid out in a grid. Doesn't that say everything? In Britain, it takes this convoluted, arcane knowledge to get from one bus-stop to the next. That claustrophobic, stifled Englishness is conducive to great art. (Quoted in Harris 77)

There is a sense of unease being expressed here that sees America as the threat, the

potential invader. To counter this threat the English bands must rely on the “arcane knowledge” of their own territory, like resistance fighters investing locations only understood thanks to an inherited local appreciation of the terrain. Within this framework, breaking America appears to respond to the age-old adage that the best form of defence is attack.

1992 was also the year Blur returned from their second American tour. After a combination of continuous touring, numerous radio visits, promotional events in record shops, seeing their creative control placed in the hands of their American record company *SBK*, and excessive alcohol consumption, Damon Albarn was left to conclude:

I just started to miss really simple things [...] I missed people queuing up in shops. I missed people saying “goodnight” on the BBC. I missed having at least fifteen minutes between commercial breaks. And I missed people having respect for my geographical roots, because Americans don’t care if you’re from Inverness or Land’s End. I missed everything about England. (Harris 72).

John Harris, the author of *Britpop: Cool Britannia and the Spectacular Demise of English Rock* (2004), suggests that this may remind us of John Major’s speech where the former Prime Minister defined England as the country of long shadows on cricket grounds, warm beer, invincible green suburbs, dog lovers, etc.<sup>2</sup> It was Blur’s 1992 tour of America that would redefine their musical output and lead them to produce such recognisably English albums as *Modern Life is Rubbish* (1993) and *Parklife* (1994). This leads us to conclude that one primary experience English bands may garner when trying to break America is that of the necessity of trying to define their English identity as a band, of trying to define what feeds their artistic message or, indeed, trying to define *an* artistic message. When defining that artistic message, however, what cultural values are feeding into it? What definition of place and space do these English bands perform in order to export themselves and break America? What sense of Englishness are they taking with them?

## 2.0 *Green and pleasant land or pathological nostalgia as the stabilisation of vagueness*

The construction of the noun “Englishness” suggests a condition of what “English” is, and yet there is a hybrid essence to the notion that on the one hand allows us to frame a *space* that is Englishness, but on the other makes Englishness difficult to locate, difficult to ground, difficult to *place*. In this way any sense of nationhood is an imagined space of extraterritorial fuzziness. Though there is a geopolitical reality of the nation of England, these realities can shift as borders can be redefined and policies are continually in flux. Englishness, and nationhood in general, can only be based on contingency regulated through consensus and mediated through “operational fictions which preclude pure solipsism and stabilize vagueness” (Grant 2001: online).<sup>3</sup>

Social theorists such as Siegfried J. Schmidt have used the concept of operational fictions to identify such shared constructs that reduce social complexities especially in acts of communication (Schmidt 2001). From Sir Hubert Parry’s vision of William Blake’s “Jerusalem” to John Major’s conservative use of the country village as a metonymy for the nation, the construction of an ur-England as a green and pleasant land is one such example of an operational fiction that is consensually and perhaps almost immediately recognisable.

Let us turn our attention back to two groups belonging to the first and third British Invasions. Such songs as “Parklife” (1994b) and “Country House” (1995), firmly place the band Blur in a pop music tradition that stems back to The Kinks and their 1968 album *The Kinks Are the Village Green Preservation Society* which declared in the song “Village Green”: “I miss the village green / The church, the clock, the steeple.” This reminds us of the journalist Jeremy Paxman’s comment in his book *The English* (1998), where he suggests that what is “essentially English” is “the prayer of a people marching backwards into the future, for whom change always meant change for the worse” (Paxman 18).

The somewhat nostalgic predicament of “marching backwards into the future” appears to even apply itself to the manifestations of popular culture of such groups



as The Kinks and Blur, undoubtedly helping to promote them as quintessentially English bands. We may wish to read into these songs a certain sense of irony, but no matter how shrewd and astute these bands and their musical output may desire to appear, Stanley Baldwin's proclamation to the Royal Society of Saint George in 1924 that "England is the country and the country is England" (Baldwin 6) is tangible here.

It would seem possible to conclude that Englishness is constructed on the foundations of a pathological nostalgia, where the present and future states of what it is to be English are built upon a constant gaze back across past glories. With a sense of pastoral mourning we travel back through the World Cup victory of 1966, the Second World War, the Empire, the Industrial Revolution, until we finally reach "the world we have lost" (Laslett 1965) before the long shadows were cast by dark satanic mills. This romantic view of a pre-industrial England remains an operational fiction and therefore a means for popular music artists to identify themselves as English.

It may be difficult to see how such an operational fiction finds itself translated into lyrics such as "Last night I said these words to my girl / I know you never even try girl / C'mon (C'mon) C'mon (C'mon) C'mon (C'mon) C'mon (C'mon) / Please please me, whoa yeah, like I please you" ("Please Please Me") or "I can't get no satisfaction / I can't get no satisfaction / 'Cause I try and I try and I try and I try / I can't get no, I can't get no" (["I Can't Get No"] "Satisfaction"), but as Hoskyns succinctly puts it:

By the time London was officially swinging in 1965, it was no longer compulsory to cover songs by American R&B artists; the Mersey was now as hip as the Mississippi. Hence the Beatles of "Eleanor Rigby" and "Penny Lane"; the Who of "Happy Jack" and "Pictures Of Lily"; the Kinks of "Dead End Street" and *The Village Green Preservation Society* – all records as immutably English as the great Ealing comedies of the '50s. *Sgt. Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band*, universally regarded as the high watermark of '60s pop experimentation, was virtually a

concept album about Englishness, crammed with the influences of music-hall tradition. Even the Stones, by far the most immersed in American influence of all the major English bands, went through the pre-Raphaelite pop phase of “Lady Jane” and “Ruby Tuesday.” In the mid-to-late ‘60s, the Union Jack was everywhere, and pop was Backing Britain. (Hoskyns 1996: online)

The analysis that Hoskyns offers us of the apparent obsession English bands have with breaking America is that the pictures of The Beatles landing in the US in 1964 have left them with “images of mass adulation and tickertape parades, fuelling a thousand fantasies of megastardom” (Hoskyns 1996: online). The problem for English bands wanting to break America is two-fold: firstly, there is the belief that “megastardom” is the due of groups coming from England and already well-accustomed to performing to sold-out concerts in Europe; secondly, the British Invasion groups hold a sense of irony-driven superiority. Discussing the case of Blur and Oasis, a *Melody Maker* cover story published in 1996 concluded that:

[B]oth bands were way too British, way too lippy and mouthy and parochial, way too patronising of American culture, to appeal to your typical US citizen who prefers his stars far more reverent towards the culture they grew up with. Did Virgin America seriously think that Blur’s sarcastic, jaunty take on the whole fame/success thang in “Country House” would be even considered for radio play in a country where to be famous is the be-all and end-all of existence? (True 1996: online)

### ***3.0 “Selling Out” or Transculturation as performance of the inauthentic***

At this juncture it is possible to identify a paradox: breaking America requires conquering the secondary markets which itself requires extensive tours where isolated nostalgic artists come to identify themselves, through spatial rivalry, with the operational fictions of their nationhood which feed into their cultural production and in turn render their music less accessible to an American audience. It is

important, however, not to oversimplify the process of cultural construction in these English groups.

Today, major record labels are largely sub-units of transnational corporations, and independent record labels are often forced to sell out to the “majors” either because they can no longer cope with the demand for a particular artist on their books or because they are perceived as a potential threat. Needless to say, the two are usually linked. How then is it possible to locate expressions of national culture at an age of “polycentric corporations” (Morley & Robins 109)? The record industry has evolved considerably since the folk recordings of pioneering ethnomusicologists John and Alan Lomax. Over the past fifty years, as “independents” have turned into “majors” which have then gone on to become transnational corporations, it can be contended that the music itself has become transnational.

Transnationalism may suggest itself to be a manifestation of globalisation but the notion of circulation is conceived differently in the two concepts. If, as we have seen, the English bands that failed to break America did so through a lack of willingness to put in the necessary touring once in America, Phil Sutcliffe, writing in *The Los Angeles Times*, reminds us that “American arms of multinational majors had little incentive to promote acts signed in other countries because, if they did make a profit, most of it had to be ‘repatriated’ within the corporation—and, naturally, kudos would leak away along with the cash” (Sutcliffe 2002: online). Indeed, if major music corporations adopt transnational practices, that is operate within a paradigm of space, these practices are implemented from localised places, from headquarters with national bases. This is not globalisation as we commonly understand it but, according to Ambalavaner Sivanandan, a change in the “circuits of imperialism” (Sivanandan 169). Rather than trade following the road laid down by the invader, the would-be invader must follow the trail blazed by trade. Therefore, as Negus has suggested, we could follow the analysis of Herbert I. Schiller and approach such “transnational practices” by shifting cultural imperialism away from national characteristics towards “transnational corporate culture domination” (Schiller 297). One could view this, as does Slavoj Žižek, through the lens of global capitalism where commodities (here, record circulation) are more easily able to cross borders

whereas the free movement of people (here, touring bands) poses more of a problem of control.<sup>4</sup>

Defenders of globalisation will see here an escape from notions such as invasion and imposition through continuous interaction between different musical expressions leading to culture breaking free of nationalist manacles; altermondialists will see here the homogenisation of cultures through a “West in the rest” process. Whichever perspective one may wish to choose, the transnational commercial trend does appear to have engendered the musical category known as the “international repertoire” which catalogues Anglo-American artists singing conventional pop-rock songs in English. Record sales statistics demonstrate that this repertoire has dominated worldwide sales for the past four decades. Following on from Stuart Hall’s definition of the global as the “self-presentation of the dominant particular” (Hall 67), Negus understands international repertoire as “a ‘dominant particular’ against which other sounds are assessed and around which the world production and consumption of music became organized in the early 1990s” (Negus, 1993, 1996).

It would be difficult to posit that globalisation has cancelled out cultural imperialism. The term “globalisation” is undoubtedly more of a media-friendly term than, for instance, “homogenisation,” and appears more commercially viable than the expression “transnational corporatism,” but the forces that some may today qualify as globalising may still be perceived by others as repressive and exploitative, indeed, as the very forces of cultural imperialism. In light of this, Jocelyne Guilbault suggests two ways of defining the characteristics of one’s local culture: for “small and industrially developing countries,” when faced with globalisation or cultural imperialism, the tendency is to react through a fear of losing cultural identity; for “traditionally dominant cultures,” however, she posits that the question of local culture is a focus for debate about national distinctiveness and difference (Guilbault, 1993).

Beyond the use of operational fictions, we still need to understand how we define local culture and more particularly here, how we define local music. This study would necessarily involve aspects of geopolitics, cultural intersubjectivity, social theory and a study of the construction of authenticity. The notion of

authenticity in popular music plays an important role—artists identified as local are often perceived as being creatively independent, closer to grass roots and therefore authentic, whereas artists of international repertoire will be considered as having “sold out” and, therefore, of being inauthentic. In *Big Sounds from Small Places* (1984), Roger Wallis and Krister Malm straightforwardly suggest that local music comes from *a place*, whereas the international repertoire comes from nowhere. The question of national distinctiveness as set against other dominants, as suggested by Guilbault, combined with the expression of a sense of place, however that may be conveyed, leads Negus to define his notion of “spatial rivalry” which is an extremely useful tool in understanding the double dialectic in which English bands find themselves when trying to break America.

### ***Conclusion***

Beyond notions of transculturation that may have been occasioned by the development of transnational corporations, if we compare all-time album sales in the United States of America and the United Kingdom we notice that in both top-tens only two bands are neither British nor American. Firstly, AC/DC, who have sold in excess of 22 million album copies in the US, are Australian. Though often perceived as the archetypal hard rock group, it is possible to contend that AC/DC could be classified as international repertoire—they state that they play conventional rock’n’roll<sup>5</sup> and their music conveys topoi inherent to the philosophy of rock’n’roll such as beer-drinking, guitar playing, pacts with dark forces, and women. Secondly, ABBA, who have sold in excess of 4.5 million album copies in the UK, are Swedish. Seen by many as the first to commercialise Euro-disco by focusing on close harmony and symphonic melodies set to danceable beats, ABBA chose to sing in English making them eligible to be qualified as international repertoire.

Of the seven British acts which appear across these two charts all of them are English. In the US top-ten there are four English acts, whereas in the UK top-ten only two acts are American occupying the last three positions in the chart. It would appear then that the British audience is more conservative than the American audience. These consumer trends may reflect an intersubjective inferiority complex.

After all, intersubjectivity is, according to Emmanuel Levinas, asymmetrical in character (Levinas 163). If Ireland, Scotland and Wales have defined themselves by constructing or even reinventing a sense of local national identity against their dominant other that is England, so England has defined itself against its dominant other that is the United States of America.

In his article “The Third Invasion: Britpop Strikes!,” Hoskyns is left asking:

All of which rather begs the question, just why *is* it so important for British acts to make it in America—especially when other international markets have proved to be equally lucrative? Does it stem from the need to prove oneself in the bigger pond, or even from resentment at the ever-increasing Americanization of the globe? Or is it simply the fact that when you make it in America, everybody back home knows about it? (Hoskyns 1996: online)

Perhaps the answer is not that it “stems from a need to prove oneself in the bigger pond” but from a need to define oneself against the *other side* of the Atlantic Ocean. This article is only the beginning of a much wider investigation into the notion of breaking America, therefore it is important not to draw any precipitated conclusions. Though Blur produced recognisably English albums such as *Parklife*, it is their album *Blur* (1997) that has sold the most copies. Released after their more recognisably English albums, *Blur* mixes grunge—the very musical development the group were reacting against a few years earlier—and “tripsy folk.” Inspired by their extensive travels of the United States, this album is very much Blur's interpretation of the great American album. Is this Blur “selling out”? Or had they grown tired of the limitations of Englishness when trying to attain the global market? Perhaps they had simply lost their inferiority complex. Indeed, if Paxman sees marching backwards into the future as typical of Englishness, Phil Sutcliffe offers an ironic angle on this when writing in Mojo he states: “Change of ‘direction’ hears Blur muss up their sound and back-pedal into the future” (Sutcliffe 1997: online).

Writing in *Melody Maker*, Everett True suggests that the relationship between

British groups and the United States of America remains an unexplored territory, one which this article is only beginning to explore:

Why British bands are so infatuated with the idea of “breaking America” is a story which has yet to be written: I’m sure that when it is, Britain’s cultural inferiority complex will come into it. That and our traditional xenophobia. (True 1996: online)

## WORKS CITED

### Bibliography

- Baldwin, Stanley. *On England, and Other Addresses*. London: Philip Allan, 1926.
- Churchill, Winston. “The Sinews of Peace.” Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, 1946. 5<sup>th</sup> March 1946. Online:  
[http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1946/s460305a\\_e.htm](http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1946/s460305a_e.htm)
- Costambeys-Kempczynski, Raphael. “A View of Englishmen from Street Level: Mike Skinner and the Geezer”. In *Englishness Revisited*, ed. Floriane Reviron-Piegay, Newcastle-upon-Tyne: CSP, 2009: 79-96.
- Fordyce, Keith. “Tips All the Hit Singles.” *New Musical Express*. No. 835 (11<sup>th</sup> January 1963): p. 4.
- Grant, Colin. “Language, Vagueness, and Social Communication.” *Comparative Literature and Culture: a WWWeb Journal* 3.4 (December 2001).  
<http://clwebjournal.lib.purdue.edu/clweb01-4/grant01.html>
- Guilbault Jocelyne. *Zouk: World Music in the West Indies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Hall, Stuart. The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity. *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, ed. A. King, 19-40. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.
- Harris, John. *Britpop: Cool Britannia and the Spectacular Demise of English Rock*. Cambridge, MA: DaCapo Press, 2004.
- Hoskyns, Barney. “The Third Invasion: Britpop Strikes!” *Musician*. July 1996. Online:  
<http://www.rocksbackpages.com/article.html?ArticleID=1546>

- Laslett, Peter. *The World We Have Lost*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *De l'existence à l'existant*. Paris: Vrin, 1978.
- Lewisohn, Mark. *The Beatles Recording Sessions*. New York: Harmony, 1988.
- Morley David & Kevin Robins. *Spaces of identity: global media, electronic landscapes and cultural boundaries*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Negus, Keith. *Popular Music in Theory: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity, 1996.
- Paxman, Jeremy. *The English*. London: Penguin, 1998.
- Roach, Martin, ed. *The Virgin Book of British Hit Albums*. London: Virgin Books, 2009.
- Schiller, Herbert I. Not Yet the Post-Imperialist Era. *Media and Cultural Studies KeyWorks*, Revised edition, eds. Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, 295-310. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Schmidt, Siegfried J. Media Societies: Fiction Machines. *Language-Meaning-Social Construction: Interdisciplinary Approaches*, eds. Colin B. Grant and D. McLaughlin, 11-25. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001.
- Shore, Larry. *The crossroads of business and music: a study of the music industry in the United States and internationally*. Palo Alto: Stanford University, 1983.
- Sivanandan, Ambalavaner. *Communities of Resistance: Writings on Black Struggles for Socialism*. London: Verso, 1990..
- Sutcliff, Phil. Blur: *Blur (Food)*. *Mojo*. March 1997. Online:  
<http://www.rocksbackpages.com/article.html?ArticleID=2195>
- Sutcliff, Phil. "How to Succeed by Really Trying." *The Los Angeles Times*. 6<sup>th</sup> January 2002. Online: <http://articles.latimes.com/2002/jan/06/entertainment/ca-sutcliffe6>
- Thompson, Gordon. *Please Please Me: Sixties British Pop, Inside Out*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- True, Everett. "Blur in America." *Melody Maker*. 9<sup>th</sup> March 1996. Online:  
<http://www.rocksbackpages.com/article.html?ArticleID=14110>
- Wallis, Roger & Krister Malm. *Big Sounds from Small Peoples: Music Industry in Small Countries*. London: Constable, 1984.
- Žižek, Slavoj, *Violence*. London: Profile Books, 2008.



## Discography

AC/DC. *Bonfire*. 18<sup>th</sup> November 1997. 5 CD boxset.

Eno, Brian & Robert Fripp. *(No Pussyfooting)*. November 1973. Island. LP vinyl.

The Beatles. *Please Please Me / Ask me Why*. 11<sup>th</sup> January 1963 (UK) / 25<sup>th</sup> February 1963 (US). Parlophone. 7" vinyl.

The Beatles. *Please Please Me / From Me To You*. 3<sup>rd</sup> January 1964 (US). Parlophone. 7" vinyl.

The Beatles. *Can't Buy Me Love / You Can't Do That*. 10<sup>th</sup> July 1964. Parlophone. 7" vinyl.

The Beatles. *Twist and Shout / There's A Place*. 2<sup>nd</sup> March 1964. Tollie. 7" vinyl.

The Beatles. *She Loves You / I'll Get You*. 23<sup>rd</sup> August 1963 (UK) / 16<sup>th</sup> September 1963 (US). Parlophone (UK) / Swan (US). 7" vinyl.

The Beatles. *I Want to Hold Your Hand / I Saw her Standing There*. 29<sup>th</sup> November 1963. Capitol. 7" vinyl.

Blur. *Modern Life is Rubbish*. 10<sup>th</sup> May 1993. Food (UK) / SBK (US). CD.

Blur. *Parklife*. 25<sup>th</sup> April 1994. Food (UK) / SBK (US). CD.

Blur *Parklife (featuring Phil Daniels) / Supa Shoppa / Theme from an Imaginary Film*. 22<sup>nd</sup> August 1994. Food (UK) / EMI (US). CD1 single.

Blur. *The Great Escape*. 11<sup>th</sup> September 1995. Food (UK) / Virgin (US). CD.

Blur. *Country House / One Born Every Minute / To the End (la comédie)*. 14<sup>th</sup> August 1995. Food. CD1 single.

The Buggles. *Video Killed the Radio Star / Kid Dynamo*. 7<sup>th</sup> September 1979. Island. 7" vinyl.

The Kinks. *The Kinks are the Village Green Preservation Society*. Ray Davies and Dave Davies. © 1968 by Reprise. Reprise 6327. LP.

The Rolling Stones. *(I Can't Get No) Satisfaction / The Spider and the Fly (UK) / The Under Assistant West Coast Promotion Man (US)*. 20<sup>th</sup> August 1965 (UK) / 6<sup>th</sup> June 1965 (US). Decca (UK) / London (US). 7" vinyl.

## Filmography

Dougherty, Kathy, Susan Frömke (as Susan Froemke) & Albert Maysles, dirs. 1991.  
*The Beatles: The First U.S. Visit*. Apple films.

---

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> « [L]istening involves the recognition and interpretation of how a place is signified musically and [...] this is often related to the way that music can be used to construct a sense of 'spatial rivalry' » (Negus 189).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. <http://www.number10.gov.uk/history-and-tour/prime-ministers-in-history/john-major>

<sup>3</sup> For further reading cf. Costambeys-Kempczynski (2009).

<sup>4</sup> For further reading cf. Žižek 2008.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Murray Engleheart's liner notes to AC/DC's *Bonfire* (1997).

© 2013 Raphael Costambeys-Kempczynski & GRAAT