

There are many who say 90s-formed Bush 'sound just like Nirvana'. (Well many DID I mean, I'm sure most are over that issue by now. Well, maybe they are. I guess Kurt Cobain is still famous, technically speaking). Yes, they do sound like the band, but tons of people really like Nirv, so I don't see what the problem is. If the grunge legends released hundreds of albums, fair enough, most would be sick of the style, but they didn't, they only released a few. That's why I welcome Nirvana clones with open arms. Is Bush's songwriting as strong as Nirv's? It's pretty close! The former's album 'Razorblade Suitcase' could be described as an improved version of 'In Utero', even. I'm sure that comment will infuriate many Nirvana fans, but fortunately most of them are starting to age, making them poorer fighters. So I can say what I want. Some of them may even carry walking sticks. If so, remember the phrase 'go for the knees, go for the knees', and you should be fine. No only joking.

Even if I wasn't, I'm sure no grungers will fight with anyone. If anything, such individuals are more depressed than aggressive. It's black metal fans you want to stay away from. In my voluntary music journalism experience, they can take criticisms a little personally, making being a (serious) critic ever so slightly hazardous. I want to say to some black metallers 'lighten up!', but of course light would literally and metaphorically destroy their whole world, which would be a shame. Who doesn't like a bit of Mayhem every now and then? Anyway, Bush! I saw the album in good condition in a shop, and guess how much I paid for it? Surely more than £3, right? Nope, 33p. As you may have guessed the shop was a charity one, but don't knock them - in exchange for a needy person getting a small bar of chocolate or whatever, (perhaps negatively affecting their health and making them needier :S) I've been given music with a very long lifespan. Pretty cool.

Is there anything I don't like about the album? I mean... not really. I guess I don't like the band name too much. In comparison 'Nirvana' is a hard to explain, perfect state that all Buddhists want to achieve. 'Bush' on the other hand is just another name for a shrub. Not exactly deep, right? It's not among my least favourite band names, though. Those titles have to go to any band that starts with a number, or the letter 'A'. If I get a CD from such artists, I have to rearrange my whole collection because it's alphabetised. ZZ Top on the other hand is an EXCELLENT name for a band. I also hate names with special characters, meaning you can't type them. Motorhead, with two dots above an 'O' is one such band, though it is fun to spell it 'Mot :O rhead'.

Is there anything else, perhaps neutral or irrelevant to say? Ohhh, there's always something irrelevant to say, BUT, I'm going to try and not go down that road. I guess I could talk about the album cover, that's not too bad. Does it feature a bush, a 'razorblade suitcase' (???) a normal suitcase or a razorblade? Nope, it features something on fire. Ok then. That's random. But at least bushes are flammable (in the right conditions) so maybe that's what the band were going for. If so, the band are deeper than I first thought. Well not really. It's just something on fire. Not to worry, though; I'm all about the actual music as I'm sure most people are. So, let's rate everything: Band name: 5 - I guess it's catchy. Album Name: 1 - It's meaningless. Album cover: 1 - That's even worse. Music: 9/10. Overall: 9.5/10. (Only joking, 9/10). Bye!!!