

The Cold War and Musical Convergence in Uruguay

DENISE MILSTEIN
Columbia University

Abstract

This paper explores how the Cold War directly and indirectly shaped the terrain on which popular music evolved in Uruguay during the period of authoritarianism that stretched from the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s. Four moments in the evolution of two distinct musical movements, one associated with protest, the other with rock, reveal the intersection of politics and culture in the world of popular music. When Cold War driven repression supersedes aesthetic divisions between musicians, a new movement arises which brings together both tendencies in order to resist authoritarianism “between the lines.”

Keywords: Music, Cold War, Authoritarianism, Social Movements, Resistance

Resumen

Este trabajo explora las formas en las cuales la Guerra Fría estructuró, tanto directa como indirectamente, el terreno en el que se desarrolla la música popular durante el período autoritario desde mediados de los sesenta hasta 1985. Cuatro momentos en la evolución de dos movimientos musicales distintos, uno asociado a la tendencia de protesta, el otro asociado al rock nacional, muestran la intersección de la política y la cultura en el mundo musical. La represión motivada por la Guerra Fría lleva a que los músicos logren trascender las divisiones entre ellos, y emerge un nuevo movimiento que une ambas tendencias para lograr “entre líneas” resistir al autoritarismo.

Palabras clave: música, guerra fría, autoritarismo, resistencia, movimiento sociales.

The Cold War inspired many manifestos and declarations of commitment. In one by the Uruguayan group, *Rumbo*, the musicians declare,

We think it's fundamental to clarify that – above and beyond our belonging and participation in an artistic movement, a line of expression, as a more or less recent generation of musicians, singers, lyricists or poets – we are part of a moment, an environment, a precise historical context with perfectly defined characteristics and details, which constantly signals, conditions, nourishes, moves, and claims our attention.¹

The tone here reflects a sense of urgency that had begun to settle over musicians and other artists a decade and a half earlier, when Uruguayan democracy started its descent into an authoritarian dictatorship that would last twelve years. Under the political and cultural repression imposed by the military, the Cold War became much more than an international political context for musicians in the country and in the region. From early on during that period, a group of politically active popular musicians rooted in local musical traditions, often identified as the protest movement, was brutally repressed. But they were not the only ones. Rock musicians – loosely identified in the 1960s as part of the Beat movement – whose music only sometimes expressed a political stance, suffered repression as well.² As protest musicians floundered in prison or struggled to continue their careers in exile, and as those rock musicians who could left the country in hoards to try their luck abroad, a new musical movement evolved. It was forged by the remaining musicians – a younger generation – who wove together protest and Beat sounds to create musically innovative songs which staunchly resisted authoritarianism. *Rumbo* was one of several resulting groups; their manifesto built on a long tradition of political engagement in Uruguayan popular music. They and others of their cohort carried forward the early resistance to the dictatorship into the democratic transition.

Uruguayan music had its own distinct sound early on in the history of the country, but musicians became especially keen on distinguishing and developing that sound from the second half of the 20th century onward. Bounded by Argentina and Brazil, two giant influences on culture and politics in the region, Uruguayan popular musicians of the 1960s composed their songs by patching together the styles they had inherited from regional genres with new sounds they caught on the radio waves. Parallel to them, rock musicians cobbled together their own electric guitars and imitated styles that came from the United States and England. These first rock musicians sang in English, and their imitation phase lasted until the late 1960s, at which time the incorporation of Uruguayan sounds demanded a

grounding in local identity that fostered Spanish lyrics reflecting their particular experiences as individuals, in their communities, and in their world.³

The political and cultural territory on which musicians worked was stretched thin and tight during the Cold War. The post-World War II international conflict, which came to envelop the entire world, manifested itself in Uruguay as anti-Communist propaganda, United States supported espionage and anti-insurgency activities that targeted leftist activists within the country, and in the Southern Cone region. The post-war context damaged the Uruguayan economy. Discontent gave rise to increased social movement mobilization. In the meantime, the Cuban revolution of 1959 deepened and fueled political surveillance and control from the United States, which had begun long before the Cold War, and spawned interventions throughout Central and South America. Marxist and neo-Marxist ideologies attracted large numbers of supporters in a country with a solid history of union organizing and leftist mobilization. During that time, a strong nationalist current pulled both conservatives and progressives, and was the result of sometimes overlapping and sometimes antithetical anti-communist and anti-imperialist ideologies.⁴ Popular music could not remain aloof or immune to these tensions.

On an ideological level, the Cold War introduced a binary opposition between progressives and conservatives. Marxism became an umbrella under which a diverse set of progressive stances united and overcame, for the most part, ideological discord. Meanwhile conservative sectors adhered to capitalist driven economic reform as a path to development. They saw alliance with the United States and acceptance of its mandates to quell social movements, a barely veiled imperialism, as essential to protecting peace and security. On both sides of the divide, the impetus toward a national identity colored political expression, either as a reaction to US imperialism or as a response to the alleged threat of Soviet influence. In this sense, there was a second structuring divide super-imposed over the east/west opposition, that between the global north and south, more important for the progressive sector than for conservatives.⁵ The Cold War lifted Cuba into a guiding role for leftist, revolutionary minded activists. For the authoritarian régime, which began long before its formalization with the coup d'état, the Cold War strengthened collaboration and mentorship between United States defense institutions, including the Department of State and the CIA, and the Uruguayan armed forces. The counterinsurgency effort encompassed the entire Southern Cone region,⁶ and waged war against any resistant social, political, or cultural movement, whether committed to armed struggle or not. As such, the Cold War deepened ideological commitments on all sides, exacerbated clashes between the state and civil society, and turned nationalism into a symbolic field of conflict between the state and popular musicians.⁷ This context steeped encounters

between musicians – in performance venues, on radio programs, and in political meetings or demonstrations – in loaded national symbols and ideological content.

Musicians' songs, writings, and interviews constitute the historical register on which this paper builds. They reflect the trauma of living under the régime, and being caught in the throes of the Cold War, but also detail the cultures, musical innovations, and relational dynamics whereby artistic communities and movements evolved. History demonstrates that the Cold War did not create but rather pushed already existing tendencies and currents to diverge or converge, to quicken, to deepen. Three propensities in Uruguayan popular music – all established before the Cold War, contributed to the convergence between the beat and protest music movements. First, progressive and sometimes radical ideologies guided musicians from the earliest phases of popular music in Uruguay.⁸ The great majority held to oppositional ideologies, oftentimes including affiliation with predominantly Marxist parties and social movement organizations. Second, social movements and the state had always clashed, although the solid democratic tradition of the country facilitated the peaceful resolution of these conflicts.⁹ The Cold War brought new practices and methods for repressing social and cultural movements, which did away with the tradition of compromise that had bolstered Uruguayan democracy. Third, over the 20th century, Uruguayan artists increasingly sought to express a national identity distinct from that of neighboring countries.¹⁰ This identity both overlapped with and confronted the nationalism of the state, which deepened with the authoritarian régime.¹¹ These elements impacted how popular music in Uruguay was shaped by and responded to the Cold War political climate.

Following a brief discussion of methodological and theoretical approaches to the relationship between global dynamics, state institutions, and local cultural production, I analyze four emblematic events in the evolution of Uruguayan popular music during the Cold War. The four moments open windows onto the mechanisms whereby musical movements were shaped by political and cultural repression, even though they are not historical turning points in themselves. They constitute a convenient sample representative of a larger set of events that make up the history of Uruguayan popular music under authoritarianism.

Theoretically, this paper departs from previous work on régimes and movements, which has highlighted political and economic aspects, but seldom the social and cultural dimensions of authoritarianism. Guillermo O'Donnell's definition of bureaucratic-authoritarianism served as a point of departure for political scientists and sociologists who analyzed the break-down and later transition back to democracy in the southern cone.¹² His perspective and that of his peers highlighted political institutions and parties, the structure and strength of civil society, military-civil relations, economic dependency and levels of capitalist

development in multi-faceted comparisons of Latin American countries under military régimes throughout the 20th century.¹³ Though it may be possible to deduce the effects of mobilization, régime transitions and repression on the arts, these theories do not examine the relationship that developed between the régime and civilians or, specifically, the relationship between the régime and the communities of artists. Those studies that do consider art and politics seldom consider the mutual influences in the relationship between the state, the movements, and the artists.¹⁴ They tend to focus on the structural limitations that the state exerts unidirectionally onto artists and social movements. Most studies either focus on the state as a repressive agent,¹⁵ or examine artists and their responses to repression.¹⁶ Closer to my own approach, studies that consider art worlds under social crisis and authoritarianism, focus on aspects such as interaction with the developing music industry,¹⁷ the evolution of countercultural movements,¹⁸ nationalism, and the construction of national culture in artistic and intellectual movements.¹⁹ Repression and exile as particular experiences in civil society, especially for artists and intellectuals, have been explored in Uruguay, but from a predominantly historical rather than sociological perspective.²⁰

The sociological lens applied in this paper shifts from a macro to a micro level of analysis and back by considering aesthetic and ideological positions expressed through songs, performances, manifestos, and interviews as the vehicles that link individuals and political régimes. Janet Wolff's definition of ideology is particularly apt for this endeavor. She specifies that "[...] the ideas and beliefs people have are systematically related to their actual and material conditions of existence."²¹ In the context of the Cold War, ideological stances, by reflecting on "actual and material conditions" also and inevitably engaged with political and social conditions. Living under capitalism in a dependent state ideologically bifurcated by the Cold War also fostered a consciousness that stretched far beyond the local. It comes as no surprise then that even musicians whose creative output was not political would become politicized in time under the experience of authoritarianism. For both protest and beat musicians, Marxist and other forms of anti-imperialism revealed the structure that set the conditions, not just for economic life, but also for social, cultural, and political life. That awareness in itself brought the potential for local and regional large-scale transformation to the fore. But, as Wolff claims, ideology is not forged in isolation, but rather results from shared experience and reflection. Popular music created a space for this collective and individual negotiation of ideology, whether in public space, through performance, or in private spaces where the songs sounded out their messages to individuals and small groups. Following Wolff, I understand art works – in this case, songs – to be "[...] the product of specific historical practices on the part of identifiable social groups in given conditions[; they] bear

the imprint of the ideas, values and conditions of existence of those groups, and their representatives in particular artists.”²²

In the four cases describe below, I take an ethnographic approach to the historical record. Recorded albums, the writings of musicians and critics, interviews with members of the popular music art world, and films of performances reveal the junctures that shape movement trajectories.²³ First, I begin in Cuba, with the 1967 “Meeting of the Protest Song,” and follow its repercussions back to Uruguay. Second, I travel to a street scene where beat musicians – who have yet to become politicized – prepare for a concert while students are being attacked by police. Third, I go behind the scenes to the decision to use a protest song to accompany the announcement of the coup d’état on a mainstream radio station. Finally, a few years into the régime, I look at the incorporation of the melody of a banned protest song by a new generation of musicians, a between-the-lines reference that bypasses the censors and signals resistance and hope to its audience.

Meeting in Cuba

There was much to protest in Uruguay in the 1960s. From the late 1950s onward, the country had slid into a state of economic, social, and political turmoil. By 1963, the traditional political parties that had supported Uruguayan democracy were fragmenting under the pressure of this crisis. From the mid-1960s onward, the country saw the strengthening and radicalization of social movements calling for the redistribution of wealth and increased democratic participation. The state responded in turn by bolstering police and military institutions. This move was not independent of advice and direct support from the United States CIA and State Department, which later supported Operation Condor, a collaboration among the countries of the Southern Cone which deployed state terror and extreme repression against any perceived manifestation of resistance or Soviet influence.²⁴

By 1967, guerrilla mobilization was evident, student activism had intensified, and repression became increasingly violent. In 1968, the government declared a state of emergency and proceeded to wage open warfare against social movements and the Tupamaro Guerrilla. In the meantime, democratically minded activists had formed a leftist coalition party, the *Frente Amplio*, which attained almost 20 percent of support in the 1971 election. This, together with violent mobilizations, alarmed local and international observers steeped in Cold War fears of a turn toward Marxism and other leftist ideologies in social and political movements. In 1973 and with support from the CIA, a coup d’état replaced the severely weakened democratic government with a military junta.²⁵

For most politically engaged musicians, ideology came first and shaped the approach to song writing. These musicians also acted beyond the realm of music by writing for progressive publications, participating in student mobilizations, working as radio broadcasters, and organizing musical events in direct support of social movement organizations. The leading popular musicians of the time, including Daniel Viglietti, Alfredo Zitarrosa, Numa Moraes, and the duo, *Los Olimareños*, came to occupy political, poetic and ideological spaces that reached broad audiences. Their political activities, along with their socially critical and politically engaged songs, led to increasingly stringent censorship and banning of their songs from public broadcasts.²⁶

A key moment that formalized the political commitment of Uruguayan popular musicians took place far from Montevideo. In July and August 1967, an international group of singer-songwriters gathered at the “Meeting of the Protest Song” in Cuba, at Casa de las Américas. There, the Uruguayan delegation, which included many musicians who would, in varied ways, suffer the consequences of political repression later on, met with others whose songs also demanded social and economic justice and transformation. As Viglietti describes it, “That 1967 meeting was like an intimate revolution, experienced by those of us who made it here [to Cuba].”²⁷ The meeting supported the consolidation, through music, of resistance to United States imperialism, the expression of idealist visions for the future, and the combination of distinct national identities with an adherence to Pan-American solidarity. In Cuba, popular musicians cemented their commitment to a broader revolutionary movement which connected struggles in sixteen countries into a network of musical resistance. The manifesto they produced articulated a collective, trans-national understanding of the social and political role of music:

The workers of the Protest Song must be conscious that the song, due to its particular nature, has an enormous power to communicate with the masses insofar as it breaks barriers such as illiteracy, which complicate the dialogue between artists and their own people. Consequently, the song must be a tool at the service of the people, not a commodity used by capitalism to alienate them. The workers of the Protest Song have the duty to enrich their profession, since the search for artistic quality is itself a revolutionary activity.²⁸

If the song was to be a tool for social change, then form needed to facilitate the transmission of a revolutionary content. The value of innovation lay primarily in its capacity to serve the interests of communication. Cultural change, viewed as super-structural in a Marxist perspective, should be instrumental to economic

and political transformation. This perspective incited varied interpretations, which incited resistance the interests of the music industry and mainstream media and steering clear of the less political youth counter-cultures emerging in the north. An ideological fault line developed between folk and rock music, which threatened to create chasms between musicians. To say that musicians stood on one or the other side of this fault line would be inaccurate and overly simplistic. Political context and types of repression, not just the music itself, activated the fault line, which shook up and shifted musicians around on the terrain surrounding it. Musicians moved over this unstable field throughout their careers, cultivating collaborative or competitive, conflictive or harmonious relationships with one another along the way.

Upon their return from Cuba, the Uruguayan delegation of musicians established the Center for the Protest Song (which soon became the Center for Popular Singers and Artists).²⁹ The organization sponsored shared recitals and mediated the relationship between popular singers and social and political movements. Increasingly through the late 1960s and early 1970s, politically engaged folk musicians played to large audiences in festivals and auditoriums, and in small recitals, political acts, and meetings throughout the country. Familiar genres and revolutionary lyrics established strong relationships with these audiences, who consumed and disseminated the songs beyond live performance. The music innovated subtly on regional and Latin American genres, and even though the songs often expressed radical messages, the musicians for the most part remained within conservative norms of self-presentation: they were clean cut, respectful and professional. Daniel Viglietti was one of the few who ventured discreetly into less traditional images, letting his hair grow long and assuming a pose reminiscent of the beat aesthetic on one of his album covers.

As political violence increased, many musicians in the Popular Song movement rejected the “Protest Song” label they had endorsed in Cuba in 1967. They preferred to identify themselves as persons who denounced or, in the case of Viglietti, persons who “proposed” through their songs.³⁰ Over time, many came to view the protest label as an imposition of the media and referred to their music as part of the New Song movement instead. This redefinition reflected the understanding that songs themselves were not going to transform society. An interview with Zitarrosa in 1974, a year after the coup d’état, exemplifies this attitude:

[Interviewer:] “Do you really think that a song can change the course of history?”

Or, not going so far, do you think a song can vitally influence people?”

- [Zitarrosa:] “That is a very delicate issue. I don’t think a song can lead anyone to do anything that person wasn’t capable of doing in the first place.
- [Interviewer:] “Don’t you think that a song could transform a coward into a brave person?
- [Zitarrosa:] “No. I think a song can help him experience catharsis in his living room and then go to bed peacefully. I’m pretty suspicious of people addicted to certain revolutionary songs. It’s the same suspicion I feel toward singers who fire bullets with the guitar and then tremble on the stairwell.”³¹

Nevertheless, the authorities ruthlessly persecuted protest musicians, including those who had participated in the 1967 meeting in Cuba. Regardless of the label, politically engaged music produced a direct response from the state. The Cold War engendered a kind of repression, politicization and ideological positioning which blurred the borders between culture and politics both for artists and the régime.

Beat in crisis

The rock inspired movement that evolved around the same time protest song consolidated in Cuba was, for the most part, not producing politically engaged songs. These musicians, loosely united under the “Beat” label, had begun their careers in imitation of the northern rock music that they heard on the radio. Like their counterparts in popular music, the members of the beat movement also sought a national sound. In their case, the search for a local identity in music was less driven by political concerns than by the participation of musicians rooted in Afro-Uruguayan traditions like candombe music. Rubén Rada and Eduardo Mateo were two of the many musicians who joined ensembles and began, underground, to incorporate candombe songs and sounds to night club repertoires. The fusion of rock and candombe took place in the beat “caves,” spaces where young Uruguayans experimented with and bopped to a music that, though largely apolitical, took aesthetic risks unheard of in the mainstream or folk environments.

From 1966 to 1971, several branches of the beat movement moved through distinct phases of innovation. Unlike parallel movements in Latin America, such as Tropicália or Argentinean rock, whose innovations reached broad audiences, most of the leading beat bands remained underground. As Guilherme de Alencar Pinto argues, groups such as *El Kinto* approximated the Brazilian Tropicália phe-

nomenon because of the ways in which they “cannibalized” influences to produce an entirely new music.³² In comparison to its neighbors, though, Uruguay lacked powerful vehicles for mass dissemination. Because of this, beat and popular musicians seldom crossed paths on television, and the venues that brought the two together reached meagre audiences. Beat movement fans remained, during this period, largely distinct from the protest song audience.

Two central actors in the beat movement worked to bring together beat and protest song musicians, although Zitarrosa also bridged the divide with his short-lived venue, *La Claraboya Amarilla*. The first was Gastón “Dino” Ciarlo who tirelessly broadcast diverse Uruguayan music and created spaces for musicians from both movements to play together. The second was Horacio Buscaglia, a poet, musician, and journalist who also worked in theater. His column, *La Morsa*, in the leftist newspaper, *El Popular*, covered both protest and Beat music.³³ These two actors opened the way for beat or, as it began to refer to itself, rock, into the cultural left. Up until that point, rock musicians had suffered types of repression different from that faced by protest musicians; they were repeatedly and violently harassed, and often arrested, albeit for brief periods, as visible members of a counterculture. This situation changed as rock became politicized by the late 1960s, Buscaglia and Mateo had begun to collaborate, organizing, in 1969, a series of four multidisciplinary concerts, the *Musicaciones*. Each *Musicación*³⁴ brought beat musicians together with artists from other realms. The eclectic programs combined music, theatre, film, and literature to produce imaginative, absurd and often disjointed collages that criticized repression both from the state and the more socially conservative sectors of the left. *Musicación* built a loose countercultural network between the beat scene and its collaborators, clearly expressing resistance to growing political repression. Still, appreciations of the political engagement of the *Musicación* series varied. The concerts appealed to the absurd rather than directly challenging the régime in the style of protest song. From the perspective of the musicians themselves, political engagement was not central to their work. Chichito Cabral, Mateo’s percussionist, who played a pivotal role in several bands commented,

One afternoon there was terrible chaos on the street, close to El Galpón [the theater where *Musicación* would be performed]. Students throwing rocks, police shooting at them. And we, Urbano and I, were sticking signs on a door... There could have been a great war and we’d only be thinking about the music... But wait! I’ll also tell you that the same youth who were throwing rocks, those same students, followed and supported us. They would tell us, “Hey man, that was great, we saw you the other day, when do

you play again?" That's when we started to be conscious about things, about everything that was going on.³⁵

The distinction between politics and culture, and politics and music, collapsed in the midst of violent repression. Encounters of bands such as *El Kinto* with leftist student audiences, driven by Dino and Buscaglia, among others, transformed both. Still, protest music and art prevailed among leftist student audiences until the troubled election of November 1971, when collaboration between political parties, social movements and cultural producers began to crumble under the pressure of police and military repression.³⁶

The coup d'état and its musical context

The wave of nationalism that washed indistinctly over political and cultural movements and the régime in Uruguay in the 1960s set the stage for confrontation over the use of national symbols and tropes. For popular singers, political songs went hand in hand with the expression of a national identity which connected to a vast network of Latin American musicians following a similar path; it was compatible with a Pan-Americanist approach that emphasized some of the same themes, including freedom and independence from imperialism. Singer-songwriters consistently argued that they occupied a privileged place, analogous to that of organic intellectuals, from which they could feel the pulse of "the people" and reflect it in their songs. Parallel to this cultural nationalism, state nationalism burgeoned so that singer-songwriters and state propagandists found themselves using the same symbols: historical moments, national heroes, and glorified descriptions of the land and its people.³⁷ Both incorporated overlapping tropes to strengthen their platforms for diametrically opposed projects of social and political transformation. Nationalism thus became a space of contestation between social movements and the rapidly institutionalizing régime. As repression hardened, the context of crisis increased artists' sense of political responsibility. National identity deepened with the pressure to demonstrate authenticity vis-à-vis a régime also intent upon building legitimacy through patriotic pronouncements.

The protest musician's use of national symbols infuriated state authorities in a way that the Beat movement never could have done. Shared symbols, ironically enough, made the songs amenable to use by the régime. The state thus appropriated key protest songs, disseminating them in contexts that transformed their meanings while actively repressing the song writers themselves. A telling example of this took place on June 27, 1973, the day of the coup d'état. Early that morning, the manager of Radio Montecarlo, a leading station in the capital,

was directed by uniformed officials to broadcast news of the coup with a musical background. Journalist Antonio Álvarez recounts the exchange between the radio journalist and the military official who brought the text to be read:

“Well, we need folk music,” the official said to the journalist, as he handed over the texts. Sarkissián responded that they had few albums available at that early hour because the discothèque was closed. “I have ‘A Don José’,” offered Sarkissián with some hesitation, convinced that the song as a soundtrack would not meet the needs of the military communiqués.

A Don José, a song written in 1961 by Ruben Lena, was, at the time, an unofficial anthem of the leftist resistance. It described José Gervasio Artigas, the most venerated independence leader of the 19th century, and quoted his pronouncement, “With liberty I offend not, I fear not.” The song had been popularized by *Los Olimareños*, whom everyone knew to be fully committed to protest music. Upon hearing that *A Don José* was available to accompany the broadcast of the communiqué,

“That’s very good,” the military official in charge of the operation said.

“But look, I only have the version sung by Los Olimareños,” explained Sarkissián. The soldier looked at him with an air of satisfaction and answered:

“All the better.”³⁸

Protest songs built on iconic figures shared with the dictatorship, and thus exacerbated the potential for confrontation between the régime and musicians. The songs themselves could be used and abused at the will of the régime, but the musicians remained a threat. Part of the strategy for repression involved the separation of authors from their work, and the appropriation of symbols to be emptied and then refilled with new content.

Within a year of the coup, *Los Olimareños* had been forced into exile. Braulio López, a member of the duo, was imprisoned for approximately a year in Argentina. Subsequently, the two spent much of the rest of the dictatorship in Spain. Daniel Viglietti was arrested and, following a campaign for his release supported by intellectuals such as Jean-Paul Sartre and Julio Cortázar spent his exile in Paris.³⁹ Alfredo Zitarrosa was briefly arrested, his house searched, and was exiled to Mexico and, later on, to Spain. Imprisonment, torture, exile, and disappearance were the fates suffered by members of the resistance, whether political or cultural.⁴⁰

Culture and politics from Beat to Rock

As described, some beat musicians may have accompanied social movements, but not all of them, and certainly not with their music, at least not initially. Yet, even without taking a clear political stance, their songs still chipped away at the régime's culture. Beat musicians musically innovated as a result of contact with popular music coming from Great Britain and the United States. They adhered to the "rock aesthetic," using electric instruments and microphones, manipulating sounds through the use of new technologies, and using their voices in a less structured, more spontaneous way than Popular Song musicians. Over time, these musicians politicized their songs as a result of contact with politically committed audiences and clashes with the authorities. Still, and in spite of raised consciousness, they initially chose – as the following 1966 manifesto to a beat concert attests – to remain independent of social movements, at least as far as their art was concerned.

this Beat-concert intends to be an "in" (from *inconformismo* [unwillingness to conform]) kind of show (?), without apparent motivations since we haven't set out looking for them. but we can still, of course, define ourselves as a sensitive and not an analytic generation....

and to save ourselves from what we say above we remind you that "saying stupidities in our time, where everyone reflects so profoundly, is the only way to prove that our thought is free and independent."⁴¹

At this stage, the beat movement struggled for autonomy from the cultural imperatives of both the radicalized left and the authorities. Their effort was quickly pushed to the margins by the pervasive conflicts between leftist groups and the régime. Unlike beat musicians, protest musicians remained at the center, embroiled in these conflicts, and highly visible. Because of this, their songs were carried forward more effectively into the collective memory of that period.

The negative and repressive reaction of conservatives on both sides of the political spectrum responded to the rock aesthetic as much as to the irruption of new electronic sounds on the musical landscape. Thinking from the perspective of musicians, their initial adherence to this new music could be understood as a form of escape from and resistance to cultural conservatism on all sides, a possible alternative to the daily violence of Uruguayan society in the late sixties.⁴² Musicians sought this alternative outside Uruguayan borders, only to return to local forms of expression having traveled far into North American and British

rock. The concurrent popularity of protest song, a movement deriving legitimacy from its Uruguayan authenticity, helps to understand this turbulent time as one where a dominant politically engaged movement and smaller subcultural manifestations respectfully co-existed but maintained distance. Under pressure from both right and left, this subculture – despite its potential – could not become a full-fledged counterculture. Building and maintaining musical autonomy was already an enormous challenge. The institutionalization of dress codes, crack-down on drug use, and elimination of meeting spaces contributed to the collapse of the movement. Countercultural beat musicians left the country not merely as a result of persecution, but also because they simply could not survive there as musicians. Those who remained dropped their countercultural projects and drew closer to the protest song aesthetic.

Yet, these differences should not obfuscate the common cause behind the trajectories of the two movements. While protest musicians developed their music in conjunction with the left, supporting the concerns of their massive audience and thereby reaching unprecedented levels of popularity, beat musicians acted at the margins of that same leftist culture, receiving less but still significant support. The less publicized, less extreme but still unrelenting repression of beat musicians produced results more devastating for the survival of the movement than the detentions, imprisonment and forced exile of protest musicians.

The aesthetic divide between Beat and Protest Song musicians was set by protest song more than beat. While beat musicians adopted a variety of performance styles, protest song musicians only seldom crossed into counter-cultural forms of expression. Participation in the type of performative aesthetic used by beat musicians would have incited the rejection of leftist sectors which viewed countercultural behavior as superficial and a middle class privilege.⁴³ For these audiences, countercultural images were associated with the commercialization of music and participation in a capitalist cultural industry that they rejected.⁴⁴ But the goal of appealing to a wide public was not the only limitation to the development of countercultural practices. Protest musicians had embraced an image of earnest, hard-working, committed citizens. Their collective embodiment of the “new man,” a utopian ideal inherited from the Cuban revolution, was meant to transform political and economic structures and revolutionize social relationships. Radical transformation of the type US and British 1960s counter-cultures called for was not a part of this project, and the anti-imperialist stances of protest musicians set them in direct opposition to counterculture as it manifested itself in the north.

Despite some similarities in the repression that beat and popular song musicians describe, the differences are significant to comparing the two movements. Beat musicians suffered as a result of the cultural and moral challenge their music and subculture posed to traditional Uruguayan society, and secondarily,

as a result of their political stances. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, they were constantly targeted by police as members of a subculture that expressed itself through physical appearance and dress. They also suffered under continual criticism and moral condemnations from the traditional left, either for producing music identified with the US empire or for adhering to alternative and – what leftists considered to be – alienated cultural and aesthetic standards. As Macu-naíma, a prominent poet and journalist of the time states,

On the one hand there was the necessity of the media to reach a young audience, but on the other, a certain format was rejected, a model that was considered culturally alien. From the left because it was said this was a path of alienation, and from the right for fear of the content that music might have, which was anti-establishment and went against certain obsolete and overused values and proposed something else.⁴⁵

In spite of all this, the historical development of beat in Uruguay shows increasing politicization as repression rose toward the 1973 coup d'état. Throughout 1971, Tupamaro guerrillas and the Uruguayan military and police clashed in direct combat. Daily confrontations between students and police, fire-bombings of leftist politician's homes, massive strikes and demonstrations were impossible to ignore, even within the more "alienated" beat scene. As protest musicians attained massive popularity and faced increasing repression, more beat musicians began to consider the role of politics in music. Bands such as Totem, one of the candombe-beat innovators, were also not immune to censorship; for example, the song, "Mi pueblo," with a fairly vague political content, was not included in the second Totem album, "Descarga", out of fear of the censors.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, not censorship but the elimination of entertainment venues would prove the most devastating to beat music. Dances, which constituted a primary source of livelihood for beat musicians, decreased as police and military raids became commonplace. Beat musicians struggled to survive in this environment.

Among increased violence, interviews and articles in the cultural supplement of *El Popular* continued to exude the rebel aesthetic that had begun to consolidate in the late 1960s. Buscaglia's writings in *La Morsa* and the entire cultural supplement in which his column appeared were openly oriented to hip, politicized youth, familiar with musical innovators in Uruguay and abroad. Writers and their interviewees in this and other leftist publications still drew a line separating North and South, and enveloped appreciations of music in a nationalist rhetoric compatible with other Latin American progressive perspectives. For example, events such as the deaths of Jimmy Hendrix and Janis Joplin opened

an opportunity to discuss the negative impact of drug consumption on young people in the North, and to distinguish them from South American hippies. As Buscaglia wrote, "...we, Latin Americans, men of the Third World, in addition to liking good music, know that there is only one liberation, and that it is total and definitive: revolution."⁴⁷

By the time of the 1971 election, beat musicians increasingly expressed the need to resist and call for social change as much as protest musicians. Those who had joined in leftist mobilizations early on transitioned to writing songs that expressed their political stances. The Cold War context had blurred the boundaries between politics and culture, and, consequently, music and politics became almost inseparable. *Totem* and the bands *Psiglo* and *Syndikato* led the way alongside individual beat musicians such as Dino and the musician and performance artist Leo Antunez. Though surrounded by a different atmosphere, their activities began to overlap with the activities of protest musicians: they joined in the struggle against the invasion of foreign music, participated in protests, and reflected their political views in their songs. In this sense, repression laid the groundwork for the convergence of the two groups into a new movement. Almost a decade and a half after the Meeting of the Protest Song in Cuba, both beat musicians and protest musicians were accepting the challenge of political engagement and resisting commercialization. In an interview, the members of *Génesis*, a Beat group contemporary with *Totem* stated that,

We understand that the musician, the artist, must be committed to himself and engaged with the reality that surrounds him.

It would be easy to make commercial music, but we would be lying to ourselves and lying to the public.

Of course, many write social songs simply because these can become commercialized, but they are easily identified as insincere.⁴⁸

The demise of the band *Totem* in 1974 followed a violent encounter with the armed forces typical of the time. Soldiers raided a dance in which *Totem* and the Spanish singer, Joan Manóel Serrat, were performing, forcing the dance to end. As the members of *Totem* and Serrat made their way to Serrat's hotel, they were stopped by another group of military officials. As Eduardo Useta recalls,

They made us take out our equipment and we had to unscrew all the speakers to make sure there was nothing inside them. Since they didn't find anything, they broke everything. It was brutal. Three or four days later we decided to break up, and [say] goodbye.⁴⁹

Interviews published later in popular music publications such as *La del Taller* revealed the commonality of such incidents, and their negative impact on musicians already considering emigration. Musicians and audience members were regularly detained for a day or two and let go following severe mistreatment and torture. Jaime Roos, a beat musician whose career developed in the mid-1970s, recounts,

From 1972 on the dictatorship pounded that whole rock movement. There were raids at the end of each dance in the caves, they cut people's hair with bayonets, it was really tough to leave those dances.⁵⁰

But, offering another possible cause of the demise of the movement,

On the other hand many musicians had moved toward a more bluesy sound, with long solos, a less danceable format and well, other elements that contributed to the end of live danceable rock music. But, above all, the dictatorship's blow to dance locales.⁵¹

As interviews and transformations in the lyrical content of songs indicate, clashes with the police or military, whether experienced or witnessed, raised consciousness among musicians and politicized the production of prominent rock groups including Syndikato, Opus Alfa, Tótem, and Génesis. As repression increased, more groups crossed into political and socially critical terrain with their lyrics. Violent encounters further wore down musicians already under economic strain. When musicians emigrated *en masse* in the early and mid-1970s, the beat movement dissipated. Only isolated musicians continued to sing in Uruguay and the musicians who took up rock in the mid-eighties did so without the reference of the pre-dictatorship movement. In contrast, the memory and popularity of songs from the more traditional and folk oriented politicized members of the "canción popular" generation survived the dictatorship.

Convergence and resistance between the lines

Uruguayan rock's subtle moves in the direction of popular song in the early 1970s set the stage for the fusion that would take place among a new generation of popular musicians in the mid to late 1970s who had begun to play in the shadow of beat figures Rada, Mateo, and Dino. Unlike the earlier generation, these musicians built their careers within the authoritarian régime, they had witnessed the repression of protest musicians and were politically committed.

By the time they came into their own, protest song was banned, with most of its musicians either in exile or in prison. Their songs continued to circulate among Uruguayans in unmarked cassette copies, but their detection by authorities was sufficient to question and imprison listeners.⁵²

The rise of the mid-1970s generation coincided with the most intense period of repression in the Uruguayan dictatorship. Live recitals and the distribution of unmarked tapes were the most effective means of dissemination. Their music, its form and content, indicated continuity with both the protest song generation and beat. As another member of the new generation stated, "...what we want [is] for Canto Popular [the name the new generation used for its music] to be a language through which we communicate, see the reality that surrounds us, and create a shared identity between the public and the artist."⁵³ The group excelled in communicating "between the lines" both verbally and musically. Lyrics largely focused on Montevideo, oftentimes using the city as a metaphorical field for the expression of resistance and other banned themes.⁵⁴

Canto Popular musicians began singing and organizing concerts in small venues that grew as the return to democracy drew near. By using the resources of both movements, they were able to bypass the censors, constructing a type of music that communicated between the lines through both musical and verbal languages. The music of the group *Los que iban cantando* [The ones who went singing] offers a clear example of this strategy. In a 1977 concert, the musicians began with an instrumental version of a song by Dino that had not been banned, "Milonga de pelo largo" [Long haired milonga].⁵⁵ The song refers to the repression suffered by the "long haired," a clear reference to members of the beat subculture, and also considers "The memory of those who run from our land/ because of the misery/ because of the violence."⁵⁶ Following the first notes of Dino's milonga, two new instruments, a guitar and flute, interweave the melody and accompaniment of Viglietti's song, "Milonga de andar lejos," originally recorded in 1965, and openly calling for revolutionary transformation in Uruguay.⁵⁷ Viglietti was in exile at the time, his songs banned yet illicitly circulating among a large group of followers. The arrangement by *Los que iban cantando* entangled the Viglietti's and Dino's milongas such that audiences recognized the two melodies. The song represents the successful combination of two disparate movements in resistance to the dictatorship through between-the-lines communication.

Having destroyed open political opposition, the dictatorship had set out to execute its cultural agenda, crushing the beat movement and forcing protest song underground. In this process, the descendants of these two movements converged in opposition to authoritarianism. Their resistance grew, bridging political commitment and musical innovation to support the transition to democracy.

Conclusion

The deep split the Cold War imposed between two ideological and political forces did not produce but rather pushed leftist ideologies, many of them Marxist, into the songs of Uruguayan musicians. The largely progressive democracy that dominated the first half of the 20th century had supported ideological commitment as part of political participation. Political conflict and repression broke through the surface of that democratic tradition when the Uruguayan armed forces added counter-insurgency terror to an authoritarian régime that relied on Cold War divisions. The Cold War split the Uruguayan social and political terrain two ways: first, ideologically, by drawing a line between leftist and conservative proponents of change, and second, with respect to imperialism, by bringing nationalism to the fore among anti-imperialist leftists and the anti-Soviet régime.

As the United States struggled to maintain a relationship of dependency with Latin American states, Cuba emerged, literally, as an island of resistance. Amid rising tensions, both progressive and Marxist social movements and political parties increased their mobilization. Entrepreneurs, political leaders, and military officials overlapped within the circles of highest power, hunkered down in defense of institutions that sustained the imperialist bond, and repressed the increasingly mobilized and radical movements that stood in their way. For artists, and protest musicians in particular, culture became a path to resisting state repression and advocating for radical social and political change. Both the state and popular musicians turned to national identity to ground their claims, and competing yet overlapping nationalist conceptions fueled clashes between them. National identity evolved as a manifestation of anti-imperialism and anti-Soviet fear mongering. In its anti-imperialist respect, nationalism produced a conflict between popular musicians whose work built on local folk traditions and beat musicians whose careers had begun with imitation of US and English rock 'n roll. Ultimately, the Cold War blurring of the boundary between the political and cultural realms led musicians to overcome these differences. In this way, the Cold War directly and indirectly structured not just political resistance, but also cultural resistance to authoritarianism through music. The brutality of the régime superseded splits between musical movements and facilitated the unification of protest and beat musicians in a new generation which – in the most intense period of censorship, arrests, torture, assassinations, and forced exile – resisted and sustained the idealism of a civil society ready to embrace democracy upon its return.

Notes

- 1 Capagorry, Juan, and Elbio Rodríguez Barilari, *Aquí se canta: canto popular, 1977-1980* (Montevideo: Arca, 1980), p. 108.
- 2 The labels “protest” and “beat” stand in here for a wide variety of terms used and contested among musicians. These terms serve as meeting points at one time or another for many of the musicians discussed in this article, who also used terms such as “popular song,” “new song,” “canto popular,” and “rock” among others to describe their music and the communities with which they identified. During the time period considered, the label “protest” evolved into the labels “popular song” and “new song”; this paper reflects that transformation. Likewise, the label “beat” evolved into “rock.” However, even today the terms continue to be used interchangeably by musicians, journalists, researchers. This is the result of the continually shifting terrain for creative work described in this paper. My use of these labels aims to guide the reader through a complex musical community rather than to impose fixed categories on the history of popular music in Uruguay.
- 3 Figueredo, Maria, *Poesía y canción popular: su convergencia en el siglo XX: Uruguay 1960-1985* (Montevideo: Linardi y Risso; Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University, 2005).
- 4 These tensions are extensively detailed in Brands, Hal, *Latin America’s Cold War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).
- 5 I do not use the terms east, west, north, and south in a geographical sense here, but rather to define the ideological and economic divisions that structured the Cold War.
- 6 Dinges, John, *The Condor Years: How Pinochet and His Allies Brought Terrorism to Three Continents* (New York: New Press, 2005).
- 7 Franco, Jean, *The Decline and Fall of the Lettered City: Latin America in the Cold War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002).
- 8 Ayestarán, Lauro, *El folklore musical uruguayo* (Montevideo: Arca, 1967).
- 9 Nahum, Benjamín, *Manual de historia del Uruguay: 1903-1990* (Montevideo: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental, 1995).
- 10 Haitisma, Marjanne, *El tamboril se olvida y la miseria no. La nueva canción popular uruguaya entre 1960 y 1973* (Bachelor of Arts Thesis, Utrecht, University of Utrecht, 1986), and Martins, Carlos A., *Música popular uruguaya, 1973-1982* (Montevideo: CLAEH and Ediciones de la Banda Oriental, 1986).
- 11 Marchesi, Aldo, *El Uruguay inventado: la política audiovisual de la dictadura, reflexiones sobre su imaginario* (Montevideo: Trilce, 2001).
- 12 O’Donnell, Guillermo, *Modernization and Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism* (Berkeley: Institute for International Studies, 1973) and O’Donnell, Guillermo A., Philippe C. Schmitter, Laurence Whitehead, and Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Latin American Program, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986).
- 13 Corradi, Juan, *Fear at the Edge: State Terror and Resistance in Latin America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).
- 14 For a notable exception to this, see Goldfarb, Jeffrey C., *On Cultural Freedom: An Exploration of Public Life in Poland and America* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1982).
- 15 D’Araújo, Maria Celina Soares, Gláucio Ary Dillon Soares, and Celso Castro, *Os Anos de Chumbo: A Memória Militar Sobre a Repressão* (Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará, 1994).

- 16 Sosnowski, Saúl, ed., *Represión, exilio y democracia: la cultura uruguaya* (Montevideo: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental, 1987) and Sosnowski, Saúl, and Jorge Schwartz, eds., *Brasil: O Trânsito da Memória* (São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 1994).
- 17 Napolitano, Marcos, “*Seguindo a canção*”: *engajamento político e indústria cultural na MPB, 1959-1969* (São Paulo: Annablume; São Paulo: FAPESP, 2001).
- 18 Zolov, Eric, *Refried Elvis: The Rise of Mexican Counterculture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999) and Dunn, Christopher, *Brutality Garden: Tropicália and the Emergence of a Brazilian Counterculture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).
- 19 García Canclini, Néstor, *Culturas híbridas: estrategias para entrar y salir de la modernidad* (Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 1992) and Ridenti, Marcelo, *Em Busca do Povo Brasileiro: Artistas da Revolução, do CPC à Era da TV* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Record, 2000).
- 20 Sosnowski, Saúl, ed., *Represión, exilio y democracia: la cultura uruguaya* (Montevideo: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental, 1987) and Markarian, Vania, *El '68 Uruguayo* (Buenos Aires: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, 2012).
- 21 Wolff, Janet, *The Social Production of Art* (Second Edition. New York: New York University Press, [1981] 1993), p. 50.
- 22 *Ibid.*, p. 49.
- 23 Sahlins, Marshall, *Apologies to Thucydides: Understanding History as Culture and Vice Versa* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).
- 24 Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, Organization of American States, “Developments in the Situation of Human Rights in Uruguay,” in *Annual Report of the Inter-American Commission of Human Rights*, <http://www.cidh.oas.org/annualrep/78eng/section.4c.htm>. OEA/Ser.L/V/II.47, Doc. 13 rev. 1, 29 June 1979 and Dinges, John, *The Condor Years: How Pinochet and His Allies Brought Terrorism to Three Continents* (New York: New Press, 2005).
- 25 Support from the US is detailed in Carlos Osorio’s Southern Cone Documentation Project. For example, see Osorio, Carlos, “Nixon: “Brazil helped rig the Uruguayan elections,” 1971, in *National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 71* (<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB71/>, 2002).
- 26 Márquez, Ernesto, “Tumbando caña,” interview with Héctor Numa Moraes (<http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2005/11/12/a12o1esp.php>, 2005); Zitarrosa, Alfredo, “Gatos coloquiales,” in *Obras de Alfredo Zitarrosa, Crónicas: Entrevistas para Marcha* (Montevideo: Ediciones de la Banda Oriental, [1966] 2001), pp. 65-8; Zitarrosa, Alfredo, “Alfredo Zitarrosa: El destino de un hombre,” in *Hit*, August (1970), p. 5; Zitarrosa, Alfredo, “Zitarrosa ’71,” interview by Rimac in *El Popular*, Magazine, 20 June (1971), p. 11; Zitarrosa, Alfredo, “Arte y vivencia de Alfredo Zitarrosa,” interview by Oribe Irigoyen in *Magazine*, 24 October (1971), pp. 3-4; Zitarrosa, Alfredo, “Entrevista en Madrid” in *Recording* (Buenos Aires: Editorial La Página, [1976] 1999); Viglietti, Daniel, “Viglietti: Avatares de la Protesta (III),” interview in *Ahora*, 7 October (1971), p. 18; Viglietti, Daniel, “Vigencia de la nueva canción: raíz, rama y otros vuelos,” in *La del Taller*, 2 (1985), pp. 22-4; Viglietti, Daniel, “Capítulo segundo: Daniel Viglietti: Canción para mi América,” interview by Juan Carlos Roque, Radio Nederlands. <http://www.informarn.nl/programas/ProgramasEspeciales/cantopoesia1> (2005).
- 27 In a recent interview, Viglietti names Los Olimareños, Alfredo Zitarrosa, Quintín Cabrera, Carlos Molina, Marcos Velázquez, Yamandú Palacios, and Anibal Zampayo among the Uruguayan participants. Viglietti, Daniel, “Uno que encontró la sobrevida,” interview by

- Fidel Díaz, El Caimán Barbudo: la revista cultural de la juventud cubana, <http://www.caimanbarbudo.cu/entrevistas/2016/01/uno-que-encontro-la-sobrevida/> (2016).
- 28 “Declaración,” in *Casa de las Américas* 45 (1967), p. 40.
 - 29 Pellegrino, Guillermo, *Cantares del alma: una biografía definitiva de Alfredo Zitarrosa* (Montevideo: Planeta, 1999), p. 108.
 - 30 López, Sara, *El canto popular: expresión cultural de la resistencia antiautoritaria*. Unedited interviews with Ruben Castillo, Numa Moraes and Hugo Giovanetti Viola (1988) and Benedetti, Mario, *Daniel Viglietti* (Barcelona: Júcar [1974] 1987).
 - 31 Interview with Maria Esther Gilio for *Crisis*, in Buenos Aires, 2 April, 1974, cited in Pellegrino, Guillermo, *Cantares del alma: una biografía definitiva de Alfredo Zitarrosa* (Montevideo: Planeta, 1999), p. 187.
 - 32 Pinto, Guilherme de Alencar, *Razones locas: el paso de Eduardo Mateo por la música uruguaya* (Buenos Aires: Zero Ediciones, [1994] 2002).
 - 33 Buscaglia, Horacio, “Dime lo que escuchas y te diré si eres morsa,” in *Magazine*, cultural supplement to newspaper, *El Popular*, 3 January (1971), p. 14; Buscaglia, Horacio, “Don Pascual tira la línea al agua,” in *Magazine*, cultural supplement to newspaper, *El Popular*, 2 May (1971), pp. 2-3; and Buscaglia, Horacio, “Lo Mejor del ’71, III Parte,” in *Magazine*, cultural supplement to newspaper, *El Popular*, 23 January (1972), p. 26.
 - 34 The word is a combination of “música” and “ocasión” in Spanish, literally a combination of music and occasion.
 - 35 Peláez, Fernando, *De las cuevas al Solís: cronología del rock en el Uruguay: 1960-1975. Tomo 1* (Montevideo: Perro Andaluz Ediciones, 2002), p. 216.
 - 36 Markarian, Vania, *El ’68 Uruguayo* (Buenos Aires: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, 2012).
 - 37 Marchesi, Aldo, *El Uruguay inventado: la política audiovisual de la dictadura, reflexiones sobre su imaginario* (Montevideo: Trilce, 2001).
 - 38 Álvarez, Antonio, “Crónica de la caída de las instituciones democráticas y de sus causas en el Uruguay de hace 30 años: La noche del día menos pensado,” in *Diario El País*, no date. http://www.elpais.com.uy/Especiales/golpe_de_estado/golpe_1.shtml (2003).
 - 39 “‘Conferencia de Prensa’ de Viglietti en Jefatura,” in *Ahora*, 31 May (1972), p. 13.
 - 40 Human rights violations are detailed extensively in Servicio Paz y Justicia – Uruguay (translated by Elizabeth Hampsten), *Uruguay Nunca Más: Human Rights Violations, 1972–1985* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992).
 - 41 “Manifiesto” from the program of Concierto Beat (III), November 1966, in Pinto, Guilherme de Alencar, *Razones locas: el paso de Eduardo Mateo por la música uruguaya* (Buenos Aires: Zero Ediciones, [1994] 2002), p. 70.
 - 42 Ortiz, Renato, *Otro territorio: ensayos sobre el mundo contemporáneo*. Translated by Carlos E. Cortés Sánchez (Bogotá: Convenio Andrés Bello, 1998), p. 12.
 - 43 Markarian, Vania, *El ’68 Uruguayo* (Buenos Aires: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, 2012).
 - 44 Articles in the *La Del Taller*, a magazine devoted to popular music that appeared during the 1980’s transition to democracy, reflected back on this issue and continued to support the visual presentation of performers as members of society at large, and not countercultural labels. Criticism of US counterculture in the more progressive cultural supplements of the time also supports the claim that leftist audiences rejected aesthetics that transgressed Uruguayan cultural norms.
 - 45 Peláez, Fernando, *De las cuevas al solís: cronología del rock en el Uruguay: 1960-1975. Tomo 2* (Montevideo: Perro Andaluz Ediciones, 2004), p. 129.

- 46 The song's writer, Eduardo Useta, later claimed that the words of "Mi pueblo" had nothing to do with politics, although audiences may not have agreed. The lyrics were: "When they close the doors / so that no one can escape / When you want everyone / to know all your dreams / And when you understand that /you can't sing them anymore / Streets, parks and plazas / are a bit deserted / Flowers that wilt / awaiting the spring / Fields that dry up / waiting for steel / What a people, my people. / What a people, my people." "Mi pueblo" by Eduardo Useta, in Peláez, Fernando, *De las cuevas al solís: cronología del rock en el Uruguay: 1960-1975. Tomo 2* (Montevideo: Perro Andaluz Ediciones, 2004), p. 180.
- 47 "Morsa." Magazine, cultural supplement to newspaper, *El Popular*, 27 June (1971), p. 6.
- 48 Buscaglia, Horacio, "La Morsa oyó que," Magazine, cultural supplement to newspaper, *El Popular*, 2 May (1971), p. 6.
- 49 Peláez, Fernando, *De las cuevas al solís: cronología del rock en el Uruguay: 1960-1975. Tomo 2* (Montevideo: Perro Andaluz Ediciones, 2004), p. 307.
- 50 *Ibid.*, p. 304.
- 51 *Ibid.*, p. 304.
- 52 Peter Manuel explores the dissemination of music through cassette copies as an alternative in other nations where access is limited economically. However, his perspective also serves to understand the proliferation of cassette copies in an ambit where political repression limited access in Manuel, Peter, *Cassette Culture: Popular Music and Technology in North India* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).
- 53 Martins, Carlos A., *Música popular uruguaya, 1973-1982*, (Montevideo: CLAEH and Ediciones de la Banda Oriental, 1986), p. 94. Originally quoted in "Trochón: una actitud crítica y cuestionante," interview by Gerardo Sotelo in *Opción*, October 26 (1982).
- 54 Donas, Ernesto, and Denise Milstein, *Cantando la ciudad: lenguajes, imaginarios y mediaciones en la canción popular montevideana (1962-1999)* (Montevideo, Nordan, 2003).
- 55 An extensive study of *Los que iban cantando: Pinto*, Guilherme de Alencar, *Los que iban cantando: detrás de las voces* (Montevideo, Taller Uruguayo de Música Popular, 2013). Specific reference to this song is on p. 247. Also see Ciarlo, Gastón "Dino," "Milonga realista," Interview with Juan Castel, <http://www.deluruguay.net/notas/xedicion.asp?idnota=54>, September (2000).
- 56 Peláez, Fernando, *De las cuevas al solís: cronología del rock en el Uruguay: 1960-1975. Tomo 2*, (Montevideo: Perro Andaluz Ediciones, 2004), p. 82.
- 57 Viglietti, Daniel, "Milonga de andar lejos," in *Canciones para el hombre nuevo*, (EMI/Orfeo 8 59486 2, 1968).

Copyright of Estudios Interdisciplinarios de America Latina y el Caribe is the property of Instituto Sverdlin de Historia y Cultura de America Latina and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.