

---

## Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Neil Kulkarni - 12-05-2008 20:08

---

Has to be between Oasis Radiohead & The Strokes I reckon.

Oasis win this I think. I see their influence as nothing but malign, their rise as nothing short of a crime of silent cowardice on behalf of the music press, and their continuing ability to prise the comment 'yeah, but there's no denying there's some good songs there' from people you might otherwise consider acquaintances, all equally infuriating and depressing. From Embrace to Starsailor, Kasabian to The Enemy they've contributed nothing but shit to the world.

I almost entirely blame Radiohead for Coldplay, James Blunt and all their ilk: y'know that little vocal tic, that horrible altarboy swoop that Blunt does - he got it from Martin who got it from Yorke (who I guess got it from Jeff Buckley - and there's another over-rated pile of cunt as well) . 'kin corduroy choirboys. Here I'll admit there are some 'good' songs but the legion of po-faced cack that's come since from all kinds of wankers wouldn't be quite as earnestly nauseating without Yorke's cheerless vaguery as it's spiritual crutch, the faux-profundity of all those Qmag-friendly cunts with acoustics can be traced directly back to 'The Bends' & 'OK Computer' I think. And Ratboy out of Muse.

You can blame alot of shit drainpiped bands on the Strokes being so fucking ace I think for that first album and a fair chunk of the second n'all. Not their fault really. And out of all the above's recorded output, Radiohead included, I think 'Is This It' is the only thing I still would wanna listen to.

The reason I ask is cos, isn't it about time Oasis started getting called out & slagged IN PUBLIC, in the press, on the radio, everywhere for how shit they've always been ? They've been getting away with this bollocks for fucking ages.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by J1s - 12-05-2008 20:40

---

Quite liked The Strokes until I saw them live and Julian Casablancas said (without irony) to the crowd: "Whoh, you guys sure know how to rock!" Is that was passes for "cool" in New York?

Radiohead strike me as avant-garde tourists and Thom Yorke is just another Roger Waters; not because of his proggy leanings (well, a bit...) but because of his pompous, ivory-tower misanthropy. Who's the bigger twat: him or Bono?

Oasis actually remind me of The Sex Pistols. Not the Sex Pistols of 1977 but The Sex Pistols now: a bunch of tiresome, playing-to-the-gallery cabaret artists. They've got a few alright tunes though (ha ha).

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Pan Tau - 12-05-2008 21:00

---

A guy says something vaguely banal and you stop liking his band? You're setting high standards.

If one elects to view Coldplay and their clones as something "damaging" (and I am not arguing that they aren't), then Radiohead have to carry the can for that.

I'm not sure whether Oasis have much influence anymore. But I suppose that the ilk of Arctic Monkeys are an outgrowth of Britpop culture. In which case I suppose someone should invent a timemachine and drown Britpop at birth. So that's the Happy Mondays out of the way.

Far more damaging than Coldplay and even Arctic fucking Monkeys has been the corporate R&B and Hop Hop scene. At least the Coldplay gang write and play their own music. Rock will survive them. But soul isn't going to rise again, not from the sustained gangrape it has suffered over the past decade. The last good year in R&B was 1999. Since then, almost exclusively forgettable shit.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Neil Kulkarni - 12-05-2008 21:44

---

---

Oh my fucking god Pan Tau, you've got to be kidding. Are you Robert Elms or summat?

=====

**Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?**

Posted by dogbeak - 12-05-2008 21:57

---

the corporate R&B and Hop Hop scene

rabbit music?

my answer to this question depends entirely on what kind of scope we're discussing.. at least on a local level, playing in a band i heard enough shite that could have avoided a painful birth if people hadn't listened to so much oasis.

or as chris morris commented on "tracy jacks" - 'imagine what pub rock is going to sound like in a few years thanks to that.' it's not the imitators that make it that are the worst thing...

=====

**Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?**

Posted by Neil Kulkarni - 12-05-2008 22:26

---

Too many kids see Oasis as something akin to Gods - untouchable, inarguably great - when I suggested to one of my classes that they were in fact shite it was greeted with a genuine gasp, like I was uttering some kind of heresy. Couldn't believe it. If someone can tell me one good thing about Oasis it might help. I mean, seriously. Name one good song they've ever done, name one song you hear in a club by them that doesn't make you wanna kill people. They're the musical equivalent of those Carling 'Belong' ads. Just utterly loathsome on every level.

=====

**Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?**

Posted by Nico Rijnders - 12-05-2008 22:34

---

Surely Oasis have just been critical whipping boys for more than a decade though? Most of Neil Kulkarni's complaints are pretty much received opinion in any kind of vaguely credible press or message board. Even Chris Evans gave up on them after Be Here Now. It's just fish in a barrel.

=====

**Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?**

Posted by Neil Kulkarni - 12-05-2008 22:40

---

There aren't any critical whipping boys anymore. Oasis stopped all that.

=====

**Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?**

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 12-05-2008 22:45

---

I've been consistently "calling out" Oasis (or whatever the phrase was) since the 90s, so I hope I'm spared Neil's disappointment. I do think they're the most evil force in music (at least, in British rock music), and have been since they first made it big.

The Strokes were actually a force for good. It's hard to grasp now - especially in light of how quickly their aura faded, and how, when it had faded, they were left high and dry, looking like the posh boys with nothing to say about anything that they'd always been - just how exciting hearing "Last Nite" for the first time on the early vinyl pressings of "The Modern Age EP" felt, and how seeing those carefully calculated B&W photos felt: a return to sharpness, a return to the concept of 'cool' (even if I'm sure we would all disagree wildly over the precise definition of cool). Suddenly, kids were wearing shirts and ties and jackets again, and actually putting some thought into what they wore, instead of just slouching about in

---

beige t-shirts. In this respect, sartorially as well as musically, The Strokes were a reaction against Radioheadism, and in a way they kicked down the doors for things like electroclash (which they had fuck all to do with musically).

Radioheadism, by the way, is indeed as evil and as far-reaching as Neil says it is. I'll stand up for one exception, though. Muse are fucking brilliant.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 12-05-2008 22:48

---

Neil Kulkarni wrote:

There aren't any critical whipping boys anymore. Oasis stopped all that.

Aye. Exactly. Balance of power shifted, and it's never shifted back.

Coldplay on the front of the NME this week. Fucking COLDPLAY!

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Nico Rijnders - 12-05-2008 22:52

---

No, I'm serious. They've hardly had a decent review outside of say Q (which a quick Google shows listed at least one of their albums in a 50 worst albums ever list) since Be Here Now and even Morning Glory before had famously mixed reviews.

I'd say this, from OTF favourite and supposed Oasis/Weller apologist John Harris is pretty typical:

[http://blogs.guardian.co.uk/music/2007/08/cocaine\\_supernova\\_oasis\\_be\\_her.html](http://blogs.guardian.co.uk/music/2007/08/cocaine_supernova_oasis_be_her.html)

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Neil Kulkarni - 12-05-2008 22:53

---

I saw Muse in a German ballroom once and they were fucking amazing. Went to the dressing room afterwards and the two other ones had to stand in the corridor because Matt Bellamy's practice synth was so massive. They didn't look pleased.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Nico Rijnders - 12-05-2008 22:54

---

Oasis clearly put a fair bit of thought into what they were wearing too, it's just not to your taste.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 12-05-2008 22:54

---

Nico Rijnders wrote:

No, I'm serious. They've hardly had a decent review outside of say Q (which a quick Google shows listed at least one of their albums in a 50 worst albums ever list) since Be Here Now and even Morning Glory before had famously mixed reviews.

I'd say this, from OTF favourite and supposed Oasis/Weller apologist John Harris is pretty typical:

[http://blogs.guardian.co.uk/music/2007/08/cocaine\\_supernova\\_oasis\\_be\\_her.html](http://blogs.guardian.co.uk/music/2007/08/cocaine_supernova_oasis_be_her.html)

Do you read the NME, Nico? I mean, I wouldn't blame you if the answer was 'no', but trust me that according to that comedy rag, Oasis have been seamless Godlike Geniuses, unchallenged kings of everything that is cool and right and true, everything that every band should aspire to be like, from '94 thru '08.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 12-05-2008 22:58

Nico Rijnders wrote:

Oasis clearly put a fair bit of thought into what they were wearing too, it's just not to your taste.

Maybe they did, maybe they didn't. The point is that their fans didn't need to put any thought into it at all, because the whole point of that look was that you could buy it ready-made off the peg from any high street sportswear retailer, whereas with the whole Strokes thing you actually needed to think laterally and raid some vintage or chazza shops (not true now, of course, since Top Man have cottoned on and started selling the Pete Doherty/Blake Fielder Civil look to the masses, but it was true for a bit.)

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by steveeeeeeeee - 12-05-2008 22:58

The Killers and The Kills seem to have taken a fair whipping recently, and quite fairly so.

I was having a browse in my local magazine store this afternoon and it dawned on me that these days I don't even browse the racks that contain music publications. 5 years ago they'd probably the only racks I browsed.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Nico Rijnders - 12-05-2008 23:12

Spearmint Rhino wrote:

Do you read the NME, Nico? I mean, I wouldn't blame you if the answer was 'no', but trust me that according to that comedy rag, Oasis have been seamless Godlike Geniuses, unchallenged kings of everything that is cool and right and true, everything that every band should aspire to be like, from '94 thru '08.

Well, the answer is "no" but I take your point and I was going to specify NME along with Q in my caveat, but when I looked up the album reviews they were surprisingly mixed. Still, I can't deny that the rest of their coverage of the band is shameless cheerleading. I did say credible source, though, and while I will damn myself on OTF by admitting to having read NME religiously back in the day (my day starting in about 1991, is Robin Carmody about to track, hunt and maim me?), I don't think it is much of a stretch to suggest that it essentially isn't the same magazine any more, other than in name and hasn't been for a long, long time. I can't blame you for being frustrated and annoyed by that though.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Neil Kulkarni - 12-05-2008 23:13

They might not have had any positive reviews but my point is that after the commercial fact of Oasis happened those 'reviews' didn't matter shit anymore even if they were dissenting. My guess is that most of those 'negative' reviews were still keeping the faith: none of them I recall pointed out the real horror of the whole idea of Oasis being our national band, our frontpage news, the victors. None of them took the band on for their stunted, utterly unbeautiful songs, too many milksops running scared of those gobshites - none nailed them, cos they're still fucking breathing. (And already you feel the cunt's got away with the Jay-Z shit already - course everyone's gonna let it blow over cos they know their fucking readers agree with him!)

---

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by adams house cat - 12-05-2008 23:22

---

PT has a point. I could nominate Destiny's Child/Bbeyonce. I think Beyonce has a fine voice but the over-melismatic way she handles it has led countless pale imitators to strangle good songs and drown them in a bath of over-emoted wailing. Destiny' Child are responsible for bleaching the soul out of current R'n'B.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by mafu - 12-05-2008 23:33

---

people have been doing that for ages though. see, i dunno, whitney houston? it would seem strange to me to pin all that on destinys child

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The\_Liquidator - 13-05-2008 00:08

---

Too many kids see Oasis as something akin to Gods - untouchable, inarguably great - when I suggested to one of my classes that they were in fact shite it was greeted with a genuine gasp, like I was uttering some kind of heresy.

Where on earth do you teach, 1996?

The point is that their fans didn't need to put any thought into it at all, because the whole point of that look was that you could buy it ready-made off the peg from any high street sportswear retailer, whereas with the whole Strokes thing you actually needed to think laterally and raid some vintage or chazza shops

I find that an odd statement coming from a critic who makes a big deal of the democratising effect of punk. I really don't see what is cool about seeing a band and thinking 'ooooh, I want to dress like them.' That's the opposite of cool, surely?

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The Prodigal - 13-05-2008 00:22

---

I think Oasis may well still be revered - it's amazing how many kids take on the supposed wisdom of their elder brothers and, increasingly, even their parents. If the kids Neil's teaching have a particular set of tastes and mix in particular musical circles Oasis will be revered as "elder statesmen". It sickens me, but I'm sure it's happening. We forget how few "we" actually are.

The great thing about Neil's original post is that he's nailed the worst of all classes.

I've no problem with Nico having read the NME in the 1990s - it may not have had a Penman or Morley, but even then it was comparatively varied and readable, though it's not something I'd ever get nostalgic over.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Pan Tau - 13-05-2008 07:47

---

Oh my fucking god Pan Tau, you've got to be kidding. Are you Robert Elms or summat?

Well, that's my argument thoroughly demolished, Mr Kulkani. If that response reflects your usual method of teaching, then I'm not surprised that ver kids beg to differ with you.

---

Mind you, I'm taking a rather more global view of things here. This thread is a bit parochial (something which the opening post did not qualify).

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 13-05-2008 09:17

---

The\_Liquidator wrote:

The point is that their fans didn't need to put any thought into it at all, because the whole point of that look was that you could buy it ready-made off the peg from any high street sportswear retailer, whereas with the whole Strokes thing you actually needed to think laterally and raid some vintage or chazza shops

I find that an odd statement coming from a critic who makes a big deal of the democratising effect of punk. I really don't see what is cool about seeing a band and thinking 'oooooh, I want to dress like them.' That's the opposite of cool, surely?

I think you've missed the point. You couldn't buy The Strokes look off the peg from JD Sports (or indeed your local goth-metal emporium) even if you wanted to, so if the way The Strokes looked excited you, it forced you to think for yourself a little bit and experiment. Most people ended up with their own individual version of it, because you couldn't just replicate it exactly. That was a very positive development.

(I'm not sure I am "a critic who makes a big deal of the democratising effect of punk" anyway. I have very mixed feelings on all that. But that's another discussion.)

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by diggedy derek - 13-05-2008 09:31

---

Great thread, and I concur with almost all of what's being said about The Strokes.

Destiny's Child is a fair shout for a "damaging band" – they kicked off RnB's frosty detachment, the whole 'look but don't touch' style of RnB feminism. Its a shame as their music is, in places, stellar.

I think it's harsh on Radiohead to blame them entirely for Coldplay et al. Admittedly, Radiohead showed wallowing in miserabilism could shift serious units, but their music in places is pretty good, even disassembling their own mythic status on tracks on tracks like "Pyramid Song" or whatever it's called, that really minimal, awkward ballad. Whatever Radiohead did, they did so with a certain degree of nuance and sincerity.

I think Oasis is probably it, even though I've stuck up for lots of their tunes in the past. But there's no denying how backwards looking they are, eschewing several decades of Brit-rock as essentially an arty, sometimes camp phenomenon.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 13-05-2008 09:38

---

By the way...

Pan Tau wrote:

Far more damaging than Coldplay and even Arctic fucking Monkeys has been the corporate R&B and Hop Hop scene. At least the Coldplay gang write and play their own music.

How on earth is this a point in Coldplay & co's favour? It means they don't even have the Nuremberg defence.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by E10 Rifle - 13-05-2008 10:01

---

Completely agree with what DD and Pan Tau have said about hip hop/r'n'b. Bang on the money.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Neil Kulkarni - 13-05-2008 10:21

---

"Well, that's my argument thoroughly demolished, Mr Kulkarni. If that response reflects your usual method of teaching, then I'm not surprised that ver kids beg to differ with you."

Well, of course it doesn't reflect my usual method of teaching. I'm not at fucking work here am I? And I wish the kids would beg to differ more with me to be honest. The reason I said 'Robert Elms' is because whenever I hear anyone bemoaning the current state of hip-hop or r'n'b I always think - hold on a sec, somewhere along the line you just stopped listening didn't you? So come on - tell me what was the great r'n'b of 1999 you hold in such high esteem? The idea of r'n'b or hip-hop being seperate genres is kinda bullshit now but so's the idea that since 1999 there's been no good r'n'b singles. I suspect you see album-length-quality as the sole criteria for r'n'b's health, in which case I heartily agree there's been very little as consistently hour-long good as 'One In A Million', 'Writing On The Wall' or 'Fanmail' since 2000. But if you've spent this decade ignoring records by Ciara, Amerie, Beyonce, Chante Moore, Mary J., Usher, Chris Brown, Rihanna, Alicia Keys more fool you and if you can't hear r'n'b in all kinds of things from dancehall to reggaeton to b-line then I don't think you've been following things properly. Mariah Carey & Leona Lewis aren't the only r'n'b story of this decade.

"Mind you, I'm taking a rather more global view of things here. This thread is a bit parochial (something which the opening post did not qualify)."

I admit that, s'just that in terms of causing damage to hip-hop/r'n'b's forward-motion I'd earmark Fiddy or Xtina as being way more harmful than Destiny's Child in terms of fucking up people's perceptions of those genres. Tell me what you think good r'n'b is and what bad r'n'b is and whether or not both haven't ALWAYS existed in the same ratios that they do right now.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Max Payne - 13-05-2008 10:29

---

I was having a browse in my local magazine store this afternoon and it dawned on me that these days I don't even browse the racks that contain music publications. 5 years ago they'd probably the only racks I browsed.

There's definitely room in the crowded marketplace for a really good all round magazine that's just interesting to read. Nobody ever cracked it. Melody Maker was always one I read. That and FHM in the earlier days. Nowadays it's just WSC.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by diggedy derek - 13-05-2008 10:35

---

Tell me what you think good r'n'b is and what bad r'n'b is and whether or not both haven't ALWAYS existed in the same ratios that they do right now.

Well, I do think the ratio isn't quite as high these days, but I do agree that to reduce RnB to a golden age and an endless rut is very simplistic. When I try and recall good recent RnB tracks, I don't think there are as many as before, or quite as distinctive. I guess you've got Timberlake (who has done great stuff), but one of the biggest stars, Rhianna, is merely quite good I think.

I've got a theory going that flamboyance in RnB has gone from being camp (ie challenging, provocative, flirtatious) to being ostentatious (frosty, fixed, superior). And it's not a good thing.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

---

Posted by Neil Kulkarni - 13-05-2008 10:41

---

And what about 'Voodoo', 'Love Below', 'Trapped In The Closet', 'Loose', 'Sweet Escape' - to me they're all great albums that couldn't exist without r'n'b, and that's not even getting into what Estelle, Erykah, Gnarls Berkeley, Justin Timberlake, Kelly Rowland, Monica, Ne-Yo have been doing this decade. To blanket piss on all of that seems a bit rich to me s'all. I'd not say that Oasis, Radiohead & The Strokes are all that went on in this decade's guitar music and I'd be equally wary of saying that histrionics is all that's gone on in contemporary r'n'b. And I ask again - what is this amazing pre-1999 r'n'b that is being carefully curated here? Could someone clear that up for me?

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Disney Girl Does Dulwich - 13-05-2008 10:56

---

Damaging is a difficult term to define really. Presumably it is how many bands have been influenced in a bad way by one source?

I have to admit to be mystified by Muse, Killers and Arcade Fire. I find Muse and Arcade Fire appallingly sanctimonious, chin-strokingly retrograde and really full of false emotion (also how many time and key changes do you need in one track?!! Yuck). The Killers just come across as a sub-standard mid-80's act and their first album was, quite frankly, the most front loaded rip-off of recent times.

Whether any of those three have been particularly damaging in a sea of recent indie/dance mediocrity I don't really know.

I could point the finger at Goldfrapp (who I like a lot) for introducing a wave of shitty half glam/electro dancefloor imitators from Rachel Stevens to Madonna via a load of anonymous DJ productions, for the last few years....

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Pan Tau - 13-05-2008 11:10

---

Hold on, where did I say that all soul/R&b post '99 has been shit? I employed exactly the same parameters you did in criticising current rock music.

Having said that, some of those artists you mention have been the cause for the decline in R&B as record corporations started to mass produce clones in the image of Mary J Blige (who once was great) and Destiny's Child (ditto) and Boyz II fucking Men.

You mention Ne-Yo, whom I find incredibly boring because it is impossible to distinguish him from any number of Hip Hop tinged soulsters. It's all gone corporate in the same way the Radiohead-influenced acts have.

Of course there are individual artists who produce quality soul. They represent a small number, whereas in the "golden ages" (and, my goodness, of course there were golden ages of soul) there was a much wider spread of styles and quality.

I could compile a list of 100 outstanding soul songs representing a wide variety of styles from the period of 1970-1978, and regret omissions. I would find it very difficult to do likewise for the 00s.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Bored Of The Dance - 13-05-2008 11:35

---

I have genuinely taken on board the comments on here and would say Radiohead but could there be a mention for The Libertines?

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

---

Posted by Mitch - 13-05-2008 11:37

---

shitty half glam/electro dancefloor imitators from Rachel Stevens to Madonna

You know, I think the Rachel Stevens singles are so much better than they've got any right to be. I can't think of any Goldfrapp single that I prefer to So Good.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Disney Girl Does Dulwich - 13-05-2008 11:39

---

The Libertines would certainly win the award for the most inappropriately hyped or rated band in a long, long time. If they were the spokesmen for a generation, what was the original question ffs? Simplistic (not in a good way) tunes and just down right crap lyrics.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 13-05-2008 11:40

---

Bored Of The Dance wrote:

I have genuinely taken on board the comments on here and would say Radiohead but could there be a mention for The Libertines?

You've got a point, but The Libertines are directly post-Strokes, though. When I first saw Pete Doherty hanging around the Rhythm Factory, I pissed myself laughing at how much he was trying to be an English Casablanca. (But, like, a wonky Rodney Bewes version.)

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The Horse - 13-05-2008 11:46

---

You know, I think the Rachel Stevens singles are so much better than they've got any right to be. I can't think of any Goldfrapp single that I prefer to So Good.

I agree, and So Good wouldn't even make my Stevens top five!

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 13-05-2008 11:51

---

Yep. Rachel Stevens is great.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 13-05-2008 11:52

---

The Horse wrote:

You know, I think the Rachel Stevens singles are so much better than they've got any right to be. I can't think of any Goldfrapp single that I prefer to So Good.

I agree, and So Good wouldn't even make my Stevens top five!

I've never knowingly heard "So Good", but "Some Girls" is definitely the best single Goldfrapp ever made.

---

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Mitch - 13-05-2008 11:57

---

Oh, I think you'd really like it SR. Get yourself on LimeWire.

(and yeah, "Some Girls" is daylight robbery really)

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 13-05-2008 12:00

---

On the substantive: I think this is tricky. There's no shortage of bands like Kasabian who've inherited Oasis' Mantle of Blokey Lairiness together with their love of beer and cocaine, but in some ways I prefer "irritating" to "dreary". It's the sheer so-what-ness of so much indie these days that's its true curse. The macho swaggerers have at least got something about them. Something annoying, but something.

Can we blame the Athletes and Coldplays on Radiohead? Hmm. I'm not sure. I'm far from being a fan of Radiohead, but it's obvious, even to a tin-eared Radioheadsceptic like me, that they were always pretty multidimensional. There were a number of directions in which their legacy could have been taken. It wasn't written in the stars that the bands of the noughties would draw only on Radiohead's downbeat moaniness, and jettison all the band's musicality and inventiveness. Or at least, it wasn't written in the stars that the ones who did would find such ready buyers for their pointless dirges.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by diggedy derek - 13-05-2008 12:20

---

Estelle- that single with Kanye is really irritating, so smooth it's offensive. Gnarl's Berkeley- yeah, he's, sporadically, brilliant, sure. Erykah- yeah, she's been pretty good since she got some hiphop producers in. But Kelly Rowland and Ne-Yo- nah, I've never heard anything by them that wasn't insipid to the max.

It's hit and miss, RnB. I don't think there's anyone out there who's a quarter as exciting as Timbaland when he first broke through (and half of the ones who are good, eg Rhianna, sound a lot like Timbaland anyway).

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Harry Lime - 13-05-2008 12:20

---

Spearmint Rhino wrote:

I think you've missed the point. You couldn't buy The Strokes look off the peg from JD Sports (or indeed your local goth-metal emporium) even if you wanted to, so if the way The Strokes looked excited you, it forced you to think for yourself a little bit and experiment. Most people ended up with their own individual version of it, because you couldn't just replicate it exactly. That was a very positive development.

Ah but what about the original genesis of the scally look? You are aware that it was copied wholesale off the girls of St Etienne?

Plus ever since then, at the sharper end, it's always been about what isn't available on the British high street. You find stuff on the internet, or on Euro away trips, or in the adidas factory shops. Or even, before they was ruined by over exposure, budget places like TK Maxx and Brunswick Warehouse.

Five or six years ago they were the places to source rare adidas gear - trainers that now go on ebay for 80 quid were going for 20 to 25 in those gaffs, in unique colour schemes as well. it's a sort of neo-mod one upmanship and always has been.

---

I'd no sooner go in a JJB that you would, SR.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 13-05-2008 12:27

---

Harry Lime wrote:

Spearmint Rhino wrote:

I think you've missed the point. You couldn't buy The Strokes look off the peg from JD Sports (or indeed your local goth-metal emporium) even if you wanted to, so if the way The Strokes looked excited you, it forced you to think for yourself a little bit and experiment. Most people ended up with their own individual version of it, because you couldn't just replicate it exactly. That was a very positive development.

Ah but what about the original genesis of the scally look? You are aware that it was copied wholesale off the girls of St Etienne?

Plus ever since then, at the sharper end, it's always been about what isn't available on the British high street. You find stuff on the internet, or on Euro away trips, or in the adidas factory shops. Or even, before they was ruined by over exposure, budget places like TK Maxx and Brunswick Warehouse.

Five or six years ago they were the places to source rare adidas gear - trainers that now go on ebay for 80 quid were going for 20 to 25 in those gaffs, in unique colour schemes as well. it's a sort of neo-mod one upmanship and always has been.

I'd no sooner go in a JJB that you would, SR.

You seem to be off into some kind of elite football casual realm there. We're not talking about that. We're talking about the Oasis look, and its massive cultural repercussions.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Harry Lime - 13-05-2008 12:31

---

Oh sure, and Oasis were very reactionary and undoubtedly a bad thing, but Noel in particular sees himself as part of that "elite vanguard" rather than man at JJB.

Just thought I'd mention it because it's a subject that interests me.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 13-05-2008 12:36

---

Harry Lime wrote:

Oh sure, and Oasis were very reactionary and undoubtedly a bad thing, but Noel in particular sees himself as part of that "elite vanguard" rather than man at JJB.

Just thought I'd mention it because it's a subject that interests me.

Well, I do know all about the football casual thing, from an arms-length distance. I saw a lot of my ex-mod mates go into that in the mid-80s (via a transitional Style Council-influenced Europhile phase), and I used to follow it all in The Face etc, even though I hated that look myself.

The thing is, sure, maybe at the very elite level the top crews of football supporters could spot the minute differences in the labels their opponents were wearing, but the average bloke and blokette didn't 'get' that, and on a broader level it just meant that everyone started wearing mass-manufactured sportswear. And Oasis and their fans are coming from that phenomenon, I reckon (via Baggy, of course).

=====

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Harry Lime - 13-05-2008 12:44

---

Well... I'm uncomfortable with the word "crews" myself... I go to the match but I don't see myself as "a lad" and I'd hate to think I dressed like a football hooligan.

As I say, I see it as a neo-mod thing. I've always liked those particular clothes, and finding a rare adidas jumper in a place like Preston TJ Hughes is as exciting as finding a Julian Casablancas style denim jacket in Camden would be.

If I saw the same jumper in JJB a week later, I genuinely wouldn't wear it again!

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by O Colluphid - 13-05-2008 13:19

---

I pretty much agree with Neil's opening but I think some of the blame must lie with a band that came before Oasis and were an obvious influence on them: The Stone Roses. Ever since them, British indie rock has been mostly backwards looking.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Harry Lime - 13-05-2008 13:41

---

Ah, but then surely you should blame Primal Scream, because the Roses were making a goth racket of a completely different kind until they heard Velocity Girl.

Oasis were a watershed unlike any other band, it's hard to deny that. The press happily fed the monster however - and I include MM in this - in fact arguably they even created it.

I'm certain Melody Maker even covered Oasis before the NME.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The\_Liquidator - 13-05-2008 14:02

---

Ah but what about the original genesis of the scally look? You are aware that it was copied wholesale off the girls of St Etienne?

I hope you mean the city and not the band, arf arf.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Harry Lime - 13-05-2008 14:23

---

Hah! Easy for a Londoner to get confused on these sartorial matters though (Liquidator = Chelsea, right?) All the cockneys bar Millwall were still wearing donkey jackets and air ware until about summer 1980.

Even Carlisle were on the case by then!

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by EIM - 13-05-2008 14:28

---

---

Who is this Harry Lime?

=====

### Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Nico Rijnders - 13-05-2008 14:32

---

Blimey, this didn't take long.

=====

### Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Harry Lime - 13-05-2008 14:32

---

Well I've been keeping my head down since the Vienna thing went tits up...

=====

### Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The Chubby Cyclist - 13-05-2008 15:15

---

Oasis did their damage more than a decade ago (and the Stone Roses nearly 2 decades ago). Radiohead's damage was all OK Computer and The Bends, so I think falls out of "the last decade" category, too.

=====

### Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Pants - 13-05-2008 16:07

---

Five words for Neil: Live Forever and Slide Away. Neither make up for the avalanche of shite that followed, but they are both indisputably, life-changingly great songs.

=====

### Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 13-05-2008 16:08

---

Pants wrote:

Five words for Neil: Live Forever and Slide Away. Neither make up for the avalanche of shite that followed, but they are both indisputably, life-changingly great songs.

Christ.

What was your life like before hearing "Live Forever" and "Slide Away" by Oasis, and in what respects was your life different after hearing "Live Forever" and "Slide Away" by Oasis?

=====

### Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The Prodigal - 13-05-2008 17:36

---

"Live Forever" fired the starting gun on an era, without doubt. Doesn't make it good - indeed, it definitively ended the era when Brit indie culture was meaningfully outward-looking or genuinely alternative - but I can understand better than I could then why people wanted to believe in it.

One thing that always riled me about Oasis was that they were as contrived, in terms of their class image etc, as Blur.

---

Now I wouldn't inherently disapprove of that in itself - I hate the current mockney tribe, but I certainly don't see contrivance as inherently a bad thing - but it was just that Oasis were promoting themselves as sole representatives of PROLE AUTHENTICITY, and judged by their own criteria (the only meaningful criteria to apply to them) they were - hilariously, considering the rhetoric of their defenders even now - fake.

Never forget that in the "documentary" (basically just a free ad) the BBC showed about them immediately before 'Be Here Now' was released, the Gallaghers were seen returning to the area of Manchester they came from. Except it wasn't - they were actually seen in an inner-city area (probably Moss Side) they'd probably never even been to before, because they were worried that their image might be affected if they were seen in the comparatively affluent suburb they actually came from. Similarly, Ian Brown and John Squire were grammar school boys from Altrincham. It's not so much the faking itself that has always infuriated me, as the way their fans would insist that this was somehow different from Blur not wanting to be seen returning to Colchester. Can't see any meaningful difference, myself - both bands were largely regressive influences, but Albarn has redeemed himself since, and even then he was capable of "To The End" and "This Is A Low", songs that were actually potent.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Nico Rijnders - 13-05-2008 17:44

---

>Similarly, Ian Brown and John Squire were grammar school boys from Altrincham.

What were they meant to be faking then?

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Carcass - 13-05-2008 18:35

---

Burnage isn't an "affluent suburb". I used to live there and it's solidly upper working class. I fucking hate Oasis but don't feel the need to make stuff up about them in order to dislike them.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by adams house cat - 13-05-2008 18:41

---

I didn't mean to blame it all on Destiny' Child, Whitney Houston certainly has a case to answer, but Beyonce and crew took it to where there was no soul at all. Mary J. Blige, and others always seemed to me to be fighting a rearguard action to keep some soul alive. Mind you, what I have said here was also said about the Supremes, and others, all those years ago.

As for Oasis returning to visit their "roots" was it their idea or did their 'Management' persuade them that it was a good idea?

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Ginger Yellow - 13-05-2008 18:42

---

Can we blame the Athletes and Coldplays on Radiohead? Hmm. I'm not sure. I'm far from being a fan of Radiohead, but it's obvious, even to a tin-eared Radioheadsceptic like me, that they were always pretty multidimensional. There were a number of directions in which their legacy could have been taken. It wasn't written in the stars that the bands of the noughties would draw only on Radiohead's downbeat moaniness, and jettison all the band's musicality and inventiveness.

But that's not the point of the thread, really. We're not saying they're culpable (except perhaps Oasis). Just that their very presence was damaging because of all the cunts that were inspired by/became successful because of them.

Anyway, I'm with Pan Tau on soul, but then I also fit Kulkarni's description of a modern R&B hater, so you can safely

ignore my opinion.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by bckjags - 13-05-2008 20:46

---

The Spice Girls were damaging in a range of ways, musically, obviously. Encouraging pre-teen girls to dress 'sexily', and who knows if Beckham might've been a better player had he not married the publicity hound.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Pan Tau - 13-05-2008 20:56

---

Absolutely. But here too Destiny's Child and Britney Spears et al caused even greater damage.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Carcass - 13-05-2008 21:58

---

Encouraging pre-teen girls to dress 'sexily', and who knows if Beckham might've been a better player had he not married the publicity hound.

What a load of fucking codswallop. They no more 'encouraged' pre-teens to dress like mini-whores than Adam Ant 'encouraged' me to dress like a pirate.

As for the second point; typical OTF sexist crap. Perhaps Bill Clinton wouldn't have stooped to having his nob polished by an intern if he hadn't married Hilary. Typical sparkling logic.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by EIM - 13-05-2008 22:00

---

So why do you dress like a pirate?

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Carcass - 13-05-2008 22:12

---

It's nature not nurture, foo.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The\_Liquidator - 13-05-2008 22:31

---

I blame dem bitches meself.

Hah! Easy for a Londoner to get confused on these sartorial matters though (Liquidator = Chelsea, right?) All the cockneys bar Millwall were still wearing donkey jackets and air ware until about summer 1980.

Even Carlisle were on the case by then!

I wasn't born till 1981 grandad, so I'll take your word for it.

---

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The Prodigal - 13-05-2008 23:56

---

OK, I'll take an ex-resident's word re. Burnage. But "upper working class" is still further up the scale (or lower down, in pop-cred terms) than Oasis liked to present themselves as being. I suspect it probably wasn't their idea to be seen revisiting their "roots" that weren't, but it says a lot about them that they played along with it.

The Stone Roses did seem to me to be conveying the impression of being from \*inner\* Manchester, that whole anti-monarchist, voting Workers' Revolutionary, radical heritage thing. When in fact their two main members (who, as we've seen, had very little musically in common) came from what I think was at one stage under Blair the only constituency in any of the metropolitan counties (as they were before Thatcher abolished their councils at the same time as the GLC) in the North to still be Tory. It doesn't necessarily bother me much, but I think it's worth commenting on - it was key to their image that they were seen as being from a city rather than affluent suburbs (and where they came from really is affluent, even if Burnage isn't).

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Pan Tau - 14-05-2008 08:21

---

What a load of fucking codswallop. They no more 'encouraged' pre-teens to dress like mini-whores than Adam Ant 'encouraged' me to dress like a pirate.

The trend of the sexualisation of pre- and barely pubescent girls coincided with the advent of the Spice Girls and the likes of Britney Spears. I see nothing sexist in being alarmed by that; indeed, I think being alarmed is a very valid feminist position.

The analogy between Spice Girls and Adam Ant doesn't work. I can't think of a really good one, but I don't think there can be a very long debate about the notion that the sartorial ways of pop/rock stars have an influence on popular culture.

The debate as to how far that influence reaches and about the validity of individual cases can be never-ending, however. So I'll give you as much as this: on reflection, I'm not sure that the Spice Girls aggressively overstepped any marks in cultivating a mini-whore look.

I find the Spice Girls more damaging in regard to their rehabilitation of Thatcher (the godmother of Girl Power, evidently).

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Hofzinsler - 14-05-2008 10:51

---

I find the Spice Girls more damaging in regard to their rehabilitation of Thatcher

I think the damage caused by that was pretty negligible.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The Horse - 14-05-2008 10:58

---

Yeah, it was almost universally seen as a harmless gaffe.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by E10 Rifle - 14-05-2008 11:01

---

---

The problematic aspects of the sexualisation of childhood can't really be pinned on the Spice Girls. Indeed, part of their initial appeal was that they looked and acted like normal girls next door - very much the opposite of, say, Xtina or girls in Fifty Cent videos and the repackaging of almost Benny Hill levels of sexism in that area,. This is where you might be better off allocating feminist blame.

Re the overall discussion, whatever people think of Oasis, there's always been a trend in pop music for good, inspiring bands to bequeath a legacy of dismal unoriginal copyists. I remember Purves making that point a while back about the Pixies (who had a lot more going for them than Oasis).

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by King Mob - 14-05-2008 11:31

---

Radiohead may have begat Coldplay, but it's Coldplay that successive bands have tried to ape, so I don't hold Radiohead culpable. It's largely thanks to Coldplay, not Radiohead, that the supermarkets, and therefore the album charts, and therefore the radio playlists and label rosters, are full of wistfully vacant melancholy. So, j'accuse Coldplay.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Pants - 14-05-2008 13:32

---

:

Five words for Neil: Live Forever and Slide Away. Neither make up for the avalanche of shite that followed, but they are both indisputably, life-changingly great songs.

Christ.

What was your life like before hearing "Live Forever" and "Slide Away" by Oasis, and in what respects was your life different after hearing "Live Forever" and "Slide Away" by Oasis?

Before I heard 'Live Forever' I was an enormously depressed, nihilistic self-harmer with a dangerous drug problem. The song helped me to understand that there were good things in my life, people I loved and looked up to, and that, while things were tough and looked bleak, it was worth pushing on. Around the same period of time I read 'The Enemy Within', the Seamus Milne book on the miners' strike and remember being similarly inspired by Scargill's idea that "the greatest victory in the strike was the struggle itself." It struck me as being the same sentiment as Noel Gallagher's "Maybe I will never be/All the things that I want to be/But now is not the time to cry/Now's the time to find out why."

Also, as a tribute to Gallagher's mother, 'Live Forever' made me think a lot about my relationship with my own mother, how much I'd taken it for granted and how important she was (still is) to me.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Pan Tau - 14-05-2008 15:44

---

In a bid to drive carcass to suicide, I'll 'fess up that I really like Don't Look Back In Anger, Champagne Supernova AND Wonderwall. Despite my intense dislike for the monobrowed brothers.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Nico Rijnders - 14-05-2008 15:57

---

Fantastic post, Pants.

=====

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 14-05-2008 16:02

---

Pants wrote:

:

Five words for Neil: Live Forever and Slide Away. Neither make up for the avalanche of shite that followed, but they are both indisputably, life-changingly great songs.

Christ.

What was your life like before hearing "Live Forever" and "Slide Away" by Oasis, and in what respects was your life different after hearing "Live Forever" and "Slide Away" by Oasis?

Before I heard 'Live Forever' I was an enormously depressed, nihilistic self-harmer with a dangerous drug problem. The song helped me to understand that there were good things in my life, people I loved and looked up to, and that, while things were tough and looked bleak, it was worth pushing on. Around the same period of time I read 'The Enemy Within', the Seamus Milne book on the miners' strike and remember being similarly inspired by Scargill's idea that "the greatest victory in the strike was the struggle itself." It struck me as being the same sentiment as Noel Gallagher's "Maybe I will never be/All the things that I want to be/But now is not the time to cry/Now's the time to find out why."

Also, as a tribute to Gallagher's mother, 'Live Forever' made me think a lot about my relationship with my own mother, how much I'd taken it for granted and how important she was (still is) to me.

Bloody hell.

Whatever gets you through the night, I suppose.

Although I don't see how Oasis' trite bollocks is any more inherently powerful than, I dunno, a bog-standard Boyzone single or an above-averagely-sentimental instalment of Neighbours, if they caught you at a sufficiently suggestible moment.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by zal cleminson - 14-05-2008 16:25

---

Easily Oasis, I'd say. Just can't shake that feeling that whenever real meat and potatoes guitar music like that comes back in, half the music press/industry breathe a massive sigh of relief and say "Thank God. It looked like something interesting was going to happen for a minute..." Felt exactly the same with the Libertines I thought...

I know plenty of people here were saying words to the effect of 'Oasis have been shit for years, no-one's that into them anyway', but I DJed at an indie event up in Stoke last month, and when you go somewhere like that you realise what a massive chokehold that kind of bog-standard indie still has over a lot of people. Singers waddling around like gibbons in badly-fitting Henri Lloyd jackets, talking about 'havin' it', trotting out all the clichés about 'being the biggest fuckin' band in the world, man' etc. Fucking dismal.

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Pants - 14-05-2008 17:12

---

Bloody hell.

Whatever gets you through the night, I suppose.

Although I don't see how Oasis' trite bollocks is any more inherently powerful than, I dunno, a bog-standard Boyzone single or an above-averagely-sentimental instalment of Neighbours, if they caught you at a sufficiently suggestible moment.

Rhino, one man's "trite" is another man's brilliant simplicity. Why is any song "powerful"? I reckon it depends on the place you're at in your life when you hear it and whether the sentiment of the song resonates with that, lyrically and/or musically. Boyzone singles and Neighbours episodes come from a cliché template, a lame attempt to manipulate

---

emotion; a powerful song like 'Live Forever' comes from a universal truth, boldly expressed.

I've always found it both interesting and depressing that Noel Gallagher could write something so remarkable quite early in his songwriting career and then spend the rest of his career writing stuff that absolutely pales in comparison (stuff that, like the aforementioned Boyzone singles, lamely attempts to manipulate emotion). Mind you, I'm sure he finds it a lot more depressing than I do.

By the way, cheers, Nico.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The Horse - 14-05-2008 17:21

---

Gallagher has admitted in interview that he said all he had to say as a songwriter in Rock 'n' Roll Star: track one, side one, album one. He's right. That one is good, though. Live Forever is great as well. LF and to a lesser extent Slide Away are endearingly simplistic, whereas everything else is annoyingly simplistic, because they've lost their initial vim and replaced it with bloated cynicism.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by zal cleminson - 14-05-2008 18:19

---

I'm sure I remember reading an interview with Alan McGee where he claimed that when he first saw Oasis, Noel Gallagher had an absolutely enormous raft of songs already written and was already playing versions of songs that ended up on the third and fourth albums. If I recall correctly, he essentially said that NG had one enormous spurt of 'creativity' and then basically couldn't write anything else. So when everyone complained that all his songs sounded the same throughout his career, that was because most of them were from the same period and were just being rationed out over the subsequent ten years. Not sure if this was actually true, or just McGee slugging him off...

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by adams house cat - 14-05-2008 18:31

---

I don't see Britney Spears as a power for good in music. I feel rather sorry for her, in fact, as she comes across as an unsophisticated girl with a little talent who has been manipulated and subsequently destroyed by the American media. Jay Leno and his ilk should burn in hell for what they have done to her. The argument that she knew what she was getting into is, frankly, crap. I spoke to Joe Elliott of Def Leppard once and he said that it took years to come to terms with the music business by which time the damage was done and Leppard are much more level-headed than Britney Spears. To blame her, and her like, for the sexualization of childhood is nonsense. That has been going on at least since the St. Trinians movies. Jailbait rock was not invented in the 90s. Ask Brenda Lee.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The Horse - 14-05-2008 18:44

---

I'm sure I remember reading an interview with Alan McGee where he claimed that when he first saw Oasis, Noel Gallagher had an absolutely enormous raft of songs already written and was already playing versions of songs that ended up on the third and fourth albums

Yeah, All Around the World is definitely one that was written pre-Definitely Maybe. Gallagher said he was waiting until they had the production budget to do it the way he wanted, ie turn it into a seemingly endless, gloopy turd.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Pan Tau - 14-05-2008 22:51

---

---

Jay Leno and his ilk should burn in hell for what they have done to her.

What did Leno do? Tell a few Britney jokes? What next? Leno responsible for Dubya's low approval ratings because of those poor Bush impersonators he likes to roll out?

When Spears gets the blame for the sexualisation of pre-teens, she is really a proxy, a figurehead for a wider culture. Actually, I think Paris Hilton and her likes are far more toxic (ha ha) than Britney.

But when you see kids in t-shirts proclaiming their porn star ambitions, you don't immediately think that Brenda Lee and Elvis with his pelvis cut off on the Whatever Allen Show are quite on the same level.

I agree though that Britney is a bit of a tragic figure.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Neil Kulkarni - 14-05-2008 23:08

---

[http://m.gmgrd.co.uk/res/972.\\$split/C\\_71\\_article\\_1009076\\_image\\_list\\_image\\_list\\_item\\_0\\_image.jpg?13%2F06%2F2007%2013%3A07%3A29%3A456](http://m.gmgrd.co.uk/res/972.$split/C_71_article_1009076_image_list_image_list_item_0_image.jpg?13%2F06%2F2007%2013%3A07%3A29%3A456)

Just look at them. Charmless fuckers.

And Brit's not tragic, she's virtually back. The last album and the vids (her true home and true story) have worked totally.

"Before I heard 'Live Forever' I was an enormously depressed, nihilistic self-harmer with a dangerous drug problem. The song helped me to understand that there were good things in my life, people I loved and looked up to, and that, while things were tough and looked bleak, it was worth pushing on."

See I kinda want my rock'n'roll to say it's ok to be an enormously depressed, nihilistic self-harmer with a dangerous drug problem. S'why the Mondays always pissed from a great height on the Roses & Oasis for me.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Pants - 15-05-2008 10:02

---

Hmm, I'm not sure I really believe that you really believe that, Neil. Yeah, it's a fun thought and I love the Hicks sketch as much as anyone, but do you really want your rock music to say it's a good thing to be self-destructive?

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 15-05-2008 10:59

---

I like the phrase "the Americam media". Could just be shortened to "Americam".

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Nishlord - 17-05-2008 13:26

---

I'd like to chuck in Girls Aloud. Not for anything they themselves have particularly done, but for being the one act from that horrible 'reality' period that survived (and even gained a modicum of credibility), thus dooming us to another ten years of the fucking programmes.

=====

---

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 17-05-2008 13:52

---

Nishlord wrote:

I'd like to chuck in Girls Aloud. Not for anything they themselves have particularly done, but for being the one act from that horrible 'reality' period that survived (and even gained a modicum of credibility), thus dooming us to another ten years of the fucking programmes.

Well, I think Girls Aloud themselves are brilliant. But I see your point.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Auntie Beryl - 18-05-2008 00:47

---

I suspect the damage is limited - yes, Girls Aloud have thrived (deservedly I might add) but you have to dig deep for anyone else.

Leona Lewis.... possibly, jury's still out. Will Young: second album sold very well, but he seems hell bent on 'going jazz' so a potential career is about to be nipped in the bud. Plus he's hit the West End.

Apart from that, the reality thing has delivered fuck all. Shayne Ward? One True Voice? That bloke called Steve who did the Phil Collins impersonation? Do me a favour.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by Joe Wiz - 18-05-2008 09:30

---

And of course.....Chico.

Give his "Cola Bottle Baby" a listen. Truly beyond excuse.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by The Horse - 19-05-2008 10:27

---

I'd like to chuck in Girls Aloud. Not for anything they themselves have particularly done, but for being the one act from that horrible 'reality' period that survived (and even gained a modicum of credibility), thus dooming us to another ten years of the fucking programmes.

Eh? The shows' enormous ratings and the million-selling singles by Will Young and Gareth Gates (1st and 2nd biggest selling singles of the decade) kept talent shows going quite nicely, without Girls Aloud. People soon forgot Girls Aloud were formed by a TV show, in any case.

=====

## Re:Most damaging band of the last decade?

Posted by King Mob - 19-05-2008 10:34

---

Will Young: second album sold very well, but he seems hell bent on 'going jazz'

There's something about the way you've phrased that, that brings a horrible image into my head.

=====