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ABSTRACT

The authors investigate how American and Dutch rock music consumers navigate the whiteness of rock music practice and discourse. In doing so, they address the complex connection between aesthetic categories (popular music) and ethnoracial categories and to what extent this relationship is open or resistant to structural change. Connecting literature on the racialization of cultural genres and on symbolic violence, the authors demonstrate how authentication through faithfulness to preestablished sociocultural configurations reinforces the whiteness of rock music consumption in both countries in very similar ways. The analysis of 27 in-depth interviews produces a threefold typology of positions that rock consumers take up vis-à-vis the sociocultural configuration of rock music authenticity: complying, amending, and replacing. From a position of complicity to this configuration, people of color are often a priori regarded as inauthentic participants, also by outsiders who consider them to “act white.” However, the analysis indicates that the shift toward a symbolic economy of authenticity enables actors to resist white hegemony as discursive authenticity at the expense of the more rigid dispositional and agentic variations underlying symbolic violence. This allows an active amending of the hegemonic configuration within the genre—authenticity maneuvering—by replacing the discourse, forging new spaces of consumption, and installing heavily policed inclusive practices.
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INTRODUCTION
As a young adolescent, Jennifer’s unfolding taste for rock music was met with suspicion by her immediate social environment: “When I was growing up, people were always so surprised that I was into rock music. Like, ‘you’re a black girl, you’re not supposed to be into rock music.’” Her experience demonstrates how music preferences strongly relate to ethno-racial categories (Roy and Dowd 2010). Clearly, Jennifer’s family and friends perceived her blackness (and femininity) as somehow conflicting with her preference for rock music. Why was rock music not seen as an authentic cultural preference for her?

Whereas rock music has its roots in African-American culture (Nanry 1972), it became dominated by white producers and consumers in the mid-1950s due to, among others, a reluctance of the commercial music industry to sell ‘black’ cultural products to white audiences in a period of institutionalized racial segregation (Redd 1985). The symbolic whiteness of rock music has remained in place ever since, even as rock music gained widespread international appeal and sprouted dozens of subgenres (Bannister 2006; McDowell 2017). This association has remained largely unattended to by artists, audiences and media (Hamilton 2016), as is often the case with cultural forms dominated by whites (see Brunsma, Chapman, and Lellock 2016; Motl 2018). Consequently, a person of color with an interest in rock music is frequently marked as inauthentic, “as someone who has either misunderstood which music is appropriate for his or her consumption or has abandoned black culture by investing in what is perceived as a white music form” (Mahon 2004:9-10). Rock music is built on a paradoxical configuration: on one hand, its culture historically carries connotations of resistance against the social constraints of ‘mainstream’ society, including dominant race-relations (Bertrand 2000); while on the other hand, it has remained both symbolically and numerically white. Rock music hence poses an
interesting cultural form to investigate how inequalities along ethno-racial lines are deconstructed, ignored or reinforced in cultural participation. To address this sociological puzzle, we focus on how actors navigate different authenticities – whiteness in particular – in rock music consumption.

Therefore, we conducted 27 in-depth interviews with American and Dutch rock music participants of various ethno-racial backgrounds. First, our analyses bring forth three strategies that actors use to navigate the sociocultural configuration of rock music: complying, amending, or replacing. The symbolic exclusion of people of color is often the unintended consequence of how authenticity is attributed at a discursive level and translated into practices: they are a priori regarded as inauthentic resulting from complicity to the whiteness of rock music (Schaap 2015). Yet, the symbolic economy of authenticity (Schwarz 2016) affords participants to resist white hegemony by actively amending or replacing the dominant configuration. Second, outside the rock configuration, non-white participation in rock music is frequently seen as inauthentic by co-ethnics. Not participating in a music genre that authenticates blackness, such as hip-hop (Clay 2003), often leads to allegations of ‘not being black enough’ or ‘acting white’ (Rollock et al. 2013).

Our article makes several contributions to the sociological study of race and ethnicity. First, we advance the understanding of how everyday inequalities in music consumption, often seen as “insignificant or (at best) secondary to the ‘real business’ of race” (Pitcher 2014:29), are consequential for the general maintenance of social boundaries along ethno-racial lines (Bonilla-Silva 2015; Doane 2017). Second, the study of a cultural expression whose symbolic whiteness often remains unnoticed (Brekhus et al. 2010) can shed light on how music genres can have distinctly racialized discourses and practices, even – or especially – when they are not actively
promoted or marketed as such. Third, we empirically unpack how symbolic violence is perpetuated through diverging constructions of authenticity (Schwarz 2016). Ideas about authenticity provide raw symbolic material for reinforcing as well as changing dominant configurations (‘authenticity maneuvering’). On one hand, rock-authenticity is (implicitly) defined in terms of white dispositions, which helps maintain exclusionary practices. On the other hand, color cognizant actors actively change or replace the existing rock configuration and the structural constraints it poses, drawing on a form of authenticity defined in terms of agentic resistance (see Sewell 2005).

WHITENESS AND ROCK MUSIC

We define music genres as collectives that “bind together an industry, performers, critics, and fans in making what they identify as a distinctive sort of music” (Lena 2012:6). Actors share a collective belief in genre boundaries based on content, semantics and practices (Altman 1999). Constructing and maintaining these categorical boundaries is essential in the formation of music scenes and subcultures (Bennett and Peterson 2004). While relatively fluid (Bennett 1999), such boundaries are the concrete outcomes of mental frameworks that have developed and shared over time (Nippert-Eng 1996). Thus, genres function as ‘sociocultural configurations’ (DiMaggio 1997; Patterson 2014a): mental frameworks that provide artists and audiences with relatively stable, domain-specific collections of cultural knowledge, making some discourses and practices more easily available than others (Patterson 2014a:20). For example, a ‘hip hop configuration’ (Patterson 2014b) offers a different framework in terms of symbolic conventions (clothing styles, sound, instruments) and social conventions (dominant types of ethno-racial connotations) than a ‘rock configuration.’ Indeed, the historical development of rock music and its sociocultural
configuration provide an exemplar of the changing alignment between genres and ethno-racial differentiations.

**Rock Music in the United States**

Rooted in the South of the United States, early rock ‘n’ roll musicians such as Chuck Berry, Little Richard, Rosetta Tharpe and Big Mama Thornton were of African-American descent and had a background in gospel and (rhythm and) blues (Nanry 1972; Redd 1985). Associated with working-class culture and blackness, early rock ‘n’ roll was understood by critics as primitive, rebellious noise bearing a message of moral decay (Bertrand 2000). Due to segregationist practices, record labels were reluctant to market and sell ‘black’ music to white audiences (Dowd 2003; Peterson 1990). Consequently, white rock ‘n’ roll musicians such as Bill Haley, Elvis Presley and Jerry Lee Lewis were less hesitantly embraced by record companies and media outlets than their black counterparts when the genre gained traction among mainstream audiences. Although historical accounts differ, this occurred in a relatively brief period between 1954 and 1956 (cf. Chapelle and Garofalo 1977; Marcus 1976; Peterson 1990; Shaw 1987) and, aside from changes in the socio-cultural landscape, technological changes such as the major music companies’ shift from radio to television, played a fundamental role in propelling the genre in the United States as well as internationally (Negus 1992; Peterson 1990).

These developments effectively re-constructed a color line (Miller 2010) in a genre originally heralded as one of the first racially ‘mixed’ music genres (Bertrand 2000). The commercial ‘whitewashing’ of rock music – the “Elvis effect” (Taylor 1997) – has remained largely unaffected ever since, resulting in the dominance of white artists and audiences in rock music and its numerous subgenres such as indie rock (Bannister 2006), punk (Traber 2001) and
metal (Spracklen 2013). This association has been rather resilient and, as Hamilton (2016:12) notes, “(...) attempts to reckon the music’s racial exclusivity have often been met with hostility.” Consequently, music executives regularly claim that “black rock won’t sell to whites because it is black, and it won’t sell to blacks because it is rock” (Mahon 2004:68). From a perspective of production and distribution, the sociocultural configuration of rock music provides little space for discussions of ethno-racial diversity.

**Rock Music in the Netherlands**

In the Netherlands, rock music was first produced in the 1950s by Indonesian and Moluccan immigrants who were forced to relocate to the Netherlands in the decade after the Indonesian War of Independence (1945-1949). Due to the presence of American radio stations in Indonesia after the war, many of these migrants were familiar with American guitar-propelled music, unlike most of their Dutch peers. Not knowing whether they would remain in the Netherlands and being prevented full participation in the labor force, many of these new immigrants pursued a career in the entertainment industry by playing American-style rock ‘n’ roll (Mutsaers 1990). ‘Indorock,’ as it was ethnically marked retrospectively, dominated Dutch dancehalls between 1956 and 1964 with bands like The Crazy Rockers, The Hap-Cats and The Tielman Brothers (Smilde 2017). Artistically, these bands were considered authentic rock acts to such an extent that some white musicians painted their faces darker in an attempt to increase their legitimacy (Mutsaers 1990:310). Commercially, these groups were relatively unsuccessful as “the gatekeepers of the industry and the media were reluctant to invest in a self-supporting scene of immigrant youths with attitudes” (Mutsaers and Keunen 2018:xxiv). Despite claims by themselves and others that they were never discriminated against, reports show that artists were regularly called *pinda’s*
SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE AND THE SYMBOLIC ECONOMY OF AUTHENTICITY

According to Bourdieu (1991), how people categorize and classify culture is essential in the struggle for power between social groups. Classification is a political process that involves negotiations between various self-interested parties (Nippert-Eng 1996). A key aspect of this struggle is the act of symbolic violence, a non-physical form of violence that makes “particular interests and invested understandings and social relations of the world appear to be universal, natural, and true” (Hancock 2008:789). In other words, those in positions of social dominance continually (re-)establish certain cultural forms – and their related social groups – as universally better than others. Although symbolic violence can be employed in an instrumental way, its structural nature causes complicity among both dominant and dominated groups (Schwarz 2016), “who do not want to know that they are subject to it or even that they themselves exercise it” (Bourdieu 1991:164). Thus, symbolic violence can make dominated groups act against their own interests.

Schwarz (2016) describes how, in contemporary western societies, symbolic violence is increasingly based on (different) notions of authenticity. Authenticity is widely regarded as “a claim that is made by or for someone, thing, or performance,” a social construct that is “either
accepted or rejected by relevant others” (Peterson 2005:1086). For most people, authenticity is meaningful as it stands for that which is ‘real’ rather than that which is ‘false’ or ‘fake’ (Grazian 2003:16). Symbolic violence based on authenticity focusses on how actors are evaluated to fit in with discourses and practices of a configuration. As such, “engagement with the very same cultural practice may grant value to some social actors (for whom it is recognized as authentic), while devaluing others (for whom it is not)” (Schwarz 2016:7). However, configurations encompass multiple authenticities (Nagy-Sándor and Berkers 2018). Social actors can emphasize “certain categories within a normative cluster of conditions that govern authenticity, while downplaying others” (Harkness 2012:288). Hence, authenticity claims are intrinsically situational and can be used to change configurations. The act of attempting to change the hegemonic form of authenticity of a configuration, is what we label ‘authenticity maneuvering.’

In general, authenticity can have three different meanings, which sometime intersect (Schwarz 2016). First, agentic authenticity refers to ‘being true to one self,’ regardless of social position (Giddens 1991; Taylor 1992). Notions of authentic self-realization are rooted in the idea that individuals should ‘follow their heart’ or can only find their ‘authentic selves’ through personal introspection. Second, dispositional authenticity refers to acting in line with the position into which one was socialized, the Heideggerian view of “authenticity as faithfulness to one’s past,” habitus or social group (Schwarz 2016:10). This form of authenticity explains why socially mobile individuals often feel inauthentic based on an experienced “gap between what the social world objectively allows us to ‘express’ at a given moment and what it has put in us during past socialization” (Lahire 2003:354). Third, discursive authenticity refers to one’s fit with “discursive, cultural structures” (Schwarz 2016:9) or sociocultural configurations (Patterson 2014a). Not the agentic idea of ‘turning the gaze inwards,’ or the notion that social dispositions
determine authenticity, but rather one’s fit with a sociocultural configuration and its discourse, establishes (in)authentic participation.

Obedience to genre boundaries lies at the heart of all value judgments in music (Frith 1996:75), making discursive authenticity a central type of authenticity within music production and reception. However, in order to determine who does (not) fit within these boundaries, social actors draw upon certain authenticities, while ignoring others (Nagy-Sándor and Berkers 2018). For example, white rap participants are frequently judged as ‘acting black’ (Harrison 2008), arguably being disloyal to both their ‘true selves’ and the social group they were socialized in. This judgment relies on the ideological discourse that signifies rap music as black culture; yet, its origins are rather mixed (Rose 1994). This lack of dispositional authenticity can however only be partially compensated for by drawing on discursive authenticity – adopting styles of dress and talk (Cutler 2003) or displaying subcultural knowledge (Thornton 1995) – or agentic authenticity – being a commercially successful (music) entrepreneur (Peterson 1997).

In summary, rock music as a configuration comprises tacit genre boundaries (discursive authenticity), which on one hand encourages self-realization (agentic authenticity) – to many, rock music connotes freedom and anti-establishment – but on the other hand has been racialized as white, limiting participation (dispositional authenticity). Below we will discuss how participants draw on different rock authenticities to maintain or change its dominant but often implicit whiteness. While our focus is on authenticity maneuvering within the rock configuration, we will also report on reactions that respondents receive from ethno-racial peers outside the rock configuration.
DATA AND METHODS

For this article, the first author (white, male) conducted 27 in-depth interviews to study how rock participants navigate its whiteness, in Atlanta and Rotterdam. In the United States, Atlanta was selected as it is a ‘minority-majority’ city, home to around 475,000 inhabitants (excluding Atlanta-metro) of which more than half identify as African-American (U.S. Census Bureau 2016). Fieldwork and interviews were conducted from April to August, 2016. In the Netherlands, Rotterdam was selected as a field of study. Rotterdam is a distinctly multi-ethnic city, housing around 638,000 inhabitants of which a relatively large amount (38 percent) is of ‘non-western descent’ (Gemeente Rotterdam 2018). Fieldwork and interviews here took place between June 2015 and April 2016. Both medium-sized cities are better known for their urban or hip-hop scenes than their rock scenes; yet, active and musically diverse rock scenes exist in both metropoles. Atlanta and Rotterdam provide a rather interesting comparison because their rock music scenes are, first, considerably present while not dominant and, second, in a local context that is ethno-racially heterogenous.

Fifteen respondents were located in the Atlanta rock scene, twelve in Rotterdam. In order to draw a diverse sample from these populations, we used a maximum-variation sampling strategy (Flick 2006:130–131), making sure that persons from various backgrounds (age, gender, level of education and race/ethnicity) were included. As music ‘scenes’ have both local and virtual properties (Bennett and Peterson 2004), respondents were recruited at rock concerts and (online) social spaces pertaining to the genre, varying in size and subgenre. Potential respondents were queried into the frequency of their participation, as we targeted individuals who considered themselves relatively active participants in their local scene. Respondents were interviewed at a location of their choice (at their home, a coffee shop, bar, concert venue or university). By
including people of color and whites, our research recognizes the inherently dialectical and spatially situated nature of ethno-racial boundaries, allowing for a conjunctive understanding of everyday inequalities (Wimmer 2015:2188). Yet, as the research populations are dominated by whites and our focus is on whiteness, the majority of our sample is white (ten men and seven women). Moreover, due to our sampling strategy, there is ample within-group variation regarding age and educational background. Ten respondents are non-white (self-defined, see table 1), of which four identify as female. The mean age is 28.9, ranging from 18 to 38. The educational breakdown of our interviewees varies, with 13 having enjoyed high school or vocational training and 14 having a college or university degree. On average, interviews lasted 63 minutes, the shortest taking 34 minutes and the longest lasting 105 minutes. All were (audio) recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Table 1. Respondent sociodemographic characteristics (n=27).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbigail</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bi-ethnic, white / Asian-American</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White / American</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White / Dutch</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnout</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White / Dutch</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berna</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Turkish-Dutch</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White / American</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claas</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White / Dutch</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic-American</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White / Dutch</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bi-racial, white / African-American</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwayne</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White / American</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White / American</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bi-ethnic, White / Hispanic-American</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estelle</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White / American</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White / Dutch</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic-American</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each interview started with a photo elicitation task based on Q Methodology (Watts and Stenner 2012), in which respondents were asked to sort a diverse range of rock musicians based on the question “how ‘rock’ do you rate this artist?” (Schaap and Berkers 2019). These images were diverse in terms of rock’s subgenres (e.g. indie, punk, metal, stadium rock), but also in terms of artists’ ethno-racial and gender traits. This aided in opening up the conversation on whiteness, particularly when interviewing white men (especially as a white, male interviewer). Moreover, as respondents discussed the different photos, it become clear which aspects they paid attention to (and, importantly, which they ignored), which aspects they ‘marked’ (Brekhus et al. 2010), and how this relates to authentication practices. None of the respondents reported any difficulty in sorting or conceptualizing what ‘rock’ means to them.

Interviews were conducted using an open interview guide, which concentrated on the personal biography of the respondent’s involvement in rock, general experience of the local scene, and ideas about what encompasses ‘authentic’ rock. To make sure respondents discussed the rock scene in their own understanding and experience, we left it up to them whether and when they brought up specific topics, such as race-ethnicity. This also allowed us to assess to what
extent respondents are aware of these issues, if and how they grant precedence to one aspect over the other, and what they find relevant. This strategy made the interviews considerably reflexive and content-rich (Roulston 2010). The interviews were analyzed using an iterative, inductive coding process based on grounded theory (Bryant and Charmaz 2007). This allowed for a continual cross-comparing of the different subjectivities and discourses presented to us by the respondents. By following a sequence of open, axial and selective coding (Charmaz 2006; Goulding 2002), we abstracted three latent positions towards the rock music configuration – complying, amending and replacing – which we will discuss below.5

INSIDE THE ROCK CONFIGURATION

Complying: “No One Cares. In a Good Sense No One Cares.”

For most white respondents, the configuration of rock music remains white – unmarked and unexamined. In their discussions of diversity in scene-involvement, abstract universalist ideas about the negligible relevance of race-ethnicity are habitually brought to the fore (Bonilla-Silva 2003). In this position of complicity, authentication is implicitly based on ethno-racial markers (dispositions) to question – albeit rarely intentionally – others’ participation in the scene. Of all interviewees, Johan (male, white) verbalizes best what many say: “No, that’s something I don’t pay attention to at all. No, no, it really isn’t of any interest to me.” Similarly, Kamille (female, white) notes that “I see it as all the same. I don’t see it as one or the other, you know?” Such color-blind attitudes are not exclusively expressed by white respondents, however. Naresh (male, Indian-Dutch), while often being the only person of color at shows, shares similar ideas, adding that “you really shouldn’t pay attention to that [race] in music.” Passionately, Jeffrey (male, Colombian-American) summarizes: “no one cares. In a good sense, no one cares.”
To explain the occasional presence of people of color, white respondents typically juxtapose specific individual traits of these participants with essentialist ideas about blackness. In such cases, non-whites are often perceived as authentic when they have enjoyed a ‘white’ socialization. For example, Daisy (female, white) uses dispositional authentication – based on socialization and expected role behavior – to explain why a fan of rock music fits in, despite being black:

I think it is because they are people that I know personally or that have grown up here. And then I think “yeah, that’s so you [‘innate’]⁶, that’s not black.” Which is really strange of course. Because they do have another skin color than white. But because it’s so you, it isn’t black for me.

Alfred (male, white) reasons in a similar vein, noting how the milieu-specific context one is socialized into matters more than racial traits, yet clearly equating being Dutch with whiteness: “Most black people, like ‘dark,’ other ethnicities or something… who are into rock music – I suddenly realize – it seems like they are just less part of black culture or something.” Marc (male, Indonesian-Dutch) too explains that “the few guys that I know who are black and a little bit into making alternative music with white people, are adopted.” Daisy (female, white) quite clearly draws from a framework of authentication through ascribed group identity:

I continually want to make the comparison with when a Dutch man or woman teaches Tai Chi lessons. Then I find the Tai Chi all of a sudden less, ehm, really Tai Chi than when it would be an Asian person. That’s ridiculous of course, but that’s the way it is, that’s the way I feel it.
Asking her to extend this metaphor to music, Daisy chooses to apply it to whiteness in hip-hop, which she also sees as a mismatch: “because I associate hip-hop with blackness. That if they all were white people, I would really think ‘you’re all just little Eminems’ or ‘what are you doing here, acting cool and everything?’” Interestingly, white respondents typically use examples that ridicule white people in a black scene rather than people of color in a white scene – even though the latter is essentially the topic of the conversation (see also: Hancock 2008).

Non-white respondents observe – and experience – that digressions from the white norm are often approached with suspicion. Although this is routinely disguised as (at times, genuine and positive) surprise, people of color entering this white configuration are first regarded as out-group members and hence considered discursively inauthentic. In Kendrick’s (male, African-American) experience, white people are often vocally appreciative of ethno-racial difference. Nevertheless, he adds that: “I get little micro-aggressions when I first meet someone. Like, even if I go to a punk show and, like, ‘yeah, I listen to this and this band’. ‘Oh? You do?’ Something like that.” Jennifer (female, bi-racial) also feels welcome in the rock scene, regardless of the fact that she is often marked as a woman of color. The querying of her discursive authenticity is not unique to the rock scene in her experience:

I literally feel that every interaction. I literally feel that every day at some point.

So that doesn’t really tip the scales for me. I’m used to being one of the few black people in the room and I’m definitely used to being the only black girl in the room.

Similarly, Kendrick does not think this kind of behavior is unique to the rock scene since “that’s just stuff that, like, as a black person, you just kinda get accustomed to.” Likewise, Berna
(female, Turkish-Dutch) notices how she is often kept at arm’s length by others at shows – even in crowded venues – until she signals familiarity with the music (e.g. singing or moving along to the songs), which authenticates her presence for others. Recently, she noticed at a concert that:

I saw everyone around me – I was the only person there wearing a headscarf – looking at me like ‘what is she doing here?’ And I felt so… You’re so close together [at shows], but I could really do [makes a wide gesture] with my arms. No one was next to me. (…) Then after they saw me singing along, then they all came up to me and we started talking and it got close again. Because I think they think, like, “she doesn’t belong here.”

Being perceived as discursively inauthentic, people of color often only feel authenticated after harsh albeit tacit scrutiny. To circumvent this kind of symbolic violence, non-white respondents typically retort to redirecting the focus of discursive authentication from race-ethnicity to subcultural capital, by singing along like Berna, or by means of apparel as Dennis (male, bi-racial) explains:

[If] I would wear what I’m basically wearing right now, like a t-shirt, baggy shorts and tennis shoes or whatever, people look at me like “what are you doing here?” (…) I think that, like, no matter what I do, I can’t slap on a pair of jeans and erase the color of my skin.

However, Dennis has also often experienced being singled out in a supposedly positive way:

Like, I’ve been told by certain people, like, “O, you’re the coolest black dude I’ve ever met!” and that in itself is a really strange sentence. (…) Like, I already have
a million biases against me, but the, because of like, who I am, they’re like “I appreciate you even though…” It’s kinda like an underhand compliment.

To some white participants, Dennis’ blackness signals that he belongs to an outgroup. This demonstrates how the assessment of an individual’s discursive authenticity occurs both through explicit scrutiny and, more implicitly, in positive affirmation of participation. As Dennis states himself – ‘an underhand compliment’ –, such acts of symbolic violence may not be exclusionary by intention but nonetheless instigate feelings of being excluded.

*Amending: “That People Go Home Thinking ‘Oh, So That’s Also Possible!’”*

Not all scene members relegate topics regarding inequality to ‘the universe of the undiscussed’ (Bourdieu 1977:168). Instead, there is a substantial group of people who try to amend the dominant configuration of rock music by ‘adding’ non-white experiences to it. In the Dutch context, Pinar and Berna (both female, Turkish-Dutch) are most active in this regard. By embracing the scene and amending the configuration to obtain discursive authenticity from white members, they employ their agency to (try to) bring forth configurational changes and decrease symbolic violence. Berna explains that:

> If I look back at the last two years, then I’m really happy that I did it [wearing a head scarf] because it helped me gain so many good experiences. And I’ve changed the minds of so many people. And that’s what I like most about going to rock shows: that people go home thinking “oh, so that’s also possible!” you know?
In a similar way, Pinar feels that her Muslim identity, signified by her colorful headscarf, helps to break open conversations with fellow rock fans on topics such as identity and belonging – particularly since the terrorist attacks at the Bataclan concert venue in November 2015. These conversations take place at concerts but also on social media. She claims to not mind that she often is treated with suspicion in the scene:

No not really, because the more I get to be seen as a Muslim or foreigner, the more minds I can change, you know? The more prejudice I can change. (…) People are coming to these shows with an idea like “ah, those Muslims really aren’t cool people,” and then they go home with the idea that “ah, that was a really cool Muslim-woman [Moslima]!” you know? That’s what I’m all in favor of. That’s just… That’s what I really live for. I like it so much!

Pinar enjoys opening up these conversations, almost as an act of subversion:

I just start with one person, or I start the conversation. And then it just increases, you know? Because you see that people do want to ask something but they just don’t know how I’m going to respond. But to me, it’s actually the other way around. Like, how are they going to react to my presence here? So the moment someone begins to talk, the rest starts talking as well, you know? Then it gets really fun.

In the U.S. context, Jennifer (female, bi-racial) is less enthusiastic about functioning as a marker for change. She feels that white people are structurally unaware of these issues, adding:
I think there’s been a couple of sporadic moments of clarity and awareness. But that usually comes at the expense of a black person saying “you guys?!” [scowls], you know? (…) It’s always been someone from the outside saying “get it together.” Which I don’t think bodes very well and I don’t think it’s very healthy and I also don’t think it’s my obligation to tell you that you don’t have any black people here.

As we saw earlier with participants aiming to escape a position of complicity, individuals who resist symbolic violence based on one attribute can still feel unsure or complicit towards another. Erin (female, bi-ethnic), who is very outspoken about her feminist ideals, states:

I don’t speak too much on racial issues because I don’t want to be told that I’m doing it wrong, that I’m ignorant, that I don’t understand. So until I can fully understand – which will never happen – I’m a white female American, I can’t take a stand you know?

As these conflicts demonstrate, amending the configuration that establishes rock music authenticity has limitations regarding reachable change, and are felt – sometimes optimistically, often pessimistically – to necessitate time and persistence to enact change. Instead, some interviewees report to employ another form of creative resistance to the guiding configuration: replacing it.

Replacing: “Fine, then I’ll make my Own Public Space”

Amending the rock configuration brings forth short-term changes among specific individuals. However, participants who take this position often disparage instances of being regarded as
discursively inauthentic by fellow scene members and are aware of the sustained effort that is necessary to enhance their position. Based partly on a longing for immediate rather than future change and partly due to experiencing tiredness of continuously addressing issues of ethno-racial inequality – ‘racial battle fatigue’ (Smith, Allen, and Danley 2007), some interviewees aim to simply replace the current rock configuration for another, more inclusive one.

First, in order to do so, participants do not invent new authenticities. Instead, in an act of authenticity maneuvering, they draw upon possible authenticities already embedded in rock history and re-construct a new rock configuration out of this raw symbolic material. They re-affirm the agentic authenticity of rock music, i.e. its history of anti-‘mainstream’ ideas and rebellion against hegemony (McDowell 2017). Moreover, they recover rock music’s African-American roots as part of its discursive authenticity. Excavating this raw material has become substantially easier as rock music’s diverse history is accessible through online sources dedicated to such topics. From the perspective of this discourse and accompanying practices, individuals from marginalized groups are perceived to have more reason to rebel through rock music than those in privileged positions. As Alexis (female, white) explains: “You know, it’s kind of like, the act is political. And like, taking out space. For these people [people of color], taking that space is political.” Similarly, Arnout (male, white) finds that “protest music is originally more a black kind of music than a white kind of music,” and hence argues that people of color are very much part of rock music culture. Respondents typically mention specific black rock artists (primarily Bad Brains, Big Mama Thornton and Living Colour) who are seen to embody this position. This authenticity maneuvering aims to solve the paradox of, on one hand, rock music’s rebellion against (white) mainstream society and, on the other hand, it’s whiteness, by aligning non-white dispositional authenticity with rock’s discursive authenticity.
Second, respondents employing this position often reflect on the role of gatekeepers who determine what is authentic and what is not. Dwayne (male, white), who occasionally organizes shows, is reflexive about how his own social position might influence his scene activity:

it’s really weird because it’s just the constant argument; it’s like, well, I am part of the problem, inherently. (…) But I try my best to realize that privilege that I have, just like, as a white male in America. And I use, sort of, that knowledge and awareness of that privilege to try and base my decisions.

Similarly, Jennifer (female, bi-racial) feels that white gatekeeping still is an issue, “plaguing a lot of the scenes where I’m in in Atlanta where they’ll say ‘we’re inclusive, we just don’t know anybody [of color] from over there.’” To her, this “it’s just a matter of, like, the way things are promoted, the way things are advertised. You’re never gonna reach certain parts of the city if you don’t actively go over there and try to get black people to your shows.” Dwayne (male, white) feels that the local grassroots (“Do It Yourself,” DIY) scene is more diverse in terms of gender and sexuality than race-ethnicity. Although in his experience, this is due to practical difficulties of getting people in, which he actively works on:

It’s hard when you want to be very organic with your outreach and things, but sometimes you don’t want to force someone to be interested in something. So it’s about opening the door and saying “here we are, this is what we’re doing, it’s queer-positive, body-positive, any race, any ethnicity, come on in!”

To all, the underlying goal is to replace the discourse and its grip on established gatekeepers by forging new spaces. As Alexis (female, white) explains: “I can’t go to
shows at whatever bar anymore?” Fine, then I’ll make my own public space. And that’s kind of what it is.”

Third, this is followed by a perceived need to exchange rock music practices by other, more inclusive ones. The main goal of this strategy is to simply secure space for those excluded in rock’s white-male configuration. Constructing a more inclusive configuration based on rock’s established practices is sometimes practically challenging. Dwayne (male, white) is one of the most outspoken supporters of founding new “positive and inclusive” scenes. He explains:

If you really wanna have an inclusive scene, I think a lot of things need to be done. I think, one is, the majority of shows need to be “all ages.” And you can’t just book shows with all white dudes in the bands.

Discussing a relatively common practice in certain spaces to not allow any kind of violence at shows, including stagediving or mosh pits, Winston (male, white) finds it difficult to abide to these new conventions when he gets excited about an artist but then always decides: “you wanna have a reaction but then having to step outside of yourself and say ‘no, I can’t do that. I could also express my enthusiasm in a way that’s not gonna possibly hurt somebody at the same time.’” Chuck (male, white) supports such policing: “I really appreciate seeing bands stop people from brawling or whatever. It’s not their responsibility, but I appreciate them feeling responsible for it.” He directly relates this to creating a more (in this case, gender) inclusive scene:

I feel like if I was a woman and I had the choice to like, “I want to see this band but I just really don’t want to stand in a room full of sweaty dudes swinging their arms around,” like, I would be less inclined to go, as a woman.
Dwayne (male, white) extends these rules to lyrical content, discourse and practices, which “should not be offensive.” This is policed by individually addressing audience or band members on their behavior:

As a teacher, you don’t yell at a kid in front of their friends. They’re gonna hate you and they’re never gonna listen to you again. You sit ‘em down and you say what’s going on. It’s the same thing with, like, dealing with bands that sort of violate the ethics of the community.

If this is not possible, he adds, it feels “comforting just to look around the room and see people look at each other and cringing.” Although Dennis (male, bi-racial) agrees that derogatory behavior is unwelcome at shows, according to him, public shaming (e.g. online) does not allow for change. He explains:

You never know when someone can change, you know what I mean? I say that as somebody who formerly, like… I was a total shithead in high school. (…)

Someone easily could’ve put me on that list back then, for being an asshole. (…)

That really just bugs me, cause you don’t know when you’re catching someone.

It’s not right to publicly smear someone. And to me, that’s definitely not rock ‘n’ roll.

Again, such discourse stands in stark opposition to the reasoning of respondents supporting rock’s historical ideology. As Alfred (male, white) argues: “it’s a genre where you have to let yourself go. It’s something wild and it has something with yelling, drinking a lot. (…) But also yourself… Not caring about what others think of you.” From such juxtapositions, it becomes
clear that aiming to amend – rather than replace – rock’s discourse and practices, can easily be legitimated.

Yet, this active configurational restructuring is occasionally experienced as difficult to maintain – resisting requires more effort than complying – but interviewees are quick to note the unexpected advantages of these spaces, such as the potential for musical innovation, which is also regarded as a way to discursively authenticate inclusive practices. For example, Dennis (male, bi-racial) feels that these spaces fuel innovation because a new scene “doesn’t have a connotation or an identity yet, so anyone can access it. (..) You can be anyone, I guess, and access it. It has this, like, a connotation of being more open-minded.”

OUTSIDE THE ROCK CONFIGURATION

The analysis also reveals how authentication by co-ethnics outside the rock configuration contributes to symbolic violence from the outside in. Importantly, white respondents rarely mention that they were judged or obstructed by family members or friends when they sparked an interest in rock music. As whites, their participation in rock music is never observed as being unaligned with their dispositional inauthenticity. Arnout (male, white) epitomizes this position when he states “I never really took it into consideration (…) I don’t feel it matters anything that I am a white [blanke] man.”

For non-white respondents however, their perceived dispositional misalignment with the rock configuration is a crucial theme. Most of them report feeling pressured to avoid rock music as a form of identification, due to its whiteness. Jennifer (female, bi-racial) rarely feels understood by black family members and friends: “I have black friends of mine who think that it’s not, like, ‘I don’t listen to that, that’s for white people, that’s a white people thing.’”
Although her co-ethnic friends are mainly “bemused” by her preferences, growing up, family members gave considerable pushback as Jennifer’s preference for rock music was considered as at odds with black culture:

They just thought I was “acting white.” They didn’t think that this was serious. (…) They didn’t think anything of my younger sister going to gangster rap artists. Like, they didn’t think anything of that. They just thought that it was weird that a black girl was into rock music. (…) They just didn’t think that rock was for black people and therefore I shouldn’t participate in it. (…) I definitely heard it all at this point.

As Jennifer’s experience clearly reveals, ‘black’ music genres such as hip hop can authenticate blackness (Clay 2003; Oware 2016), which can function as a double-edged sword. On one hand, support for these musical forms can provide a distinct sense of social belonging and empowerment. On the other hand, persons of color supporting non-black or disliking black music genres are easily perceived by whites and non-whites to contradict their ascribed identity. As such, symbolic violence on the basis of race and ethnicity is not only perpetuated by whites, but also by those who are dominated in the ethno-racial system (Hancock 2008).

Similarly, Jeremiah (male, African-American) experienced difficulties growing up and developing a taste for rock and heavy metal music as a black person: “Being a black person from a black community in the early 90s, everyone was into rap, you know? And it was not accepted to be a black person and like metal.” As a consequence, he was considered an outcast and bullied a lot, being “the only black kid liking metal” in his community. In the same way, Kendrick (male, African-American) was often told by peers “you’re still into rock? You’re so white dude!”

Drawing from the equation of whiteness as essentially ‘cultureless’ (Hughey 2012), he explains
that “white is synonymous with, like, especially here [in Atlanta], lameness. Like, you can’t
dance? ‘you so white!,’ stuff like that.” Although quick to explain this is often meant as a joke,
Kendrick is frequently judged to act at odds with authentic blackness: “Like, ‘you listen to rock
music? I think I’m blacker than you!'” As a strategy to circumvent this, Kendrick reports that he
“would listen to rap just to try to fit in,” downplaying his unfolding interest in rock music.

In the Netherlands, Pinar (female, Turkish-Dutch) feels an outcast in her ethnic
community. When she started listening to rock music, she first was hesitant to engage with the
genre: “It was so different. And I didn’t want to be even more different than I already was, you
know?” Because of her rock music apparel, musical preferences, and the fact that she did not
wear a headscarf, “allochtones⁷ at school didn’t want to have anything to do with me.” Among
co-ethnics, her musical preference is seen as problematic, especially when she showcases her
taste through her clothing – employed to increase her discursive authenticity within the rock
configuration:

Now you don’t really see it that I listen to that kind of music. But, yeah, I do still
wear black and band shirts and such, but basically you can’t really see that I’m
listening to it [rock music] anymore. I don’t have my studded belt dangling
around at knee-height anymore. And then all of a sudden it’s okay again, because
it’s all about appearance and status. Then you look normal.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

While rock music is rooted in notions of rebellion against ‘mainstream’ society, it has also been a
symbolically ‘white’ cultural product since its whitewashing in the early 1950s. As such, rock
music culture offers a rather paradoxical combination of (potential) liberation from societal
conventions, while reproducing its normative whiteness. In this article, we investigated how rock music consumers in the Netherlands and the United States navigate this tension, i.e. how white and non-white rock consumers authenticate each other vis-à-vis the categorical boundaries in rock music’s sociocultural configuration and its discourse. We demonstrated how symbolic violence depending on authentication through faithfulness to pre-established sociocultural configurations reinforces the whiteness of rock music consumption in both countries in very similar ways. The analysis indicates how the shift towards a symbolic economy of authenticity affords actors to resist white hegemony as discursive authenticity is employed at the expense of the more rigid dispositional and agentic variations underlying symbolic violence (Schwarz 2016). This is done by (re)negotiating the dominant configuration within the genre – authenticity maneuvering –, or forging new spaces of consumption by replacing the discourse and installing new practices. More specifically, the analysis of interviews produced a three-fold typology of positions that rock consumers take vis-à-vis the configuration of rock music authenticity: complying, amending, or replacing.

First, in a position of complicity, people of color are often a priori regarded as inauthentic participants – also by individuals outside of rock’s configuration who consider them to ‘act white.’ Second, we identified a position of awareness of the rock music configuration and the goal of amending this within their local scene. Rock scene participants engage with the configuration but do not accept it. Rather, they aim to (repeatedly) demonstrate that rock music is not exclusively white. A third position aims at replacing the configuration pertaining rock music authenticity with a more inclusive one, primarily by creating new spaces beyond the existing scene. From this position, rock music’s notions of rebellion are converted to speak specifically to a ‘non-white’ experience, effectively de-authenticating rock’s whiteness. Importantly,
exclusionary practices – mainly found in the first position – are not only perpetrated by white men: intersecting positions of whiteness/femininity or blackness/masculinity place actors simultaneously in a position of advantage and disadvantage, on the basis of which they can shift positions between complicity or resistance. Further studies should address such intersectional aspects (e.g. Dawes 2012), also including other potential sources of exclusion such as religion or sexuality – both only briefly addressed in our article.

Despite the fact that the ethno-racial constellations of the Netherlands and the United States are very different, the analysis demonstrates that issues regarding race-ethnicity are largely viewed from a similar perspective. We can identify two reasons for this considerable overlap. First, American popular culture has dominated cultural consumption, particularly popular music, in the Netherlands since the Second World War. As such, cultural knowledge about rock music is quite similar between American and Dutch respondents and heavily U.S.-focused. The sociocultural configuration of rock music, including its ties to whiteness, is thus shared between both consumer groups, as the configuration has ‘travelled’ from the United States to the Netherlands. Second, the reluctance to discuss race-ethnicity in the Netherlands (Essed 1991) is similar to that in the United States (Bonilla-Silva 2003), even though the ethno-racial makeup (and its consequences) are quite distinct. As the analysis demonstrates, both American and Dutch respondents utilize similar understandings of ethno-racial difference. This is probably strengthened by Dutch familiarity with American ethno-racial discourse through substantial exposure to U.S.-based (social) media and popular culture.

Nevertheless, there are some notable differences between the American and Dutch sociocultural configurations. First, while American respondents are relatively aware of the mixed racial roots of rock ‘n’ roll, Dutch respondents are typically less familiar with these origins. They
also tend to be unaware of the Dutch history of rock music production, as most of their knowledge regards American and, to a lesser extent, British rock music. This does not, however, seem to have consequences for how they evaluate whiteness. Second, due to the lack of an unequivocal vocabulary to discuss issues of ethno-racial inequality in the Netherlands (Weiner 2016), Dutch respondents often struggle to find the “right” words, preferring ethnic terms (e.g. Surinamese, African-American, Muslim) over racial ones that American respondents use. While the employment of color-blindness prevails among both respondent groups, this more often regards ethnicity than race in the Netherlands. Overall however, these discursive differences do not seem to influence the very similar processes of symbolic violence identified in the American and Dutch contexts.

Finally, our study demonstrates that music consumers are not always simply complicit to a genre’s configuration and that, if they resist, this is not always related to their own ethno-racial background. By changing what it means to authentically be “rock” – authenticity maneuvering –, these actors try to achieve structural change in and beyond their local rock scenes, which are dominated by white men. Structuralist arguments, especially those found in Bourdieu, rarely allow for narratives of structural change. However, our study implicates that actors’ efforts and motivations to change a dominant configuration affords agentic structural change. Indeed, we can follow Sewell’s (2005) framework that:

Structures are in fact dual: how historical agents’ thoughts, motives, and intentions are constituted by the cultures and social institutions into which they are born, how these cultures and institutions are reproduced by the structurally shaped and constrained actions of those actions, but also how, in certain
circumstances, the agents can (or are forced to) improvise or innovate in structurally shaped ways that significantly reconfigure the very structures that constitute them (128).

Indeed, in a symbolic economy of authenticity (Schwarz 2016), actors engaged with forms of expression numerically and/or symbolically dominated by whites, can actively choose to address and replace the implicit yet dominant perspective that authentic participation is a distinctly white activity. As these practices take place online as well – and stand in direct interaction with it through the persistent usage of smartphones and social media in social spaces – such change gains faster traction than in the past. Clearly, awareness of structural socio-cultural schemas that guide human action through complicity – as found in the symbolic violence pertained by many white and/or male respondents – can also be a fundamental source for resistance.

NOTES
1. Whereas ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ are distinct concepts and subject to considerable discussion in the United States (e.g. Wimmer, 2015; Winant, 2015), they are often used interchangeably (for a comprehensive discussion, see Cornell and Hartmann 2007:15-40). In the Netherlands, references regarding race are shunned and replaced by ethnic, cultural or national associations (Essed and Trienekens, 2008; Weiner, 2016). Having researched both national contexts, Essed (1996) suggests to use the term ‘racial-ethnic’ instead, variations of which we employ throughout the article.
2. Besides its whiteness, rock music production is also notably masculine (Berkers and Schaap, 2018; Leonard 2007). This article occasionally touches upon gendered aspects of
rock music consumption, particularly when intersecting with race-ethnicity. Nevertheless, a full intersectional analysis is an avenue for future research.

3. To ensure anonymity, all respondent names are pseudonyms.

4. Self-defined by respondents during or after the interview.

5. About two-thirds into the recruitment and interviewing, we noticed the patterns as described in our manuscript, and reached theoretical saturation as no fundamental new patterns/positions emerged in subsequent interviews.

6. Daisy used the Dutch word ‘eigen’ here, which roughly translates to ‘innate.’ However, the term ‘you,’ with emphasis, stays closer to the Dutch meaning of the word.

7. Upon asking what ‘allochthones,’ a contested term in the Netherlands meaning ‘non-native Dutch’ but usually indicating ‘non-natively Western’ i.e. white – means to her, she responded: “Moroccan, Turkish, Iraqi… everyone who kind of hangs out with each other.”
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