Singers and songs are like seeds; they follow a large migration. When people leave their country and go on migrations, usually they take their stock of seeds and songs with them. I like the idea of people singing a song and then putting their own stamp on it and then passing it on like a tool.

*Tom Waits (1993)*

To this point in the development of the scholarly study of the popular music industry, the most compelling, complete, and focused treatment of race and the music business remains a collection of chapters from Keith Negus’ two books, *Popular Music in Theory* and *Music Genres and Corporate Cultures*. Negus’ position relies on two points: that meaning in popular music is mediated by identity and that identity is subject to constant social negotiation. While the idea of identity as social performance dates back to the 1950s (Goffman 1959), Negus’ analysis of race and music also benefits from the subsequent development of social construction theory (Berger and Luckman 1966; Romàn-Velázquez 1996; Stokes 1994). Negus considers race and genre as categories that mediate between individual, ready-made social constructs on one hand and the variability of socio-cultural contexts on the other. It is from this position that Negus attacks essentialism as one of the traditional, ethno-musicological approaches to race. If essentialism seeks to locate specific musical elements or motifs as authentically “black” or “Latino,” etc., Negus conversely argues that blues, salsa, or reggae are genres that support the social construction of musical as well as racial identities.

In this chapter, Negus’ position is an important starting point due to its assertion that meaning in music is negotiable and therefore not fixed. The following pages consider the corporate production and reproduction of popular music as a process of translation. The concept of translation serves as a way to articulate various forces driving and informing this core issue of music’s ability to acquire new significance based on its socio-cultural context. Just as the Tom Waits quote above points to the impact of migration upon the meaning or value of a given community’s musical stock, the economic interests of corporate entities such as the radio industry and record companies inscribe new meaning into music. For example, how does Jamaican reggae music prior to 1970 mean something
different from the global version found later in the decade? If, as Georgina Born and David Hesmondhalgh (2000) assert, “a music’s construction of its own identity may involve the exclusion or repudiation of another music,” we will ask how developing genres exclude or repudiate some part of themselves. As a given genre is pushed to grow from ethnic to epic, what is lost in translation?

Rebranding of Black Music in America

In this section, we will look at the birth of rock ’n’ roll and the rebranding of rap as hip-hop as instances in the development of what has been labeled “black music” in America. The plight of black forms of popular music (such as the blues and r&b) at the dawn of the rock ’n’ roll era reveals a great deal regarding race and power in the music business. The movement of these musical forms from the margins to the mainstream of the music business signifies the role of record labels as mediators of provincial music trends and larger socio-cultural norms. As Mike Rowe explains in his book *Chicago Blues: The Music and City*, the story of the great migration grounds the figurative development in the historical reality of migrant communities.¹ The cultural and artistic implications of this exodus support the generally accepted claim that Chicago blues is the electrified permutation of Delta blues that, in turn, contributed to the formation of rock ’n’ roll (George 1998; Marcus 2008; Peterson 1990). Initially grounded in the experience of oppression and poverty shared by rural laborers, the blues now boasts its own iconography within the wider entertainment industry. Contemporary Hollywood movies like *Crossroads* and *O Brother Where Art Thou?* use the icon of the nomadic bluesman hoboing with his stock of songs to convey grassroots yet streetwise authenticity across a wide demographic. While the story of the blues locates migration as an element of cultural translation, how does it respond to our larger inquiry regarding how the music business works to rearrange the meaning of the music?

In the case of rock ’n’ roll and its debt to the blues, the coronation of rock’s king—Elvis Presley—is an important moment of cultural translation. A major division exists in the scholarly appraisal of Elvis with respect to black music in particular. Bound by a predominant black–white binarism, one group criticizes Elvis as a representative of opportunistic white artists who achieved success by virtue of re-recording or “covering” black artists (Altschuler 2003; George 1998; Jefferson 1973; Southern 1971). In contrast, a second group uses socio-economic and musicological perspectives to re-appraise this earlier position (Bertrand 2000; Garofalo 1993; Linden 2012; Marcus 2008). This latter group uses social caste and hegemony to critique the idea that disenfranchisement in the music business is primarily a racial issue. Instead, these studies consider the primacy of power relationships separating creative from corporate communities. From this perspective, Elvis joins a host of other artists of various races and genres all united by record company mismanagement of artist royalties. In other words, as I’ve argued, “The lines of division are not drawn strictly by race, but by the location of an individual within the hierarchy of power, ownership, and control” (Linden 2012: 46). Paraphrasing George Lipsitz, Michael Bertrand adds, “If the popular music establishment had to accept the fad, it would ensure that only one ‘Rock and Roll’ revolutionary from outside the mainstream received corporate clout and a national forum from which to articulate the music’s working-class message” (Bertrand 2000: 80). Within a year following his record deal with RCA, Elvis’ interviews show an active and focused whitewashing of his image:
I don't smoke and I don't drink, and I love to go to movies. Maybe someday I'm gonna have a home and a family of my own, and I'm not gonna budge from it. I was an only child but maybe my kids won't be.

(Presley 1957)

Despite Bertrand’s argument that Elvis’ affinity for blues music was more a reflection of his social caste than of some pre-meditated posturing, his major-label makeover leaves little doubt that the image of “the king” was in fact the result of strategic forethought. While the above quote signifies wholesome values, it is also an effort to overwrite or erase the troublesome image mixing gyrating hips with the sounds of black music. As such, it is a commercial re-packaging of the artist designed for mainstream appeal.

Even in its repackaged form, rock ‘n’ roll remained disruptive to the music business as it impacted labels, broadcasters, and concert promoters. Over the course of the 1950s, the major labels’ decision to pass on what they saw as the new fad of rock ‘n’ roll resulted in their loss of control of the record market. By the end of the decade, the majors had gone from owning 78 percent of record sales to 24 percent, ceding their dominance to independent labels like Chess, VeeJay, and Specialty (Hull 2004: 123). Given that handling rock ‘n’ roll in the 1950s implicated the dual taboos of sex and race, the majors’ need to quickly regain control was risky. Prior to Elvis, it was convenient for mainstream 1950s America to write off sexually suggestive music as a sort of black aberration. With the loss of their market share, the recording industry establishment began to use radio and concert programming to reach out to the previously overlooked black community. By 1960, scandals involving prominent DJs, concert promoters, TV producers, and record companies revealed the corporate structures overseeing the mainstream recording industry were unable to keep from abusive exploitation, including that of the “race” market.²

While the issue of race clearly takes a back seat to the larger issue of profit, it is important to recognize the hegemonic subjugation of the working class—including its significant minority population—as a component of mainstream success. In the case of rock ‘n’ roll, there are numerous examples of black authors whose compositions were overshadowed after being covered and re-released by white mainstream artists. Examples include “Shake, Rattle and Roll” (Bill Haley, 1954 from Jesse Stone, 1953); “Rocket 88” (Bill Haley, 1952 from Ike Turner, 1951); “A Little Bird Told Me” (Evelyn Knight, 1948 from Paula Watson, 1947); and “Sh-Boom” (the Crew Cuts, 1954 from the Chords, 1952). In all of these instances, the cover version would place near the top of the more lucrative pop music charts while the original versions might reach the less lucrative r&b charts. In these cases, authorship, royalties, and the visibility of the original artist’s brand would suffer as the musical form crossed over from r&b into the mainstream.

From Rap to Hip-Hop

Many of these same forces resurface in Byron Hurt’s documentary that examines rap music, Hip Hop: Beyond Beats and Rhymes. This documentary indicates how rap’s movement from an independent distribution network to subsequent incorporation into major record labels impacts its overall message. Not unlike the example of blues/r&b and rock ‘n’ roll, Hurt shows that majors also repackaged rap as a mainstream genre. To better understand this as a process of translation, consider the shifting lyrical content of songs within the genre. In the 1980s and early 1990s, rap conveyed a diversity of messages including the anti-violence of “Self Destruction” (Stop the Violence Movement) and the
cautionary “Children’s Story” (Slick Rick) to the gritty “Message” (Grand Master Flash) and misogynist “Wild Thing” (Ton Loc). Collecting testimonies of young black rappers in Chicago, Hurt shows that the transition from early rap to mainstream gangsta-rap mirrors the transition from rap as an independent label product to the corporate buyout of those labels by the majors. One of the young hopefuls interviewed by Hurt puts it like this: “They don’t give us deals when we speak righteously, they think we don’t want to hear that” (Hurt 2006). Cultural critic Mark A. Neal offers another summary:

When you’re talking to these young rappers, the most important thing for them is to get a record deal . . . and what they’re hearing from the record companies is that “there are only certain examples of blackness that we’re going to let flow through this space.”

(Quoted in Hurt 2006)

Hurt’s exposé reveals that the takeover of rap by major media outlets resulted in a narrowing of the lyrical content to heavily misogynistic and violent themes. As former Def-Jam President Carmen Ashurist Watson puts it, “The time when we switched to ‘gangsta’ music is the same time that the majors bought up all the [independent] labels; and I don’t think that’s a coincidence” (quoted in Hurt 2006). Hurt’s interviews are powerful indicators of how popular music forms can be subject to a semantic overhaul in the course of their commercial development.

Given that major-label affiliation means mainstream circulation, the shift to “gangsta” rap also coincides with the fact that the music was selling to mainstream consumers. This equation is clearly suggestive of how sex and violence can be used to construct a version of what rappers are supposed to be like that would entice the suburban white imagination. Hurt shows that connecting to mainstream white audiences coincides with a degree of disconnection with the experiences of young rappers on the street, its original community. The “gangsta” identity is thus a corporate construct ostensibly used by major labels to increase sales, but with the added result of alienating blacks as well. Negus shows how majors maintain corporate hegemony by tactics that amount to differential treatment of their hip-hop divisions either through violent corporate rhetoric or a general lack of resources. A case in point is Capitol records’ decision to name their rap promotion unit “Capitol Punishment” as well as their use of other war-like metaphors like “snipers,” “commanders,” and “wardens” to describe their rap unit or its associated “street teams.” Combined with under-investment in rap divisions, these metaphors constitute a mode of address that pre-figures a particular type of relationship linking major labels, rap music, and ultimately the perception of the consumers (Negus 1999: 97).

The example of translating rap deviates from that of rock ‘n’ roll and blues in that black artists remain visibly associated with the music, but their creative control is stripped and reduced to only singing about a limited number of themes.

Salsa: Immigration and Translation

In his study, “Popular Music in Puerto Rico: Toward an Anthology of Salsa,” Jorge Duany argues for a Puerto-Rican, as opposed to Cuban, reference point for the provenance of salsa. According to Duany, salsa has profound ties to the communal identity of working-class Puerto-Rican immigrants he refers to as a “semi-nomadic population, perpetually in transit between its homeland and exile” (Duany 1984: 197). To speak of salsa as a form of
popular music in translation, then, it is necessary to bear in mind the ties that *salsa* articulates between this migrant community and its homeland. In this context, the music does not signify the homeland as such, but the experience of being uprooted, the continuous loss of homeland. It follows that *salsa* lays greater claim on the identity of this migrant community than we find in the other groups and genres in this study. This stronger tie works to resist *salsa*’s translation into the mainstream. Without endorsing an essentialist perspective, reading *salsa* in this way benefits from extra focus on the particularities of its native context. In the absence of a stable geographical reference point for generating an identity, immigrant Puerto-Rican communities use *salsa* as an assertive, self-affirming declaration of identity.

From this perspective, the effects of migration upon cultural art forms include new opportunities that did not exist in the homeland, such as the ability to voice political concerns. In the case of *salsa*, both Duany and Felix Padilla reveal tensions that arise from this scenario (Padilla 1990; Duany 1984). While the music industry has interest in the effort to reconfigure *salsa* for commercial exploitation, the migrant Puerto-Rican musicians responsible for bringing the music to the US understand an additional, political significance. These musicians maintain a vital relationship with the live performance as a public platform to directly address Latino consciousness and their own geographic and social mobility. As Negus indicates, “During the late 1960s and early 1970s, *salsa* became integral to the cultural political agenda of activists struggling for social, economic and political recognition in the Americas and Caribbean” (Negus 1999: 131).

While not exclusively bound to either the commercial or political context, it is useful to see the malleability of the status of *salsa* music as a signifying cultural artifact as it shifts in translation. From the transplant Puerto-Rican perspective, the commercial and artistic levels are largely conflated by the need to speak to the sorrows and dreams of a working-class barrio life. However, the commercial effort to re-package *salsa* by record labels has been described as removing the proletarian aggression from the earlier form (*salsa caliente*) and replacing it with a sentimental, feminized version (*salsa romantica*) also referred to as “ketchup” or “*salsa* lite” (Manuel 1995: 283). While it stands to reason that members of the original, migrant community tend to dismiss the modernized version of what they once claimed as their music, Margaret Ramirez reminds us that corporate co-optation also results in new audiences. In the case of *salsa romantica*, the genre’s reception develops—at least from a financial perspective—“from an older, blue collar, Spanish-speaking population to a younger, bilingual market” (Ramirez 1996: B5).

Standard major-label distribution models demonstrate the tensions inherent in trying to translate the meaning of *salsa* between the native and corporate contexts. As Negus indicates, there is a frequent breakdown in these U.S. labels’ ability to re-constitute or even reach *salsa*’s original, blue-collar communities. Labels attempting to distribute Latin music the way they distribute their mainstream records suffer from many of the differences separating Latin and U.S. cultures. Negus finds that the majority of Latin divisions at major labels are unable to communicate with the distribution division that, in turn, lacks the specialist knowledge of the target culture needed when approaching Latin music retailers. He shows how Sony records successfully avoided this situation “as the only major record company which has, for many years, maintained a separate Latin distribution system, Sony Discos” (Negus 1999: 143). This rare, functional model reveals corporate co-optation of distribution as one stumbling block for U.S.-based major labels trying to reach Latin markets. Just as we have seen with hip-hop divisions, major labels typically marginalize their Latin ones. In the case of *salsa*, however, problems of translation are quite literal as demands for greater support and investment result in the standard response to “sing in English.”
Mainstreaming Reggae

Reggae music provides another example of a genre whose signification shifts as migrant Jamaican communities bring their stock of songs to the UK in the post-WWII rebuilding effort. In this context, reggae music is imported as part of the larger Jamaican culture and subsequently incorporated into the growing British recording industry. Stuart Watts’ 2009 documentary *Keep On Runnin’: 50 Years of Island Records* shows how Island Records laid its foundation in selling Jamaican music to Jamaican transplants. Watts uses interviews with artists and businessmen to show how Island developed its niche. Jamaican ex-patriot Count Prince Miller recounts, “Can you imagine? You just leave Jamaica, you leave the Ska, and when it came, it was like a godsend! Every house had it.” British music executive Tom Hayes echoes that thought: “Music to Jamaicans was the same as groceries to us . . . . Whatever their weekly wage was, part of [it] was for music.”

Between 1960 and 1964, Island Records continued to gain market share, most dramatically following Millie Small’s hit “My Boy Lollipop.” Island founder Chris Blackwell’s account of Small’s return to Jamaica after her first international tour provides some perspective on her success:

> I recall when Millie’s motorcade came to the hotel where her mother was waiting for her, and Millie came out and walked towards her mother and her mother curtsied to her. When I saw that, I thought “oh my lord!” Her mother felt so far away from her. Up to that moment, I thought I had done a great job for her, but then I wasn’t sure.

*(Watts 2012)*

This anecdote reveals that the effect of “othering” imparted by the machinery of the music business was powerful enough to reverse the order of the nuclear family. Instead of demanding the respect of her daughter, Millie’s mother abandons it as if the daughter had come from another, royal family. In the current context, this observation suggests an analogy between family relationships and those at work on a wider social level. In so doing, it helps us recognize how commercial success can be disruptive to identity on the levels of the individual, the family, and larger social communities.

In less than a decade, Island Records entered into direct competition with the major labels. By 1970, it had grown into the largest independent label in the UK with artists like Cat Stevens and Bob Marley selling more records than many major-label artists. As one of Island’s top acts of the 1970s, Bob Marley exemplifies the translation of reggae from a provincial to a mainstream music genre. In the hands of Island Records, Marley’s traditional reggae sound was updated. As Island artist representative Richard Williams put it, “It’s very hard now to conceive how unfashionable reggae was with the rock audience in the 1970s, it’s not exaggerated to say it was despised, really, really loathed, and clearly Blackwell and Island were interested in changing that perception” *(Watts 2009)*. In many ways, Blackwell’s career up to the mid-1970s was an investment in bringing positive visibility to reggae culture, through records, film, and artist development.3 With Marley, however, Blackwell drew on his earlier success introducing the electric guitar as a lead instrument into the context of reggae for the first time.4 This innovation not only sonically re-imagined the Wailers as a black rock group, it also helped move the group from the provincial market of reggae music onto the lucrative rock charts.
So how far had reggae come? What was this antecedent, underground form of the music, its social context, and the meaning of the music in that context? Andrew Kopkind responds to these questions with his definition of reggae:

[Reggae is] a percussive beat and a melodic line of music, but by extension a social and artistic movement that expressed the Jamaican mood of suffering, blackness and heavenly peace. [Its] lyrics say something about the pain of the world and the hope for a sunnier future. They replicate perfectly the visual tones of Jamaican shantytown poverty against the agonizing beauty of the Caribbean sky.

(Kopkind 2012: 149)

Jimmy Cliff echoes this with his own equation: “Sixty percent of it is the frustration of oppressed people . . . Forty percent is fantasy. We sing a happy melody but it is sad underneath” (Kopkind 2012: 150). Kopkind’s understanding of Jamaican suffering includes the Anglo-American exploitation of the island nation’s resources. To this end, he cites the film The Harder They Come as an ironic sign of reggae’s integration into what he calls the “imperial entertainment industry.” Kopkind’s irony comes from the film’s focusing on black and poor Jamaicans juxtaposed against what he refers to as the “pervasive Anglo-American penetration of the island” and “the American music monster . . . making plans for the biggest cultural rip-off since Calypso” (Kopkind 2012: 151). As Jamaicans, Cliff and Kopkind ground reggae’s cultural meaning in a basic and communal experience of suffering and fantasy. Just as Cliff calls reggae the “only true people’s music,” prior to Bob Marley, reggae was strongly associated with a provincial experience that did not translate to the mainstream.

To support its crossing over to widespread audiences, reggae needed a slight adjustment—the addition of electric guitar. As we have seen, however, commercial success is not always a positive experience, especially according to members within the genre’s original community. In his “Roots and Rock: The Marley Enigma,” Linton Kwesi Johnson criticizes Blackwell’s handling of Marley as “a truly capitalist affair” (Johnson 2012: 154). Johnson recognizes the mainstream translation of reggae as being intimately involved with the construction of a marketable image, that of the “Rasta rebel”:

The “image” is derived from Rastafarianism and rebellion, which are rooted in the historical experience of oppressed Jamaica. It then becomes an instrument of capital to sell Marley and his music, thereby negating the power which is the cultural manifestation of this historical experience. So, though Marley is singing about “roots” and “natty,” his fans know not. Neither do they understand the meaning of dread . . . . The dread has been replaced by the howling rock guitar and the funky rhythm and what we get is the “enigma” or “roots” and rock.

(Johnson 2012: 154)

For the study at hand, this quote demonstrates how translation works to cover the distance between image and reality. Johnson recognizes that music is tethered to the experience of a community when he says reggae is “rooted” in a history of oppression. But post-translation, that history is no longer embodied by the Rasta rebel. Similar to the irony Kopkind describes above, the enigma of roots and rock is the juxtaposition of imperialist Anglo-American rock dressing itself in the authenticity of the experience of oppression, while also creating more oppression through imperialistic disenfranchisement.
Popular music

(i.e., Kopkind’s “cultural rip-off”). From a semiotic point of view, the Rasta rebel is a sign emptied of its historical content and open for association with defiance as a vaguely defined idea, one with which mainstream teens are able to more easily identify. In this sense, the “howling guitar” marks the absence of the history of oppression, a history that is erased in the process of reggae’s commercial ascension.

Conclusion

The preceding pages provide an overview of how specific music genres develop from the popular (an identity based on the experience of a specific community) to the professional (as identity based on profitability and the marketplace). Though popular music may be subject to the essentialist claim that ties it indelibly to the idea of a homeland, such music also exhibits a degree of plasticity. As noted in the introduction, Negus reformulates the issue of race and music away from using music to look for signs of racial authenticity and toward locating the wider context in which “musical expression is appropriated as a sign system for the creation of specific socio-cultural identities” (Negus 1996: 122). The use of cultural translation as an interpretive methodology allows readers to follow popular music forms across a “before” and “after” structure. Scholarship dedicated to reggae, rock, salsa, and rap reveals how the signification of provincial music forms becomes untethered from its original situation. As such, popular music forms are very much like the seeds or tools from Tom Waits’ introductory quote; they are developed and used in an initial cultural context and then passed on and subject to further articulations bound to reconfigure their semantic content. As noted in the introduction, Negus reformulates the issue of race and music away from using music to look for signs of racial authenticity and toward locating the wider context in which “musical expression is appropriated as a sign system for the creation of specific socio-cultural identities” (Negus 1996: 122). The concept of “différance” as elaborated by Jacques Derrida in his Of Grammatology offers a useful theoretical support by addressing semiology as a fundamental and recurrent disjunction of sign and referent. From this perspective, the relationship between musical genre and any ultimate cultural “signified” or “referent” is subject to constant disruption, renegotiation, and deferral.

In the early 1950s, the upbeat blues music of the pre-rock ‘n’ roll era was reaching the mainstream white American kids, and that was a problem for the conservative, pre-civil rights establishment. It didn’t need to be rebranded and given a white “king of rock ‘n’ roll” to be successful on its own terms. But it was co-opted, whitewashed, and re-framed to satisfy the market-driven needs of its then disenfranchised handlers. Looking at this as an instance of translation, it was not the small labels but the black creators, songwriters and performers, who were temporarily forgotten. Forty years later, in the midst of the major-label buyout of independent rap labels, this instance of cultural appropriation has a short-lived but interesting analog, the Black Rock Coalition (BRC). An intentional effort by black musicians to subvert the stereotype of rock as a predominantly white genre, the BRC reveals a broadening formal signification as black artists reclaimed their original tie to the birth of rock. Despite its short-lived success, the black rock movement is important to our conclusion because it speaks directly to the predominant loss of agency by black artists since rock ‘n’ roll went mainstream. Amidst issues of erasure, marginalization, or corporate redefinition of artistic image, the ability to control artistic identity stands out as the predominant legacy associated with the mainstreaming of black popular music forms over the last half-century.
Looking at ethnic music forms originating outside of the US, *salsa* and reggae present an opportunity for comparing and contrasting the effects of mainstreaming. While reggae experienced a degree of success that cannot be claimed by *salsa*, both had to be stripped of their specific historical legacies of political oppression to engage large-scale distribution systems. As we have seen with rap music’s translation into hip-hop, both *salsa* and reggae underwent a shift in artistic reference that is legible on the level of lyrical content. However, while gangsta-rap focused narrowly on songs asserting sex and violence as an appeal to the suburban white imagination, *salsa* and reggae sacrificed their defiant political stance to gain widespread distribution. In these cases, overt revolutionary messages are overwritten by pacified images of sensuality, unity, or perhaps a vague sense of angst. Economically speaking, the greater success of reggae may also be located in its strategy of translation. The incorporation of electric guitar as a lead instrument allowed for reggae to make sense within the rock aesthetic as it was defined by the radio and record industry. Compared to reggae, *salsa*’s resistance to translation included the language barrier, a stronger tie to communal identity, and a comparatively disorganized integration into the Anglo-American “music monster.”

Because music conveys the same “discursive instability” attributed to race (Radano and Bohlman 2000), the use of translation to mark shifts in geographical, economic, and semantic contexts may be evaluated positively or negatively. In most cases, it results in the creation of new and larger audiences. However, the issue of translating a musical genre from the context of its native community across corporate structures such as record labels or other mass distribution platforms reveals significant pitfalls in articulation. This study has shown alienation of core fan bases, loss of artistic control, and loss of perceived authorship as associated ills suffered by multiple ethnic communities whose musical stock has been picked up by mass media business entities.

Notes

1 Rowe’s estimates of the immigration of blacks from the southeastern US range from approximately 453,800 in the decade spanning 1910–20 to over 1.5 million per decade between 1940 and 1960.
2 Alan Freed’s fall from grace and Dick Clark’s interrogation by the U.S. Senate are well-known examples. For an overview of these as well as the “month’s worth of chicken dinner” scam perpetrated by Nashville radio DJ John Richbourg see Linden, P. (2012) “Race, Hegemony and the Birth of Rock and Roll,” *MEIEA Journal* 1(12): 56.
3 After struggling to break Jimmy Cliff onto the charts, Blackwell redoubled his focus on Jamaican music, notably by working on the film *The Harder They Come*.
4 Blackwell’s experimentation adding distortion to Steve Winwood’s guitar and the Spencer Davis Group’s “Keep on Running” was part of a formula that momentarily displaced the Beatles’ “Day Tripper” as the #1 song in 1966.
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