6 ‘Hope I Die Before I Get Old’: Social Rebellion and Social Diseases.

Clifford Williamson

1. Introduction

This chapter chronicles the development of the anxieties about the impact of modern popular music since its emergence in the mid-1950s. It offers an introduction to the history of popular music since 1955 and the various ways in which it has interacted with the issues of delinquency, deviance and disorder. It will then consider the approaches taken by scholars to the significance of popular music as a contributory factor in patterns of criminality and deviance. Here three themes are discussed. First, we will outline the emergence of popular music as a legitimate subject for historical analysis. Second, we will investigate how the debate on subcultures associated with specific popular music genres gained academic credibility via cultural studies. Third, we will delineate the dialogue on deviance as it has developed since the 1950s gradually gaining a foothold in scholarly circles.

The final section of the chapter will look at the case study of the ‘pay-party’ movement within the Rave phenomenon of the mid 1980s and early 1990s. ‘Pay-parties’ were clandestine events organised via anonymous mobile telephone services where patrons were given directions to a location where they paid for entrance to a so-called ‘Acid House rave.’ The reasons for focussing on this topic are numerous. First the panics and anxieties associated with Rave were many and related to a variety of issues such as public safety, mass trespass, road safety, mass

misuse of drugs, organised crime, and anti-social behaviour, to name just a few. Second the political interest in rave (and in the 'pay-party' movement more specifically) was in excess of any other popular music associated panics. For instance there would be three different pieces of legislation passed in the UK in 1989, 1994 and 1997 which attempted to control the rave scene: this was an unprecedented number. The debate around rave was about lifestyle, leisure and libertarianism; about the boundaries of behaviour between the legal and the illegal. In some ways, it was also about the normalising of deviance based on individual interpretations of just law and personal freedom and what to do about mass law-breaking. For instance, it was estimated that at the height of the rave fad, around 300,000 people consumed MDMA (Ecstasy) every weekend.[1] This kind of statistic illustrated how in some respects drugs seemed to be becoming a major feature of the behaviours of many young people and this in turn entrenched the notion that a mass drugs culture had arrived.

The debate also re-ignited discussion of the generation gap. Furthermore, it raised questions of rural versus urban and suburban communities with the weekend 'pay-party' rave scene largely made up of mobile youngsters from the cities partying in fields in the country. Prominent amongst those who raised concerns about rave parties were MPs from rural Wiltshire and Somerset who felt threatened by these interlopers, as they saw them.[2] The rave scene also emphasised a clash between mainstream culture and a re-emergent counterculture. Ravers found allies in their campaign to resist attempts to limit where they could party in the residual elements of the '60s hippies and the peace convoys which had grown off the back of the anti-nuclear movement and who were now fashioned in the media as 'New Age

Travellers.'[3] They too had claimed that their freedom of movement and lifestyle had been curtailed and had been met with violence when they attempted to gather at certain places. Most notably this occurred at Stonehenge in 1985 when more than 400 people were arrested by the Wiltshire police during the so-called 'Battle of the Beanfield'.[4] The rave controversy therefore saw the collision of a whole series of elements not just related to the music but to behaviour, attitudes, lifestyle and drugs. Many of these elements were regarded, especially by those in authority, as an anathema and as deviant threats to the social order. As such, the rave scene, and the 'pay-party' movement more specifically, provides a perfect case study for this chapter and indeed for the book more broadly.

2. Chronology

The whole period described as the modern era of popular music (that is from roughly 1955 through to the present day) has been subject to periodic anxieties, or what some observers such as Stanley Cohen have called 'moral panics'.[5] These are episodes where concerns have been voiced about the influence and impact of the performers and subcultures associated with various genres of popular music. From the violence associated with the so-called Teddy Boys of the 1950s, through to the media outrage over members of reality show pop group One Direction being shown smoking marijuana joints in 2014, politicians, the police and media campaigners amongst others have sought to stigmatise, criminalise or shame such deviancy and to limit the influence they may have had on the behaviours of the nations' youth.[6] The strategies employed in the pursuit of these objectives have been varied from legislation to censorship and from to social exclusion through to outright violence against those associated with subcultures.

The discussion of popular music alongside other themes in this volume may at first seem trivial. Can the occasional media fascination with the words and behaviours of superficial pop stars and their fans compare with an analysis of terrorism, murder or rape? There does seem to be a major imbalance in terms of scale and severity that we need to bear in mind. For example in 1965, Myra Hindley and Ian Brady were arrested on suspicion of the murder of three children. In the same year all three members of the Rolling Stones were fined £5 each for public urination. [7] As a representation of the polarities of deviance it is hard to find such a wide variation in behaviour. Yet five young men found relieving themselves behind a garage in Romford was world news. Yet the issues surrounding popular music in modern Britain have not always been this trivial. They have been serious, momentous and sometimes catastrophic. This section deals chronologically with some of the controversies that have been part and parcel of the era.

a) Pre-Rock'n'Roll era.

It is important to start with an awareness that the debates about delinquency and deviance relating to youth and music predate the emergence of 'Rock'n'Roll in the mid-1950s. Indeed, it has been an omnipresent concern stretching back centuries as correcting the behaviours of youth enabled society to properly inculcate in them the standards of citizenship and civilisation. Even in the twentieth century, and particularly after the Second World War, there was a pre-existing dialogue on behaviour as it related to the leisure time and popular culture of youth and the moral development of young people as evidenced by the 1947 Clarke Report *School and Life*. [8] This anxiety was established early in the twentieth century with the

popularisation of Jazz music in the 1920s, followed by swing music in the 1930s and 1940s. Despite the economic difficulties of the time it was estimated that the wages of young people (those between 14 and 20) rose during the interwar period. Boys saw an increase in salary of 300%, whilst girls enjoyed an uplift of more than 500% at this time.[9] Although the bulk of these wages were handed over to parents to help in the upkeep of the family home, there was still, nonetheless, considerable disposable income amongst British youth to spend on leisure time activities such as the cinema and the dance hall.[10]

Three themes emerged in the interwar period about the influences that popular music and the activities associated with it had on young people. First there were anxieties about external cultural influences particularly those coming from America such as Jazz. This was often mixed with racial concerns with one Oxford don describing the new sound as 'Nigger music (that) comes from the Devil'.[11] Second, there were a whole series of fears that the dance hall - the main venue for listening and dancing to jazz - was causing moral and intellectual decline. It was said that men and women dancing in such close proximity would inevitably encourage immorality. Indeed, one dance hall denizen who contributed to various Mass Observation surveys neatly summed up their role by saying 'The chief function of the dance halls is to get young people together…' they were locations where '…sexuality could be explored.'[12] The fear of the dance halls could turn into panic. There was one notable case in Cambridge in 1931 where the owner of a dance hall was accused and convicted of running a disorderly house, when a police raid discovered that a number of undergraduates were found in the arms of local women and one even had his hand on a girl's knee.[13] For the most part however there was effective

moral policing of the halls, with supervisors stalking the dance floor making sure that there 'was no funny business' going on.[14] What happened after they left the venues was another matter. There were other concerns about the impact of dancing. Book publishers for instance became worried that the dance hall craze was leading to a decline in people reading books[15], and there was at least one case of dance halls breaking the law prohibiting dancing on a Sunday.[16] The third and final anxiety that emerged during the interwar period related to fears that dance halls would become arenas for street gangs to fight turf wars. It seems that some of this concern was well placed. It was not uncommon for instance, for local *Palais de Danse* to be troubled by violence instigated by rival members of local gangs. There were violent incidents recorded in London in 1926 and in 1932. In 1934 in Glasgow there was a murder associated with violence in dance halls in which thirteen gang members were charged.[17]

Concerns about dance halls reached their peak in wartime. In both the Great War and in the Second World War dance halls were a major focus for moral campaigners who sought to target unescorted women and dissuade them from frequenting such establishments. However, the exercise of moral control proved to be difficult, as one women pointed out: 'Britain seemed so dull and corny, the yanks gave us cigarettes and chewing gum and the music was fantastic…Who wants to listen to schmaltzy music when you are young and can dance to the 'A-train' with the Yanks.'[18] The allure and affluence of American servicemen has undoubtedly become part of the folklore of the Second World War. In Glasgow, religious groups organised volunteers to trawl the cafes, restaurants and dance halls in order to try and persuade young women to leave these venues. Such were the fears over the potential for vice and

immorality that at times groups tried to use the police to enforce some kind of moral curfew on women. As was the case in the interwar period, the dance hall could be the scene of violence in the 1940s and 1950s. For instance, the US Navy shore patrol regarded the Criterion Dance Hall in Londonderry as the most dangerous location in the city for disorderly behaviour and fighting.[19] Aside from all of these concerns there were again problems with the nature of the dancing. Even more then was the case with previous dances, the jitterbug, with its energetic character and manhandling of the female dancers, was looked upon with horror by some. US Billboard magazine for instance claimed that there was a campaign in Britain to ban the jitterbug from dance halls and bars with jukeboxes where young people would dance.[20]

What was important about the musical culture of the pre-Rock'n'Roll era was the way in which the three themes discussed would be the precursors of concerns writ much larger in the second half of the twentieth century. An analysis of public concerns regarding popular music in the interwar period helps us not only to map out the anxities which would figure prominently in subsequent decades but it also demonstrates that fears about behaviour, concerns about delinquency of various sorts and the potentially corrupting influence of American music were well established and entrenched in discourses about popular culture and society by 1945. There would, of course, be differences. Adolescents would become more independent after the Second World War, with many leaving the family home to go into higher education and experiment with new lifestyle choices for example the number of young people at university had risen from in 50,000 1938/39 to 235,000 by 1970/71.[21] For those who still stayed at home, they would have even greater

disposable income. The average income of young manual workers would increase from £2.18s in 1948 to £6.6s.7d. by 1960 and with this came access to technologies which would accelerate access to consumer goods notably with the advent of transistor radios, cheap vinyl records and modestly priced players for them.[22]

b) Rock'n'Roll

After the Second World War in particular, there was an awareness of a gap opening up between the generations. Young people between the ages of 14 and 20 would come to feature prominently in the controversies over popular music. Paul Rock and Stanley Cohen characterised the generational division as being facilitated by the 'relative economic emancipation of working class adolescents.' [23] Increasing economic independence was joined with a second feature identified by Rock and Cohen, an increasing reliance of some sections of youth on the advice and example of their peers as opposed to their parents as major role models in shaping behaviour.[24] This was seemingly a global or at least a western trend in socialisation. It was identified in the USA and increasingly elsewhere in the early 1950s. It would, in time, turn the generation gap into a generational schism especially, as we shall see, in the 1960s.

The first identifiable group to emerge from this generational gap in the UK at least, were the Teddy Boys. The 'Teds' came to prominence in the middle of 1953 following a fatal disturbance in Clapham in south London.[25] They were called 'Teds' or the 'New Edwardians' due to the fact that many of the youngsters caught up in the violence were seen to be wearing Edwardian style frock coats; a fashion trend borrowed from upper class ex-army officers who had championed the look as a way

to differentiate themselves from the 'spiv' style of suits that predominated in capital in the post-war period.[26] In the aftermath of the Clapham murder, the media jumped all over the issue and produced a whole series of nightmarish reports on the criminal character and generally deviant nature of the 'Teds'. The moral panic generated by the 'Teds' predated the emergence of Rock'n'Roll in Britain. In fact, as Pamela Horn argues, the whole issue of 'misdoing of youth loomed large as focus of public attention' after the Second World War.[27] This was exemplified by the 1949 *Mass-Observation* report on Juvenile Delinquency and also by the 1955 King George Jubilee Fund report *Citizens of To-morrow* both of which looked at the influences shaping the behaviour of Britain's youth.[28]

The fusion of deviance with popular music took place in 1956 with the arrival of the movie *Blackboard Jungle* that had as its main theme juvenile delinquency but it was not this that caused the controversy. Rather, it was the soundtrack of the film and in particular the track *Rock Around the Clock* by Bill Haley and the Comets that seemed to cause significant unrest with a number of cinemas. When later in the year a movie of the same title was released to cash in on the Rock'n'Roll craze there was a number of disturbances leading to the being banned in Bristol, Ipswich and a number of other places.[29] This collision of popular cultural phenomenon would be the template for future concerns and patterns of moral panic.

The response of 'moral entrepreneurs' was multifaceted. There were some who blamed a supposedly lenient criminal justice system for the increasing incorrigibility of youth, pointing to the abolition of birching for young offenders as a result of the 1948 Criminal Justice Act. Indeed, there was an attempt to restore birching in 1961

in the British House of Commons but it did not gain much support.[30] There were those who blamed American cultural imperialism. Then there were those that pointed to societal issues such as concerns about National Service with conscription. This issue was seen as the cause of some bad behaviour due to the gap between leaving school for the majority at 15 years of age and eligibility for National Service at the age of 18. This left youngsters with insufficient activities to do with their free time prior to service. However, some individuals maintained the view that National Service had its advantages for youth. As once in the services, there was evidence that individuals such as the Teddy Boys were quite easily turned into good citizens. The perceived lack of youth leadership would be a further major theme in the discussion of 'the Ted scare'. It had been identified by the Kings Jubilee Fund as an issue in 1955 and the 1961 Wotton Report on the Youth Service called for the revitalisation of the organisation as crucial to address the problem of directionless young delinquents as exemplified by 'the Teds'.[31] As with most moral panics, after the initial furore and action, the issue gradually fell out of prominence. 'The Teds' themselves entered adulthood, settled down, or moved on to the next fashion and musical trend.

'The Teds' would never totally disappear however. Some gave up their frock coats for leather jackets to become rockers. Others took their cue from the sartorial precision and dynamism of the new Edwardians and maintained their passion for being well dressed. They started to adopt the 'Italian look' as it was described, with fitted suits and short haircuts drawn from images from the increasingly popular output of Italian cinema. Some even went as far to adopt the scooters which were omnipresent in Italy by the start of the Sixties. A few stayed loyal to 'the Ted'

lifestyle, leaving a residual presence that would remain influential and often referenced in future popular cultural trends. Most notably, the ethos of 'the Teds' would be instrumental in the development of punk rock both in terms of style and in the basic character of the music.

c) Mods and Rockers

In the study of deviance and delinquency in popular music, the era of the clashes between 'mods' and 'rockers' in the holiday resorts of the United Kingdom during 1964 and 1965 figures very prominently. For Stanley Cohen for instance, they were the focus of his ground-breaking study of the nature of 'moral panics' in modern Britain.[32] For Clive Bloom the 'mods' and 'rockers' lifestyles and behaviour revealed a '…shift in values from those of the austere war generation to the newly affluent baby-boomers.' These youths were, he said '…trapped between British inertia and unobtainable American opportunity.'[33]

On the last weeked in March 1964, at the seaside resort of Clacton-upon-sea in Essex, a series of disturbances took place between competing gangs of men the police intervened and nearly 100 were arrested.[34] Most of these arrests were for minor charges relating to criminal damage. However, some were for more serious offences such as assault with a deadly weapon and malicious wounding. [35] Throughout the next few months, there were other examples of similar disorder in other holiday resorts including Bournemouth and Brighton.[36] The men involved were identified as the moderns or 'mods'. They were well-dressed and well groomed taking their style of clothing and distinctive motor scooters from the current wave of popular Italian films. Their adversaries were styled 'rockers'. They too had a

distinctive look sporting greased coifs, long sideburns and dressed in leathers, copying the look of American movie stars such as Marlon Brando and James Dean. These two groups were also defined by musical tastes with the 'mods' acolytes of American soul and blues or the new British blues scene led by the Rolling Stones and the Yardbirds while the musical taste of the 'rockers' was much older, as they remained devotees of mid-1950s Rock'n'Roll movement.[37]

On the back of the disorder, which occurred, there was much media sensationalism with the headlines screaming 'Wildest Ones Yet!' in the *Daily Sketch* and the *Daily Mirror* 'Wild Ones "Beat Up" Margate' after a major disturbances at the seaside resort on the weekend of 16th/17th May 1964.[38] Urgent questions were asked in the House of Commons to the Home Secretary about the ability of the law to deal with such outbreaks of violence.[39] The Home Secretary initially sought to reassure the House that there was more than enough in terms of legal devices and police to cope with future outbreaks. Yet within weeks there would be a whirlwind of legislative activity which was intended not only to deal with the disorder directly, but also to impact upon the role that 'pep-pills' (such as Drinmyl or purple hearts as they were popularly known), may have played in shaping the behaviour of the youngsters involved in the incidents. Parliament quickly passed the Malicious Damages Act of 1964 and the 1964 Misuse of Drugs Act.[40] Outside of Parliament, there was anxiety at the meaning of the turmoil - what it meant for youth, what it meant for society and what it meant for the future. Even the Pope was to get involved. While addressing 1,000 Rovers of the Catholic Scouting Association Pope John XXIII lamented 'the unhappy faces of the Teddy boys…the Mods and Rockers' which he said revealed

'…profound, piteous dramas filled with sorrow, lack of trust, vice, badness and delinquency.'[41]

There were four significant aspects of the 'mods' and 'rockers' episode which are of importance to our study. First was the class composition of the 'mods', in particular. In a study published in *The Times* newspaper based on those remanded in custody during the disturbances, it was argued that many of the youngsters caught up in violence came from 'respectable' suburban backgrounds.[42] This was a departure from the predominant image of delinquency as a working-class problem as evidenced by the 'Teddy Boys' of the 1950s. The spread of nihilism and hooliganism into the suburban middle classes was regarded with horror. Parents were blamed and they also blamed themselves for the advent of the so-called 'respectable thug'. One parent quoted in *The Times* felt that she had been too lenient in terms of discipline, a fact she now lamented.[43] However, for some, even the usual recourse to corporal punishment was insufficient. Another parent quoted in the article for instance, pointed out that his son was seemingly immune to a 'thrashing'. The second key aspect of the 'mods' and 'rockers' episode related to the impact of the abolition of National Service and whether the two were linked. In the discussions about 'the Teds' for example, there was often reference made to the role of conscription in helping to eliminate anti-social tendencies.[44] Without it there was arguably no effective means of controlling or channeling youthful high spirits or misbehaviour in a positive direction.

The third significant aspect of the disorder was the emergence of open warfare between some popular music subcultures.[45] The two groups were identifiable as

subcultures through dress and mode of transportation, but the major thing that divided them was their musical loyalties. It had always been acknowledged that locality, religion and sports allegiances could spark off disorder, but choice of music was for the United Kingdom at least, a unique development. A final aspect of the episode that was held to be important and was routinely commented on was the lifestyles of the 'mods' and the 'rockers'. The chairman of the Brighton Council of Youth had compiled a survey based on interviews with over 500 youngsters found in coffee bars over the spring and summer of 1964. The survey discovered the 62% of the 'mods' questioned had tried drugs. The proliferation of drugs amongst 'rockers' was 42%. Sexual attitudes were also surveyed with 73% of male 'mods' claiming to have had intercourse and 28% of females. 'Rockers' seemed to have been less promiscuous (or less willing to admit to being so) with 60% of boys and only 12% of girls claiming to be sexually active. How accurate or reliable the report was is debatable, but according to this survey, youth culture was certainly evolving into one involving 'sex, drugs and Rock'n'Roll' or 'sex, drugs and Soul' if you were a mod.[46]

d) The Sixties

After the furor over 'mods' and 'rockers', popular music underwent a considerable cultural transformation and for a short time became a virtuous representation of change. The engine of this change was the global impact of 'The Beatles'. 'The Fab Four', as they were affectionately known, were representative of all the social and cultural changes of the era including the triumph of popular music, the end of deference, the end of elitism in culture and perhaps most significantly, the rise of youth. Moral campaigners found some aspects of the appeal of the band problematic. Beatlemania was sometimes disorderly. The flocks of hysterical

teenagers who screamed at any and every sight of the band were regarded with disapproval. Paul Johnson writing in the New Statesman called them 'a collective portrait of generation enslaved by a commercial machine.'[47] The group had been carefully managed and presented as the cheeky but clean-cut boys next door. It was an image that seduced all aspects of popular culture and society at the time. 'The Beatles' were feted by the popular press and the intelligentsia. With politicians seeking to use a bit of star power in the new age of television politics, the British monarchy too had to bow to Beatle power awarding the band MBEs in 1965 for services to music and business as the UKs best export brand. 'The Beatles' became the kings of swinging London a city that was achieving global recognition for its cultural trendsetting.[48]

Gradually, however, there was to be a revival of anxieties about the role of popular music as the Sixties progressed. 'The Beatles' themselves had caused some controversy, less so in Britain than elsewhere. In the Unites States of America for instance, a comment attributed to John Lennon in 1966, that to some young people 'The Beatles' were bigger than Jesus, provoked a major backlash especially in the Bible belt, with a number of radio stations and churches calling for a boycott of their shows.[49] In Japan, anti-Beatles protests took place from those who abhorred the extent of the influence that western culture, as represented by 'The Beatles', was now having across Japanese society.[50] More serious was an international incident caused when the band snubbed, or was alleged to have snubbed, the wife of the dictator of the Philippines Ferdinand Marcos.[51]

'The Beatles' were able to ride out most of these storms, but their putative rivals 'The Rolling Stones' were not so lucky. 'The Stones' management cultivated an image of menace and danger for the group, best summed up by the slogan: 'Would you let your daughter go out with a Rolling Stone?'[52] Where 'The Beatles' sang 'I Want to Hold your Hand', 'The Stones' sang 'Let's Spend the Night Together'. In 1965, while 'The Beatles' were getting MBEs, 'The Stones' were up on a charge of disorderly behavior after three band members were caught by the police urinating against a wall. Found guilty, the three were fined £5 each.[53] More serious for the band was when first Brian Jones, and then Mick Jagger and Keith Richards were arrested for the possession of illegal drugs in early 1967.[54]

The mid-1960s saw increasing political attention given over to the issues relating to the misuse of drugs and their intimate association with the subcultures of popular music. In 1961, the United Nations Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs called for action on the cultivation of cannabis. The British government wrote this into law with the 1964 Dangerous Drugs Act and in the same year passed the Drugs (Prevention of Misuse) Act 1964, which targeted amphetamines.[55] In 1966, the Prevention of the Misuse of Drugs Modification Order outlawed LSD.[56] The 1967 equivalent legislation increased the powers of search and seizure available to the police and customs officers.[57] The definitive legislative response to concerns towards recreational drug use was to be the 1971 Misuse of Drugs Act.[58] This act is still the basis of British drug law today.

It was not just the Stones that found themselves in trouble over drugs the folk singer Donovan was arrested in 1966. The previously untouchable Beatles had their

run in with the police with both John Lennon in 1968 and George Harrison in 1970 convicted of possession. Quite why these particular stars were singled out remains controversial. For the likes of Keith Richards it was an attempt by the 'establishment' as he refereed to it to clamp down of youth culture.[59] For writers such as Dominic Sandbrook, the crackdown was more as a result of a revolt by middle class moralists seeking to reverse the permissive tide of the late 1960s.[60]

e) Punk

The era of punk, from roughly 1975 to 1980, brought a whole series of controversies and issues to the fore covering such themes as obscenity, blasphemy, iconoclasm, racism and anti-social behaviour. Of all of the musical subcultures associated with deviance and delinquency, it is punk that is the most synonymous with misbehaviour. Indeed, many of the leading lights of the movement seemed to encourage disorder. The manager of the quintessential punk band 'The Sex Pistols', Malcolm McLaren, himself a former member of King Mob an offshoot of the anarchist group 'Situationalist International', promoted the idea of 'cash from chaos'.[61] His outspoken views inspired significant degrees of outrage, ostracism, and alienation that were to push some punks onto the peripheries of society, but it was also a movement that gave a sense of identity and a voice to people and groups that seemed to have been bypassed by the mainstream.

The arrival of punk on the national stage in Britain occurred during a television interview with 'The Sex Pistols' on *the Bill Grundy Show* in 1976. It was to be the start of a firestorm of media outrage which resulted in the band (which was just about to start their 'Anarchy' tour as it was called) being turned into pariahs. Workers at the

main EMI record-pressing plant at Hayes refused to handle any 'Sex Pistols' records.[62] University Chancellors, Student Union Presidents and local councillors cancelled gigs. 'The Sex Pistols' were scheduled to play twenty-seven concerts on their tour but they only ended up being allowed to play five.[63] The hysteria of the Grundy aftermath saw traditional arenas of free speech such as universities pretty much forced into censorship. Trades Unions, at a time of radical industrial action, also backed their members when they boycotted handling 'Sex Pistols' records.[64] The undoubted impact of this series of events is analysed by Keith Gildart in his work *Images of England through Popular Music*. Gildart argues that the 'Anarchy' tour was not just a moral panic, but it was also '…a particular cultural/political event that formed one response to a sense of change.'[65] 'The Sex Pistols' and punk rock became symbols of a delinquent epoch and of a nation, that for some people at least, had gone from swinging to dystopian within a decade.

Although this initial phase of panic would subside, it would be followed in 1977 by a further series of episodes that would consolidate the impression of punk as anathema and punks as deviant. 1977 was the Silver Jubilee of the accession of Queen Elizabeth II. 'The Sex Pistols' released the track 'God Save the Queen' to coincide with the anniversary. Such a provocative title was bound to be a problem; it was not played on the radio, except on the music show of John Peel and many of the chain stores refused to stock it.[66] The artwork on the single cover by Jamie Reid featured the Queen with a safety pin through her nose and was accordingly banned from displays.[67] Reid himself was beaten up for his trouble. Despite this, on its release, the record went towards the top of the charts selling 150,000 copies in five days.[68] Punk energised a whole subculture to copy and emulate the do-it-yourself

ethos with fanzines, self-financed records and shops to distribute them. [69] The success of 'God Save the Queen' was testimony to the power of this underground movement.

It proved impossible for punk in general and for 'The Sex Pistols' in particular to avoid trouble. The release of the their album *Never Mind the Bollocks* later in 1977 resulted in charges of obscenity under the Indecent Advertising Act of 1899 being levelled. [70] Interestingly, the case revolved around the meaning of the word 'Bollocks', and not the content of the record more generally. In defence of title, Virgin Records employed as a star witness James Kingsley the Professor of English Literature at Nottingham University. Professor Kingsley discussed the origins and usage of the word from its original meaning as a small ball to an expression of exasperation. He took the title in this context to mean 'Never mind the nonsense, here is The Sex Pistols'.[71] The Magistrate in his own words 'reluctantly' agreed with this interpretation and dismissed all charges. [72] This was the first in a series of obscenity trials relating to punk. For instance, 'The Anti-Nowhere League' and 'Crass' were successfully prosecuted in 1982 and 1984 respectively under the 1959 Obscene Publications Act.[73] All the remaining copies of 'The Anti-Nowhere League' record 'So What' were destroyed. 'Crass' were partially successful on appeal, with only one of their songs *Beta Motel* from the album *Penis Envy* declared obscene.[74]

The punk movement also highlighted some of the lifestyle alternatives of the 1970s such as squatting and collective living. By 1979 there was an estimated 50,000 squatters in the United Kingdom of whom 30,000 were in London.[75] Almost all of the punk pioneers, including Joe Strummer of 'The Clash' and John Lydon of 'The Sex

Pistols' had been a squatter at one time or another.[76] Steve Platt, writing in the monograph *Squatting: The Real Story* argued that squatting was 'the harbinger of a new style of social and political activity.'[77] Some of those who would eventually be characterised as 'anarcho-punks' would take the quasi-political rhetoric inherent in punk and translate it into direct action. Glasper described them as '…making punk a movement as opposed to merely an outlandish fashion statement.'[78] Worley went further and argued that they were 'the basis for an alternative society.' [79] These punks, sometimes called 'crusties', would eventually find common cause with the remnants of the Free Festival Movement and other outsider movements occasionally characterised as 'new age travellers' the fate of which will be made clear in the case study in this chapter on Rave.

This section has highlighted a selected number of controversies over the period covered in this volume. They are by no means the only concerns over popular music and the subcultures associated with them. There was contemporaneous to punk the growing disquiet in some circles about Reggae music and the behaviour of the growing number of West Indian youths adopting Rastafarianism as a culture.[80] The years following the high watermark of punk were characterised as the post-punk era and they had their share of anxieties associated with them. They ranged from the growth of 'Oi' a splinter movement which was to become increasing associated with racism and the National Front to the anarcho-punks such as Crash who, as already noted, on a number of occasions fell foul of the authorities over obscenity [81]. Also later in the eighties was the rise of hip-hop and rap and the frequent clashes over public order, sexism and racism, which accompanied this new musical genre.[82]

The main examples highlighted were chosen the illuminated the broad trends of the issues around music and young people. These ranged from concerns about sexual impropriety in the Jazz age, through the delinquency associated with the Teddy Boys, the mass disorder of the mods and rockers era, the growing alarm about the drug culture of the sixties and the compendium of fears raised by punk. In the case study of rave that follows later in this chapter we see all of these issues collide in a mega panic, which will bring down the wrath of the state and society upon the patron of this new cultural movement.

3. Historiography

For the most part, the study of popular music has been divided between the 'popular' and the 'professional' or scholarly. 'Popular writing' is that produced by the music press or the fanzine or the Internet fan sites for the consumption of 'fandom' reflecting the obsessions and interests of enthusiasts. This is not to say that they are unimportant or inferior. The music press has been crucial in the chronicling and critiquing of the genre. Indeed, some of this work has attained significant scholarly respect such as the publication *New Musical Express* in Britain or *Rolling Stone* in the United States. Fanzines have also been much used in academic studies and there has been a general acknowledgement that works such as *Sniffin Glue* or *Boy's Own* are vital insights into the world of the fan, as well as being crucial in their own eras in popularising many music genres notably punk and rave. Matthew Worley summed up the role of fanzines by saying '…punk fanzines served as a product of agency, a means of participation and a platform for creative and political expression.'[83]

Professional scholarship relating to popular music has been gaining creditability over the last forty years. There are now a number of peer-reviewed journals covering the history of popular music. Notably these include *Popular Music and Society*, which started in 1971, *Popular Music History* established in 2004, and more recently *Rock Music Studies* in 2014.[84] Most are interdisciplinary, mixing musicology, studies of technology and sociology amongst many other forms of academic discipline. In terms of monograph publications, the study of the history of popular music has remained dominated by biographies, 'bandographies' and extended reviews of the works of individual performers or groups or genres.[85] This is not to disparage such outputs as the works of journalists such as Simon Reynolds, Jon Savage and Matthew Collin which are widely quoted in this chapter.

Academia has been very slow in treating the history of popular music seriously. In terms of historical works, there have been very few major publications covering the British music scene. Arguably, there is literally nothing to compare with *All Shook Up* by Glenn Altschler - a major study on the role of Rock'n'Roll in shaping the racial, sexual and generational politics of the United States of America in the 1950s.[86] Keith Gildart attributes this scholarly reticence on the part of the British to 'the overall "conservatism" of the profession and an orthodoxy suggesting that the role ascribed to popular music and its impact…owes more to "myth" than "reality".' [87] Gildart himself sought to establish the scholarly legitimacy of the study of popular music with his 2013 monograph *Images of England Through Popular Music*. In it he argued that popular music was '…an important cultural, social and political force in post war English society' and therefore relevant as a factor in understanding identity and social change.[88]

Due to the dearth of scholarly activity in the British context, much of the scholarly work on deviance and popular music has been established in disciplines other than history. It has been in sociology and its latent offspring cultural studies for instance, where the issues discussed in this chapter have been initially developed. Starting with Howard Becker's *The Outsiders* in 1963, Stanley Cohen's *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* in 1973, through to Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson in *Resistance through Rituals* in 1976 and Richard Hebdige's *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* in 1979, we have a substantial literature on the concept and use of moral panics and the deviance associated with certain subcultures created as a result of the emergence and popularity of pop and rock music. Although in many cases they have been challenged as scholarly orthodoxy, particularly the works of Cohen and Hebdige, they remain vital staging posts in the emergence of academic interest in the popular music and its followers and establishing the scholarly legitimacy of the field.

It was Cohen, for instance, who identified the process by which alleged deviant behaviour was identified and addressed.[89] And, it was Hebdige who was to chronicle the crucial role played by popular music genre in shaping youth subcultures and the sense of identity that was felt by those who were often regarded as pariahs and outsiders. [90] Becker gave shape to the concept of labelling deviants and the consequences of social exclusion and he also derived the notion of the 'moral entrepreneur', who sought to exploit anxieties about deviance to pursue political or behavioural change.[91] Hall and Jefferson, on the other hand, examined the way in which groups manifested dissent through collective behaviours. [92] All of these pioneering works have laid the basis for further study and their crossover appeal into

the historical profession has allowed the topic of popular music to at last be regarded as legitimate in studies of the past.

4. Case Study – The 'Pay-Party' Movement in the Rave Era.

During the middle to late 1980s in the United Kingdom, there emerged a new youth subculture built around dancing called 'rave' or 'acid house'.[93] It was initially based around nightclubs, but as its popularity grew, promoters began to hire larger venues or rent out warehouse or farm buildings to accommodate the numbers who wanted to dance the night away. As many of the larger venues were outside of the main cities and into the countryside, urban and suburban clubbers formed large twilight and dawn convoys to get to and from the locations. This brought the 'ravers', as they were called, to the attention of the authorities - initially the police and local authorities - due to the noise and disruption said to have been caused and owing to the fact that many of the events were not licensed under existing legislation. The media and other 'moral entrepreneurs' also focused upon the open proliferation of illegal drugs, most notably MDMA or ecstasy which was a central feature of the subculture.[94]

What became known as the 'rave' or 'acid house' scene was comprised of three key elements: the music, the event and the drugs. The music called 'house' had emerged in the nightclubs of the American mid-west, most notably in Detroit and Chicago in the mid-1980s. It was a synthesis of electronic beats, sounds and pre-recorded samples mixed by a DJ into elongated beat driven dance music.[95] The second element was the event: the all-nighter. These were evenings of dancing that lasted well beyond the regular licensed hours of clubs that were popular in the holiday destinations of the Mediterranean, most notably the Balearic Islands of which

Ibiza was the most famous. Since the 1960s, Ibiza had been a popular resort for the package holiday crowd but also a bohemian refuge and in the latter part of the decade it became a vital stop-off on the hippy trail. [96] It retained its hedonistic character into the 1980s where youngsters seeking new thrills rediscovered it. The final element of the 'rave' scene was the role of drugs especially MDMA (3,4-methylenedioxy-*N*-methylamphetamine). The German pharmaceutical company Merck had developed this substance in 1912, but it never really found a place as a therapeutic treatment and it was used variously as a truth drug, in marriage therapy and in psychotherapy. [97] It did find a place as part of the buffet of drugs in the psychedelic era however, and it was notorious enough in the UK in 1970s to be placed in category A of the 1971 Dangerous Drugs Act in 1977, although it remained legal in the USA till the 1990s. [98] Since the 'mod' era, all-nighters had required artificial energy to keep dancers going. The house scene was no different but the drug of choice had a special contribution to make to the success and notoriety of the subculture. Since the early 1980s, MDMA had been popular in the club scene where it was known as variously as X-T-C or X or ecstasy.[99] It had the unique qualities of enhancing the music, making the flashing lights more vivid and it produced an empathetic response that helped to create a sense of collective euphoria.[100]Dancers were 'loved up' in the vernacular of the scene and for some it was to be an almost religious experience. Indeed ecstasy was to be instrumental in stimulating in a revived interest in alternative spiritualism in elements of the club scene.[101]

According to Simon Reynolds, the first attempt to 'recreate the Balearic' experience was in 1985 at the Project Club in Stretham initiated by the DJ Paul Oakenfold.[102] This was followed in 1987 with the setting up of the first club solely devoted to

'house' called Shoom.[103] It was at Shoom that the iconography and look of 'acid house' took shape with the adoption of the smiley face logo and clubbers in baggy clothes that were either tie-dyed or consisted of luminous day-glo colours. Gradually across London and in other parts of the United Kingdom, acid house nights were taking place in clubs and new venues were being opened to accommodate the fad. So widespread was the subculture that it even had its fanzine called 'Boys Own' which started publication in 1986.[104] The crowds gathering to the scene were a mix of hipsters, celebrities, Ibiza veterans and oddly, football hooligans, known as 'acid casuals' looking for afterhours drinking.[105] The venues also grew from small weekly club nights to all night, every night parties in the larger city centre clubs. Eventually, these too proved to be too small for the numbers involved and so the 'scene' migrated to any larger empty space that could be hired or broken into. Technicians then wired up to the mains to power lights and sound systems and clubbers reached the venues via public transport or walking. The occupation of some of these venues resulted in a crackdown by the police who were gradually to chase the 'pay-parties' (as they came to be) called out of the city and into the suburbs and beyond.[106]

The 'rave scene' was to become particularly vulnerable to organized crime as it required increasing quantities of MDMA to satisfy demand. In the end, it was the only stimulant required as clubbers eschewed alcohol. Early in the 'scene' it had been procured in small amounts by clubbers visiting the likes of Amsterdam and Ibiza and bringing the drug back undetected through customs.[107] Now as the number of clubs mushroomed and the size of the audience increased, it was a big business that could only be satisfied via the networks provided by drug gangs.[108] It was the drug connection that brought the 'scene' to the media's attention with *The Sun* newspaper

publishing an exposé of the acid house scene in June 1989.[109]. Yet early coverage of the subculture was ambiguous as *The Sun* marketed its own line in 'acid house' apparel alongside its reportage of 'rave scene' events.[110]

In 1989, a major development took place that was to transform the politics and legal aspects of the 'rave' scene. Two entrepreneurs of the London acid house parties Tony Colston-Hayer and Dave Roberts, became frustrated at the crackdown on 'pay-parties' in the capital by the Met police force, and so they decided to take the 'scene' into the countryside.[111] Making use of recently introduced mobile telephones and British Telecom's 'Voice Bank System', they transmitted information to 5,000 subscribers to a mailing list about the venues and time of raves.[112] The first took place in April at South Warnborough. There followed a summer of such events characterized as the 'Second Summer of Love'.[113] Clubbers not only made use of new technology but also the recently completed M25 orbital motorway around London to gain easy access to the Home Counties as well as interchanges to the M4 which opened them up to possible venues in the south and west of England, setting off a firestorm of local protests such as in Wortham in Kent in the late summer of 1989 where locals said they were subject to an 'Acid House Ordeal' when ravers descended on their locality[114].

During the 1984-85 Miner's Strike in Britain, to counter 'flying pickets' from striking coal areas reaching collieries in other locations, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) had formed a liaison committee which used the national reporting centre to monitor and intercept buses carrying pickets and prevent them from reaching their chosen destinations.[115] A key event in the campaign was the closing

of the Dartford tunnel in Kent to flying pickets. The supervising officer at that time was Chief Superintendent Ken Tappenden and by 1989, he was now Commander in North Kent (an area bisected by the M25). At his behest a 'Pay-Party Unit' was created which used all of the know-how gleaned from the Miners' Strike, to counter the party organisation strategies of Roberts and Colston-Hoyer. [116] The use of intercepts, of phone tapping or the restrictions of movement, all considered highly dubious when they were used in 1984-85, were now freely deployed to stop convoys of teenagers partying. For many, this episode evidenced that there was some kind of culture war being fought in Britain between youth and the older generations. In many ways it was an updated skirmish in a battle fought by successive waves of young people throughout the century as chronicled by many other examples in this chapter. What stood out in the era of the pay-party was the comprehensive character of the intervention by the state with policing strategies more readily recognisable from major industrial disputes employed to suppress the raves. It would see legislation introduced on an unprecedented scale to counter movement, as will be discussed below, and the longevity of the panic extending from 1988 until 1997. Concerns about Mods and Rockers fizzled out within a few months of the first seaside incidents; punk had its most significant period under the microscope from the middle of 1976 till the end of 1977 but rave would continue to raise anxieties for nearly a decade.

Throughout the first half of 1989, there were a slew of headlines that would eventually force the Thatcher administration to support legislation intended to crack down on the 'pay-party' movement. In March there was the first reported death associated with Ecstasy.[117] There were also reports of fraud. In one case, bogus

party organisers had sold 15,000 tickets at £15 a head for a party that was supposed to take place at Thorpe Park. There was no such event however, and the fraudsters absconded with an estimated £225,000.[118] The 'scene' also became associated with other nefarious activities as it was claimed that partygoers had looted a petrol station in Essex on the way to a rave.[119] During the summer, and in response to an outrage over a raucous acid house party in Berkshire, the Home Secretary (Douglas Hurd) signalled that there could be further action after he called for a full report into this event and others like it and the Chief Superintendent of Aylesbury Police also called for new legislation to deal with the problems caused by the parties.[120]

The first move towards a crackdown was made by the police when after the annual Conference of the Association of Chief Police Constables on 2nd October 1989, a new intelligence unit was created to address the lack of co-ordination between police forces as partygoers crossed jurisdictional lines between police authorities. Seven forces were to co-operate in this venture Kent, Essex, Sussex, Surrey, Hampshire, Hertfordshire, and Thames Valley.[121] At the same time, moves were made to disrupt the ability of party organisers to communicate and promote the location of the venues to ravers for the 'pay-parties' via special rate phone lines. The Independent Committee for the Supervision of Telephone Services instructed the main providers of these services - BT, Mercury and Vodaphone - to end the facility, as it was a breach of the Committee's code of conduct.[122] Every means available was being mobilised to address the 'threat' acid house parties within the terms of existing legislation and through the 'creative' policing strategies both again unprecedented actions in the annals of the history of popular music and deviance. When these were shown to be inadequate the government was to step in, and again in an

unprecedented move act specifically to counter a trend in the popular musical culture of youth.

Despite increasing government interest in the issue, it was to be a private member's bill that would legislate to restrict the rave scene. Graham Bright MP for Luton South introduced a bill in in early 1990. His purpose in bringing it forward was that it,

> … aims to ensure that our young people can go to parties to dance and enjoy music, confident that they are in a safe environment, without making the lives of nearby residents a misery and endangering their own lives. Stiffer penalties for those who are exploiting them are the readiest way of doing that.[123]

The Entertainments (Increased Penalties) Bill 1990 introduced a new range of fines and prohibitions on party organisers under the disparate collection of local authority rules and bylaws. The prospect of legislation had provoked a considerable outcry amongst the 'acid house' community. Coylston-Halter for instance recruited Paul Staines, a weekend raver and a Conservative Party activist with considerable contacts in politics, to help co-ordinate the media side of the 'Freedom to Party Campaign' - a loose coalition of acid house ravers and promoters.[124] The group organised a series of demonstrations in London to raise awareness of the cause and to lobby parliament. The first demo attracted about 5,000 people according to organisers, but the second was a major disappointment with only a few hundred gathering in the capital in the rain.[125]

The fizzling out of the Freedom to Party group was an odd end to what seemed to be the political mobilization of a mass music subculture. However the group was never

that well organised. It was largely the work of Staines and Coylston-Halter who used all the influence they could muster to generate publicity and despite the false promise of the first rally ravers did not seem to be all that political. Highlighting as it did the gap between the possibilities for political activism with the general indifference experienced. Worley's conclusion in his study of the failure of the political groups to mobilise punks is also very relevant to the rave scene. He said:

> 'Rather than secure lasting support, such a focus helped reaffirm notions of individualism and cultural experimentation that lent themselves more to a political fragmentation or disengagement than to activism…'[126]

During the passage of the 1994 Criminal Justice Act another attempt was made by the left to mobilise ravers with a similar experience of boom and bust.[127]

The debate on the rave scene was not just a spat between the younger and older generations over the safety of the parties or between the authoritarian right and the liberal left over lifestyle choices. There was also a debate within the right between 'traditional' conservatives and libertarian conservatives. Libertarianism had been gathering pace within Conservative Party during the 1970s through the likes of the 'Monday Club', 'Committee for a Free Britain' and the 'Federation of Conservative Students'. The most authoritative statement on conservative libertarianism and acid house parties came from the aforementioned Paul Staines in an article for the Libertarian Alliance Political Notes in 1991. He attacked those who he described as the 'Lifestyle Police' and the 'Safety Nazis' for a 'hysterical smear campaign' against 'free market dance party entrepreneurs.'[128] His criticism encompassed what he saw as the totalitarianism of the state which used all manner of repression to stop people having a good time. He decried what he saw as the arcane nature of licensing laws

arguing that they were an '…area crying out for Thatcherite deregulation.'[129] The use of the language of the free market and laissez-faire is notable at a time where they were very much dominating intellectual discourse.

The advent of the Increased Penalties Act (IPA) was a decisive moment in the history of the rave scene. The prospect of a fine of £20,000 or a prison sentence was enough to discourage many from promoting 'pay-parties'. Prior to the IPA, fines under existing legislation could be absorbed as legitimate business expenses as a maximum of only £2,000 could be imposed, but the prospect of the entire profit from one event being extracted as a penalty proved to be too much for some.[130] Yet as Collin has argued, although at first glance it seemed that the 'ravers had been utterly defeated' it was also the case 'that raves became integrated into the infrastructure of the entertainment industry.' [131] With more liberal licensing laws enacted in many locations the way was paved for a new generation of super clubs to allow ravers, in the words of Simon Reynolds, to continue 'the living dream of rave.'[132]

The suppression of the pay-party brought to an end the first and arguably the most important of the panics associated with rave and acid house culture. The state had dealt a considerable blow to the movement. However it would not be completely eradicated and from 1990 through to 1997 there would be periodic revivals of the anxieties associated with the phenomenon. This would result in further in political and judicial action to deal with those who still wanted to dance and take ecstasy. Clauses would be added to the 1994 Criminal Justice Act to outlaw outdoor gatherings where music with repetitive beats was played.[133] In 1997, The Public Entertainment Licenses (Drugs Misuse) Act[134] was passed after a clubber called

Leah Betts who had taken ecstasy had died. The cause of death was judged to be *hyponatremia* or water intoxication after falling ill at a nightclub in 1995.[135]. The act sought to close venues where it could be established drugs were being sold. It was however the pay-party panic which was to introduce all the parameters of the debate: illegal assembly, trespass, disorder and drug misuse. There were the key issues, which would shape future action.

5. Conclusion.

The 1997 Act brought an end to the long period of the rave panic and indeed to some extent the era of controversy over popular music in the United Kingdom. Although there have been notable episodes of concern such as the aforementioned One Direction scandal, they have not had the same shattering impact on Britain in terms of society, culture and the law. That is not to say that panics over popular music and deviance will not reoccur in the future, but we can look at the twentieth century period as a definable epoch in which pop music was the main characteristic of youth culture and therefore the priority and obsession of moral campaigners.

Throughout the twentieth century the paradigm of the panics related to popular music was fashioned. In the era of Jazz and Swing the template was set: with concern expressed about the malign influence of popular music on behaviour, etiquette and sexual morals. The notion of dance hall as a transgressive venue was also sketched out in this period, with dancing gradually breaking down the physical space between the sexes, and possibly inhibitions as well. Also it could be an arena of violence where street gangs could find another place to fight turf wars. However

early on these venues were, for the most part, well policed by management and chaperones. Violence was uncommon despite the hysteria occasionally generated.

In the post war period added to the pre-existing dialogues about deviance and popular music was the growing consciousness of the power of youth both in terms of numbers via the baby boom but also the independent economic influence of the young wage earner. Greater financial autonomy from the older generation was augmented with an increased tendency to copy others in their peer group displacing adults and parents. These peer groups or subcultures as they were ultimately characterized were more often than not built around tastes in popular music. Starting with the Teddy Boys and followed by a succession of others from mods to rockers to punks to skinheads to Rasta's and the increasingly fragmented and numerous other musical subcultures we saw a musical balkanization. It was more private, more exclusive and for those excluded from them anxiety as to the meaning and potential for deviant behavior of such cliques.

With each successive panic a further element was added to list of possible delinquent activities. The Teds were associated with violence right from the outset, the mods and rockers with mob violence and confrontation. The musical subcultures of the sixties era were to bring sharply into focus the changing sexual politics of period and awareness of mass experimentation in recreational drugs. All of which elicited a considerable judicial and political response with enhanced powers for the police and criminalization of the narcotics now associated with popular music. Punk brought fears of the degradation of youth. It was associated with nihilism and

obscenity. For some these were the symptoms of a collapsing social fabric in an era of multiple social deprivation and mass youth unemployment.

The collision of all of these fears can be seen in the response to the 'acid house' scene. Rave was seemingly preprogrammed to be deviant. It had emerged out of the sexual and drug *demi-monde*. It was inherently hedonistic with pleasure at its heart and ecstasy a pillar of the scene. It exploited darkness to find a place to party. It sought to stay ahead of the authorities by exploiting technology and the transport system but in doing so aggravated and mobilized powerful local and national vested interests to crackdown in an unprecedented manner on the pay-party scene.

From the dance halls to the beaches of seaside resorts to the hard shoulder of the M25, each generation had its own arena of moral conflict in which anxieties and fears about behaviour, morality and civility were discussed and challenged and where popular music was the dominant cause for concern. We can see that these panics generated larger debates about the influences which shaped the behaviour of young people and in a particular context, about the growing power of shared youth culture as a force in society.

---

[1] *House of Commons Debates*, 17th January 1997, Vol 288, c.526

[2] *House of Commons Debates*, 08 November 1989, Vol 159, c.97.

[3] A. J. Ivakhiv (2001) *Claiming Sacred Ground: Pilgrims and Politics at Glastonbury and Sedona.* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press), p. 89.

[4] *The Times* 03rd June, 1985, p. 3.

[5] S. Cohen (2011 edition) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* (London: Routledge).

[6] Howard Becker has characterised the authorities in these instances as 'moral entrepreneurs' – see H. Becker (1997) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance* (London: Simon and Schuster), p. 179.

[7] *The Times* 2nd July, 1965, p. 15

[8] Ministry of Education (1947) *School and Life Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)*. (HMSO,London) pp.83-87.

[9] D. Fowler (1995) *The First Teenagers: The Lifestyle of Young Wage-Earners in Interwar Britain* (London: Woburn Press), p. 93.

[10] *Ibid*, p.100.

[11] Quote from Dr Farrell in B. Morton (1993) 'The World of Popular Music' in C. Bloom (ed.) *Literature and Culture in Modern Britain* - Volume One: 1900-1929 (London: Longman), pp. 215-41 at p. 227.

[12] *Ibid*, p. 189 and p. 190.

[13] *The Times*, 1st January 1931, p. 9.

[14] Morton (1993) 'The World of Popular Music', p. 187.

[15] *The Times*, 4th June 1928, p. 19.

[16] *Ibid*, 6th October 1928, p. 9.

[17] *Ibid*, 6th March 1934, p. 11.

[18] J. Savage (2008) *Teenage: The Creation of Youth – 1875-1945* (London: Pimlico), pp 416-17.

[19] Report of the Senior Shore Patrol Officer to Commanding Officer, Marine Barracks, USOB, quoted in L. McCormick (2006) '"One Yank and They are Off": Interaction between US troops and Northern Irish Women, 1942-1945' *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 15, 2, pp. 228-57 at p. 237.

[20] *The Billboard*, 24th November 1945, p. 88.

[21] D. Butler and G. Butler (2000) Twentieth Century British Political Facts. (Macmillan Palgrave, Basingstoke), p.366.

[22] Department of Employment (1971) *British Labour Statistics and Historical Abstract 1886-1968,* (HMSO: London) pp.116-117.

[23] S. Cohen and P. Rock (1970) 'The Teddy Boy' in V. Bogdanor and R. Skidelsky (eds) *The Age of Affluence*, (Macmillan: Oxford), pp. 288-320 at p. 288.

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] *Daily Mirror*, 15th September 1953, p.1.

[26] R. Ferris and J. Lord, (2012, Kindle Edition) *Teddy Boys: A Concise History*. (Milo, London), Loc 63

[27] P. Horn (2010) *Young Offenders* (Amberley: London), p. 211.

[28] H.D. Willcock (1949) *Report on Juvenile Delinquency* (London: Mass Observation Society) and King George's Jubilee Trust (1954) *Citizens of To-morrow: A Study of the Influences Affecting the Upbringing of Young People* (London: Odhams Press).

[29] D. Kynaston (2009) *Family Britain. 1951-57. (*Bloomsbury, London), p.654.

[30] *House of Commons Debates*, 11th April 1961, Vol 638, c72.

[31] Wotton Committee (1961) *The Youth Service in England and Wales*.(HMSO, London), p.36.

[32] Cohen (2011 edition) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*, *passim.*

[33] C. Bloom (2014) 'Teenage Rampage: Mods vs Rockers', *History Today*, 64, 7 from http://www.historytoday.com/clive-bloom/teenage-rampage-mods-vs-rockers-1964. (Accessed 30th June. 2015.)

[34] *The Times* 30th March, 1964, p. 8

[35] *Ibid*

[36] *Evening Argus*. 18th May 1964, p.1

[37] B. Osgerby (1998*) Youth in Britain Since 1945,* (Blackwell, Oxford), p. 42.

[38] *Daily Sketch* 18th May, 1964, p.1. *Daily Mirror* 18th May 1964, p.1.

[39] *The Times* 1st April 1964, p. 10.

[40] For more on this see S. Mitchell (2002) 'The Conservative Party and the Threat of Rebellious Youth, 1963-64', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 4, pp. 1-10.

[41] *The Times*, 18th August 1964, p. 1.

[42] *Ibid*, 22nd May 1964, p. 7.

[43] *Ibid*.

[44] *House of Commons Debates*, 1stMarch 1956, Vol 549, cc1387.

[45] S. Cohen *Folk Devils and Moral Panics,* p.1.

[46] *The Times*, 22nd May 1964, p. 7.

[47] *New Statesman*, 28th January 1964 quoted in B. Osgerby *Youth in Britain Since 1945,* p. 59.

[48] *Time Magazine*, 15th April 1966.

[49] *The Times* 5th August 1966; p. 8

[50] See T. Fukuya (2011) *The Beatles' Untold Tokyo Story.* (Tokyo: Fukuya)

[51] P. Norman (2003) *Shout. The True Stories of the Beatles*, (London: Sidgwick and Jackson), p.267.

[52] P. Norman (2013) *Mick Jagger*. (London: Harper Collins), p.218.

[53] *The Times* 2nd July, 1965, p. 15

[54] *The Times* 18th March, 1967 pg. 1

[55] *Dangerous Drugs Act.* 1964 c.36, *Drugs (Prevention of Misuse) Act* 1964 c.64.

[56] *House of Lords Debates* 04 August 1966 vol 276 cc1461-5

[57] *Dangerous Drugs Act*, 1967 c. 82

[58] *The Misuse of Drugs Act* 1971 c.38

[59] K. Richards (2010) *Life* (New York: Back Bay), p. 225.

[60] D. Sandbrook (2003) *White Heat*, 1964-1970 (London: Little Brown), p. 526.

[61] J. Savage (2001 edition) *England's Dreaming: Sex Pistols and Punk Rock* (London: Faber and Faber), p. 34.

[62] K. Gildart (2013) *Images of England through Popular Music* (Basingstoke: Palgrave), p.179.

[63] *Ibid* p. 191.

[64] *Ibid* p. 179.

[65] *Ibid* p. 178.

[66] M. Cloonan (1996) *Banned: Censorship of Popular Music in Britain* (Aldershot: Arena), p.68.

[67] J. Savage *England's Dreaming,* p.349

[68] Ibid p. 358.

[69] For a full discussion of the DIY ethos read M. Perry (2011) *Sniffin' Glue: And Other Rock 'n' Roll Habits* (London: Omnibus) and R. King (2012) How Soon is Now?: The Madmen and Mavericks who made Independent Music 1975-2005 (London: Faber and Faber).

[70] *The Times* 25th November 1977; p. 2.

[71] J. Savage *England's Dreaming: Sex Pistols and Punk Rock*, p. 425.

[72] *Ibid*.

[73] M. Cloonan *Banned: Censorship of Popular Music in Britain* pp.77-79.

[74] *Ibid* p. 81.

[75] Kearns, K (1979) *Intra urban Squatting in London*, Annals of the Association of American Geographers, Vol. 69, No. 4 (December 1979), pp. 589-598, p.589.

[76] P. Gilbert (2004) *Passion is a Fashion. The Real Story of the Clash* (London: Aurum), p. 20. J. Lydon (2014 Kindle Edition) *Anger is an Energy, My Life Uncensored.* (London: Simon and Schuster) Loc 1059.

[77] Quoted in N. Waites and C. Wolmar (1980) (eds) *Squatting: The Real Story* (London: Bayleaf Books), p. 14.

[78] I. Glasper (2014) *The Day the Country Died* (Oakland, CAL: PM Press), p. 8.

[79] M. Worley (2012) 'Shot by Both Sides: Punk, Politics and the End of Consensus', *Contemporary British History*, 26, 3, pp. 333-54 at p. 345.

[80] *House of Commons Debates* 16 April 1981 vol 3 cc472-8.

[81] See M. Worley (2013) 'Oi! Oi! Oi!: Class, Locality, and British Punk', *Twentieth Century British History*, 24 (4): 606-636 and I. Glasper (2014) *The Day the Country Died, passim.*

[82] See R. Bramwell, (2015) *UK Hip-Hop, Grime and the City: The Aesthetics and Ethics of London's Rap Scenes,* (London:Routledge). M. Cloonan *Banned: Censorship of Popular Music in Britain,* pp. 87-95.

[83] M. Worley (2015) 'Punk, Politics and British (Fan)zines, 1976-84: "While the World was Dying, Did you Wonder?"' *History Workshop Journal*, 79, pp. 76-106, p. 100.

[84] All three titles are produced independently

[85] See for example P. Guralnick's two volume biography of Elvis Presley (1995) *Last Train to Memphis* and (2000) *Careless Love,* (London: Abacus), D. McNally, (2003) *A Long Strange Trip. The Inside History of the Grateful Dead.* (London: Corgi) and C. Granata, (2003) *I Just Wasn't Made For These Times: Brian Wilson and the Making Of Pet Sounds*(London: Unanimous)

[86] G. Altschuler (2003) *All Shook Up: How Rock and Roll Changed America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

[87] Gildart (2013) *Images of England,* p. 5.

[88] *Ibid*, p. 17.

[89] Cohen (2011 edition) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*, *passim.*

[90] D. Hebdige (1979) *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (London: Routledge), *passim.*

[91] Becker (1997) *Outsiders, passim*.

[92] S. Hall and T. Richardson (1975) (eds) *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Postwar Britain (London: Routledge), passim.*

[93] S. Reynolds (2008, Kindle edition) *Energy Flash: A Journey through Rave Music and Dance Culture* (London: Faber and Faber). Loc.1077

[94] *The Sun*, 26th June 1989, p.1. See J. Ward (2015) Flashback: Drugs and Dealing in the Golden Age of the London Rave Scene. (London: Routledge).

[95] For the evolution of house music and its technical aspects see S. Reynolds, *Energy Flash* Chapter One.

[96] M. Collin (2010) *Altered State: The Story of Ecstasy, Culture and Acid House* (Profile Books: London), p. 46

[97] R. Davenport-Hines (2001) The Pursuit of Oblivion: A Global History of Narcotics 1500-2000 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson), p. 389.

[98] *Ibid*

[99] *Ibid*

[100] *Ibid*

[101] For more on this see S.R. Hutson (1999) 'Technoshamism: Spiritual Healing in the Rave Subculture', *Popular Music in Society*, 23, 3, pp. 55-77.

[102] S. Reynolds *Energy Flash* Loc. 1077

[103] *Ibid*, Loc 1209.

[104] *Boy's Own* was self published by Terry Farley, Cymon Eckel and Andrew Weatherall calling themselves the Karma Collective, in London and was produced from 1986 until 1992. A complete collection of the fanzine was published by DJbooks.com in 2014.

[105] See for example M.C. Flux (2015) *Dirty MC Flux: The Confessions of a Reformed Drug Addict and Soccer Hooligan who made it Big on the Dance Scene,* (London: Merco)

[106] M. Collin *Altered State p. 90.*

[107] *Ibid* p.65.

[108] *The Times* 7th November 1988, pg. 2

[109] *The Sun*, 26th June 1989, p.1.

[110] *The Sun*, 12th October 1988, p. 15.

[111] M. Collin *Altered State p. 91.*

[112] *Ibid* p.95.

[113] The first was in 1967 - it was another example of the conscious modelling of the rave scene on the counterculture of the sixties.

[114] *The Times*, 21st September 1989, p. 2.

[115] For a more detailed study of this see the essays in B. Fine and R. Millar (eds) Policing the Miners' Strike (London: Lawrence and Wishart).

[116] *The Times*, 17th October 1989, p. 13.

[117] *The Times*, 30th March 1989, p. 2.

[118] *The Times*, 4th August 1989, p. 4.

[119] *The Times* 25th September 1989, pg. 7.

[120] *The Times*, 5th October, 1989, p.1

[121] *The Times*, 17th October 1989, p. 2.

[122] *Ibid*

[123] *House of Commons Debates*, 9th March 1990 Vol 168, cc1121-22.

[124] M. Collin *Altered State, p.116.*

[125] *Ibid*, p. 124

[126] M. Worley 'Shot by Both Sides: Punk, Politics and the End of Consensus', p. 348.

[127] See Osgerby *Youth in Britain Since 1945* pp. 91-95.

[128] P. Staines (1991) 'Acid House Parties Against the Lifestyle Police and the Safety Nazis', *Political Notes - The Libertarian Alliance*, 55, p. 1.

[129] Ibid. page 4.

[130] http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-24971287. (Accessed on 29th September 2015).

[131] Collin (2010) *Altered State*, p. 127.

[132] Reynolds (2008) *Energy Flash*, Loc 1675.

[133] Criminal Justice Act and Public Order. 1994.. London, 1994 C.33 Clause 63

[134] The Public Entertainment Licenses (Drugs Misuse) Act. London, 1997. C.49

[135] *The Times*, 15th November 1995; p 6.