That's Me in the Spotlight: Audiences and Musicians on Screen

As a popular musician, how do you learn how to perform? One answer is that you watch television, film or video. Most contemporary pop and rock performers will have gained their first impressions of their trade by watching other performers on screen. They will have seen filmed performances before they have played live and before they have attended a gig. As an audience member, how do you learn how to perform? I believe the answer is the same: the screen is a primary location for discovering what you are expected to do. Most fans first witness other music audiences via mediated sources.

In this chapter I will address ways in which audiences have been represented on screen, exploring uses that have been made of their representations by other fans, by musicians, and by media producers. I will examine four periods and four types of filmed audience. Firstly, I will look at Elvis Presley's 1950s television appearances. During the rock 'n' roll era the filming of fans provided an act of *interpretation*. Cameras would zone in on audience reactions to help attach meaning to the music. Secondly, I will look at the more knowing use of media that was made by artists and audiences during the 'British invasion' years of the mid-1960s. In clips from this era, it can be seen that musicians have a conscious indebtedness to the filmed performances of other musicians, while fans are indebted to the filmed performances of other fans. Nevertheless, the actions of the two parties are not always aligned. As a consequence the audience can be viewed as causing *interference*. Thirdly, I will look at the rock years of the late 1960s and 1970s, a period that witnessed contradictory tendencies towards audiences. On the one hand, the audience was spurned - rock was seen as music of individual artistic genius and claimed opposition to mass media and mass culture; on the other hand, it was embraced - rock was regarded as music of

community. Mediation sat uneasily amongst these processes; there was *incompatibility* between the rock aesthetic and previous forms of audience representation. Fourthly, I will look at the video era of the 1980s and beyond. Video recording brought with it various types of *interaction*. Promotional films drew on live performance, while live performance drew on promotional films. There was also dialogue between genres: pop videos drew upon rock aesthetics, while heavy rock videos drew upon traditions of pop audience presentation. Video technology has also fostered interaction between musicians and audiences: at bigger gigs live performance is filmed while it is happening and is broadcast to the audience on large video screens. Moreover, due to mobile phone technology, many fans now have their own cameras, meaning they too can shoot footage of gigs. These developments have provided new interfaces between artists and their fans.

A main concern of this chapter is representations of male musicians and female audiences. Musical genres have been codified in gender terms. While pop music has been regarded as having feminine qualities, rock music has been depicted as male (Frith and McRobbie, 1990). This binary has been credited to the music itself (through the perceived 'passivity' of pop as opposed to the thrust of 'cock rock') (ibid.: 375-6), as well as to the genre's audiences (pop appeals to a largely female audience while rock is often the preserve of males).[1] In this piece I will explore the role of filmed representations in creating and reinforcing this gendered divide.

The Age of Interpretation

---

[1] Statistical evidence shows that this audience split has remained broadly true. In the UK, pop was the dominant genre amongst women in 2013, making up 37.4% of purchases. Amongst men, pop accounted for 26% of purchases. The figures were reversed when it came to rock, which was the leading genre amongst male shoppers, making up 36.3% of their purchases. For women rock accounted for 26.9% of purchases (Green, 2014: 85).

Television was the medium that did most to promote Elvis Presley during the early years of his career. Simon Frith has noted that it was 'key to the process in which Elvis Presley became a national American star' (2001: 42), and Peter Mills has written of the 'single mercurial moment' that transformed Presley's career (2010: 55). This moment came on 5 June 1956, when Elvis appeared on the *Milton Berle Show*, singing 'Hound Dog' on television for the first time. The performance featured a spontaneous slowed-down coda to the song, to which Elvis danced in a suggestive manner.

The American press responded with outrage. The *New York Journal-American* regarded the performance as 'a display of primitive physical movement difficult to describe in terms suitable to a family newspaper', while the *Daily News* argued that 'Popular music has reached its lowest depths in the "grunt and groin" antics of one Elvis Presley'. The Catholic newspaper *America* found itself caught in a feedback loop of representation, stating that 'If the agencies (TV and other) would stop handling such nauseating stuff, all the Presleys of our land would soon be swallowed up in the oblivion they deserve' (press reports quoted in Guralnick, 1995: 285-6).

While Elvis's 'Hound Dog' routine was more provocative than his previous TV performances, he had already appeared on seven other variety shows and on each occasion had danced freely. What really differentiated this performance was that it was the first to feature reaction shots of female fans. It was the receptive excitement on the young girls' faces - the fact that they were readily interpreting Elvis's advances - that helped to confirm the sexuality of his routine. David R. Shumway has noted the way this audience was filmed, honing in on 'particular faces whose response tells us of the excitement the performer is generating' (1992: 127). In the 'Hound Dog' clip we can see the conversation that is set up between Elvis and a young fan. After the singer's

first low crouch, the editors switch to a girl with pigtails, who is shown bouncing on her seat and clapping with glee. As he enters the coda, she is returned to, still voicing her approval.

Elsewhere, the show offers a prescriptive course in Elvis reactions. Elvis is featured in a skit with Milton Berle in which he complains about hordes of screaming girls tearing off his clothes. He says he would prefer a sedate woman, such as Hollywood actress Debra Paget. Berle informs Elvis that she is too sophisticated for him (she's the Waldorf, while he's Heartbreak Hotel). Paget is then brought on stage, and responds to the presence of Elvis by screaming, caressing him and kissing him full on the lips. In a second skit young actresses pose as Elvis fans, waiting for a personal appearance by the singer at a record shop. In the melee that surrounds his arrival, the girls mistakenly tear Berle's clothes off.

In the outrage that followed this show, the actions of the female fans – whether spontaneous or staged - were downplayed, as was Berle's own part in the affair. Instead, the blame was placed firmly on Elvis. The response was focused on him too. Elvis appeared in four more variety shows in 1956 and 1957, including the *Steve Allen Show*, 1 July 1956, in which he was humiliated by being made to sing 'Hound Dog' to a basset hound, and the *Ed Sullivan Show*, 6 January 1957, in which he was castrated by being filmed from the waist up only. These neutering strategies have been widely remarked upon. What has been less regularly discussed is that, in these shows, female fans are expunged. After the original 'Hound Dog' performance, Elvis's 1950's TV shows include no further sights of excited young girls. In the *Steve Allen Show* their sounds are excluded too; instead there is an older audience who feign amusement at Allen's lame conceit.

At the start of his programme Allen states that he wants 'to do a show that the whole family can watch and enjoy'. He twice calls the singer a 'good sport'. Sullivan echoes these sentiments: in his final dialogue with Elvis he refers to him as 'real, decent fine boy', thus reassuring viewers that the performer is safe for consumption. This tendency for television to absorb and nullify musical danger has led to the medium being viewed negatively by commentators, artists and audiences alike. Frith has stated that music viewing that 'provided a bit of a laugh for grown ups' was the 'kind of packaging that rock fans and musicians came to despise' (2003: 283). Nevertheless, as John Hill has pointed out, music television has contradictory tendencies. On the one hand, television has attempted to make popular music 'more acceptable to a family audience', while on the other it has encouraged artists to 'exaggerate, rather than play down, the apparent grotesque of their performances' (1991: 104). Moreover, it is the fact that these performances take place within the context of family viewing that lends them their frisson. Greil Marcus has captured well the shock that persists in Elvis's original 'Hound Dog' performance: '"My God," I said to myself as I watched him move a quarter-century after the fact. "They let that on television?"'(1991: 241). However, it is not just artists whose actions are heightened by the presence of cameras and microphones: audiences are also in the habit of exaggerating their behaviour. It has been this out-of-control nature of female studio audiences as much as the pacifying nature of television producers that has led to the rock scorn for music TV.

The Age of Interference

As with Elvis, television was the medium that escalated the Beatles' career. The onset of Beatlemania came with the group's performance on *Sunday Night at the London Palladium*, 16 October 1963. An estimated 15 million British viewers witnessed the screams and excitement of

their female fans (Davies, 1985: 254). This 'mania' was also witnessed in the United States. Viewers were introduced to the Beatles via news reports from England:

> Jack Paar, who hosted a Friday evening variety program on NBC, marveled to his TV audience over the unbelievable Beatlemania phenomenon he had observed overseas. Paar then showed a film clip of the Beatles performing 'She Loves You' as the English teens went hysterical. (Jackson, 1997: 227)

Ehrenreich et al. have suggested that 'When the Beatles arrived in the United States the fans knew what to do. Television had spread the word from England'. The instruction was 'a license to riot' (1987: 12).

England had also spread the word about how to film these fans (Lynskey, 2013). The Beatles' first American TV performance took place on the *Ed Sullivan Show*, 9 February 1964. In this hour-long special they are given 12 minutes of screen time, during which they perform five songs. Out of this screen time, one and a quarter minutes is devoted to their fans. This is in sharp contrast to the rest of this edition of the variety show, during which the audience cannot be seen. As well as mirroring the film style of British Beatlemania, the American broadcasts had similar effects. Beatles fan Linda Ihle stated, 'Seeing them on the *Ed Sullivan Show*, with the girls screaming in the audience, it was contagious. That, coupled with news reports of girls screaming at the airport, spurred it on' (ibid.).

The filming of the Beatles' audience on the *Ed Sullivan Show* has aspects in common with Elvis's performance on the *Milton Berle Show* eight years earlier. Individual fans or pairs of fans are shown in medium close-up. One girl provides a direct echo of 'Hound Dog': she is shown bouncing

up and down and clapping with glee. The performance by the Beatles' audience is more exaggerated, however. Some girls are panting for breath and are close to tears. Others are more brazen: one pokes her tongue out in a lewd manner, while the girl sat beside her puckers her lips.

There are further differences in the responses that the two acts generate. In Elvis's 1950's TV performances, the audiences' reactions are to Elvis's movements. Their screams and sighs are usually at their most intense when he dances to Scotty Moore's guitar solos. Elvis also just about maintains control of this response; he is always ready to tone it down by cracking a corny gag or a giving a sly look. As Shumway has pointed out, the shots of the audience during 'Hound Dog' are the 'equivalent to the shot/reverse shot editing that structures the gaze in narrative cinema' (1992: 127). These sequences establish Elvis as an eroticized object for his female fans. Shumway argues that this editing 'showed other fans how to respond appropriately' (ibid.).

But what was the Beatles' audience responding to? During the *Ed Sullivan Show* the band make little effort to generate or diffuse their fans' behaviour. They remain fairly static. The group had seen Elvis's filmed performances and had chosen not to mimic him. John Lennon stated, 'the Beatles deliberately didn't move like Elvis, that was our policy, because we found it stupid and bullshit' (Wenner, 1973: 34). Consequently, it is only at moments of exciting vocal interplay that the girls' screams appear to be called forth by the group's musical endeavours. As a consequence, the TV crew struggles to find a source for the girls' enthusiasm; they cut between images of fans and band in a somewhat random manner. In fact, the reaction shots during this show are self-generating: they occur because the performance is being filmed. Monitors in the studio provide a live relay of shot selection, hence the fans can see what is being captured. Their largest screams are not for the music, but for moments when band members are featured in close-up, not least

because the band subtly respond to these shot selections. The other images that interest the audience are the shots of themselves. When girl fans appear on screen the mania intensifies.

It has been argued that the Beatles' female fans utilized the band's presence for their own needs. Ehrenreich et al. have made a case that Beatlemania 'was the first and most dramatic uprising of *women's* sexual revolution' (1987: 11. Emphasis in original). However, without wishing to denigrate the power of the fans, it should not be forgotten who was controlling their representation. It was the TV producers who elected to devote so much screen time to the Beatles' audience. Nor should it be forgotten that this focus might prove problematic to the artists: why should their act be viewed as a prompt for outlandish behaviour, in contrast to the other performances on Ed Sullivan's programme? The filming does not have the performers' artistry as its main focus; instead its aim is to capture a phenomenon.

The film *A Hard Day's Night* (1964) fictionalises the Beatles' relationship with the broadcast process. The movie climaxes with a TV performance by the group that could almost be described as Brechtian in its execution: cameras are in shot and we witness the activities of the production crew in their control room. The Beatles are shown mocking this crew, but ultimately they concede to their demands. The film's exposure of the filming process is not quite honest, however. While the monitors in the control room show shots from the various cameras that are filming the band, they do not show any footage from the cameras that are trained on their fans' reactions. Moreover, although the film itself includes plenty of footage of the audience in the TV theatre, this crowd is filmed in a different manner to the rest of the TV production, as well as to the way that Beatles' followers would usually be framed. Some of the fan footage is shot documentary-style via hand-held cameras, and the filming takes place amongst the audience. This filming technique

renders the footage of the fans more 'real' than the Beatles' mimed performance. While the Beatles appear to be carrying out pre-meditated roles, the fans' behaviour is for the most part unscripted and wild. By filming the audience differently and denying this footage any presence in the control room, the film suggests that crowd reaction shots were not a usual part of a Beatles' TV production. As with the press reaction to Elvis's Milton Berle performance, there is a denial that the filmed audience helped to establish the meaning of the act. In both instances we witness a fear of female agency. However, whereas in the Berle example the audience's reactions are ignored so that the sexuality of the routine can be regarded as Elvis's responsibility, in *A Hard Day's Night* they are ignored in order to give artistic credit to the Beatles. Here we can see the early stirrings of the rock aesthetic.

A Hard Day's Night does nevertheless illustrate the fact that fan behaviour had developed a momentum of its own. It could often be in excess of the musicians' routines. Fans could be more visually spectacular than the artists, and they could be more audibly spectacular as well. In their reminiscences, male 1960s pop performers regularly claim that they could not hear themselves play and that their fans could not hear them either (e.g. Richards with Fox, 2010: 137). The reminiscences of female fans, meanwhile, have indicated that it could be their own actions, and not the presence of the bands or their music, that was of most importance to them. Sheryll Garrett has recalled, 'Our real obsession was with ourselves; in the end, the actual men behind the posters had very little to do with it at all' (1990: 402).[2]

This attitude is captured in the Monkees' self-destructive film *Head*. Their song 'Circle Sky' is about Vietnam, and is accompanied in the film by news footage of the conflict. The clip also shows the

Monkees' performing the song live, but the way that this footage is intercut with news items suggests that their female fans aren't interested in global politics; instead all they care about is surging towards the band. It is difficult to know whose eyes we are meant to be looking through at the end of the performance, when the band are revealed to be mannequins and are destroyed by their audience. Is this how the Monkees see themselves? Or do they feel that they have glimpsed the way their fans see them? This footage is clear, however, in representing the female audience as interference. A TV viewer who is shown watching at home clicks between images of the fans, news items and adverts as if it was all just static on the screen.

The Age of Incompatibility

As it splintered from pop, rock music developed and depicted a different relationship between artists and audiences. The rock aesthetic drew upon a number of earlier artistic movements. From romanticism it gained the idea of individual expressive genius, but also the idea of the rock audience as some form of folk community; from modernism it gained ideas of onward progress and a belief in art for its own sake. What these art movements and rock music had in common was an antipathy towards mass culture and mass media. In doing so, rock shared another quality with modernism: a negative attitude towards the 'feminine' audience.

In his essay 'Mass Culture as Woman', Andreas Huyssen argues that modernism was constructed around a binary. He suggests that modernist discourse 'consistently and obsessively genders mass culture and the masses as feminine, while high culture, whether traditional or modern, clearly remains the privileged realm of male activities' (1986: 47). The solitary artist is male; he is

---

[2] Garratt is recalling her youth as a Bay City Rollers fan. Although a 1970's group, the Rollers were

'objective, ironic, and in control' (ibid.). He stands opposed to large crowds, which in their femininity represent 'nature out of control . . . the unconscious . . . sexuality . . . the loss of identity and stable ego boundaries' (ibid.: 52). Huyssen quotes the 19th century writer Gustave Le Bon, who stated, 'Crowds are somewhat like the sphinx of ancient fable: it is necessary to arrive at a solution of the problems offered by their psychology or to resign ourselves to being devoured by them' (ibid.: 52-3). He also quotes Nietzsche:

> The danger for artists, for geniuses . . . is woman: adoring women confront them with corruption. Hardly any of them have character enough not to be corrupted – or 'redeemed' – when they find themselves treated like gods: soon they condescend to the level of the women. (ibid.: 51)

Nietzsche was opposed to any form of theatricality in music, because in theatre 'solitude is lacking . . . one becomes people, herd, female, pharisee, voting cattle, patron, idiot' (ibid.). It was this sort of theatricality that TV producers had forced upon the pop artists of the 1950s and 1960s: many filmed performances were characterised by reaction shots of female fans. As some of these musicians turned towards rock, they developed attitudes reminiscent of Nietzsche. Here, for example, is John Lennon, speaking in 1970:

> I resent being an artist . . . I resent performing for fucking idiots who don't know anything. They can't feel; I'm the one that's feeling, because I'm the one expressing . . . I'd sooner be in the audience, really, but I'm not capable of it. (Wenner, 1973: 105)

---

promoted using the conventions of Beatlemania.

Rock performers felt the need to differentiate their screen presence from that of pop performers. One response was to place a distance between artists and audiences. In 1966 the Beatles stopped playing live and devoted more time to the recording studio. They also stopped performing on live TV, creating promotional films for their singles instead. The clips for songs such as 'Penny Lane' or 'Strawberry Fields Forever' have no screaming girls. In fact, they have no audience members at all. This manoeuvre was echoed in British music TV shows. *Ready Steady Go* has been cast as the archetypal British pop show of the early 1960s. As Frith has pointed out, this programme 'simulated a youth group on the screen itself'. He suggests that 'The young people dancing in the studio were the audience among whom we, as viewers, could place ourselves' (Frith, 1988: 209). In contrast, *The Old Grey Whistle Test* typified a 1970's rock approach. Here, the producers elected to film rock acts in a studio that was devoid of audience members. It says much about the complexities of mediation, in particular the disregard for the meaning-making presence of female fans, that the latter TV programme has been viewed as somehow more 'real' than the former. Mills, for example, has argued that it 'set out to show what "*authentic* musicians" looked like, positioned in the reality of a genuine musical performance' (2010: 63. Emphasis in original).

Rock musicians also distanced themselves from TV in general. Just as they eschewed singles in favour of LPs, bands such as Pink Floyd and Led Zeppelin turned away from televised performances, electing to produce feature films instead. The improved sound quality of film was one reason why they chose this medium, but film also gave them greater control over the way they could represent themselves and their audiences. Pink Floyd's *Live at Pompeii* (1972) echoes *The Old Grey Whistle Test*: the band plays live, but to an audience of none. In contrast Led Zeppelin's *The Song Remains the Same* (1976) does feature an audience. This audience is

downplayed, however. In this 137-minute film it is given less screen time than the Beatles' fans on the *Ed Sullivan Show*.

Although film helped to support the rock idea of solitary artistic genius, it could also be used to promote the ethos of the rock community. The Beatles are again representative. Two of the group's late 1960's singles, 'All You Need is Love' and 'Hey Jude', feature communal sing-along refrains. As a consequence, they are provided with communal promotional films. In each case the conventional layout of live performance is abandoned. There is no division between audience and band; all share the same stage. Correspondingly, there is little shot/reverse filming. Instead, artists and fans are captured within the same frame. These promos also feature a higher proportion of male fans than earlier films of the Beatles.

Some of the festival films of this period also aim to celebrate the communal nature of the rock audience. *Woodstock* (1970), in particular, is keen to devote much of its time to documenting the hippie audience's worldview. The film faces several problems, however: how to depict rock musicians as artistic deities, while placing their audience on the same level as them; how to depict the huge scale of this audience without dismissing it as a mass; how to celebrate the organic nature of the festival when using mass media.

Woodstock addresses these problems by utilizing its various 'splits'. Much of the film is edited using split-screen technique. On occasions this technique is used to show musicians in one segment of footage, while alongside them, in a separate screen, audience members are shown listening to their music. This has a different effect to the reaction shots of earlier music TV. Here the performer is not set up as an eroticized object, the focus of a gaze. In addition, the split screen

technique disperses visual attention but channels auditory attention: it promotes the music as being the binding agent between musicians and audience. More commonly, *Woodstock* enacts a larger split. Most of the performances are shot without any footage of audience members: the focus is on the artistic expressivity of the musicians. In the film these musical performances are interspersed with non-musical segments. It is in the latter that the audience takes centre stage. They are shown on the fringes of the festival site, forging a rural community.

It was through its mediation – as song, soundtrack album, film and news story – that the Woodstock festival became famous, and yet these artifacts could promote an anti-mediation ethos, suggesting instead the importance of a rooted sense of place. Joni Mitchell, who only experienced the festival second-hand, wrote about Woodstock as an Eden-like paradise. Her song suggests, 'we've got to get ourselves back to the garden', to a pre-fall, pre-mediatized time.[3] As David Brackett has pointed out, Woodstock's triple-LP soundtrack and three-hour film 'required feats of endurance similar to those needed to survive the original event' (2005: 224). In absorbing these artifacts listeners and viewers could believe they were part of the Woodstock nation. This feeling is captured in J. R. Young's review of the album in *Rolling Stone*. It depicts a character called Bill, who failed to make it to the festival, but became so immersed in its mediation that he started to tell people he was there. Moreover, he condemns the 'media trip' that Woodstock has become (Young, 2005: 225). Bill is eventually exposed by someone who had been at the festival, who corrects him that 'the movie was pretty far out. But it wasn't like being there. Nothing was like being there' (ibid.: 226). Woodstock was nevertheless mediated through and through; watching the film it is apparent that the performers are spending some of their time playing directly to camera, as is the audience, even in some of its more unguarded moments.

---

[3] 'Woodstock', written by Joni Mitchell (Sony/ATV Music Publishing).

Steven Connor has noted the disappointing 'authenticity' that became the established norm of 1970's rock concerts. The 'real corporeal presence' of the performers was facilitated by distance, he has recalled squinting at 'tiny figures performing inconsequentially on a stage half a mile away' (1997: 174). The reverse of this is that, from the performers' perspective, the crowd became tiny figures, reacting inconsequently half a mile away. This represents a turnaround from the 1960s pop audience, whose presence could visually and audibly compete with the musicians. The audience also had a different composition: while the TV audiences of the 1950s and 1960s had a female bias, the live rock crowd of the 1970s was predominantly male. According to Frith and McRobbie, 'It is boys who become interested in rock as music . . . It is boys who form the core of the rock audience . . . It is boys who experience rock as a collective culture' (1990: 376). They credit this gender bias, in part, to the fact that in the 1970s street life was dominated by boys: 'Teenage girls' lives are usually confined to the locality of their homes; they have less money than boys, less free time, less independence of parental control' (ibid.: 381). A case can be made, however, that this male audience was also the result of successful differentiation on rock's behalf, reflecting a modernist need to escape the feminised mass. Although the male-dominated festival audiences of the 1970s were far larger than the female audiences who populated TV studios and provincial theatres in the 1960s, they were not seen to have the same devouring, Sphinx-like nature.[4] Moreover, although massive, they had shed (some of) the ties with mass media. Huyssen

---

[4] Altamont, the 1969 music festival headlined by the Rolling Stones, has regularly been cast as Woodstock's antithesis. This is partly due to the documentary film of the event (*Gimme Shelter*, 1970). Here the male mass is depicted and it is *devouring*. The film culminates with a male fan brandishing a gun at the Rolling Stones, who are performing on stage. He is murdered by the band's macho security: the Hells Angels. The aggression at the concert represents some sort of culmination of a dilemma that the Rolling Stones' audience faced. From the outset this audience had been more male than that for the Beatles (see, for example, the claims of Mick Jagger in the film *Crossfire Hurricane* (2012)), and yet its examples of fan behaviour had been learnt from watching girl fans on TV. These male fans could go further than the Beatles' female fans - stage invasions were common - and yet they became confused

notes that the 19th century castigation of the mass as female was connected to a fear of the mass political emancipation of women (1986: 50-51). This should make us think again, both about the suggestion made by Ehrenreich et al. that Beatlemania was an uprising of women's sexual revolution, as well as about the fact that rock musicians generally shunned the filmed presence of female audience members.

The Age of Interaction

If television was the main mode of representation for 1960's pop, and film provided the equivalent function for 1970's rock, video has been at the forefront in both genres from the early 1980s onwards. In this closing section I shall examine how this technology has transformed relationships between musicians, audiences and moving images. In particular, I am interested in the extent to which video represents a turn away from the idea that artistry and mass media are incompatible, and has instead provided a mediated domain in which musicians and audiences can interact.

The initial impact of video, particularly in America, was felt via MTV. This national music channel, broadcasting 24 hours a day, seven days a week, transformed notions of the music business, not least in academia. It was viewed as representing a rejection of the rock ethos of unmediated live performance in favour of a concentration on promotional video clips. Several commentators regarded this as a postmodernist turn (Fiske, 1986: 74-9; Kaplan, 1987). Video and MTV were conflating commerce and culture; they were introducing blank parody in place of earnestness; they were disrupting traditional narrative flows. Andrew Goodwin has suggested, on the contrary,

---

when coming face-to-face with the band. Having been schooled in the erotic gaze/reverse gaze of audience representations, their first impulse was to kiss their heroes. Quickly rejecting this, they would often hit them instead (Coates, 2010: 191).

that MTV helped to maintain popular music's 'Romantic aesthetic', particularly when it came to the performances of rock musicians in rock videos (1993: 178). While there is much in his argument, video helped to confuse as well as reinforce generic differences. It is notable that both pop and rock benefitted from MTV rotation: the first phase of the channel (1981-1983) was dominated by British New Pop, while the second phase (1983-1985) saw a turn towards heavy rock (ibid.: 132-5).

As well as learning from each other, these two genres reversed earlier taste hierarchies. In Britain, a number of journalists approached, and indeed forged, the New Pop movement with a critical regard that had previously been the preserve of rock (Reynolds, 2005: 361-82). Moreover, it was the visual artistry of these pop performers that 'validated music videos as an expressive form' (Frith, 1988: 210). In contrast, the heavy rock bands that took advantage of the video boom - in particular the 'hair metal' bands from Los Angeles - comprised one of the most critically reviled sub-genres of rock. Although there were a number of aesthetic, cultural and sociological reasons for this dismissal (Thompson, 2001: 227-41), video and MTV were at least partly to blame. Adopting these forms represented an embrace of mass media: MTV was, after all, global in its ambitions. In addition, there is the use these bands made of music video. Here too we can witness a turnaround between pop and rock.

Goodwin notes that many New Pop videos are 'anti-realist' (1993: 133). Artists are situated in dramatic situations, whether created in a film studio (as with the Buggles' 'Video Killed the Radio Star') or via picturesque location shoots (as with Duran Duran's travelogue videos). They are thus distanced from their fans. In contrast, a dominant trope among early rock videos is the 'live' performance, whether this is taking place in a recording studio, rehearsal space or on stage. For

Goodwin, these locations serve as a '*guarantor of authenticity*', a continuation of the music's romantic and modernist beliefs (ibid.: 77. Emphasis in original). This is not, however, the authenticity of the earlier rock movement, which vacillated between viewing audiences as interference or as equals. Here, the heavy metal bands take the eroticized gaze of early pop TV and run with it. Female fans are prioritized and are shown responding wildly to the musicians. However, while there is a degree of fan agency in the earlier Elvis and Beatles clips, the images in these videos are more contrived and controlled. Bon Jovi's 'You Give Love a Bad Name', Ratt's 'Round and Round', Def Leppard's 'Pour Some Sugar on Me' and Poison's 'Your Mama Don't Dance' are illustrative of the genre. These 'live' performances feature reaction shots that hone in on young/attractive/scantily-clad/well-endowed girl fans. Mötley Crüe's 'Girls, Girls, Girls' takes this trope to an extreme: the band performs the song to grateful strippers in a strip club.

With its concentration on the single record and its 24-hour broadcasting policy, MTV increased the repetitiveness of music imagery. Greil Marcus complained about the standardized nature of musicians' video performances: 'the male-rock-performer script . . . everything you see is second-hand, third-hand – received and reified'. For Marcus, the musicians' gestures are empty; they merely signify that bands know 'what male rock stars are supposed to do on stage' (Frith, 1988: 218). In a similar manner, the performances of audience members in both pop and rock videos became increasingly predictable. The video director, record company or artists might select only the most beautiful fans (or even the most beautiful non-fans); these fans might be costumed; their moves choreographed; their actions edited. There can also be a direct echo of the musicians' hackneyed performances, with the audience members singing the words back to them or mimicking their gestures.

It should be noted that 'authentic' 1980s rock performers can be witnessed in anti-realist videos (Peter Garbiel's 'Sledgehammer'; Foreigner's 'I Want to Know What Love Is') while pop artists' videos can show them cutting it live (Wham's 'The Edge of Heaven'; the Eurythmics' 'Sisters are Doin' it For Themselves'). Moreover, regardless of their generic type, these video performances fed into the artists' live routines. Auslander has described the 1980s as being an era of 'simulation': videos imitated live performance, and beyond that live performance imitated 'music video imitating live performance' (2008: 101). And so, while artists such as Prince and Madonna would enact 'anti-realist' video-type scenarios on stage, the live routines of heavy metal acts would mirror the stagecraft they had developed for their video performances. In fact, the relationship between live and mediated performance was wound even tighter than Auslander depicts. As I have indicated above, the influence of the moving image on live acts has a longer history, therefore music video wasn't just imitating live performance; it was imitating live performance imitating filmed performance. And what of the audiences? Auslander doesn't mention their role in the live simulation of video or in the video simulation of live performance. They were nevertheless caught within complex webs of representation. In the latter half of the 1980s the 'performance' clip gained ascendancy (Goodwin, 1993: 136). Many of these videos showed idealized images of fans. Consequently, they provided audience members with increased opportunities to see how musicians expected them to look and behave at their gigs.

It was also in this period that concerts first began to regularly incorporate video recording and transmission. Connor compared the 'corporeal' distance of 1970's music concerts with the simulated closeness of a mediated 1980s gig:

[Bruce] Springsteen's appearances on his world tour in 1985, which were rarely to fewer

than 50,000 people, made sure that no member of the vast audience could escape the

slightest nuance of music or voice. Behind him, an enormous video screen projected

claustrophobically every detail of his agonized facial expressions in a close-up which at one

and the same time abolished and re-emphasized the actual distance between him and his

audience. (1997: 174)

These video screens have now infiltrated all but the smallest of gigs. In doing so, they have helped

to foster the imitative interaction between artists' filmed and live performances. At live concerts,

musicians aren't just performing for the fans in front of them; they are also projecting towards the

camera. The live audience will also be filmed and broadcast on the screens. This provides another

means for closeness and distance. Distance is abolished by means of a common interface. Where

artists and audiences previously had the clear division of stage and auditorium, the video screen

offers a platform where they can be edited side-by-side. Both parties can be shown in close-up

and they can both be brightly lit. Distance is re-established by means of control. Audiences may

well receive a greater share of the limelight, but video screens coerce them into further levels of

simulation. Cameramen are in search of standardised reaction shots, the preceding promo videos

having informed them of the appropriate responses to musicians' actions. And fans know what to

do in order to secure a better chance of appearing on screen. It is of benefit to be

female/young/attractive/scantily-clad/well-endowed. An example of the standardised nature of

fan reactions can be witnessed in concert videos. When gigs are filmed for commercial release it

can be convenient to shoot footage of audience members at a separate performance to the one

used to compile the shots of the musicians (Plasketes, 2009: 113-14). The fact that this practice

usually goes unnoticed is indicative of the extent to which reactions have become reified.

Auslander concludes *Liveness* arguing that live performance will continue to be indebted to televisual performance. This is because, 'At present, television is the dominant cultural form' (2008: 187). This statement is included in both the 1999 and 2008 editions of his book, and it possibly remains true for the founding area of his enquiries: theatre of the stage and screen. It is more problematic for popular music. His key measures are 'cultural presence and prestige – and profitability' (ibid.). For many leading musicians, it is arguable that live performance now outperforms television in each of these domains. The fortunes of music video have also fluctuated. In the 21st century, MTV is something of a spent cultural force and includes fewer videos in its programming (Hay, 2001: 68-9). Moreover, one of the initial effects of digital downloading – both legal and pirated – was that record companies and artists had less money to spend on promotional videos (Batey, 2010). YouTube, in contrast, has helped to revive the currency of the music video. It has nevertheless meant that these clips are now more commonly seen on computers and phones than on television screens.

Live performance remains indebted to filmed representations. It does, however, draw upon a number of different traditions, rather than being solely in thrall to the artists' promotional videos. It has also developed mediated conventions of its own. The most basic of these is the expectation that fans will gesticulate wildly when realising their presence has been captured on the screen.[5] Here there is something of a return to the Beatles' TV audiences, whose reactions were

---

[5] Perhaps the most depressing of all audience interactions is the tradition of the 'boobs shot'. Cameramen will be in search of girls who have been hoisted up onto their partner's shoulders; the crowd will then urge the filmed girl to lift up her top. If she concedes, the crowd will point phone cameras towards the large video screen and film the footage of the girl's display. For an extreme example see Steel Panther, 'Party All Day (Fuck All Night)', http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U7ILDT52qrQ.

heightened by their appearance on studio monitors. Promotional video, meanwhile, provides fewer outlets for excessive fan behaviour.

Another difference between the promotional and live uses of video is that, ironically, live performance now has more layers of mediation than its promotional counterpart. There is a proliferation of mobile phones and digital cameras at gigs. Many fans have the ability to film the concerts that they attend. They can film the live performance and they can film its transmission on video screens. They can also film themselves being filmed. This provides more opportunities for mediated interaction, but questions of agency and influence still remain. Caught within these layers of mediation, do fans behave in accordance with previous modes of representation or are they able to forge new ones?

While digital technology has increased the depictions of fans as consumers, it has also enabled some of them to become producers. Bands such as Nine Inch Nails and Radiohead have endorsed the compilation of their audiences' film footage into concert movies.[6] These two groups have modernist tendencies and it may therefore appear odd that they have embraced fan agency in this way. The footage is telling, however. Although compiled in different manners – the Nine Inch Nails footage is sequenced from '422 individual files from 25+ sources' but edited by representatives of the band, while the Radiohead fans maintained control over the editing stage of their concert film – the outcome is similar.

These amateur filmmakers are not providing usual YouTube-style films. There are no crowd shots of their friends gurning at cameras or transforming themselves into human emoticons, and nor are

there any shots of video screens in the venues (if, indeed, any were used). Instead their mobile phones are trained firmly on the live performers. This may be the result of the editing process (the editors' outlook is apparent in the Radiohead footage, which elects to fade to black between each song, rather than show any cheering fans). However, it may also be a representation of the amateur filmmakers' beliefs, or indicative of the way that fans shoot film at gigs (where footage is not usually shot from their own perspective, instead cameras are raised up, so that they can provide a view over the heads of other audience members and over the masses of other mobile phones). Nevertheless, the net effect is that these camera images offer a return to the idea of authentic distance that Connor experienced at 1970s rock festivals. Out-of-focus footage of tiny figures doesn't have the effect of bringing us closer to the musicians, if anything it renders them more untouchable.

The fan-made Nine Inch Nails and Radiohead films present a solution to some of the dilemmas of the rock era. Live performance and mediation are no longer incompatible. Turning the filmmaking over to the audience supports the idea of rock community and removes the deadening hand of corporate involvement, while the way these films are shot provides the distance needed to preserve the integrity of the artists' lonesome genius. The films also place music at the centre of matters. While the visual output moves skittishly between different viewpoints (similar to the split-screen technique used in *Woodstock*, and again with an absence of shot/reverse shots), the audio output is steady. Moreover, the audio output is superior: while much of the imagery has an expected amateurish quality, the audio is sourced directly from each band. These films are interactive, but only up to a certain point. The fans have agency, but choose to focus their attention on the artists, rather than on themselves. Moreover, they only have agency when it

---

[6] For footage of the Nine Inch Nails project, see http://atinylittledot.com/. The Radiohead film can

comes to the visual recording of the band. When it comes to the audio, the artists remain firmly in control. We once again have isolated modernist heroes, and we once again have an absence of fans.

Conclusion

Are we swirling in ever decreasing circles of simulation? At times, it seems as though there is no escape from mediation and there is no escape from popular music's past. Although I have divided this chapter up into four periods and four types of filmed audience, I would not like to give the impression that these tendencies can only be witnessed in their dominant eras. In fact, I would argue that the filming of audiences has been of such centrality to popular music practice that three of these forms of representation have persisted. Interpretative camerawork has been in evidence in the filming of punk, rave and other sub-cultures, while the interfering audience has continued to present a dilemma for all boy bands and girl groups who wish to move in an 'artistic' direction. Conversely, the ability to interact with mediated representations has a longer history than some digital theorists would have us believe. What has perhaps disappeared, though, is the idea that performance and mediation are incompatible. The majority of live performances by musicians are indebted to past and present forms of representation, even if those forms of representation try to kid us that they are against the idea of visual display.

The same holds true for many audience members: they behave in a mediated manner. Nevertheless, in this conclusion I do want to urge some caution. This chapter is titled 'That's Me in the Spotlight'. It is the audience members in the first few rows of a gig, video or TV performance

---

be seen at http://consequenceofsound.net/2012/11/watch-a-fan-made-radiohead-concert-film/.

who have been my preoccupation, the ones who are most regularly caught in the stage lights and who are liable to be captured on film. Not all members of audiences have received such exposure. As Wendy Fonarow argues, there is 'differential participation and spatial distribution' at gigs (1996: 33). The audience members at the back of the hall operate in a different manner to those hogging the limelight at the front. Here, fan behaviour is learnt as much through regular attendance at gigs as it is by watching audiences on screen. The people at the back have rarely been captured on film, not least because if they were documented they would often display a spectacular degree of inattention to the musicians on stage. As Fonarow has noted, this is a space for 'disparate activities' (ibid.: 35).

Finally, I want to return to the representation of female audiences. Huyssen concludes 'Mass Culture as Woman' on a positive note, arguing that 'the gendering of mass culture as feminine and inferior has its primary historical place in the late 19th century', and that 'the old rhetoric has lost its pervasive power because the realities have changed' (1986: 62). The new reality for Huyssen is postmodernism, a cultural condition that has witnessed a merging of high culture and mass culture and a greater proportion of female artists working in each domain. Popular music would perhaps belie his optimism. Although it bears some of the hallmarks of postmodernism, not least in its blurring of the represented and the real, it has not entirely given itself over to this condition. Simon Reynolds has argued that, with its 'isolated modernist hero figures', popular music has in fact held out longer than other art forms 'against the onset of postmodernism' (2011: 173). Its modernist phase didn't happen in the late 19th century; it is still happening now. One way of measuring popular music's progress towards the freedoms of postmodernism is via its representations of female audiences. As long as female fans are depicted as sexualized masses or are expunged from view, it can be argued that there still remains some distance to go.

Bibliography

Auslander, P. 2008. *Liveness: performance in a mediatized culture*. (2nd edn.) London and New

York: Routledge.

Batey, A. 2010. So Solid Crew: what we're doing now is bigger than music. Internet document

accessed 13.04.15 at http://www.theguardian.com/music/2010/jan/14/so-solid-crew-interview

Brackett, D. (ed.) 2005. *The pop, rock, and soul reader: histories and debates.* New York and

Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coates, N. 2001. Whose tears go by? Marianne Faithfull at the dawn and twilight of rock culture',

in L. Stras (ed.), *She's so fine: reflections on whiteness, femininity, adolescence and class in 1960s*

music. Farnham: Ashgate.

Connor, S. 1997. *Postmodernist culture: an introduction to theories of the contemporary*. (2nd edn.)

Oxford: Blackwell.

Davies, H. 1985. *The Beatles: the only authorised biography*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Ehrenreich, B., E. Hess, and G. Jacobs. 1987. *Re-making love: the feminization of sex.* Glasgow:

Fontana.

Fiske, J. 1986. MTV: post structural post modern. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10, no. 1: 74-

79.

Fonarow, W. 1996. Spatial distribution and participation in British contemporary musical

performances. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 7, no. 1: 33-43.

Frith, S. 1988. *Music For Pleasure.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Frith, S. 2001. The popular music industry. In S. Frith, W. Straw and J. Street (eds.), *Cambridge*

companion to pop and rock. Cambridge: CUP.

Frith, S. 2003. Look! Hear! The uneasy relationship of music and television. *Popular Music* 21, no.

3: 277-90.

Frith, S. and A. McRobbie. 1990. Rock and sexuality. In S. Frith and A. Goodwin (eds.), *On record:*

rock, pop and the written word. London: Routledge.

Garratt, S. 1990. Teenage dreams'. In S. Frith and A. Goodwin (eds.), *On record: rock, pop and the*

written word. London: Routledge.

Goodwin, A. 1993. *Dancing in the distraction factory: music television and popular culture.* London:

Routledge.

Green, C. (ed.) 2014. *BPI yearbook 2014*. London: BPI.

Guralnick, P. 1995. *Last train to Memphis: the rise of Elvis Presley.* London: Abacus.

Hay, C. 2001. Proper role of music TV debated in the US. *Billboard,* 17 February: 1, 68-9

Hill, J. 1991. Television and pop: the case of the 1950s. In J. Corner (ed.), *Popular television in*

Britain: studies in cultural history. London: British Film Institute.

Huyssen, A. 1986. *After the great divide: modernism, mass culture and postmodernism.*

Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Jackson, J. A. 1997. *American Bandstand: Dick Clark and the making of a rock 'n' roll empire.* New

York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, E. A. 1987. *Rocking around the clock: music television, postmodernism and consumer*

culture. London: Methuen.

Lynskey, D. 2013. Beatlemania: 'the screamers' and other tales of fandom. Internet document

accessed 13.04.2015 at http://www.theguardian.com/music/2013/sep/29/beatlemania-

screamers-fandom-teenagers-hysteria

Marcus, G. 1991. *Mystery train: images of America in rock 'n' roll music*. (4th edn.)

Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Mills, P. 2010. Stone fox chase: *the Old Grey Whistle Test* and the rise of high pop television. In I. Inglis (ed.), *Popular music and television in Britain*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Plasketes, G. 2009. *B-sides, undercurrents and overtones: peripheries to popular in music, 1960 to the present.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Reynolds, S. 2005. *Rip it up and start again: postpunk 1978-1984.* London: Faber and Faber.

Reynolds, S. 2011. *Retromania: pop culture's addiction to its own past.* London: Faber and Faber.

Richards K. with J. Fox. 2010. *Life.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Shumway, D. R. 1992. Rock & roll as a cultural practice. In A. DeCurtis (ed.), *Present tense: rock & roll and culture*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Thompson, B. 2001. *Ways of hearing: a user's guide to the pop psyche, from Elvis to Eminem.* London: Orion.

Wenner, J. 1973. *Lennon remembers: the Rolling Stone interviews.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Young, J. R. 2005. Review of various artists, *Woodstock*. In D. Brackett (ed.), *The pop, rock, and soul reader: histories and debates*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.