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Jan: Listen Maybe you can write about the album. We read in the foreign press about the band but they never mention the music…only about being symbols of resistance.
Nigel: Yeah…that’s the story, I’m afraid.

(Extract from *Rock’n’Roll* by Tom Stoppard unpaginated)

**You’ve got to Fight for Your Right to Party?**

**Spanish Punk Rockers and Democratic Values**

Amongst the many foreign reporters sent to Madrid in 1985 to document the state of democratic Spain ten years after the death of General Franco – whose victory in the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) sustained Europe’s most resilient non-Communist totalitarian state for nearly forty years – was Bob Spitz, from Rolling Stone magazine. According to his analysis: “The son of a bitch kicked off in 1975, paving the way for King Juan Carlos and the establishment of a democratic order in Spain. Since then, Madrid has been having itself one on-going coming-out party. The kind you like to have when the folks are away for the weekend. Only this time the Old Man isn’t coming back.”

This is an enduringly romantic paradigm for La Movida, a term resistant to both definition and translation, but which is eloquently described by Chris Perriam as “the alternative, cultural aggregation of interventions (rather than a movement) which is associated with the early 1980s phase of the Transition” (51). In other words, there was a concentration of movers and shakers in a series of primarily urban centers who expressed themselves in a variety of media in the aftermath of Franco’s death. The internationally celebrated filmmaker Pedro Almodóvar was both an instigator and product of the scene(s) surrounding La Movida, and in Spain itself the pop-punk singer Alaska is the most enduring icon of the period: the poster-girl for the Golden Age of Spanish rock (1977-1987) has been unusual in being able to sustain a career and creativity until to the present day, fronting electro-pop band Fangoria and retaining a high media profile. Carlos Berlanga, guitarist and
principal lyricist for her former pop-punk bands – Kaka de Luxe, Alaska y los Pegamoides, Alaska y Dinarama – died of a heroin overdose in 2002. The UK broadsheet The Independent published an unusually long-obituary for a Spanish cultural figure not widely known in the Anglophone world:

In 1977, aged 17, he co-founded the group Kaka de Luxe with his childhood playmate Nacho Canut. They could barely play nor sing, and their provocative lyrics irked the still Draconian censor. But that was the point: “The Movida meant challenging the previous generation. We just wanted to have fun,” Berlanga said. (Nash)

The words may be his, but they have been taken completely out of context. The youngest child of celebrated filmmaker Luis García Berlanga made this point not in relation to the Francoist censor, but rather to the previous generation of more socially conscious and earnest professional musicians (19). This is just one striking example of how the reification of dissent has distorted discussions of popular music in Spain, a tendency that is hardly the unique preserve of foreign commentators.¹

In an attempt to counterbalance both revisionism and romanticism, this article will advance three interrelated arguments. First, the late Franco regime was not as antagonistic to popular music as we have frequently been led to believe. Second, the dictator’s death was a necessary but not sufficient condition for an outpouring of Spanish musical creativity, centered primarily albeit not exclusively in Madrid.² Third, the music, iconography and ideology associated with La Movida were at least as much influenced by Warhol and the subsequent CBGB’s scene in New York as by British punk. These claims, both individually and collectively, suggest the need to revise the critical vocabulary employed to variously celebrate or denigrate La Movida, revealing its frequent positing as a belated importation of the “swinging sixties” and/or a watered-down version of British punk to be both culturally chauvinistic and politically tendentious. My underlying hypothesis is that popular culture in Spain not only transcended mere imitation but, as a result of various socio-cultural factors,
anticipated a series of debates that would only subsequently come to the fore in Anglo-American contexts.

What, if Anything, do We Know about the Censorship of Music in Spain

In comparison with the vast and arguably over-crowded bibliographies in relation to literature, press, theatre and cinema, relatively little attention has been paid to the censorship of popular music under Franco:

What work there is tends to focus on oppositional singer-songwriters whose inclusion is usually a result of the perceived literary output of their output, their oppositional stance and the tangible persecution to which they were subjected (see, for example, Aragüez Rubio) – [Joan Manuel] Serrat was boycotted by most of the media in the wake of his withdrawal from Eurovision and Lluis Llach went into exile in France following the banning of his song “L’Estaca. (Wheeler “Raphael” 27)

There are multiple explanations for this critical lacuna, but the fact that neither songs nor musicians are indexed in the vast state censorship archives – the Archivo General de la Administración in Alcalá – is symptomatic of popular culture not traditionally being taken all that seriously in Hispanic studies, especially as practiced in Spain.

There has, however, been a growth of books produced on music produced for a more general readership over recent years. In relation to the subject at hand, Xavier Valiño’s encyclopaedic Poison in Camouflaged Doses: The Censorship of Pop and Rock Records under Franco, based on a laborious raking through of archives in Alcalá, clearly sets a new benchmark; it is, for example, particularly informative on bureaucratic process:

In principal, all of the submission of texts in English, French and Italian – the latter two occupied a tiny proportion in comparison to English – were revised by one of them [the four censors]. All of the texts in Castilian, Catalan, and possibly, also in Basque were then supervised by a second reader, aided in the other languages by the other two. Their superiors also contributed to the revision of submissions when their participation was needed.3 (55)

Valiño unearths a series of fascinating case-studies relating to the control of both lyrics and record covers. The Osmonds “She makes me warm” was prohibited for “pronounced eroticism” (120), presumably a result of linguistic conflation – “caliente” means both “warm”
in temperature and “hot” in sexual parlance. The Velvet Underground’s debut album was released minus “Venus in furs” – banned for references to masochism (141) – but including “Waiting for the man”, a ditty the censor believed to narrate the story of a young woman invariably left waiting by an unpunctual boyfriend; she has other suitors, but he is special to her, and she just incidentally happens to be carrying 26 dollars in her hand (142).

Anecdotal value aside, do these examples make any collective headway towards establishing a broader picture? Not really, for Valiño’s book is beset with a series of familiar methodological pitfalls. First, he simultaneously assumes the censors to be omniscient and ignorant. Second, there is no recognition that censorship was not the unique preserve of Spain; inextricably linked to this, there is never any notion that there might be grounds for, say, censoring the image of a naked adolescent girl on the front cover of The Scorpions’ Virgin Killer album from 1976 (244) or, more pressingly, that censorship is frequently a process of (pacted) negotiation. Censors, for example, retained the right to approve songs for inclusion on LPs alone, thereby precluding the possibility of release as a single or radio play. It would have been instructive for the author to have examined the lengthy documentation contained in Alcalá on The Beatles star-vehicle A Hard Day’s Night (Richard Lester, 1964). In February 1969, concerned internal memos were exchanged amongst high-ranking officials in the Ministry of Information and Tourism about stories been run by both The Sun and The Daily Sketch claiming the Spanish censor would only allow the release of a Beatles film if a striptease scene is cut. The bureaucrats have no memory of this, but decide to investigate their own records; on locating the file relating to the film, they discover A Hard Day’s Night was initially awarded the rating of “for patrons of 14 years and over,” but also note the inclusion a letter dated 25 August 1964 from Filmayer offering to make any cuts that are required to ensure the Fab Four’s cinematic outing can be seen by viewers of all ages. They thereby conclude that a deal must have been reached.
As Martin Cloonan notes more generally about censorship in music, “[…] while direct censorship of artists tends to grab the headlines, it is the more insidious forms of censorship which are of more importance on a day-to-day basis” (“Call that censorship” 23). Under Francoism, the constraints imposed on domestic and international product were clearly different. In relation to the former, censors were better informed linguistically, and were more likely to be offended by references to contemporary Spanish mores; apart from the few high-profile cases, at least some of which were the products of misunderstandings, the latter was largely a result of protectionist laws and the desire to safeguard domestic cultural production.

In a letter dated 23 January 1962, the director of radio station La voz de Madrid [Madrid’s Voice] wrote to the Director-General of Radio and Television in response to a demand for at least a third of the playlist of Caravana musical [Musical Caravan] to feature Spanish artists; he argued this would destroy the show’s unique selling point as a showcase for North American music and that, in overall terms, the radio station abided by the general regulation that at least seventy per-cent of all songs aired ought to be of Spanish origin. In order to secure the requisite permits for international acts to perform in the 1970s, promoters had to agree to provide employment for local musicians, pay the local official charged with granting the relevant permissions with a relatively small bribe, while providing them with anodyne translations and summaries of the songs that would comprise the visiting band’s concert (Wheeler, “In conversation” 183). Although there is little extant documentation to allow us to recreate such processes, low-level corruption was clearly instrumental not only to the music scene(s) of late Francoist Spain, but also in the vested interest that so many state officials had in the perpetuation of the regime.

Since the end of the 1950s, Spain had, in Tatjana Pavlovič’s memorable phrase, “one foot in a burgeoning market capitalism and the other in Marxist anti-dictatorial struggle” (47). With the establishment of American airbases in Spain – most significantly in Torrejón, just
outside Madrid – the exponential growth of tourism, and emigration amongst foreign
workers, Spain’s (in)famous “difference” became significantly less pronounced in a relatively
short period of time. Indicative of this was the arrival of consumer goods including popular
music, which has its industrial and iconographical roots in the economic boom of post-war
America. Pop and rock bands from abroad began to make waves in Spain, and there were
soon home-grown counterparts: Los Brincos; Los Bravos, whose “Black is black” single was
also a top five hit in both the UK and the US; el Dúo Dinámico; Karina; Miguel Ríos; or Los
Sirex. Spanish airwaves ceased to be so heavily dominated by the coplas of the 1940s and
1950s, although folkloric singers such as Lola Flores, Sara Montiel, and Carmen Sevilla
continued to have great commercial success both on record and as concert attractions in Spain
alongside much of the Hispanic world.

Manuel Vázquez Montalbán has estimated that sixty per-cent of music consumed by
young people between 1965 and 1970 was in English (xxi-xxii). It would be ridiculous to
think that Spain could have experienced a musical counter-culture equivalent to that of the
UK or the US in the 1960s with Franco still alive. There were, however, concerts by
international touring acts, a vibrant domestic scene, and access to many if not all of the songs
and records that defined a new transnational youth movement. In many respects, the official
response to rock music flagged what Pavlović terms “a major contradiction at the heart of
dictatorship: the attempt at modernization without modernity and democratization.” (12)
Whilst even the NO-DO – official newsreels projected in cinemas before the main feature
film – began to report on The Rolling Stones and The Beatles, or fights between mods and
rockers, they were generally seen as at best an amusing curiosity and at worst a threat to
public order. A revealing exception is episode 1204A from 1966: an enthusiastic report on a
concert by The Animals in Warsaw suggests the fact that even youngsters from the Eastern-
bloc countries are beginning to enjoy themselves bodes well for the future.
It is therefore ironic that the twist was considered suitably subversive that daytime concerts for adolescents at Madrid’s Circo Price were brought to a permanent halt by the Spanish authorities in 1963 (Ríos 99-107). In 1, 2, 3, al escondite inglés/1, 2, 3, Hide and Seek (José Luis Borau and Ivan Zuleta, 1970), clearly inspired by Richard Lester’s psychedelic Beatles films, a group of young Spaniards enamored of English pop, mock their country’s obsession with winning Eurovision, while elsewhere bemoaning the number of records from abroad that have been banned. The Rolling Stones’ Sticky Fingers album from 1971 had to be released with an alternative cover of a can of fingers replacing the original of a male crotch in tight jeans and underwear name-checking Andy Warhol, and the removal of the song, Sister Morphine (Muniesa 26); David Bowie’s Aladdin Sane was subsequently banned in 1973 (Haro Ibars 40). However, from the admittedly limited evidence available, individual prohibitions appear to have been more the result of ad-hoc trepidation on the part of individual censors, rather than a concerted coordinated effort from above.

As Justin Crumbaugh notes, “scholars on cultural production under Franco have […] overemphasized the regime’s taste for atavism” (19); and “one cannot oppose Francoist rule to Western modernity’s own modes of governance” (90-91). Stars as diverse as Cliff Richard, Jimi Hendrix, The Troggs and the Kinks were authorized to perform, but teenagers not having the level of economic independence and disposable income as their counterparts in many neighboring countries was a major obstacle to the establishment of a professionalized concert circuit. Las Ventas bullring was only half full when The Beatles played in 1965; this has been attributed to bad publicity surrounding the performance, and the threat of police violence (Martínez and Fouce 7; Sánchez and Castro 26; Tarazona and Castro 204), but I have yet to see any concrete evidence. Frequently bandied claims of this kind tend to forget that the “burgeoning market capitalism” promoted by some sectors of the regime was more receptive to pop-rock that those “embroiled in Marxist anti-dictatorial struggle.” If the seeds
of both Francoism’s resilience and demise were paradoxically contained within the modernization of which mass culture was potentially a manifestation, the reticence with which dissidents viewed such phenomena is not entirely without foundation.

Figures such as the bullfighter Manuel Benítez “El Cordobés”, and popular young performers like Rocío Jurado or Raphael – who existed at the interface of folkloric traditions and more modern international notions of the popular – found a ready platform in the emerging record market and television, whilst their rags to riches biographies and connections with the Francoist elite made them stalwarts of the ever-expanding market of the revistas del corazón [women’s magazines] and the scourge of the opposition who – grounded in the model of cultural determination inherited from the Frankfurt School – felt that mass culture was the opium of the people. In the words of Jesús Ordovás:

For the vast majority of our intellectuals, the arrival of the Beatles in Spain was no more than a folkloric visit, an opinion that was confirmed – according to them – by the meeting between The Beatles and El Cordobés, and by the type of questions and answers that occurred in the two press conferences that were held for the press, radio and television. (63)

The result was a growing gulf between high and popular culture succinctly described by Jo Labanyi in the following terms:

[…] while the regime’s anti-intellectualism had devastating effects on high-cultural production, it exalted certain resemanticized versions of popular and mass culture – notably, folklore, cinema, and sport. The result, by way of reaction, was the emergence of an intellectual opposition for whom popular and mass culture were irremediably ideologically tainted, and who therefore set about the task of ideological subversion by high-cultural means, through the creation of a neo-realist art cinema, an intellectualized “social-realist” novel and, above all, ‘social poetry’ – the inevitable result being failure to reach the masses. (7)

A very select number of protest singers provided an exception to this general pattern; the ability of figures such as Joan Manuel Serrat to combine “social poetry” with genuine popular appeal has enabled Esther Pérez Villalba to make a credible case for “singer-songwriting and political singers as cultural pro-democracy agents” (7).
What the Manichean division between mass culture and avant-garde art alongside cultural lines conveniently forgets, however, is that the latter as well as former were frequently co-opted by the regime; as Enrique Sacau-Ferreira notes in an impeccably documented but regrettably unpublished D.Phil. thesis, the “political undertones of Spanish music criticism as well as the promotion of avant-garde music under Franco has been ignored even when they carried out duties that were decidedly at odds with democratic practices” (177-78); in spite, or perhaps even because of this, in democracy, “Spanish avant-garde composers have always tried to present themselves as either rebellious or impartial” (184).9

Although some singer-songwriters did undeniably suffer reprisals and make genuine sacrifices, there has equally been no shortage of false martyrs who have capitalized on largely apocryphal tales of dissent. Luis Eduardo Aute, for example, wrote the song “Al alba” [To dawn] about a girlfriend; the song is best known in a version popularized by Rosa León who began to dedicate the song in concert to the ETA prisoners sentenced to death by the regime. She was taken aback a few years ago to see Aute on the television claiming he wrote it as protest song about the death penalty, and phoned him up to say that if he carried on making up such stories, she would be forced to publically expose his claims, a simple enough task when his version was recorded before sentencing had even take place.10 In other words, there are a series of vested interests in the narrative of a repressive censor that aggressively policed the opposition: a diverse array of musicians have sought to establish themselves as ethically and aesthetically – the two terms often appeared to be interchangeable in commentaries and criticism – superior to commercial products primed for the mass-market. More than a reaction against Francoism, La Movida was an attempt to break away from the politicization of everyday life and puncture the division between art and popular culture.

Trans-Atlantic Punk and (Sub-)Cultural Capital
In a poll undertaken by El País, Spain’s leading broadsheet, a hundred Spanish musicians were asked for the songs that had most influenced them; glam is remarkably well-represented with Fangoria choosing Gary Glitter’s “Rock and roll, part two” as their favorite record of all time (Rodríguez). Glitter had performed in Madrid’s upmarket Salamanca district in the M&M disco, a venue at which Nico also performed prior to Franco’s death (McNamara and Vaquerizo 33). One explanation for the appeal is the fact that, as Philip Auslander notes, “glam rock was the first fully developed post-countercultural genre of rock music” (6); La Movida in many respects attempted to privilege style over politics as the fulcrum upon which individual identities and social life hinge.

In Auslander’s view, “[g]lam rock’s central social innovation was to open a safe cultural space in which to experiment with versions of masculinity that clearly flouted social norms” (228). Long before she was a star in the traditional sense, a barely teenage Alaska appropriated the name by which she would come to be known by fans and friends alike from Lou Reed’s song “Caroline says II.”¹¹ She had first encountered the lyrics in a book by Eduardo Haro Ibars titled Gay Rock, which featured an introductory essay followed by the original lyrics to English-language songs accompanied by a translation into Spanish. Although homosexuality was still illegal at the time,¹² the fact a book was published with the title Gay Rock featuring a daring dedication to Haro Ibars’ teenage lover – “For Juan Ángel, my partner” – could variously be interpreted as evidence of the regime’s liberalization or naivety. Gay Rock could easily have been titled Glam Rock; the conflation of glam with gay – non-normative sexual role-playing with homosexuality – is arguably the book’s principal weakness, while also being the symptom and cause of their being much-less of a distinction between art school glam and rock and roll glam in Spain than the UK.

David Bowie or the punkish New York Dolls may have openly courted bisexuality and forged links with New York’s gay underground but purveyors of lads’ rock such as Slade
and Mott the Hoople would likely have been aghast, as would their fans, by any association with homosexuality. In his ethnographic research amongst what he construes to be upwardly-mobile working class fans of art school glam, Andrew Branch notes how they were first struck by “glam’s perceived newness,” but this was circumscribed within set limits: “the androgyny of glam was constantly framed within a broader discussion, in which the parameters of normative male sexuality were reasserted” (32). In contrast, on the day after Franco’s funeral, Haro Ibars, replete with painted fingernails and draped in sequins, reputedly mingled amongst the Falangists – the Spanish Fascist party – and mourners queuing to see the dictator in his coffin (Fernández 198).

In spite of its limitations, Gay Rock is a landmark text in popular music studies in Spain that has rarely been bettered. By the time that it fell into Olvido’s hands, she was already familiar with homosexuals, albeit indirectly, from stories she had heard from her Cuban-born mother and grandmother about their pre-revolution social circles (Vaquerizo 14). On reading it, she has repeatedly claimed that her pre-pubescent self exclaimed: “I want to be a man in order to be a poof” (cited in Gallero 377). This was an early example of what would subsequently become instrumental to Alaska’s celebrity longevity: the seemingly effortless ability to efface the difference between personality and persona, and the capacity to vicariously embody and communicate transgression.

Rather than necessarily expressing commitment to a specific sexual inclination, this iconoclastic reflection constituted a precocious recognition that homosexuals were often at the vanguard of many cultural movements: “At the musical level, gay clubs have always been the first to play music that later becomes mainstream. The Ramones and all those people from the New York scene started off in gay clubs, which is where they were open minded enough to let them play” (Alaska cited in Gallero 377). Andy Warhol both inspired and endorsed the Manhattan punk scene centered around CBGB’s club – home to Blondie, Richard Hell, The
Ramones, Patti Smith and Television amongst others – whose roots lay in the demimonde which emerged around the artist and Lou Reed’s The Velvet Underground. Detroit’s Iggy Pop – who, alongside the MC5, had developed a hitherto unknown sonic abrasiveness that would subsequently characterize punk – was a regular performer at Max’s Kansas City, Warhol’s nightclub of choice, where the house-band were the androgynous New York Dolls. Although it would often later be masked by macho heterosexual aggression, English punk arguably had its origins in a sexually heterogeneous “carnival of the oppressed” who gravitated around the Sex Pistols and the fetish shop, Sex, in the UK’s “first full working out of the legacy of Andy Warhol’s Factory” (Savage 192).

Punk was also the first global pop phenomenon Spain experienced with the same intensity as its European neighbors. As Jon Savage has noted of the Sex Pistols, despite the fact they “were later presented as a radical break with all of pop’s past, Glam’s cadences are always lurking in the rhythm section”; drummer Paul Cooke and lead guitarist Steve Jones’ musical preferences were directed towards “groups that mixed Glam with lads’ rock, such as Mott the Hoople and the New York Dolls” (77). This latent tendency was far more blatant in Spain. Eddie and the Hot Rods secured a loyal live audience, while Pedro Almodóvar’s relatively short-lived musical band presented themselves as the Black Kiss Dolls at their first concert in honor of the New York Dolls (McNamara and Vaquerizo 147). There is a remarkably socio-cultural synergy in the fact that the music and iconography were so well suited to appropriation in a society that had experienced the major currents of the previous two decades in a piecemeal and highly accented fashion; in Jon Savage’s words, with punk, “pop’s linear time was shattered forever: there would be no more unified ‘movements’, but tribes, as pop time became forever multiple, Postmodern” (478).

The dawning of Spanish democracy thereby coincided with a cultural and musical movement that took as axiomatic the frantic and heterodox recycling of the past alongside the
philosophy of bricolage both in the popular translation of the word as “do it yourself” and in relation to Roland Barthes’ notion of creating new discourse from the intelligent appropriation of materials from different spheres (see Wheeler, “Noche”). Almodóvar has described his debut film Pepi, Luci Bom y otras chicas del montón (1980), starring Alaska as a teenage punk sadist, as equidistant between a zarzuela [Spanish light opera] and Elvis Costello. The Oscar winning filmmaker was from a humble background in a rural backwater, but he was very much the exception rather than the rule. The exorbitant cost of electric guitars and amplifiers had traditionally ensured that rock and roll in was the almost exclusive preserve of students with economic resources, contacts and cultural kudos (Ordovás 52). The majority of La Movida’s future stars were from upper-middle class parents with the financial and social means to travel. The prime movers may not have been professionals in the traditional sense of the world, but its promiscuous aesthetics and appropriations required a certain cosmopolitanism that was not always available at home.

Alaska recalls from first moving to Spain from Mexico aged ten that her main reservations about her new home were the absence of Barbie dolls, and the fact it was impossible to watch David Cassidy on television (Cervera 44). It was proof of what she saw as Madrid’s parochial backwardness that there was no Burger King, and she and her grandmother had to decamp to Woolworths as their new local eatery. She continued not only to import major cultural reference points from abroad, but also to actively seek out anything which made her less isolated from modes and fashions of international capital. In 1977, she made a pilgrimage to the Kings Road in Chelsea where Malcolm McLaren and Vivienne Westward’s infamous shop was housed; she also returned to Madrid with a whole collection of records that she had bought on her UK visit. Almodóvar first spotted Alaska at an Iggy Pop and then a Siouxsie and the Banshees concert (Cervera 15); he claims that, at this point, she was one of two punks in Madrid (Cervera 78) – the other being the half Brazilian, half
Italian Bernardo Silvano Bonezzi who would found The Zombies, another emblematic Movida band at the age of thirteen in 1978. Alaska and Almodóvar initially became friendly over their shared tastes for David Bowie, Gary Glitter and the New York Dolls (20).

This is a far cry from UK punk scene – or at least the discourse which surrounded it – in which, to borrow a phrase from Lucy O’Brien, “[t]he more proletarian your roots, the harder your struggle, the more ‘real’ you were” (133). This heuristic and ideological tendency was both the product and the cause of the doctrine of sub-cultures, through which opposition and oppression were reified to vindicate popular culture; for its most influential exponent, Dick Hebdige, punk constituted a holy union between working class youth and the marginalized black community who had found a voice for their struggle and an inspiration for the punks through reggae. This analytical framework is relevant to the occasional Spanish punk band, most pertinently La Trapera del Rio, but is more readily applicable to the radical rock of the Basque Country (see Sánchez Ekiza) or, in a context where migration flows have come primarily from impoverished rural areas rather than abroad, heavy metal, “the soundtrack of the under-developed suburbs, which were struggling to become integrated into the urban structure of the city” (Fouce and Val 125).

Hispanists have, nevertheless, repeatedly charged La Movida with failing to pass the subcultural entrance exam. In Paul D. Begin’s pejorative diagnosis, “[p]unk, as a commercial commodity, is stripped of its political potency and neutralized. It is decontextualized from its so-called working class opposition. It is used only as an aesthetic device; it is trouble as fun” (17). Mark Allison concurs:

The position of Madrid’s underground version of punk culture is different in several important aspects. First, it is derivative, finding its inspiration in British punk and attempting to copy it […] Secondly, the movida is selective in its appropriation of punk’s cultural baggage. The aesthetic of punk and the element of bad taste and corrosive humour are taken up, but largely without the political or moral significance. (227)
British punk is not, however, the sole or even the primary model for La Movida: punk first entered in Spain via the Ramones – a band whose repertoire is far better known and more respected in much of the Hispanic speaking world than in the UK or the US. Set-lists for early Alaska and the Pegamoides concerts included covers of songs by the aforementioned New Yorkers and fellow CBGB’s luminary, Wayne County (Cervera 135).

In a landmark Spanish publication revealing titled “Punk: passport to nostalgia,” Jordi Vargas offers a sub-culture orientated analysis of the British scene, while going on, first, to note, the formative influence of US punk, before noting the dangers inherent in trying to mechanically map what is going on in, say, London to Madrid. Allison, for example, problematically substantiates his general argument through repeated comparisons between Laberinto de Pasiones (1982) and Jubilee (Derek Jarman, 1978), when the Spanish director has gone or record as saying that, if Pepi Luci, Bom’s aesthetic has something of the grittiness of late 1970s New York, then its follow up is closer to the more frivolous pop world of 1960s London (125). In terms of contemporary reference points, Laberinto de pasiones is closer in aesthetic and ethical terms to John Waters’s Polyester (1981), starring 1950s heartthrob Tab Hunter, which is similarly in thrall to pop culture and construes anything from ethnic minorities and foot fetishes to pro-abortion anti-pornography feminists as fit for ridicule.

In any case, as Angela McRobbie notes more generally, “[t]he problem with this kind of account is that that it posits a style of music, i.e. punk, as being inherently close to politics, as though politics were this quantifiable, identifiable thing at the center of social life” (“Thinking” 38). This model, developed by what Clinton Heylin terms “sociologists in music critic’s clothing” (xi) has nevertheless had a (per)formative influence on what has formed part of the public punk canon, at least in early accounts meant that the London-based scene was better represented in print than its elder cousins in New York, and ensuring a certain clash of cultures. Julie Burchill and Tony Parsons were completely dismissive at the time of
“American rock and roll – very affluent, very much Television with Credibility” (67). Over thirty years later, Richard Hell would retaliate in his autobiography, described them as “corps of pettiness grabbing at the chance that ideological ‘punk’ gave them to feel noble while behaving disgustingly – like Communist children reporting their parents to the authorities for criticizing political officials at the dinner table” (234). These were precisely the kind of debates that could be transferred to the Madrid scene, and it is clear that for most Movida luminaries, sympathies would not only lie with Hell, but also that they would hardly see the epithet “Television with credibility” as an insult, quite the opposite in fact.

In a book on popular culture, which takes it as axiomatic that “[g]lamour, glitter and gloss should not so easily be relegated to the insistently apolitical” (19), McRobbie highlights Blondie – a band poignantly described by Bob Stanley as “Brill Building pop reinvented for a John Waters movie, catfights in velvet” (425) – as the ultimate encapsulation of post-modernism. Neither Debbie Harry – an ex-Playboy bunny girl and waitress from Max’s Kansas City brought up in suburban New Jersey – nor Alaska have been well served by criticism predicated on sub-cultural capital, but the problem might just reside in the theory rather than the subjects. Alaska may lack her American counterpart’s high cheek-bones and simmering sexuality, but Harry is the closest point of reference in the international punk-pop canon. Both are figures with an arsenal of hits known by almost everyone, but who have also always kept one foot in the underground. A pop aesthetic has on occasion transformed them into figures of ridicule amongst their contemporaries, but has also made them mainstream pioneers: Alaska’s “Bailando”, like Blondie’s “Rapture” in the US context, is the first major Spanish hit to feature a rap. Their sound, image and iconography self-consciously evokes the past, present and future frequent simultaneously; in the same way that Blondie would frequently cover songs from girl-groups of the 1960s – “Out in the Streets” by The Shangri-
Las, or “Denise” by Randy and the Rainbows – the inspiration for the name Alaska and The Pegamoides came from the 1960s girl-groups.

Rock-Ola – a concert-venue frequently referred to as the Temple of La Movida opened with a gig in 1981 by the UK Subs – not only had middle-aged uniformed waiters but also a maître de (Prada 17); even more surreal was the Barcelona venue where Loquillo, Spain’s quintessentially teddy-boy, was first immersed in the tunes that would later crystallize into his own repertoire:

The Army’s Club, also known as the San Jorge Club was one of the places we could get in under age. The regal image of the dictator greeted you from a painting that presided over the entrance; the permissiveness with under-agers when it came to getting to the dance floor made everything easier. Youngsters of all types and persuasions would meet up there with a very noticeable overdose of testosterone. Rubbing along with members of the ultra-right or with the first batch of punks – one didn’t know in the end which was which a their insignia was very similar, and in reality nobody gave a shit. Everyone knew why we were there: good looking girls and the opportunity to listen to classic rock and roll with no hassle. (Sanz 52-3)

Reactionary factions of Spanish society would not always be so accepting, as is demonstrated by the bombing of a counter-cultural bar, La Vaquería, by the ultra-right wing Guerilleros de Cristo Rey [Warriors of Christ, Our Lord] in Madrid on June 6 1978 (see Wert Ortega).

If one of the principal lessons of democracy is to learn to peacefully co-exist with those with whom we do not necessarily agree, music and La Movida performed an important role throughout the Transition. As Loquillo’s bandmate, Sabino Ménde
z, notes in his autobiography: “It was a country in which punks shared the pavement with nuns, and were mutually but politely disheartened by each other’s presence” (69). Although some concerts were marked by violence, and Rock-Ola was, for example, closed in 1985 after a violent clash between mods and rocks – a genuine and tragic anachronism – it was a sign not only of La Movida’s ostensibly depoliticized status, but also of increasing socio-cultural tolerance that there was no equivalent in Spain to the Sunday Mirror headline “Punish the punks” (see Long 112) or the prosecution of records under obscenity laws (see Cloonan, Banned 76-79).
The closest equivalent to a Bill Grundy moment was when the all–female band Las Vulpes performed “Quiero ser una zorra” – a translation into Spanish of Iggy and the Stooges’ “I wanna be your dog” – recorded at Rock Ola on television around Easter 1983. Although the program’s director was sacked as a result, the subsequent debate was conducted in relatively civilized terms, at least in comparison to the UK example. La Movida had its anti-Bill Grundy moment when Alaska was invited onto La clave/The Key, a television debate program, to discuss politeness and manners alongside other guests including the head of protocol at the royal palace. Rather than playing up, she articulates her right to express herself and dress differently, maintaining mutual respect as a cornerstone of civilized society.

This was a marked contrast to the nervous giggles of the female hangers-on broadcast by the BBC. Although the role of female British punks is receiving some belated and well-deserved attention (see O’Brien and Wheeler; Reddington), women were more obviously protagonists in Spain. La Edad de Oro/The Golden Age – the principal television program associated with the movement, which combined cultural reports and interviews with live performances – was presented by Paloma Chamorro. This is just one example of how comparisons between the UK and Spanish manifestations of punk ought not to be construed solely in terms of imitation and loss; if, as we have seen, La Movida was an amalgamation of different styles, so too was the return of Spanish democracy. In the third and final section I would like to suggest that, following the election of ostensibly left-wing parties at the municipal, regional and national levels, politics and socio-cultural fused in a way that, for better or worse, anticipated what David Runciman characterises as the Blair administration’s “combination of free-market pragmatism and pop cultural cringe” (24).

Pop Life: Culture and Cultural Policy in Socialist Madrid

In 1998, Anthony Giddens noted how the “debate around New Labour, lively and interesting though it is, has been carried out largely in ignorance of comparable discussions
that have been going on in Continental social democracy for some while” (viii). The sociologist, simultaneously a guru to and publicist for the incoming Blair government, references Spain but only in relation to the autonomous communities of Catalonia and the Basque Country (32, 134); Blair himself repeatedly voiced admiration for what social democrat Mayor Pasqual Maragall had done for Barcelona (McNeill 7).

Following the success of the Olympics in 1992, the Catalan capital had become the text-book example of a city which, in Sharon Zukin’s formulation, effectively controlled “diversity while re-creating a consumable vision of civility” (31). Barcelona might have been an obvious contemporary reference point, yet Madrid and the political situation of ten years previously arguably provided a much closer synergy with the politics and urban policies of the Blairites. As Paul Julian Smith notes:

Mutatis mutandis, the return of the Labour Party to power in the UK in 1997 presents some structural parallels with the triumph of the Socialists to Spain in 1982. Just as the city would prove central to the transition, so an urban renaissance was held to be key to social and cultural change in Britain. (53)

The first major victory by a left-wing politician in Spain since the Second Republic (1931-1936) – the period of democracy which preceded the Civil War – was Enrique Tierno Galván’s election as Mayor of Madrid in 1979. Representing the center-left Partido Socialista y Obrero Española/Spanish Socialist and Workers Party (PSOE), he would retain the position until his death aged 67 in 1986. To borrow a phrase from Hamilton Stapell, the Spanish capital became “Tierno Galván’s own personal classroom” (43): education and culture were the cornerstones of the civic curriculum.

Popularly known as the “the old professor,” the former Marxist who had spent time at Princeton managed to present himself successfully as an avuncular figure, who subsidized concerts and talent contests for local bands as part of a broader strategy to integrate young people into civic society and promote non-violent mass gatherings. Counter-intuitively, his advanced age worked in his favor when promoting popular music: if, in his dalliances with
popular culture, Neil Kinnock was frequently disregarded as “the political dad dancing at the school disco” (Robinson 371), Tierno Galván’s incongruous patronage of, and appearance at, a Tina Turner concert was seen as charming rather than undignified (see Amorós), as were his infamous public proclamations in which he referred to John Lennon as John Lennox, or his invocation to rockers to get drugged up through the use of a colloquialism – “Rockeros: el que no esté colocado, que se coloque...y al loro [Rockers, whoever isn’t high, time to play catch up and get high] – whose meaning it is never quite clear if he understood or not. This surface bonhomie camouflaged a canny and ruthless operator, fully aware of the electoral strength of a disenfranchised youth that, largely as a result of the Francoist ideal of the large family, were both huge in number, and suffering record highs in unemployment.

In spite of their reputation for political apathy, abstention rates by young people in both the 1979 and 1982 elections were far below the national average (Val 18-21), and they tended to vote overwhelmingly for the PSOE or regional left parties (151). As in a number of other European countries, birth-rates peaked in 1964 (Gil 100). If La Movida is recalled so fondly for the energy and the buzz of Madrid’s night-life, this is largely because of the relative volume of teenagers and young people, which far surpassed that of London during the Swinging Sixties. Just over half of the city’s population was under thirty years old in 1981, and only 10% of the population was over the age of 65; approximately 1.1 million people between 15 and 30 were living in the compact Spanish capital (Stapell 87). The combination of this demographic boom and the global economic recession was, however, devastating: in 1976, the unemployment rate in Spain was 4.7%; it rose every year until 1985 when it hit a peak of 21.7% (Alonso Zaldívar and Castells 289).

Tierno Galván was the antithesis of “the Byronically tousled perm, the year-round tan, the open-necked shirts and designer shirts” which characterised and caricatured Jack Lang (Loosely, “The Politics” 158), the first ever left-wing Ministry of Culture in France’s history
Nevertheless, the old-teacher’s policies and panache both coincided with and pre-dated those of his Gallic counterpart, surmised as followed by David Looseley:

[...] popular music, and pop particularly, was a magic wardrobe into modernity or, more accurately, post-modernity, at a time when the post-1968 Left was considered by reconstructed intellectuals to be locked in a semi-Marxist mindset which had lost the plot. (“Popular Music” 145)

As Yaw Agawu-Kakraba notes: “Drawing on tendencies in the emerging post-Franco consumer culture that favour the aesthetization of life, postmodernism within the Spanish context emphasizes a continuous pursuit of new-experiences, values and vocabularies” (12).

These were well captured in state- and magazines such as La luna de Madrid and Madriz (see García-Torvisco; Smith 51-74; Usoz de la Fuente) largely publically-funded publications, which Lang sent a commission to Madrid to study (Stapell 115). More generally, as José-Carlos Mainer notes: “Everything, perhaps too much, was thought to hinge on culture, as anyone who undertakes a detailed semantic study of how the word was used throughout the Transition, will discover” (156). In abstract terms, the major political players were agreed on the intrinsic value of culture and its democratizing potential: the Ministry of Information and Tourism was rebranded as the Ministry of Culture and Welfare in 1977. Two years later, Pio Cabanillas, Minister of Culture for the right-of-center UCD Coalition, stated in a public mission statement that “democracy is a cultural conquest” and that “political content ought not to be predominate over specifically cultural values and acts” (unpaginated). When I asked Cabanillas’s replacement, Soledad Becerril, about the rationalization for subsidizing concerts by The Rolling Stones and Julio Iglesias in 1982, she seemed genuinely puzzled by the question; her response was that it would not be something that would be needed now, and that even then it was simply a way of attracting tourism and providing a cultural dimension to Spain’s hosting of the World Cup, but that it did not strictly speaking constitute part of the Ministry’s core mission or definition of culture.
If there was inter-party consensus on the importance of culture, what distinguished the PSOE was the level of investment and their inclusion – their detractors would say co-option – of popular culture with a special emphasis on music as a matter of state. Felipe González – who would be voted in as Prime Minister in a landslide victory for the PSOE in autumn 1982 – claimed he would never have become a politician if he had been able to sing and play guitar (see Martínez); Becerril might not have been present at the Rolling Stones concerts, but both the future President of Spain and Henry Kissinger were (Muniesa 86).

Perhaps inspired by the example of Jacqueline Kennedy, González’s wife, Carmen Romero, began to organize informal gatherings and dinners with artists and celebrities at La Moncloa, the Presidential Palace (Quaggio 303). In 1983, the Ministry of Culture had 0.74% of the state budget; this figure had increased to 0.95% by 1986 (Quaggio 288). The coincidence of a left-leaning populist Mayor and Prime Minister also ensured that the four years between 1982 and 1986 constituted the apogee of La Movida’s institutionalization; it became a showcase for the country’s (post-)modernity and new democratic credentials both at home and abroad. Franco may have ensured that the reverberations of the Paris student uprisings were felt in heavily accented form, but it is also the case that the youthful PSOE government – the average age of the cabinet on election being 41 – was the first in Europe to belong almost exclusively to the generation of 68. It is not necessary to claim González as a direct influence on Blair in order to appreciate that Spain’s socio-political belatedness paradoxically ensured it had to address a number of the challenges for ostensibly progressive politics that would subsequently come to the fore in the UK.

Franco’s longevity was inextricably linked to traumatic memories of the Civil War, and the propaganda exercise that he had brought peace to an inherently disorderly nation. The not unreasonable fear was that his death would precipitate a return to chaos and bloodshed. If this was averted, it was largely because a degree of consensus prevailed and compromises
were made on both ends of the political spectrum: the Communist Party – the primary opposition to the dictatorship – was legalized but, in exchange, party leader Santiago Carrillo eschewed demands for a major structural overhaul of economic wealth. The PSOE not winning the 1979 elections is widely attributed to the UCD’s leader, Adolfo Suárez, shamelessly playing on voting fears by making repeated references to the Party’s Constitution being predicated on allegiance to Marxist doctrine in a televised debate with the much younger González. Anticipating the internal party politics Blair had to overcome in order to have Clause IV excised from Labour’s Constitution, González fought and won a battle at the 1979 annual conference to relinquish Marxism as the cornerstone of party policy and ideology. This, alongside a general shift in public mood to the left following the unsuccessful coup attempt of February 23, 1981, ensured a landslide victory in the next general elections.

The campaign slogan was “Por el cambio” [For Change], an arguably closer fit to New Labour’s “Things can only get better” mantra than Bill Clinton’s much cited campaign trail which, as Joe Klein notes, also “appeared to exist, entirely, and very comfortably, within the grammar of popular culture – a cross between a disaster mover and a country music song” (41). The times truly were a changing. When Harold Wilson had previously attempted to capitalize on London’s swinging sixties, he was accused of crass populism when he awarded the Beatles their MBEs a few days before their debut Spanish concert (Sandbrook 210). In contrast, as Peter Mandelson notes: “New Labour was not only electorally popular, it was chic, and people wanted a bit of that chic at their parties and receptions” (224-25); even Mandelson’s famous sound-bite about “being intensely relaxed about people getting filthy rich” was anticipated by the PSOE’s Finance Minister, Carlos Solchaga – brought in to replace Miguel Boyer who, on marrying Isabel Preysler, Julio Iglesias’s ex-wife, left government for private banking – when he boasted that “Spain was the country in the world
where people could get richest quick”, largely because he left out the Labour politician’s vital caveat: “as long as they pay their taxes.”

As Slavoj Žižek notes in his discussion of Hegelian dialectics, “a true historical break does not simply designate the ‘regressive’ loss (or ‘progressive’ gain) of something but the shift in the very grid which enables us to measure loss and gains” (13, original emphasis). Ironically, both the PSOE and New Labour frequently couch their discourse in Hegel, the foundation of Marxist doctrine. Deputy-prime Minister Alfonso Guerra speaks in his memoires of the need to break with “a dialectic of hostility and distrust] in “a contradictory Spain that had still to find its definitive synthesis” (29). In a 2007 television documentary about La Movida broadcast in 2007 and named after Alaska’s “A quién le importa” hit, Felipe González noted how Tierno Galván would proudly proclaim himself as “the synthesis between Marxism and Coca-Cola.” Blair would later proclaim that the “era of the grand ideologies – all-encompassing, all-pervasive, total in their solutions, and often dangerous – is over” (New Britain 213); in his terms, the “new left-of-centre is not simply an accommodation of the Right but tries to move the political debate beyond the old boundaries between Left and Right altogether” (207). Critics of the PSOE and New Labour would posit this less as the culmination of historical progress than a symptom of what John Hooper decried in 1995 as the “virtual absence of ideology from Spanish politics”, symptomatic, in his view, of “a certain moral vacuousness” (143).

In his autobiography, Blair explicitly frames this debate in musical terms:

There was, in a sense, a cultural as well as a political divide between the party and the people. Normal young people went out on a Saturday night, had a few drinks and partied. Labour young people sat and talked seriously about the inequities of the Tory government and the inevitable long-term decline of capitalism […] back in the late 1980s there was a group of rock musicians called Red Wedge, fronted by people like Paul Weller and Billy Bragg, who came out and campaigned for us. It was great. But I remember saying after one of their gigs […] “We need to reach the people listening to Duran Duran and Madonna” (a comment which went down like a cup of sick). I felt, in art and culture, we should represent all strands, avant-garde through to basic popular art that our voters might go to watch or listen to. 17 (A Journey 90-91)
If the recollection is genuine, it finds an unlikely bed-fellow in the memoirs of Everything but the Girl’s Tracey Thorn, when she looks back to her student days:

[...] politicisation seemed to be the norm, and would continue to seem so well into the 1980s. Even as musical styles changed, and many of the old punk battles were left behind, for those of my age the ideals of the late 1970s remained a driving force [...] It may have been Thatcher’s decade, with vacuous social climbers such as Duran Duran sometimes held up to represent the whole period, but it didn’t feel like that at the time. (158)

By contrast, as Rupa Huq notes, “Britpop can be characterized as a post-ideological soundtrack to post-political times” (100).

So, what about the music? Is it just a case of Anglo-American chauvinism that we don’t go out dancing to Alaska on a Saturday night? Yes and no. With the exception of Mecano, stars of La Movida have been unable to crack Latin America, a highly lucrative market that has made numerous Spanish starts from Julio Iglesias to Joan Manuel Serrat into multi-millionaires. It was both a symptom and a cause of their success that Mecano were viewed with suspicion by their contemporaries and musical snobs: late-comers to the party, the highly polished sound and carefully-manicured image of these pop stars left any vestiges of punk behind. If truth be told, they simply have the best repertoire: Hoy no me puedo levantar, a musical about Madrid and La Movida, based around their songs has been a Transatlantic phenomenon (see Fouz Hernández); there is no other group of the time who would have enough high-quality well-known songs that they could sustain a large-scale musical project of this kind. There is, in other words, no musical ambassador to rival Pedro Almodóvar in the Anglophone cultural sphere. Although Carlos Berlanga and Nacho Canut excel at melodies and choruses, offering a bespoke accented version of a global music trends, the frisson of their major hits derives primarily from iconic lyrics, which complement but rarely overshadow the music, alongside Alaska’s culturally-specific star persona.
If, as is frequently asserted, Margaret Thatcher’s biggest victory was Tony Blair, a Labour leader in thrall to neo-liberalism, could Duran Duran’s bastard offspring be Oasis, an ostensibly indie band familiar to millions? In addition to mutual opportunism on both parts, Noel Gallagher’s flirtation with the Blair administration was fueled not only by drugs, but also by the synergy by which both musicians and politicians were attempting to transcend the underdog status to which their peers and predecessors had frequently seemed to be willingly consigned; what John Harris characterizes as “a fervent desire for power, success and influence, expressed by people who had grown tired of living the ascetic life of dissidents” (xvi). An earlier desire to enact a politically and culturally historical break can be documented in the Spain of the early 1980s: a frequent charge against both the main protagonists of La Movida and the PSOE was that they were frivolous in the face of the struggles and hardships undertaken by their predecessors (no past as opposed to no future), but, for better or worse, they were undoubtedly far better attuned than the traditional left or doctrinaire singer-songwriters to what David Hesmondhalgh terms “the more affective and emotional aspects of politics” (146).

Conclusion

In the words of John Street: “Music’s politics cannot be read straight from its context because music-making is not just journalism with a backbeat. The music is a result of the interplay of commercial, aesthetic, institutional, and political processes” (246). This is manifest in the musical and verbal declarations of most of the prime-movers of La Movida, who shared a frustration articulated by Arthur Marwick in his study of cultural revolution in Britain, France, Italy, and the United States between 1958 and 1974:

My complaint about the Marxists will be that they are so busy looking for a revolution which could not happen that they miss the fact that another kind of revolution did happen (or so I shall be arguing), a “revolution”, or “transformation” in material conditions, lifestyles, family relationships, and personal freedoms for the vast majority of ordinary people; certainly there was no political or economic revolution,
no fundamental redistribution of political and economic power. Slightly hesitantly, I am calling this “revolution” or “transformation” a “cultural revolution”. (14-15)

The reification of a particular kind of dissent has prevented a full appreciation of the cultural and musical value of the work produced in and around La Movida: variously construed solely in reference to Franco or as insufficiently political, both critical positions posit it as the cultural manifestation of belated modernity.

It is ironic that Rolling Stone made their claims in a year when Ronald Regan caused controversy in his trip to democratic Spain when he claimed that most Americans believed that their countryman who had volunteered to fight against Franco were on the wrong side in the Civil War (New York Times), while Tipper Gore and the PRMC were leading their moral crusade against what they perceived to be obscene messages and lyrical content (see Fischer). Although the ostensibly exemplary nature of the Transition is increasingly being questioned at home, it was taken as a model for a number of post-Communist and Latin American states; future work would do well to examine if and how live music in Spain provided an industrial and ideological precedent for popular music being packaged as the lingua franca of the free world. In terms of domestic musical production, Spain’s claims on the global ear are not necessary pressing, but it is far more interesting in relation to infrastructure and cultural politics. These need to be framed by a far more sophisticated model than the Anglophone media’s “repression”/“freedom” binary currently allows. La Movida’s status as the golden age of Spanish pop is not solely the result of a select-number of first-rate compositions, but is also due to it providing a soundtrack for the transition as social praxis, popular music questioning as well as embodying definitions of freedom.
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1 An article I published on this subject under the title “Exhibitionism: Why the Stones are Still the Greatest Rock’n’Roll Band in the World,” which challenged the idea that the Francoist regime was the biggest challenge to popular music in Spain, was reprinted without even consulting me or asking permission by Newsweek under the revised title, “How the Stones Freed Spaniards from Franco.”

2 Vigo was, for example, home to the Galician Movida.

3 All translations are my own.

4 Songs, for example, banned by Radio 1 include: The Beatles “A Day in the life” (1967); Donna Summer’s “Love to love you baby” (1976); the Sex Pistols’ “God save the Queen” (1977); Frankie Goes to Hollywood’s “Relax” (1984); George Michael’s “I want your sex” (1987); and The Shamen’s “Ebeneezer Goode” (1992). (Thornton 130).

5 Box no 67385 in Alcalá.

6 Box no 04093 in Alcalá.

7 The appeal was successful. Box no 4408 in Alcalá.

8 For evidence of this, and far more detailed information than the remit of this article allows, see Ordovás, Historia; and Álvarez Cañas.

9 One of the composers discussed in the thesis threatened the University of Oxford with legal action if they did not withdraw details of the thesis from the university webpage. The chair of examiners decided that the D.Phil. was fully defensible and simply told the complainant to take legal action if they so wished. They did not.

10 Rosa León told me this over lunch on 20 January 2015 before we took part in a round-table discussion at the University of Leeds organised by Isabel Marc.

11 “All of her friends call her Alaska. When she takes speed, they laugh and ask her What is in her mind, What is in her mind.”

12 According to the 1970 Law of Social Danger, it was classified alongside prostitution and drug addiction

13 Eduardo Haro Ibáñez was seemingly aware of the book’s importance and limitations. In a letter to a friend, he wrote: “My book – which is fairly mediocre, I admit (and I’m not saying this with the false modesty so characteristic of intellectuals – seems amazing when compared with the rubbish I’ve read on the subject in Spanish and some international magazines” (cited in Fernández 175).

14 In a report on the London punk scene for the Marxist-inflected Spanish periodical, Vindicación Feminista/Feminist Vindicación, Gamer Fuentes complained about the repackaging of traditional gender norms in new bondage: “The female admirers may be variously aggressive exhibitionist, or inoffensive according to the individual case, but they continue to follow their male idols like their grandmothers followed Rudolph Valentino” (46).

15 That is not to say that the show, or indeed the Movida, was free from sexual discrimination. See, for example, Rodríguez Ortega for a discussion with Matilde Fernández of the discrimination she claims to have suffered when working as assistant director on La Edad de Oro. Similarly the presenter, Paloma Chamorro, has commented on how:

I remember in the 1970s, being in the editing suite of one of my programmes, with a male TV executive and seeing the look of horror on his face because I, who was then a young not bad-looking woman wearing makeup, was talking about things he didn’t understand. If I’d been a guy with a
moustache… but in those days that was something considered unbearable. (Cited in Veiga and Ibáñez 243-44)

16 Interview with the author on 23 July 2014.

17 This Red Wedge tour actually took place in 1985. Perhaps adding credence to Blair’s argument, Paul Weller – by far the tour’s star attraction – was made to feel uncomfortable on the tour for the attention and money he lavished on his clothes. In his recollection, friend and biographer Paolo Hewitt writes:

When the tour finally hit the road, Paul attended many press conferences where he found himself out of his depth as questions rained down on all sides, and he began to develop a great suspicion about the motives of the politicians who aligned themselves to the cause, as well as some of the people instrumental in creating the movement. (175)

This provides one explanation for why he refused to allow New Labour to use “The changing man,” the original choice for campaign song, for which “Things can only get better” provided a last minute substitute.