



ROGER WATERS AND PINK FLOYD

The Concept Albums

PHIL ROSE

Roger Waters and Pink Floyd

The Fairleigh Dickinson University Press Series in Communication Studies

General Editor: Gary Radford, Department of Communication Studies, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison, New Jersey.

The Fairleigh Dickinson University Press Series in Communication Studies publishes scholarly works in communication theory, practice, history, and culture.

Recent Publications in Communication Studies

- Phil Rose, *Roger Waters and Pink Floyd: The Concept Albums* (2015)
- Ronald C. Arnett and Pat Arneson (eds.), *Philosophy of Communication Ethics: Alterity and the Other* (2014)
- Pat Arneson, *Communicative Engagement and Social Liberation: Justice Will Be Made* (2014)
- Erik A. Garrett, *Why Do We Go to the Zoo?: Communication, Animals, and the Cultural-Historical Experience of Zoos* (2013)
- Philip Dalton and Eric Kramer, *Coarseness in U.S. Public Communication* (2012)
- Catherine Creede, Beth Fisher-Yoshida, and Placida Gallegos (eds.), *The Reflective, Facilitative, and Interpretive Practices of the Coordinated Management of Meaning* (2012)
- Jolanta Aritz and Robyn C. Walker, *Discourse Perspectives on Organizational Communication* (2011)
- S. Alyssa Groom and J. M. H. Fritz, *Communication Ethics and Crisis: Negotiating Differences in Public and Private Spheres* (2011)
- R. C. MacDougall, *Digination: Identity, Organization, and Public Life* (2011)
- Deborah Eicher-Catt and Isaac E. Catt (eds.), *Communicology: The New Science of Embodied Discourse* (2010)
- Dan Cassino and Yesamin Besen-Cassino, *Consuming Politics: Jon Stewart, Branding, and the Youth Vote in America* (2009)

On the Web at <http://www.fdu.edu/fdupress>

Roger Waters and Pink Floyd

The Concept Albums

Phil Rose



FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNIVERSITY PRESS
Madison • Teaneck

Published by Fairleigh Dickinson University Press
Copublished by The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
www.rowman.com

Unit A, Whitacre Mews, 26-34 Stannary Street, London SE11 4AB

Copyright © 2015 by Phil Rose

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Rose, Phil, 1969- author.
Roger Waters and Pink Floyd : the concept albums / Phil Rose.
pages cm. -- (The Fairleigh Dickinson University Press series in communication studies)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-61147-760-3 (cloth) -- ISBN 978-1-61147-761-0 (electronic)
1. Waters, Roger--Criticism and interpretation. 2. Pink Floyd (Musical group) 3. Rock music--
History and criticism. I. Title.
ML420.W25R67 2015
782.421660922--dc23

2014042038



™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America

To Ainsley, for all . . .

. . . and to my parents, Gordon and Barbara Rose—whose continued presence in the world the works here considered have helped me truly to appreciate and whose continued encouragement, support, and assistance are beyond thanks.

“There are two ways of settling disputed questions: one by discussion, the other by force. The first being the characteristic of man, the second of brutes.”

—Cicero

“It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.”

—Jesus Christ

“The most fundamental value of art is that it can strip us of our selfishness and lend us tears for sorrows that are not our own.”

—Oscar Wilde

“The pessimists are right. But only the optimists change the world.”

—Bertrand Blanchet, Bishop of Gaspésie, Québec

Contents

Preface	xi
Introduction	1
1 <i>Dark Side of the Moon</i>	13
2 <i>Wish You Were Here</i>	41
3 <i>Animals</i>	65
4 <i>The Wall</i>	89
5 <i>The Final Cut: A Requiem for the “Post War Dream”</i>	155
6 <i>Amused to Death</i>	191
Interview With Roger Waters: February 28, 1995	235
Works Cited and Consulted	245
Album Information	251
Index	257
About the Author	263

Preface

As a younger person, I discovered the work of Pink Floyd and Roger Waters. Never before had I heard music that had been recorded with such distinct attention to sonic detail, nor had I heard rock songs that consistently contained such cleverly crafted and socially relevant lyrics. That the ideas presented in these songs were sustained throughout an entire album, however, was the trait that made them most intriguingly exceptional. For this illustrated something that, aside from the rare exception, I had found notably absent from popular culture—namely, *prolonged thought*.

In my youthful ebullience, I began to purchase books that had been written about the band and its work, but these volumes continuously disappointed me. None of them ever seemed to contain anything more than short and rather insufficient comments about the conceptual content of the recordings, and I had just begun to regard such knowledge as being essential for one to possess a deeper understanding and appreciation of them. It was for this reason that I was first motivated to complete the present volume.

Before I began to write, however, it was suggested to me that I not overlook in my study of these albums the significance of their musical and sonic aspects and how these also contribute to interpretations of the works' overall meanings. At first, this seemed a strange idea, since my university's music department had taught me that music essentially had no meaning—at least none that was “worth talking about” in relation to academic discussions of music. Rather, in the positivistic tradition of the highly influential nineteenth-century music critic Eduard Hanslick, our analytical attention ought to be directed simply toward “sounding forms in motion.” It did not take me long to decide that this clearly was an inaccurate and ideologically inflected belief and one that became more obviously so, as a result of the particular music with which I was dealing—a music whose lyrics, sound effects, imagery, and moving imagery, along with other elements of presentation and performance, cry out for audiences to consider all of these contributing elements within a holistic, integrated symbolic structure. Throughout the writing of this book, in fact, whether communicated through the choice of instrumentation, genre references, metrical shifts, or other musical processes, I was often truly startled to find out how richly meanings are encoded within this music if one takes the time to think about it.

I must admit that I have had reservations about including some of my observations in the body of this volume: this is solely the result of my inability to discuss some of these musical processes without requiring recourse to technical vocabulary, some of which will undoubtedly alienate many potential readers. This is likely true as well of my inclusion of occasional fragments of notated sheet music, which I use a number of times in the service of clarifying a particular musical aspect. I have endeavored to keep such discussions as simple and succinct as possible, and I suspect that most queries about which can quickly be resolved with a brief web search.

In the first section of the introduction, I provide the background necessary to understand the direction from which I approach my study of these recordings. This is a journey that takes them through the processes of academic musicology's late-twentieth-century deconstruction and consequent reconstruction—processes largely undertaken through the influence of insights drawn from various traditions of communication studies and related disciplines. This transformation emerged from a field dedicated primarily to formalist discussions of the sonic moving structures of Western art music—inspired by the close study of printed scores—to one more ready, willing, and able to address styles of music that have never been thus mediated, either because they were directly recorded or because they derive from musical traditions that have neither composed nor preserved their music using techniques of notation, a definitive feature of most of the world's music cultures.

The second section of the introduction discusses the evolution of the concept album and Roger Waters's contribution to it, and the remainder of the book offers further insight into the complexity and profundity of these artistic pieces than what may have been previously apparent. That they can encourage and ultimately facilitate their listeners' adoption of what has been called the "anthropological perspective," or the ability to perceive one's culture from both the inside and the outside, is perhaps their greatest attribute. It is one that becomes especially apparent in Waters's direct reference to the intellectual tradition known as media ecology, through the work of Neil Postman, with his third solo album, *Amused to Death* (1992). I should note also that the book has been written under the assumption that its readers have a strong familiarity with the recordings in question. Therefore, they should familiarize themselves with them beforehand if they have not yet done so.

If there is any kind of summary that can be made from my study of the content of these works, it is that their words and sounds work together to communicate one fundamental concern and one that is effectively articulated by the journalist Karl Dallas (1987)—they are all characterized by their "affirmation of human values against everything that conspires against them in life" (105); although this comment was made in relation to *Dark Side of the Moon*, it applies equally to the other recordings consid-

ered. Notwithstanding Dallas's useful formulation and the many other pertinent observations that he records and that I draw on here, his book is an exemplar of those that barely penetrate the surface of Waters's work with the kind of systematic analysis that it requires.

Aside from the distinction that I suspect they will continue to receive solely from their artistic merit, it is my prediction that the underlying ideas and sentiments that are presented in these and Waters's post-Floydian works will be the features that even more so distinguish their author among the vast group of his contemporaries. Such concerns include repeated and ongoing devastating abuses of power across the globe, a pragmatic stance toward the problem of technology and human survival, and the elucidation of our personal and cultural contradictions, especially as they pertain to violence. I believe that his work will be perceived, in the future, as having made a seminal contribution to the positive changes that I am desperately hoping we shall witness across the globe, among which we could include an amicable resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a coordinated international effort to counter the deleterious effects of climate change, a similarly organized international effort to reframe and understand the phenomenon of sociotechnical conflict, and a general reform of our monetary, financial, economic, political, and educational systems. Clearly, this depends on their being given the proper critical attention and to the subsequent inclusion of their concepts in the education of young people, which could easily occur through their inventive adoption by teachers of various subjects at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels. If this book in any way helps to facilitate this process, it will certainly have fulfilled its purpose.

Introduction

They talk about “intervals” of sound, and listen as carefully as if they were trying to hear a conversation next door. . . . They all prefer to use their ears instead of their minds.

—Plato

The academic study of rock music has taken a rather long time to emerge from its infancy during the 1970s and 1980s, but there are a couple of reasons for this. The principal one is the great deal of resistance that it faced from academic music departments well into the 1990s; most originally refused to acknowledge any other types of music but those from the European “classical” music tradition as being *serious* and thus worthy of study (see McClary and Walser 1990). But this perception has considerably changed since the late 1990s, as academic music study has had to make itself more broadly relevant, by widening the range of styles of music with which it concerns itself and by adopting a far greater interdisciplinary orientation. As John Shepherd (2012) observes, this transformation is largely the result of the wide range of disciplines outside musicology that have contributed so much to its ongoing development. Particularly prominent among such perspectives are sociology, anthropology, ethnomusicology, music cognition, and communication.

If one recognizes, along with Susanne Langer, that the arts are all subsets of communication study, then the latter becomes especially relevant for the historical and analytical study of music. In this regard, communications scholars and musicologists alike are much indebted to the scholar Robert Albrecht for his book *Mediating the Muse: A Communications Approach to Music, Media, and Culture Change* (2004) because it provides a systematic historical, archaeological, and anthropological synthesis of how musical communication technologies have influenced the character of human music making. However, Albrecht does not convey how a communications perspective might effectively be applied to other types of musical/cultural analysis. For instance, such is similarly helpful for understanding what Marshall McLuhan (1962) would identify as traditional musicology’s inherent ‘typographic bias’—that is to say, the influence that print technology exerted over the emergence of musicology or the so-called ‘scientific study of music’, which occurred, of course, during the culminating stage of the printing press’s monopoly on Western information environments early in the nineteenth century. This bias manifested itself not only in the discipline’s positivistic assumptions and

ideologies, but also in the relative inadequacy of its analytic methods when confronted with other types of music, such as jazz, popular forms like rock, or the music of non-Western cultures.

To be precise, musicology has been traditionally slanted by the characteristics of musical notation, or what we colloquially call “sheet music,” which tends to foreground those musical parameters, such as melody or harmony, that can be easily notated. It is often the case, however, that these particular parameters are the least important in other forms of music. In this relation, Philip Tagg (1982) observes that music that is neither conceived nor designed to be distributed as notation is often characterized by a large number of important parameters of musical expression, such as rhythm, pitch gradation, timbre, and the whole ensemble of performance articulation techniques that are “either difficult or impossible to encode in traditional notation” (41). But the implication of this tendency for notation-centric training to “foreground” certain parameters and neglect other, often more important, ones is noteworthy. In the words of Richard Middleton (1990)—it “induces particular forms of *listening*, and these then tend to be applied to all sorts of music, appropriately or not,” usually leaving alternative repertoires to be found wanting. But as Middleton goes on to say, “it needs a considerable act of sociological sympathy to grasp that other listeners may actually hear different things, or hear them in different relationships” (105).

Traditional musicology’s print bias extends to its broad terminology, molded as it was by the needs and history of Western classical music, itself the product of high typographic culture. Such terminology always involves selective conceptions of what music *is*, but when it is applied to other kinds of music, as Middleton suggests, the results are clearly problematic. For instance, he points out that effects such as “dissonance” and “resolution”—terminologies that traditional musicologists reserve to describe harmonic or melodic phenomena—are achieved through other means, as through the use of “stop-time” in rhythm and blues for instance. Likewise, “motives” may be used as “hooks” or “riffs” in popular forms, rather than for the type of harmonic and melodic thematic development that characterizes the classical literate tradition. Similarly, as Middleton recommends as well, drones will sometimes function as complex structural devices, as when one plays bottleneck blues guitar variations on a single chord.

Keeping in mind that the historical “bourgeois” is likewise a product of the age of print, also relevant here is the orthodox assumptions behind what Roger Savage (2010) refers to as “the bourgeois religion of art”—that art works are autonomous and ought to be studied or appreciated in their own right, with analysis always “text-centered” and granting little consideration to the creative object’s production, cultural context, effects on audiences, and the like. This perspective, of course, is reflected in the nineteenth-century debates advanced between advocates of so-called ab-

solute music, individuals such as Eduard Hanslick and Johannes Brahms, and others such as Franz Liszt and Richard Wagner, who wished to turn their instrumental music into rich symbolic tapestries of musical multimedia by attaching it to some type of extramusical poetic or dramatic “program.” The overwhelming victory of the former camp’s influence resulted, however, in musicology’s great difficulty in relating musical discourse to the remainder of human existence in any way, the description of emotive aspects in music either occurring sporadically or being avoided altogether in favor of considerations related to the highly structured musical architecture created by “sounding forms in motion” (Tagg 1982). Under the sway of the bourgeois religion of art, music thus had the semblance of existing in a type of existential vacuum. But, as Tagg also tells us, this tendency gave rise to “a culture-centric fixation on certain ‘notable’ parameters of musical expression (mostly processual aspects such as ‘form’, thematic construction, etc.)” (41), which, again, were fundamental to the Western art music tradition. It is hardly surprising, then, that those musicologists—whose musical experience was rooted in this traditional, absolutist approach—perceived other musical styles as generally lacking.

MUSICAL HERMENEUTICS

As an alternative to formalism, individuals who are critical analysts of rock and other forms of music have tended to insist on the priority of *meaning*, and such studies naturally tend to encourage interdisciplinary investigation. Shepherd (1994), for instance, stresses that “music as opposed to its sounds can only be understood by references to the whole range of human activity: political, economic, religious, educational and so on” (139). With rock music in particular, McClary and Walser (1990) cite the importance of attending to many specific extramusical characteristics in the construal of meanings. Included among these are verbal texts, performance styles, video imagery, modes of commercial production and distribution, the construction of band or star images, the history of a singer’s career, and political issues (the positioning of the music with respect to class, race, gender, technology, etc.). To this list we could add considerations of audience reception, in the spirit of individuals such as Daniel Cavicchi (1998) and John Platoff (2005). In our attempts to construct a broadly holistic hermeneutic understanding that leaves no stone unturned, all of these elements can and frequently ought to be analyzed in conjunction with musical components.

But there has been the occasional backlash to such perspectives, usually from musicologists, perhaps sensitive to the sense that their particular technical expertise is being in some way diminished. John Covach (1999), for example, laments the way that cultural critics and sociologists domi-

nate popular music studies, centering on in particular McClary, Walser, and Shepherd—all card-carrying musicologists—for rejecting the idea that rock music can or should be studied in the same way as “art” music. According to Covach, such scholars have bridged the gap between popular music studies and musicology “not by folding popular music into the standard concerns of musicology, but by folding all music into what have to be seen in the end as sociological issues” or, as he maintains, “at least as issues that have tended to interest sociologists much more than musicologists” (458).¹

Covach articulates what he loosely calls the contrasting ways in which the “musicologist” and “sociologist” approach music, pointing out that this difference is often cast as a distinction between an emphasis either on text or on context. From the sociological side, scholars such as Ruth Finnegan (2003) observe the way that many analysts currently focus on “practices” rather than “musical works.” But, as she recommends, she would go further and suggest that in our explorations of musical experience, “we would do well to abandon the fashionable concept of ‘text’ [which] turns us away from people’s diverse experiences back into that limiting approach of locating emotion in the work and its exposition by experts” (188). In their total concern for audience reception and total exclusion of considerations related to musical encoders or senders, such views strike me as highly ideological, bearing considerably less nuance than those espoused by scholars such as Shepherd, McClary, Walser, Moore (2001), and Brown (2006). These perspectives, with their interest in meaning as the primary unit of analysis, are grounded in the observation that meaning arises from the mutual mediation of music and society. This nuanced perspective is reflected further in the work of scholars such as Rob Bowman (2004), who identifies and locates various elements of performance practice along a “product/process continuum” from textual or artifactual orientations to process- or practice-based ones, to establish what he calls their corresponding “musico-socio meanings.”

In my estimation, the issues that tend to interest musicologists are generally not the ones that concern average music listeners, even academic ones—and perhaps something cognate can be said concerning the interests of sociologists. This is not to suggest that room doesn’t exist for people who conduct highly technical analyses of popular music forms, however, as scholars such as Covach (1999) and Moore (2004) have done. It is just that their audience will always be necessarily a specialist and therefore vastly limited one—especially since many of the people who actually understand such analytical techniques are even often not interested in reading them. We might conjecture that such efforts will have to fight for their lives, an idea apparently reflected in recent years in what has occurred regarding funding patterns within academic music departments, since they have had to reorient themselves toward socially rele-

vant interactions with other areas of concern, such as music cognition or music therapy.

In contrast, for the German musicologist and writer Hermann Kretzschmar (1848–1924)—the “father” of musical hermeneutics—interpretive discussions of music were ultimately intended for general pedagogical purposes. To that end, as Leo Treitler (2011) observes, Kretzschmar’s hermeneutic writings “eschewed the technical, which was consigned to appendices” (244). I essentially share Kretzschmar’s general pedagogical goals and am likewise aligned with the sentiments that Ralph Locke (1999) delineates, concerning how moral considerations of both personal and social concern ought to play more frequently into musicological enquiries. For myself, the role that sociological analyses and critiques have historically played in music’s aesthetic emancipation have not obsoleted what Savage calls “the strong concept of art,” where celebrated individuals or groups can still be associated with musical events, and a close textual analysis can yield significant insight into their workings. I illustrate this particularly in my employment of McLuhan’s (1964) perspective concerning artistic activity as the creation of “counter-environments”; like McLuhan, Savage is interested in how works of art operate upon their users, with the work of interpretation being “inseparable from the event of meaning in which the world unfolded by a work or text refigures the horizons of its listeners or readers” (88). This important reshaping of our perception relates to music’s psychic enhancement qualities, particularly with what Savage identifies as its ability “to re-describe affective dimensions of our experiences” and “to refigure our inherence in the world” (28).

Most people have difficulty envisaging the complex mutual mediation of music and society, since they are unaccustomed to thinking about music in terms of social meaning. As Nicholas Cook (1998) suggests, however, for it to be considered as possessing meaning, music must be viewed as a form of communication. This entails that we must also begin “with a clear grasp of the communicative context within which this meaning is realised” (4). But Cook notes the tendency to discuss musical meaning in the abstract, instead of in relation to its contexts of production and reception. Thus, he suggests that instead of asking “what music means,” we should be talking always about “what the music means here,” thereby making allowance for the contexts in which musical meaning emerges. In reference to the use of Mozart’s *Marriage of Figaro* overture in the context of a television commercial, Cook clarifies that it is a mistake to think of something that music *has*, rather than to think of it as something that music does and has done to it within a specific context. Although the Mozart overture contributes various attributes, these qualities enter into the television commercial’s discursive structure and are associated with the product (in this case, an automobile). Their meaning in this context “emerges from their interaction with the story line, the

voice-over, and the pictures. If the music gives meaning to the images, then equally the images give meaning to the music" (8).

Many of the meanings that music brings to the television commercial text in Cook's analyses are, in his own words, "ready-made." Genre references are an example of these, since different genres have different inherent connotations (e.g., electronic musics connote technology, classical instruments connote "high culture," etc.). But Cook stresses that "purely musical" relationships are equally capable of creating meanings through their emotive qualities, noting Daniel Putnam's account of what Langer refers to as music's tonal analogues of feeling-states, which can manifest themselves independently of particular situations and be transferred to various objects. This is what happens in the television commercials that Cook discusses, where the broad expressive character of a snippet of Mozart's music acquires meaning through its relationship to words and pictures, with meaning forming a kind of common currency among these symbolic elements. "Exactly the same applies to the relationship between music and words in song" (22), as Cook reminds us, and his conclusions reinforce the necessary relationship between our adopting an analytical framework based in musical hermeneutics and the need for an interdisciplinary approach to the study of music. Not only does he attend to the extramusical environment in which the music is embedded but also that of its historical and sociocultural context, including aspects of performance practice and reception. At the same time, he highlights the importance of the relationship in songs between words and music—to which we could add images and other media. All work together in the delivery of messages to listeners.

Historically, nonetheless, song analyses have generally tended to be merely interpretations of a song's verbal text, with little or no attention paid to the music. "It was the exceptional critic," as John Platoff (2005) attests, "who attempted a response that encompassed both the words and their musical setting," adding that "more often the music was either ignored or, at best, treated as a separate entity" (248). Simon Frith long ago (1983) observed the inadequacy of this approach:

In songs, words are the sign of a voice. A song is always a performance and song words are always spoken out, heard in someone's accent. Songs are more like plays than poems; song words work as speech and speech acts, bearing meaning not just semantically, but also as structures of sound that are direct signs of emotion and marks of character. Singers use non-verbal as well as verbal devices to make their points—emphases, sighs, hesitations, changes of tone; lyrics involve pleas, sneers and commands as well as statements and messages and stories. (120)

Frith's suggestions were taken even further by Walser (1993), who—contrary to Covach's portrayal—recognizes the importance of analyzing

the *music* of rock music “beyond the vocals,” thereby grounding discussion in the history and significance of actual musical details and structures.

There is, however, one thing that readers need to keep in mind throughout their reading of this volume. In my opinion, this point is effectively made by the musicologist Lawrence Kramer (1990), one of the most influential voices in the late-twentieth-century resurgence of musical hermeneutics. Kramer points out that interpretation can never be successfully disciplined, regimented, or controlled. Rather, it is an unruly and opportunistic practice that, if guided by rules at all, makes them up as it goes along. To do its work, interpretation will without any hesitation seize on “any association, substitution, analogy, construction or leap of inference that it requires” (15). Kramer also reminds us that in contrast to a true account of something, interpretations are never able to exclude an incompatible rival account. Bearing this in mind in relationship to the hermeneutic analyses I conduct herein with regard to the work of Roger Waters and Pink Floyd, mine are surely not to be the last words on the topic.

ROGER WATERS AND THE EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT ALBUM

The transition in rock music from dance compositions to music composed expressly for listening was realized in the work of progressive or “art” rock musicians in the 1960s, and their work coincided with the creation of what Moore (2004) calls the palette of “stereo space,” or what James C. Morrison (2009) with even more precision, perhaps, denotes “aural space.” This era, as Alan Durant (1984) observes, also saw the development of the record album as a genre:

It is only in the course of the later 1960s, particularly with the emergence of the “concept album” and with experimentation in stereo following more widespread commercial availability of stereo equipment around 1968, that the album takes on its appearance as a distinct, compound musical form. Before this period, it is only in “classical” music (and to some extent in jazz—particularly in its aspirations towards a scale of form and cultural influence along the lines of “classical” music), that use of extended playing time is widely made. (212)

The work most commonly cited as initiating this trend is the Beatles’ *Sergeant Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band* (1967), a recording that, as Durant points out, was to take seven hundred hours of studio time, in comparison with ten hours in 1963 for the earliest Beatles LP (213)—a fact indicative of the greater sophistication that artists and producers began to display in their use of the recording studio. Along with its reprise of earlier material (the title song), *Sgt. Pepper* displays this increased sophistication especially by its fusing of certain songs together, making them

continuous and thereby suggesting that they are not to be perceived as separate entities² but as what David Montgomery (2002), following William J. Schafer, calls an “extended work for rock” (14). Although it undoubtedly influenced the birth of the concept album, I suggest that *Sgt. Pepper* itself is not one, at least in the generally accepted sense (although many have referred to it as such), given the lack of cohesion present among the lyrics of its songs. The majority of albums since this landmark recording and its contemporaries have been merely collections of unrelated songs. To differentiate the concept album from a regular album, then, is to say that it is a form in which the music, imagery, and, perhaps most significant, lyrics are conceptually linked to a single overall theme or unified story.³

No other artist has been as dedicated to the concept album as Roger Waters. Pete Townshend, for example, an artist who has contributed much to the development of the genre, has interspersed many of his conceptual works with albums that are collections of individual songs rather than extended unified works. This appears to be true of Waters’s former bandmates also, his interest in concept albums being initially met with resistance by the other members of Pink Floyd. According to guitarist and singer David Gilmour in 1972,

we’ve had huge arguments about what exactly to do on some of those soundtrack albums and other albums. Some of us thought we should just put songs on them, others thought we should turn the whole thing into one subject concept for the whole album. . . . Roger has certainly got a bit of an obsession about making the whole album into a one subject deal, into what you might call a concept album. (Miles 1980)

Beginning with *Dark Side of the Moon* (1973) and continuing through to his third solo album, *Amused to Death* (1992), all of Waters’s recordings have taken this form. Gilmour’s statement suggests that Waters may have been greatly influenced by Pink Floyd’s involvement in the composition of film soundtracks, particularly with regard to the linking of music to a narrative and the increasing length of musical structures.⁴

Because I am interested in the concept album form and in Waters’s specific command of it, my analysis all but ignores Pink Floyd’s first seven albums and begins with *Dark Side of the Moon*. For the same reason, my study ignores the two studio albums that the band recorded in the wake of Waters’s departure; neither do I attend herein to Waters’s first two solo albums, nor the opera for which he wrote the music to accompany the libretto of his friends Étienne and Nadine Roda-Gil titled *Ça Ira—There is Hope* (2005). I do, however, opt to engage his third solo album because, in my view, *Amused to Death* (1992) represents Waters’s finest work. Yet, Waters himself has suggested that he regrets letting himself be convinced into using the significantly compromising 1980s production techniques employed on *Radio KAOS* (1987), and he admitted to me di-

rectly that the underlying content expressed in *The Pros and Cons of Hitchhiking* (1984)—his piece “about forty five minutes of sleep”—is not “fundamental” (see appendix).

I should clarify why I have been tempted to amplify Waters’s authorial role in relation to this era of Pink Floyd’s repertoire: It is primarily as a result of their texts that these recordings can be defined as concept albums, and it was with *Dark Side of the Moon* that Waters assumed the responsibility for writing all the group’s lyrics.⁵ Even in their live performances, Waters appears to have been the member of Pink Floyd most concerned with the communication of ideas.⁶ Pink Floyd was, of course, well known for the theatrical visual effects that the band employed during its concerts and—besides enhancing the presentation—these effects reinforced and further constructed the material’s meaning. The special effects, as Karl Dallas suggests, likewise tended to be Roger Waters’s ideas, and he reports about a 1977 rehearsal that he witnessed at Wembley, where he heard him instructing the crew about what lyric he wanted the introduction of smoke to coincide with and where in the song their new giant inflatable pig was to make its first appearance to the audience (Dallas 1987, 59).

According to Nick Griffiths, an engineer who worked with the band, the film footage that accompanied Pink Floyd in concert was also Waters’s domain:

Roger edited it and oversaw it and made sure it fitted the bill. . . . He can walk into a film cutting room, sit down with the editor, and take control very knowledgeably of the whole proceedings. He knows the technology, doesn’t really need to rely on anyone else to come up with the ideas. He has his own ideas. (Schaffner 1991, 217–18)

One need only look at the album credits, though, to see Waters’s gradual creative domination of the group musically as well.⁷ By no means do I intend to belittle or suggest that the musical and production contributions made to these recordings by the other members of Pink Floyd are insignificant (particularly the compositional contributions made to *Dark Side of the Moon* and *Wish You Were Here*); I merely suggest that Waters’s work formed the basis for the communication of ideas and meanings.

Although each chapter of my book is intended to be able to stand alone and be read in isolation, the intertextual elements of the albums that I investigate reward the sustained exploration associated with reading the book in its entirety. If it is read in sequence, the reader will also get a sense of the overall direction and flow of Waters’s work, as it ultimately moves toward the fundamental concern of human survival expressed in *Amused to Death*. Beginning with *Dark Side of the Moon*’s exploration of all the anti-life pressures that contribute to undermining people’s sense of psychological affluence, this part of the journey is followed

by *Wish You Were Here* (1975), a documentation of the band's response to its crippling massive artistic and commercial success, which functions simultaneously as an homage to original Pink Floyd member Syd Barrett, who succumbed early to the aforementioned anti-life pressures. From this scathing analysis of the dreams of stardom that the music industry promotes, we move to *Animals* (1977), which anthropomorphically probes and deconstructs the similar visions of success that are promoted to everyone under the cultural conditions of advanced technocratic capitalism. Following this, *The Wall* (1979) reconfronts the incessant urge toward schizoid withdrawal head-on, concluding after extended self-examination that it is necessary finally to "tear down the wall." Our musical journey then proceeds to *The Final Cut* (1983), where Waters continues to address the loss of his father, but this time in the context of his perceived personal and cultural betrayal of "the post war dream," the latter aspect most focally enacted through Great Britain's 1982 war against Argentina over the Malvinas or Falkland Islands. Waters's enduring concern with human violence is then recapitulated in a profound way with *Amused to Death*, which seems neatly to encapsulate and synthesize all the themes that he addresses in his previous work, only in the post-Cold War context of the early 1990s. Indeed, in its concern with "Crusade vs. Jihad," Waters's work pertains to us even more saliently in the new millennium than it did in the early 1990s.

I have discovered in my interactions with people over the years that they seem to enjoy the works of Roger Waters and Pink Floyd for various reasons: some for the incredible care and sophistication apparent in the quality and precision of the recordings, some for the expressive nature of the songs, and some primarily for the complexity and seriousness of subject matter with which the albums deal. Although I must include myself a member of all of these camps, the ultimate concern of this book is to discuss the complexity and seriousness of their subject matter, thus making a significant contribution to what Chris McDonald (2009) observes is "a relatively recent and small body of work focusing on a single popular rock group or artist" (12). Moreover, my intention is to offer a scholarly book on popular music whose approach is informed by a communications perspective that contributes not only to the furtherance of communications scholarship but to that of popular music studies as well.

NOTES

1. Covach is largely accurate in his appraisal but he largely overstates the case against these individuals.

2. This practice joins the tracks "Sergeant Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band" and "With a Little Help from My Friends" at the beginning of the album and "Good Morning Good Morning," "Sgt. Pepper's (Reprise)," and "A Day in the Life" at the album's close.

3. According to Karl Dallas (1987, 21), the first work that fits this description is the Pretty Things' *SF Sorrow* (1968), which in turn supposedly inspired Pete Townshend to write *Tommy* (1969). I suggest that the Pretty Things were predated by the Moody Blues with *Days of Future Passed* (1967), who were themselves predated by Frank Zappa and the Mothers of Invention with *Freak Out* (1966).

4. Such projects included Barbet Schroeder's *More* (1969), Michelangelo Antonioni's *Zabriskie Point* (1970), and Schroeder's *La Vallee* (1972). Waters worked with Ron Geesin on music from *The Body* (1970) and more recently by himself on the soundtrack to *When the Wind Blows* (1986).

5. It can in fact be argued that, in Waters's hands, the concept album has become as much a literary genre as a musical one—a point that I hope becomes apparent in this study. It is certainly significant that lyric sheets are included with *Dark Side of the Moon* and all subsequent Pink Floyd/Roger Waters recordings.

6. Richard Wright, the group's keyboardist, told *Crawdaddy Magazine* (vol. 4, no. 5) in 1970, "I don't feel political. I play music. I see myself as a musician, turning people on to music, but I don't see myself as wanting them, or trying to make them change. I don't care about that."

7. On *Dark Side of the Moon* (1973), all four Pink Floyd members (Roger Waters, David Gilmour, Richard Wright, and Nick Mason) are credited with compositions. By *Wish You Were Here* (1975), this has diminished to Waters, Gilmour, and Wright, and the latter two's contributions are limited to the suite "Shine on You Crazy Diamond." By *Animals* (1977), this has further diminished to Waters and Gilmour, but the latter contributes to only the track "Dogs." Gilmour contributes to three of the twenty-six tracks on *The Wall* (1979), and *The Final Cut* (1983) is composed entirely by Waters.

