
led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Bridge - 2010/02/22 10:18

;)

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Deidzoeb - 2010/02/22 10:18

I love Zeppelin, but I think the Beatles have staying power. They stayed together as a group longer. (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? Oh well. And they've had some sorta reunions over the years. The Beatles are too rich to need many reunions at this point.) Also the Beatles ranged through different styles, early rock and roll like Chuck Berry, teeny-bopper songs like Saw her standing there , to psychedelic, folk, love songs, almost metal (I'm thinking Helter Skelter), almost punk (I'm thinking Lennon solo stuff, but Yer Blues and Revolution maybe?). Zeppelin had some folky moments and rockin moments, but that was pretty much the extent of their range. Musicians of widely varying styles and genres perform serious covers of different Beatles tunes, but it would turn to hokum if someone played Stairway to Heaven or Black Dog on accordion. Hey Jude or Let it be would work fine on accordion. Zeppelin and the Beatles will still be played and discussed in 2070, but it will be like discussing Grieg and Bach. Everybody knows Bach. If you have to google Edvard Grieg to know who I'm talking about, then my analogy works well. (I only know Grieg because a lot of his music was used in Warner Bros cartoons.) Hey, I thought of a way to bring this thread on-topic. I was going to say the Beatles don't have to perform reunion tours because they're RICHER THAN GOD! ;) Anyway, I thought the big dichotomy was supposed to be if you're a Beatles-person or an Elvis-person? I still lean towards Beatles there too. On Oct 12, 8:13 am, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com wrote: - Hide quoted text -- Show quoted text - ;-

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Bridge - 2010/02/22 10:18

say the Beatles don't have to perform reunion tours because they're RICHER THAN GOD! ;) Anyway, I thought the big dichotomy was supposed to be if you're a Beatles-person or an Elvis-person? I still lean towards Beatles there too. On Oct 12, 8:13 am, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com wrote: ;)- Hide quoted text - - Show quoted text

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Deidzoeb - 2010/02/22 10:18

Both the Beatles and Led Zeppelin are sounding terribly dated It's subjective. I disagree. Maybe it's just another passing fad, but I notice lots of bands trying to sound like stripped down rock and roll once again. Everything old is new again. ...for a minute.

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Bridge - 2010/02/22 10:18

On Oct 14, 1:47 am, Deidzoeb <deidz...@gmail.com wrote: I love Zeppelin, but I think the Beatles have staying power. They stayed together as a group longer. (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? Oh well. And they've had some sorta reunions over the years. The Beatles are too rich to need many reunions at this point.) Also the Beatles ranged through different styles, early rock and roll like Chuck Berry, teeny-bopper songs like Saw her standing there , to psychedelic, folk, love songs, almost metal (I'm thinking Helter Skelter), almost punk (I'm thinking Lennon solo stuff, but Yer Blues and Revolution maybe?). Zeppelin had some folky moments and rockin moments, but that was pretty much the extent of their range. Musicians of widely varying styles and genres perform serious covers of different Beatles tunes, but it would turn to hokum if someone played Stairway to Heaven or Black Dog on accordion. Hey Jude or Let it be would work fine on accordion. Zeppelin and the Beatles will still be played and discussed in 2070, but it will be like discussing Grieg and Bach. Everybody knows Bach. If you have to google Edvard Grieg to know who I'm talking about, then my analogy works well. (I only know

Grieg because a lot of his music was used in Warner Bros cartoons.) I suspect that 70 years from now people will still be listening to Grieg and Bach but both the Beatles and Led Zeppelin will be largely forgotten. It's a judgment call. If we looked hard enough, we could find some critics in the time of Grieg and Bach saying that they would be forgotten too. Do *you* know the popular music from a hundred years ago? I know some folk songs that are probably derived from popular music of 100 years ago. My ignorance doesn't prove that no pop music has staying power. Weren't Grieg and Bach writing the pop music of their time? Both the Beatles and Led Zeppelin are sounding terribly dated. It's subjective. I disagree. Maybe it's just another passing fad, but I notice lots of bands trying to sound like stripped down rock and roll once again. Everything old is new again. ...for a minute.- Hide quoted text - - Show quoted text - I respect everyone's right to an opinion but for me, Led Zeppelin will never sound dated.

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Deidzoeb - 2010/02/22 10:18

stayed together as a group longer. (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? Oh well. And they've had some sorta reunions over the years. The Beatles are too rich to need many reunions at this point.) Also the Beatles ranged through different styles, early rock and roll like Chuck Berry, teeny-bopper songs like Saw her standing there, to psychedelic, folk, love songs, almost metal (I'm thinking Helter Skelter), almost punk (I'm thinking Lennon solo stuff, but Yer Blues and Revolution maybe?). Zeppelin had some folksy moments and rockin moments, but that was pretty much the extent of their range. Musicians of widely varying styles and genres perform serious covers of different Beatles tunes, but it would turn to hokum if someone played Stairway to Heaven or Black Dog on accordion. Hey Jude or Let it be would work fine on accordion. Zeppelin and the Beatles will still be played and discussed in 2070, but it will be like discussing Grieg and Bach. Everybody knows Bach. If you have to google Edvard Grieg to know who I'm talking about, then my analogy works well. (I only know Grieg because a lot of his music was used in Warner Bros cartoons.) I suspect that 70 years from now people will still be listening to Grieg and Bach but both the Beatles and Led Zeppelin will be largely forgotten. It's a judgment call. If we looked hard enough, we could find some critics in the time of Grieg and Bach saying that they would be forgotten too. Do *you* know the popular music from a hundred years ago? I know some folk songs that are probably derived from popular music of 100 years ago. My ignorance doesn't prove that no pop music has staying power. Weren't Grieg and Bach writing the pop music of their time? Both the Beatles and Led Zeppelin are sounding terribly dated. It's subjective. I disagree. Maybe it's just another passing fad, but I notice lots of bands trying to sound like stripped down rock and roll once again. Everything old is new again. ...for a minute. I was reconsidering last night. Maybe staying power isn't the greatest measure of a song. Trying to think of songs that were popular in 1900 or 1850s, I'm picturing people sitting around at home with their family, playing songs they've heard, making variations, unable or uninterested in recording their new versions on paper. I've played a couple handfuls of open mike gigs and listened to lots of other people playing minor league music. The fact that the original songs or stylistic variations played live may never be recorded doesn't change the fact that we had a hell of a time playing and listening to them. So maybe I was wrong when I presumed that staying power is proof of a classic. Anyway, with music that's 200 years old or even 100 years old, it can be difficult to prove whether a particular song was 100% original, or different enough to be considered inspired by some earlier song instead of considering it a variation or rip-off of the earlier song. It's fairly well known that Beethoven created an elaborate arrangement of Ode to Joy based on an existing folk melody. I'm not saying we should scold Beethoven for creating a variation, or expanding on something he heard, or that it's generally wrong for people to practice with old tunes, play around with variations, etc. But it's a problem if we forget that greats like Beethoven also played cover songs, and that some or most or all of their music could be considered to varying degrees homage or rip-offs or variations on earlier music they had heard. How many forgotten folk melodies like Ode to Joy are the basis of music that we now consider classic? And would it be fair to say that folk music is just popular regional music? Popular music might appear ephemeral if we perceive most great music as being startlingly original intellectual property, not a series of variations on earlier themes or styles.

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Deidzoeb - 2010/02/22 10:18

stayed together as a group longer. (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? Oh well. And they've had some sorta reunions over the years. The Beatles are too rich to need many reunions at this point.) Also the Beatles ranged through different styles, early rock and roll like Chuck Berry, teeny-bopper songs like Saw her standing there, to psychedelic, folk, love songs, almost metal (I'm thinking Helter Skelter), almost punk (I'm thinking Lennon solo stuff, but Yer Blues and Revolution maybe?). Zeppelin had some folksy moments and rockin moments, but that was pretty much the extent of their range. Musicians of widely varying styles and genres perform serious covers of different Beatles tunes, but it would turn to hokum if someone played Stairway to Heaven or Black

Dog on accordion. Hey Jude or Let it be would work fine on accordion. Zeppelin and the Beatles will still be played and discussed in 2070, but it will be like discussing Grieg and Bach. Everybody knows Bach. If you have to google Edvard Grieg to know who I'm talking about, then my analogy works well. (I only know Grieg because a lot of his music was used in Warner Bros cartoons.) I suspect that 70 years from now people will still be listening to Grieg and Bach but both the Beatles and Led Zeppelin will be largely forgotten. Do *you* know the popular music from a hundred years ago? Both the Beatles and Led Zeppelin are sounding terribly dated already but Bach and Grieg are as fresh as ever - and I am saying this as a person who listens to popular music more often than classical. The popular is ephemeral. Blasphemy!!!! :-)

It's not blasphemy yet, but the Inquisition of the Electric Church will commence if anyone speaks ill of Jimi. Have you accepted the Lord God Almighty John Allen (James Marshall) Hendrix as your savior? Or at least your shordurpersav (short duration personal savior, a concept promoted by the Church of SubGenius)? If you haven't, that's cool too.

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Bridge - 2010/02/22 10:18

stayed together as a group longer. (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? Oh well. And they've had some sorta reunions over the years. The Beatles are too rich to need many reunions at this point.)

Also the Beatles ranged through different styles, early rock and roll like Chuck Berry, teeny-bopper songs like Saw her standing there, to psychedelic, folk, love songs, almost metal (I'm thinking Helter Skelter), almost punk (I'm thinking Lennon solo stuff, but Yer Blues and Revolution maybe?). Zeppelin had some folky moments and rockin moments, but that was pretty much the extent of their range. Musicians of widely varying styles and genres perform serious covers of different Beatles tunes, but it would turn to hokum if someone played Stairway to Heaven or Black Dog on accordion. Hey Jude or Let it be would work fine on accordion. Zeppelin and the Beatles will still be played and discussed in 2070, but it will be like discussing Grieg and Bach. Everybody knows Bach. If you have to google Edvard Grieg to know who I'm talking about, then my analogy works well. (I only know Grieg because a lot of his music was used in Warner Bros cartoons.) I suspect that 70 years from now people will still be listening to Grieg and Bach but both the Beatles and Led Zeppelin will be largely forgotten. Do *you* know the popular music from a hundred years ago? Both the Beatles and Led Zeppelin are sounding terribly dated already but Bach and Grieg are as fresh as ever - and I am saying this as a person who listens to popular music more often than classical. The popular is ephemeral. Blasphemy!!!! :-)

It's not blasphemy yet, but the Inquisition of the Electric Church will commence if anyone speaks ill of Jimi. Have you accepted the Lord God Almighty John Allen (James Marshall) Hendrix as your savior? Or at least your shordurpersav (short duration personal savior, a concept promoted by the Church of SubGenius)? If you haven't, that's cool too.- Hide quoted text - - Show quoted text - I believes in the Good Lord Jimi, aye!

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by moron - 2010/02/22 10:18

split up after the drummer died, right? And maybe 12 10. Beatles hands down because duh!

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Bridge - 2010/02/22 10:18

I love Zeppelin, but I think the Beatles have staying power. They stayed together as a group longer. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Beatles The Beatles . . . formed in 1960. . . .broke up in 1970. . . http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Led_Zeppelin Led Zeppelin . . . formed in 1968 . . . disbanding following Bonham's death in 1980. . . (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? And maybe 12 10. Beatles hands down because duh! I always say, The Beatles are the greatest band of all time and Zeppelin is the greatest rock band of all time. Seems to keep everyone happy!

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Deidzoeb - 2010/02/22 10:18

I love Zeppelin, but I think the Beatles have staying power. They stayed together as a group longer. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Beatles The Beatles . . . formed in 1960. . . .broke up in 1970. . . http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Led_Zeppelin Led Zeppelin . . . formed in 1968 . . . disbanding following Bonham's death in 1980. . . (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? And maybe 12 10. |:P

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Wanderer - 2010/02/22 10:18

On Oct 14, 1:47 am, Deidzueb <deidz...@gmail.com> wrote: I love Zeppelin, but I think the Beatles have staying power. They stayed together as a group longer. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Beatles The Beatles . . . formed in 1960. . . .broke up in 1970. . . http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Led_Zeppelin Led Zeppelin . . . formed in 1968 . . . disbanding following Bonham's death in 1980. . . (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? And maybe 12 10. Beatles hands down because duh! I always say, The Beatles are the greatest band of all time and Zeppelin is the greatest rock band of all time. Seems to keep everyone happy! I disagree. Peter, Paul and Mary are the greatest band of all time whether rock or not.

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Bridge - 2010/02/22 10:18

On Oct 30, 10:17 am, moron <meandmyar...@gmail.com> wrote: On Oct 14, 1:47 am, Deidzueb <deidz...@gmail.com> wrote: I love Zeppelin, but I think the Beatles have staying power. They stayed together as a group longer. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Beatles The Beatles . . . formed in 1960. . . .broke up in 1970. . . http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Led_Zeppelin Led Zeppelin . . . formed in 1968 . . . disbanding following Bonham's death in 1980. . . (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? And maybe 12 10. Beatles hands down because duh! I always say, The Beatles are the greatest band of all time and Zeppelin is the greatest rock band of all time. Seems to keep everyone happy! I disagree. Peter, Paul and Mary are the greatest band of all time whether rock or not.- Hide quoted text - Oy vey! - Hide quoted text -- Show quoted text - - Show quoted text -

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Wanderer - 2010/02/22 10:18

On Oct 30, 11:34 am, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com> wrote: On Oct 30, 10:17 am, moron <meandmyar...@gmail.com> wrote: On Oct 14, 1:47 am, Deidzueb <deidz...@gmail.com> wrote: I love Zeppelin, but I think the Beatles have staying power. They stayed together as a group longer. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Beatles The Beatles . . . formed in 1960. . . .broke up in 1970. . . http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Led_Zeppelin Led Zeppelin . . . formed in 1968 . . . disbanding following Bonham's death in 1980. . . (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? And maybe 12 10. Beatles hands down because duh! I always say, The Beatles are the greatest band of all time and Zeppelin is the greatest rock band of all time. Seems to keep everyone happy! I disagree. Peter, Paul and Mary are the greatest band of all time whether rock or not.- Hide quoted text - Oy vey! +O:-)

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by LiamToo - 2010/02/22 10:18

On Oct 30, 10:17 am, moron <meandmyar...@gmail.com> wrote: On Oct 14, 1:47 am, Deidzueb <deidz...@gmail.com> wrote: I love Zeppelin, but I think the Beatles have staying power. They stayed together as a group longer. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Beatles The Beatles . . . formed in 1960. . . .broke up in 1970. . . http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Led_Zeppelin Led Zeppelin . . . formed in 1968 . . . disbanding following Bonham's death in 1980. . . (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? And maybe 12 10. Beatles hands down because duh! I always say, The Beatles are the greatest band of all time and Zeppelin is the greatest rock band of all time. Seems to keep everyone happy! I disagree. Peter, Paul and Mary are the greatest band

of all time whether rock or not. Peter, Paul and Mary were great but not as groovy as the Association or Bread. I'd put your favorite in my top 10 though and the Beatles and Led Zeppelin are way down as well.

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Bridge - 2010/02/22 10:18

On Oct 30, 11:34 am, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com wrote: On Oct 30, 10:17 am, moron <meandmyar...@gmail.com wrote: On Oct 14, 1:47 am, Deidzoeb <deidz...@gmail.com wrote: I love Zeppelin, but I think the Beatles have staying power. They stayed together as a group longer. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Beatles The Beatles . . . formed in 1960. . . .broke up in 1970. . . http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Led_Zeppelin Led Zeppelin . . . formed in 1968 . . . disbanding following Bonham's death in 1980. . . (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? And maybe 12 10. Beatles hands down because duh! I always say, The Beatles are the greatest band of all time and Zeppelin is the greatest rock band of all time. Seems to keep everyone happy! I disagree. Peter, Paul and Mary are the greatest band of all time whether rock or not. Peter, Paul and Mary were great but not as groovy as the Association or Bread. I'd put your favorite in my top 10 though and the Beatles and Led Zeppelin are way down as well.- Hide quoted text - Now I'm sure the end of the world is coming soon. Liam have you ever gotten wasted and listened to Zep? - Hide quoted text -- Show quoted text - - Show quoted text -

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Wanderer - 2010/02/22 10:18

On Oct 30, 11:34 am, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com wrote: On Oct 30, 10:17 am, moron <meandmyar...@gmail.com wrote: On Oct 14, 1:47 am, Deidzoeb <deidz...@gmail.com wrote: I love Zeppelin, but I think the Beatles have staying power. They stayed together as a group longer. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Beatles The Beatles . . . formed in 1960. . . .broke up in 1970. . . http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Led_Zeppelin Led Zeppelin . . . formed in 1968 . . . disbanding following Bonham's death in 1980. . . (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? And maybe 12 10. Beatles hands down because duh! I always say, The Beatles are the greatest band of all time and Zeppelin is the greatest rock band of all time. Seems to keep everyone happy! I disagree. Peter, Paul and Mary are the greatest band of all time whether rock or not. Peter, Paul and Mary were great but not as groovy as the Association or Bread. I'd put your favorite in my top 10 though and the Beatles and Led Zeppelin are way down as well. Like Bridge the Yiddish says, Oy Vey!

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by LiamToo - 2010/02/22 10:18

Liam have you ever gotten wasted and listened to Zep? Yes I did. I like Stairway to Heaven, the reason why they're number 9 on my list. The Beatles are number 8.

=====

led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by LiamToo - 2010/02/22 10:18

On Oct 31, 2:19 pm, Wanderer <WanderingJoe...@yahoo.com wrote: On Oct 30, 11:34 am, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com wrote: On Oct 30, 10:17 am, moron <meandmyar...@gmail.com wrote: On Oct 14, 1:47 am, Deidzoeb <deidz...@gmail.com wrote: I love Zeppelin, but I think the Beatles have staying power. They stayed together as a group longer. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Beatles The Beatles . . . formed in 1960. . . .broke up in 1970. . . http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Led_Zeppelin Led Zeppelin . . . formed in 1968 . . . disbanding following Bonham's death in 1980. . . (Maybe that's not fair, Zeppelin split up after the drummer died, right? And maybe 12 10. Beatles hands down because duh! I always say, The Beatles are the greatest band of all time and Zeppelin is the greatest rock band of all time. Seems to keep everyone happy! I disagree. Peter, Paul and Mary are the greatest band of all time whether rock or not. Peter, Paul and Mary were great but not as groovy as the Association or Bread. I'd put your favorite in my top 10 though and the Beatles and Led Zeppelin are way down as well. Like Bridge the Yiddish says, Oy Vey! I say Groovy!

=====
led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Redshirt Bluejacket - 2010/02/22 10:18

Pink Floyd. On Oct 12, 7:13 am, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com wrote: - Hide quoted text -- Show quoted text - ;-)

=====
led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Bridge - 2010/02/22 10:18

Pink Floyd. On Oct 12, 7:13 am, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com wrote: ;-)- Hide quoted text - - Show quoted text - Good call.

=====
led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Jerry - 2010/02/22 10:18

;-) Beatles here.

=====
led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Bridge - 2010/02/22 10:18

On Oct 12, 6:13 am, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com wrote: ;-) Beatles here. Welcome! How are you liking the google group experience?

=====
led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Jerry - 2010/02/22 10:18

On Dec 5, 10:09 am, Jerry <JerryHightower...@yahoo.com wrote: On Oct 12, 6:13 am, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com wrote: ;-) Beatles here. Welcome! How are you liking the google group experience? Very nice and thank you very much.

=====
led zeppelin wikipedia Led Zeppelin or the Beatles and why?

Posted by Bridge - 2010/02/22 10:18

On Dec 5, 1:24 pm, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com wrote: On Dec 5, 10:09 am, Jerry <JerryHightower...@yahoo.com wrote: On Oct 12, 6:13 am, Bridge <bqs4l...@gmail.com wrote: ;-) Beatles here. Welcome! How are you liking the google group experience? Very nice and thank you very much. We're basically the flag-football version of AvC. What's your story, Jerry? Soul-saver or empiricist, possibly both?
