ChatGPT

Sexual Power Dynamics in ABBA's "Waterloo": A Lyric Analysis

ABBA poses with an actor dressed as Napoleon Bonaparte to promote "Waterloo" in Copenhagen, 1974 [1]. *The band's playful use of Napoleonic imagery highlights the song's central metaphor of conquest in love.*

Introduction

"**Waterloo**" was the Swedish pop group ABBA's breakthrough hit after winning the 1974 Eurovision Song Contest [2] [3]. On the surface, it's an upbeat, catchy song about **falling in love**, but its lyrics frame romance in terms of **military defeat and surrender**. The title and lines reference Napoleon Bonaparte's final defeat at the 1815 Battle of Waterloo, using it as a metaphor for a woman "*surrendering*" to a man's love [4]. This unusual metaphor invites scrutiny: Does the song *romanticize* an unhealthy power dynamic, with the woman cast as the "defeated" and the man as conqueror? Are there hints of coercion or forced submission behind the peppy tune? This report delves into a line-by-line analysis of "Waterloo"'s lyrics, examining their sexual ethics and power implications. We also consider the songwriters' intentions, contemporary and retrospective commentary from critics (including feminist perspectives), and the 1970s cultural context to understand how "Waterloo" portrays romantic surrender and how interpretations of its sexual dynamics have evolved.

Song Background and Metaphor

"Waterloo" was written by ABBA members Benny Andersson and Björn Ulvaeus with their manager Stig Anderson (who penned most of the lyrics) [5]. Notably, a German-language version was also recorded, with translation by Gerd Müller-Schwancke [6]. The song began with a working title "Honey Pie" and was musically inspired by the glam-rock style of the early 1970s [7]. Stig Anderson had the idea to use the Battle of Waterloo as a lyrical hook – a dramatic historical reference to stand out at Eurovision. In his

concept, *Napoleon's surrender* became a grand metaphor for *falling in love*. As the official ABBA site describes, **"Stig used that historical event as a metaphor for a girl surrendering to the courting of an insistent suitor"** [8]. In other words, the song paints the woman's acceptance of a man's romantic pursuit as her personal *"Waterloo"* – a final capitulation. This framing is tongue-in-cheek, yet it establishes a clear power dynamic: the man "wins" as the victor, and the woman "loses" by surrendering (even though she finds joy in that defeat).

Before analyzing the lyrics in depth, it's important to recognize how common the phrase *"meet one's Waterloo"* was in English long before ABBA. It metaphorically means to encounter a **decisive defeat or obstacle** from which one cannot escape. By the mid-20th century, to "meet your Waterloo" was a familiar idiom for any great final defeat [9]. ABBA's lyric draws on this idiom in a lighthearted way: love is cast as a battle you inevitably *lose*. The question is whether this charming pop metaphor carries undertones of coercion or problematic romantic norms. Keep in mind the era – the early 1970s – when traditional gender roles in love songs were rarely questioned in pop music, even as the women's liberation movement was gaining momentum. With this context, let's break down **"Waterloo"** line by line and see what dynamics are at play.

Lyric-by-Lyric Breakdown: Love as a Battle of Surrender

Verse 1: Setting the Stage with History

"My, my, at Waterloo Napoleon did surrender, oh yeah…" – The song opens by evoking a famous historical surrender [10]. Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo symbolizes an **unyielding force finally giving in**. By starting with "**Napoleon did surrender**," the lyric immediately establishes the theme of capitulation. There is no ambiguity that this is about *one side overpowering another*. However, in this context it's delivered with an exclamation ("My, my… oh yeah") that sounds more excited than tragic. This suggests a playful or upbeat tone despite the defeat imagery. There's no direct sexual content here, but the choice to start with a capitulation sets up a power dynamic metaphor right away – we're primed to expect someone in the story will likewise *surrender*.

"And I have met my destiny in quite a similar way." – Here the **narrator explicitly compares herself** to Napoleon [11]. She claims she's met her *destiny* similarly to how Napoleon met his at Waterloo. This line indicates that, like Napoleon, she has encountered an overpowering force she cannot resist – in this case, **her lover or the experience of falling in love**. The word *"destiny"* gives a sense of inevitability. There's a hint of **fate**: she was fated to lose this battle of love. Notably, describing a romantic surrender as "destiny" can romanticize the act of giving in, making it seem natural or preordained rather than something to question. There is no outright coercion described; instead, it's framed as fate that she *must* yield emotionally. This can be read as **romantic fatalism** – the idea that resisting is pointless because love's power is meant to conquer her. Whether this implies unhealthy submission depends on interpretation: is she truly without choice, or is she playfully exaggerating how smitten she is? The lyric leans into the drama of *inevitability*, which can border on implying lack of agency ("met my destiny" suggests she couldn't avoid this outcome).

"The history book on the shelf is always repeating itself." – This line broadens the metaphor and gives it a proverbial twist [12]. It implies that **history repeats**, and the scenario of a strong figure being defeated by a greater force (like Napoleon by the Allies, or a person by love) is a recurring pattern. In terms of romantic dynamics, it suggests **countless women (or men) have 'fallen' in love in the same surrendering way**. This normalizes the notion of capitulation in love as something age-old and common ("as old as history"). It somewhat trivializes the power imbalance by saying *this is how it always goes*. On one hand, it's a clever lyric tying back to the history theme; on the other, it might be read as

absolving the dynamic ("it always happens, so it's fine"). There's a whiff of the idea that **women inevitably end up submitting in love** because "history" decrees it – a generalization that feminist critics could certainly bristle at. Still, the tone remains upbeat and cheeky rather than literal doctrine. At this point, the song has set up its extended analogy: the singer is like Napoleon, about to surrender to an overwhelming love. The groundwork of a **dominance-submission metaphor** is clearly in place, though couched in lighthearted language.

Chorus: Defeat, Entrapment, and Devotion

"Waterloo – I was defeated, you won the war." – In the chorus, the narrator explicitly describes the outcome: **she lost and he won** [13]. Using "Waterloo" as a triumphant shout, she sings that she was *defeated* and *"you won the war."* This is the clearest expression of the power imbalance in the song. One person is the *victor* (the man, addressed as "you") and the other is the vanquished (the female singer). It portrays the romantic relationship in terms of **winner vs loser**. From a sexual ethics standpoint, this phrasing unabashedly romanticizes **dominance** (on his side) and **submission** (on hers). She is effectively celebrating his *conquest* of her. There is no hint of resentment; on the contrary, the tone is joyful – she sounds almost gleeful that he "won." This suggests *consent after the fact* – she's happy to have lost the battle of love. However, it does raise an eyebrow: is it healthy to view love as something one person *wins* at the expense of the other? The lyric can be taken as a playful exaggeration (love felt like a war and I'm happy I lost), yet it undeniably puts the man in a position of **power** ("you won") over the woman. There's an implicit assumption that such defeat is pleasurable for her (a notion that can be problematic if taken literally, but here it's metaphorical). Critics have noted that in "Waterloo," the female protagonist is **"defeated, trapped, [and] forced to surrender to her paramour's love"** [14] – a dynamic that is "cute" only insofar as it's not examined too deeply. This line epitomizes that dynamic: she's outright stating her defeat.

"Waterloo – promise to love you forever more." – Immediately after conceding defeat, the singer declares her unconditional love and loyalty to the victor [13]. The juxtaposition is striking: *because* he "won," she now *promises to love him forever*. This mirrors the idea of a **surrender on the victor's terms** – akin to a peace treaty in which the loser pledges fealty. In romantic terms, it means once he's "conquered" her heart, she is devoted permanently. This line **reinforces a potentially unhealthy dynamic**: the woman's future (loving forever) is now defined entirely by the man who overcame her. It can be read as *romantic* (eternal love is a common theme in love songs) but in context of the battle metaphor, it's almost like she's thanking the conqueror and vowing loyalty. One might ask, is her "promise to love him forever" truly her choice, or a condition of her surrender? The song frames it as her joyful decision – she's willingly pledging love. Yet the power dynamic is uneven; it's not described as a mutual vow, it's a one-sided promise. Feminist thinkers might point out that this reflects **traditional gender roles**: the woman's role after "losing" is to *devote herself* to the man, fulfilling the notion that a woman's happy ending is committing to a man (and that without him she's incomplete). Indeed, one modern critic argued that ABBA's oeuvre often encodes the message that "**women without men are nothing**" [15], and lines like this – where the woman's life mission becomes loving him "forever more" after he asserts power – exemplify that problematic sentiment. In a generous interpretation, though, this line is simply the *emotional resolution*: she's so in love that of course she'll love him forever. The ethical concern arises from the framing: it's a *consequence of defeat*.

"Waterloo – couldn't escape if I wanted to." – Here the song makes the power dynamic even more explicit. The narrator claims she **"couldn't escape"** this love "if [she] wanted to" [16]. This suggests *total surrender of agency*: even if she had the desire to get away, she was incapable of resisting. In a literal sense, such a statement edges into uncomfortable territory – it implies a lack of consent or even *entrapment*. Within the metaphor, it's meant to convey the irresistible pull of love; she's basically saying her attraction or his charm was so overwhelming that resistance was futile. But phrasing it as "couldn't

escape" carries a darker undertone. **Coercion** in relationships is typically not something to celebrate, yet the song presents this in a bubbly, positive light. Listeners at the time likely took this as a hyperbolic expression of infatuation (akin to "I'm hooked on you, there's no way out!"). However, from a sexual ethics perspective, lyrics like this can be seen as normalizing the idea that one partner can **overpower the will** of the other in romance. It's important to note the difference between *literal* and *figurative* meaning here. Figuratively, she means her feelings are too strong to run away from – a common theme in love songs (for example, "I can't fight this feeling anymore" in REO Speedwagon's power ballad, or any number of songs where love is an all-consuming force). Literally, if one "couldn't escape" a person, it would signal an abusive scenario. ABBA's intent was almost certainly figurative and lighthearted. Yet, in framing it as *her fate to be captured*, the song undeniably **romanticizes the notion of being "held" by love against one's initial will**. This is a classic pop trope (the irresistible lover), but it walks a fine line. Modern ears might find *"couldn't escape if I wanted"* to be an uncomfortable lyric, hinting at a lack of consent even though it's meant as "I fell so hard for you that I can't imagine leaving."

"Waterloo – knowing my fate is to be with you." – This line underscores the theme of **fate and inevitability** [17]. She accepts that her destiny ("fate") is to be with this person. The use of *"knowing my fate"* again implies that some force (destiny, or the man's will) has sealed her future. In context, it's a joyful acceptance – she's *happy* that this is her fate. But viewed critically, it reinforces that the outcome was never in doubt; her role was essentially to end up with him, and she has no personal alternative. It suggests a surrender not only of her physical presence but of her **future autonomy** – her fate is now tied to him. While romantic in tone, the lyric positions her as passive and **pre-determined** in the relationship. From a gender role standpoint, this resonates with traditional narratives where the woman's story ends when she "gets her man" – her fate is fulfilled through a man. There's an element of *resigned contentment* here: she "knows" it's meant to be, so she stops resisting. This can romanticize the idea that a woman's proper fate is to pair off with a man (an assumption second-wave feminists in the 1970s were actively challenging in society). It's worth noting how language like "fate" and "destiny" sugarcoat the imbalance – it's no longer that he's actively dominating her, it's that some cosmic destiny brought them together and she simply can't fight it. In effect, it removes blame from the man or the woman for any power play and hands it to fate. Still, the power dynamic remains: the fate in question was *her surrender*. She's finally "facing [her] Waterloo" – confronting the inevitable defeat – and accepting it with open arms.

"Waterloo – finally facing my Waterloo." – This repeating tag line wraps up the chorus with the central metaphor on full display [17]. **"Facing my Waterloo"** means she is finally confronting the moment of surrender. The word "finally" indicates she may have delayed or resisted up to now, but at last she's giving in. This confirms that there was a struggle and now it's ending in capitulation. In the narrative of the song, this is portrayed as a positive, even triumphant moment (the music is jubilant at this point). It's the *climax* of the story: she stopped fighting and yielded to love. From a romantic storytelling perspective, it's akin to the happy ending where the lovers unite because one confesses or gives in to their feelings. From a critical perspective, **it crystallizes the romanticization of defeat** – turning what could be viewed as a loss of agency into a celebratory outcome. The listener is encouraged to cheer along with her "Wa, wa, Waterloo!" refrain as she "faces her Waterloo." The ethical question is, should such a power-imbalanced scenario be portrayed as a joyous resolution? In 1974, few would have objected; it's presented as playful roleplay with historical metaphor. Only later do analysts ask whether glorifying the **"I can't resist you any longer"** trope feeds into unhealthy norms (such as the idea that a woman's initial resistance will eventually crumble if a man persists – a concept that can be misused to justify ignoring a partner's boundaries). At face value, however, "finally facing my Waterloo" just means *finally falling completely in love*. The battle is over; in love-song logic, that means the relationship can begin. It's simultaneously a submission and the start of a partnership, which is an interesting duality: she "loses" to him, and that loss *creates* the union that presumably both will enjoy. This duality ("I feel

like I win when I lose," as we'll see) is the linchpin that attempts to reconcile the power imbalance by saying *everyone's happy in the end*.

Verse 2: Resistance and Capitulation

(Verse 2 opens with a similar "My, my," as verse 1, signaling a continuation of her story. Here, the perspective shifts more directly to the dynamics between her and her lover.)

"My, my, I tried to hold you back but you were stronger, oh yeah…" – The narrator admits she **"tried to hold [him] back"** but *"you were stronger."* [18] This line depicts an actual struggle of wills. She attempted to *slow down or stop* the advance of his love (or perhaps his persuasive efforts), yet he overpowered her attempt. "You were stronger" can be understood in a few ways. Likely it means **his feelings/ persistence were stronger than her resolve to resist**. It might imply he was more determined in pursuing her than she was in pushing him away. In a purely emotional sense, it could mean his love for her (or the mutual love) was too strong to deny. However, phrased this way, it almost sounds physical – *he was stronger*. It's a fine choice of words: the songwriters probably intended a figurative meaning (stronger *emotionally* or *in will*), but literally it hints at a physical power imbalance as well. In a worst-case literal reading, it could be "I tried to stop you but you overpowered me," which veers into non-consensual territory. **Nothing else in the song suggests physical force**, so it's safer to interpret "hold you back" as *keep you at arm's length emotionally*, not as a physical fight. Nonetheless, the dynamic is one of **her resistance being overcome**. She acknowledges trying to say no or slow down, and he didn't relent. This is the classic narrative of persistent courtship – a staple of old romance films and songs – where one person pursues and the other eventually yields. Modern consent discourse tends to criticize this trope ("no means no," and persistent pressure is frowned upon). In 1974 pop, though, it was portrayed as romantic for a suitor to be "insistent" and for the beloved to *finally give in*. Indeed, recall the official description: an *"insistent suitor"* courting a girl until she surrenders [8]. This line encapsulates that: he was insistent (stronger in pursuit) and thus she couldn't hold him back. It implies that **his agency and desire trumped hers** in determining the course of the relationship. The ethical concern is that it normalizes a scenario where one partner's "no" or hesitation is merely an obstacle to be overcome, not a final decision – a notion at odds with healthy consent. Still, in the context of the song, we are led to believe that deep down she wanted to love him too; her resistance was perhaps half-hearted or driven by caution until love overwhelmed her.

"And now it seems my only chance is giving up the fight." – Having established that he was stronger, she concludes that her **"only chance"** now is to **stop fighting** [18]. This is effectively *capitulation*. The phrasing "only chance" is interesting – her chance for what? Presumably, her only chance to be happy or to resolve the situation is to surrender. It suggests that continuing to resist is futile ("no chance" of winning against him), so the *only viable option* is to yield. The word "fight" confirms that she did view their courtship as a struggle from her side. She was fighting off his advances or fighting against her own feelings, and that conflict has reached a point where surrender is depicted as a strategic choice. This line portrays **capitulation as something rational** ("only chance") because all other options are exhausted. In a love context, it again reinforces that resistance is temporary and *meant* to be overcome. By casting giving up as a positive solution, the lyrics romanticize the idea that a woman *should* eventually stop resisting a persistent lover for her own good. It feeds into the narrative that *to find happiness, one must relent*. If one were to look for coercion, this line could be a subtle red flag: the phrase "my only chance" can imply desperation or lack of alternatives, as if she's cornered. But since she's the one singing it, it comes across as her *decision* to relent, not something externally forced at gunpoint. It's a fine distinction – essentially the story is that **he wore down her defenses** to the point that even she agrees surrender is best. The consent here is *eventually given*, but only after persistence. This dynamic is precisely what some feminist commentators criticize in pop culture: the normalization of relentless pursuit until the woman says yes. Nonetheless, from the song's perspective, this moment

is liberating for her – she stops struggling and can embrace love. The ethical crux is whether we view her "fight" as a genuine no that got overridden or as a playful reluctance that she's relieved to drop. ABBA's tone strongly suggests the latter (there's relief and excitement in the chorus that follows, not trauma).

"And how could I ever refuse?" – This rhetorical question signals her final capitulation: she finds it impossible to *refuse* him [19]. It serves as a transition line leading into the chorus hook, but it's significant. The question "How could I ever refuse?" implies that saying *no* was not truly viable because the offer (his love) was too good or too powerful. It's another way of saying, *"I can't say no to you."* This sentiment is often intended as romantic flattery – meaning the person is so wonderful that of course you must say yes. However, it again toes the line on the consent issue. If one "cannot refuse," then one's consent is a foregone conclusion, not freely given. In context, she's likely marveling at her own change of heart: after all her attempts to hold back, she realizes she *can't resist* him because she loves him. The line drips with the capitulation theme – it's effectively an admission of **surrender of will**. From a romantic perspective, it's the moment of giving in to love with a sigh of "I give up – I'm yours." From a power dynamics perspective, it underscores that **his dominance in the situation is complete** – she literally cannot refuse him anything now. The fact that it's phrased as a question ("how could I…?") suggests that *resistance would have been unthinkable*, possibly because he's been so persistent or because love has made her unable to muster a "no." The ethical discomfort here is subtle but present: it paints an ideal where the pursued person's consent is essentially inevitable, not enthusiastic from the start but eventually *coerced by love*. Love itself is the coercive agent in the song's logic – a common theme in literature and music (where love is depicted as overpowering one's rational decisions). So while not describing literal force, "how could I refuse?" contributes to the song's overall romanticization of **irresistible dominance**. It's worth contrasting this with a healthier ideal where both parties freely choose each other without one having to beat down the other's resistance. The song isn't interested in that symmetrical scenario; it relishes the chase and surrender narrative.

"I feel like I win when I lose." – This famous line closes Verse 2 (and repeats as a refrain) [20]. It encapsulates the **paradox** at the heart of "Waterloo." The singer proclaims that *losing* (the battle of love) actually feels like *winning*. In other words, **she enjoys being "defeated"** because it leads to a positive outcome (being with her beloved). This is how the song resolves the apparent negativity of the surrender metaphor – by reframing the defeat as a *victory* of a different sort. She "wins" love and happiness by "losing" her defenses. This clever turn of phrase attempts to equalize things: it implies that both sides win, in a sense. He won the "war," but she wins *emotionally* because she gets love. This is the emotional justification for the entire metaphor. It tells the listener that her submission was in fact **consensual and pleasurable**, even empowering in its own way (since it's a "win" for her feelings). From a critical standpoint, "I feel like I win when I lose" is a classic example of *romanticizing defeat*. It's basically the anthem of **"surrender = sweet"**. The woman convinces herself (and us) that giving up her agency or battle is not only fine, but actually beneficial to her. This can be read as a form of coping or rationalization – she's taking agency in the only way left, by choosing to perceive her submission as a triumph. Feminist cultural critics might see this as the **internalization of patriarchal norms**: i.e. a woman is taught to find satisfaction in yielding, to consider it a "win" because it aligns with romantic ideals. Indeed, Simone de Beauvoir analyzed how women in love often *glorify self-sacrifice*, losing themselves in the man but feeling it's virtuous or fulfilling. De Beauvoir described this problematic phenomenon as a "**love of sacrificial self-abnegation**," where a woman *"surrenders [herself] to [her] partner"* and defines her whole self through that relationship [21]. She warns that this kind of love "effectively ends a person's independent capacity to choose" as they become an appendage of their partner [22]. "Waterloo"'s signature line – feeling like you win by losing yourself – could easily be seen as an example of exactly that dynamic Beauvoir cautioned against. The song, of course, presents it uncritically as a happy, catchy hook. It equates *romantic fulfillment* with *defeat of the self*. On the flip side, one could argue this line also contains a note of **empowerment through vulnerability**: by letting

down her guard (losing), she gains something valuable (love). In a healthy relationship context, sometimes one does "lose" an argument or give up some control and the partnership is better for it – compromise can feel like winning when it leads to mutual happiness. If we're charitable, we can interpret "I win when I lose" as saying *true love isn't a competition; both win when one stops treating it like one*. However, given the rest of the lyrics maintain a one-sided conqueror/conquered theme, the more straightforward reading is that she personally feels satisfied with being conquered. It's a decidedly *submissive* pleasure she's expressing. The complexity of this line is what makes the song intriguing to analyze: it's the moment where the song acknowledges the power imbalance but tries to resolve it by saying "don't worry, it's actually great for the one who submits." Whether one finds that acceptable or not may depend on one's view of romantic power dynamics. Many listeners simply find it a fun, relatable exaggeration of how love can humble you (you "lose" your cool or your heart, but you "win" love). Critics, especially from a feminist lens, may see it as glossing over the real issue of **imbalance and loss of self** in some romantic ideals.

Summation of the Narrative

By the end of the second verse and its famous last line, the narrative of "Waterloo" is clear: the female protagonist initially resists a man's advances, but his persistence and the force of love overpower her. She surrenders to him, discovering that in surrendering she actually gains the reward of love, which she deems a personal victory. The song then repeats the triumphant chorus, celebrating her capitulation as the best thing that could have happened to her (*"finally facing my Waterloo"* with joyful abandon). Throughout the lyrics, **coercion is implied in a figurative sense** – not that the man used violence, but that love itself was an overwhelming force and the man was "stronger" in will. The woman's agency is limited to the act of surrender; she has agency only in that *she chooses to stop resisting*. The man's agency drives the action (he "wins the war," he is the active pursuer). The power dynamic is unambiguously tilted: he leads, she follows; he conquers, she yields. Yet, the ethical shading of this dynamic is softened by the song's framing: she *welcomes* the outcome and even frames it as mutual happiness (her "win" inside her "loss"). There's a romantic notion here that *love conquers* one or both partners, and that being conquered by love is delightful.

In summary, line by line we've seen language that in another context could sound alarmingly like **romantic coercion** ("couldn't escape," "only chance is giving up," "you were stronger"), but in this pop song context it's meant to be metaphorical and benign – even empowering in a twisted way – because the "surrender" is emotionally consensual and joyful by the end. Still, the song undeniably **romanticizes dominance and submission** roles in a relationship. It makes dominance (on the man's part) seem heroic and submission (on the woman's part) seem desirable. There's no hint of a *mutual* surrender or equal meeting; the Napoleon-and-victor metaphor doesn't allow that. Next, we will explore how the songwriters themselves viewed these lyrics, how contemporary audiences and critics received them, and what cultural critics and feminist theorists have said about this kind of romantic portrayal.

Songwriters' Intent and Band Perspectives

When examining the ethical dimensions of "Waterloo," it's useful to ask: what did ABBA's creators intend by these lyrics? There's no evidence that Benny Andersson or Björn Ulvaeus (who composed the music) or Stig Anderson (who wrote most of the lyrics) set out to promote an unhealthy relationship model – rather, they wanted a **catchy, memorable song** suitable for Eurovision [23]. In interviews and retrospectives, the band members often emphasize the *fun* and novelty of the "Waterloo" concept rather than any deep message about relationships. Björn Ulvaeus has mentioned that musically the song was inspired by the joy of early rock 'n' roll (even citing The Beatles as an influence) [24], and the idea was to marry an upbeat tune with an unusual lyrical hook. Stig Anderson, known for clever wordplay, thought the historical metaphor would make the song stand out. As noted earlier, Stig "used

that historical event as a metaphor for a girl surrendering to the courting of an insistent suitor" [8]. This confirms that the lyric was deliberately crafted around the idea of **persistent courtship and eventual female surrender**, but presented in a playful manner. In essence, the writers were tapping into a classic romantic narrative (the chase) and giving it a novel twist (Napoleon's defeat) to create pop drama.

It's important to note that in the Swedish original and other language versions (ABBA recorded "Waterloo" in Swedish and German as well), the core metaphor and dynamic remain the same. The universality of the theme might have been seen as a feature – many listeners could identify with feeling *overpowered by love*. The German version, for instance, still portrays the woman as unable to resist ("Seit dem Tag ist es um mich gescheh'n," roughly "Since that day I've been done for") with Müller-Schwancke's translated lyrics echoing the surrender idea. This shows the band expected international audiences to understand and enjoy the metaphor without alarm.

ABBA's female members, Agnetha Fältskog and Anni-Frid (Frida) Lyngstad, who sang "Waterloo," have not publicly objected to the lyrics' content – at least not back in the '70s. They performed it with gusto, clad in glitzy outfits (and famously, silver boots and even a helmet with horns in some promo photos for a campy Napoleonic touch). The performance was very upbeat and somewhat tongue-in-cheek; Agnetha and Frida delivered lines like "I was defeated, you won the war" with winks and smiles. This performative aspect signaled to audiences that the song wasn't to be taken as a literal dramatic ballad of pain, but as a cheeky role-play of romantic submission. In the visual presentation, the women did not appear weak or sad – on the contrary, they appeared confident, having fun with the scenario. This complicates the interpretation: visually and vocally, they projected *agency* and joy, even as the lyrics put them in a submissive narrative. It's as if the band was saying, "We're in on the joke of this metaphor."

Björn Ulvaeus, who often wrote lyrics in later ABBA songs, has conceded that some early lyrics (like those on "Waterloo") were more about sound and impact than about nuanced storytelling. ABBA's primary goal was to create **irresistible pop**; any deeper interpretation came second. In the years following, ABBA songs did mature to cover more emotionally complex ground (infidelity in "SOS," divorce in "Knowing Me, Knowing You," heartbreak in "The Winner Takes It All"). But "Waterloo" comes from a more innocent, flamboyant era of their career where **dramatic imagery trumped realism**. The band likely saw "Waterloo"'s lyrics as a fun metaphor and were not consciously endorsing unhealthy power dynamics – they were, however, unconsciously reflecting the stereotypical courtship model of their time (persistent man, hesitant woman).

In interviews about Eurovision and "Waterloo," Björn and Benny have mostly talked about the song's musical success. For instance, Björn noted how "Waterloo" changed their lives by launching them internationally [25]. They rarely dissect the lyrics in interviews; the consensus in their camp seemed to be that the song was simply about "a girl who gives in and falls in love with her man" [26]. That straightforward description – *girl gives in* – shows that even the creators viewed it in terms of a giving in or surrender, but with no hint of seeing that as controversial. It was viewed as a happy, **storybook romance outcome**. Stig Anderson's legacy as a lyricist (celebrated in ABBA lore) includes the ability to distill broad emotions into accessible phrases. In "Waterloo," he distilled *falling head-over-heels in love* into a single vivid concept (meeting one's Waterloo). He probably did not anticipate that decades later, people would parse the song for sexual politics – indeed, ABBA's music in the '70s largely escaped such analysis because it was considered "harmless pop" [27].

It's also worth mentioning that at the time "Waterloo" was released, **Eurovision songs and pop songs generally favored broad, dramatic themes** that would instantly hook listeners, rather than subtle or progressive relationship depictions. In that sense, ABBA was aligning with commercial expectations. If

anything, using a battle metaphor for love was a bold creative choice (as one journalist quipped, "there simply are no other songs that link power-mad Mediterranean conquerors and acquiescent Swedish love-bunnies" [28] – ABBA did that and got noticed for it). The band likely saw the Napoleon-and-lover parallel as tongue-in-cheek and entertaining, not as an endorsement of actual male domination in relationships.

In conclusion, the songwriters' intent was to craft a **memorable, high-impact love song**, and they drew on conventional romantic tropes (strong pursuer, yielding lover) amplified by a historical allegory. ABBA's members embraced the song's campy theatricality. There's no indication from the band's perspective that they found the dynamic in "Waterloo" problematic; by all accounts, they viewed it as a **fictional, dramatic scenario** equivalent to acting out a role – much like one would in a musical or opera where metaphors of conquest in love are common. That said, they were products of their time, and as we'll see, some critics in later decades have looked back on those lyrics with a more critical eye that perhaps wasn't present in ABBA's own mindset during the 1970s.

1970s Cultural Context: Gender Norms in Pop Romance

To fully understand the reception of "Waterloo" and its sexual ethics, we must consider the cultural norms of the early 1970s. This was a period of **transition in gender roles** – the women's liberation movement (second-wave feminism) was underway, advocating for women's equality and autonomy in society and relationships. Yet, mainstream popular culture (especially pop music) often lagged behind or selectively engaged with those changing ideals. In 1974, pop lyrics were still frequently portraying **traditional heterosexual romance tropes**: men as active pursuers or protectors, women as objects of affection who either coyly resist or eagerly accept. It was common for songs to frame love as a game of chase, even a battle of the sexes, without much critique of that framework.

Comparatively, some contemporaneous songs did challenge norms – for example, Helen Reddy's feminist anthem "I Am Woman" (1971) was a hit that explicitly empowered women, and Loretta Lynn's "The Pill" (1975) boldly celebrated female sexual autonomy in country music. However, ABBA's domain was **pop music for a broad audience**, and their themes were generally apolitical and conventional in terms of romance. A look at other popular love songs of the era confirms that "Waterloo" was not out of place. Many female-sung hits from the '60s and '70s involve women longing for men or eventually succumbing to love. For instance, the 1963 girl-group classic "Be My Baby" by The Ronettes has a woman pleading for a man's affection (not resisting, but clearly putting the man in the driver's seat of the relationship). In 1975, The Stylistics' "Can't Give You Anything (But My Love)" – sung by a male lead – presents the man as the giver and the woman as the receiver who presumably waits for his love. The **idea of a woman being "conquered" by love** was woven into countless romance novels, films, and songs of mid-20th century culture. It wasn't usually framed as troubling; it was seen as romantic destiny.

Thus, when "Waterloo" came out, the vast majority of listeners (male and female) likely interpreted it as a fun, relatable exaggeration of how it feels to fall in love unwillingly. The battle metaphor was novel, but the underlying dynamic (persistent man, finally-willing woman) was familiar and mostly unquestioned. Notably, **no major controversy or feminist backlash erupted over "Waterloo" in the 1970s**. The song was celebrated – it won Eurovision, topped charts across Europe and beyond [3] [29], and became synonymous with ABBA's energetic, youthful image. If anything, some highbrow critics sneered at it for being *trivial pop*. For example, an often-cited critique was that ABBA's music was "bubblegum" and lyrically inane [30] [31]. Joe Queenan in *The Guardian* (2007) humorously noted that aside from "Waterloo"'s quasi-historical pretensions, much of ABBA's early output was not taken seriously by critics [32]. But those criticisms were about artistic merit, not ethical content. In the mid-'70s

rock press, ABBA's cheesy use of Napoleon might have raised eyebrows or chuckles, but **the gendered surrender theme was not singled out** as problematic at the time. It was essentially *invisible* as an issue due to how normalized it was in love songs.

It's also crucial to consider that Eurovision itself (the context in which "Waterloo" was introduced) was an arena known for spectacle and broad-strokes themes. Songs in Eurovision often aim for instantly understandable sentiments and grand imagery to win over an international audience in three minutes. ABBA's choice to use a universal metaphor of "surrendering to love" fit that bill perfectly – it's easily digestible. The theatricality of framing it as Waterloo likely helped them stand out and win. Eurovision entries weren't typically scrutinized for feminist messaging; they were judged on catchiness, performance, and appeal. ABBA delivered on those fronts with glittery costumes and a rollicking performance that made the surrender narrative seem like bubbly fun. The band members even posed in promotional photos with a Napoleon look-alike (as shown above) to play up the theme, indicating that **camp and humor** were part of the package.

In the broader 1970s pop culture, the notion of a woman's "no" turning into "yes" by the end of a story was widespread. Classic film romances often depicted heroines initially spurning a suitor only to relent when his true worth was proven (a trope going back to Jane Austen and earlier). This was seen as a happy resolution, not a dangerous one. It was generally presumed that the woman secretly *wanted* to say yes all along or that her initial resistance was due to propriety or fear, which the right man could overcome with persistence and charm. This is sometimes called the **"pursuit trope"** or "playing hard to get" in dating parlance. In fact, being an "insistent suitor" was portrayed as admirable male behavior in many narratives – a man who doesn't give up. ABBA's "Waterloo" slides neatly into that tradition: the suitor was insistent (stronger), and ultimately the woman's capitulation is framed as heartwarming.

That said, it's interesting that even in 1974, ABBA chose to put these words in the mouth of the *female* singers (Agnetha and Frida). The song is from the woman's perspective, describing her own surrender. One could argue this gave the woman a voice and a form of agency in narrating her experience, rather than the man singing victoriously about conquering her. If a man were singing "Waterloo" ("you were defeated, I won the war"), it would sound overtly triumphalist and arguably more disturbing. By making it first-person from the woman, ABBA perhaps softened the dynamic – it's self-described submission, which listeners may find more palatable because it implies *her acceptance*. This aligns with how the romance genre often works: we hear the woman's interior monologue of falling in love, which justifies the idea that her resistance was just a phase. This narrative device might have helped avoid accusations of misogyny at the time, since the woman's perspective is foregrounded (even if that perspective is basically "I love being dominated by you," it's expressed by the woman herself).

Additionally, ABBA's image in the '70s was not that of macho men and subjugated women – it was actually somewhat progressive in **presenting a group of equals** (two women, two men, all prominently featured). On album covers and TV performances, Agnetha and Frida were not relegated to demure backup roles; they were frontwomen. The men and women in ABBA often stood on equal footing visually. This gave an outward impression of *gender parity* in the group's dynamic. As one retrospective analysis points out, ABBA embodied "unmatched gender parity and equality" in their makeup, with "strong women and sensitive men who love and respect one another" being central to the group's image and appeal [33] [34]. This aspect endeared them to many, including LGBTQ audiences who saw in ABBA a kind of ideal of partnership and androgynous balance beyond traditional rock's machismo [35] [36]. While this doesn't change the content of "Waterloo"'s lyrics, it means that culturally ABBA wasn't viewed as a sexist enterprise; rather, they were seen as a wholesome mixed-gender group. In the 1970s, they were occasionally even dismissed as "syrupy" or too wholesome in contrast to edgier, male-dominated rock acts.

Furthermore, by the standards of the day, "Waterloo" likely read as a female sexual **liberation of sorts** in that the woman openly declares her love and desire ("promise to love you forevermore" isn't coy at all – it's a direct admission of devotion and presumably sexual/romantic commitment). The song is upbeat and celebratory about a woman's passion. Compared to older songs where women had to be very coy or where sex was only implied, "Waterloo" is relatively frank that *yes, the woman wants this man*. She might have resisted, but ultimately she enthusiastically consents ("I'm **promising** to love you forever"). In that light, some could argue it's a narrative of a woman **embracing her feelings** and *choosing* to be with someone despite initial hesitation – which is not inherently antifeminist. The fine line is between *choosing* and *having no choice*, and "Waterloo" blurs that line by using fate and defeat language.

In summary, the 1970s context meant that ABBA's "Waterloo" was not out of step with prevailing romantic storytelling. The norms of romantic expression tolerated and often glorified unequal power dynamics, so long as they culminated in a loving relationship. The song's reception was overwhelmingly positive, with listeners charmed by the catchy chorus rather than concerned with its implications. It's likely that had someone in 1974 raised an issue with the song's portrayal of the woman, they'd have been seen as overthinking a harmless pop ditty. Only with later decades' shifts in awareness do such questions come to the fore.

Critical and Feminist Perspectives: Then and Now

While "Waterloo" was not scrutinized for sexual politics upon release, subsequent commentary by music critics and feminist observers has re-examined ABBA's work (including this song) through a critical lens. In the 21st century, there's been a growing interest in analyzing the subtext of beloved pop songs, and ABBA is no exception. Here we'll explore how critics have interpreted "Waterloo" and ABBA's themes, from laudatory to scathing, and consider what feminist theorists have to say about the kind of dynamics this song represents.

One of the most direct critiques comes from a **2018 VICE article by Shaad D'Souza**, bluntly titled "ABBA's Music Was Sexist, But 'Mamma Mia' Helped Fix That." This piece singles out "Waterloo" as an example of problematic depiction of women in ABBA's lyrics. D'Souza writes that *"the metaphor, then, is that the protagonist of 'Waterloo' has been defeated, trapped, [and] forced to surrender to her paramour's love"* [14]. By calling the protagonist "trapped" and "forced to surrender," the article emphasizes the **lack of agency** and the element of coercion in the song's scenario. The tone ("It's cute, right?" the author adds sarcastically [37]) suggests that what ABBA presents as a cute metaphor actually masks a darker dynamic if taken seriously. The VICE piece goes further, arguing that *"women in ABBA's songs are, in some way or another, prisoners"* of love or circumstance [38]. It accuses songwriters Benny Andersson and Björn Ulvaeus of writing female characters as *"fragile and lonely women who are desperate for love and protection from men,"* projecting *"twisted fantasies"* and a worldview in which *"women without men are nothing."* [39]. This is a harsh assessment, and "Waterloo" is cited as part of that pattern – a woman essentially meaningless until "captured" by a man's love. The article even hyperbolically suggests Andersson and Ulvaeus "hated women," pointing to bitter lyrics in other songs as evidence [15].

This VICE critique is one of the strongest condemnations of ABBA's sexual politics, and it clearly sees "Waterloo" as *promoting unhealthy dynamics*. The unhealthy dynamic in question is the idea that a man's persistence is rewarded and the woman's role is to surrender and find fulfillment only in that surrender. From a **feminist ethics** perspective, this is indeed problematic: it valorizes power imbalance and could be read as endorsing the notion that "no" just needs more effort to turn into "yes." In real-life terms, that's a dangerous message, as it can blur boundaries and encourage disrespect for a woman's initial agency. The VICE article contextualizes ABBA's songwriting in the time period (noting some "reductive treatment of women" might be due to the era) [40], but it ultimately doesn't let them off the hook. It

highlights that for years such lyrics flew under the radar because ABBA was seen as *"harmless pop music… rarely subjected to intense analysis,"* effectively shielded by their catchy melodies and the perception of being beyond serious critique [27]. Now, with hindsight, critics are peeling back that shield.

On the other hand, not all modern commentary is negative. Some critics and academics have taken a more *celebratory or nuanced* view of ABBA's output and the "Waterloo" metaphor. For instance, Dr. Jadey O'Regan, a musicologist, noted that the lyrics of "Waterloo" were **"oblique"** in referencing a battle as a relationship metaphor, calling it unique and part of what made the song catchy and interesting [41]. This suggests an appreciation of the metaphor's creativity rather than a focus on its power implications. Music journalist and author Elisabeth Vincentelli has pointed out the inherent *contradictions* in many ABBA songs – musically sunny but lyrically sad, or vice versa – which intrigue listeners. "Waterloo" has forthright happy music and (seemingly) happy lyrics, but if you scratch the surface, the theme is one of *capitulation*. Some have noted that ABBA's brilliance lies in these kinds of contrasts and layers, which perhaps invite exactly the analysis we're doing.

A notable perspective comes from the **LGBTQ+ community and queer theorists**, who often embrace ABBA's music. An LA Times article in 2021 discussing how ABBA became beloved gay icons mentions the "romantic surrender" in "Waterloo" in a list of the band's signature themes [35] [42]. It describes ABBA's work as full of *"conflicts and contrasts,"* such as *"fortified instrumentation juxtaposed against romantic surrender ('Waterloo')"* [35]. Interestingly, the same article celebrates ABBA's gender dynamics, as noted earlier, highlighting their *gender parity and equality* and how ABBA presented "strong women and sensitive men who love and respect one another" [34]. To a gay audience that often felt alienated by hyper-macho or overtly heteronormative pop culture, ABBA's somewhat campy and egalitarian vibe was appealing. From that angle, *Waterloo*'s surrender could be seen as just an extravagant performance of love's drama, not a literal guide to relationships. The queer reading tends to enjoy the **kitsch and melodrama** of ABBA's narratives – e.g., the way *The Supremes* could sing about *"emotional enslavement"* (as the LA Times piece notes of songs like "You Keep Me Hangin' On") and yet those songs became anthems in gay clubs [43]. It suggests that marginalized audiences often interpret these "surrender to love" themes through a lens of *shared emotional intensity* rather than a simple man/woman power binary. For many fans, the emotional truth (love can feel overwhelming) resonates more than any literal subjugation theme.

Another point of defense can be found among ABBA's fan community and some retrospective critics who argue that ABBA's songs gave voice to women's emotions in a way that was rare in pop at the time. For example, although Vice lambasted songs like "Mamma Mia" or "Gimme! Gimme! Gimme!" as showing "broken, helpless" women [44], others note that those songs (and ABBA's ballads) actually explore women's perspectives on heartbreak and longing with honesty. In the case of "Waterloo," an ABBA fan or even a neutral defender might say: *the song isn't about a woman being oppressed; it's about a woman deciding to let love in*. She's the protagonist telling her story – that's agency in itself. Some even point out that "Waterloo" could have been sung by a man (the lyrics are not explicitly gendered except by context). Indeed, cover versions or stage performances could flip the script; one Reddit discussion noted that a male character sings "Waterloo" in certain performances of the *Mamma Mia!* stage musical as a duet, indicating the song's dynamic isn't inherently gender-locked – it's about whoever is in the position of resisting love eventually relenting [45]. This suggests the *power dynamic is situational* rather than a blanket statement about men and women generally. If viewed that way, "Waterloo" could just as easily be about a *man* who can't resist a *woman's* love (or any gender configuration), and the meaning wouldn't fundamentally change – one person yields to another's love. That universality might mitigate the sexism accusation slightly, though in ABBA's case it was clearly framed heteronormatively with a female singer surrendering to a male.

From an academic feminist theory perspective, as touched on earlier with Simone de Beauvoir, the dynamic in "Waterloo" can be critiqued as one of **unequal partnership**. Beauvoir championed the idea of *authentic love* as a meeting of equals where neither dominates nor dissolves themselves for the other [46]. "Waterloo" describes pretty much the opposite: love as a complete yielding of one self to another, a temporary inequality that presumably becomes a union. This falls into what Beauvoir would call inauthentic love, where one is the subject and the other the object (for a while at least). Another feminist writer, perhaps not directly commenting on ABBA but relevant, is **Janice Radway**, who in the 1980s studied romance novel readers. She observed that despite the seemingly submissive narratives in romance novels (where heroines often "tame" alpha males by eventually surrendering to love), readers – many of whom were women – found a form of satisfaction and even empowerment in these stories because they centered female emotional experience and guaranteed a caring outcome. Similarly, fans of "Waterloo" might argue that the song's narrative, while outwardly about submission, actually *centers the woman's feelings* ("I feel like I win…") and ensures she ends up loved. Radway and others have noted that women readers/listeners often interpret these "surrender" stories not as endorsements of oppression, but as affirmations that their emotional needs (to be truly loved after pushing the man to prove himself) will be met. In "Waterloo," the suitor essentially had to "win" by loving her persistently; her surrender comes once she's convinced (notice the lyric *"how could I ever refuse?"* – implying he made such a good case for himself or love made such a compelling argument that refusal no longer makes sense). In that framing, the power dynamic might be seen as a narrative device rather than a literal ideal – the woman's "no" is a test, and the man's "strength" is his devotion. Of course, this is *precisely* the kind of romantic notion that can be critiqued for encouraging unhealthy real-life courtship (where refusal is not taken at face value). But it's important to note how audiences often compartmentalize fiction versus reality in these matters.

We should also consider how the **musical "Mamma Mia!" (1999 stage, 2008 film)** recontextualized ABBA's songs and possibly "fixed" some of the perceived issues, as the VICE article title suggests. In the *Mamma Mia!* musical, ABBA songs are woven into a story about a single mother (Donna) and her daughter, with themes of female independence, friendship, and choosing one's own path. "Waterloo" is performed in the stage musical (usually as an encore number, somewhat outside the narrative, often just for fun during curtain call). In the 2018 film *Mamma Mia! Here We Go Again*, "Waterloo" is featured in a lighthearted sequence where a young man (Harry) sings it to a young woman (Donna) in a Paris restaurant, trying to woo her. In that context, the gender roles are actually flipped – the man is the one effectively saying *"how could I refuse; I feel like I win when I lose"* as he's instantly smitten with Donna. It's a playful scene, and by putting the song in a male character's mouth, it neutralizes the original's male-dominant framing. He's acting out the song to impress her, and she playfully dances with him but ultimately leaves – implying that *his* Waterloo (defeat) is that she doesn't stay with him, though it's a friendly goodbye. This reinterpretation in a feminist-spirited film (which *Mamma Mia 2* is, to a degree) shows how **flexible the song's meaning can be**. It became a fun romp about a nerdy guy falling hopelessly in love rather than a woman being conquered. The existence of such reinterpretations demonstrates that ABBA's lyrics, while written in a certain paradigm, can be reimagined. It also supports the idea that "Waterloo"'s problematic aspect isn't inherent to the metaphor itself but to how we apply gender to it. If any lover can "meet their Waterloo" in the sense of succumbing to love, it's not inherently a treatise on female submission; it's just the idiom of overwhelming love.

Feminist critics, however, would remind us that historically it is far more often the woman who is portrayed as the one who must submit, not the man. And ABBA's original kept that pattern. So while it's possible to flip it, the choice to frame it woman-surrenders-to-man in 1974 was simply following the entrenched trope.

In academic circles, one might also bring up the concept of **rape culture or "no means yes" narratives**, which are heavily criticized. Songs that blur the line of consent, even metaphorically,

contribute to normalizing persistence in face of refusal. “Waterloo” is mild compared to, say, some rock songs of the same era that had more explicitly predatory vibes. But it is part of a continuum of media that didn’t see a big issue with a bit of *“romantic conquest.”* It’s instructive to compare how society now reacts strongly against songs like “Blurred Lines” (2013) for implying non-consensual undertones, whereas “Waterloo” got a pass. The difference is partly that “Blurred Lines” was overtly sexual and had the man’s perspective pushing against a woman’s hesitation, whereas “Waterloo” couches everything in historical allegory and first-person capitulation. The latter is more palatable and seemingly innocent, which is why it has largely escaped censure. But from a feminist ethical standpoint, both can be placed in the broader category of media that *trivialize or romanticize the erosion of a woman’s initial autonomy* in a sexual/romantic context.

To sum up the critical perspectives: **Music journalists and cultural critics** acknowledge the catchy genius of “Waterloo” but some, like the VICE author, critique the song for its regressive subtext. **Feminist theorists** (directly or through applicable theory) would likely critique the song’s dynamic as one of unequal power and inauthentic love, where the woman’s identity and choice vanish in favor of being with a man. **Other critics and fans** defend or reinterpret the song as a benign exaggeration of mutual love or simply a product of its time that can be enjoyed without endorsing its literal implications.

The divergent views highlight an interesting point: **listener interpretation matters**. Many listeners have loved “Waterloo” for decades without feeling that it promotes anything harmful – they see it as a dramatized way to say “I fell head over heels.” Others, looking at it through a modern ethical lens, recognize the unhealthy pattern it represents. Both can be true: the song *both* reflects an antiquated idea of romance *and* is largely understood by its audience in a tongue-in-cheek way.

Evolving Resonance and Conclusion

Over 45 years since “Waterloo” burst onto the scene, the standards of sexual ethics in popular media have evolved. What was once accepted without question – the portrayal of a woman’s resistance melting under a man’s persistence – is now often critically examined. Contemporary audiences are more attuned to issues of consent, equality, and the problematic nature of glorifying one-sided power dynamics in relationships. In this climate, a song like “Waterloo” can provoke mixed reactions. Some younger listeners might hear the lyrics and cringe at lines like “couldn’t escape if I wanted to,” perceiving a whiff of toxicity. Others, especially those who grew up with the song or encounter it in a joyous context (like a musical or wedding dance floor), still embrace it as an essentially innocent celebration of love’s triumph.

One might ask: **does “Waterloo” promote unhealthy dynamics, or simply portray them?** The answer can depend on interpretation. The song undoubtedly *portrays* a dynamic where one partner yields to another. Whether it *promotes* it is subtler – the triumphant, upbeat nature certainly doesn’t cast that dynamic in a negative light. It makes it look fun and exciting. There is no caution or critique within the song; it’s all-in on the romance of surrender. So in that sense, yes, it normalizes and even encourages the idea that being conquered in love is desirable. However, it’s also so exaggerated and metaphorical that most people do not take it as literal relationship advice. It operates in the realm of fantasy and melodrama.

In the context of ABBA’s larger body of work, “Waterloo” is one of their more *naively joyful* songs. As ABBA matured, their later songs like **“The Winner Takes It All” (1980)** dealt with power dynamics in love in a much more somber, realistic way (depicting the aftermath of a breakup, implying that one person often ends up hurt while the other “takes it all”). By that point, the songwriters – and indeed society – had a more nuanced view of relationships. It’s telling that in “The Winner Takes It All,” which

Björn Ulvaeus has said was inspired by his divorce from Agnetha [47], the “winner/loser” metaphor is actually portrayed as heartbreaking and hollow, not celebratory. The *same duo* that once cheerfully sang “I feel like I win when I lose” later delivered the line *“the winner takes it all, the loser standing small”* with a very different mood. This suggests that within a few years, even ABBA explored the darker side of the imbalanced relationship equation. But “Waterloo” remains frozen in its Eurovision pop bubble – a time capsule of early ’70s exuberance and simplicity.

Today, how we hear “Waterloo” can be colored by awareness. A listener informed by feminist critique might enjoy the song’s sound but remain uneasy about singing along to “you won the war” earnestly. Yet, another listener might contextualize it as *a metaphor not meant to be dissected*, much like one can watch an old romantic comedy with outdated gender roles and still find charm in it, recognizing it as a product of its time.

In pop culture, *metaphors of battles for love* are still quite common (we still hear phrases like “love is a battlefield,” thanks to Pat Benatar’s 1983 song, for example). What has changed is the sensitivity to making sure that in reality, love isn’t about one side defeating the other’s will. Modern romantic comedies, for instance, have shifted more towards themes of mutual choice and respect, and if a character is “persistent” against someone’s rejection, it’s often portrayed critically or for humor rather than as straight-up romantic. The concept of **enthusiastic consent** has entered mainstream discourse: the idea that both parties should be clearly on board, not reluctantly cajoled. “Waterloo” doesn’t fit neatly with that concept; it’s all about reluctant cajoling (albeit by Cupid’s force if not the man’s).

However, because “Waterloo” is couched in metaphor and sung with glee, it tends to get a pass. It’s even frequently included in feel-good playlists, movies, and events without controversy. The song’s metaphor might actually shield it: by talking about Napoleon, it places itself at a storybook distance. Listeners are less likely to think of real-life coercive scenarios and more of playful analogies. If the song literally said “I said no but you kept pushing and I finally gave in,” it would sound much worse, right? Instead we get “I tried to hold you back but you were stronger... giving up the fight” – lines that veil the scenario in poetic terms. This speaks to how songwriting can sugarcoat dynamics in a way that slips into people’s hearts without triggering defense mechanisms. It’s a reminder that catchy art can make us sing along to ideas that, on paper, might trouble us.

In conclusion, ABBA’s “Waterloo” stands as a brilliantly crafted pop song that uses the metaphor of historical defeat to dramatize the experience of falling helplessly in love. Line by line, we’ve seen that it undeniably sets up a dominant-versus-submissive romantic scenario: the woman surrenders to an “insistent” man’s love and finds joy in that surrender. While intended playfully, the lyrics do imply coercion in the sense of overwhelming persistence and capitulation, and they do romanticize an unequal power dynamic (the man’s will prevails, the woman’s resistance crumbles). In the cultural context of the 1970s, this was a standard romantic plot device, and ABBA delivered it with such hook-filled flair that it won Europe’s heart. From a modern standpoint, such a dynamic can be viewed as promoting unhealthy ideas if one were to take it as a model – namely that “no” just needs some persistence and that a woman’s proper fate is to give in to a man. Feminist critics have rightfully pointed out these issues, using “Waterloo” and similar songs to illustrate how pop culture often inadvertently reinforced patriarchal notions. Yet, the song’s legacy hasn’t suffered from these critiques; it remains beloved and is often enjoyed with a sense of nostalgia and irony. “Waterloo” may have a **retrograde theme** when analyzed seriously, but it’s also wrapped in ABBA’s empowering package of strong vocals, infectious melody, and the image of two confident women fronting the band. This complicates a one-dimensional reading of it as simply “sexist.” Like much of ABBA’s music, it lives in a space between pure camp and genuine feeling.

Ultimately, “Waterloo” can teach us about the evolution of our collective understanding of romantic ethics. We can still love the song and sing along to its “aha!” moments, while also acknowledging the ways in which love was metaphorically portrayed as a conqueror to be submitted to. It’s a catchy reminder of how far we’ve come in questioning the narratives of love – and perhaps also of how enduring those narratives are, given that people still find the idea of being “swept away” by love appealing. As listeners, we can hold both truths: that *love* sometimes feels like a surrender, and that *healthy relationships* in real life work best as partnerships of equals. ABBA’s “Waterloo” sits at the intersection of those ideas, a sparkling product of its era that continues to resonate, whether as a carefree dance-floor anthem or a case study in romantic power dynamics.

Sources:

- ABBA Official Site – *In Focus: Waterloo!* (song background and Stig Anderson’s metaphor) [8]
- Smooth Radio – *The Story of “Waterloo”* (song meaning summary and chart success) [4] [3]
- Vice – Shaad D’Souza, *“ABBA’s Music Was Sexist, But ‘Mamma Mia’ Helped Fix That”* (feminist critique of ABBA’s lyrics, including “Waterloo”) [14] [15]
- The Guardian – Joe Queenan, *“Waterloo: I feel like I win when I lose”* (satirical analysis of the song’s historical metaphor and lyrics) [28]
- Los Angeles Times – *“How ABBA became beloved gay icons”* (discussion of ABBA’s appeal, noting “Waterloo” as romantic surrender and highlighting the group’s gender parity) [35] [34]
- The Guardian – Caroline Sullivan, *“Money, Money, Money! How can I resist it?”* (1999 article reflecting on ABBA’s revival, mentions confusion over “Waterloo” lyrics) [48]
- University of Sydney News – *“ABBA: 50 years since Waterloo”* (Dr. Jadey O’Regan’s commentary on the song’s impact and unique lyrical metaphor) [41]
- Big Think – *“The 2 pitfalls of love, according to Simone de Beauvoir”* (exploration of Beauvoir’s views on domination vs. surrender in love, relevant to the song’s theme) [21] [46] .

---

[1] [3] [4] [7] [26] [29] The Story of... 'Waterloo' by ABBA - Smooth
https://www.smoothradio.com/features/the-story-of/abba-waterloo-lyrics-meaning-eurovision-video/

[2] [23] [41] ABBA: 50 years since Waterloo - The University of Sydney
https://www.sydney.edu.au/news-opinion/news/2024/04/05/abba-50-years-waterloo-music-sweden-pop-expert.html

[5] “Waterloo” by ABBA - Oldies Music
https://greatsong.charmingflowers.com.vn/waterloo-by-abba

[6] Gerd Müller-Schwanke - Muso
https://credits.muso.ai/profile/a49782d6-e749-4744-bc83-10c932c6e6a1

[8] In Focus: Waterloo! | ABBA
https://abbasite.com/articles/waterloo-39-years-since-abbas-breakthrough/

[9] Why did ABBA sing about Napoleon/Waterloo/Wellington ... - Quora
https://www.quora.com/Why-did-ABBA-sing-about-Napoleon-Waterloo-Wellington-and-whats-the-meaning-Also-whats-the-meaning-behind-voulez-vous-Voulez-vous-what-And-why-in-French-when-90-of-the-songs-lyrics-are-in-English

[10] [11] [12] [13] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] 13 Waterloo | ABBA
https://abbasite.com/tracks/13-waterloo/

[14] [15] [27] [37] [38] [39] [40] [44] ABBA’s Music Was Sexist, But ‘Mamma Mia’ Helped Fix That
https://www.vice.com/en/article/mamma-mia-movie-feminist-reimagining-abba-benny-bjorn-essay-2018/

[21] [22] [46] The 2 major pitfalls of love, according to de Beauvoir- Big Think
https://bigthink.com/thinking/problems-with-love/

24 How the Beatles Influenced ABBA's 'Waterloo' - Ultimate Classic Rock
https://ultimateclassicrock.com/beatles-abba-waterloo/

25 ABBA star Björn Ulvaeus: Waterloo took us from rat race - Sky News
https://news.sky.com/story/abba-star-bjorn-ulvaeus-waterloo-took-us-from-rat-race-i-wish-that-for-other-songwriters-12297381

28 30 31 32 Waterloo: I feel like I win when I lose | Music | The Guardian
https://www.theguardian.com/music/2007/oct/05/abba

33 34 35 36 42 43 How ABBA became beloved gay icons: the surprising story - Los Angeles Times
https://www.latimes.com/entertainment-arts/music/story/2021-11-04/abba-voyage-dancing-queen-gay-icons

45 Debunking of a Bullshit Article : r/ABBA - Reddit
https://www.reddit.com/r/ABBA/comments/gn0sl8/debunking_of_a_bullshit_article/

47 What is that song about? – ABBA Omnibus | 25 years
https://abbaomnibus.com/songs/what-is-that-song-about/

48 Money, money, Money! How can I resist it? | West End | The Guardian
https://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/1999/mar/24/features11.g21