

It is the most conspicuous feature of the listeners' ambivalence toward popular music. They shield their preferences from any imputation that they are manipulated. Nothing is more unpleasant than the confession of dependence. The shame aroused by adjustment to injustice forbids confession by the ashamed. Hence, they turn their hatred rather on those who point to their dependence than on those who tie their bonds.

—Adorno, section 41

- **Does this go any way to explaining the 'chip on popular music scholarship's shoulder' about its subordinate relationship to traditional musicology?**
- **Do we talk enough about manipulation of listeners in popular music studies? How could we explore this further?**
- **Why do we like what we like?**

I would classify...critical anger under three headings:

- Anger that other people are enjoying something that is not worthy of enjoyment. (...critics are particularly incensed when someone they regard as musically sloppy if not meretricious is rapturously applauded for "sentimental" reasons.)
- Anger that performers or composers are betraying their talent. (This is often seen to be in the pursuit of crowd-pleasing, whether emotionally or commercially. The most familiar version of this argument is the rock cultural concept of "selling out".)
- Anger that a performer or composer or record company is dishonouring music by corrupting its original integrity. (This is the language...of moral rights...of ethnomusicologists' despair at the way in which local ritual and spiritual music is sampled for Western entertainment.)

In all these cases the performance is heard to be insulting, and the performers to lack respect, whether for their music, its composers, or their listeners.

—Frith, pp 22-23

- **Can you identify specific examples of these tropes?**
- **Do you agree with Frith that anger is the difference between not liking music and thinking it is 'bad'?**