
Subject: Re: Music - a commodity
Posted by [justcron](#) on Tue, 10 Jan 2006 20:32:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thank you again Matt Drudge.

I read that and I thought people are apathetic because music sucks so bad nowadays.

"DC" <dc@spamyermama.org> wrote in message news:43c40c33\$1@linux...
>
> <http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/01/10/060110164416.p4z0rn x6.html>
>
> I find this disturbing and further, I think it ties directly into why so
> new and challenging music is being made.
>
> DC

Subject: Music - a commodity
Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 10 Jan 2006 20:34:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/01/10/060110164416.p4z0rn x6.html>

I find this disturbing and further, I think it ties directly into why so new and challenging music is being made.

DC

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity
Posted by [Chris Lang](#) on Tue, 10 Jan 2006 20:43:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Interesting that there is an ad in the sidebar for a free iPod!

Music overload leads to apathy and passivity! Get yours free today! :)

"DC" <dc@spamyermama.org> wrote:
>

> http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/01/10/060110164416.p4z0rn_x6.html
>
> I find this disturbing and further, I think it ties directly into why so
> new and challenging music is being made.
>
> DC

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity
Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 10 Jan 2006 21:29:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Blah blah blah. Fatigue of the machine age, the emptiness of modernity, blah
blah blah. I'm reading a book about the building of the trans-continental
railway in the US. I'm sure the indentured Chinese laborers had a much "deeper
emotional involvement with music" blah blah blah. Theodor Adorno wrote "The
Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" in freaking 1936, so blah
blah blah can't we just go find music we like and listen to it however we
want to?

"DC" <dc@spamyermama.org> wrote:

>
> http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/01/10/060110164416.p4z0rn_x6.html
>
> I find this disturbing and further, I think it ties directly into why so
> new and challenging music is being made.
>
> DC

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity
Posted by [Carl Amburn](#) on Tue, 10 Jan 2006 22:10:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think it's amazing that so much music is available all over the place - a
good good thing. I think the internet is really helping artists find their
niche of fans too, if they are smart enough to adapt and use it to their
advantage.

-Carl

"DC" <dc@spamyermama.org> wrote in message [news:43c40c33\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:43c40c33$1@linux...)
>
> http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/01/10/060110164416.p4z0rn_x6.html
>
> I find this disturbing and further, I think it ties directly into why so
> new and challenging music is being made.

>
> DC

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity
Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 10 Jan 2006 22:17:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm shocked, shocked! that you would choose to ignore the clear effects of technology and commoditization upon the arts!

heh heh

Now, play some Alban Berg, or heck, some Morton Lauridsen or even Barber before your next show and notice a few folks asking you "what was that cool music?" afterwards.

I've done it, and you have to ask how anything other than commodity-music gets any exposure today?

Know anyone that had a required music-appreciation course in college who is under 40?

Even Adorno wasn't wrong about everything.

DC

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>Blah blah blah. Fatigue of the machine age, the emptiness of modernity, blah
>blah blah. I'm reading a book about the building of the trans-continental
>railway in the US. I'm sure the indentured Chinese laborers had a much "deeper
>emotional involvement with music" blah blah blah. Theodor Adorno wrote "The
>Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" in freaking 1936, so
blah
>blah blah can't we just go find music we like and listen to it however we
>want to?

>
>"DC" <dc@spamyermama.org> wrote:

>>
>> <http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/01/10/060110164416.p4z0rn x6.html>
>>

>>I find this disturbing and further, I think it ties directly into why so
>>new and challenging music is being made.

>>
>>DC

>

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity
Posted by [Kim](#) on Tue, 10 Jan 2006 22:42:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"justcron" <pachinko@hydrorecords.com> wrote:
>I read that and I thought people are apathetic because music sucks so bad

>nowadays.

Hehe. Yes you could be on to something there also. Perhaps it's just a co-incidence that the MP3's and downloading co-incided with the bad music. I'd be interested to know if they bothered to seperate genres in the study to see if the effects were actually universal to everyone with a player, or only to those who download shite...

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 04:08:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Mr T,

Damn liberal New Englander!!!
I thought Stalin got rid of all you intellectuals.

:)

Chris

TAB wrote:

> Blah blah blah. Fatigue of the machine age, the emptiness of modernity, blah
> blah blah. I'm reading a book about the building of the trans-continental
> railway in the US. I'm sure the indentured Chinese laborers had a much "deeper
> emotional involvement with music" blah blah blah. Theodor Adorno wrote "The
> Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" in freaking 1936, so blah
> blah blah can't we just go find music we like and listen to it however we

> want to?
>
> "DC" <dc@spamyermama.org> wrote:
>
>> http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/01/10/060110164416.p4z0rn x6.html
>>
>>I find this disturbing and further, I think it ties directly into why so
>>new and challenging music is being made.
>>
>>DC
>
>

--

Chris Ludwig
ADK
chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>
www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>
(859) 635-5762

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity (reply 1)
Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 04:26:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spamyermama.org> wrote:
>
> http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/01/10/060110164416.p4z0rn x6.html
>
>I find this disturbing and further, I think it ties directly into why so
>new and challenging music is being made.
>
>DC

leaving out that word was annoying.

Off to jail!

-anonymous

Subject: Re: 3D - a Commodity (reply 2)
Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 04:51:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You've noticed it. There are cheezy 3D everythings now. A frightening 3D rendered version of Popeye. 3D commercial everythings. 3D knobs on VSTis. 3D desktops.

3D CGI effects everywhere.

Kids nowadays don't even have to read books and imagine for a second what a real 3D world would be like. It's handed to them like a cheap dish of onion fries!

Oh wait. We're in a real 3D world. I forgot.

****start again****

You've noticed it. There are cheezy 3D everythings now. A frightening 3D car in your driveway. 3D stores and businesses, staffed with 3D people. Real 3D instruments, that make real noises. 3D desks. The entire world, once you know what to look for (from studying modern 3D CGI effects) is in 3D!

Kids nowadays don't even have to look at 3D video games (much less red and green lensed 3D glasses!) and imagine for a second what a real 3D world would be like. It's handed to them like a cheap dish of onion fries!

This commodification of the 3D world is just cheapening the experience.

It's getting as bad as real stereo sound. I can remember when that 3D Stereophonic Demonstration record was new - the one with the locomotive on it. Soon thereafter, if a person happened to be next to a real train, the first thing they'd think is, hey, that's almost as good a stereo effect as that locomotive on the Stereo Demo Record!

Now, with everyone plugged into their iPods, stereo sound is just a cheapened commodity!

But, seriously, the world of Simulated Reality has so infiltrated Authentic Experience that few even notice it anymore.

It's curious that that article relates back to the 1800s, before Edison, since that was when things were either Real or imagined through Reading. The claims it makes for iPods strike me as bogus, since virtually the same claims could be (and were) made for records, then radio broadcasts, then television (first black and white, then, gasp! Color!), stereo, etc.

-steve the artguy

yes, I have a cold. That is my excuse.

Subject: Re: 3D - a Commodity (reply 2)

Posted by [Kim](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 05:10:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"steve the artguy" <artguy@svnartichokespittle.net> wrote:

>virtually the same

>claims could be (and were) made for records, then radio broadcasts, then

>television (first black and white, then, gasp! Color!), stereo, etc.

That would be true, and I'd suggest that each of those steps did, in fact, cheapen the experience, hence those claims were all actually valid, as is this one. The steps were each small, but I'd suggest that prior to radio and recorded music, hearing music in any form would have been a much more treasured experience.

In any case, prior to this technology, music was a tribal/social event. Nowadays, with an iPod, it's an isolating event.

News was once news. Now it's largely infotainment. It all got cheaper along the way. It was a gradual process, but it's been happening...

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity (reply 1)

Posted by [DC](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 05:44:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You know, I did audio and video for the Claude Gordon trumpet seminar one summer. This is a master-class for brass people.

Sitting there recording for a week, listening to all these world-class players lecture and demonstrate, I learned something I never would have suspected:

That the level of technical skill and musicianship is actually lower now than in the late 19th century. Claude unearthed pieces from back then, that you had to be able to play to be a good trumpet player, that almost no one could play today. His goal was to restore a 19th-century level of musicianship to brass players, and the people who demonstrated that week played brass like I have never heard before. Brass with balls is the best way to put it.

Hearing people like Frank Kaderabek play was bracing, but watching the brass pros with their jaws on their chest was even more so.

The point? That music, pumped into your ears, as the soundtrack to, say riding the train, or jogging, is likely to be different music than that from a world with no TV and no radio, where families sang together, and learning an instrument was like learning to read; pretty much everyone did it.

Reasoning backward from technology to art reduces art. The gear should not have too much control over the shape of music, but with most of us, it does.

Creating forward from art to technology is possible, but it requires a level of discipline and vision that few can muster today.

Hence; bad music.

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity (reply 1)

Posted by [Kim](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 06:43:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Very interesting stuff. It does make sense that with nothing else to do people would learn an instrument.

And one sense, the instruments WERE the MP3 players of the day. No doubt there were voices back then complaining that "with all this new fandangled musical instrument technology we're losing the art of conversation"... and they may have been correct also. At least playing exercised the mind and promoted self discipline though...

....as opposed to promoting a generation of "give me more and give me now"...

Cheers,
Kim.

"DC" <dc@spamthehorns.com> wrote:

>

>You know, I did audio and video for the Claude Gordon trumpet
>seminar one summer. This is a master-class for brass people.

>

>Sitting there recording for a week, listening to all these world-class
>players lecture and demonstrate, I learned something I never would
>have suspected:

>

>That the level of technical skill and musicianship is actually lower
>now than in the late 19th century. Claude unearthed pieces from
>back then, that you had to be able to play to be a good trumpet
>player, that almost no one could play today. His goal was to
>restore a 19th-century level of musicianship to brass players, and
>the people who demonstrated that week played brass like I have
>never heard before. Brass with balls is the best way to put it.

>

>Hearing people like Frank Kaderabek play was bracing, but watching
>the brass pros with their jaws on their chest was even more so.

>
>The point? That music, pumped into your ears, as the soundtrack
>to, say riding the train, or jogging, is likely to be different music than
>that from a world with no TV and no radio, where families sang
>together, and learning an instrument was like learning to read;
>pretty much everyone did it.
>
>Reasoning backward from technology to art reduces art. The gear
>should not have too much control over the shape of music, but
>with most of us, it does.
>
>Creating forward from art to technology is possible, but it requires
>a level of discipline and vision that few can muster today.
>
>Hence; bad music.

Subject: Re: 3D - a Commodity (reply 2)
Posted by [justcron](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 06:59:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:43c48528\$1@linux...

> News was once news. Now it's largely infotainment. It all got cheaper
> along
> the way. It was a gradual process, but it's been happening...

That literally disgusts me.... I hate when the evening news talks about
celebrity bullshit.

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity
Posted by [erlilo](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 09:26:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

....Hmmm... ...Stalin??? Is he an intellectual from New England???...
....hmmm....
;)

Erlilo

"Chris Ludwig" <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> skrev i melding
news:43c48483\$1@linux...

> Hey Mr T,
>
>
> Damn liberal New Englander!!!

> I thought Stalin got rid of all you intellectuals.
>
>
> :)
>
>
> Chris
>
>
> TAB wrote:
>
>> Blah blah blah. Fatigue of the machine age, the emptiness of modernity,
>> blah
>> blah blah. I'm reading a book about the building of the trans-continental
>> railway in the US. I'm sure the indentured Chinese laborers had a much
>> "deeper
>> emotional involvement with music" blah blah blah. Theodor Adorno wrote
>> "The
>> Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" in freaking 1936, so
>> blah
>> blah blah can't we just go find music we like and listen to it however we
>> want to? "DC" <dc@spamyermama.org> wrote:
>>
>>> <http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/01/10/060110164416.p4z0rn x6.html>
>>>
>>>I find this disturbing and further, I think it ties directly into why so
>>>new and challenging music is being made.
>>>
>>>DC
>>
>>
>
> --
> Chris Ludwig
> ADK
> chrisl@adkproaudio.com <<mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>>
> www.adkproaudio.com <<http://www.adkproaudio.com/>>
> (859) 635-5762

Subject: Re: 3D - a Commodity (reply 2)
Posted by [rick](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 10:28:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

are you telling me that i don't really need to know??? i remember
when the news weather and sports took 15 minutes.

On Wed, 11 Jan 2006 01:59:12 -0500, "justcron"

<pachinko@hydrorecords.com> wrote:

>
>"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:43c48528\$1@linux...
>
>> News was once news. Now it's largely infotainment. It all got cheaper
>> along
>> the way. It was a gradual process, but it's been happening...
>
>That literally disgusts me.... I hate when the evening news talks about
>celebrity bullshit.
>

Subject: Re: 3D - a Commodity (reply 2)
Posted by [Kim](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 12:54:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:
>are you telling me that i don't really need to know??? i remember
>when the news weather and sports took 15 minutes.

Here in Oz, on one of the major three commercial channels as well as the (generally better IMO) government world channel, the late news and weather take 1/2 hour and sport then gets it's own 1/2 hour. Of course in the commercial network by the time you take out the weather, the finance report, the Hollywood story, and the cat stuck up a tree, you probably get about 3 proper news stories...

....of course it is, and always has been, far more important that we know the in depth on the upcoming tennis tournament than, say, an upcoming election or war...

<rant off>

A Sheez.... new I should have gone to bed straight after posting on Don's blog... ;o)

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: Re: 3D - a Commodity (reply 2)
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 15:19:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Damn right, Steve. And don't forget, we used to get along JUST FINE without

all this 3D crap lying around. Sure, it made getting the pasta and boiling water into the colandar a little trickier, but after a few bouts with third degree burns you'd learn to put the pot in in the same place and check the damn thing to be sure both handles were visible from the front BEFORE boiling the water. These days, I mean, kids just walk up to the stove, check the pasta to see if it's done (do you believe that? they actually get a fork out and pull out a strand to be sure it's done, no fear of buring themselves) and then absentmindedly grab the pot and drain the pasta! All because of all of this 3D stuff.

And if you think it's all great, this 3D crap? The other day I was hanging out with my grandfather and we were talking. Kids can't even freaking SEE these days. By the time he was nine he could have run a factory with one eye closed and two prosthetic limbs. It just doesn't MEAN anything these days.

TCB

"steve the artguy" <artguy@svnartichokespittle.net> wrote:

>

>You've noticed it. There are cheezy 3D everythings now. A frightening 3D rendered

>version of Popeye. 3D commercial everythings. 3D knobs on VSTis. 3D desktops.

>3D CGI effects everywhere.

>

>Kids nowadays don't even have to read books and imagine for a second what

>a real 3D world would be like. It's handed to them like a cheap dish of onion

>fries!

>

>Oh wait. We're in a real 3D world. I forgot.

>

>**start again**

>

>You've noticed it. There are cheezy 3D everythings now. A frightening 3D

>car in your driveway. 3D stores and businesses, staffed with 3D people.

Real

>3D instruments, that make real noises. 3D desks. The entire world, once you

>know what to look for (from studying modern 3D CGI effects) is in 3D!

>

>Kids nowadays don't even have to look at 3D video games (much less red and

>green lensed 3D glasses!) and imagine for a second what a real 3D world would

>be like. It's handed to them like a cheap dish of onion fries!

>

>This commodification of the 3D world is just cheapening the experience.

>

>It's getting as bad as real stereo sound. I can remember when that 3D Stereophonic
>Demonstration record was new - the one with the locomotive on it. Soon thereafter,
>if a person happened to be next to a real train, the first thing they'd
think
>is, hey, that's almost as good a stereo effect as that locomotive on the
>Stereo Demo Record!
>
>Now, with everyone plugged into their iPods, stereo sound is just a cheapened
>commodity!
>
>But, seriously, the world of Simulated Reality has so infiltrated Authentic
>Experience that few even notice it anymore.
>
>It's curious that that article relates back to the 1800s, before Edison,
>since that was when things were either Real or imagined through Reading.
>The claims it makes for iPods strike me as bogus, since virtually the same
>claims could be (and were) made for records, then radio broadcasts, then
>television (first black and white, then, gasp! Color!), stereo, etc.
>
>-steve the artguy
>
>yes, I have a cold. That is my excuse.

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity (reply 1)
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 15:33:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OF COURSE the level of AVERAGE musicianship among orchestral musicians of the 19th century would have been higher than today. There were more opportunities for those type of musicians to work then, and training for classical musicians has not changed dramatically since then. So, more jobs * same average talent * similar training = better average musicians. No great mystery there.

Your original post referred to an article that claimed *listeners* have changed. That's true, of course, people are different today than they were 150 years ago, but I find it hard to believe that people with a vastly greater array of music choices would find music less meaningful. Me, I like modernity. If I want Thai food I walk two blocks from my house and order some. In the gorgeous 19th century I'd have had to get on a steam (or even sailing) ship and travel 'round South America to a French colony called Siam just for some chicken pad-see-u. Does this mean that food *means* less to me?

TCB

"DC" <dc@spamthehorns.com> wrote:

>
>You know, I did audio and video for the Claude Gordon trumpet

>seminar one summer. This is a master-class for brass people.
>
>Sitting there recording for a week, listening to all these world-class
>players lecture and demonstrate, I learned something I never would
>have suspected:
>
>That the level of technical skill and musicianship is actually lower
>now than in the late 19th century. Claude unearthed pieces from
>back then, that you had to be able to play to be a good trumpet
>player, that almost no one could play today. His goal was to
>restore a 19th-century level of musicianship to brass players, and
>the people who demonstrated that week played brass like I have
>never heard before. Brass with balls is the best way to put it.
>
>Hearing people like Frank Kaderabek play was bracing, but watching
>the brass pros with their jaws on their chest was even more so.
>
>The point? That music, pumped into your ears, as the soundtrack
>to, say riding the train, or jogging, is likely to be different music than
>that from a world with no TV and no radio, where families sang
>together, and learning an instrument was like learning to read;
>pretty much everyone did it.
>
>Reasoning backward from technology to art reduces art. The gear
>should not have too much control over the shape of music, but
>with most of us, it does.
>
>Creating forward from art to technology is possible, but it requires
>a level of discipline and vision that few can muster today.
>
>Hence; bad music.

Subject: Re: 3D - a Commodity (reply 2)
Posted by [emarenot](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 16:22:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I seem to recall that there was a bit of a row when "the novel" became popular :-)
MR

"steve the artguy" <artguy@svnartichokespittle.net> wrote in message
news:43c480c0\$1@linux...

>
> You've noticed it. There are cheezy 3D everythings now. A frightening 3D
rendered
> version of Popeye. 3D commercial everythings. 3D knobs on VSTis. 3D
desktops.

> 3D CGI effects everywhere.

>

> Kids nowadays don't even have to read books and imagine for a second what

> a real 3D world would be like. It's handed to them like a cheap dish of onion

> fries!

>

> Oh wait. We're in a real 3D world. I forgot.

>

> **start again**

>

> You've noticed it. There are cheezy 3D everythings now. A frightening 3D

> car in your driveway. 3D stores and businesses, staffed with 3D people.

Real

> 3D instruments, that make real noises. 3D desks. The entire world, once you

> know what to look for (from studying modern 3D CGI effects) is in 3D!

>

> Kids nowadays don't even have to look at 3D video games (much less red and

> green lensed 3D glasses!) and imagine for a second what a real 3D world would

> be like. It's handed to them like a cheap dish of onion fries!

>

> This commodification of the 3D world is just cheapening the experience.

>

> It's getting as bad as real stereo sound. I can remember when that 3D

Stereophonic

> Demonstration record was new - the one with the locomotive on it. Soon thereafter,

> if a person happened to be next to a real train, the first thing they'd think

> is, hey, that's almost as good a stereo effect as that locomotive on the

> Stereo Demo Record!

>

> Now, with everyone plugged into their iPods, stereo sound is just a cheapened

> commodity!

>

> But, seriously, the world of Simulated Reality has so infiltrated Authentic

> Experience that few even notice it anymore.

>

> It's curious that that article relates back to the 1800s, before Edison,

> since that was when things were either Real or imagined through Reading.

> The claims it makes for iPods strike me as bogus, since virtually the same

> claims could be (and were) made for records, then radio broadcasts, then

> television (first black and white, then, gasp! Color!), stereo, etc.

>

> -steve the artguy
>
> yes, I have a cold. That is my excuse.

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity (reply 1)
Posted by [DC](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 21:07:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>OF COURSE the level of AVERAGE musicianship among orchestral musicians of
>the 19th century would have been higher than today. There were more opportunities
>for those type of musicians to work then, and training for classical musicians
>has not changed dramtically since then. So, more jobs * same average talent
>* similar training = better average musicians. No great mystery there.

Where did they come from? Average homes where they sang non-classical songs and played non-classical tunes, and learned to listen to music. This has an effect far outside of the orchestral world as you should know.

At any rate, there are millions more classical musicians, many more good schools, and orchestras, and many new ways of teaching today, but all that is really irrelevant.

>Your original post referred to an article that claimed *listeners* have changed.
>That's true, of course, people are differnet today than they were 150 years ago, but I find it hard to believe that people with a vastly greater array
>of music choices would find music less meaningful.

Did you read the article? I don't think "choices" was causal...

The very *idea* of meaning is laughable to many musicians today so what should the public do? Well they listen to tired oldies don't they, and some search for great new stuff and sometimes find it, while many embrace a postmodern world so as not to lose any self respect as a sophisticated person.

>Me, I like modernity.

But that is a period style too! Nothing new there. Even "shocking the bourgeoisie" is boring.

>If I want Thai food I walk two blocks from my house and order some. In the
>gorgeous 19th century

Just a minute, ****straw man alert****

The concept here is improving musicianship and the appreciation of music in our time. Try to stay on-topic...

>I'd have had to get on a steam (or even sailing) ship
>and travel 'round South America to a French colony called Siam just for some
>chicken pad-see-u. Does this mean that food **means** less to me?

Of course it does. The trip would have elevated the food to a near religious experience.

Go to your local church, sing a cute song or two. Now take a boat to Borobudur. Now climb the site slowly, and you cannot go further until you understand each scene in front of you. Above lies enlightenment. 10 years later, you reach the summit...

Which experience (regardless of you personal beliefs) is likely to be more intense and meaningful? (assuming of course that you could find it within yourself to give Borobudur that much of your time, and do so sincerely)

No one is suggesting that we return to any other time, nor make things arbitrarily more difficult.

I would suggest that there are lessons to be learned however.

Just a thought...

DC

>
>TCB
>
>"DC" <dc@spamthehorns.com> wrote:
>>
>>You know, I did audio and video for the Claude Gordon trumpet
>>seminar one summer. This is a master-class for brass people.
>>
>>Sitting there recording for a week, listening to all these world-class
>>players lecture and demonstrate, I learned something I never would

>>have suspected:

>>

>>That the level of technical skill and musicianship is actually lower
>>now than in the late 19th century. Claude unearthed pieces from
>>back then, that you had to be able to play to be a good trumpet
>>player, that almost no one could play today. His goal was to
>>restore a 19th-century level of musicianship to brass players, and
>>the people who demonstrated that week played brass like I have
>>never heard before. Brass with balls is the best way to put it.

>>

>>Hearing people like Frank Kaderabek play was bracing, but watching
>>the brass pros with their jaws on their chest was even more so.

>>

>>The point? That music, pumped into your ears, as the soundtrack
>>to, say riding the train, or jogging, is likely to be different music than
>>that from a world with no TV and no radio, where families sang
>>together, and learning an instrument was like learning to read;
>>pretty much everyone did it.

>>

>>Reasoning backward from technology to art reduces art. The gear
>>should not have too much control over the shape of music, but
>>with most of us, it does.

>>

>>Creating forward from art to technology is possible, but it requires
>>a level of discipline and vision that few can muster today.

>>

>>Hence; bad music.

>

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity (reply 1)

Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 12 Jan 2006 03:29:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spamyermama.com> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>OF COURSE the level of AVERAGE musicianship among orchestral musicians
of

>>the 19th century would have been higher than today. There were more opportunities
>>for those type of musicians to work then, and training for classical musicians
>>has not changed dramtically since then. So, more jobs * same average talent
>>* similar training = better average musicians. No great mystery there.

>

>

>Where did they come from? Average homes where they sang

>non-classical songs and played non-classical tunes, and learned
>to listen to music. This has an effect far outside of the orchestral
>world as you should know.

Ah yes, those average nineteenth century homes, where the music rang to the rafters as the four generations ranged 'round the dinner table. After a day avoiding cholera and working in the fish gutting shacks of the Lower East Side who WASN'T inspired to song?

>At any rate, there are millions more classical musicians, many more
>good schools, and orchestras, and many new ways of teaching
>today, but all that is really irrelevant.

There are more musicians, for sure, but has the teaching changed all that much? I mean, when my golf pro works with my swing we have fast motion video and a host of other technology tools that have changed the way people learn to swing a golf club. Sam Snead and Ben Hogan had no such tools. But is learning to play classical fiddle really all THAT different than it was in 1900?

>
>>Your original post referred to an article that claimed *listeners* have
>changed.
>>That's true, of course, people are different today than they were 150 years
>>ago, but I find it hard to believe that people with a vastly greater array
>>of music choices would find music less meaningful.

>
>
>Did you read the article? I don't think "choices" was causal...
>
>The very *idea* of meaning is laughable to many musicians today
>so what should the public do? Well they listen to tired oldies don't
>they, and some search for great new stuff and sometimes find it,
>while many embrace a postmodern world so as not to lose any self respect
>as a sophisticated person.
>

Why is the idea of meaning lacking in musicians now? You're losing me here.

>
>>Me, I like modernity.
>
>But that is a period style too! Nothing new there. Even "shocking
>the bourgeoisie" is boring.

I meant not a particular style but the general state of the modern world, where I can listen to music from across the planet and drive to work and fly to Japan and so on. And as far as "shocking the bourgeoisie" I work 60

hour weeks for an organization that manages \$15 billion. To be more establishment I'd need to make partner at Goldman Sachs.

>

>>If I want Thai food I walk two blocks from my house and order some. In the

>>gorgeous 19th century

>

>Just a minute, ****straw man alert****

>

>The concept here is improving musicianship and the appreciation

>of music in our time. Try to stay on-topic...

No, the question was whether "nobody **cares** anymore" about music, and whether there was some previous era in which people did. I use the example of food because it's a great example of how modernity allows us to become **more** passionate and interested in things. Had I lived in the time you talk about my musical and culinary horizon would have been severely limited to what I could find within a few miles of myself. Instead, today I can enjoy the dub of Jamaica and the electronica of Berlin and the hip hop of Oakland all in the same day.

>

>>I'd have had to get on a steam (or even sailing) ship

>>and travel 'round South America to a French colony called Siam just for some

>>chicken pad-see-u. Does this mean that food **means** less to me?

>

>Of course it does. The trip would have elevated the food to a near religious experience.

>

>Go to your local church, sing a cute song or two. Now take a boat to Borobudur. Now climb the site slowly, and you cannot go further until you understand each scene in front of you. Above lies enlightenment. 10 years later, you reach the summit...

>

>Which experience (regardless of you personal beliefs) is likely to be more intense and meaningful? (assuming of course that you could find it within yourself to give Borobudur that much of your time, and do so sincerely)

Glad you made that point so I don't have to. Had I the means and time in 1850 to dedicate three years to getting Thai food I could have had some and it would have registered as more exotic, though not necessarily more meaningful.

As far as the stuff about what's meaningful, and that only difficult things can be so, I think that's bunk. I've had lots of incredibly unmeaningful

experiences that were crushing hard work and some enourmously meaningful experiences that were easy like Sunday morning.

But if you'll excuse me, I have to restring two guitars right now so I can play a show tomorrow tonight. Which I probably shouldn't bother doing since nobody really cares about music anymore.

TCB

>No one is suggesting that we return to any other time, nor make
>things arbitrarily more difficult.

>

>I would suggest that there are lessons to be learned however.

>

>Just a thought...

>

>DC

>

>>

>>TCB

>>

>>"DC" <dc@spamthehorns.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>You know, I did audio and video for the Claude Gordon trumpet
>>>seminar one summer. This is a master-class for brass people.

>>>

>>>Sitting there recording for a week, listening to all these world-class
>>>players lecture and demonstrate, I learned something I never would
>>>have suspected:

>>>

>>>That the level of technical skill and musicianship is actually lower
>>>now than in the late 19th century. Claude unearthed pieces from
>>>back then, that you had to be able to play to be a good trumpet
>>>player, that almost no one could play today. His goal was to
>>>restore a 19th-century level of musicianship to brass players, and
>>>the people who demonstrated that week played brass like I have
>>>never heard before. Brass with balls is the best way to put it.

>>>

>>>Hearing people like Frank Kaderabek play was bracing, but watching
>>>the brass pros with their jaws on their chest was even more so.

>>>

>>>The point? That music, pumped into your ears, as the soundtrack
>>>to, say riding the train, or jogging, is likely to be different music
than

>>>that from a world with no TV and no radio, where families sang
>>>together, and learning an instrument was like learning to read;
>>>pretty much everyone did it.

>>>

>>>Reasoning backward from technology to art reduces art. The gear
>>>should not have too much control over the shape of music, but
>>>with most of us, it does.
>>>
>>>Creating forward from art to technology is possible, but it requires
>>>a level of discipline and vision that few can muster today.
>>>
>>>Hence; bad music.
>>
>

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity (reply 1)
Posted by [DC](#) on Thu, 12 Jan 2006 07:02:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>Ah yes, those average nineteenth century homes, where the music rang to
the
>rafters as the four generations ranged 'round the dinner table. After a
day
>avoiding cholera and working in the fish gutting shacks of the Lower East
>Side who WASN'T inspired to song?

Is there a point here?

>There are more musicians, for sure, but has the teaching changed all that
>much? I mean, when my golf pro works with my swing we have fast motion video
>and a host of other technology tools that have changed the way people learn
>to swing a golf club. Sam Snead and Ben Hogan had no such tools. But is
learning
>to play classical fiddle really all THAT different than it was in 1900?

I used to teach recording in a university music dept. Oh yeah, things
have changed. Apple donated a whole slew of DAW's and notation
apps and lots of other stuff. Even trumpet players have to learn
how to use them.

Things have changed quite a bit, but some things remain the same.

It was most interesting though to see Claude bringing back
techniques that had been mostly lost, so sometimes things can
come from unexpected directions as well.

>Why is the idea of meaning lacking in musicians now? You're losing me here.

Well, I think you are aware of the absurdist bent in many contemporary bands. As a matter of fact, I think you actually participate in it, don't you?

Nothing wrong with it, we had Captain Beefheart years ago too, but the very idea of music being a positive social force is pretty laughable to most of us now, wouldn't you agree?

Certainly there are many musicians with a strong message, but it is getting harder and harder to get the message through the merchandizing. Sometimes, to paraphrase McLuhan, the celebrity is the message. Or the boobs, or the booty, or the gangster image, or the naughty bits, or even the cynical humor.

>>>Me, I like modernity.

>>But that is a period style too! Nothing new there. Even "shocking >>the bourgeoisie" is boring.

>I meant not a particular style but the general state of the modern world, >where I can listen to music from across the planet and drive to work and >fly to Japan and so on. And as far as "shocking the bourgeoisie" I work 60 >hour weeks for an organization that manages \$15 billion. To be more establishment >I'd need to make partner at Goldman Sachs.

Well, I painted with too broad a brush, but you must admit that modernity too, may have run its course. I hope not, since I too am very glad I live in our age. One of the beauties of this freedom we have today is the freedom to reject the ideology of the new, and the belief of constant revolutionary changes. Sometimes an old, buggy POS orphan DAW makes a hit record, fer instance.

There you go.

To be truly modern, IMO, is to be able to synthesize the best from all eras, without rejecting something because it is not of our generation. My kid trains with an old Japanese karate teacher. There will never be anything like him again, because the world that created him is forever gone. But we can write books and tell stories, and integrate some of him into our world. Doing so makes it much richer and better.

It is the ideology of the new and obsolescence that I reject, not modernity. Modernity beats sharia every time.

>No, the question was whether "nobody *cares* anymore" about music, and whether
>there was some previous era in which people did. I use the example of food
>because it's a great example of how modernity allows us to become *more*
>passionate and interested in things. Had I lived in the time you talk about
>my musical and culinary horizon would have been severely limited to what
>I could find within a few miles of myself. Instead, today I can enjoy the
>dub of Jamaica and the electronica of Berlin and the hip hop of Oakland
all
>in the same day.

And understand none of it.

Well, you would understand it, but many others will not even hear it
and you do not explain how they ever will nor what educational
process will expose them to it.

>Glad you made that point so I don't have to. Had I the means and time in
>1850 to dedicate three years to getting Thai food I could have had some
and
>it would have registered as more exotic, though not necessarily more meaningful.

I think the commitment required to experience it would have made it
nearly mystical to you.

There is a difference between listening to the Saint-Saens 3rd
Symphony, never having heard it before, in a great hall with a
monster pipe organ, and listening to it on a download from an
iPod.

There is. You know there is. With the first, there is an assent to
the work made by you, just by going to the event, dressing up,
paying good money for a ticket, hearing it with many other people,
and the real acoustics of the room. With an iPod, you can
listen in your underwear, while watching Hulk Hogan.

This is analogous to Neil Postman's point that it is hard to take
the TV preacher seriously when you know that there are detectives
on the next channel and wrestling on the other.

The preacher is merely another entertainment option.

With my Media Tech classes, I call this "The Hulk Hogan effect".

Now you can make the point that we lose something, yet gain something from every shift in technology, but I will always respond that unless we are *aware* of what we are losing, we may not gain as much as we could have.

Hence the article.

>As far as the stuff about what's meaningful, and that only difficult things
>can be so, I think that's bunk. I've had lots of incredibly unmeaningful
>experiences that were crushing hard work and some enourmously meaningful
>experiences that were easy like Sunday morning.

I did not make that point. Some very worthwhile things are very difficult, yet I love "Surfin' Bird too.

Ooh Mah mah, papa ohh ma ma ma...

It is a shock to find that those backwards folks from the 19th century were better at some stuff, and there are lessons to be learned there.

BTW, I did not find those pieces that almost no one could play today to be particularly interesting. My point is that the ideology of constant progress and newness can blind as well as enlighten.

>But if you'll excuse me, I have to restring two guitars right now so I can
>play a show tomorrow tonight. Which I probably shouldn't bother doing since
>nobody really cares about music anymore.

Whew! Another straw man! Terrific. Hey, the article is *evidence* that people care about music, and so is your audience. Nonetheless I think they are on to something.

DC

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity (reply 1)
Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 12 Jan 2006 14:55:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OK, I have it now. For music to have "meaning" it has to have a social agenda and be "positive" and make the world better and so on. And the increasing commodification/globalization/star-systemization of music means that is less possible, etc etc. Using those presuppositions (which I don't) you're right, so it's clear now.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spamyermama.org> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>>Ah yes, those average nineteenth century homes, where the music rang to
>the

>>rafters as the four generations ranged 'round the dinner table. After a
>day

>>avoiding cholera and working in the fish gutting shacks of the Lower East

>>Side who WASN'T inspired to song?

>

>Is there a point here?

>

>

>>There are more musicians, for sure, but has the teaching changed all that
>>much? I mean, when my golf pro works with my swing we have fast motion
>video

>>and a host of other technology tools that have changed the way people learn
>>to swing a golf club. Sam Snead and Ben Hogan had no such tools. But is
>learning

>>to play classical fiddle reall all THAT different than it was in 1900?

>

>

>I used to teach recording in a university music dept. Oh yeah, things
>have changed. Apple donated a whole slew of DAW's and notation
>apps and lots of other stuff. Even trumpet players have to learn
>how to use them.

>

>Things have changed quite a bit, but some things remain the same.

>

>It was most interesting though to see Claude bringing back
>techniques that had been mostly lost, so sometimes things can
>come from unexpected directions as well.

>

>

>>Why is the idea of meaning lacking in musicians now? You're losing me here.

>

>Well, I think you are aware of the absurdist bent in many
>contemporary bands. As a matter of fact, I think you actually
>participate in it, don't you?

>

>Nothing wrong with it, we had Captain Beefheart years ago too,
>but the very idea of music being a positive social force is pretty
>laughable to most of us now, wouldn't you agree?

>

>Certainly there are many musicians with a strong message, but
>it is getting harder and harder to get the message through the
>merchandizing. Sometimes, to paraphrase McLuhan, the celebrity
>is the message. Or the boobs, or the booty, or the gangster image,
>or the naughty bits, or even the cynical humor.
>
>
>>>>Me, I like modernity.
>
>>>But that is a period style too! Nothing new there. Even "shocking
>>>the bourgeoisie" is boring.
>
>>I meant not a particular style but the general state of the modern world,
>>where I can listen to music from across the planet and drive to work and
>>fly to Japan and so on. And as far as "shocking the bourgeoisie" I work
60
>>hour weeks for an organization that manages \$15 billion. To be more establishment
>>I'd need to make partner at Goldman Sachs.
>
>Well, I painted with too broad a brush, but you must admit that
>modernity too, may have run its course. I hope not, since I too
>am very glad I live in our age. One of the beauties of this freedom
>we have today is the freedom to reject the ideology of the new,
>and the belief of constant revolutionary changes. Sometimes an
>old, buggy POS orphan DAW makes a hit record, fer instance.
>
>There you go.
>
>To be truly modern, IMO, is to be able to synthesize the best from
>all eras, without rejecting something because it is not of our
>generation. My kid trains with an old Japanese karate
>teacher. There will never be anything like him again, because the
>world that created him is forever gone. But we can write books
>and tell stories, and integrate some of him into our world. Doing so
>makes it much richer and better.
>
>It is the ideology of the new and obsolescence that I reject, not
>modernity. Modernity beats sharia every time.
>
>
>
>>No, the question was whether "nobody *cares* anymore" about music, and
whether
>>there was some previous era in which people did. I use the example of food
>>because it's a great example of how modernity allows us to become *more*
>>passionate and interested in things. Had I lived in the time you talk about
>>my musical and culinary horizon would have been severely limited to what
>>I could find within a few miles of myself. Instead, today I can enjoy the

>>dub of Jamaica and the electronica of Berlin and the hip hop of Oakland
>all
>>in the same day.
>
>
>And understand none of it.
>
>Well, you would understand it, but many others will not even hear it
>and you do not explain how they ever will nor what educational
>process will expose them to it.
>
>
>
>>Glad you made that point so I don't have to. Had I the means and time in
>>1850 to dedicate three years to getting Thai food I could have had some
>and
>>it would have registered as more exotic, though not necessarily more meaningful.
>
>
>I think the commitment required to experience it would have made it
>nearly mystical to you.
>
>There is a difference between listening to the Saint-Saens 3rd
>Symphony, never having heard it before, in a great hall with a
>monster pipe organ, and listening to it on a download from an
>iPod.
>
>There is. You know there is. With the first, there is an assent to
>the work made by you, just by going to the event, dressing up,
>paying good money for a ticket, hearing it with many other people,
>and the real acoustics of the room. With an iPod, you can
>listen in your underwear, while watching Hulk Hogan.
>
>This is analogous to Neil Postman's point that it is hard to take
>the TV preacher seriously when you know that there are detectives
>on the next channel and wrestling on the other.
>
>The preacher is merely another entertainment option.
>
>With my Media Tech classes, I call this "The Hulk Hogan effect".
>
>Now you can make the point that we lose something, yet gain
>something from every shift in technology, but I will always respond
>that unless we are *aware* of what we are losing, we may not gain
>as much as we could have.
>
>Hence the article.
>

>
>>As far as the stuff about what's meaningful, and that only difficult things
>>can be so, I think that's bunk. I've had lots of incredibly unmeaningful
>>experiences that were crushing hard work and some enourmously meaningful
>>experiences that were easy like Sunday morning.
>
>I did not make that point. Some very worthwhile things are very
>difficult, yet I love "Surfin' Bird too.
>
>Ooh Mah mah, papa ohh ma ma ma...
>
>It is a shock to find that those backwards folks from the 19th
>century were better at some stuff, and there are lessons to be
>learned there.
>
>BTW, I did not find those pieces that almost no one could play today
>to be particularly interesting. My point is that the ideology of
>constant progress and newness can blind as well as enlighten.
>
>
>>But if you'll excuse me, I have to restring two guitars right now so I
can
>>play a show tomorrow tonight. Which I probably shouldn't bother doing since
>>nobody really cares about music anymore.
>
>Whew! Another straw man! Terrific. Hey, the article is *evidence*
>that people care about music, and so is your audience. Nonetheless
>I think they are on to something.
>
>DC

Subject: Re: Music - a commodity (reply 1)
Posted by [DC](#) on Thu, 12 Jan 2006 16:25:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, I for one am glad you got that off your chest.

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>OK, I have it now. For music to have "meaning" it has to have a social agenda
>and be "positive" and make the world better and so on. And the
increasingcommodification/globalization/star-systemization
>of music means that is less possible, etc etc. Using those presuppositions
>(which I don't) you're right, so it's clear now.

>
>TCB
>
