
youse lot will probably like this

Posted by EIM - 04-07-2008 21:24

<http://archivedmusicpress.wordpress.com/>

Most of you will have probably seen this already. Mind, most of you wrote it.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Squid Ink - 04-07-2008 22:17

Lovely stuff, thanks for that. This is quite interesting. I never had Reynolds and Stubbs down as fans of Metallica and Womack & Womack.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by EIM - 04-07-2008 22:30

Fucking hell. David Stubbs with hair.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Taylor - 04-07-2008 23:10

That's a very dashing shot of Wingco in the '88 critics' choice, isn't it?

I remember that Mr Agreeable that's up now - one of my favourites at the time. The Derek Kent is very good, too, but not as good as some of his interviews with top female celebrities of the day, none of which I can remember right now, bringing this sentence to a rather unsatisfying close.

As yet, none of my articles have gone up there. I suspect that one of two things will happen: 1. he never puts anything by me up there, and I can relax, but feel slightly bad about myself, or 2. he puts up one of the (many) very bad articles for which I was responsible, and I get pitched into another bout of "I was never any good"-ing. I mean, I was quite good. But not always. And sometimes, I was fucking dreadful. One or two reviews in particular still haunt me, and I'm almost prepared to put money on one of them appearing on that site soon. I shan't name them because he clearly checks out who links to his site, and if he reads this I don't want to give him any ideas.

Very odd and seemingly arbitrary choice of stuff he's got there. Several articles by Push (who was a lovely bloke, but without being unkind, I only remembered he existed when I saw his name on that site), some of Chris Roberts' worst stuff, some of those memorable NME articles by Ted Kessler, etc. In fact, pretty much nothing he's got there is remotely "significant" or "important" - no last interviews with Kurt Cobain, no classic slag-offs, no controversy. It's like he's picked them totally at random. I quite like that in a way, but it would be nice to get a bit more meat.

Best thing is that I followed a link, and then another link, and found Neil Kulkarni's interview with Marilyn Manson, which is fantastic, and which I'd never read before (despite - I think - still writing for Melody Maker at the time, albeit halfway out the door). The fact that this got printed in the music press in 1997 is absolutely astonishing.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Squid Ink - 04-07-2008 23:20

The main stage at Glastonbury in '89 featured sets from Amabuthu, Mahlatini and the Mahotella Queens, David Rudder, Heathcoate Williams, and (thanks to a typo) an unthinkable hybrid named Pixies The Proclaimers.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Auntie Beryl - 05-07-2008 08:34

That's a site to get lost in.

Even the '91 singles reviews on the front page at the mo took me spiralling back (I could hum you 80% of the tunes mentioned) and has made me reassess the early 90s somewhat.

I'm going back in. I may be some time.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 05-07-2008 08:54

If it's any consolation, I don't think I'm on there as a 'name' writer either. You can see a few of my insignificant downpage reviews when you zoom in on the scans of other people's lead reviews, that's all.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 05-07-2008 08:59

Oh wait, there's a David Bowie live review by me. Not a bad piece of work. Could have been a lot worse.

And I think the Boo Radleys cover story was by me, but he's only scanned the cover, not the story...

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by G.Man as Trotaconventos - 05-07-2008 10:55

You're namechecked in the blogger's text a few times, Simon.

Not having read MM in the 90s, I had never known the stylings of Mr Stubbs before OTF. He had it going on in 1989 already. That bit about De La Soul and their physical shape in Mr Amusing (?) had me laughing out very loudly.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by The Horse - 06-07-2008 09:27

Those James Brown singles reviews are bizarre. And I don't just mean the idiosyncratic punctuation.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Carcass - 06-07-2008 16:08

There is something on there by Taylor and Everett True about the Cranberries according to the Plan B forum.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by EIM - 13-07-2008 23:41

<http://archivedmusicpress.wordpress.com/2008/07/10/taylor-parkes-interviews-the-boo-radleys-18th-february-1995/>

Taylor has made it at last!

So have I!

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Taylor - 14-07-2008 00:31

Not an article I care to be reminded of, really. Bits of it are shockingly bad. Could have been worse, though, which is a chilling thought.

Crazy days, man. Crazy days.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Hieronymus of Hesselink - 14-07-2008 00:38

The Horse wrote:

Those James Brown singles reviews are bizarre. And I don't just mean the idiosyncratic punctuation.

"Bizarre" isn't the word I'd use, to be honest . . .

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 14-07-2008 07:48

Ah, you're too modest, Taylor. I still remember that passage about listening to The Beatles in the car (although I'd forgotten it came from a Boo Radleys piece), and it makes a really compelling case for The Beatles, even to a hater like me.

Another remarkable thing about that piece, of course, is how long it is. You just can't imagine any music mag (apart from the glossy dadrock monthlies, who only talk to old duffers anyway) running such an in-depth article about a young/current band, but it was routine for MM in those days.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Lucia Lanigan - 14-07-2008 10:13

Taylor, a more comforting thought is that it's hard to imagine how a feature about the Boo Radleys could have been better.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by The Horse - 14-07-2008 10:43

I think the length of that piece is the only problem with it, really. You could comfortably cut it down to a single page. (Not that I think the move to shorter features is a good thing in general, of course.)

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 14-07-2008 10:48

The Horse wrote:

I think the length of that piece is the only problem with it, really. You could comfortably cut it down to a single page. (Not that I think the move to shorter features is a good thing in general, of course.)

Tsk, you internet-age kids with your gnat-like attention-spans...

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Hieronymus of Hesselink - 14-07-2008 10:48

Lucia Lanigan wrote:

Taylor, a more comforting thought is that it's hard to imagine how a feature about the Boo Radleys could have been better.

In fairness, Martin Carr was usually good value in interviews even if the other three were boring bastards.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Taylor - 14-07-2008 16:53

I should probably point out here that I certainly wasn't angling for compliments or anything - I just think that's a pretty poor piece of work. Didn't really start writing good stuff until shortly after that one was published, and even then I'd churn out clunkers on a fairly regular basis. Never had the consistency of someone like Wingco, who could dash off his worst-ever article and still have it read pretty well, all things considered. I suppose you'd call it not being a bloody professional.

It is indeed long by today's standards, but nothing compared to stuff from NME from about '81 or '82. You used to get, like, 1000 words of writer-waffle before there's even a quote from the band. The funny thing is, by the 90s, certain editors were always chastising us for putting too much of our own stuff into features, rather than just "getting the story" - forgetting that these were no longer the days of three weeks of full access to a Rolling Stones tour of America. Most of these features involved staring at a tongue-tied young guitarist for the twenty minutes you'd been granted, then going away and realising you'd got about 400 words' worth of halfway-interesting quotes with which to fill a 2,500 word article. And that there was rarely a "story" as such, because nothing ever happened, and if it did, you weren't allowed to talk about it. Being able to fill space was a big part of the job.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by wingco - 16-07-2008 20:35

Oh my God, he's just put up my first interview with The Young Gods in December of 1987. I vividly remember the state of high excitement I worked myself up into in writing/preparing for this (heavily, heavily imagistic piece) - much of it was feverishly sketched out in note form in a cafe in Zurich which was on the location of one of the old Dada cafes, might even have been the same one. I always, always wince with automatic embarrassment at anything I wrote in the past, more because it's in the past than there's necessarily anything to be embarrassed about - but having dared briefly to glimpse at the opening of this piece, I'm just taken aback at the way it just leaps straight in with this sort of fervent, naive, youthful energy I don't think I'd even attempt to emulate nowadays (or be allowed to).

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by G.Man and Squirrel - 17-07-2008 10:17

Professional hazard, innit? I cannot imagine any writer not cringing at their early works. Perhaps a bit like how the Beatles must have felt by 1969 when they heard "Anna" from their debut.

I re-read some stuff I wrote just eight years ago. In my head I was subbing the bastard thing to the point of gratuitous mutilation. It's not that it was poorly written - actually, it's fucking good - but I'd write it much differently now.

On the other hand, I re-read something I wrote about a few years before that, and didn't think I could improve much on that even now.

But I also found a satire I wrote at university about student politics. Stylistically not of highest literary standard, perhaps, but I thought I had lost some satirical edge since those days.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Roland Walter Dutton - 18-07-2008 15:57

Remarkable stuff, and I write as a mere reader from those days (yes, I could have been a contender etc. but the day job won, and probably just as well). Enjoyed reading the '88 individual writers' lists again - much better than the main EOY albums/singles lists which, by consensus definition, tend to be a little dull - and remembering the days when I could be inspired to go out and buy a record on the basis of what the Monitor chaps in particular had to say about it.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Taylor - 23-07-2008 02:48

Browsing this site again, I've just stumbled on what seems, at 3.30 am, like the funniest thing I've ever seen in my life.

Don't want to be mean, like, but... the spoken introduction to the Galaxie 500 YouTube clip halfway down this page. Just see if you can watch it with a straight face.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Reed of the Valley People - 23-07-2008 03:14

Who is Galaxie 100?

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Spearmint Rhino - 01-08-2008 08:58

Bloody hell, Ngaire on television! (I followed a link from Archived Music Press.) She was never the most naturally gifted of writers, but she was a really lovely person. I had no idea she had a telly gig. Bless her.

Edit: I see Taylor's already mentioned the same clip.

=====

Re:youse lot will probably like this

Posted by Taylor - 01-08-2008 13:33

Yeah, she was very kindly. Which makes that clip even more toe-curling.

=====