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One of the defining characteristics of popular music performance since the rock ‘n’ roll explosion of the mid-1950s has been ‘imitation’. Throughout ensuing decades, the hits of the day have been slavishly reproduced or ‘covered’ by local bar and pub bands in cities and towns throughout the world. In more recent years, this desire to imitate has taken on a significant new dimension in the form of the ‘tribute band’. Unlike cover bands, tribute bands often go to great lengths to capture the ‘authentic’ sound and, in many cases, visual image of the tributed band or artist. Tribute bands now cover the spectrum of post-Second World War popular music, with tributed acts ranging from the Beatles, the Rolling Stones and the Doors, through Genesis, Pink Floyd, Abba and the Eagles to more recent acts such as Oasis and Nirvana. There is also a growing trend towards solo tribute acts, both for contemporary popular music artists, such as Elvis Presley, Rod Stewart and Neil Diamond, and those from earlier periods, for example, Frank Sinatra and Dean Martin. While some tribute bands play only in local venues (see e.g. Bennett 2000) others are major touring concerns, their shows featuring lighting rigs, special effects, large PA (public address) systems and all the other trappings that one associates with a headline rock or pop act. Moreover, in a number of cases, a tribute band has received material endorsements from the tributed act. For example, the Montreal-based Genesis tribute band Musical Box, whose stage show comprises purely Peter Gabriel era material, were fortunate enough to receive a donation from Gabriel of original stage props and backdrop effects used by Genesis in their live performances circa 1973.

From a sociological point of view, tribute bands are a highly interesting phenomenon. On the one hand they have a distinctly postmodern character, the ultimate goal of the tribute band being to produce a perfect simulacrum of the tributed act. On the other hand, through their reworking of performances by groups who are either long since defunct, or who tour infrequently and generally perform only in large auditoriums, tribute bands respond to a range of mundane, everyday desires exhibited by audiences: to relive a particular moment in their youth; to experience again their personal icons in a live
setting (and perhaps take their children along too); to engage in the rapport between performer and audience deemed integral to the communicative quality of popular music. This chapter considers some of these aspects of tribute bands and, in doing so, attempts to account for the ongoing success and appeal of the tribute band phenomenon.

**Tribute bands and postmodernism**

At one level, the tribute band phenomenon can be linked to what many theorists have described as the ‘postmodern turn’ (Best and Kellner 1997). According to a leading exponent of postmodernist social theory, Jean Baudrillard (1983), a centrally defining characteristic of the postmodern era is the dominance of simulacra. The term ‘simulacra’ refers to the simulation of objects, a process which has been accentuated through the dominance of media representations in contemporary society (Stevenson 1995). Everything, from works of art to significant historical sites and aspects of national culture is now experienced at the everyday level as a series of simulations. Integral to the process of simulation is the loosening of objects from their original meanings, or at the very least the possibility of a more malleable relationship between object and meaning. As MacCannell and MacCannell observe: ‘The simulacrum, by definition and by contrast, can exist with reference to anything, even other simulations, and therefore has no particular relationship to the real’ (1993: 131–2). To put this another way, reality has given way to simulated representation to the extent that representation has become, in itself, a reality for citizens of postmodern society. This argument is supported by Lash (1990: 24) through his observation that: ‘We are living in a society in which our perception is directed almost as often to representations as it is to “reality”. These representations come to constitute a very great proportion of our perceived reality. And/or our perception of reality comes to be increasingly by means of these representations’.

Lash’s comments have a distinct resonance with certain qualities associated with the tribute band. The art of the tribute band involves creating as perfect as possible a representation of the tributed act. Many tribute bands go to great lengths to achieve this, both musically and visually. In some cases this involves seeking out vintage guitars, amplifiers and electronic effects, or having them specially built in order to capture the ‘authentic’ sound of the tributed act. Moreover, in many cases individual members of tribute bands attempt to emulate as closely as possible the image and persona of the musician they are portraying. Where a tributed act has a prominent front-person, the individual assuming this role will work particularly hard to ‘be’ that person, often perfecting his/her onstage posturing, and in many cases popular onstage phrases, the latter being learned verbatim by repeated listening to live albums and/or viewings of film and documentary footage of the tributed act.
As Jason Oakes suggests, through such emulative techniques, tribute bands ‘try to capture [the tributed act’s] essence’ (1995: 1). This involves studiously identifying those aspects of the tributed act that make it unique and perfecting its re-creation to the extent that a tribute band can pass itself off as ‘the real thing’.

The success of the tribute band in achieving this aim is of course also highly dependent upon the willingness of the audience to buy into and go along with the ‘trick of illusion’ that the tribute band attempts to stage. The issue of audience reception also needs to be set in context. As noted above, tribute bands have assumed their place in a world where the replication and reproduction of objects and images is increasingly taken for granted and largely perceived as ‘normal’. This is particularly striking in the case of popular music where, in addition to tribute bands, a range of television shows, such as Pop Idol and Stars In Their Eyes, feed an apparently inexhaustive desire on the part of audiences for rock and pop impersonators. However, a question might be asked as to why it is specifically popular music that has become the object of tribute acts. Certainly, other aspects of contemporary popular culture, notably sport, are now the focus of a ‘lookalike’ culture, demonstrated by the growing industry for imitators of sports personalities such as David Beckham at parties, weddings and other social functions. In the case of the tribute band, however, it is not ‘just’ the individual personality, or rather the latter’s representation, that provides the spectacle. Indeed, when seen close up, tribute band artists may not look that much like the artists they portray (and in some cases tribute bands consciously avoid attempting to copy the image of the tributed act altogether). Rather, the key ingredient of the tribute band and its success is the authentic reproduction of the music. Arguably, the appeal of the tribute band formula has everything to do with the way audiences respond to popular music and tribute bands’ understanding of this response. As a primary form of ‘youth’ leisure and entertainment during the 1950s, popular music was initially the most systematically commodified form of mass produced, post-war popular culture. Certainly, with the progression of time, popular music has given rise to its own taste cultures whose canonical discourses are often at least as elaborate, in terms of their justification for consuming particular objects and artefacts, as those used by connoisseurs of ‘high’ culture (Frith 1996). Indeed, one might go as far as to argue that, in mobilizing such discourses to separate out the good from the bad, the authentic from the inauthentic, certain popular music audiences engage in a process of ‘aurification’ (Benjamin 1973). One need only think of how, during the 1970s, ‘serious’ music fans held progressive rock groups, such as Genesis, Yes and Emerson Lake and Palmer in high esteem because of their technical ability and virtuosity, while rejecting top-20 orientated pop groups such as the Bay City Rollers, for their allegedly unashamed commercialism. Progressive rock groups commanded their own particular kind of aura. Fans of these groups engaged in an almost ritualistic form of fandom which involved
the ‘correct’ displays of musical appreciation and a knowledge about the musical backgrounds and technical abilities of the musicians involved.

However, as Frith and Horne (1987) observe, while progressive rock groups were highly revered by their fans, at the same time they were subject to exactly the same processes of commercialization as those regarded as being at the bottom of the artistic ladder. Irrespective of the particular discourses of authenticity that fans may attach to their icons, the latter are ultimately consumed as ‘products’ (Negus 1992). Moreover, as Frith (1988) notes, fans do not form direct relationships with rock and pop stars, but rather understand and articulate this relationship through the medium of their music and image. It is this quality of post-1950s popular music – the mechanical reproduction of its sounds, and the packaging of its stars – that has primed audiences for the tribute band experience. Already used to treating recorded sounds and mediated images as the primary text (Moore 1993), from the point of view of the audience it could be argued that tribute bands are merely another medium for the enjoyment of their favourite music. The audience realizes that the tribute is not the ‘real thing’, but this is not the point. For decades, records, tapes and videos have had to stand in for the original. Tribute bands follow this pattern of standing in for the original, but with the added novelty of the flesh and blood dimension which they bring to the reproduction of the music. In many ways, tribute bands are, to paraphrase Bob Geldof’s definition of his 1985 Live Aid event, a ‘live jukebox’, showcasing the hits and other old favourites from the tributed act’s back catalogue with the added appeal of a concert atmosphere.

All around the world

The global ubiquity of the tribute band phenomenon also lends itself to a postmodern interpretation. Bands tributing a variety of artists from each era of post-Second World War popular music history can now be found in major cities around the world. As previously stated, for Baudrillard (1983) a key manifestation of postmodernism’s representational affect is the ever intensifying global flow of images, with the image taking priority over the original artefact. For example, although a minority of people may have visited the Taj Mahal, or the pyramids of Egypt, through their appropriation by the media the images of these buildings have come to be known and instantly recognizable throughout the world. Moreover, the imagery and design of these and other buildings have been endlessly replicated in public spaces such as restaurants, shopping centres and theme parks. Eco (1987) argues that this increasing emphasis upon replication has led to a transformation of reality into ‘hyper-reality’. As Smart observes, the hyper-real has effectively dissolved the boundaries between ‘true’ and ‘false’, reality and reproduction, creating ‘a spatio-temporal haze where virtually everything appears present’ (1993: 53).
The tribute band phenomenon fits well with Smart’s description of a postmodern landscape in which the real and the hyper-real blur into one. An often cited explanation for the origins of the tribute band phenomenon is that it began as a response to the perpetual ‘unavailability’ of original acts in particular parts of the world (see Chapters 2 and 5). Many rock and pop acts, although having attained a global audience, may tour infrequently, and a tour of any given country on the international circuit may extend only to a few large venues. Thus, opportunities for fans to see a favourite group or artist are in many cases limited, both due to ticket availability and cost. Tribute bands effectively fill this void by providing an opportunity for fans to see authentic simulations of their favourite artists in a live context. In such instances, a tribute band’s replication not only stands in for the ‘real thing’; it frequently becomes a primary referent for the audience.

**Playing with time**

One further aspect of the tribute band phenomenon with a distinctly ‘postmodern’ edge is the often evident ‘disrespect’ displayed by tribute bands for chronological continuity. According to Redhead (1990), popular music is, by its very nature, a postmodern form due to its disruption of linear time. Pop time, argues Redhead, is ‘circular’, a feature that is most readily observed through the continuous re-emergence of music and related styles of clothing in a continuous cycle of pop-revivalism. Tribute bands add a significant new dimension to this process. In the course of tribute band performances, dead rock stars are brought back to life, defunct bands are reassembled, and classic live performances of yesteryear are accurately reproduced again and again. Moreover, in revisiting a tributed group or artist’s recording and performing history, tribute bands are in the privileged position of being able to creatively play around with that history and will often do so to present an idealized version of events. The following examples illustrate this point. The world renowned Beatles tribute band the Bootleg Beatles perform a cross-section of material from the entire Beatles’ back catalogue. This includes songs from post-*Revolver* albums which were never performed live by the Beatles themselves, the group having retired from live performance following their concert at San Francisco’s Candlestick Park in August 1966 (Giuliano 1992). Indeed, some of the later Beatles’ songs performed by the Bootleg Beatles, notably material from the 1967 *Sergeant Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band* album, were deemed to be irreproducible in a live context at the time of their release (see Martin and Hornsby 1979). Being in a position to reproduce this music, using state of the art digital effects to create the brass and string parts, together with other sound effects heard in later Beatles’ songs, the Bootleg Beatles cut through such accepted historical narratives, presenting instead the show that members of the audience ‘want to see’. For example, during their national
UK tour of 2002, the spotlight trained on ‘Bootleg John’ as he sang ‘A Day in the Life’ (the closing track from Sergeant Pepper), complete with his pastel green Sergeant Pepper bandsman’s uniform and seated at the trademark white grand piano.

Three years earlier, the Bootleg Beatles had recreated the Beatles’ legendary ‘rooftop’ concert at 3 Saville Row, formerly the headquarters of the Apple Organisation. Held to mark the 30th anniversary of the original rooftop concert, the Bootleg Beatles played an entire set to the delight of the crowd. The Beatles’ original concert, as depicted in the 1970 film Let It Be, had to be cut short part way through the song ‘Get Back’ following an intervention by the police who were concerned about the traffic congestion caused by the large numbers of people that had gathered in the streets below to listen. As with the live rendition of ‘A Day in the Life’, prior to the Bootleg Beatles’ performance, the complete rooftop concert had existed only in the imagination of Beatles’ fans. Through the hyper-reality of the Bootleg Beatles’ recreation of the event, however, this particular fan fantasy was brought dramatically to life.

To cite a further example of how tribute bands use their creative licence to rework pop history, the Rolling Stones tribute band the Counterfeit Stones perform a selection of music from the complete Rolling Stones’ back catalogue. During the course of their career, the Rolling Stones have had three different lead guitarists: Brian Jones, Mick Taylor and Ronnie Wood.
Although the Counterfeit Stones perform songs originally featuring each of these respective musicians, until quite recently the lead guitar was played throughout by ‘Bryon Jones’, a band member posing as original Rolling Stones’ lead guitarist Brian Jones. At a pragmatic level, the inclusion of ‘Bryon Jones’ for the whole of the performance helps retain a sense of continuity. Replicating the series of Rolling Stones’ line-up changes over the course of a two hour stage performance, with one band member periodically changing identity, would disrupt the flow of the performance both temporally and visually. However, the omnipresence of Bryon Jones also works at an aesthetic level. For many Rolling Stones fans, the line-up featuring Brian Jones marks a time when the group released their best songs, and were at their best musically. Similarly, what are now regarded as the ‘classic’ Rolling Stones publicity shots, and those which established the group’s reputation as rock icons, are the ones taken during the mid-1960s prior to Jones’ departure from the group and subsequent untimely death.3

Thus far, I have been concerned to address those qualities of the tribute band phenomenon that most closely align with alleged characteristics of postmodern affect. There are, however, a further set of issues that need to be examined in relation to why tribute bands have become such a popular form of entertainment over the last 20 years. I have already noted how part of the appeal of the tribute band phenomenon relates to its feeding the audience’s desire to experience again the spectacle of their favourite artists in a live setting and, in some cases, to have particular unfulfilled dreams regarding these artists brought to life. I have also noted how a major part of the tribute band’s success rests on the willingness of the audience to go along with the ‘trick of illusion’ that the tribute band performs. At the same time, however, tribute bands bring their own particular performative conventions to the live concert experience as a means of drawing the audience into the event, which I will now consider.

Small is beautiful

While the level of success achieved by some tribute bands is such that they now attract a considerable audience and thus play primarily in larger venues, many tribute bands continue to play in small clubs and bars. In certain cases, a tribute band performing in a small venue can seem anomalous, particularly when the act they tribute would generally perform in much larger venues. For example, in the course of researching the Benwell Floyd, a Pink Floyd tribute from the city of Newcastle upon Tyne in the North East of England, I attended one of the band’s concerts at a workingmen’s club in a small village in County Durham. On entering the club, just prior to the band’s soundcheck, I was struck by the amount of instruments, sound and lighting equipment and stage props crammed onto the small stage (see Bennett 2000). As the
performance got underway, however, it became evident that the compact nature of the venue facilitated a sense of intimacy, and thus an easy interaction, between the band and its audience. In this respect, there are clear comparisons between the tribute band phenomenon and the British pub rock scene of the early 1970s. Central to the pub rock ethos was an emphasis on small-scale, accessible live music performance in contrast to the growing trend towards stadium rock. As Laing (1985: 8) observes: 'The size of the bar-room allowed for, even insisted upon, the intimacy between musicians and audience [that pub rock bands] believed was somehow essential for meaningful music. Pub rock’s stance implied that things went wrong for bands when they became superstars and “lost touch” with their original audiences.'

While most tribute bands do not share the reactionary stance of the pub rock scene, the chemistry underpinning tribute band performances is equally reliant on the creation of an intimate relationship between performance and audience. Perhaps the primary difference is that pub rock bands challenged stadium rock, not only ideologically but also musically, and prided themselves on performing simply arranged three-minute songs in contrast to the musically complex, and often elongated, songs of stadium rock bands (see Bennett 2001). In contrast, tribute bands span the whole spectrum of post-1950s popular music, including those stadium rock artists so despised by the pub rock movement. For some rock ‘purists’, the notion of a tribute band remaking the music of stadium rock giants such as the Eagles, Genesis or Pink Floyd in a local bar may seem repulsive. And yet for many members of the audience, the success of a tribute band in transcending the ‘epic’ quality of stadium rock appears to form part of the appeal of the tribute band formula. By taking stadium rock and performing it in small, accessible, local venues, tribute bands effectively bring this music ‘home’ for their audience. Although the gravitation of many rock and pop stars to the stadium (or, to use current parlance, arena circuit) may have suited the commercial incentives of the music industry, it has not uniformly been to the liking of music fans. Having shared in the excitement of early live performances in smaller local venues, fans of the more successful rock and pop artists saw their icons become bigger and more remote, in some cases becoming casualties of rock excess. Thus, for many fans, tribute bands present something of a ‘return to form’, turning the rock process full circle by bringing the music back into smaller, more intimate and accessible venues. Indeed, as a member of the Benwell Floyd observed on one occasion, people in the band’s audience had openly expressed their preference for Benwell Floyd concerts over Pink Floyd concerts because of the intimate atmosphere. The band member continued:

Wherever we go there's always a core of people there who we know and vice versa. But I also think it's how we're doin' it . . . I mean, I like Pink Floyd a lot, but there's this thing you know, you're shelling out
a load of money to watch four dots on a stage half a mile away. What we’re doing is accessible . . . it’s there like . . . for people to see. (Bennett 2000: 176)

In addition to lending intimacy to tribute band performances, smaller venues have the added attraction of charging more affordable ticket prices and being situated in easy to reach locations. The relatively low-key, affordable and accessible nature of tribute band performances has also made them highly popular among family groups. Cohen (1991) and Bennett (2000) have each noted the significance of popular music in parent–children relationships, with children often inheriting tastes in music directly from their parents. Moreover, such shared musical tastes may form the basis for other aspects of kin relations, with parents and children listening to music together and collectively discussing the meaning of lyrics, and so on. Such discussions may in turn lead to parents sharing particular music-related stories with their children, for example, seeing Jimi Hendrix perform at the 1970 Isle of Wight Festival, or queuing for hours to buy tickets for a Led Zeppelin concert. In an age where such conventions of music fandom have been displaced by breakthroughs in television broadcasting, dedicated music channels and internet ticketing services, such stories may seem even more magical from the point of view of children for whom music of all kinds is now available quite literally at the touch of a button. Tribute bands thus provide an ideal, and in some cases exclusive, opportunity for parents to take their children along to experience in a live context the music they share and talk about at home.

Sharing the Joke

Another device used by tribute bands as a means of connecting with their audience is the use of humour. Although the tribute band performance is ultimately about reproducing the music and onstage persona of the tributed act, there is often scope for the use of humorous asides. Even among those tribute bands who have achieved higher levels of success, necessitating that they play in venues with a capacity of several thousand, a level of rapport with the audience is maintained through the injection of humour into the performance. For example, during a Bootleg Beatles performance which I attended in 1999, part way through the band’s set Bootleg John suddenly broke into the opening bars of ‘Imagine’ on the piano, before stopping abruptly and exclaiming, ‘oops, I haven’t written that one yet!’ Similarly, during a Counterfeit Stones concert, lead singer Nick Dagger noted on several occasions how well Bryon Jones had done to learn ‘all the new songs’ (meaning those songs written and performed after Brian Jones’ departure from the Rolling Stones). In addition to adding to the entertainment value of a tribute band’s performance, such devices, drawing as they do on elements of
satire, function as important role-breaking moments. Although the primary function of the tribute band is to replicate the object of its tribute as accurately and 'authentically' as possible, it is important that tribute bands do not overstep the mark in this respect. Tribute bands gain the adulation of the audience through the quality of their portrayal of the tributed act, not through actually claiming to 'be' the artists they tribute. It is thus crucial in this respect that tribute bands are seen to not take themselves 'too' seriously. This is achieved by occasionally reminding themselves and the audience that they are not 'the real thing'. The use of humour enables tribute bands to laugh about themselves and invites the audience to share the joke.

Opportunities for the use of humour also exist where both the tribute band and its audience are from a particular place or region and share the same local knowledge and experience. During my research on the Benwell Floyd, I would often note how the group's frontman made use of local dialect and in-jokes common to the North East region of England as a means of generating a rapport with the audience. On one occasion the frontman emerged onto the stage for the group's second set of the evening wearing a Newcastle United football shirt, knowing full well that many members of the audience were Sunderland supporters, the intense local rivalry that exists between Newcastle and the nearby town of Sunderland being echoed in the support for their local football teams. There then followed an ongoing banter between the frontman and the audience regarding the relative merits and shortcomings of each other's team. During an interval between songs a member of the audience jokingly commented 'Your music's great man, no worries. But that top stinks' (Bennett 2000: 190). At the end of the performance the Benwell Floyd's frontman had one last football-related joke with the audience: 'Goodnight, thanks for having us and I hope your team does better next year!' (Bennett 2000: 191).

Although musically very proficient, much of the success generated by the Benwell Floyd undoubtedly revolved around their ability to engage at a local level with their audience in this way. The use of a strong local dialect by the group's frontman, his ability to name-check local places and his knowledge about the region's local culture, were all crucial to the rapport he shared with the audience and made his tongue in cheek references to issues such as the rivalry between Newcastle and Sunderland acceptable; lacking such local knowledge, a person from outside the region would almost certainly have failed to achieve the same level of rapport with the audience.

The use of local imagery is another way in which tribute bands can imbue themselves with a sense of humour and highlight the parodic aspects of their craft. For example, during a mid-1990s tour of the UK, the Australian Pink Floyd Show issued a tour poster and flyer listing concert dates that drew on the design of the 1977 Pink Floyd album *Animals*. On the original album cover, a huge inflatable pig is seen floating above the derelict Battersea Power Station in London. The Australian Pink Floyd Show's poster and flyer replaced
the inflatable pig with an inflatable kangaroo. Clearly, at one level, such a branding device adheres to a particular stereotype of Australia. On the other hand, it communicates the Australian tribute’s sense of parody and imitation to the audience. Like the Benwell Floyd, they are accepting of the fact that they are ‘not’ the real thing and draw on a particular local resource as a means of underscoring this fact.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the tribute band phenomena both as an aspect of postmodern culture and a form of performance that draws on everyday knowledge relating to place, intimacy and humour. It has been argued that from a sociological perspective many of the features of the tribute band phenomenon align closely with particular characteristics associated with postmodernity. In particular, the tribute band’s aim of achieving a near perfect simulacrum as possible of the tributed act corresponds with the reproduction and simulation often associated with postmodern affect. Similarly, in using their creative licence to recreate aspects of a tributed act’s performing history, tribute bands exemplify the process identified by Redhead (1990) whereby popular music, as a quintessentially postmodern cultural form, subverts the linear progression of time associated with modernity and replaces this with ‘circular’ pop time. Despite these features of the tribute band phenomenon, however, it has also been argued that a great part of its appeal also depends upon the willingness of the audience to buy into the illusion staged by the band. To some extent this can also be attributed to postmodern affect in that we now live in a world where reproduction and simulation are taken increasingly for granted. At the same time, however, tribute bands use a number of other, more mundane, strategies in achieving a rapport with their audience. Thus, the use of small venues creates an intimacy in tribute band performances which in turn ensures a high level of communication between band and audience. Similarly, the use of humour by tribute bands allows them to periodically come out of their role as imitators and helps them retain affinity with the audience. The use of humour also serves to emphasize the point that a tribute band is an elaborate trick of illusion, rather than ‘the real thing’.

Notes

1 The Bootleg Beatles’ reproduction of later Beatles songs is also sometimes achieved by using real orchestral instruments played by guest musicians. The combination of these instruments with the conventional rock instruments used by the Bootleg Beatles in a live context is reliant on the use of high
quality acoustic pickups capable of accurately reproducing the sounds of orchestral instruments from the piccolo trumpet, featured on ‘Penny Lane’, to the strings used on ‘I Am The Walrus’. Again, this technology was unavailable to the Beatles at the time when this material was originally released.

2 John Lennon is seen playing a white grand piano both during a performance of the song ‘I Am The Walrus’ in the film *Magical Mystery Tour* (1967) and four years later in the promotion film for his post-Beatles hit ‘Imagine’ (1971).

3 More recently, the Counterfeit Stones have acquired a new member, Dave Birnie, who does indeed change identity throughout the band’s set, beginning as ‘Bryon Jones’ (Brian Jones), then changing into ‘Mick Tailor-Made’ (Mick Taylor), and finally becoming Ronnie B. Goode (Ronnie Wood). The band has added a further member in the form of ‘Nicky Popkiss’ (keyboardist Nicky Hopkins who recorded and performed with the Rolling Stones as a guest musician during the late 1960s and early 1970s). Significantly, however, the pictures on the Counterfeit Stones website continue to feature the original Rolling Stones line-up, including a recreation of the promotional shot for the group’s 1968 rockumentary, *Rock and Roll Circus*.
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